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The first step towards establishing credibility in computational physics simulations involves code verification, which is typically performed using exact and manufactured solutions. However, exact solutions are typically limited, and manufactured solutions generally require the invasive introduction of an artificial forcing term within the source code, such that the code solves a modified problem for which the solution is known. For some physics phenomena, such as non-decomposing ablation, there are many possible exact solutions to the governing equations, but the boundary conditions may render these impractical and eliminate such conveniences as separation of variables. For such phenomena, however, we can manufacture the terms that comprise the boundary conditions to obtain exact solutions. In this paper, we present a nonintrusive method for manufacturing solutions for non-decomposing ablation in two dimensions, which does not require the addition of a source term.

I. INTRODUCTION

Ablation plays an important role in many scientific and engineering applications, including fire protection, surgical procedures, combustion, and manufacturing. An understanding of ablative processes is particularly critical in the realm of hypersonic flight, where the ablating material serves to carry heat energy away from the vehicle and its payload. Since weight and cost are paramount concerns for flight vehicles, accurate prediction of the rate of mass and energy removal is essential, as it allows the designer to minimize heat shield weight under the constraint of maintaining adequate thermal protection. Furthermore, the spatial distribution of the ablation process directly affects the aerodynamic performance of the vehicle. Hence, credible predictions of ablative processes are crucial for the design of safe and efficient high-speed vehicles.

As with the computational simulation of any physical phenomenon, it is necessary to assess the implementation and the suitability of the underlying models in order to develop confidence in the simulation results. These assessments typically fall into two complementary categories: verification and validation. Validation evaluates the appropriateness of the models instantiated in the code for representing the relevant physical phenomena, and is typically performed through comparison with experimental data. Verification, on the other hand, assesses the correctness of the numerical solutions produced by the code, through comparison with the expected theoretical behavior of the implemented numerical methods. Following Roache [1], Salari and Knupp [2], and Oberkampf and Roy [3], verification can be further divided into the activities of code verification and solution verification. Solution verification involves the estimation of the numerical error for a particular simulation, whereas code verification assesses the correctness of the implementation of the numerical methods within the code. A review of code and solution verification is presented by Roy [4].

This paper focuses on code verification. The discretization of the governing equations of the physical models necessarily incurs a truncation error, and the solution to the discretized equations therefore incurs an associated discretization error. In the most basic sense of verification, if the discretization error tends to zero as the discretization is refined, the consistency of the code is verified [5]. This may be taken a step further by examining not only consistency, but the rate at which the error decreases as the discretization is refined. The code may then be verified by comparing this rate to the expected theoretical order of accuracy of the discretization scheme. Unfortunately, this approach requires knowledge of the exact solution to the problem at hand, and exact solutions to problems of engineering interest are rare. Hence, manufactured solutions are frequently employed to produce problems of sufficient complexity with known solutions [6].

Verification has been performed on computational physics codes associated with several fluid dynamics phenomena, including laminar flows [7], turbulent flows [8–12], flows with finite Knudsen numbers [13], viscous flows in shock tubes [14], hypersonic reacting flows [15], dense gas–particle flows [16], fluid–structure interaction [17], heat transfer in fluid–solid interaction [18], multiphase flows [19], and radiation hydrodynamics [20], as well as on the discretization of the gradient operator for finite volume methods [21]. Code-verification techniques for ablation have been presented by Hogan et al. [22], Blackwell and Hogan [23], and Amar et al. [24–26] for simple exact solutions. Additionally, a manufactured solution for heat conduction is presented in Amar et al. [26]. A nonintrusive approach to manufactured solutions for non-decomposing ablation in one dimension was introduced by Freno et al. [27].

In this paper, we extend the approach of Reference 27 to introduce a nonintrusive manufactured solutions approach for non-decomposing ablation in two dimensions, which introduces additional considerations, such as non-trivial mesh deformation and coordinate system choice.
We begin this process by optionally transforming the governing equations and deriving solutions to them. These solutions satisfy the boundary conditions on the nonablating surfaces but not on the ablating surface. With these solutions, we manufacture the remaining parameters to satisfy the boundary conditions on the ablating surface. Like traditional manufactured solutions, certain desirable properties of the underlying functions, such as a sufficient number of finite nontrivial derivatives and elementary function composition, take precedence over being physically realizable. Through this approach we can modify external data, rather than modifying the code to introduce a forcing term.

This paper is organized as follows. Section II describes the heat equation, as well as the ablation contribution and the domain evolution. Section III details our approach for verifying the accuracy of the discretization. Section IV provides derivations of exact solutions to the heat equation to account for ablation in Cartesian and polar coordinates. Section V describes how the ablation parameters are manufactured to satisfy the boundary conditions. Section VI demonstrates this methodology with numerical examples. Section VII summarizes this work.

II. GOVERNING EQUATIONS

For a solid, the energy equation due to heat conduction is

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}(\rho e) + \nabla \cdot q = 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

The specific internal energy $e$ can be modeled by $e = e_0 + \int_{T_0}^T c_p(T) d\tilde{T}$, where $c_p = c_p(T)$ is the specific heat capacity, and the heat flux $q$ can be modeled by Fourier’s law,

$$q = -k(T)\nabla T,$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

where $k(T)$ is the thermal conductivity of the isotropic material.

If the material density $\rho$ is invariant with respect to time and temperature, (1) becomes

$$\rho c_p(T) \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} - \nabla \cdot (k(T)\nabla T) = 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

When the material properties are constants, such that $\rho = \tilde{\rho}$, $k = \bar{k}$, and $c_p = \bar{c}_p$, (3) reduces to the constant-coefficient heat equation, $\frac{\partial T}{\partial t} - \bar{a} \Delta T = 0$, with thermal diffusivity $\bar{a} = \frac{k}{\rho \bar{c}_p}$.

A. Ablation and Boundary Conditions

We denote the time-dependent domain of the material by $\Omega(t)$. The boundary $\Gamma$ of the domain consists of an ablating surface $\Gamma_s$ and a non-ablating surface $\Gamma_0$, such that $\Gamma = \Gamma_s \cup \Gamma_0$. We denote the ablating surface by $\Gamma_s = \{ (x, y) : x = x_s, y = y_s \}$, which is arbitrarily parameterized by $x_s(\xi, t) = (x_s(\xi, t), y_s(\xi, t))$, where $\xi \in [0, 1]$ increases in the counterclockwise direction, and $t \in [0, T]$.

Along the ablating surface $\Gamma_s$, the material recedes by an amount $s(\xi, t)$ in the direction opposite to the outer normal of the surface, such that the recession rate is defined by

$$\dot{s}(\xi, t) = -\frac{\partial x_s}{\partial t}(\xi, t) \cdot n_s(\xi, t),$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

where the outer unit normal vector is defined by

$$n_s(\xi, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(\partial x_s/\partial\xi)^2 + (\partial y_s/\partial\xi)^2}} \begin{cases} y_s \end{cases}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

Appendix A provides a brief discussion on the implications of the parameter choice $\xi$.

The recession rate is modeled by

$$\dot{s}(\xi, t) = \frac{B'(T_s, p_s) C_s}{\rho_s},$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

where $\rho_s$, $T_s(\xi, t)$, and $p_s(\xi, t)$ are the material density, temperature, and pressure along the ablating surface, $B'(T_s, p_s)$ is the nondimensionalized char ablation rate, and $C_s(\xi, t)$ is the heat transfer coefficient, commonly denoted by $\rho_s u_s C_h$, where $C_h$ is the Stanton number and $u_s$ are the density and velocity at the outer edge of the boundary layer$^{23}$.

Defining $q_s = q_s \cdot n_s$, the heat flux along the ablating surface is

$$q_s = C_s [h_w(T_s, p_s) - h_r] + \rho_s \dot{s} (h_w(T_s, p_s) - h_s(T_s)).$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

In (7), the first term is the convective heat flux, and the second term is the energy loss from ablation. $h_w(T_s, p_s)$ is the wall enthalpy, $h_s(\xi, t)$ is the recovery enthalpy, and $h_s(\xi, t)$ is the solid enthalpy, computed from

$$h_s(T_s) = h_0 + \int_{T_0}^{T_s} c_p(T) d\tilde{T},$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

where, for our purposes, we set $h_0 = 0$ J/kg and $T_0 = 273.15$ K. $h_w(T_s, p_s)$ in (7) and $B'(T_s, p_s)$ in (6) are both computed from a surface thermochemistry model and provided as tabulated data.

From (2) and referencing (7), the boundary condition along the ablating surface is

$$-k(T_s) \frac{\partial T}{\partial n} = q_s.$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

Along the non-ablating surface $\Gamma_0$, there is no heat flux ($q_0 = q_0 \cdot n_0 = 0$), such that, from (2),

$$\frac{\partial T}{\partial n} = 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)
III. Manufactured Solutions

A governing system of partial differential equations can be written generally as

\[ r(u; \mu) = 0, \]  
(11)

where \( r \) is the residual vector, \( u = u(x, t) \) is the state vector, and \( \mu \) is the parameter vector. To solve (11) numerically, it must be discretized in time and space:

\[ r_h(u_h; \mu) = 0, \]

where \( r_h \) is the residual of the discretized system of equations, and \( u_h \) is the solution to the discretized equations.

The discretization error is \( e_u = u_h - u \), and its norm \( \| e_u \| \approx Ch^p \), where \( C \) is a function of the solution derivatives, \( h \) is representative of the discretization size, and \( p \) is the order of accuracy. Through convergence studies of the norm of the error, we can assess whether the expected order of accuracy is obtained.

However, \( e_u \) can only be measured if \( u \) is known. Exact solutions to (11) require negligible implementation effort, but are generally too limited to fully exercise the capabilities of the code. Manufactured solutions are therefore popular alternatives, which typically introduce a forcing vector into the original equations to coerce the solution to the manufactured one:

\[ r_h(u_h; \mu) = r(u_{MS}; \mu). \]  
(12)

In (12), \( r(u_{MS}; \mu) \) is computed analytically since \( r, u_{MS} \), and \( \mu \) are known.

An alternative approach, which we employ in this paper, involves manufacturing the parameters instead to obtain \( r(u; \mu_{MP}) = 0 \), which is solved numerically by

\[ r_h(u_h; \mu_{MP}) = 0. \]  
(13)

Unlike the approach in (12), the approach in (13) does not require code modification.

To compute \( u \), we derive solutions to the governing equations. For the boundary conditions that cannot be satisfied, we manufacture the underlying parameters \( \mu_{MP} \). For ablation, we demonstrate this approach in Sections IV and V.

IV. Heat Equation Solution

We consider the temperature-dependent material properties \( k(T) = \bar{k} f(T) \) and \( c_p(T) = \bar{c}_p f(T) \), where \( f(T) > 0 \) for \( T > 0 \) and \( \rho = \bar{\rho} \). Employing a Cole–Hopf transformation\(^{28}\), we obtain

\[ \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t} = f(T) \frac{\partial T}{\partial t}, \]

\[ \nabla \theta = f(T) \nabla T, \]  
(15)

which are substituted into (3) to yield a constant-coefficient heat equation

\[ \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t} - \bar{\alpha} \Delta \theta = 0. \]  
(16)

From (15), the normal derivatives are related by

\[ \frac{\partial T}{\partial n} = \frac{1}{f(T)} \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial n}. \]  
(17)

To solve (16), we temporarily disregard the time dependency of the domain and assume we can separate the time and space dependencies of the solution, such that

\[ \theta(x, t) = \sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty} \hat{\theta}_{m,n}(t) \varphi_{m,n}(x), \]  
(18)

where \( \varphi_{m,n}(x) \) is an orthogonal basis, and \( m \) and \( n \) are indices associated with the basis of different spatial coordinates. Substituting (18) into (16) yields

\[ \frac{1}{\bar{\alpha}} \frac{\partial \hat{\theta}_{m,n}(t)}{\partial t} = \Delta \hat{\theta}_{m,n}(x) = -\lambda_{m,n}. \]  
(19)

From (19),

\[ \hat{\theta}_{m,n}(t) = \hat{\theta}_{m,n_0} e^{-\bar{\alpha} \lambda_{m,n} t}, \]  
(20)

where

\[ \hat{\theta}_{m,n_0} = \frac{\int_{\Omega(0)} \theta(x, 0) \varphi_{m,n}(x) d\Omega}{\int_{\Omega(0)} \varphi_{m,n}(x)^2 d\Omega}. \]

Because we are focusing on ablative processes and interested in verifying the time integrator, we are particularly interested in cases where the temperature increases with time, which occurs when \( \lambda_{m,n} < 0 \).

In the following two subsections, we derive \( \varphi_{m,n}(x) \) and \( \lambda_{m,n} \) for 1) a particular type of domain in Cartesian coordinates, and 2) a particular type of domain in polar coordinates.

A. Cartesian Coordinates

For this problem, the domain is defined by \( \Omega = \{(x, y) : 0 \leq x \leq x_s, 0 \leq y \leq H\} \}. The ablating surface \( \Gamma_s \) is subject to the boundary condition in (9), whereas the remaining edges \((x = 0, y = 0, y = H)\) comprise \( \Gamma_n \), with the boundary condition in (10). Figure 1 provides an
From (19), we obtain
\[ \nu_n(y) = \cos(n\pi y/H). \]  
(23)

From (22), \( u'_n(x) + \mu_m^2 u_n(x) = 0 \), where \( \mu_m^2 = \lambda_{m,n} - \nu^2_n \), and \( \mu_m^2 \) is real. From (10) and (17), at \( x = 0 \) and \( y = H, \frac{\partial\theta}{\partial y} = 0 \), such that \( v'_n(0) = v'_n(H) = 0 \). For a nontrivial solution for \( v_n \), \( v_n = n\pi/H \) for \( n \in \mathbb{N}_0 \), such that
\[ \lambda_{m,n} = \mu_m^2 + \nu_n^2. \]  
(25)

known, (18) satisfies (16) and the boundary conditions on \( \Gamma_0 \) (10). However, the boundary conditions on \( \Gamma_s \) (9) have not been addressed and \( \mu_m \) has not been determined. Because the domain varies with respect to time and \( x_s \) can vary with respect to \( y \), we cannot satisfy general boundary conditions with (18). Therefore, in Section V, we manufacture the ablating boundary condition such that it is always satisfied.

**B. Polar Coordinates**

For this problem, the domain is defined by \( \Omega = \{(r, \phi) : r_0 \leq r \leq r_s, 0 \leq \phi \leq \phi_0 \} \). The ablating surface \( \Gamma_s \) is subject to the boundary condition in (9), whereas the remaining edges \( (r = r_0, \phi = 0, \phi = \phi_0) \) comprise \( \Gamma_0 \), with the boundary condition in (10). Figure 2 provides an example of this domain with \( \phi_0 = \pi/2 \); however, it is not necessary for the domain to initially be a fractional annulus. The requirements are that the two radial edges that comprise \( \Gamma_0 \) remain radial at fixed angles, and the inner radius edge remains unchanged.

With these requirements, we assume we can separate the \( r \) and \( \phi \) dependencies, such that
\[ \varphi_{m,n}(x) = u_{m,n}(r)v_n(\phi). \]  
(21)

Note that, unlike \( u_m(x) \) and \( v_n(y) \), which are decoupled in Section IV A, \( u_m(r) \) depends on \( v_n(\phi) \). From (19), we obtain
\[ \lambda_{m,n} r^2 + \frac{r^2 u''_{m,n}(r) + r u'_{m,n}(r)}{u_{m,n}(r)} = -\frac{v'_n(\phi)}{v_n(\phi)} = \nu_n^2. \]  
(26)

From (26), \( v''_n(\phi) + \nu_n^2 v_n(\phi) = 0 \), and from (10) and (17), at \( \phi = 0 \) and \( \phi = \phi_0, \frac{\partial\theta}{\partial \phi} = 0 \), such that \( v'_n(0) = v'_n(\phi_0) = 0 \). For a nontrivial solution for \( v_n \), \( v_n = n\pi/\phi_0 \) for \( n \in \mathbb{N}_0 \), such that
\[ v_n(\phi) = \cos(n\pi \phi/\phi_0). \]  
(27)
From (26), we obtain
\[ r^2 u_{m,n}''(r) + ru_{m,n}'(r) + (\lambda_{m,n}r^2 - \nu_n^2)u_{m,n}(r) = 0, \]
and from (10) and (17), at \( r = r_0 \), \( \frac{\partial u}{\partial r} = 0 \), such that \( u_{m,n}(r_0) = 0 \). For a nontrivial solution for \( u_{m,n} \),
\[
u_n \begin{cases} 
K_{m,n} I_{\nu_n}(r') + I_{m,n} K_{\nu_n}(r') & \text{for } \lambda_{m,n} < 0 \\
Y_{m,n} J_{\nu_n}(r') + J_{m,n} Y_{\nu_n}(r') & \text{for } \lambda_{m,n} > 0, \\
\cosh(\nu_n \ln(r/r_0)) & \text{for } \lambda_{m,n} = 0
\end{cases}
\]
where \( r' = \sqrt{\lambda_{m,n}} r \), \( I_\nu \) and \( K_\nu \) are modified Bessel functions of the first and second kind\(^{29} \), \( J_\nu \) and \( Y_\nu \) are Bessel functions of the first and second kind, and
\[
\begin{align*}
K_{m,n} &= K_{\nu_n-1}(r'_0) + K_{\nu_n+1}(r'_0), \\
I_{m,n} &= I_{\nu_n-1}(r'_0) + I_{\nu_n+1}(r'_0), \\
Y_{m,n} &= Y_{\nu_n-1}(r'_0) - Y_{\nu_n+1}(r'_0), \\
J_{m,n} &= -J_{\nu_n-1}(r'_0) + J_{\nu_n+1}(r'_0).
\end{align*}
\]
\( \lambda_{m,n} \) depends on the boundary condition at \( r = r_s \).
As with Section IV.A, the boundary conditions on \( \Gamma_s \) (9) have not yet been addressed and \( \lambda_{m,n} \) has not been determined. In Section V, we manufacture the ablating boundary condition such that it is always satisfied.

V. BOUNDARY CONDITION RECONCILIATION

In this section, we manufacture the ablating boundary condition so that we can manufacture arbitrary solutions without adding a source term. In doing so, we have much freedom, provided the functions are sufficiently smooth. Like traditional manufactured solutions, certain desirable properties of the underlying functions, such as a sufficient number of finite nontrivial derivatives and elementary function composition, take precedence over being physically realizable.

We begin by manufacturing \( T(x, t) \), which requires manufacturing the material properties \( k(T) \), \( c_p(T) \), and \( \rho \), as well as \( \theta(x, t) \) (18).

To manufacture the material properties, we must manufacture \( k, c_p, \) and \( \rho \), as well as \( f(T) \). From \( k, c_p, \) and \( \rho \), we can compute \( \theta \) in (20). \( f(T) \) relates \( T(x, t) \) and \( T(x, t) \) and provides the dependencies of \( k(T) \) and \( c_p(T) \) on \( T \); it should be manufactured such that the inverse of (14), \( T(x, t) = F^{-1}(\theta) \), can be easily computed.

To manufacture \( \theta(x, t) \), we truncate the series in (18) and we specify \( \theta_{m,n} \) in \( \theta_{m,n}(t) \) (20). If we are using Cartesian coordinates, we specify \( \theta_{m,n} \), which appears in \( u_{m,n}(x) \) (24) and \( \lambda_{m,n} \) (25). If we are using polar coordinates, we specify \( \lambda_{m,n} \). With \( \theta(x, t) \) specified, we can compute the temperature from \( T(x, t) = F^{-1}(\theta) \).

Next, we manufacture \( x_s(\xi, t) \), such that we can compute \( n_s(\xi, t) \) from (5), then \( \dot s(\xi, t) \) from (4).

With \( T(x, t) \) and \( x_s(\xi, t) \) manufactured, the next step is to manufacture the parameters to satisfy the boundary condition on \( \Gamma_s \) (9):
\[
-k(T_s) \frac{\partial T}{\partial n} = C_s [h_w(T_s, p_s) - h_r] + p_s \dot s [h_w(T_s, p_s) - h_s(T_s)], \tag{29}
\]
as well as the recession rate (6). In (29), \( \frac{\partial T}{\partial n} \), \( T_s \), \( k(T_s), p_s \), and \( \dot s(\xi, t) \) have already been determined, and \( h_s(\xi, t) = h_s(T_s, \xi, t) \) can be computed from (8) using \( T(x, t), x_s(\xi, t), \) and \( c_p(T) \). Therefore, \( C_s(\xi, t), p_s(\xi, t), h_w(T_s, p_s), \) and \( h_r(\xi, t) \) need to be determined. In (6), \( s(\xi, t) \) has already been determined, such that \( B'(T_s, p_s) \) and \( C_s(\xi, t) \) need to be determined. Therefore, we next manufacture \( B'(T_s, p_s) \) and \( p_s(\xi, t) \).

Using (6), (9) can be written as
\[
\begin{align*}
q_s &= C_s (h_w(T_s, p_s) [1 + B'(T_s, p_s)] - h_r - B'(T_s, p_s) h_s(T_s)) \tag{30}.
\end{align*}
\]
In manufacturing the parameters, care must be taken to ensure that (30) does not introduce instabilities due to perturbations in the temperature, such as those that arise from discretization errors. Because we are interested in cases where the temperature increases with time, we impose \( \frac{\partial T}{\partial n} \geq 0 \). This is explained in Appendix B. For convenience, we consider the equality:
\[
h_w(T_s, p_s) [1 + B'(T_s, p_s)] = B'(T_s, p_s) h_s(T_s) = g(p_s),
\]
which yields
\[
h_w(T_s, p_s) = \frac{B'(T_s, p_s) h_s(T_s) + g(p_s)}{1 + B'(T_s, p_s)}.
\]
For additional convenience, we set \( g(p_s) = 0 \). With these functions known, we compute \( C_s(\xi, t) \) from (6) and \( h_r(\xi, t) \) from (29).

VI. NUMERICAL EXAMPLES

In this section, we demonstrate the methodology of Section V on problems in Cartesian and polar coordinate systems using SIERRA Multimechanics Module: Aria\(^{30} \) for multiple discretizations. The spatial domain is discretized using second-order-accurate finite elements, and the equations are integrated in time using a first-order-accurate backward Euler scheme. Therefore, each subsequent discretization uses twice the number of elements in each dimension and quadruple the number of time steps as the previous discretization. Additionally, the piecewise linear interpolation of tabulated parameters is second-order accurate, such that, for each discretization, we double the amount of samples contained in the tables. Letting \( h \) denote a quantity proportional to the number of elements in one dimension and accounting
for the aforementioned refinement ratios, we expect the error to be $O(h^2)$.

We measure the error in the temperature using the norm

$$
\varepsilon_T = \max_{t \in [0, \bar{t}]} \| T_h(x, t) - T(x, t) \|_2,
$$

(31)

by taking maximum over the time steps of the $L^2$-norm of the error over the spatial domain. The subscript $h$ denotes the solution to the discretized equations. We similarly measure the error in the ablating surface using the norm

$$
\varepsilon_s = \max_{t \in [0, \bar{t}]} \| x_{s,h}(\xi, t) - x_s(\xi, t) \|_2.
$$

(32)

In (32), the $L^2$-norm of the error is computed over the ablating surface.

Mesh deformation is accomplished through a Gent hyperelastic mesh stress model.

For the material properties of both problem sets, we consider $\bar{\alpha} = \{10^{-8}, 10^{-7}, 10^{-6}, 10^{-5} \}$ $m^2/s$, $\bar{\rho} = 1000$ kg/m$^3$, and $\bar{k} = 0.7$ W/m/K, which enable us to compute $\bar{\epsilon}_p$. For the thermochemical data, we manufacture

$$
B'(T_s, p_s) = \exp \left( \frac{3T_s}{T} - \frac{p_s}{50\bar{\rho}} \right),
$$

where $\bar{p} = 101,325$ Pa, and $p_s(t) = \bar{p}e^{5t/\bar{t}}/200$.

A. Cartesian Coordinates

The first problem set we consider uses Cartesian coordinates. For the temperature dependence, we choose

$$
f(T) = \frac{4}{3} \left( \frac{T}{T_{\text{sat}}} \right)^{1/3},
$$

such that $\theta(x, t) = F(T) = (T(x, t)^4/\bar{T})^{1/3}$ and $T(x, t) = F^{-1}(\theta) = (\bar{T}\theta(x, t)^3)^{1/4}$. We set $\bar{T} = 3000$ K.

For $\theta(x, t)$, we truncate (18) to max $m = 0$ and max $n = 1$. We choose this truncation because $u_0(y) = 1$ and $v_1(y) = \cos(\pi y/H)$ (23) enable us to obtain variation with respect to $y$ without $\theta(x, t)$ becoming negative. For $u_0(x)$, we choose an imaginary valued $\mu_0 = 3i/(2W)$, such that $\lambda_{m,n} (25)$ is negative and the temperature increases with time. $u_0(x) = \cosh(3x/(2W))$ (24) then provides sufficient variation with respect to $x$. We set $\bar{\theta}_{0,0} = 400$ K, and $\bar{\theta}_{0,1} = -100$ K. With these choices, (18) becomes

$$
\theta(x, t) = 100e^{22.5\alpha_0 t} \left( 4 - e^{-2500\pi^2\alpha_0 t} \cos(\pi y/H) \right) \times \cosh(3x/(2W)) K.
$$

To manufacture the recession, we manufacture

$$
x_s(\xi, t) = \left\{ W \left( 1 - \frac{t}{\bar{t}} + 2 \sin(\pi \xi/2) \right) / 4, H\xi \right\},
$$

which has the initial condition $x_s(\xi, 0) = \{W, \xi H\}$, such that the initial domain is a rectangle. $\xi$ is related to $x_s$ by $\xi = y_s/H$. For the spatial domain, we set $W = 1$ cm and $H = 2$ cm, and, for the time domain, we set $\bar{t} = 5$ s. Figure 1 shows the evolution of the domain, and Figure 3 shows evolution of $T$ for $\bar{\alpha} = 10^{-5}$ m$^2$/s. Tables 1 and 2 list the extrema of $T_s$, $c_p(T_s)$, $k(T_s)$, $h_s(T_s)$, $h_w(T_s, p_s)$, $B'(T_s, p_s)$, $h_s(\xi, t)$, and $C_s(\xi, t)$ for $t \in [0, \bar{t}]$.

We consider five discretizations, the coarsest of which contains $8 \times 16$ elements with a time step of 0.2 s, and the finest contains $128 \times 256$ elements with a time step of 0.78125 ms. For each of the five values of $\bar{\alpha}$, Figure 4 shows how the error norms $\varepsilon_T$ (31) and $\varepsilon_s$ (32), which are nondimensionalized by $T_0 = 1$ K and $x_0 = 1$ m, vary with respect to $n$, which is the number of elements. The error norms in both plots are $O(h^2)$, as expected.
B. Polar Coordinates

The second problem set we consider uses polar coordinates. For this problem set, we use constant coefficients, such that \( f(T) = 1 \), and \( T(x, t) = \theta(x, t) \).

For \( \theta(x, t) \), we truncate (18) to max \( m = 0 \) and max \( n = 1 \). We choose this truncation because \( v_0(\phi) = 1 \) and \( v_1(\phi) = \cos(\pi \phi / \phi_0) \) (27) enable us to obtain variation with respect to \( \phi \) without \( \theta(x, t) \) becoming negative. For \( u_{0,0}(r) \) and \( u_{0,1}(r) \) (28), we choose \( \lambda_{0,0} = \lambda_{0,1} = -22,500 \) m\(^{-2}\), so that the temperature increases with time. \( u_{0,0}(r) \) and \( u_{0,1}(r) \) provide sufficient variation with respect to \( r \). We set \( \theta_{0,0} = 200 \) K, and \( \theta_{0,1} = 30 \) K.

To manufacture the recession, we relate \( \xi \) to \( x_s \) by \( \xi = \phi_s / \phi_0 \), and we manufacture

\[
    x_s(\xi, t) = r_s(\xi, t) \{ \cos \phi_s, \sin \phi_s \}, \tag{33}
\]

where

\[
    r_s(\xi, t) = r_1 - (r_1 - r_0) \frac{t \, 3 + \cos(\pi \xi)}{t}.
\]

Equation (33) has the initial condition \( x_s(\xi, 0) = r_1 \{ \cos \phi_s, \sin \phi_s \} \), such that the initial domain is a fractional annulus. For the spatial domain, we set \( r_0 = 1 \) cm, \( r_1 = 2 \) cm, and \( \phi_0 = \pi/2 \), and, for the time domain, we set \( t = 5 \) s. Figure 2 shows the evolution of the domain, and Figure 5 shows evolution of \( T \) for \( \tilde{\alpha} = 10^{-5} \) m\(^2\)/s. Tables 3 and 4 list the extrema of \( T_s \), \( c_p(T_s) \), \( k(T_s) \), \( h_s(T_s) \), \( h_w(T_s, p_s) \), \( B'(T_s, p_s) \), \( h_r(\xi, t) \), and \( C_s(\xi, t) \) for \( t \in [0, \tilde{t}] \).

We consider five discretizations, the coarsest of which contains \( 8 \times 18 \) elements with a time step of 0.2 s, and the finest contains \( 128 \times 288 \) elements with a time step of 0.78125 ms. For each of the five values of \( \tilde{\alpha} \), Figure 6 shows how the error norms \( \varepsilon_T (31) \) and \( \varepsilon_{x_s} (32) \) vary with respect to \( n \). The error norms in both plots are \( O(h^2) \), as expected.
Figure 5: Polar coordinates: Temperature at multiple instances in time for $\bar{\alpha} = 10^{-5}$ m$^2$/s.

### Table 3: Polar coordinates: Extrema of $T_s$, $c_p(T_s)$, $k(T_s)$, and $h_s(T_s)$ for $t \in [0, \bar{t}]$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\bar{\alpha}$ [m$^2$/s]</th>
<th>$T_s$ [×10$^3$ K]</th>
<th>$c_p(T_s)$ [J/kg/K]</th>
<th>$k(T_s)$ [×10$^{-1}$ W/m/K]</th>
<th>$h_s(T_s)$ [J/kg]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$10^{-5}$</td>
<td>0.3268</td>
<td>7.0000 × 10$^4$</td>
<td>7.0000 × 10$^4$</td>
<td>3.7530 × 10$^6$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10^{-6}$</td>
<td>0.3301</td>
<td>7.0000 × 10$^3$</td>
<td>7.0000 × 10$^3$</td>
<td>3.9858 × 10$^5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10^{-7}$</td>
<td>0.3653</td>
<td>7.0000 × 10$^2$</td>
<td>7.0000 × 10$^2$</td>
<td>6.4478 × 10$^4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10^{-8}$</td>
<td>0.4110</td>
<td>7.0000 × 10$^1$</td>
<td>7.0000 × 10$^1$</td>
<td>9.6514 × 10$^3$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4: Polar coordinates: Extrema of $h_w(T_s, p_s)$, $B'(T_s, p_s)$, $h_r(\xi, t)$, and $C_s(\xi, t)$ for $t \in [0, \bar{t}]$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\bar{\alpha}$ [m$^2$/s]</th>
<th>$h_w(T_s, p_s)$ [J/kg]</th>
<th>$B'(T_s, p_s)$ [×10$^{-1}$]</th>
<th>$h_r(\xi, t)$ [J/kg]</th>
<th>$C_s(\xi, t)$ [kg/m$^2$/2]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$10^{-5}$</td>
<td>8.0534 × 10$^5$</td>
<td>8.5613 × 10$^5$</td>
<td>7.6789 × 10$^3$</td>
<td>1.6576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10^{-6}$</td>
<td>8.5752 × 10$^4$</td>
<td>8.5613 × 10$^4$</td>
<td>7.7888 × 10$^3$</td>
<td>1.6576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10^{-7}$</td>
<td>1.4259 × 10$^4$</td>
<td>8.5613 × 10$^4$</td>
<td>8.9993 × 10$^3$</td>
<td>1.6576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10^{-8}$</td>
<td>2.2366 × 10$^3$</td>
<td>2.7206 × 10$^4$</td>
<td>1.7095 × 10$^3$</td>
<td>0.9285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VII. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we provided an approach to perform code verification for two-dimensional, non-decomposing ablation by deriving solutions that did not require code modification. Through this approach, we computed solutions to the heat equations for different coordinate systems, then we manufactured the dependencies of the boundary conditions. In doing so, we could compute error norms and measure their convergence rates. We demonstrated this approach for two cases, which achieved the expected accuracy.
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Appendix A: Parameter Implications for $x_s(\xi, t)$

$x_s(\xi, t) = (x_s(\xi, t), y_s(\xi, t))$ is parameterized arbitrarily in terms of $\xi$, which is chosen for convenience. However, in general, this parameterization does not reflect the material recession $s(\xi, t)$ in the direction opposite to the outer normal of the surface:

$$\frac{\partial x_s}{\partial t} \neq -\dot{s}n_s.$$  

Instead, let such a parameterization be denoted by $\eta = \eta(\xi, t)$, such that $\xi = \xi(\eta, t)$.

Consequently,

$$\frac{dx_s}{dt} = \frac{\partial x_s}{\partial \xi} \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial x_s}{\partial \eta} \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial t} = -\dot{s}n_s. \tag{A1}$$

To obtain (4), we take the dot product of (A1) with $n_s$ (5):

$$\dot{s} = -\frac{dx_s}{dt} \cdot n_s$$

$$= -\left(\frac{\partial x_s}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial x_s}{\partial \xi} \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial x_s}{\partial \eta} \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial t}\right) \cdot n_s$$

$$= -\left(\frac{\partial x_s}{\partial t} \frac{\partial y_s}{\partial \xi} + \frac{\partial y_s}{\partial \xi} \frac{\partial x_s}{\partial \xi} + \frac{\partial y_s}{\partial \eta} \frac{\partial x_s}{\partial \eta} \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial t}\right) \cdot n_s$$

$$= -\left(\frac{\partial x_s}{\partial t} \frac{\partial y_s}{\partial \xi} + \frac{\partial y_s}{\partial \xi} \frac{\partial x_s}{\partial \xi} \right) / n_s,$$

$$= -\frac{\partial x_s}{\partial t} \cdot n_s. \tag{A2}$$

where $n_s = \sqrt{\left(\frac{\partial x_s}{\partial \xi}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\partial y_s}{\partial \xi}\right)^2}$ and (A2) is (4). Therefore, despite potentially not knowing $\eta$, we can proceed with $\xi$. 

Figure 6: Polar coordinates: Norms of the error in $T$ (a) and $x_s$ (b).
Appendix B: Stability Implications of $\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x}$

Consider the constant-coefficient heat equation (16). From (10) and (17), the boundary condition on $\Gamma_0$ is $\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial n} = 0$. From (9) and (17), the boundary condition on $\Gamma_s$ is

$$\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial n} = f(T_s) \frac{\partial T_s}{\partial n} = -\frac{q_s(T_s)}{k}.$$  

From (16), the error $e_\theta$ is governed by

$$\frac{\partial e_\theta}{\partial t} - \alpha \Delta e_\theta = 0. \quad (B1)$$

The boundary condition on $\Gamma_0$ is $\frac{\partial e_\theta}{\partial n} = 0$, and the boundary condition on $\Gamma_s$ is

$$\frac{\partial e_\theta}{\partial n} = -\frac{q_s(T_s) - q_s(\bar{T}_s)}{k}.$$  

A Taylor series expansion of $q_s(\bar{T}_s) - q_s(T_s)$ in (B2) about $\bar{T}_s = T_s$ yields

$$q_s(T_s) - q_s(T_s) = \frac{\partial q_s}{\partial T_s} e_{T_s} + O(e_{T_s}^2). \quad (B3)$$

where $e_{T_s} = \bar{T}_s - T_s$ and a Taylor series expansion of $e_{T_s}$ about $\bar{\theta}_s = \theta_s$ yields

$$e_{T_s} = F^{-1}(\bar{\theta}_s) - F^{-1}(\theta_s) = \frac{1}{f(T_s)} e_{\theta_s} + O(e_{\theta_s}^2). \quad (B4)$$

As in Section IV, we express the solution to (B1) as

$$e_\theta(x, t) = \sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty} \hat{e}_{\theta_{m,n}}(t) \varphi_{m,n}(x),$$

such that

$$\hat{e}_{\theta_{m,n}}(t) = \hat{e}_{\theta_{m,n}} e^{-\alpha \lambda_{m,n} t}. \quad (B5)$$

Therefore, if $\lambda_{m,n}$ is negative in (B5), $e_\theta$ will grow with time and (16) will be unstable, unless $\varphi_{m,n}(x) = 0$.

From (19),

$$\Delta \varphi_{m,n}(x) + \lambda_{m,n} \varphi_{m,n}(x) = 0. \quad (B6)$$

Projecting (B6) onto $\varphi_{m,n}(x)$ yields

$$\int_{\Omega(t)} \varphi_{m,n}(x) \Delta \varphi_{m,n}(x) d\Omega + \lambda_{m,n} \int_{\Omega(t)} \varphi_{m,n}(x)^2 d\Omega = 0. \quad (B7)$$

From (B2), (B3), and (B4), at $\Gamma_s$,

$$\frac{\partial \varphi_{m,n}}{\partial n}(x_s) \approx -\frac{1}{k(T_s)} \frac{\partial q_s}{\partial T_s} \varphi_{m,n}(x_s). \quad (B8)$$

Integrating the first term in (B7) by parts using (B8) yields

$$-\int_{\Gamma_s(t)} \frac{1}{k(T_s)} \frac{\partial q_s}{\partial T_s} \varphi_{m,n}(x_s)^2 d\Gamma - \int_{\Omega(t)} \| \nabla \varphi_{m,n}(x) \| d\Omega + \lambda_{m,n} \int_{\Omega(t)} \varphi_{m,n}(x)^2 d\Omega = 0. \quad (B9)$$

If $\lambda_{m,n}$ is negative and $\varphi_{m,n}(x) \neq 0$, (B9) is only satisfied if $\frac{\partial q_s}{\partial T_s} < 0$. Therefore, $\frac{\partial q_s}{\partial T_s} \geq 0$ will yield $\varphi_{m,n}(x) = 0$, such that $e_\theta$ will not increase in time and (16) will be stable.


