Shock capturing schemes based on nonuniform nonlinear weighted interpolation for conservation laws and their application as subcell limiters for FR/CPR
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Abstract

A series of shock capturing schemes based on nonuniform nonlinear weighted interpolation on nonuniform points are developed for conservation laws. Smoothness indicator and discrete conservation laws are discussed. To make fair comparisons between different types of schemes, the properties of eigenvalues of spatial discretization matrices are proved. And the proposed schemes are compared with Weighted Compact Nonlinear Schemes (WCNS) and Flux Reconstruction or Correction Procedure via Reconstruction (FR/CPR) in dispersion, dissipation properties and numerical accuracy. Then, the proposed shock capturing schemes are used as subcell limiters for high-order FR/CPR and the hybrid scheme has superiority in data transformation and satisfying discrete conservation laws. Accuracy, discrete conservation laws and shock capturing properties are tested. Numerical results in one and two dimensions are provided to illustrate that the proposed schemes have good properties in shock capturing and can be applied as subcell limiters for FR/CPR.
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1. Introduction

High-order methods have been widely used in large eddy simulations (LES) and direct numerical simulations (DNS) of turbulent flows, computational aeroacoustics (CAA) and shock-induced separation flows \cite{1,2,3,4}. Since solution of conservation laws may contain discontinuities even if the initial conditions are smooth, numerical methods need to be designed carefully to capture discontinuities effectively without generating obvious oscillations. High-order finite difference (FD) schemes based on nonlinear weighted interpolation have good properties in capturing discontinuities, for instance, WENO schemes \cite{5,6} and WCNS schemes \cite{7,8}. These FD schemes take nonlinear interpolations to obtain fluxes at interface and use the same difference operator to discretize flux derivative for different solution points. On the other hand, high-order finite element (FE) methods are compact, efficient to parallel and applicable to complex unstructured meshes, such as DG and FR/CPR. These FE schemes take high-order linear interpolation in one cell to obtain fluxes at interface and use different operator to discretize flux derivative for different solution points in the cell. Although These FE schemes introduce Riemann fluxes at cell interface, the shock-capturing ability still can not meet the need of many simulations with strong shocks \cite{2,3,9}. FD schemes based on uniformly spaced solution points are difficult to be combined with FE method, which usually take nonuniformly spaced solution points, to capture discontinuities. Data transformations between FE solution points and FD solution points
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need to be done, which will add extra computation times and make it difficult to satisfy discrete conservation law [10, 11].

The problem of finite element method, such as DG and FR/CPR, to capture shock or large gradients is mainly caused by improper approximation of the discontinuity appearing in a cell by taking the same high-order polynomial for all solution points and using compact difference operator in one cell. There exist different approaches to deal with this problem. One approach is to add artificial viscosity to the original equations to change properties of PDE and smear out oscillations near discontinuities [12]. Another approach is to limit the solution distribution in a cell, such as Hermite WENO limiter [13, 14, 15], a simple WENO limiter [9, 16, 17], P-Weighted limiter [18] and MLP limiter [19]. The high order DG schemes relying on element based limited reconstructions would have wide shock width and do not have sub element resolution. Another approach is hp-adaption which reduce the degree of the polynomials in shock regions and refine the grid to guarantee the resolution [20, 21].

Recently, a new subcell limiting procedure is developed, which refines the DG cell in shock region into subcells and adopts shock capturing schemes on the subcells. In 2014, Dumbser et al. proposed a posterior subcell limitig for DG method for the simple Cartesian case in [22], which refines the troubled cells into equally spaced subcells and take finite volume (FV) method to recompute the discrete solution. The method has the ability to resolve discontinuities at a sub-grid scale. In 2016, Dumbser extended the method to general unstructured triangular and tetrahedral meshes in two and three space dimensions [23], where an edge of the simplex element is equally divided into sub-edges. In 2017, Boscheri and Dumbser generalized the method to moving unstructured meshes [24]. In 2019, Ioriatti and Dumbser presented a posteriori sub-cell FV limiting of staggered semi-implicit DG schemes for the shallow water equations [25]. An even more general idea based on subcell type shock capturing was recently introduced by Vilar [26]. Although this posteriori approach is effective for shock capturing, the posteriori strategy is a bit complicate for code design and equally spaced subcells need data transformation or projection between DG cells and FV subcells, which adds extra costs.

Another approach is to design subcell limiting by taking a proiri strategy and using an inherent refinement of the DG elements into several FV sub-cells with a lower order approximation without changing the degrees of freedom (DOFs) [27]. Each sub-cell is associated with one degree of freedom within the DG grid cell. In 2021, Kraus et al. combined DG spectral element method with a subcell FV method to capture shocks in their FLEXI framework [28]. In 2021, Hennemann et al. extended the subcell idea and proposed a shock capturing approach for discretely entropy stable collocation discontinuous Galerkin spectral element method (DGSEM) with Legendre Gauss-Lobatto (LGL) nodes based on a subcell low order FV type discretization, which directly uses the nodal LGL values of the high order entropy stable DGSEM [29]. We can see that these approaches take nonuniformly spaced solution points of DG schemes and show superiority in data exchange and discrete conservation law. All of these shock capturing schemes try to vary high-order polynomial distribution of physical variables or fluxes for all solution points.

Based on these observation, this paper deal with this problem by developing novel shock capturing schemes based on nonuniform spaced solution points, which are flexible to be combined with high-order finite element methods (including DG, FR/CPR, SD). Nonuniform nonlinear weighted interpolations are developed to introduce nonlinear mechanism and flux derivatives are discretized by using fluxes in one cell to make scheme compact. In addition, shock capturing schemes with different resolution and robustness will be developed by varying accuracy order of interpolation and accuracy order of difference operator. In order to combine with CPR schemes, shock capturing schemes are constructed based on nonlinear weighted interpolation directly using the nodal Gauss values of high-order FR/CPR schemes. Then, a priori subcell limiting procedure is developed for FR/CPR method. The indicator based on modal energy is used to detect discontinuity and the troubled cells are solved by the proposed shock capturing schemes. Based on nonuniform nonlinear weighted interpolations, the new subcell limiting procedure has some merits in less data exchange for physical variables and in preserving discrete conservation law.

The main contributions of this paper are as follows:

1. Nonuniform nonlinear weighted (NNW) interpolations are proposed. Both of high-order nonlinear interpolation and second order nonlinear interpolation are considered. Calculation of smoothness indicators in nonuniform solution points are discussed.

2. Compact nonuniform nonlinear weighted (CNNW) schemes are constructed by taking NNW interpolation to obtain the left and right values of Riemann fluxes and discretizing flux derivative by using fluxes in one cell to make scheme compact. Discrete conservation laws are given. To make fair comparisons between different
schemes, properties of eigenvalues of spatial discretization matrix are proved and eigenvalues of different high-order schemes are calculation by the same method.

(3) High-order FR/CPR method based on subcell CNNW limiter are proposed. CNNW are applied in discontinuous area while FR/CPR are used in smooth area. A series of CNNW with different resolution are applied to blend smooth area to discontinuous area.

(4) Numerical experiments are conducted to show the good properties in accuracy, shock capturing ability and discrete conservation law of the proposed CNNW and CPR based on CNNW subcell limiter (CPR-CNNW).

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we develop nonuniform nonlinear weighted interpolation and compact nonuniform nonlinear weighted schemes based on nonuniformly spaced solution points. Smooth indicators, discrete conservation law and spectral properties are discussed. Section 3 gives FR/CPR scheme based on subcell CNNW limiter and Section 4 shows numerical investigation about CNNW and hybrid schemes CPR-CNNW. The conclusion is given in the Section 5.

2. Shock capturing schemes based on nonuniform nonlinear weighted interpolation

In this section, we first introduce high-order CPR which will be combined with the new shock capturing schemes. Secondly, nonuniform nonlinear weighted (NNW) interpolation is developed based on the nonuniform solution points of high-order FR/CPR schemes. Thirdly, a fifth-order shock capturing scheme based on the fifth-order NNW interpolation and the fifth-order compact differential operator is developed. Smoothness indicator and discrete conservation law are discussed for the proposed schemes. In addition, different differential operators and different interpolations are given to construct shock capturing schemes. At last, all eigenvalues of space discretization matrix are analyzed for different schemes and spectral properties are compared with each other.

2.1. The high-order FR/CPR

Correction procedure via reconstruction (CPR) method was originally proposed by Huynh as flux reconstruction (FR) for structured grids [30] and then was generalized to unstructured grids by Wang et al. [31]. Here we take a brief review of the CPR method. For more details we refer to papers [30, 32, 31].

Consider conservation law in physical space

\[
\frac{\partial \mathbf{U}}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}) = 0,
\]

where \( \mathbf{U} \) is the conservative variable vector, and \( \mathbf{F} \) is the inviscid flux. By introducing an arbitrary test function \( W \) and applying integration by parts, the weak form of the conservation law can be obtained,

\[
\int_{V_i} \frac{\partial \mathbf{U}}{\partial t} W d\Omega + \int_{\partial V_i} (\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}) \cdot \mathbf{n}) W dS - \int_{V_i} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}) \nabla W d\Omega = 0.
\]

After replacing the normal flux term \( \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}) \cdot \mathbf{n} \) by a common Riemann flux \( \mathbf{F}_{\text{com}} \) and applying integration by parts again, we obtain

\[
\int_{V_i} \frac{\partial \mathbf{U}^h}{\partial t} W d\Omega + \int_{\partial V_i} [\mathbf{F}_{\text{com}} - (\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}^h) \cdot \mathbf{n})] W dS + \int_{V_i} W \nabla \cdot \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}^h) d\Omega = 0.
\]

In order to transform the second integral term in (2) into an elemental integral, a correction field \( \delta_j \) is defined as

\[
\int_{V_i} W \delta_j d\Omega = \int_{\partial V_i} [\mathbf{F}_{\text{com}} - (\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}^h) \cdot \mathbf{n})] W dS.
\]

Then, according to (2) and (3), we obtain the following form,
By projecting the second term onto the degree $n$ polynomial space and noticing that the equation (4) holds for a set of test functions, we can obtain the following differential form,

$$\frac{\partial U_h^i}{\partial t} + \Pi \nabla \cdot F(U_h^i) + \delta_i = 0,$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

where $\Pi$ denotes the projection operator of the nonlinear flux to the polynomial space.

After transformation into the computational space, conservation law (1) becomes

$$\frac{\partial \hat{U}}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \hat{F}}{\partial \xi} + \frac{\partial \hat{G}}{\partial \eta} = 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

where $\hat{U} = JU$, $\hat{F} = F\hat{\xi} + G\hat{\eta}$, $\hat{G} = F\hat{\eta} + G\hat{\xi}$. Here grid metrics are

$${\hat{\xi}}_x = J\xi_x = y_\eta, \quad \hat{\eta}_x = J\eta_x = -y_\xi,$$

$${\hat{\xi}}_y = J\xi_y = -x_\eta, \quad \hat{\eta}_y = J\eta_y = x_\xi.$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

and Jacobian is

$$J = \left| \frac{\partial (x, y)}{\partial (\xi, \eta)} \right| = x_\xi y_\eta - x_\eta y_\xi.$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

In this paper, we take Gauss-Legendre points as solution points and Legendre-Lobatto points as flux points, as shown in Fig. 1. For quadrilateral cells, the operations are in fact one-dimensional. Thus, for two-dimensional case, each element has $K + 1$ solution points and $K + 2$ flux points in each direction, as shown in Fig. 2.

The conservation variables inside one element are approximated by polynomials, for example the following degree $K$ Lagrange interpolation polynomial

$$U_{i,j}^h(\xi, \eta) = \sum_{l=1}^{K+1} \sum_{m=1}^{K+1} U_{i,j,l,m} L_l(\xi)L_m(\eta),$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)
where $U_{i,j,l,m}$ are the state variables at the solution point $(l, m)$ of the $(i, j)$ cell, $L_l(\xi)$ and $L_m(\eta)$ are the 1D Lagrange polynomials in $\xi$ and $\eta$ direction. Then, Lagrange Polynomial (LP) approach is applied to approximate the second term in (5),

$$
\hat{F}_{i,j}(\xi, \eta) = K + 2 \sum_{l=1}^{K+1} \sum_{m=1}^{K+1} \hat{F}_{i,j,l,m} L_l(\xi) L_m(\eta), \quad \hat{G}_{i,j}(\xi, \eta) = K + 1 \sum_{l=1}^{K+2} \sum_{m=1}^{K+1} \hat{F}_{i,j,l,m} L_l(\xi) L_m(\eta).
$$

Then, the flux derivatives in (6) can be obtained.

Therefore, the nodal values of the state variable $U$ at the solution points are updated by following equations

$$
\frac{\partial \hat{U}_{i,j,l,m}}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \hat{F}_{i,j}(\xi_l, \eta_m)}{\partial \xi} + \frac{\partial \hat{G}_{i,j}(\xi_l, \eta_m)}{\partial \eta} + \delta_{i,j}(\xi_l, \eta_m) = 0, \quad 1 \leq l, m \leq K + 1
$$

where

$$
\delta_{i,j}(\xi_l, \eta_m) = \left[ \hat{F}_{i,j}(-1, \eta_m) - \hat{F}_{i,j}(-1, \eta_m) \right] g'_L(\xi_l) + \left[ \hat{F}_{i,j}(1, \eta_m) - \hat{F}_{i,j}(1, \eta_m) \right] g'_R(\xi_l)
\quad + \left[ \hat{G}_{i,j}(\xi_l, -1) - \hat{G}_{i,j}(\xi_l, -1) \right] g'_L(\eta_m) + \left[ \hat{G}_{i,j}(\xi_l, 1) - \hat{G}_{i,j}(\xi_l, 1) \right] g'_R(\eta_m).
$$

Here $\delta_{i,j}(\xi, \eta)$ is a correction flux polynomial, $g'_L(\xi)$ and $g'_R(\xi)$ are both the degree $K + 1$ polynomials called correction functions. $\hat{F}$ and $\hat{G}$ are the common fluxes. Riemann solvers can be used to compute common fluxes, such as Lax-Friedrichs, Roe, Osher, AUSM, HLL, and their modifications. We refer to papers [33, 34] and references therein. Correction functions are chosen to be $g_L = R_{R,L,K+1}$, $g_R = R_{L,R,K+1}$. Here $R_{L,R,K+1}$ and $R_{R,L,K+1}$ are the left and right Radau polynomials $R_{R,L,K+1} = \frac{(-1)^{K+1}}{2} (P_{K+1} - P_K)$ and the right Radau polynomial $R_{L,R,K+1} = \frac{1}{2} (P_{K+1} + P_K)$. $P_K$ is the Legendre polynomial of order $K$. For case $K = 4$,

$$
g'_L(\xi) = -\frac{1}{16} (315\xi^4 - 140\xi^3 - 210\xi^2 + 60\xi + 15), \quad g'_R(\xi) = \frac{1}{16} (315\xi^4 + 140\xi^3 - 210\xi^2 - 60\xi + 15).
$$

The FR/CPR method considered in this paper is equivalent to DG method. For the equivalence of FR and DG, we refer to details in [35]. For simplicity, we just use the name CPR in the following.

### 2.2. NNW interpolation

For capturing shock effectively, nonlinear weighted interpolations were used in MUSCL [36, 37], WENO [5, 6] and WCNS schemes [7, 8] to prevent interpolation across discontinuities. In this section, we generalize the nonlinear interpolations to nonuniformly spaced solution points in the computational space.
2.2.1. High-order Nonuniform nonlinear weighted (NNW) interpolation

Suppose a computational element has \( K + 1 \) solution points and \( K + 2 \) flux points. The solution points locate in the internal of the element and flux points contain two endpoints of the cell. Solution points and flux points are located in staggered distribution, which means each solution point locates between two flux points, as shown in Fig. 3. In this paper, we take Gauss-Legendre points as solution points and Legendre-Lobatto points as flux points, which are the same as those of CPR schemes described in Subsection 2.1. Although this paper focuses on Gauss solution points and Lobatto flux points, the interpolation presented in the following is applicable to any kinds of solution points and flux points. Then, nonlinear weighted interpolation are taken to obtain the flow-field variables at flux points. Here we take fifth-order nonlinear weighted interpolation for instance.

NNW interpolation takes a stencil of several adjacent solution points, as shown in Fig. 3. Here we give fifth-order nonlinear weighted interpolation in one-dimensional case for obtaining the right values at the first flux point of the \( i \)th cell \( u_{i,fp_1} \) based on the stencil of \( sp_1 \), where the subscript \( fp_1 \) and \( sp_1 \) denote the first flux point and the first solution point at the \( i \)th cell, correspondingly. The interpolation for other flux point values can be obtained by similar procedure.

Step A: Choose a stencil of five points \( S_{i,sp_1} = \{u_{i-1,sp_4}, u_{i-1,sp_5}, u_{i,sp_1}, u_{i,sp_2}, u_{i,sp_3}\} \) and divide this stencil into three small stencil \( S_{i,sp_1}^{(1)} = \{u_{i-1,sp_4}, u_{i-1,sp_5}, u_{i,sp_1}\} \), \( S_{i,sp_1}^{(2)} = \{u_{i-1,sp_1}, u_{i,sp_1}, u_{i,sp_2}\} \), \( S_{i,sp_1}^{(3)} = \{u_{i,sp_1}, u_{i,sp_2}, u_{i,sp_3}\} \).

Step B: Construct Lagrange interpolation polynomial \( p_{sp_1}^{(m)}(\xi) \) in each stencil \( S_{i,sp_1}^{(m)} \), \( m = 1, 2, 3 \), we have

\[
\begin{align*}
p_{sp_1}^{(1)}(\xi_{fp_1}) &= c_{11}u_{i-1,sp_4} + c_{12}u_{i-1,sp_5} + c_{13}u_{i,sp_1}, \\
p_{sp_1}^{(2)}(\xi_{fp_1}) &= c_{21}u_{i-1,sp_5} + c_{22}u_{i,sp_1} + c_{23}u_{i,sp_2}, \\
p_{sp_1}^{(3)}(\xi_{fp_1}) &= c_{31}u_{i,sp_1} + c_{32}u_{i,sp_2} + c_{33}u_{i,sp_3}.
\end{align*}
\]

Step C: Calculate the linear weights \( d_m \) for each stencil \( S_{i,sp_1}^{(m)} \), \( m = 1, 2, 3 \). The fifth-order linear interpolation for obtaining \( u_{i,fp_1} \) can be obtained by Taylor expansion or Lagrange interpolation polynomial,

\[
u_{i,fp_1} = a_{11}u_{i-1,sp_4} + a_{12}u_{i-1,sp_5} + a_{13}u_{i,sp_1} + a_{14}u_{i,sp_2} + a_{15}u_{i,sp_3}
\]

According to the relation

\[
\begin{align*}
a_{11}u_{i-1,sp_4} + a_{12}u_{i-1,sp_5} + a_{13}u_{i,sp_1} + a_{14}u_{i,sp_2} + a_{15}u_{i,sp_3} \\
&= d_1(c_{11}u_{i-1,sp_4} + c_{12}u_{i-1,sp_5} + c_{13}u_{i,sp_1}) \\
&+ d_2(c_{21}u_{i-1,sp_5} + c_{22}u_{i,sp_1} + c_{23}u_{i,sp_2}) \\
&+ d_3(c_{31}u_{i,sp_1} + c_{32}u_{i,sp_2} + c_{33}u_{i,sp_3}),
\end{align*}
\]

the linear weights \( d_1, d_2, d_3 \) can be obtained. Coefficients and linear weights in NNW5 interpolation are collected in Appendix A.

Step D: Compute smoothness indicator \( \beta_m \) and nonlinear weights \( \omega_m \) to get NNW interpolation value at the flux points \( \xi_{fp_1} \).
where \( \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3\} \) are nonlinear weights. Various types of nonlinear weights have been developed, we refer to [38] and references therein. We consider two types of nonlinear weights in this paper. The first one is the JS weights [5], which are defined by

\[
\omega_k = \frac{\beta_k}{\sum_{m=1}^{3} \beta_m}, \quad \beta_k = \frac{d_k}{(\epsilon + IS_{k,sp_i})^2},
\]

where \( \epsilon = 10^{-6} \) is a small number and \( IS_{k,sp_i} \) is a smooth indicator. The second one is the Z weights [38], which are defined by

\[
\omega_k = \frac{\beta_k}{\sum_{m=1}^{3} \beta_m}, \quad \beta_k = d_k \left( 1 + \frac{|IS_{sp_i} - IS_{sp_j}|}{\epsilon + IS_{k,sp_i}} \right),
\]

where \( \epsilon = 10^{-10} \) is a small number and \( IS_{k,sp_i} \) is a smoothness indicator.

Smoothness indicators used in nonlinear interpolation need to be carefully calculated in the case of nonuniformly spaced solution points. Suppose grid transformation from physical coordinates to computational coordinates is a linear transformation. Then, for the \( l \) th subcell \( [\xi_{fp_i}, \xi_{fp_{i+1}}] \) we have \( x_{\xi} = \frac{\Delta l}{\Delta \xi} \) with \( \Delta l = x_{fp_{i+1}} - x_{fp_i} \) and \( \Delta \xi_{\xi} = \xi_{fp_{i+1}} - \xi_{fp_i} \). For the small stencil \( S_{sp_i}^{(k)} \), the corresponding interpolation polynomial \( p^{(k)}_{sp_i}(\xi) \) is of degree 2. Then, we have

\[
\omega_k = \frac{\beta_k}{\sum_{m=1}^{3} \beta_m}, \quad \beta_k = d_k \left( 1 + \frac{|IS_{sp_i} - IS_{sp_j}|}{\epsilon + IS_{k,sp_i}} \right),
\]

where \( \epsilon = 10^{-10} \) is a small number and \( IS_{k,sp_i} \) is a smoothness indicator.

Therefore, accurate smoothness indicator becomes

\[
IS_{k,sp_i}^{\text{accurate}} = \int_{\xi_{fp_i}}^{\xi_{fp_{i+1}}} (\Delta l) \left( \frac{\partial p^{(k)}_{sp_i}}{\partial \xi} \right)^2 d\xi + \int_{\xi_{fp_i}}^{\xi_{fp_{i+1}}} (\Delta l)^3 \left( \frac{\partial^2 p^{(k)}_{sp_i}}{\partial \xi^2} \right)^2 d\xi
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{6} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial p^{(k)}_{sp_i}}{\partial \xi} \right)_{\xi_{fp_i}}^2 + 4 \left( \frac{\partial p^{(k)}_{sp_i}}{\partial \xi} \right)_{\xi_{fp_i} + \xi_{fp_{i+1}}}^2 \right] (\Delta l)^2
\]

\[
+ \left( \frac{\partial^2 p^{(k)}_{sp_i}}{\partial \xi^2} \right)_{\xi_{fp_i}}^2 (\Delta l)^4.
\]

Approximate \( \int_{\xi_{fp_i}}^{\xi_{fp_{i+1}}} (\Delta l) \left( \frac{\partial p^{(k)}_{sp_i}}{\partial \xi} \right)^2 d\xi \) by \( \left( \frac{\partial p^{(k)}_{sp_i}}{\partial \xi} \right)_{\xi_{fp_i}}^2 (\Delta l)^2 \), we obtain following new indicator:

\[
IS_{k,sp_i}^{\text{new}} = \left( \frac{\partial p^{(k)}_{sp_i}}{\partial \xi} \right)_{\xi_{fp_i}}^2 (\Delta l)^2 + \left( \frac{\partial^2 p^{(k)}_{sp_i}}{\partial \xi^2} \right)_{\xi_{fp_i}}^2 (\Delta l)^4.
\]
For comparison, we also consider the indicator used in WCNS for uniformly spaced solution points,

\[ I_{k,sp}^{\text{ori}} = \left( \frac{\partial p_{sp}}{\partial \xi} \right)_{sp}^2 + \left( \frac{\partial^2 p_{sp}}{\partial \xi^2} \right)_{sp}^2. \]  

(16)

2.2.2. Second-order NNW interpolation

Here we propose second-order nonuniform nonlinear weighted interpolation. Consider the stencil with three nonuniformly located solution points \( \{u_1, u_2, u_3\} \). The values at flux points \( u_A \) and \( u_B \) in Fig. 4 can be obtained by following procedure.

1. Get \( u_A^{(1)} \) and \( u_B^{(1)} \) by inverse distance weight interpolation,

\[ \omega_1 = \frac{(1/\Delta \xi_1)}{(1/\Delta \xi_1) + (1/\Delta \xi_2)}; \quad \omega_2 = \frac{(1/\Delta \xi_2)}{(1/\Delta \xi_1) + (1/\Delta \xi_2)}; \quad u_A^{(1)} = \omega_1 u_1 + \omega_2 u_2; \]

\[ \omega_3 = \frac{(1/\Delta \xi_3)}{(1/\Delta \xi_1) + (1/\Delta \xi_3)}; \quad \omega_4 = \frac{(1/\Delta \xi_4)}{(1/\Delta \xi_3) + (1/\Delta \xi_4)}; \quad u_B^{(1)} = \omega_3 u_2 + \omega_4 u_3; \]

where \( \Delta \xi_1 = \xi_{sp1} - \xi_{sp2} \), \( \Delta \xi_2 = \xi_{sp2} - \xi_{sp3} \), \( \Delta \xi_3 = \xi_{sp3} - \xi_{sp4} \), \( \Delta \xi_4 = \xi_{sp4} - \xi_{sp5} \), as shown in Fig. 4.

2. Calculate the gradient of \( u \) with values \( \{u_A^{(1)}, u_2, u_B^{(1)}\} \),

\[ \omega_5 = \frac{(1/\Delta \xi_2)}{(1/\Delta \xi_2) + (1/\Delta \xi_3)}; \quad \omega_6 = \frac{(1/\Delta \xi_3)}{(1/\Delta \xi_2) + (1/\Delta \xi_3)}; \quad \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial \xi} \right)^{(1)} = \frac{u_2 - u_A^{(1)}}{\Delta \xi_2}; \quad \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial \xi} \right)^{(2)} = \frac{u_B^{(1)} - u_2}{\Delta \xi_3}; \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial \xi} = \omega_5 \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial \xi} \right)^{(1)} + \omega_6 \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial \xi} \right)^{(2)}. \]

3. Recompute \( u_A \) and \( u_B \) based on \( u_2 \) and the gradient \( \frac{\partial u}{\partial \xi} \);

\[ u_A^{(2)} = u_2 - \frac{\partial u}{\partial \xi} \Delta \xi_2; \quad u_B^{(2)} = u_2 + \frac{\partial u}{\partial \xi} \Delta \xi_3. \]

4. Add limiter to control numerical oscillation. \( u_A^R \) and \( u_B^L \) are obtained by linear reconstruction with a limiter,

\[ u_A^R = u_2 - \phi \frac{\partial u}{\partial \xi} \Delta \xi_2; \quad u_B^L = u_2 + \phi \frac{\partial u}{\partial \xi} \Delta \xi_3. \]

\[ \phi = \min\{\text{lim}(u_A^{(2)}), \text{lim}(u_B^{(2)})\}, \]

where

\[ \text{lim}(u) = \begin{cases} 
\min\{1, \frac{M-u_2}{u_3-u_2}\}, & \text{if } u > u_2, \\
\min\{1, \frac{m-u_2}{u_3-u_2}\}, & \text{if } u < u_2, \\
1, & \text{if } u = u_2,
\end{cases} \]

with \( m = \min\{u_1, u_2, u_3\} \) and \( M = \max\{u_1, u_2, u_3\} \).

2.3. New schemes based on NNW

Inspired by nonlinear interpolation of WCNS or WENO and compact differencing of CPR, we develop new shock capturing methods by taking several solution points in one cell and using Riemann fluxes inside the cell. The left and right values used in Riemann fluxes are obtained by nonuniform nonlinear weighted (NNW) interpolation on computational space. Then, compact differential operator based on fluxes in one cell is applied to calculate first-order flux derivatives.
2.3.1. High-order shock capturing schemes

In this paper, we consider a \((K + 1)\)th-order shock capturing scheme constructed by using \((K + 1)\)th-order NNW interpolation and \((K + 1)\)th-order compact difference operator, which is denoted by CNNW. We take \((K + 1)\) Gauss-Legendre points as solution points and \((K + 2)\) Legendre-Lobatto points as flux points, which is the same as those of CPR-DG schemes in Section 2.1. The difference is that CNNW uses Riemann fluxes at each flux points and CNNW does not use correction function.

Lagrange polynomial based on Riemann fluxes at \((K + 2)\) flux points is one degree higher than those of state variables and can be constructed as

\[
\tilde{F}(\xi) = \sum_{l=1}^{K+2} F_{i,fp_l} L_l(\xi),
\]

where \(\tilde{F}_{i,fp_l}\) is Riemann flux at flux points \(\tilde{F}_{i,fp_l}(u_{i,fp_l}^L, u_{i,fp_l}^R)\) and \((K + 1)\)th-order NNW interpolation is used to obtain \(u_{i,fp_l}^L\) and \(u_{i,fp_l}^R\). Then, the operator is obtained by calculating the first-order derivative of the Lagrange polynomial at solution points,

\[
\frac{\partial \tilde{F}}{\partial \xi} \bigg|_{i,sp_m} = \sum_{l=1}^{K+2} a_{m,l} F_{i,fp_l}.
\]

Discrete conservation law. In order to satisfy one-dimensional conservation law (CL), the following integral conservation law should be satisfied, i.e.,

\[
\int_{x_i}^{x_{i+1}} \frac{\partial u^h}{\partial t} dx + \left( \tilde{F}(x_{i+1}) - \tilde{F}(x_i) \right) = 0.
\]

For each solution point, CNNW with \((K + 1)\)th-order of accuracy reads

\[
\frac{\partial u_{i,l}}{\partial t} = -\frac{2}{h} \frac{\partial \tilde{F}}{\partial \xi} \bigg|_{i,l} = -\frac{2}{h} \sum_{j=1}^{K+2} a_{j} \tilde{F}_{i,j}.
\]

Thus, we can obtain

Figure 4: NNW2 interpolation
\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( \int_{x_i}^{x_{i+1}} u^h dx \right) &= \frac{h}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( \int_{x_i}^{x_{i+1}} u^h dx \right) = \frac{h}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( \sum_{l=1}^{K+1} 2w_l u_{i,l} \right) \\
&= \frac{h}{2} \sum_{l=1}^{K+1} 2w_l \left( \frac{\partial u_{i,l}}{\partial t} \right) = \sum_{l=1}^{K+1} 2w_l \left( -\frac{\partial \tilde{F}_{i,l}}{\partial \xi} \right). 
\end{align*}
\]

where \( w_l \) are the weights in Gaussian quadrature formulas. When \( K = 4 \), we have

\[
w_1 = \frac{322 - 13\sqrt{70}}{1800}, \quad w_2 = \frac{322 + 13\sqrt{70}}{1800}, \quad w_3 = \frac{64}{225}, \quad w_4 = w_2, \quad w_5 = w_1.
\]

Since flux polynomial is the Lagrange polynomial based on Riemann fluxes at \((K + 2)\)th flux points,

\[
\tilde{F}(\xi) = \sum_{l=1}^{K+2} \tilde{F}_{i,l} L_l(\xi),
\]

\( \tilde{F} \) is a \( K + 1 \) degree polynomial. Then, \( \frac{\partial \tilde{F}}{\partial \xi} \) belongs to \( P^K \). Since the quadrature rule based on \( K + 1 \) points has at least \( K \) algebraic accuracy, the rule is exact for degree \( K \) \( \) or less \( \) polynomial \( \frac{\partial \tilde{F}}{\partial \xi} \). Thus, we have

\[
\sum_{l=1}^{K+1} 2w_l \left( -\frac{\partial \tilde{F}_{i,l}}{\partial \xi} \right) = - \int_{-1}^{1} \left( \frac{\partial \tilde{F}}{\partial \xi} \right) d\xi = - \left( \tilde{F}(1) - \tilde{F}(-1) \right)
\]

\[
= - \left( \tilde{F}_{i,fpK+2} - \tilde{F}_{i,fp1} \right) = - \left( \tilde{F}_i(1) - \tilde{F}_i(-1) \right).
\]

According to \([1]\) and \([19]\), we obtain following relation

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( \sum_{l=1}^{K+1} w_l u_{i,l} \right) = - \left( \tilde{F}_i(1) - \tilde{F}_i(-1) \right).
\]

Therefore, high-order CNNW satisfies discrete conservation laws.

Suppose flux derivative at solutions points are calculated by the Lagrange interpolation polynomial of all flux points. Then, if a cell has \( K + 1 \) solution points and less equal to \( K + 2 \) flux points, CNNW satisfies discrete conservation law. And the discrete conservation law is independent of which kind of solution points and flux points are selected.

For two-dimensional case, we have

\[
\frac{\partial u_{i,j,l,m}}{\partial t} = - \frac{4}{h^2} \left( \frac{\partial \tilde{F}_{i,j,l,m}}{\partial \xi} + \frac{\partial \tilde{G}_{i,j,l,m}}{\partial \eta} \right)
\]

\[
= - \frac{4}{h^2} \left( \sum_{k=1}^{K+2} c_{i,k} \tilde{F}_{i,j,fkp} + \sum_{k=1}^{K+2} c_{m,k} \tilde{G}_{i,j,fkp} \right).
\]

Then, it can be easily proved that the discrete conservation law is

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( \sum_{l=1}^{K+1} \sum_{m=1}^{K+1} w_l w_m u_{i,j,l,m} \right) = - \frac{4}{h^2} \left[ \sum_{m=1}^{K+1} w_m \left( \frac{\partial \tilde{F}_{i,j,l,m}}{\partial \xi} + \frac{\partial \tilde{G}_{i,j,l,m}}{\partial \eta} \right) \right]
\]

\[
= - \frac{4}{h^2} \left[ \sum_{m=1}^{K+1} w_m \left( \tilde{F}(1, \eta_m) - \tilde{F}(-1, \eta_m) \right) + \sum_{l=1}^{K+1} w_l \left( \tilde{G}(\xi_l, 1) - \tilde{G}(\xi_l, -1) \right) \right].
\]
2.3.2. Low-order shock capturing schemes C2NNW5 and C2NNW2

Low-order shock capturing schemes take following second-order finite differential operator

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{F}}{\partial \xi} \bigg|_{i,sp_l} = \frac{F_{i,fP(l+1)} - F_{i,fP_l}}{\Delta \xi_l}, \quad l = 1, 2, \cdots, K + 1 \quad (21)$$

where \(sp_l\) are Gauss solution points and \(\Delta \xi_l = \xi_{fP(l+1)} - \xi_{fP_l}\). Then, a low-order scheme called C2NNW5 is constructed by taking fifth-order NNW interpolation with second-order differential operator \(\Delta \xi_l\) in \(21\). And a low-order scheme called C2NNW2 is constructed by taking second-order NN2 interpolation with the second-order differential operator in \(\Delta \xi_l\).

For each solution point, we have

$$\frac{\partial u_{i,sp_l}}{\partial t} = -\frac{2}{h} \frac{\partial \tilde{F}}{\partial \xi} \bigg|_{i,sp_l} = -\frac{2}{h} \frac{F_{i,fP(l+1)} - F_{i,fP_l}}{\Delta \xi_l}.$$ 

Then, we can obtain

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( \int_{x_i}^{x_i+1} u^b dx \right) = \frac{h}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( \int_{x_i}^{x_i+1} u^b dx \right) = \frac{h}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( \sum_{m=1}^{K+1} F_{i,fP(l+1)} u^b dx \right) = \frac{h}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( \sum_{m=1}^{K+1} \frac{\Delta \xi_l}{\Delta \xi} \frac{\partial u_{i,sp_l}}{\partial t} \right) = \frac{h}{2} \left( \sum_{l=1}^{K+1} \Delta \xi_l \left( -\frac{2}{h} \frac{F_{i,fP(l+1)} - F_{i,fP_l}}{\Delta \xi_l} \right) \right) = \sum_{l=1}^{K+1} \left( F_{i,fP(l+1)} - F_{i,fP_l} \right) = -\left( F_{i,(1)} - F_{i,(-1)} \right).$$

Therefore, C2NNW5 and C2NNW2 satisfy following discrete conservation law

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( \sum_{l=1}^{K+1} u_{i,sp_l} \Delta \xi_l \right) = -\left( F_{i,(1)} - F_{i,(-1)} \right).$$

For two-dimensional case, it can be easily proved that the discrete conservation law is

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( \sum_{l=1}^{K+1} \sum_{m=1}^{K+1} \Delta \xi_l \Delta \eta_m u_{i,j,l,m} \right) = -\frac{4}{h^2} \left[ \sum_{m=1}^{K+1} \Delta \eta_m \left( \sum_{l=1}^{K+1} \Delta \xi_l \frac{\partial \tilde{F}}{\partial \xi} \bigg|_{i,j,l,m} \right) + \sum_{l=1}^{K+1} \Delta \xi_l \left( \sum_{m=1}^{K+1} \Delta \eta_m \frac{\partial \tilde{G}}{\partial \eta} \bigg|_{i,j,l,m} \right) \right] \quad (22)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( \sum_{l=1}^{K+1} \sum_{m=1}^{K+1} \Delta \xi_l \Delta \eta_m (F(1, \eta_m) - F(-1, \eta_m)) + \sum_{l=1}^{K+1} \Delta \xi_l \left( G(\xi_l, 1) - G(\xi_l, -1) \right) \right). \quad (23)$$

Therefore, the discrete conservation law holds for both C2NNW5 and C2NNW2.

Interpolation and difference operator of C5NNW5, C2NNW5, C2NNW2 in solving 1D conservation law are shown in Table[1]. For comparison, fifth-order CPR (CPR5) and fifth-order Weighted compact nonlinear schemes (WCNS5) with hybrid cell-edge-node finite difference operator are also shown in the table.

2.4. Spectrum analysis

Finite difference schemes usually obtain the spectrum by Fourier method based on one solution points while DG-type method which locates several solution points in one cell usually calculate the spectrum by local discrete matrices of one cell. To make a fair comparison, the eigenvalues of spatial discretization matrix of different schemes are calculated by the same method. We analyze the spectrum by local discrete matrices and prove that all eigenvalues comes from the same function and each scheme has a unique spectrum curve.
where the eigenvalues are on the same curve.

In the following Theorem, we prove that all eigenvalues of the spatial discretization matrix can be obtained by collecting the eigenvalues of local spatial matrices. The properties of the eigenvalues of local spatial matrices are also proved. Then, it can be proved that all eigenvalues comes from the same function and all eigenvalues are on the same curve.

The matrix $E$ has following properties:

(1) All the eigenvalues of $E$ are given by

$$\{x|EX = xX, X \in \mathbb{C}^{(K+1)M}\} = \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} \{x|H_m Y_m = xY_m, Y_m \in \mathbb{C}^{K+1}\},$$

where $H_m = H(\varphi_m)$, $\varphi_m = m\frac{2\pi}{M}$, $m = 0, 1, 2, \cdots, M - 1$ and

$$H(\varphi) = (Ae^{-i\varphi} + B + Ce^{i\varphi})/(K + 1), \quad 0 \leq \varphi < 2\pi.$$
In other word, \( SH \triangleq \text{Spec}(E) = \{ \text{Spec}(H_0), \text{Spec}(H_1), \cdots, \text{Spec}(H_{M-1}) \} \).

(2) Suppose \( G_m = G(\varphi_m) \) with
\[
G(\varphi) = \left( Ae^{-i(\varphi(K+1))} + B + C e^{i(\varphi(K+1))} \right)/(K+1), \quad 0 \leq \varphi < 2\pi,
\]
and \( \text{Spec}(G_m) = \{ \mu^{(l)}(G(\varphi_m)) | l = 1, 2, \cdots, K+1 \} \), \( SG \triangleq \{ \text{Spec}(G_0), \text{Spec}(G_1), \cdots, \text{Spec}(G_{M-1}) \} \). It can be proved that if \( \text{mod}(M, K+1) \neq 0 \) then
\[
SG = SH,
\]
else
\[
SG = \{ \text{Spec}(H_0), \text{Spec}(H_{K+1}), \text{Spec}(H_{2K+1}), \cdots, \text{Spec}(H_{L(K+1)}) \} \subset SH,
\]
and
\[
SG \neq SH.
\]

(3) It can be proved that the \((K+1)\)th eigenvalues of \( G_m \) are
\[
\mu^{(l)}(\varphi_m) = \mu^{(l)} \left( \varphi_m - (l-1) \frac{2\pi}{K+1} \right), \quad l = 1, 2, \cdots, K+1,
\]
where \( \varphi_m = m \frac{2\pi}{M} \), \( m = 0, 1, 2, \cdots, M-1 \). Classify \( SG \) as \((K+1)\)th groups,
\[
SG = \bigcup_{l=1}^{K+1} \text{Group}^{(l)}
\]
with \( \text{Group}^{(l)} = \{ \mu^{(l)}(\varphi_m) | \varphi_m = m \frac{2\pi}{M}, \quad m = 0, 1, 2, \cdots, M-1 \} \). If \( \text{mod}(M, K+1) = 0 \), then eigenvalues in each group are the same \( \text{Group}^{(1)} = \cdots = \text{Group}^{(K+1)} \).

(4) \( SG \) can be written as
\[
SG = \begin{cases} 
\{ \mu^{(l)}(G(\phi_j)) | j = 0, 1, 2, \cdots, M(K+1) \} & \text{else}, \\
\{ \mu^{(l)}(G(\phi_j)) | j = 0, 1, \cdots, M-1 \} & \text{if } \text{mod}(M, K+1) = 0,
\end{cases}
\]
which means that all eigenvalues comes from the same function.

We added the proof of the Theorem 2.1 in Appendix B. In addition, we give an example to explain properties of the eigenvalues in Appendix C.

### 2.4.2. Comparison of spectrum of different schemes

In this subsection, the spectrum of CNNW is compared with WCNS and CPR by computing all eigenvalues from the matrix \( G \) with \( M = 40 \).

Fig. 5 shows eigenvalues in the complex plane, we can see that all eigenvalues of each scheme have negative real part, which illustrate that CNNW, CPR and WCNS are stable. In addition, three groups of eigenvalues (noted by \( z_1, z_2 \) and \( z_3 \) in the Fig. 5) are different for third-order schemes since \( \text{mod}(M, 3) \neq 0 \) and five groups of eigenvalues are the same for fifth-order schemes since \( \text{mod}(M, 5) = 0 \). These results agree with Theorem 2.4.1

Dispersion and dissipation relations in one period are shown for third-order schemes in Fig. 6 and for fifth-order schemes in Fig. 7. We can see that all eigenvalues come from the same function and the distribution curves can coincide with each other after a shift of \( \frac{2\pi}{K+1} \), which agrees with the property (3) in Theorem 2.4.1. This translation phenomenon was also found by Moura in [40]. Comparisons of different schemes show that the spectral property of the proposed CNNW is closer to WCNS than CPR. The dissipation errors of CNNW are similar to WCNS while CNNW has less dispersion errors than WCNS, which can been seen from Fig. 8 for both of the third-order schemes and fifth-order schemes.
Figure 5: Comparison of eigenvalues
Figure 6: Comparison of dispersion (imaginary part, left) and dissipation (real part, right) for third-order schemes
Figure 7: Comparison of dispersion (imaginary part, left) and dissipation (real part, right) for fifth-order schemes.
Figure 8: comparison of dispersion and dissipation for third-order schemes and fifth-order schemes
3. A priori subcell CNNW limiting strategy for CPR method

In this section, we develop a subcell limiting strategy for CPR method. Firstly, troubled cell indicators are used to detect discontinuities. Then, troubled cells are decomposed into subcells and computed by shock capturing schemes while other cells are computed by the CPR scheme. For troubled element indicator, we apply a modified indicator considering modal energy based on the stencil consisting of five points of the master cell and two points from two neighbor cells.

3.1. Troubled cell indicator

In order to find troubled cells, we take the indicator proposed in [29], which follow ideas presented by Persson and Peraire [12] and consider the rate of the highest modes to the overall modal energy. Firstly, the representation of the quantity \( \epsilon = \rho p \) with Lagrange interpolation polynomials of degree \( N \) is transformed to a modal representation with Legendre interpolation polynomials. Secondly, the maximum of proportion of the highest modes and proportion of the second highest mode to the total energy of the polynomial is calculated as

\[
EI = \max \left( \frac{m_N^2}{\sum_{j=0}^{N} m_j^2}, \frac{m_{N-1}^2}{\sum_{j=0}^{N-1} m_j^2} \right),
\]

where \( \{m_j | j = 0, 1, \cdots, N \} \) are the modal coefficients.

We consider the fifth-order CPR scheme with five Gauss solution points presented in Subsection 2.1. To consider the jump in cell interfaces, a higher degree polynomial is used to calculate \( EI \). The indicator of the \( i \)th cell is calculated based on the stencil with seven points \( \{\epsilon_L, \epsilon_{i,1}, \epsilon_{i,2}, \epsilon_{i,3}, \epsilon_{i,4}, \epsilon_{i,5}, \epsilon_R\} \), where \( \epsilon_{i,1}, \epsilon_{i,2}, \epsilon_{i,3}, \epsilon_{i,4}, \epsilon_{i,5} \) are the quantity \( \epsilon = \rho p \) at solution points, \( \epsilon_L = \text{aver}(\epsilon_{i-1,5}, \epsilon_{i,1}) \) and \( \epsilon_R = \text{aver}(\epsilon_{i,5}, \epsilon_{i+1,1}) \) are Roe average values at cell interfaces. Here \( \text{aver}(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2) = \text{aver}(\rho_1, \rho_2) \cdot \text{aver}(p_1, p_2) \) and \( \text{aver} \) is the Roe average function.

We take a threshold value

\[
T(N) = a \cdot 10^{-c(N+1)^{1/4}}.
\]

The parameters are predetermined as \( a = 0.5 \) and \( c = 1.8 \), which are the same as those in [29]. It is worth noticing that \( N = 6 \) is taken in (26) and (27) for the fifth-order CPR scheme with \( K = 4 \). For simplicity, we denote this troubled cell indicator as MDA indicator in this paper. If \( EI \geq T(N) \), the element is switched from FR/CPR to CNNW subcells.

3.2. Subcell limiting procedure based on CNNW

After calculating the MDA indicator for all cells, the troubled cells are determined and decomposed into subcells. Cells with big \( EI \) will be computed by CNNW while the rest cells will be computed by CPR. In fact, a CPR scheme based on subcell CNNW limiting is a hybrid scheme.

Based on the value of \( EI \), region division are determined by three parameters \( S_1, S_2 \) and \( S_3 \). Then, C5NNW5, C2NNW5 and C2NNW2, which have different resolution and robustness are taken to blend from smooth region to discontinuity region. The hybrid scheme can be expressed as

\[
HS = \begin{cases} 
\text{CPR5,} & 0 \leq EI_i \leq S_1, \\
\text{C5NNW5,} & S_1 < EI_i \leq S_2, \\
\text{C2NNW5,} & S_2 < EI_i \leq S_3, \\
\text{C2NNW2,} & S_3 < EI_i \leq 1. 
\end{cases}
\]

By determining parameters \( S_1, S_2 \) and \( S_3 \), the hybrid scheme based on the four schemes can recover \( C_1^4 + C_2^4 + C_3^4 + C_4^4 = 15 \) schemes. Denote the hybrid scheme by \( HS(d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4) \) with \( d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4 \) marking status of CPR, C5NNW5, C2NNW5, C2NNW2 correspondingly. Here \( d_1 = 1 \) means that a scheme is included by the hybrid scheme, otherwise not included. After region division based on the value of \( EI \), the corresponding high-order or low-order interpolation can be made. Then, the corresponding flux difference operator of first-order derivatives are chosen.
Table 2: Hybrid scheme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>CPR5</th>
<th>C5NNW5</th>
<th>C2NNW5</th>
<th>C2NNW2</th>
<th>(S1,S2,S3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS(1,1,1,1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0&lt;S1&lt;S2&lt;S3&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS(1,0,0,1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0&lt;S1=S2=S3&lt;1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3. Interface treatment

Since locations of solution points are the same for CPR and CNNW, there is no need to make data exchange between different schemes and thus the proposed scheme can take less computations. In addition, the limiting procedure do not need to take ghost cells for troubled cells. Moreover, the limiting procedure can be treated dimension by dimension, which means that we can take CPR for one dimension while CNNW for another, as shown in Fig. 9(a). Thus, these procedures are different from those subcell limiting schemes based on uniformly spaced solution points, where data exchange and ghost cells are needed and subcell limiting should be taken for all dimensions, as shown in Fig. 9(b).

The only thing need to do in interface treatment is calculation of Riemann fluxes at scheme-interface. The points needed by CNNW coincide with solution points of CPR. Thus for CNNW, extra state values required in CNNW interpolation for obtaining state values at flux points are taken from CPR cells directly. Then, Riemann fluxes at scheme-interface are calculated with one side from interpolation in CNNW cells and the other side from the reconstruction function in CPR cells.

3.4. Discrete conservation law

In order to combine with CPR and C5NNW5, we choose $\xi_{fp_m} = -1 + \sum_{l=1}^{m-1} w_l$ and $w_l$ are the Gauss weights in [18]. Then $\Delta \xi_l = w_l$ and $\Delta \eta_m = w_m$. Therefore, the discrete conservation law becomes

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left[ \sum_{l=1}^{K+1} \sum_{m=1}^{K+1} w_l w_m u_{i,j,l,m} \right] = -4 \frac{1}{h^2} \left[ \sum_{m=1}^{K+1} w_m \left( F(1, \eta_m) - F(-1, \eta_m) \right) + \sum_{l=1}^{K+1} w_l \left( \overline{G}(\xi_l, 1) - \overline{G}(\xi_l, -1) \right) \right].$$

(29)
Thus, the C2NNW2 and C2NNW5 have the same form of discrete conservation law with that of C5NNW5 in [20], which means that the Riemann fluxes at cell interfaces will be eliminated during total summation. Therefore, the hybrid schemes also satisfy discrete conservation law. The splitting of a CPR element into sub-cells based on Gauss weights is similar as those done by Sonntag et al. [27] for DG method with Gauss solution points and by Hennemann et al. [29] for DG method with Legendre-Gauss-Lobatto solution points. Thus, CPR based on subcell CNNW limiting has some merits on data transformation, flexibility of limiting and discrete conservation laws.

4. Numerical investigation

In this section, numerical experiments are presented for linear wave equations and Euler equations to test accuracy, shock capturing ability and discrete conservation law of the proposed CNNW. Comparisons with CPR and WCNS are also made. In addition, CPR based on subcell CNNW limiting is also tested in aspects of shock capturing ability and discrete conservation law. Unless the contrary is stated, the threshold value $c_0 = 0.5 \cdot 10^{-1.8(N+1)^{1/4}}$ is used in MDA indicator. Lax-Friedrichs flux is used to compute common Riemann flux.

4.1. One-dimensional cases

4.1.1. 1D linear equation

An accuracy test is taken by considering the One-dimensional (1D) linear advection equation

$$u_t + au_x = 0.$$ 

with $a = 1$.

The problem is considered in the spatial domain $[-3, 3]$ with initial condition $u(x, 0) = \sin \left( \frac{\pi x}{3} \right)$ till time $T = 3$ for accuracy test. The $L_2$ and $L_\infty$ errors, as well as the numerical order of accuracy, are contained in Table 3 for high-order schemes and Table 4 for second-order schemes. As expected, C5NNW5 reaches fifth-order of accuracy. In addition, C5NNW5 has smaller numerical error than CPR-g2 with Legendre Lobatto solution points (see references [30] [41] for details), while C5NNW5 has bigger error than WCNS5 and CPR-DG. Moreover, C5NNW5 with new smoothness indicator in (15) (C5NNW5-new) has smaller errors than that with original smoothness indicator in (16) (C5NNW5-origi). For second-order schemes, C2NNW5 has smaller errors than C2NNW2 for both linear schemes and nonlinear schemes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norm</th>
<th>DOFs</th>
<th>C5NNW5 error</th>
<th>WCNS5 error</th>
<th>CPR-g2 error</th>
<th>CPR-DG error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>order</td>
<td>order</td>
<td>order</td>
<td>order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_\infty$</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.04E-04</td>
<td>6.55E-04</td>
<td>5.28E-03</td>
<td>5.72E-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.74E-05</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>2.09E-05</td>
<td>1.77E-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8.10E-07</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>6.58E-07</td>
<td>5.93E-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2.54E-08</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.06E-08</td>
<td>1.84E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
<td>7.97E-10</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>6.44E-10</td>
<td>5.72E-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_2$</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.90E-04</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.64E-04</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.80E-05</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>1.48E-05</td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.63E-07</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.65E-07</td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1.77E-08</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>1.46E-08</td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
<td>5.54E-10</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.55E-10</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: High-order linear schemes in solving 1D linear equation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$Norm$</th>
<th>DOFs</th>
<th>$C2NNW5$-origi</th>
<th>$C2NNW5$-new</th>
<th>WCNS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$L\infty$</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.02E-02</td>
<td>3.94E-02</td>
<td>5.67E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.68E-04</td>
<td>4.68E-04</td>
<td>2.05E-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.09E-05</td>
<td>9.53E-06</td>
<td>6.59E-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3.26E-07</td>
<td>2.39E-07</td>
<td>2.04E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1.00E-08</td>
<td>7.58E-09</td>
<td>6.03E-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_2$</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.17E-02</td>
<td>1.98E-02</td>
<td>3.73E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.83E-04</td>
<td>2.83E-04</td>
<td>1.23E-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.93E-06</td>
<td>5.16E-06</td>
<td>3.74E-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1.84E-07</td>
<td>1.52E-07</td>
<td>1.14E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
<td>5.23E-09</td>
<td>4.76E-09</td>
<td>3.53E-09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: High-order nonlinear schemes in solving 1D linear equation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$Norm$</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$L\infty$</td>
<td>$C2NNW5$-origi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.88E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.61E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.17E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>5.35E-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>1.33E-04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Second-order schemes in solving 1D linear equation.
4.1.2. 1D Euler equations

1D Euler equations are solved to test the shock-capturing capability of the CNNW schemes and CPR/CNNW schemes. Nonlinear weights choose Z-weights with $\varepsilon = 10^{-10}$.

First, CNNW schemes are used to solve Sod problem, Lax problem and Shu-Osher problem.

The Sod problem with initial condition

\[
(\rho, u, p) = \begin{cases} 
(1, 0, 1), & -3 \leq x < 0, \\
(0.125, 0, 0.1), & 0 \leq x < 3,
\end{cases}
\]

is solved till $t = 0.2$ with DOFs = 200. C5NNW5, C2NNW5, C2NNW2 do not have obvious oscillations and C5NNW5 has similar results as WCNS.

The Lax problem with initial condition

\[
(\rho, u, p) = \begin{cases} 
(0.445, 0.698, 3.528), & -3 \leq x < 0, \\
(0.5, 0, 0.571), & 0 \leq x < 3,
\end{cases}
\]

is solved till $t = 0.1$ with DOFs = 500. C5NNW5, C2NNW5, C2NNW2 have small oscillations near location $x = 0.74$ while WCNS do not have obvious oscillations.

Shu-Osher problem with initial condition

\[
(\rho, u, p) = \begin{cases} 
(3.857143, 2.629369, 10.333333), & -5 \leq x < -4, \\
(1.0 + 0.2\sin(5x), 0, 1.0), & -4 \leq x < 5,
\end{cases}
\]

is solved till $t = 1.8$ with DOFs = 400. We can see that C5NNW5 has similar resolution as WCNS. For second-order schemes, C2NNW5 has higher resolution than C2NNW2.

Second, CPR/CNNW schemes are applied to solve these problems. Denote the partition vector $\mathbf{dv} = (S_1, S_2, S_3)$, where $S_1$, $S_2$ and $S_3$ are the partition parameters in hybrid scheme (28). We can see that both HS(1,1,1,1) with $\mathbf{dv} = (c_0, c_0, c_0)$ and HS(1,0,0,1) with $\mathbf{dv} = (c_0, 0.05, 0.1)$ can capture shock robustly and CNNW are mainly applied near shock. In addition, HS(1,0,0,1) has lower resolution than HS(1,1,1,1) where C5NNW5 and C2NNW5 are also included.

4.2. 2D Euler equations

In this subsection, CNNW is applied to solve Euler vortex problem used by Hu and Shu [6]. The initial condition is a mean flow with $\{\rho, u, v, p\} = \{1, 1, 1, 1\}$. The isotropic vortex is then added to the mean flow with perturbations in $u$, $v$ and $T = p/\rho$ and no perturbation in entropy $S = p/\rho^\gamma$:

\[
(\Delta u, \Delta v) = \frac{\varepsilon}{2\pi} e^{0.5(1-r^2)}(-y, x), \\
\Delta T = -\frac{(\gamma - 1)\varepsilon^2}{8\gamma^2 \pi^2} e^{1-r^2},
\]

with $r = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2}$ and the vortex strength $\varepsilon = 5$. In the numerical simulations, the computational domain is taken to be $[-10, 10] \times [-10, 10]$ with periodic boundary conditions imposed on the boundaries.

First, CNNW, CPR and WCNS are used to solve this problem till $T = dt$ and $T = 2$ by taking $dt = 0.0001$ and Lax-Friedrich flux. Table 4 and Table 7 give numerical errors and orders of accuracy. We can see that CNNW and CPR have fourth-order of accuracy at $T = dt$ while WCNS has fifth-order of accuracy and smallest numerical errors. At $T = 2$, CNNW and WCNS can obtain fifth-order of accuracy which is higher than that of CPR. However, CPR still has the smallest numerical errors.

Second, time evolution of numerical errors and numerical orders of accuracy are compared for the three schemes, as shown in Fig. 12. We can see that the numerical error of CPR increase less slower than WCNS and CNNW, which illustrate why WCNS has larger numerical errors than CPR at $T = 2$. 22
Figure 10: Comparison of single schemes in solving 1D Euler equations.
Figure 11: Hybrid schemes HS(1,0,0,1) and HS(1,1,1,1) in solving 1D Euler equations.
Table 6: Comparisons of linear schemes based on original physical variables and Lax-Friedrich flux in solving 2D vortex problem (T=dt=0.0001).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norm</th>
<th>√DOFs</th>
<th>C5NNW5</th>
<th>CPR-Gauss</th>
<th>WCNS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>error</td>
<td>order</td>
<td>error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_\infty$</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.38E-07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.33E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>10.3E-08</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>9.24E-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>400</td>
<td>6.69E-10</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>7.36E-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>800</td>
<td>4.11E-11</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>4.71E-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.15E-09</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.57E-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.91E-10</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>3.65E-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>400</td>
<td>2.31E-11</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>2.50E-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1.43E-12</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.59E-11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Comparisons of linear schemes based on original physical variables and Lax-F flux in solving 2D vortex problem (T=2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norm</th>
<th>√DOFs</th>
<th>Primary variables</th>
<th>Characteristic variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CNNW</td>
<td>WCNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>error</td>
<td>order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_\infty$</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.41E-03</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1.97E-04</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>400</td>
<td>9.18E-06</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>800</td>
<td>3.06E-07</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_2$</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.17E-04</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>9.27E-06</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>400</td>
<td>3.54E-07</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1.11E-08</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Comparisons of nonlinear schemes based on original physical variables and Lax-F flux in solving 2D vortex problem (T=2).

Third, nonlinear schemes CNNW and WCNS are taken to solve this problem till $T = 2$ by taking JS weight with $\epsilon = 10^{-6}$ and Lax-Friedrich flux. From Table 8 we can see that schemes using nonlinear weights on characteristic variables have larger numerical errors than that on primary variables. In addition, both of CNNW and WCNS have fifth-order of accuracy and WCNS has a bit smaller numerical errors than CNNW.
Table 9: The maximum of $\langle \rho \rangle$ on time samples $t_i \in \{0.1i | i = 1, 2, \cdots, 200\}$ for all schemes (40 × 40 grid, $dt = 0.001$, $T = 20$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schemes</th>
<th>CPR</th>
<th>C5NNW5</th>
<th>C2NNW5</th>
<th>C2NNW2</th>
<th>HS(1,1,1,1)</th>
<th>HS(1,0,0,1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\langle \rho \rangle_{\text{max}}$</td>
<td>4.42E-15</td>
<td>3.57E-15</td>
<td>3.71E-15</td>
<td>4.42E-15</td>
<td>5.00E-15</td>
<td>5.00E-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At last, we test discrete conservation law for both single schemes and hybrid schemes. The error of global discrete conservation law is defined as the computational error in the preservation of the integral of conservation quantity $\rho$:

$$\langle \rho \rangle = \frac{\int_V (\rho - \rho_0) dxdy}{\int_V \rho_0 dxdy} = \frac{\int_V (\rho - \rho_0) Jd\xi d\eta}{\int_V \rho_0 Jd\xi d\eta} = \frac{\text{INT}(\rho) - \text{INT}(\rho_0)}{\text{INT}(\rho_0)}$$

where $\rho$ and $\rho_0$ denote the density at the final time and at the initial time, correspondingly, $V$ indicates the whole computational domain and $\text{INT}(\rho) = \int_V \rho Jd\xi d\eta$, which is estimated by

$$\sum_{i,j} \left( \sum_l \sum_m w_l w_m \rho_{i,j,l,m} J_{i,j,l,m} \right) \Delta \xi \Delta \eta$$

for all of CPR, C5NNW5, C2NNW5, C2NNW2 and hybrid schemes. Here $w_l$ are the weights in Gauss Legendre quadrature formulas. In order to test hybrid schemes, we choose a special threshold value $c_1 = 0.0005 \cdot 10^{-1.8(N+1)^{1/4}}$ to make computation area include different schemes. Here we take $(S1, S2, S3) = (c_1, 0.000005, 0.000001)$ for HS(1,1,1,1) and $(S1, S2, S3) = (c_1, c_1, c_1)$ for HS(1,0,0,1). Errors of global conservation law $\langle \rho \rangle$ are summarized in Table 9. The integral of conservation quantity at initial time is $\text{INT}(\rho_0) \approx 398.241743560187$ for this problem. The results show that both of single schemes and hybrid schemes can preserve global conservation law.

4.3 2D Riemann problem

CNNW and hybrid schemes are applied to solve 2D Riemann problem proposed by Schulz-Rinne [42]. The computational domain $[0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ is divided into four quadrants by two lines $x = 0.8$ and $y = 0.8$ and...
Figure 13: hybrid scheme HS(1,1,1,1) for solving Euler vortex problem (40 × 40 grid, DOFs = 200 × 200, dt = 0.001)
Figure 14: Density from 0.2 to 1.7 with 31 contours computed by C5NNW5, WCNS5, C2NNW5, C2NNW2 with DOFs $= 600 \times 600$ ($T = 0.8$)

the initial constant states on the four quadrants are

$$(\rho, u, v, p) = \begin{cases} V_1 = (\rho_1, u_1, v_1, p_1), & 0.8 \leq x \leq 1.0, \ 0.8 \leq y \leq 1.0, \\ V_2 = (\rho_2, u_2, v_2, p_2), & 0.0 \leq x < 0.8, \ 0.8 \leq y \leq 1.0, \\ V_3 = (\rho_3, u_3, v_3, p_3), & 0.0 \leq x < 0.8, \ 0.0 \leq y < 0.8, \\ V_4 = (\rho_4, u_4, v_4, p_4), & 0.8 < x \leq 1.0, \ 0.0 \leq y < 0.8. \end{cases}$$

First, we test shock capturing properties for CNNW by taking Z-weight and Lax-Friedrich flux in solving the 2D Riemann problem with the initial constant states

\begin{align*}
V_1 &= (1.500, 0, 0, 1.500), & V_2 &= (0.5323, 1.206, 0, 0.3), \\
V_3 &= (0.138, 1.206, 1.206, 0.029), & V_4 &= (0.5323, 0, 1.206, 0.3),
\end{align*}

till $T = 0.8$. From Fig. 14 we can see that C5NNW5 has better resolution than WCNS5. In addition, C2NNW5 can obtain more small scale features than C2NNW2.
Second, hybrid schemes HS(1,0,0,1) with $dv = (c_0, c_0, c_0)$ and HS(1,1,1,1) with $dv = (c_0, 0.3, 0.6)$ are applied to solve this problem. The results in Fig. 15 and Fig. 16 show that both of HS(1,0,0,1) and HS(1,1,1,1) can capture shock effectively and the former one which contain C5NNW5 and C2NNW5 can capture more flow structures than the latter one.

At last, we change shock strength of Riemann problem to test shock capturing ability of CNNW and hybrid CPR-CNNW schemes. In order to change shock strength, we keep $\rho_3, p_3$ in formula (30) unchanged and take the shock Mach $M = \sqrt{2u_3}/\sqrt{\frac{\gamma p_3}{\rho_3}}$ as an adjustable parameter. According to Rankine-Hugoniot condition, the states $V_2, V_4$ and $V_1$ can be determined in turn. Then, the initial constant states become

\[
\begin{align*}
\rho_3 &= 0.138, \\
u_3 &= M \sqrt{\frac{\gamma p_3}{\rho_3}} / \sqrt{2}, \\
v_3 &= u_3, \\
p_3 &= 0.029, \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
s_{23} &= \frac{3-\gamma}{4} v_3 - \sqrt{\frac{\gamma p_3}{\rho_3}} + \left[\frac{\gamma+1}{4} v_3\right]^2, \\
\rho_2 &= -\frac{p_3 v_3^2}{s_{23}} + \rho_3, \\
u_2 &= u_3, \\
v_2 &= 0, \\
p_2 &= (\rho_3 v_3^2 + p_3) - s_{23} \rho_3 v_3,
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\rho_4 &= \rho_2, \\
u_4 &= 0, \\
v_4 &= u_2, \\
p_4 &= p_2, \\
s_{12} &= \frac{3-\gamma}{4} u_2 - \sqrt{\frac{\gamma p_2}{\rho_2}} + \left[\frac{\gamma+1}{4} u_2\right]^2, \\
\rho_1 &= -\frac{p_2 u_2}{s_{12}} + p_2, \\
u_1 &= 0, \\
v_1 &= 0, \\
p_1 &= (\rho_2 u_2^2 + p_2) - s_{12} \rho_2 u_2.
\end{align*}
\]

We change $M$ from 0 to 1000000 to test whether numerical schemes can capture shocks without blowing up. The largest $M$ for all schemes are given in Table 10. We can see that second-order schemes C2NNW5 and C2NNW2 can compute shock problems with higher strength than high-order schemes C5NNW5 and WCNS. In addition, C5NNW5 can calculate $M < 6$, which is lower than that of WCNS. It is also found that a fifth-order compact difference operator with constant function in each subcell (C5NNW1) can only calculate case $M < 8.2$. Comparison of C5NNW5, C2NNW5 and C5NNW1 in the shock capturing abilities illustrate that schemes taking high-order compact difference operator are difficult to capture strong shocks. In addition,
reducing the order of difference operator can improve shock capturing ability. Based on this observation, it is better for hybrid schemes to contain low order robust shock capturing schemes to capture strong shocks. We take \((S_1, S_2, S_3) = (c_0, 0.005, 0.01)\) for HS(1,1,1,1) and \((S_1, S_2, S_3) = (c_0, c_0, c_0)\) for HS(1,0,0,1). The two hybrid schemes can calculate \(M_{\text{max}} = 1000000\), as shown in Table 10, which illustrate that the proposed hybrid schemes have good ability in capturing strong shocks.

### 4.4. 2D double Mach reflection

Double Mach reflection problem described in [43] is a popular test case to test strong shock capturing capability of high-resolution schemes. CNNW and CPR based on subcell CNNW limiting are applied to solve this problem. The computational domain is \([0, 4] \times [0, 1]\) is taken for simulation. Z-weight with \(\varepsilon = 10^{-10}\) and Lax-Friedrich flux are used.

First, we test shock capturing properties for CNNW on a grid with the space step \(h = 1/60\). From Fig. 17, we can see that C2NNW5 has better resolution than C2NNW2 while C5NNW5 failed to simulate this problem, which agrees with the result obtained from simulating 2D Riemann problems.

Second, the problem is solved by the hybrid schemes on a grid with \(h = 1/108\) to test shock capturing properties. As shown in Fig. 18, CPR-CNNW can capture strong shock robustly. In addition, HS(1,1,1,1) can capture more flow structures than HS(1,0,0,1).

### 5. Concluding Remarks

In this paper, shock capturing schemes based on nonuniform nonlinear weighted interpolation are proposed and these schemes are applied as subcell limiters for high-order CPR method. Due to introducing Riemann fluxes inside a computational cell, the schemes has ability to capture shock. Eigenvalues of the spatial discretization matrix are proved to be collection of eigenvalues of local matrices. All eigenvalues are computed and compared with CPR and WCNS. The results show that the proposed high-order CNNW schemes are...
stable and have similar spectral properties as WCNS. Then, a priori subcell CNNW limiting approach is developed for fifth-order CPR, which is in fact a hybrid scheme. The proposed shock capturing schemes and hybrid schemes are applied to solve linear wave equations and Euler equations. Numerical investigations show that the proposed C5NNW5 have fifth-order of accuracy. C2NNW5 and C2NNW2 has second-order of accuracy and the former has higher resolution than the later one. In addition, C2NNW5 and C2NNW2 are more robust in shock capturing than high-order scheme C5NNW5. Fifth-order CPR scheme with these three schemes applied as subcell limiters has good balance in high resolution and shock capturing. In addition, it is shown that the hybrid schemes containing C5NNW5 and C2NNW5 have higher resolution than that only containing C2NNW2. The analytical and numerical results both show that the CNNW and hybrid schemes satisfy discrete conservation law. The proposed method will be generalized to unstructured meshes by making some changes in interpolation procedure in our future works.
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Appendix A. Coefficients and linear weights in NNW5 interpolation

Coefficients and linear weights in NNW5 interpolation in (12) and (14) are given in Table 11.

Appendix B. Proofs

(1) Suppose $D$ is a block circulant matrix $D = \frac{1}{K+1} Circ(C_0, C_1, C_2, \cdots, C_{M-1})$, then there exists a Fourier matrix $F^{(K+1)M}_{(K+1)M}$ such that

$$F^{(K+1)M}_{(K+1)M} D F^{*}_{(K+1)M} = diag(H_0, H_1, \cdots, H_{M-1}),$$

where

$$H_m = \frac{1}{K+1} \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} (\omega^m)^k C_k, \quad m = 0, 1, 2, \cdots, M-1, \quad \omega = e^{\frac{2\pi}{K+1}}$$
Figure 18: Density contours obtained by hybrid schemes, 31 contours from 1.5 to 21.7 ($h = 1/108$, $T = 0.2$)
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and \( F_{(K+1)M}^* = F_M^* \otimes I_{(K+1)} \),

\[
F_M^* = \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \begin{bmatrix}
    1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\
    1 & \omega & \omega^2 & \cdots & \omega^{M-1} \\
    1 & \omega^2 & \omega^4 & \cdots & \omega^{2(M-1)} \\
    \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
    1 & \omega^{M-1} & \omega^{2(M-1)} & \cdots & \omega^{(M-1)(M-1)}
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

We have

\[
det(D - \lambda I_{(K+1)M}) = \prod_{m=0}^{M-1} det(H_m - \lambda I_M).
\]

All eigenvalues of \( D \) are given by

\[
\{ \lambda | DX = \lambda X, X \in \mathbb{C}^{(K+1)M} \} = \{ \lambda | H_0 Y_0 = \lambda Y_0, Y_0 \in \mathbb{C}^{K+1} \}
\]

\[
\cup \{ \lambda | H_1 Y_1 = \lambda Y_1, Y_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{K+1} \}
\]

\[
\cdots
\]

\[
\cup \{ \lambda | H_{M-1} Y_{M-1} = \lambda Y_{M-1}, Y_{M-1} \in \mathbb{C}^{K+1} \}.
\]

Equation (32)

Denote the \((K+1)M\)th eigenvalues of the matrix \( E \) be \( spec(E) = \{ \lambda_j, j = 0, 1, 2, \cdots, (K+1)M - 1 \} \) and the \((K+1)\)th eigenvalues of the matrix \( H_m \) be \( Spec(H_m) = \{ \lambda (l)(H_m) | l = 1, 2, \cdots, K + 1 \} \), where \( m = 0, 1, 2, \cdots, M - 1 \). For the matrix \( E \), we have \( E = \frac{1}{K+1} \text{circ}(B,C,\cdots,0,A) \). According to \( (31) \), it can be easily obtained that

\[
H_m = \frac{1}{K+1} \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} (\omega^m)^k C_k
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{K+1} \left( B + \omega^m C + (\omega^m)^{M-1} A \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{K+1} \left( (\omega^m)^{-1} A + B + \omega^m C \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{K+1} \left( e^{-i\varphi_m} A + B + e^{i\varphi_m} C \right)
\]

where \( \varphi_m = m \frac{2\pi}{M} \). Therefore, we have \( Spec \left( E_{(K+1)M \times (K+1)M} \right) = \{ Spec(H_0), Spec(H_1), \cdots, Spec(H_{M-1}) \} \).

(2) Consider the case \( mod(M,(K+1)) = 0 \) and set \( M = L(K+1) \). For a fixed integer \( n_0 \in [0,K] \) and \( n_0 M \leq m (K+1) < (n_0 + 1)M \), we have

\[
G_m = G(\varphi_m) = \left( A e^{-i\varphi_m(K+1)} + B + C e^{i\varphi_m(K+1)} \right) / (K+1)
\]

\[
= \left( A e^{-i\varphi_m(K+1) - \frac{m(K+1)}{M} 2\pi} + B + C e^{i\varphi_m(K+1) - \frac{m(K+1)}{M} 2\pi} \right) / (K+1)
\]

\[
= \left( A e^{-i\varphi_m(K+1) - \frac{n_0 M}{M} 2\pi} + B + C e^{i\varphi_m(K+1) - \frac{n_0 M}{M} 2\pi} \right) / (K+1)
\]

\[
= \left( A e^{-i\varphi_m(K+1) - \frac{(m-n_0 L)(K+1)}{M} 2\pi} + B + C e^{i\varphi_m(K+1) - \frac{(m-n_0 L)(K+1)}{M} 2\pi} \right) / (K+1)
\]

\[
= H(\varphi_m)
\]

\[
H(\varphi_m) = H_{(m-n_0 L)(K+1)}
\]

It is easy to check that \( 0 \leq m - n_0 M \leq L \) or \( n_0 M \leq m \leq (n_0 + 1) L \), and

\[
\{ G_{n_0 M}, G_{(n_0 M + 1)}, \cdots, G_{(n_0 M + L)} \} = \{ H_0, H_{(K+1)}, \cdots, H_{L(K+1)} \}.
\]
Since the relation (33) is satisfied for every integer \( n_0 \in [0, K] \). Thus, we have

\[
SG = \{ \text{Spec}(G_0), \text{Spec}(G_1), \ldots, \text{Spec}(G_{M-1}) \} = \{ \text{Spec}(H_0), \text{Spec}(H_{(K+1)}), \ldots, \text{Spec}(H_{L(K+1)}) \}.
\]

Therefore,

\[
SG \subset SH,
\]

and

\[
SG \neq SH.
\]

For the case \( \text{mod}(M, (K + 1)) \neq 0 \), we set \( \text{mod}(M, (K + 1)) = l_0, M = L(K + 1) + l_0 \) and \( l_0 \in [1, K] \). For a fixed integer \( n_0 \in [0, K] \) and \( n_0M \leq m(K + 1) < (n_0 + 1)M \) we have

\[
G_m = G(\varphi_m) = \left( A e^{-i\varphi_m(K+1)} + B + Ce^{i\varphi_m(K+1)} \right) / (K + 1),
\]

\[
= \left( A e^{-\frac{m(K+1)}{M}2\pi} + B + Ce^{\frac{m(K+1)}{M}2\pi} \right) / (K + 1)
\]

\[
= \left( A e^{-\frac{m(K+1)-n_0M}{M}2\pi} + B + Ce^{\frac{m(K+1)-n_0M}{M}2\pi} \right) / (K + 1)
\]

\[
= \left( A e^{-\frac{(m-n_0L)(K+1)-n_0l_0}{M}2\pi} + B + Ce^{\frac{(m-n_0L)(K+1)-n_0l_0}{M}2\pi} \right) / (K + 1)
\]

\[
= H(\varphi(m-n_0L)(K+1)-n_0l_0)
\]

\[
= H_{(m-n_0L)(K+1)-n_0l_0}.
\]

(3) Since \( G_m \) can be written as

\[
G_m = \left( A e^{-m(K+1)2\pi} + B + Ce^{m(K+1)2\pi} \right) / (K + 1),
\]

the eigenvalue of \( G_m \) is a function of \( \omega^m \) and \( \omega = e^{\frac{2\pi i}{K+1}} \). Suppose \( \mu^{(1)}(\omega^m) \) be an eigenvalue of \( G_m \), then we have

\[
|\mu^{(1)}(\omega^m)| I_{(K+1)} - G(\omega^m(K+1)) = 0.
\]

Thus

\[
|\mu^{(1)}(e^{i\varphi_m}) I_{(K+1)} - G(e^{i\varphi_m(K+1)})| = 0,
\]

\[
|\mu^{(1)}(e^{i(\varphi_m - \frac{l-1}{K+1}2\pi)}) I_{(K+1)} - G(e^{i(\varphi_m - \frac{(l-1)}{K+1}2\pi)(K+1)})| = 0, \quad l = 2, 3, \ldots, K + 1.
\]

Since \( e^{i2\pi l} = 1 \), we have

\[
|\mu^{(1)}(e^{i(\varphi_m - \frac{(l-1)}{K+1}2\pi)}) I_{(K+1)} - G(e^{i\varphi_m(K+1)})| = 0, \quad l = 2, 3, \ldots, K + 1
\]
Thus $\mu^{(1)}(\varphi_m - \frac{(l-1)2\pi}{K+1})$, $2, 3, \ldots, K + 1$ are also eigenvalues of $G_m$. In addition, $\mu^{(1)}(\varphi_m - \frac{(l-1)2\pi}{K+1})$, $l = 1, 2, \ldots, K + 1$ are different from each other, thus the collection of them are the all eigenvalues of $G_m$, and we set that

$$
\mu^{(l)}(\varphi_m) = \mu^{(1)}(\varphi_m - \frac{(l-1)2\pi}{K+1}), \quad l = 1, 2, \ldots, K + 1. \tag{35}
$$

If $M = (K + 1)L$, we have

$$
\mu^{(l)}(\varphi_m) = \mu^{(1)}\left(\varphi_m - \frac{(l-1)2\pi}{K+1}\right)
= \mu^{(1)}\left(\frac{2\pi m}{M} - \frac{(l-1)2\pi}{K+1}\right)
= \mu^{(1)}\left(\frac{2\pi}{M} - \frac{L(l-1)-\frac{2\pi}{(K+1)L}}{M}\right)
= \mu^{(1)}\left(-L(l-1)+m\frac{2\pi}{M}\right).
$$

Since $\mu^{(1)}(\varphi)$ is a periodic function,

$$
Group^{(l)} = \left\{ \mu^{(1)}\left(\frac{2\pi m}{M}\right) \mid s = -L(l-1), -L(l-1)+1, -L(l-1)+2, \ldots, -L(l-1)+(M-1) \right\}
= \left\{ \mu^{(1)}\left(\frac{2\pi}{M}\right) m = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, M-1 \right\} = Group^{(l)}.
$$

(4) Denote $\phi_m = m\frac{2\pi}{M(K+1)}$. According to (35), we have

$$
\mu^{(l)}(\varphi_m) = \mu^{(1)}(\varphi_m - \frac{(l-1)2\pi}{K+1})
= \mu^{(1)}\left(\frac{(K+1)m}{(K+1)M}2\pi - \frac{(l-1)M}{(K+1)M}2\pi\right)
= \mu^{(1)}(\phi_{(K+1)m} - \frac{(l-1)M}{(K+1)M}2\pi).
$$

Thus, according to periodic property of eigenvalue function $\mu^{(1)}(\varphi)$ with period $2\pi$, we have

$$
\left\{ \mu^{(1)}(\phi_{(K+1)m} - \frac{(l-1)M}{(K+1)M}2\pi) \mid m = 0, 1, \ldots, M-1 \right\} \tag{36}
$$

$$
= \left\{ \mu^{(1)}(\phi_{(K+1)m+(K+1-\text{mod}(l-1)M, K+1)}) \mid m = 0, 1, \ldots, M-1 \right\}.
$$

It can be easily checked that

$$
\left\{ \text{mod}(l-1)M, K+1) \mid l = 1, 2, \ldots, K + 1 \right\}
= \left\{ \{0\}, \quad \text{if mod}(M, K + 1) = 0, \right. \\
\{0, 1, 2 \cdots, K\}, \quad \text{else.} \tag{37}
$$

Thus, taking (36) (37) and noting that

$$
\left\{ \mu^{(1)}(\phi_{(K+1)m+k}) \mid m = 0, 1, \ldots, M-1, k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, K \right\}
= \left\{ \mu^{(1)}(\phi_j) \mid j = 0, 1, 2, \cdots, M(K+1) \right\},
$$

36
we have
\[
\left\{ \mu^{(1)}(\phi_{(K+1)m}) - \frac{(l-1)M}{(K+1)M} 2\pi \right\} m = 0, 1, \ldots, M-1; l = 1, 2, \ldots, K+1
\]

\[
= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\mu^{(1)}(\phi_{(K+1)m}) & m = 0, 1, \ldots, M-1,
\mu^{(1)}(\phi_j) & j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, M(K+1)
\end{array} \right. \text{ if } \text{mod}(M, K+1) = 0,
\mu^{(1)}(\phi_j) & j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, M(K+1) \text{ else}.
\]

Therefore,
\[
SG = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\mu^{(1)}(\phi_{m}) - \frac{(l-1)M}{K+1} 2\pi & m = 0, 1, \ldots, M-1; l = 1, 2, \ldots, K+1
\end{array} \right.
\]

\[
= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\mu^{(1)}(\phi_{(K+1)m}) & m = 0, 1, \ldots, M-1,
\mu^{(1)}(\phi_j) & j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, M(K+1)
\end{array} \right. \text{ if } \text{mod}(M, K+1) = 0,
\mu^{(1)}(\phi_j) & j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, M(K+1) \text{ else}.
\]

**Appendix C. An example to explain properties of the eigenvalues in Theorem 2.1**

We take third-order WCNS for example to show the properties of the eigenvalues of local discrete matrices and the unique spectral curve.

The third-order WCNS can be written as the first form in \((24)\) with

\[
E = \frac{1}{K+1} \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{3}{2} & 1 & \frac{1}{2} \\
\frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & -3 \\
-3 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2}
\end{bmatrix} = \text{Circ}(c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_{N-1}),
\]

Here \(K = 2\) and \(N = (K+1)M\). In this case, \(E\) is not only a block circulant matrix but also a circulant matrix. The spectrum of \(E\) are

\[
\lambda_j(E) = f_C(\zeta^j) = c_0 + c_1 \zeta^j + \ldots + c_{N-1} (\zeta^j)^{N-1}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{K+1} \left\{ \frac{3}{2} + e^{j\varphi_j} + \frac{1}{2} e^{2j\varphi_j} - 3 \frac{1}{2} e^{j\varphi_j} \right\},
\]

\[
= \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{2}{3} \cos(\varphi_j) + \frac{1}{6} \cos(2\varphi_j) \right) + i \left( -\frac{1}{6} \sin(2\varphi_j) + \frac{4}{3} \sin(\varphi_j) \right),
\]

where \(\varphi_j = \frac{2\pi}{N} j = \frac{2\pi}{(K+1)M}, j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, N-1\).

On the other side, third-order WINS can also be written as the second form in \((25)\),

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \begin{bmatrix}
u_{j,1} \\
u_{j,2} \\
u_{j,3}
\end{bmatrix} = -\frac{1}{\Delta x} \cdot \frac{1}{(K+1)} \left\{ A \begin{bmatrix}
u_{j-1,1} \\
u_{j-2,2} \\
u_{j-3,3}
\end{bmatrix} + B \begin{bmatrix}
u_{j,1} \\
u_{j,2} \\
u_{j,3}
\end{bmatrix} + C \begin{bmatrix}
u_{j+1,1} \\
u_{j+2,2} \\
u_{j+3,3}
\end{bmatrix} \right\}
\]

with

\[
A = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & \frac{1}{2} & -3 \\
0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix},
B = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{3}{2} & 1 & 0 \\
-3 & \frac{3}{2} & 1 \\
\frac{1}{2} & -3 & \frac{3}{2}
\end{bmatrix},
C = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

Then, the matrix \(G_m\) is

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\begin{array}{cccc}
\mu^{(1)}(\phi_{(K+1)m}) & \frac{(l-1)M}{(K+1)M} 2\pi & \mu^{(1)}(\phi_j) & j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, M(K+1)
\end{array}
\end{bmatrix}
\]
Thus, \( \phi_m = m \frac{2\pi}{M} \), \( m = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, M - 1 \). \( G_m \) has \( K + 1 = 3 \) eigenvalues, which are

\[
\lambda^{(1)}(G_m) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{e^{i\phi_m}}{3} + \frac{1}{6} e^{2i\phi_m} - \frac{1}{e^{i\phi_m}} = f(\phi_m),
\]

\[
\lambda^{(2)}(G_m) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{e^{i(\phi_m + \frac{2\pi}{M+1})}}{3} + \frac{1}{6} e^{2i(\phi_m + \frac{2\pi}{M+1})} - \frac{1}{e^{i(\phi_m + \frac{2\pi}{M+1})}} = f(\phi_m + \frac{2\pi}{(k+1)}),
\]

\[
\lambda^{(3)}(G_m) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{e^{i(\phi_m + \frac{2\pi}{M+1})}}{3} + \frac{1}{6} e^{2i(\phi_m + \frac{2\pi}{M+1})} - \frac{1}{e^{i(\phi_m + \frac{2\pi}{M+1})}} = f(\phi_m + 2 \times \frac{2\pi}{(k+1)}).
\]

Thus, \( \{G_0, G_1, \ldots, G_{M-1}\} \) has \( (K + 1)M \) eigenvalues, which can be clarified as \( (K + 1) \)th groups,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Group}^{(1)} & = \left\{ \lambda^{(1)}(G_m), \ m = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, M - 1 \right\}, \\
\text{Group}^{(2)} & = \left\{ \lambda^{(2)}(G_m), \ m = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, M - 1 \right\}, \\
\text{Group}^{(3)} & = \left\{ \lambda^{(3)}(G_m), \ m = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, M - 1 \right\}.
\end{align*}
\]

\( \text{Group}^{(2)} \) and \( \text{Group}^{(3)} \) can be obtained by taking translation transformation for eigenvalue functions of \( \text{Group}^{(1)} \), as shown in Fig. 19(a).

Compare (38) with (39), we can find that \( \text{Group}^{(1)} \) has the same eigenvalue functions as SpecE obtained by circulant matrix or Fourier analysis. In addition, if \( M = (K + 1)L \), then \( \text{Group}^{(1)} = \text{Group}^{(2)} = \text{Group}^{(3)} \).

Here we also draw imaginary part of eigenvalues from \( \{H_0, H_1, H_2\} \), as shown in Fig. 19(b). We can see that they correspond to the first, second and third part of the spectrum Spec(E) obtained from Fourier analysis.
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(a) Imaginary part of all eigenvalues computed from matrices \(\{G_0, G_1, \ldots, G_{M-1}\}\)

(b) Imaginary part of all eigenvalues computed from matrices \(\{H_0, H_1, \ldots, H_{M-1}\}\)

Figure 19: Imaginary part of eigenvalues computed from two kinds of matrices of the third-order WCNS


