

Optimal convergence rate of the explicit Euler method for convection-diffusion equations II: high dimensional cases

Qifeng Zhang · Jiyuan Zhang · Zhi-zhong Sun

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract This is the second part of study on the optimal convergence rate of the explicit Euler discretization in time for the convection-diffusion equations [Appl. Math. Lett. **131** (2022) 108048] which focuses on high-dimensional linear/nonlinear cases under Dirichlet or Neumann boundary conditions. Several new corrected difference schemes are proposed based on the explicit Euler discretization in temporal derivative and central difference discretization in spatial derivatives. The priori estimate of the corrected scheme with application to constant convection coefficients is provided at length by the maximum principle and the optimal convergence rate four is proved when the step ratios along each direction equal to $1/6$. The corrected difference schemes have essentially improved **CFL** condition and the numerical accuracy comparing with the classical difference schemes. Numerical examples involving two-/three-dimensional linear/nonlinear problems under Dirichlet/Neumann boundary conditions such as the Fisher equation, the Chafee-Infante equation, the Burgers' equation and classification to name a few substantiate the good properties claimed for the corrected difference scheme.

Keywords Convection-diffusion equation · Explicit Euler method · Priori estimate · **CFL** condition · Optimal convergence rate

Mathematics Subject Classification (2020) 65M06 · 65M12

1 Introduction

Historically, the explicit Euler method has been one of the most classical and oldest numerical methods, which is compulsory part in our textbooks and monographs, see e.g., [3, 7, 12, 13]. It and other improved versions were frequently used as the time integrator for the numerical solutions of ordinary differential equations or partial differential equations [4, 6, 8, 11, 14].

✉ Qifeng Zhang

Department of Mathematics, Zhejiang Sci-Tech University, Hangzhou, 310018, China;
E-mail: zhangqifeng0504@zstu.edu.cn

Jiyuan Zhang

Department of Mathematics, Zhejiang Sci-Tech University, Hangzhou, 310018, China
E-mail: z018283@126.com

Zhi-zhong Sun

Department of Mathematics, Southeast University, Nanjing, 210096, China
E-mail: zzsun@seu.edu.cn

However, most of the time we ignore the fact that explicit Euler method could generate superconvergence with a specific step-ratio when it is applied to solve the convection-diffusion problems [15]. Subsequently to the result in [15], as the second part of this series of study, we further investigate the optimal convergence rate of the explicit Euler method with application to the convection-diffusion equations in two-dimensional and three-dimensional cases.

In this paper, we will first consider the numerical procedure for the initial-boundary value problem of the anisotropic convection-diffusion equation with variable convection coefficients as follows

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \nabla \cdot (A \nabla u) + B \cdot \nabla u + f(\mathbf{x}, t), & \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, t \in (0, T], \end{cases} \quad (1.1a)$$

$$\begin{cases} u(\mathbf{x}, 0) = \varphi(\mathbf{x}), & \mathbf{x} \in \bar{\Omega}, \end{cases} \quad (1.1b)$$

$$\begin{cases} u(\mathbf{x}, t) = \alpha(\mathbf{x}, t), & \mathbf{x} \in \Gamma, t \in (0, T], \end{cases} \quad (1.1c)$$

where $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ or $\mathbb{R}^3$, A is a diagonal matrix with positive diagonal elements and B is a two- or three-dimensional vector-value function. $\bar{\Omega}$ is the closure of Ω and Γ is the boundary of Ω . $f(\mathbf{x}, t)$, $\varphi(\mathbf{x})$ and $\alpha(\mathbf{x}, t)$ are given smooth functions satisfying the consistent conditions. Then we will further move our attention to a more general nonlinear convection-diffusion equation

$$\begin{cases} u_t + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{F}(u) = \nabla \cdot (A \nabla u) + r(u), & \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, t \in (0, T], \end{cases} \quad (1.2a)$$

$$\begin{cases} u(\mathbf{x}, 0) = \varphi(\mathbf{x}), & \mathbf{x} \in \bar{\Omega}, \end{cases} \quad (1.2b)$$

$$\begin{cases} u(\mathbf{x}, t) = \alpha(\mathbf{x}, t), & \mathbf{x} \in \Gamma, t \in (0, T], \end{cases} \quad (1.2c)$$

where the flux $\mathbf{F}(u) = (f(u), g(u))$ or $(f(u), g(u), h(u))$, which occurs in many applications such as semi-linear or quasi-linear problems: the Fisher equation [10] ($u_t = \Delta u + u(1 - u)$), the Chafee-Infante equation [1] ($u_t = \Delta u + u(1 - u^2)$), the scalar viscous Burgers' equation [9] ($u_t + uu_x + uu_y = \mu \Delta u$, $\mu \neq 0$ denotes the viscous coefficient), and so on.

Though there have been plenty of discussions for numerical methods to solve these issues, we here only focus on the simplest numerical discretization of the problem (1.1) or (1.2) composing of the standard centered finite difference method for the spatial derivatives and the forward Euler method for the temporal derivative because of its simplicity, time-saving and easy to implement. Scholars generally consider the scheme resulting from such discretization as a low order, conditionally stable and therefore impractical numerical method. However, by applying a corrected difference technique to the local truncation errors, we recover the optimal convergence rate four when the specific step-ratios are utilized and the exact solution satisfies a certain of regularity. Our finding makes the corrected scheme suitable to simulate the physical phenomenon with a very high precision. There are several efforts and novelty in the current paper for our corrected difference scheme. Specifically:

- (I) The explicit Euler method combines with a corrected second-order centered difference discretization exports to a superconvergent numerical scheme when the step-ratios $r_x = r_y = r_z = 1/6$, where r_x , r_y and r_z denote the step-ratios along x -, y - and z -direction, respectively. Moreover, the corrected difference scheme owns higher numerical accuracy compared with the standard centered difference scheme even if the step-ratios $(r_x, r_y, r_z) \neq (1/6, 1/6, 1/6)$.
- (II) The priori estimate is demonstrated for the corrected difference scheme under the infinite norm based on the maximum principle in the case of constant convection coefficients, which naturally leads to **CFL** condition and optimal convergence for the corrected scheme. In detail, the stability for the two-dimensional diffusion problem is doubled compared with the classical difference scheme. For three-dimensional diffusion problem, the stability slightly decreases but shows new stable region, see also Figure 2 in Section 6.
- (III) Most notably, we discover that the corrected difference scheme could be extended to solve more general high-dimensional nonlinear convection-diffusion equations such as the Fisher equation, the Chafee-Infante equation, the viscous Burgers' equation and classification to name a few.

- (IV) It is worth noting that the corrected difference scheme is fully explicit and very convenient to be implemented. Moreover, it is not constrained by the boundary conditions. Numerical examples in a variety of scenarios are carried out for linear/nonlinear problems under Dirichlet and Neumann boundary conditions to confirm the designed convergence rate.

Throughout the whole paper, we always assume that the exact solutions to (1.1) or (1.2) are sufficiently smooth in the sense that $u(\mathbf{x}, t) \in \mathcal{C}^{6,6,4}(\bar{\Omega} \times [0, T])$ for two-dimensional problem and $u(\mathbf{x}, t) \in \mathcal{C}^{6,6,6,4}(\bar{\Omega} \times [0, T])$ for three-dimensional problem.

The rest of the paper is arranged as follows. In Section 2, we derive a corrected explicit difference scheme for a linear two-dimensional convection-diffusion equation involving several special cases. In Section 3, the priori estimate with constant convection coefficients is discussed and the optimal convergence rate with fourth-order accuracy is proved. Extending the corrected difference scheme to the nonlinear convection-diffusion problem with the Dirichlet boundary conditions and the Neumann boundary conditions are available in Section 4 and Section 5 respectively. Our corrected technique is also applied to three-dimensional convection-diffusion problem in Section 6. Extensive numerical examples including linear/nonlinear cases under Dirichlet/Neumann boundary conditions are carried out to verify the theoretical results in Section 7 before a short concluding remarks in Section 8.

2 The derivation of the explicit difference scheme

In this section, we focus on the construction of the numerical scheme to solve two-dimensional convection-diffusion problem (1.1). Here $\mathbf{x} = (x, y)$, $A = \mathbf{diag}(a, b)$ with $a, b > 0$ constant diffusion coefficients and $B = (c(\mathbf{x}), d(\mathbf{x}))$ the convection coefficients. The spatial domain is set to $\Omega = (L_1, R_1) \times (L_2, R_2) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$.

We start by introducing some basic notations in the context of finite difference method. Firstly, the domain $\bar{\Omega} \times [0, T]$ is subdivided into a number of small elements by passing orthogonal lines through the region. For this purpose, we take three positive integers m_1, m_2, n and let $h_x = (R_1 - L_1)/m_1$, $h_y = (R_2 - L_2)/m_2$, $\tau = T/n$, $x_i = L_1 + ih_x$, $0 \leq i \leq m_1$, $y_j = L_2 + jh_y$, $0 \leq j \leq m_2$, $t_k = k\tau$, $0 \leq k \leq n$. Define the step-ratios $r_x = a\tau/h_x^2$, $r_y = b\tau/h_y^2$. Denote $\Omega_{h\tau} = \{(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k) \mid 0 \leq i \leq m_1, 0 \leq j \leq m_2, 0 \leq k \leq n\}$ with $\mathbf{x}_{ij} = (x_i, y_j)$, $\omega = \{(i, j) \mid \mathbf{x}_{ij} \in \Omega\}$, $\gamma = \{(i, j) \mid \mathbf{x}_{ij} \in \Gamma\}$ and $\bar{\omega} = \omega \cup \gamma$. For any grid function $v = \{v_{ij}^k \mid 0 \leq i \leq m_1, 0 \leq j \leq m_2, 0 \leq k \leq n\}$ on $\Omega_{h\tau}$, define $\delta_t v_{ij}^{k+\frac{1}{2}} = (v_{ij}^{k+1} - v_{ij}^k)/\tau$, $\delta_x v_{i+1/2,j}^k = (v_{i+1,j}^k - v_{i,j}^k)/h_x$, $\delta_x^2 v_{ij}^k = (v_{i+1,j}^k - 2v_{ij}^k + v_{i-1,j}^k)/h_x^2$, $\Delta_x v_{ij}^k = (v_{i+1,j}^k - v_{i-1,j}^k)/(2h_x)$, $\|v\|_\infty = \max_{(i,j) \in \bar{\omega}} |v_{ij}^k|$. Similarly, we could define $\delta_y v_{i,j+1/2}^k$, $\delta_y^2 v_{ij}^k$ and $\Delta_y v_{ij}^k$.

Firstly, using (1.1a), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 u_{tt} &= a(u_t)_{xx} + b(u_t)_{yy} + c(u_t)_x + d(u_t)_y + f_t(\mathbf{x}, t) \\
 &= a \left(au_{xx} + bu_{yy} + c(\mathbf{x})u_x + d(\mathbf{x})u_y + f(\mathbf{x}, t) \right)_{xx} \\
 &\quad + b \left(au_{xx} + bu_{yy} + c(\mathbf{x})u_x + d(\mathbf{x})u_y + f(\mathbf{x}, t) \right)_{yy} \\
 &\quad + c \left(au_{xx} + bu_{yy} + c(\mathbf{x})u_x + d(\mathbf{x})u_y + f(\mathbf{x}, t) \right)_x \\
 &\quad + d \left(au_{xx} + bu_{yy} + c(\mathbf{x})u_x + d(\mathbf{x})u_y + f(\mathbf{x}, t) \right)_y \\
 &\quad + f_t(\mathbf{x}, t) \\
 &= a^2 u_{xxxx} + 2abu_{xyyy} + b^2 u_{yyyy}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + 2ac(\mathbf{x})u_{xxx} + 2ad(\mathbf{x})u_{xxy} + 2bc(\mathbf{x})u_{xyy} + 2bd(\mathbf{x})u_{yyy} \\
& + \left(2ac_x(\mathbf{x}) + c^2(\mathbf{x})\right)u_{xx} + \left(2bd_y(\mathbf{x}) + bd_{yy}(\mathbf{x})\right)u_{yy} \\
& + \left(2ad_x(\mathbf{x}) + 2bc_y(\mathbf{x}) + 2c(\mathbf{x})d(\mathbf{x})\right)u_{xy} \\
& + \left(ac_{xx}(\mathbf{x}) + bc_{yy}(\mathbf{x}) + c(\mathbf{x})c_x(\mathbf{x}) + d(\mathbf{x})c_y(\mathbf{x})\right)u_x \\
& + \left(ad_{xx}(\mathbf{x}) + bd_{yy}(\mathbf{x}) + c(\mathbf{x})d_x(\mathbf{x}) + d(\mathbf{x})d_y(\mathbf{x})\right)u_y \\
& + af_{xx}(\mathbf{x}, t) + bf_{yy}(\mathbf{x}, t) + c(\mathbf{x})f_x(\mathbf{x}, t) + d(\mathbf{x})f_y(\mathbf{x}, t) \\
& + f_t(\mathbf{x}, t).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

Define the grid function

$$U = \{U_{ij}^k \mid 0 \leq i \leq m_1, 0 \leq j \leq m_2, 0 \leq k \leq n\}$$

with $U_{ij}^k = u(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k)$. Considering (1.1a) at the point $(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k)$ and using the Taylor formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
u_t(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k) &= au_{xx}(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k) + bu_{yy}(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k) + c_{ij}u_x(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k) + d_{ij}u_y(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k) + f_{ij}^k, \\
(i, j) &\in \omega, \quad 0 \leq k \leq n,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

where

$$c_{ij} = c(\mathbf{x}_{ij}), \quad d_{ij} = d(\mathbf{x}_{ij}), \quad f_{ij}^k = f(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k).$$

The forward difference quotient is utilized for the discretization of the temporal derivative and the central difference quotient for the discretization of the spatial derivatives in (2.2), which results in

$$\begin{aligned}
& \delta_t U_{ij}^{k+\frac{1}{2}} - a\delta_x^2 U_{ij}^k - b\delta_y^2 U_{ij}^k - c_{ij}\Delta_x U_{ij}^k - d_{ij}\Delta_y U_{ij}^k \\
&= f_{ij}^k + \frac{\tau}{2}u_{tt}(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k) - \frac{ah_x^2}{12}u_{xxx}(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k) - \frac{bh_y^2}{12}u_{yyy}(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k) \\
&\quad - \frac{h_x^2}{6}c_{ij}u_{xx}(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k) - \frac{h_y^2}{6}d_{ij}u_{yy}(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k) + O(\tau^2 + h_x^4 + h_y^4) \\
&= p_{ij}^k + \frac{ah_x^2}{2}\left(r_x - \frac{1}{6}\right)u_{xxx}(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k) + \frac{bh_y^2}{2}\left(r_y - \frac{1}{6}\right)u_{yyy}(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k) \\
&\quad + c_{ij}h_x^2\left(r_x - \frac{1}{6}\right)u_{xx}(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k) + d_{ij}h_y^2\left(r_y - \frac{1}{6}\right)u_{yy}(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k) \\
&\quad + \frac{\tau}{2}[(2ac_x + c^2)_{ij}\delta_x^2 U_{ij}^k + (2ad_x + 2bc_y + 2cd)_{ij}\Delta_x \Delta_y U_{ij}^k + (2bd_y + d^2)_{ij}\delta_y^2 U_{ij}^k \\
&\quad + (ac_{xx} + bc_{yy} + cc_x + dc_y)_{ij}\Delta_x U_{ij}^k + (ad_{xx} + bd_{yy} + cd_x + dd_y)_{ij}\Delta_y U_{ij}^k] \\
&\quad + \tau ab\delta_x^2 \delta_y^2 U_{ij}^k + \tau ad_{ij}\delta_x^2 \Delta_y U_{ij}^k + \tau bc_{ij}\delta_y^2 \Delta_x U_{ij}^k + O(\tau^2 + \tau h_x^2 + \tau h_y^2 + h_x^4 + h_y^4),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

where (2.1) is used in the second inequality and

$$p_{ij}^k = f_{ij}^k + \frac{\tau}{2} [a(f_{xx})_{ij}^k + b(f_{yy})_{ij}^k + (cf_x)_{ij}^k + (df_y)_{ij}^k + (f_t)_{ij}^k]$$

with $(f_x)_{ij}^k = f_x(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k)$, $(f_y)_{ij}^k = f_y(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k)$, $(f_{xx})_{ij}^k = f_{xx}(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k)$, $(f_{yy})_{ij}^k = f_{yy}(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k)$, $(f_t)_{ij}^k = f_t(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k)$.

Omitting the small terms in (2.3), a finite difference scheme for (1.1) reads

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} \delta_t u_{ij}^{k+\frac{1}{2}} &= \left[a + \frac{\tau}{2}(2ac_x + c^2)_{ij} \right] \delta_x^2 u_{ij}^k + \left[b + \frac{\tau}{2}(2bd_y + d^2)_{ij} \right] \delta_y^2 u_{ij}^k \\ &+ \left[c_{ij} + \frac{\tau}{2}(ac_{xx} + bc_{yy} + cc_x + c_y d)_{ij} \right] \Delta_x u_{ij}^k + \left[d_{ij} + \frac{\tau}{2}(ad_{xx} + bd_{yy} + cd_x + dd_y)_{ij} \right] \Delta_y u_{ij}^k \\ &+ \frac{\tau}{2}(2ad_x + 2bc_y + 2cd)_{ij} \Delta_x \Delta_y u_{ij}^k + \tau \left(ab\delta_x^2 \delta_y^2 u_{ij}^k + \tau ad_{ij} \delta_x^2 \Delta_y u_{ij}^k + bc_{ij} \delta_y^2 \Delta_x u_{ij}^k \right) + p_{ij}^k, \\ &\quad (i, j) \in \omega, \quad 0 \leq k \leq n-1, \end{aligned} \right. \quad (2.4a)$$

$$u_{ij}^0 = \varphi(\mathbf{x}_{ij}), \quad (i, j) \in \bar{\omega}, \quad (2.4b)$$

$$u_{ij}^k = \alpha(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k), \quad (i, j) \in \gamma, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n. \quad (2.4c)$$

It is easy to see that the local truncation error for (2.4a) is

$$\begin{cases} O(\tau^2 + h_x^4 + h_y^4), & \text{if } r_x = r_y = 1/6, \\ O(\tau^2 + h_x^2 + h_y^2), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (2.5a)$$

$$(2.5b)$$

Remark 2.1 The difference scheme (2.4) has improved several classical numerical schemes, for example:

(I). $c = d = 0$: the difference scheme (2.4) reduces to

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} \delta_t u_{ij}^{k+\frac{1}{2}} &= a\delta_x^2 u_{ij}^k + b\delta_y^2 u_{ij}^k + \tau ab\delta_x^2 \delta_y^2 u_{ij}^k + q_{ij}^k, & (i, j) \in \omega, \quad 0 \leq k \leq n-1, \\ u_{ij}^0 &= \varphi(\mathbf{x}_{ij}), & (i, j) \in \bar{\omega}, \\ u_{ij}^k &= \alpha(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k), & (i, j) \in \gamma, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n, \end{aligned} \right. \quad (2.6a)$$

$$(2.6b)$$

$$(2.6c)$$

where

$$q_{ij}^k = f_{ij}^k + \frac{\tau}{2} [a(f_{xx})_{ij}^k + b(f_{yy})_{ij}^k + (f_t)_{ij}^k].$$

Comparing with the classical Euler difference scheme

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} \delta_t u_{ij}^{k+\frac{1}{2}} &= a\delta_x^2 u_{ij}^k + b\delta_y^2 u_{ij}^k + f_{ij}^k, & (i, j) \in \omega, \quad 0 \leq k \leq n-1, \\ u_{ij}^0 &= \varphi(\mathbf{x}_{ij}), & (i, j) \in \bar{\omega}, \\ u_{ij}^k &= \alpha(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k), & (i, j) \in \gamma, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n, \end{aligned} \right. \quad (2.7a)$$

$$(2.7b)$$

$$(2.7c)$$

the local truncation error for the difference scheme (2.6) is the same as (2.5). However, the local truncation error for the classical Euler difference scheme (2.7) is only two globally whatever the step-ratios are.

(II). $c = d = \text{constant}$: the difference scheme (2.4) simplifies into

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} \delta_t u_{ij}^{k+\frac{1}{2}} &= \left(a + \frac{\tau}{2}c^2 \right) \delta_x^2 u_{ij}^k + \left(b + \frac{\tau}{2}d^2 \right) \delta_y^2 u_{ij}^k + c\Delta_x u_{ij}^k + d\Delta_y u_{ij}^k + \tau cd\Delta_x \Delta_y u_{ij}^k \\ &+ \tau \left(ab\delta_x^2 \delta_y^2 u_{ij}^k + ad\delta_x^2 \Delta_y u_{ij}^k + bc\delta_y^2 \Delta_x u_{ij}^k \right) + r_{ij}^k, & (i, j) \in \omega, \quad 0 \leq k \leq n-1, \\ u_{ij}^0 &= \varphi(\mathbf{x}_{ij}), & (i, j) \in \bar{\omega}, \\ u_{ij}^k &= \alpha(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k), & (i, j) \in \gamma, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n, \end{aligned} \right. \quad (2.8a)$$

$$(2.8b)$$

$$(2.8c)$$

where

$$r_{ij}^k = f_{ij}^k + \frac{\tau}{2} [a(f_{xx})_{ij}^k + b(f_{yy})_{ij}^k + c(f_x)_{ij}^k + d(f_y)_{ij}^k + (f_t)_{ij}^k].$$

The classical Euler difference scheme for the problem (1.1) is

$$\begin{cases} \delta_t u_{ij}^{k+\frac{1}{2}} - a\delta_x^2 u_{ij}^k - b\delta_y^2 u_{ij}^k - c\Delta_x u_{ij}^k - d\Delta_y u_{ij}^k = f_{ij}^k, & (i, j) \in \omega, \ 0 \leq k \leq n-1, \\ u_{ij}^0 = \varphi(\mathbf{x}_{ij}), & (i, j) \in \bar{\omega}, \\ u_{ij}^k = \alpha(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k), & (i, j) \in \gamma, \ 0 \leq k \leq n. \end{cases} \quad \begin{matrix} (2.9a) \\ (2.9b) \\ (2.9c) \end{matrix}$$

Comparing (2.8) with (2.9), similar theoretical results can be obtained for the difference scheme (2.8).

We call each difference scheme (2.4), (2.6) or (2.8) as the **corrected difference scheme**.

3 The priori estimate and the optimal convergence

For the sake of brevity, we take the difference scheme (2.8) as an example to illustrate the priori estimate. In the meantime, the problem (1.1) becomes

$$\begin{cases} u_t = au_{xx} + bu_{yy} + cu_x + du_y + f(\mathbf{x}, t), & \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, \ t \in (0, T], \\ u(\mathbf{x}, 0) = \varphi(\mathbf{x}), & \mathbf{x} \in \bar{\Omega}, \\ u(\mathbf{x}, t) = \alpha(\mathbf{x}, t), & \mathbf{x} \in \Gamma, \ t \in (0, T]. \end{cases} \quad \begin{matrix} (3.1a) \\ (3.1b) \\ (3.1c) \end{matrix}$$

Theorem 3.1 (Priori estimate) *Let $\{u_{ij}^k \mid 0 \leq i \leq m_1, \ 0 \leq j \leq m_2, \ 0 \leq k \leq n\}$ be the solution of the difference scheme (2.8) with the constraint $\alpha(\mathbf{x}, t) \equiv 0$. When*

$$\begin{cases} \max\{r_x, r_y\} \leq 1/2, \end{cases} \quad (3.2a)$$

$$\begin{cases} |c|h_x \leq a \cdot \min\left\{2, \sqrt{(1-2r_x)(1-2r_y)}/2/r_x\right\}, \end{cases} \quad (3.2b)$$

$$\begin{cases} |d|h_y \leq b \cdot \min\left\{2, \sqrt{(1-2r_x)(1-2r_y)}/2/r_y\right\}, \end{cases} \quad (3.2c)$$

it holds

$$\|u^k\|_\infty \leq \|\varphi\|_\infty + \tau \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \|r^l\|_\infty, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n.$$

Proof The difference scheme (2.8a) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} u_{ij}^{k+1} = & S_1 u_{i+1,j}^k + S_2 u_{i-1,j}^k + S_3 u_{i,j+1}^k + S_4 u_{i,j-1}^k + S_5 u_{ij}^k \\ & + S_6 u_{i+1,j+1}^k + S_7 u_{i+1,j-1}^k + S_8 u_{i-1,j+1}^k + S_9 u_{i-1,j-1}^k + \tau r_{ij}^k, \\ & (i, j) \in \omega, \ 0 \leq k \leq n-1, \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= (1-2r_y)\left(1 + \frac{c}{2a}h_x\right)r_x + \frac{c^2}{2a^2r_x^2}h_x^2, & S_2 &= (1-2r_y)\left(1 - \frac{c}{2a}h_x\right)r_x + \frac{c^2}{2a^2r_x^2}h_x^2, \\ S_3 &= (1-2r_x)\left(1 + \frac{d}{2b}h_y\right)r_y + \frac{d^2}{2b^2r_y^2}h_y^2, & S_4 &= (1-2r_x)\left(1 - \frac{d}{2b}h_y\right)r_y + \frac{d^2}{2b^2r_y^2}h_y^2, \\ S_5 &= (1-2r_x)(1-2r_y) - \frac{c^2r_x^2}{a^2}h_x^2 - \frac{d^2r_y^2}{b^2}h_y^2, \\ S_6 &= \left(1 + \frac{c}{2a}h_x\right)\left(1 + \frac{d}{2b}h_y\right)r_x r_y, & S_7 &= \left(1 + \frac{c}{2a}h_x\right)\left(1 - \frac{d}{2b}h_y\right)r_x r_y, \end{aligned}$$

$$S_8 = \left(1 - \frac{c}{2a}h_x\right)\left(1 + \frac{d}{2b}h_y\right)r_x r_y, \quad S_9 = \left(1 - \frac{c}{2a}h_x\right)\left(1 - \frac{d}{2b}h_y\right)r_x r_y.$$

When (3.2) holds, all the coefficients S_i ($i = 1, 2, \dots, 9$) on the right hand side of (3.3) are nonnegative. Meanwhile $\sum_{i=1}^9 S_i = 1$. Therefore it holds

$$|u_{ij}^{k+1}| \leq \|u^k\|_\infty + \tau \|r^k\|_\infty, \quad (i, j) \in \omega, \quad 0 \leq k \leq n-1.$$

Whence

$$\|u^{k+1}\|_\infty \leq \|u^k\|_\infty + \tau \|r^k\|_\infty, \quad 0 \leq k \leq n-1.$$

By recursion, we have

$$\|u^k\|_\infty \leq \|u^0\|_\infty + \tau \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \|r^l\|_\infty = \|\varphi\|_\infty + \tau \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \|r^l\|_\infty, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n.$$

Remark 3.2 Based on the analysis in the above, we have the following conclusions.

- The condition (3.2) is called as Courant-Friedrichs-Lewy (**CFL**) condition. The proof above implies that the difference scheme (2.8) is stable under **CFL** condition (3.2).
- When $c = d = 0$ in (3.1), **CFL** condition (3.2) is simplified to (3.2a). **CFL** condition (3.2a) of the corrected difference scheme (2.6) for the diffusion problem obviously improves that of (2.7), for which **CFL** condition is $r_x + r_y \leq 1/2$.

Furthermore, we have the convergence result.

Theorem 3.2 Let $\{U_{ij}^k \mid 0 \leq i \leq m_1, 0 \leq j \leq m_2, 0 \leq k \leq n\}$ be the solution of (3.1) and $\{u_{ij}^k \mid 0 \leq i \leq m_1, 0 \leq j \leq m_2, 0 \leq k \leq n\}$ be the solution of the difference scheme (2.8). Denote $e_{ij}^k = U_{ij}^k - u_{ij}^k$, ($0 \leq i \leq m_1, 0 \leq j \leq m_2, 0 \leq k \leq n$). When (3.2) holds, then there is a constant c_1 such that

$$\|e^k\|_\infty \leq \begin{cases} c_1(\tau^2 + h_x^4 + h_y^4), & \text{if } r_x = r_y = \frac{1}{6}, \quad 0 \leq k \leq n, \\ c_1(\tau^2 + h_x^2 + h_y^2), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This theorem can be easily proved in combination with Theorem 3.1 and the local truncation error (2.5).

4 The nonlinear problems

The corrected technique can be extended to two-dimensional nonlinear convection-diffusion equations such as semi-linear and quasi-linear parabolic problems. In what follows, we consider the numerical solution of the nonlinear convection-diffusion equation (1.2). With the help of (1.2a) we have

$$\begin{aligned} u_{tt} &= -f(u)_{xt} - g(u)_{yt} + au_{xxt} + bu_{yyt} + r(u)_t \\ &= -(f'(u)u_t)_x - (g'(u)u_t)_y + a(u_t)_{xx} + b(u_t)_{yy} + r'(u)u_t \\ &= a^2u_{xxx} + b^2u_{yyy} + 2abu_{xxy} - 2af'(u)u_{xxx} \\ &\quad - 2bg'(u)u_{yyy} - 2bf'(u)u_{xyy} - 2ag'(u)u_{xxy} \\ &\quad - 4af''(u)u_xu_{xx} - 4bg''(u)u_yu_{yy} - 2ag''(u)u_yu_{xx} \\ &\quad - 2bf''(u)u_xu_{yy} - 2ag''(u)u_xu_{xy} - 2af''(u)u_yu_{xy} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + (f'(u)^2 + 2ar'(u))u_{xx} + (g'(u)^2 + 2br'(u))u_{yy} + 2f'(u)g'(u)u_{xy} \\
& - af'''(u)u_x^3 - bg'''(u)u_y^3 - ag'''(u)u_yu_x^2 - bf'''(u)u_xu_y^2 \\
& + (2f'(u)f''(u) + ar''(u))u_x^2 + (2g'(u)g''(u) + br''(u))u_y^2 \\
& + 2(f''(u)g'(u) + f'(u)g''(u))u_xu_y - (f''(u)r(u) + 2f'(u)r'(u))u_x \\
& - (g''(u)r(u) + 2g'(u)r'(u))u_y + r'(u)r(u).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

Considering (1.2a) at the point $(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k)$ and combining the forward difference quotient for the temporal derivative with the central difference discretization for the spatial derivatives, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_t U_{ij}^{k+\frac{1}{2}} &= -f'(U_{ij}^k)\Delta_x U_{ij}^k - g'(U_{ij}^k)\Delta_y U_{ij}^k + a\delta_x^2 U_{ij}^k + b\delta_y^2 U_{ij}^k + r(U_{ij}^k) \\
&+ \left\{ \frac{\tau}{2}u_{tt} + \frac{h_x^2}{6}f'(u)u_{xxx} + \frac{h_y^2}{6}g'(u)u_{yyy} - \frac{ah_x^2}{12}u_{xxx} - \frac{bh_y^2}{12}u_{yyy} \right\}(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k) \\
&+ O(\tau^2 + h_x^4 + h_y^4) \\
&= -f'(U_{ij}^k)\Delta_x U_{ij}^k - g'(U_{ij}^k)\Delta_y U_{ij}^k + a\delta_x^2 U_{ij}^k + b\delta_y^2 U_{ij}^k + r(U_{ij}^k) \\
&+ \left\{ h_x^2(r_x - \frac{1}{6})(\frac{a}{2}u_{xxx} - u_{xxx}) + h_y^2(r_y - \frac{1}{6})(\frac{b}{2}u_{yyy} - u_{yyy}) \right\}(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k) \\
&+ \tau \left\{ abu_{xyy} - bf'(u)u_{xyy} - ag'(u)u_{xxy} \right\}(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k) \\
&- \tau \left\{ 2af''(u)u_xu_{xx} + 2bg''(u)u_yu_{yy} + ag''(u)u_yu_{xx} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + bf''(u)u_xu_{yy} + ag''(u)u_xu_{xy} + af''(u)u_yu_{xy} \right\}(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k) \\
&+ \frac{\tau}{2} \left\{ (f'(u)^2 + 2ar'(u))u_{xx} + (g'(u)^2 + 2br'(u))u_{yy} + 2f'(u)g'(u)u_{xy} \right\}(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k) \\
&- \frac{\tau}{2} \left\{ af'''(u)u_x^3 + bg'''(u)u_y^3 + ag'''(u)u_yu_x^2 + bf'''(u)u_xu_y^2 \right\}(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k) \\
&+ \frac{\tau}{2} \left\{ (2f'(u)f''(u) + ar''(u))u_x^2 + (2g'(u)g''(u) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + br''(u))u_y^2 + 2(f''(u)g'(u) + f'(u)g''(u))u_xu_y \right\}(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k) \\
&- \frac{\tau}{2} \left\{ (f''(u)r(u) + 2f'(u)r'(u))u_x + (g''(u)r(u) + 2g'(u)r'(u))u_y - r'(u)r(u) \right\}(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k) \\
&+ O(\tau^2 + h_x^4 + h_y^4),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality has utilized (4.1). Further applying the centered difference discretization to the remaining partial derivatives including first-order, second-order and mixed derivatives in space, and then rearranging the corresponding result, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_t U_{ij}^{k+\frac{1}{2}} &= \left[a + \frac{\tau}{2}(f'(U_{ij}^k)^2 + 2ar'(U_{ij}^k)) \right] \delta_x^2 U_{ij}^k + \left[b + \frac{\tau}{2}(g'(U_{ij}^k)^2 + 2br'(U_{ij}^k)) \right] \delta_y^2 U_{ij}^k \\
&- \left[f'(U_{ij}^k) + \frac{\tau}{2}(f''(U_{ij}^k)r(U_{ij}^k) + 2f'(U_{ij}^k)r'(U_{ij}^k)) \right] \Delta_x U_{ij}^k \\
&- \left[g'(U_{ij}^k) + \frac{\tau}{2}(g''(U_{ij}^k)r(U_{ij}^k) + 2g'(U_{ij}^k)r'(U_{ij}^k)) \right] \Delta_y U_{ij}^k + r(U_{ij}^k) \\
&+ \left\{ h_x^2(r_x - \frac{1}{6})(\frac{a}{2}u_{xxx} - u_{xxx}) + h_y^2(r_y - \frac{1}{6})(\frac{b}{2}u_{yyy} - u_{yyy}) \right\}(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k) \\
&+ \tau \left[ab\delta_x^2 \delta_y^2 U_{ij}^k - bf'(U_{ij}^k)\Delta_x \delta_y^2 U_{ij}^k - ag'(U_{ij}^k)\Delta_y \delta_x^2 U_{ij}^k \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 2af''(U_{ij}^k)\Delta_x U_{ij}^k \delta_x^2 U_{ij}^k - 2bg''(U_{ij}^k)\Delta_y U_{ij}^k \delta_y^2 U_{ij}^k - ag''(U_{ij}^k)\Delta_y U_{ij}^k \delta_x^2 U_{ij}^k \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -bf''(U_{ij}^k)\Delta_x U_{ij}^k \delta_y^2 U_{ij}^k - ag''(U_{ij}^k)\Delta_x U_{ij}^k \Delta_x \Delta_y U_{ij}^k - bf''(U_{ij}^k)\Delta_y U_{ij}^k \Delta_x \Delta_y U_{ij}^k \\
& + f'(U_{ij}^k)g'(U_{ij}^k)\Delta_x \Delta_y U_{ij}^k - \frac{a}{2}f'''(U_{ij}^k)(\Delta_x U_{ij}^k)^3 - \frac{b}{2}g'''(U_{ij}^k)(\Delta_y U_{ij}^k)^3 \\
& - \frac{a}{2}g'''(U_{ij}^k)\Delta_y U_{ij}^k (\Delta_x U_{ij}^k)^2 - \frac{b}{2}f'''(U_{ij}^k)\Delta_x U_{ij}^k (\Delta_y U_{ij}^k)^2 \\
& + \frac{1}{2}(2f'(U_{ij}^k)f''(U_{ij}^k) + ar''(U_{ij}^k))(\Delta_x U_{ij}^k)^2 + \frac{1}{2}(2g'(U_{ij}^k)g''(U_{ij}^k) + br''(U_{ij}^k))(\Delta_y U_{ij}^k)^2 \\
& + (f''(U_{ij}^k)g'(U_{ij}^k) + f'(U_{ij}^k)g''(U_{ij}^k))\Delta_x U_{ij}^k \Delta_y U_{ij}^k \\
& + \frac{1}{2}r'(U_{ij}^k)r(U_{ij}^k)] + O(\tau^2 + \tau h_x^2 + \tau h_y^2 + \tau h_x^2 h_y^2 + h_x^4 + h_y^4).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, a corrected difference scheme for (1.2) reads

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned}
\delta_t u_{ij}^{k+\frac{1}{2}} &= \left[a + \frac{\tau}{2}(f'(u_{ij}^k)^2 + 2ar'(u_{ij}^k)) - 2a\tau f''(u_{ij}^k)\Delta_x u_{ij}^k - a\tau g''(u_{ij}^k)\Delta_y u_{ij}^k \right] \delta_x^2 u_{ij}^k \\
&+ \left[b + \frac{\tau}{2}(g'(u_{ij}^k)^2 + 2br'(u_{ij}^k)) - 2b\tau g''(u_{ij}^k)\Delta_y u_{ij}^k - b\tau f''(u_{ij}^k)\Delta_x u_{ij}^k \right] \delta_y^2 u_{ij}^k \\
&- \left[f'(u_{ij}^k) + \frac{\tau}{2}(f''(u_{ij}^k)r(u_{ij}^k) + 2f'(u_{ij}^k)r'(u_{ij}^k)) \right] \Delta_x u_{ij}^k \\
&- \left[g'(u_{ij}^k) + \frac{\tau}{2}(g''(u_{ij}^k)r(u_{ij}^k) + 2g'(u_{ij}^k)r'(u_{ij}^k)) \right] \Delta_y u_{ij}^k + r(u_{ij}^k) \\
&+ \tau ab \delta_x^2 \delta_y^2 u_{ij}^k - b\tau f'(u_{ij}^k)\Delta_x \delta_y^2 u_{ij}^k - a\tau g'(u_{ij}^k)\Delta_y \delta_x^2 u_{ij}^k \\
&+ \frac{\tau}{2}[2f'(u_{ij}^k)f''(u_{ij}^k) + ar''(u_{ij}^k) - af'''(u_{ij}^k)\Delta_x u_{ij}^k - ag'''(u_{ij}^k)\Delta_y u_{ij}^k](\Delta_x u_{ij}^k)^2 \\
&+ \frac{\tau}{2}[2g'(u_{ij}^k)g''(u_{ij}^k) + br''(u_{ij}^k) - bg'''(u_{ij}^k)\Delta_y u_{ij}^k - bf'''(u_{ij}^k)\Delta_x u_{ij}^k](\Delta_y u_{ij}^k)^2 \\
&+ \tau(f'(u_{ij}^k)g'(u_{ij}^k) - ag''(u_{ij}^k)\Delta_x u_{ij}^k - bf''(u_{ij}^k)\Delta_y u_{ij}^k)\Delta_x \Delta_y u_{ij}^k \\
&+ \tau(f''(u_{ij}^k)g'(u_{ij}^k) + f'(u_{ij}^k)g''(u_{ij}^k))\Delta_x u_{ij}^k \cdot \Delta_y u_{ij}^k + \frac{\tau}{2}r'(u_{ij}^k)r(u_{ij}^k), \\
&\quad (i, j) \in \omega, \quad 0 \leq k \leq n-1, \tag{4.2a} \\
u_{ij}^0 &= \varphi(\mathbf{x}_{ij}), \quad (i, j) \in \bar{\omega}, \tag{4.2b} \\
u_{ij}^k &= \alpha(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k), \quad (i, j) \in \gamma, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n. \tag{4.2c}
\end{aligned} \right.$$

5 Problems under Neumann boundary value conditions

In this section, we extend our idea to the general nonlinear convection-diffusion equation under Neumann boundary value conditions as

$$\begin{cases}
u_t + f(u)_x + g(u)_y = au_{xx} + bu_{yy} + r(u), & \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, \quad t \in (0, T], & (5.1a) \\
u(\mathbf{x}, 0) = \varphi(\mathbf{x}), & \mathbf{x} \in \bar{\Omega}, & (5.1b) \\
u_x(L_1, y, t) = \alpha_1(y, t), \quad u_x(R_1, y, t) = \alpha_2(y, t), & y \in [L_2, R_2], \quad t \in (0, T], & (5.1c) \\
u_y(x, L_2, t) = \beta_1(x, t), \quad u_y(x, R_2, t) = \beta_2(x, t), & x \in (L_1, R_1), \quad t \in (0, T]. & (5.1d)
\end{cases}$$

Since (5.1a) is the same to (1.2a), it is necessary to discrete the boundary value conditions (5.1c)–(5.1d) with a fourth-order algorithm. For example, based on the fourth-order backward difference




Fig. 1: The sketch map in a rectangular domain

formula [3], we have

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} u_x(L_1, y_j, t_k) = \frac{1}{h_x} \left(-\frac{25}{12}U_{0j}^k + 4U_{1j}^k - 3U_{2j}^k + \frac{4}{3}U_{3j}^k - \frac{1}{4}U_{4j}^k \right) + O(h_x^4), \\ 0 \leq j \leq m_2, 0 \leq k \leq n, \end{array} \right. \quad (5.2a)$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} u_x(R_1, y_j, t_k) = \frac{1}{h_x} \left(\frac{1}{4}U_{m_1-4,j}^k - \frac{4}{3}U_{m_1-3,j}^k + 3U_{m_1-2,j}^k - 4U_{m_1-1,j}^k + \frac{25}{12}U_{m_1,j}^k \right) + O(h_x^4), \\ 0 \leq j \leq m_2, 0 \leq k \leq n, \end{array} \right. \quad (5.2b)$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} u_y(x_i, L_2, t_k) = \frac{1}{h_y} \left(-\frac{25}{12}U_{i0}^k + 4U_{i1}^k - 3U_{i2}^k + \frac{4}{3}U_{i3}^k - \frac{1}{4}U_{i4}^k \right) + O(h_y^4), \\ 1 \leq i \leq m_1 - 1, 0 \leq k \leq n, \end{array} \right. \quad (5.2c)$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} u_y(x_i, R_2, t_k) = \frac{1}{h_y} \left(\frac{1}{4}U_{i,m_2-4}^k - \frac{4}{3}U_{i,m_2-3}^k + 3U_{i,m_2-2}^k - 4U_{i,m_2-1}^k + \frac{25}{12}U_{i,m_2}^k \right) + O(h_y^4), \\ 1 \leq i \leq m_1 - 1, 0 \leq k \leq n. \end{array} \right. \quad (5.2d)$$

Omitting the small terms in (5.2a)–(5.2d), we have the discrete schemes for the boundary value conditions (5.1c)–(5.1d) as

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{1}{h_x} \left(-\frac{25}{12}u_{0j}^k + 4u_{1j}^k - 3u_{2j}^k + \frac{4}{3}u_{3j}^k - \frac{1}{4}u_{4j}^k \right) = \alpha_1(y_j, t_k), \\ 0 \leq j \leq m_2, 0 \leq k \leq n, \end{array} \right. \quad (5.3a)$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{1}{h_x} \left(\frac{1}{4}u_{m_1-4,j}^k - \frac{4}{3}u_{m_1-3,j}^k + 3u_{m_1-2,j}^k - 4u_{m_1-1,j}^k + \frac{25}{12}u_{m_1,j}^k \right) = \alpha_2(y_j, t_k), \\ 0 \leq j \leq m_2, 0 \leq k \leq n, \end{array} \right. \quad (5.3b)$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{1}{h_y} \left(-\frac{25}{12}u_{i0}^k + 4U_{i1}^k - 3u_{i2}^k + \frac{4}{3}u_{i3}^k - \frac{1}{4}u_{i4}^k \right) = \beta_1(x_i, t_k), \\ 1 \leq i \leq m_1 - 1, 0 \leq k \leq n, \end{array} \right. \quad (5.3c)$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{1}{h_y} \left(\frac{1}{4}u_{i,m_2-4}^k - \frac{4}{3}u_{i,m_2-3}^k + 3U_{i,m_2-2}^k - 4u_{i,m_2-1}^k + \frac{25}{12}u_{i,m_2}^k \right) = \beta_2(x_i, t_k), \\ 1 \leq i \leq m_1 - 1, 0 \leq k \leq n. \end{array} \right. \quad (5.3d)$$

In the numerical implement, we compute the numerical solutions at $(k + 1)th$ -level by the following three steps. The sketch map is referred to Figure 1:

- (i) Compute the numerical solutions on the solid points by (4.2) at kth -level;
- (ii) Compute the numerical solutions on the hollow points by (5.3a)–(5.3d) and the numerical solutions on solid points;
- (iii) Compute the numerical solutions on the star points by (5.3a)–(5.3b) and the numerical solutions on hollow points.

6 Three-dimensional diffusion problem

We consider the three-dimensional convection-diffusion problem as

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \kappa_1 u_{xx} + \kappa_2 u_{yy} + \kappa_3 u_{zz} + \lambda_1 u_x + \lambda_2 u_y + \lambda_3 u_z + f(\mathbf{x}, t), & \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, t \in (0, T], & (6.1a) \\ u(\mathbf{x}, 0) = \varphi(\mathbf{x}), & \mathbf{x} \in \bar{\Omega}, & (6.1b) \\ u(\mathbf{x}, t) = \alpha(\mathbf{x}, t), & \mathbf{x} \in \Gamma, t \in (0, T], & (6.1c) \end{cases}$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (x, y, z)$ and $\kappa_i > 0$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$) denote constant diffusion coefficients. The spatial domain is set as $\Omega = (L_1, R_1) \times (L_2, R_2) \times (L_3, R_3) \subset \mathbb{R}^3$.

To ease the notation, we only state the details for $\lambda_i = 0$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$). In addition to notations defined in Section 2, we take one more integer m_3 and let $h_z = (R_3 - L_3)/m_3$, $z_l = L_3 + lh_z$, $0 \leq l \leq m_3$, $r_z = c\tau/h_z^2$. Denote $\Omega_{h\tau} = \{(\mathbf{x}_{ijl}, t_k) \mid 0 \leq i \leq m_1, 0 \leq j \leq m_2, 0 \leq l \leq m_3, 0 \leq k \leq n\}$ with $\mathbf{x}_{ijl} = (x_i, y_j, z_l)$, $\omega = \{(i, j, l) \mid \mathbf{x}_{ijl} \in \Omega\}$, $\gamma = \{(i, j, l) \mid \mathbf{x}_{ijl} \in \Gamma\}$ and $\bar{\omega} = \omega \cup \gamma$. For any grid function $v = \{v_{ijl}^k \mid 0 \leq i \leq m_1, 0 \leq j \leq m_2, 0 \leq l \leq m_3, 0 \leq k \leq n\}$ on $\Omega_{h\tau}$, define $\delta_t v_{ijl}^{k+\frac{1}{2}} = (v_{ijl}^{k+1} - v_{ijl}^k)/\tau$, $\delta_x^2 v_{ijl}^k = (v_{i+1,j,l}^k - 2v_{ijl}^k + v_{i-1,j,l}^k)/h_x^2$. Analogously, we could define $\delta_y^2 v_{ijl}^k$ and $\delta_z^2 v_{ijl}^k$. Denote $f_{ijl}^k = f(\mathbf{x}_{ijl}, t_k)$ and define the grid function

$$U = \{U_{ijl}^k \mid 0 \leq i \leq m_1, 0 \leq j \leq m_2, 0 \leq l \leq m_3, 0 \leq k \leq n\} \text{ with } U_{ijl}^k = u(\mathbf{x}_{ijl}, t_k).$$

Considering (6.1a) at the point $(\mathbf{x}_{ijl}, t_k)$ and similar to that of two dimension, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \delta_t U_{ijl}^{k+\frac{1}{2}} - \kappa_1 \delta_x^2 U_{ijl}^k - \kappa_2 \delta_y^2 U_{ijl}^k - \kappa_3 \delta_z^2 U_{ijl}^k \\ &= f_{ijl}^k + \left(\frac{\tau}{2} u_{tt} - \frac{\kappa_1 h_x^2}{12} u_{xxxx} - \frac{\kappa_2 h_y^2}{12} u_{yyyy} - \frac{\kappa_3 h_z^2}{12} u_{zzzz} \right) (\mathbf{x}_{ijl}, t_k) + O(\tau^2 + h_x^4 + h_y^4 + h_z^4) \\ &= p_{ijl}^k + \left\{ \frac{\kappa_1 h_x^2}{2} \left(r_x - \frac{1}{6} \right) u_{xxxx} + \frac{\kappa_2 h_y^2}{2} \left(r_y - \frac{1}{6} \right) u_{yyyy} + \frac{\kappa_3 h_z^2}{2} \left(r_z - \frac{1}{6} \right) u_{zzzz} \right\} (\mathbf{x}_{ijl}, t_k) \\ & \quad + \tau \kappa_1 \kappa_2 \delta_x^2 \delta_y^2 U_{ijl}^k + \tau \kappa_2 \kappa_3 \delta_y^2 \delta_z^2 U_{ijl}^k + \tau \kappa_1 \kappa_3 \delta_x^2 \delta_z^2 U_{ijl}^k + O(\tau^2 + \tau h_x^2 + \tau h_y^2 + \tau h_z^2 + h_x^4 + h_y^4 + h_z^4), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$p_{ijl}^k = f_{ijl}^k + \frac{\tau}{2} [a(f_{xx})_{ijl}^k + b(f_{yy})_{ijl}^k + c(f_{zz})_{ijl}^k + (f_t)_{ijl}^k]$$

with $(f_{xx})_{ijl}^k = f_{xx}(\mathbf{x}_{ijl}, t_k)$, $(f_{yy})_{ijl}^k = f_{yy}(\mathbf{x}_{ijl}, t_k)$, $(f_{zz})_{ijl}^k = f_{zz}(\mathbf{x}_{ijl}, t_k)$, $(f_t)_{ijl}^k = f_t(\mathbf{x}_{ijl}, t_k)$.

Therefore, a corrected difference scheme for (6.1) is constructed as

$$\begin{cases} \delta_t u_{ijl}^{k+\frac{1}{2}} = \kappa_1 \delta_x^2 u_{ijl}^k + \kappa_2 \delta_y^2 u_{ijl}^k + \kappa_3 \delta_z^2 u_{ijl}^k + p_{ijl}^k \\ \quad + \tau \kappa_1 \kappa_2 \delta_x^2 \delta_y^2 u_{ijl}^k + \tau \kappa_2 \kappa_3 \delta_y^2 \delta_z^2 u_{ijl}^k + \tau \kappa_1 \kappa_3 \delta_x^2 \delta_z^2 u_{ijl}^k, & (i, j, l) \in \omega, 0 \leq k \leq n-1, & (6.2a) \\ u_{ijl}^0 = \varphi(\mathbf{x}_{ijl}), & (i, j, l) \in \bar{\omega}, & (6.2b) \\ u_{ijl}^k = \alpha(\mathbf{x}_{ijl}, t_k), & (i, j, l) \in \gamma, 0 \leq k \leq n. & (6.2c) \end{cases}$$

By using the maximum principle and similar to the proof in two dimension, we have the convergence result for the corrected difference scheme (6.2).

Theorem 6.3 *Let $\{U_{ijl}^k \mid 0 \leq i \leq m_1, 0 \leq j \leq m_2, 0 \leq l \leq m_3, 0 \leq k \leq n\}$ be the solution of (6.1) with $\lambda_i = 0$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$) and $\{u_{ijl}^k \mid 0 \leq i \leq m_1, 0 \leq j \leq m_2, 0 \leq l \leq m_3, 0 \leq k \leq n\}$ be the solution of the corrected difference scheme (6.2). Denote $e_{ijl}^k = U_{ijl}^k - u_{ijl}^k$, ($0 \leq i \leq m_1, 0 \leq j \leq m_2, 0 \leq l \leq m_3, 0 \leq k \leq n$). When*

$$\max\{r_x, r_y, r_z\} \leq 1/4, \quad (6.3)$$

then there is a constant c_2 such that

$$\|e^k\|_\infty \leq \begin{cases} c_2(\tau^2 + h_x^4 + h_y^4 + h_z^4), & \text{when } r_x = r_y = r_z = 1/6, \quad 0 \leq k \leq n, \\ c_2(\tau^2 + h_x^2 + h_y^2 + h_z^2), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$




Fig. 2: The sketch of the stable domain for the three-dimensional diffusion problem. Red triangular pyramid denotes the stability of the classical difference scheme (6.4) and black cube denotes the stability of the corrected difference scheme (6.2)

Remark 6.3 The following results are easily obtained from the convergence proof.

- (6.3) is also **CFL** condition for the stability of the corrected difference scheme (6.2). **CFL** condition of the classical difference scheme

$$\begin{cases} \delta_t u_{ijl}^{k+\frac{1}{2}} = \kappa_1 \delta_x^2 u_{ijl}^k + \kappa_2 \delta_y^2 u_{ijl}^k + \kappa_3 \delta_z^2 u_{ijl}^k + p_{ijl}^k, & (6.4a) \\ u_{ijl}^0 = \varphi(\mathbf{x}_{ijl}), & (i, j, l) \in \bar{\omega}, & (6.4b) \\ u_{ijl}^k = \alpha(\mathbf{x}_{ijl}, t_k), & (i, j, l) \in \gamma, \quad 0 \leq k \leq n, & (6.4c) \end{cases}$$

requires $r_x + r_y + r_z \leq 1/2$, see e.g., [2]. The stability regions between the corrected difference scheme (cube) and the classical difference scheme (rectangular triangular pyramid) are also referred to Figure 2.

- For the convection-diffusion problem with constant convection coefficients (6.1) in three dimension, **CFL** condition becomes

$$\begin{cases} \max\{r_x, r_y, r_z\} \leq 1/4, \\ |\lambda_1| h_x \leq \kappa_1 \cdot \min \left\{ 2, \sqrt{(1-2r_x)(1-2r_y)(1-2r_z)/3} / r_x \right\}, \\ |\lambda_2| h_y \leq \kappa_2 \cdot \min \left\{ 2, \sqrt{(1-2r_x)(1-2r_y)(1-2r_z)/3} / r_y \right\}, \\ |\lambda_3| h_z \leq \kappa_3 \cdot \min \left\{ 2, \sqrt{(1-2r_x)(1-2r_y)(1-2r_z)/3} / r_z \right\}. \end{cases}$$

We omit details here for sake of brevity.

7 Numerical examples

In this section, we verify the accuracy and test **CFL** condition of the numerical simulation for several problems including linear and nonlinear cases in different scenarios. We first focus on the two-dimensional case. For this purpose, we denote the difference solution $\{u_{ij}^k\}$ with the chosen fixed spacial step sizes (h_x, h_y) and temporal step size τ by $\{u_{ij}^k(h_x, h_y, \tau)\}$. Similarly, $\{u_{2i,2j}^{4k}(h_x/2, h_y/2, \tau/4)\}$ denotes the difference solution with the chosen fixed spacial step sizes $(h_x/2, h_y/2)$ and temporal step size $\tau/4$. Let $r_x = r_y := r$. The numerical errors in L^∞ -norm and global convergence orders are defined as

$$\text{Ord}_G = \begin{cases} \log_2 \left(\frac{E_\infty(h_x, h_y, \tau)}{E_\infty(h_x/2, h_y/2, \tau/4)} \right), & \text{where } E_\infty(h_x, h_y, \tau) = \max_{(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k) \in \Omega_{h\tau}} |u(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k) - u_{ij}^k(h_x, h_y, \tau)|, \\ & \text{if the exact solution is known;} \\ \log_2 \left(\frac{E_\infty(h_x, h_y, \tau)}{E_\infty(h_x/2, h_y/2, \tau/4)} \right), & \text{where } E_\infty(h_x, h_y, \tau) = \max_{(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, t_k) \in \Omega_{h\tau}} |u_{ij}^k(h_x, h_y, \tau) \\ & - u_{2i,2j}^{4k}(h_x/2, h_y/2, \tau/4)|, \text{ if the exact solution is unknown.} \end{cases} \quad (7.1)$$

In the numerical implementation, we first fixed the step-ratio r and temporal step size τ , then determine h_x and h_y by r and τ .

Similarly, the numerical errors and global convergence orders for the three-dimensional case could be defined. The step-ratio is abbreviated as “R” and the grid parameter as “P”.

7.1 Linear problems

Example 1 Firstly, the model problem (1.1) with $c = d = 0$ is solved by the correct difference scheme (2.6) and classical Euler difference method (2.7) respectively, with the parameters $L_1 = L_2 = 0$, $R_1 = R_2 = 1$, $T = 1$. The initial value condition, boundary value condition and the source term $f(\mathbf{x}, t)$ are determined by the exact solution $u(\mathbf{x}, t) = \exp(1/2(x + y) - t)$, see e.g., [12].

Two sets of diffusion coefficients **Case I**: $a = 4$, $b = 1$ and **Case II**: $a = 1$, $b = 0.0001$ are used. Numerical results are listed in Tables 1 and 2.

In **Case I**, we see clearly that when the step ratio $r = 1/6$, the corrected difference scheme (2.6) obtains the fourth-order accuracy approximatively. Otherwise, it is only second-order accurate globally. When the step-ratio increases to $r = 1/2$ gradually, the corrected difference scheme (2.6) still works. However, the classical difference scheme (2.7) fails even if the step-ratio is $r = 1/3.99$ because of the restriction of **CFL** condition. These numerical observations are surprisingly consistent with the theoretical results. Moreover, the numerical results in Table 1 are more accurate than those in Table 2 even using the same step-ratio, which display the advantage of the corrected Euler difference scheme (2.6). In **Case II**, similar results to **Case I** are observed from the third column in Table 1 and Table 2 even though the diffusion varies greatly from direction to direction.

Table 1: The errors in L^∞ -norm versus grid sizes reduction and convergence orders of the corrected difference scheme (2.6) for the linear diffusion equation in Example 1

P R	Case I					Case II				
	m_1	m_2	n	$E_\infty(h_x, h_y, \tau)$	Ord _G	m_1	m_2	n	$E_\infty(h_x, h_y, \tau)$	Ord _G
$r = 1/7$	5	10	700	$2.2598e-6$	*	5	500	175	$3.7141e-6$	*
	10	20	2800	$5.7458e-7$	1.9756	10	1000	700	$8.4007e-7$	2.1444
	20	40	11200	$1.4348e-7$	2.0016	20	2000	2800	$2.0296e-7$	2.0493
	40	80	44800	$3.5942e-8$	1.9971	40	4000	11200	$5.0363e-8$	2.0107
	80	160	179200	$8.9853e-9$	2.0000	80	8000	44800	$1.2563e-8$	2.0032
$r = 1/6$	5	10	600	$2.0937e-8$	*	5	500	150	$7.8615e-7$	*
	10	20	2400	$1.3370e-9$	3.9690	10	1000	600	$5.0407e-8$	3.9631
	20	40	9600	$8.3554e-11$	4.0001	20	2000	2400	$3.1499e-9$	4.0002
	40	80	38400	$5.1935e-12$	4.0079	40	4000	9600	$1.9706e-10$	3.9986
	80	160	153600	$1.6276e-13$	4.9959	80	8000	38400	$1.2082e-11$	4.0277
$r = 1/5$	5	10	500	$3.1255e-6$	*	5	500	125	$3.2597e-6$	*
	10	20	2000	$8.0197e-7$	1.9624	10	1000	500	$1.0517e-6$	1.6320
	20	40	8000	$2.0072e-7$	1.9983	20	2000	2000	$2.7637e-7$	1.9281
	40	80	32000	$5.0310e-8$	1.9963	40	4000	8000	$7.0022e-8$	1.9807
	80	160	128000	$1.2579e-8$	1.9998	80	8000	32000	$1.7558e-8$	1.9957
$r = 1/2$	5	10	200	$3.2085e-5$	*	5	500	50	$3.6891e-5$	*
	10	20	800	$8.0721e-6$	1.9909	10	1000	200	$1.0791e-5$	1.7734
	20	40	3200	$2.0106e-6$	2.0054	20	2000	800	$2.7808e-6$	1.9563
	40	80	12800	$5.0330e-7$	1.9981	40	4000	3200	$7.0129e-7$	1.9874
	80	160	51200	$1.2580e-7$	2.0003	80	8000	12800	$1.7565e-7$	1.9973
$r = 1/1.99$	5	10	199	$3.2334e-5$	*	5	500	50	$9.5017e-5$	*
	10	20	796	$8.1327e-6$	1.9912	10	1000	199	$1.0872e-5$	3.1276
	20	40	3184	$4.4720e-4$	-5.7810	20	2000	796	$2.8052e-6$	1.9544
	40	80	12736	$5.5224e+76$	-266.06	40	4000	3184	$5.0471e+9$	-50.676
	80	160	50944	Inf	-Inf	80	8000	12736	$1.5555e+90$	-267.38

Table 2: The errors in L^∞ -norm versus grid sizes reduction and convergence orders of the classical Euler difference scheme (2.7) for the linear diffusion equation in Example 1

P R	Case I					Case II				
	m_1	m_2	n	$E_\infty(h_x, h_y, \tau)$	Ord _G	m_1	m_2	n	$E_\infty(h_x, h_y, \tau)$	Ord _G
$r = 1/7$	5	10	700	$3.0144e-6$	*	5	500	175	$2.7831e-4$	*
	10	20	2800	$7.7458e-7$	1.9604	10	1000	700	$7.1417e-5$	1.9623
	20	40	11200	$1.9395e-7$	1.9977	20	2000	2800	$1.7854e-5$	2.0000
	40	80	44800	$4.8617e-8$	1.9961	40	4000	11200	$4.4692e-6$	1.9981
	80	160	179200	$1.2156e-8$	1.9998	80	8000	44800	$1.1173e-6$	2.0000
$r = 1/6$	5	10	600	$9.2716e-7$	*	5	500	150	$3.2822e-4$	*
	10	20	2400	$2.3637e-7$	1.9718	10	1000	600	$8.4248e-5$	1.9620
	20	40	9600	$5.9067e-8$	2.0006	20	2000	2400	$2.1063e-5$	1.9999
	40	80	38400	$1.4799e-8$	1.9969	40	4000	9600	$5.2727e-6$	1.9981
	80	160	153600	$3.6999e-9$	1.9999	80	8000	38400	$1.3182e-6$	2.0000
$r = 1/5$	5	10	500	$1.9943e-6$	*	5	500	125	$3.9804e-4$	*
	10	20	2000	$5.1709e-7$	1.9474	10	1000	500	$1.0221e-4$	1.9614
	20	40	8000	$1.2977e-7$	1.9945	20	2000	2000	$2.5556e-5$	1.9998
	40	80	32000	$3.2546e-8$	1.9953	40	4000	8000	$6.3975e-6$	1.9981
	80	160	128000	$8.1388e-9$	1.9996	80	8000	32000	$1.5994e-6$	2.0000
$r = 1/4$	5	10	400	$6.3753e-6$	*	5	500	100	$5.0264e-4$	*
	10	20	1600	$1.6472e-6$	1.9525	10	1000	400	$1.2914e-4$	1.9606
	20	40	6400	$4.1301e-7$	1.9958	20	2000	1600	$3.2294e-5$	1.9996
	40	80	25600	$1.0356e-7$	1.9957	40	4000	6400	$8.0846e-6$	1.9980
	80	160	102400	$2.5897e-8$	1.9997	80	8000	25600	$2.0212e-6$	2.0000
$r = 1/3.99$	5	10	399	$6.4302e-6$	*	5	500	100	$4.3540e-4$	*
	10	20	1596	$1.6614e-6$	1.9525	10	1000	399	$1.2948e-4$	1.7496
	20	40	6384	$4.1656e-7$	1.9958	20	2000	1596	$3.2379e-5$	1.9996
	40	80	25536	$2.1130e+18$	-82.069	40	4000	6384	$1.1756e-5$	1.4617
	80	160	102144	$1.0174e+18$	-550.39	80	8000	25536	$3.4068e+34$	-131.09

Example 2 Then we consider the problem (1.1) by the corrected difference scheme (2.7) and the classical difference scheme (2.8). The parameters are taken as $L_1 = L_2 = 0$, $R_1 = R_2 = 1$ and $T = 1$. The initial value condition, boundary value conditions and the source term are determined by the exact solution $u(\mathbf{x}, t) = \exp(x+y-t)$. We take diffusion and convection coefficients a , b , c , d as

Case I: $a = 4$, $b = 1$, $c = -10$, $d = 20$; **Case II:** $a = 1$, $b = 0.01$, $c = -1$, $d = 2$.

Numerical results are listed in Tables 3 and 4. When the step-ratio is $1/6$, the convergence rate is approximately fourth-order for the above two sets of parameters, which confirm the theoretical findings. For other step-ratios, the convergence rate is only two globally in both cases. Moreover, the corrected difference scheme (2.7) is more accurate than the classical difference scheme (2.8) whatever the step sizes are, which displays the superiority of the corrected difference scheme (2.7).

Table 3: The errors in L^∞ -norm versus grid sizes reduction and convergence orders of the corrected difference scheme (2.8) for the linear convection-diffusion equation in Example 2

R \ P	Case I					Case II				
	m_1	m_2	n	$E_\infty(h_x, h_y, \tau)$	Ord _G	m_1	m_2	n	$E_\infty(h_x, h_y, \tau)$	Ord _G
$r = 1/7$	5	10	700	$9.8608e-5$	*	5	50	175	$7.2462e-5$	*
	10	20	2800	$1.8204e-5$	2.4374	10	100	700	$1.7282e-5$	2.0680
	20	40	11200	$4.1716e-6$	2.1256	20	200	2800	$4.2680e-6$	2.0176
	40	80	44800	$1.0174e-6$	2.0358	40	400	11200	$1.0653e-6$	2.0023
	80	160	179200	$2.5287e-7$	2.0084	80	800	44800	$2.6613e-7$	2.0011
$r = 1/6$	5	10	600	$4.0615e-5$	*	5	50	150	$5.1442e-6$	*
	10	20	2400	$2.5579e-6$	3.9890	10	100	600	$3.2166e-7$	3.9994
	20	40	9600	$1.6117e-7$	3.9883	20	200	2400	$2.0103e-8$	4.0000
	40	80	38400	$1.0079e-8$	3.9993	40	400	9600	$1.2583e-9$	3.9978
	80	160	153600	$6.3068e-10$	3.9982	80	800	38400	$7.8984e-11$	3.9938
$r = 1/5$	5	10	500	$4.0159e-5$	*	5	50	125	$3.2297e+2$	*
	10	20	2000	$1.9326e-5$	1.0552	10	100	500	$2.3429e-5$	2371.7
	20	40	8000	$5.4520e-6$	1.8257	20	200	2000	$5.9274e-6$	1.9828
	40	80	32000	$1.4000e-6$	1.9613	40	400	8000	$1.4885e-6$	1.9936
	80	160	128000	$3.5249e-7$	1.9898	80	800	32000	$3.7239e-7$	1.9989

Table 4: The errors in L^∞ -norm versus grid sizes reduction and convergence orders of the classical Euler difference scheme (2.9) for the linear convection-diffusion equation in Example 2

R \ P	Case I					Case II				
	m_1	m_2	n	$E_\infty(h_x, h_y, \tau)$	Ord _G	m_1	m_2	n	$E_\infty(h_x, h_y, \tau)$	Ord _G
$r = 1/7$	5	10	700	$4.6670e-4$	*	5	50	175	$8.9757e-4$	*
	10	20	2800	$1.1650e-4$	2.0021	10	100	700	$2.2506e-4$	1.9957
	20	40	11200	$2.9304e-5$	1.9912	20	200	2800	$5.6308e-5$	1.9989
	40	80	44800	$7.3252e-6$	2.0001	40	400	11200	$1.4101e-5$	1.9975
	80	160	179200	$1.8322e-6$	1.9993	80	800	44800	$3.5254e-6$	1.9999
$r = 1/6$	5	10	600	$4.6947e-4$	*	5	50	150	$9.6777e-4$	*
	10	20	2400	$1.1720e-4$	2.0021	10	100	600	$2.4273e-4$	1.9953
	20	40	9600	$2.9479e-5$	1.9912	20	200	2400	$6.0733e-5$	1.9988
	40	80	38400	$7.3691e-6$	2.0001	40	400	9600	$1.5209e-5$	1.9975
	80	160	153600	$1.8431e-6$	1.9993	80	800	38400	$3.8026e-6$	1.9999
$r = 1/5$	5	10	500	$4.7336e-4$	*	5	50	125	$1.0660e-3$	*
	10	20	2000	$1.1817e-4$	2.0020	10	100	500	$2.6747e-4$	1.9947
	20	40	8000	$2.9724e-5$	1.9912	20	200	2000	$6.6929e-5$	1.9987
	40	80	32000	$7.4305e-6$	2.0001	40	400	8000	$1.6761e-5$	1.9975
	80	160	128000	$1.8585e-6$	1.9993	80	800	32000	$4.1906e-6$	1.9999

Example 3 We test the convergence rate and solution behavior to the problem (1.1) with the variable coefficients $c(\mathbf{x}) = \sin(x+y)$ and $d(\mathbf{x}) = \cos(x+y)$ by the difference scheme (2.4). The

initial condition is taken as $\varphi(\mathbf{x}) = \exp(-x^2 - y^2)$ and boundary value conditions are homogeneous. The exact solution is unknown. The parameters are taken as $L_1 = L_2 = -5$, $R_1 = R_2 = 5$, $T = 1$ and the diffusion coefficients are respectively taken as

Case I: $a = 4, b = 1$; **Case II:** $a = 1, b = 0.01$;

Case III: $a = 100, b = 100$; **Case IV:** $a = 0.01, b = 0.01$.

The numerical results are shown in Tables 5–6 and Figure 3. Since the exact solution is unknown, we use the second method in (7.1) to test the convergence rate. As we see from Tables 5 and 6, all the results are in agreement with our theoretical findings. Moreover, numerical surfaces are demonstrated in Figure 3 with the optimal step-ratio $r = 1/6$, which further confirm the resolution performance of the corrected difference scheme (2.4). It is worth mentioning that the smaller diffusion coefficients a and b are, the more dense grids required (see **Case IV** in Table 6).

Table 5: The errors in L^∞ -norm versus grid sizes reduction and convergence orders of the corrected difference scheme (2.4) for the linear convection-diffusion equation with the variable coefficients in Example 3

P R	Case I					Case II				
	m_1	m_2	n	$E_\infty(h_x, h_y, \tau)$	Ord _G	m_1	m_2	n	$E_\infty(h_x, h_y, \tau)$	Ord _G
$r = 1/7$	10	20	28	$3.5063e-04$	*	10	100	7	$4.7662e-03$	*
	20	40	112	$9.5061e-05$	1.8830	20	200	28	$1.0877e-03$	2.1315
	40	80	448	$2.4605e-05$	1.9499	40	400	112	$3.3119e-04$	1.7156
	80	160	1792	$6.1907e-06$	1.9908	80	800	448	$8.6900e-05$	1.9303
	160	320	7168	$1.5513e-06$	1.9966	160	1600	1792	$2.2006e-05$	1.9815
$r = 1/6$	10	20	24	$1.3708e-04$	*	10	100	6	$1.0013e-02$	*
	20	40	96	$8.6521e-06$	3.9858	20	200	24	$5.7511e-04$	4.1218
	40	80	384	$5.4266e-07$	3.9949	40	400	96	$3.5329e-05$	4.0249
	80	160	1536	$3.3796e-08$	4.0051	80	800	384	$2.2085e-06$	3.9997
	160	320	6144	$2.1103e-09$	4.0013	160	1600	1536	$1.3778e-07$	4.0027
$r = 1/5$	10	20	20	$7.2761e-04$	*	10	100	5	$2.1408e-02$	*
	20	40	80	$1.4741e-04$	2.3033	20	200	20	$2.7078e-03$	2.9830
	40	80	320	$3.5263e-05$	2.0636	40	400	80	$5.4266e-04$	2.3190
	80	160	1280	$8.7176e-06$	2.0161	80	800	320	$1.2652e-04$	2.1007
	160	320	5120	$2.1751e-06$	2.0028	160	1600	1280	$3.1116e-05$	2.0236

Table 6: The errors in L^∞ -norm versus grid sizes reduction and convergence orders of the corrected difference scheme (2.4) for the linear convection-diffusion equation with the variable coefficients in Example 3

P R	Case III					Case IV				
	m_1	m_2	n	$E_\infty(h_x, h_y, \tau)$	Ord _G	m_1	m_2	n	$E_\infty(h_x, h_y, \tau)$	Ord _G
$r = 1/7$	10	10	700	$5.8207e-12$	*	80	80	4	$7.8466e-02$	*
	20	20	2800	$1.3892e-12$	2.0670	160	160	18	$2.1898e-03$	5.1632
	40	40	11200	$3.4475e-13$	2.0106	320	320	72	$1.5272e-04$	3.8419
	80	80	44800	$8.6028e-14$	2.0027	640	640	287	$4.0011e-05$	1.9324
	160	160	179200	$2.1497e-14$	2.0007	1280	1280	1147	$1.1807e-05$	1.7607
$r = 1/6$	10	10	600	$2.0539e-13$	*	80	80	4	$7.8466e-02$	*
	20	20	2400	$7.0272e-15$	4.8693	160	160	15	$3.6061e-03$	4.4436
	40	40	9600	$4.3983e-16$	3.9979	320	320	61	$2.2628e-04$	3.9942
	80	80	38400	$2.7499e-17$	3.9995	640	640	246	$1.3218e-05$	4.0975
	160	160	153600	$1.7195e-18$	3.9993	1280	1280	983	$8.5304e-07$	3.9538
$r = 1/5$	10	10	500	$7.4220e-12$	*	80	80	3	$1.9008e-01$	*
	20	20	2000	$1.9139e-12$	1.9553	160	160	13	$5.2300e-03$	5.1837
	40	40	8000	$4.8071e-13$	1.9933	320	320	51	$5.5828e-04$	3.2277
	80	80	32000	$1.2032e-13$	1.9983	640	640	205	$8.6098e-05$	2.6969
	160	160	128000	$3.0088e-14$	1.9996	1280	1280	819	$1.8490e-05$	2.2192




Fig. 3: Numerical surfaces and corresponding contours at the same terminal time $t = 1$ in Example 3. The coefficients and parameters are respectively taken as (a) and (d): $a = 4$, $b = 1$, $m_1 = 160$, $m_2 = 320$, $n = 6144$; (b) and (e): $a = 1$, $b = 0.01$, $m_1 = 160$, $m_2 = 1600$, $n = 1536$; (c) and (f): $a = 0.04$, $b = 0.04$, $m_1 = 320$, $m_2 = 320$, $n = 246$.

7.2 Nonlinear problems

We will test Example 4 and Example 5 under Dirichlet boundary conditions by the difference scheme (4.2), (2.4b)–(2.4c) and under Neumann boundary conditions by the difference scheme (4.2), (5.3a)–(5.3d) respectively.

Example 4 We first consider semi-linear diffusion reaction equations as

$$u_t = \Delta u + r(u), \quad \mathbf{x} \in (0, 1)^2, \quad t \in (0, T],$$

where the initial and boundary value conditions are determined by the exact solution.

Case I: Fisher's equation [10]: $r(u) = u(1 - u)$. The exact solution is

$$u(\mathbf{x}, t) = \left[1 + \exp \left(-\frac{5}{6}t + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{6}x + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{6}y \right) \right]^{-2};$$

Case II: Chafee-Infante equation [1]: $r(u) = u(1 - u^2)$. The exact solution is

$$u(\mathbf{x}, t) = \frac{1}{2} \tanh \left(\frac{1}{4}x + \frac{1}{4}y + \frac{3}{4}t \right) + \frac{1}{2}.$$




Fig. 4: Numerical surfaces and error surfaces at the terminal time $t = 2$. (a)–(b): the Fisher equation, the domain are taken as $\Omega = [-20, 20] \times [-20, 20]$ and mesh parameters $h_x = h_y = 1/8, \tau = 1/384$; (c)–(d): the Chafee-Infante equation, the domain are taken as $\Omega = [-10, 10] \times [-10, 10]$ and mesh parameters $h_x = h_y = 1/16, \tau = 1/1536$.

Table 7: The errors in L^∞ -norm versus grid sizes reduction and convergence orders of the corrected difference scheme (4.2) for the Fisher equation and Chafee-Infante equation under the **Dirichlet** boundary conditions in Example 4

P R	Case I					Case II				
	m_1	m_2	n	$E_\infty(h_x, h_y, \tau)$	Ord _G	m_1	m_2	n	$E_\infty(h_x, h_y, \tau)$	Ord _G
$r = 1/7$	10	10	700	$3.2948e-9$	*	10	10	700	$2.9377e-8$	*
	20	20	2800	$1.2599e-9$	1.3869	20	20	2800	$7.9078e-9$	1.8934
	40	40	11200	$3.4607e-10$	1.8642	40	40	11200	$2.0121e-9$	1.9745
	80	80	44800	$8.8370e-11$	1.9694	80	80	44800	$5.0524e-10$	1.9937
	160	160	179200	$2.2219e-11$	1.9918	160	160	179200	$1.2645e-10$	1.9984
$r = 1/6$	10	10	600	$4.2836e-9$	*	10	10	600	$4.4406e-9$	*
	20	20	2400	$2.6769e-10$	4.0002	20	20	2400	$2.7710e-10$	3.9890
	40	40	9600	$1.6730e-11$	4.0000	40	40	9600	$1.7312e-11$	3.9883
	80	80	38400	$1.0456e-12$	4.0001	80	80	38400	$1.0825e-12$	3.9993
	160	160	153600	$6.5337e-14$	4.0003	160	160	153600	$6.7946e-14$	3.9982
$r = 1/5$	10	10	500	$1.3295e-8$	*	10	10	500	$5.1364e-8$	*
	20	20	2000	$2.3143e-9$	2.5223	20	20	2000	$1.1709e-8$	2.1331
	40	40	8000	$5.1745e-10$	2.1611	40	40	8000	$2.8569e-9$	2.0351
	80	80	32000	$1.2585e-10$	2.0398	80	80	32000	$7.0982e-10$	2.0089
	160	160	128000	$3.1237e-11$	2.0103	160	160	128000	$1.7719e-10$	2.0022

Table 8: The errors in L^∞ -norm versus grid sizes reduction and convergence orders of the corrected difference scheme (4.2) for the Fisher equation and Chafee-Infante equation with the **Neumann** boundary conditions in Example 4

P R	Case I					Case II				
	m_1	m_2	n	$E_\infty(h_x, h_y, \tau)$	Ord _G	m_1	m_2	n	$E_\infty(h_x, h_y, \tau)$	Ord _G
$r = 1/7$	10	10	700	$3.7818e-7$	*	10	10	700	$8.5997e-7$	*
	20	20	2800	$9.9509e-8$	1.9262	20	20	2800	$2.0788e-7$	2.0486
	40	40	11200	$2.5240e-8$	1.9791	40	40	11200	$5.1631e-8$	2.0094
	80	80	44800	$6.3342e-9$	1.9945	80	80	44800	$1.2890e-8$	2.0020
	160	160	179200	$1.5852e-9$	1.9985	160	160	179200	$3.2215e-9$	2.0005
$r = 1/6$	10	10	600	$7.7947e-8$	*	10	10	600	$6.8543e-8$	*
	20	20	2400	$5.0469e-9$	3.9490	20	20	2400	$4.6223e-9$	3.8903
	40	40	9600	$3.2070e-10$	3.9761	40	40	9600	$2.9933e-10$	3.9488
	80	80	38400	$2.0186e-11$	3.9898	80	80	38400	$1.9060e-11$	3.9731
	160	160	153600	$1.2221e-12$	4.0459	160	160	153600	$1.2601e-12$	3.9190
$r = 1/5$	10	10	500	$6.3087e-7$	*	10	10	500	$1.1272e-6$	*
	20	20	2000	$1.4610e-7$	2.1104	20	20	2000	$2.8694e-7$	1.9739
	40	40	8000	$3.5778e-8$	2.0299	40	40	8000	$7.2064e-8$	1.9934
	80	80	32000	$8.8960e-9$	2.0078	80	80	32000	$1.8034e-8$	1.9986
	160	160	128000	$2.2209e-9$	2.0020	160	160	128000	$4.5095e-9$	1.9997

The numerical results for these two problems with $\tau = h^2$ and $T = 1$ are listed in Table 7 for the Dirichlet boundary conditions and in Table 8 for the Neumann Boundary conditions. We clearly see that when the step-ratio $r = 1/6$, the numerical accuracy is fourth-order. Meanwhile, the numerical results are much better than that calculated by using other step-ratios. For example, when $m_1 = m_2 = 160$, the maximum numerical error 10^{-14} is achieved with the optimal step-ratio $r = 1/6$, which is about 1/1000 of that obtained by the same spatial step sizes and smaller temporal step size. A similar phenomenon is observed under the Neumann boundary conditions. The numerical solution behavior for both problems and corresponding error surfaces are displayed in Figure 4 with the optimal step-ratio $r = 1/6$.

Example 5 Next, we solve the two-dimensional scalar quasi-linear Burgers' equation [9] as

$$u_t + (u^2/2)_x + (u^2/2)_y = \mu \Delta u, \quad \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, \quad t \in (0, 1],$$

where μ is the viscous coefficient. The initial and boundary value conditions are taken from the exact solution

$$u(\mathbf{x}, t) = \frac{2\mu\pi \sin(\pi(x+y)) \exp(-2\mu\pi^2 t)}{2 + \cos(\pi(x+y)) \exp(-2\mu\pi^2 t)}.$$

The following two sets of diffusion coefficients are considered.

Case I: $\mu = 1$; **Case II:** $\mu = 0.01$;

The numerical convergence results on the domain $\Omega = [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ are listed in Table 9 for the Dirichlet boundary conditions and in Table 10 for the Neumann boundary conditions. They confirm that the corrected difference scheme is still fourth-order accuracy when the step-ratio $r = 1/6$ and second-order accuracy for other step-ratios, which fully demonstrates the good performance in accuracy of the novel corrected scheme (4.2). Comparing the results in Tables 9 and 10, we see that the numerical errors for the Neumann boundary conditions are larger than those for the Dirichlet boundary conditions. This is mainly caused by the discretization on the boundary conditions. The numerical simulation for the Burgers' equation with viscous coefficients $\mu = 1$ ($t = 0.1$), $\mu = 0.01$ ($t = 0.5$) is demonstrated in Figure 5 respectively on the domain $\Omega = [-3, 3] \times [-3, 3]$. We see that the numerical error surfaces keeps very low whether the viscous coefficient μ is large or small.




Fig. 5: Numerical surfaces and error surfaces for the Burgers' equation, (a)–(b): $\mu = 1$, $M_1 = M_2 = 320$, $N = 1707$, $t = 0.1$ (c)–(d): $\mu = 0.01$, $M_1 = M_2 = 640$, $N = 341$, $t = 0.5$.

Table 9: The errors in L^∞ -norm versus grid sizes reduction and convergence orders of the corrected difference scheme (4.2) for the viscous Burgers' equation under the **Dirichlet** boundary conditions in Example 5

R \ P	Case I					Case II				
	m_1	m_2	n	$E_\infty(h_x, h_y, \tau)$	Ord _G	m_1	m_2	n	$E_\infty(h_x, h_y, \tau)$	Ord _G
$r = 1/7$	10	10	700	$8.3065e - 12$	*	10	10	7	$3.0122e - 5$	*
	20	20	2800	$2.0419e - 12$	2.0243	20	20	28	$1.0200e - 5$	1.5622
	40	40	11200	$5.0834e - 13$	2.0061	40	40	112	$2.7123e - 6$	1.9110
	80	80	44800	$1.2710e - 13$	1.9998	80	80	448	$6.8987e - 7$	1.9751
	160	160	179200	$3.1782e - 14$	1.9997	160	160	1792	$1.7308e - 7$	1.9949
$r = 1/6$	10	10	600	$1.2581e - 13$	*	10	10	6	$2.0126e - 5$	*
	20	20	2400	$7.8107e - 15$	4.0096	20	20	24	$1.2675e - 6$	3.9890
	40	40	9600	$4.8736e - 16$	4.0024	40	40	96	$7.8155e - 8$	4.0195
	80	80	38400	$3.0483e - 17$	3.9989	80	80	384	$4.8675e - 9$	4.0051
	160	160	153600	$1.9059e - 18$	3.9994	160	160	1536	$3.0437e - 10$	3.9993
$r = 1/5$	10	10	500	$1.1283e - 11$	*	10	10	5	$9.2303e - 5$	*
	20	20	2000	$2.8372e - 12$	1.9916	20	20	20	$1.7206e - 5$	2.4235
	40	40	8000	$7.1034e - 13$	1.9979	40	40	80	$3.9883e - 6$	2.1091
	80	80	32000	$1.7785e - 13$	1.9978	80	80	320	$9.7742e - 7$	2.0287
	160	160	128000	$4.4489e - 14$	1.9992	160	160	1280	$2.4304e - 7$	2.0078

Table 10: The errors in L^∞ -norm versus grid sizes reduction and convergence orders of the corrected difference scheme (4.2) for the viscous Burgers' equation under the **Neumann** boundary in Example 5

R \ P	Case I					Case II				
	m_1	m_2	n	$E_\infty(h_x, h_y, \tau)$	Ord _G	m_1	m_2	n	$E_\infty(h_x, h_y, \tau)$	Ord _G
$r = 1/7$	10	10	700	$1.3885e - 7$	*	40	40	112	$2.7129e - 6$	*
	20	20	2800	$1.2689e - 7$	0.1300	80	80	448	$7.2243e - 7$	1.9089
	40	40	11200	$3.9364e - 8$	1.6886	160	160	1792	$1.9385e - 7$	1.8979
	80	80	44800	$1.0255e - 8$	1.9406	320	320	7168	$4.9489e - 8$	1.9698
	160	160	179200	$2.5871e - 9$	1.9869	640	640	28672	$1.2443e - 8$	1.9918
$r = 1/6$	10	10	600	$7.1556e - 7$	*	40	40	96	$1.5489e - 6$	*
	20	20	2400	$4.0472e - 8$	4.1441	80	80	384	$9.9905e - 8$	3.9546
	40	40	9600	$2.2378e - 9$	4.1768	160	160	1536	$6.2942e - 9$	3.9885
	80	80	38400	$1.2872e - 10$	4.1198	320	320	6144	$3.9461e - 10$	3.9955
	160	160	153600	$7.6769e - 12$	4.0676	640	640	24576	$2.4688e - 11$	3.9985
$r = 1/5$	10	10	500	$1.6401e - 6$	*	40	40	80	$5.9410e - 6$	*
	20	20	2000	$2.7321e - 7$	2.5857	80	80	320	$1.2168e - 6$	2.2877
	40	40	8000	$6.0382e - 8$	2.1778	160	160	1280	$2.8568e - 7$	2.0906
	80	80	32000	$1.4660e - 8$	2.0423	320	320	5120	$7.0216e - 8$	2.0245
	160	160	128000	$3.6400e - 9$	2.0098	640	640	20480	$1.7479e - 8$	2.0062

Example 6 We then consider the solution behavior to the nonlinear problem [5] as

$$u_t + f(u)_x + g(u)_y = \varepsilon \Delta u, \quad \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, \quad t > 0.$$

Case I. The initial data is given by

$$u_0(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{for } (x - 0.25)^2 + (y - 2.25)^2 < 0.5, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and the fluxes given by

$$\begin{cases} g(u) = (u - 0.25)^3, \\ f(u) = u + u^2. \end{cases}$$

Case II. The initial data is given by

$$u_0(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{for } x^2 + y^2 < 0.5, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and the fluxes given by

$$\begin{cases} g(u) = \frac{u^2}{u^2 + (1-u)^2}, \\ f(u) = g(u)(1 - 5(1-u)^2). \end{cases}$$

In **Case I**, the boundary conditions are set to be zeros to keep the consistency and the diffusion coefficient is taken as $\varepsilon = 0.1$. The temporal step size is $\tau = 0.001$ and the simulation domain is on $\Omega = [-6, 2] \times [0, 8]$, which could contain a complete evolution surface. The numerical surfaces and corresponding contours are displayed in Figure 6 for different terminal time with the optimal step-ratio $r = 1/6$. We see clearly that the numerical solutions are diffusive and move from the bottom right to the upper left.




Fig. 6: Numerical evolution surfaces (a)–(d) and the corresponding contours (e)–(h). (a) and (e): $t = 0$, $m_1 = m_2 = 327$, $n = 500$; (b) and (f): $t = 0.5$, $m_1 = m_2 = 327$, $n = 500$; (c) and (g): $t = 1.5$, $m_1 = m_2 = 327$, $n = 1500$; (d) and (h): $t = 3$, $m_1 = m_2 = 327$, $n = 3000$.

In **Case II**, we describe a problem motivated from two-phase flow in porous media with a gravitation pull in the x -direction. The flux functions $f(u)$ and $g(u)$ are “S-shape” with $f(0) = g(0) = 0$ and $f(1) = g(1) = 1$. Boundary value conditions are again put equal to zero. The diffusion coefficient is $\varepsilon = 0.01$ and the nonlinearity is very strong. We calculate the problem on the domain $\Omega = [-3, 3] \times [-3, 3]$ with a temporal step-size $\tau = 0.00005$. The numerical results are displayed in Figure 7. In order to demonstrate the numerical surfaces easily, the surfaces are drawn every ten lines to reduce image storage. We observe that the peak decreases gradually from the center to the upper left corner, which is consistent with the result in the reference [5].




Fig. 7: Numerical evolution surfaces (a)–(d) and contours (e)–(h). Here the parameters are taken as (a) and (e): $t = 0$, $m_1 = m_2 = 3464$, $n = 10000$; (b) and (f): $t = 0.5$, $m_1 = m_2 = 3464$, $n = 10000$; (c) and (g): $t = 1.5$, $m_1 = m_2 = 3464$, $n = 30000$; (d) and (h): $t = 3$, $m_1 = m_2 = 3464$, $n = 60000$.

7.3 Three-dimensional case

Example 7 Finally, we consider a three-dimensional diffusion problem (6.1) with the parameters $L_1 = L_2 = L_3 = 0$, $R_1 = R_2 = R_3 = 1$ and $T = 1$. The initial and boundary value conditions and the source term $f(\mathbf{x}, t)$ are determined by the exact solution $u(\mathbf{x}, t) = \exp(1/2(x + y + z) - t)$.

Two sets of coefficients including

Case I: (isotropic) $a = b = c = 1$;

Case II: (anisotropic) $a = 1$, $b = 0.01$, $c = 0.04$

are utilized to test the convergence rate and **CFL** condition for the corrected difference scheme and the classical difference scheme, respectively. Numerical results are listed in Tables 11 and 12.

We clearly see that the corrected difference scheme is fourth-order convergent when the step-ratio $r = 1/6$ and second-order convergent in other cases. When the step-ratio arrives at the critical value $r = 1/4$ of **CFL** condition, the numerical results still have second-order convergence. Once the step-ratio $r > 1/4$, the numerical results will irreversibly deviate from the exact solution and the numerical error tends to blow up. On the other hand, for the classical difference scheme, we have tested two sets of data with $r = 1/6$ and $r = 1/5.99$. We see that it is second-order convergence without superconvergence when $r = 1/6$ and not stable when $r = 1/5.99$. In short, all the data in Tables 11 and 12 are consistent with Theorem 6.3 and the restrictive condition (6.3).

Table 11: The errors in L^∞ -norm versus grid sizes reduction and convergence orders of the corrected difference scheme (6.2) for the three-dimensional linear diffusion equation in Example 7

$\begin{matrix} \text{P} \\ \text{R} \end{matrix}$	Case I						Case II					
	m_1	m_2	m_3	n	$E_\infty(h_x, h_y, h_z, \tau)$	Ord_G	m_1	m_2	m_3	n	$E_\infty(h_x, h_y, h_z, \tau)$	Ord_G
$r = 1/7$	5	5	5	175	$4.4376e-6$	*	5	50	25	175	$4.9047e-6$	*
	10	10	10	700	$1.0501e-6$	2.0793	10	100	50	700	$1.1087e-7$	2.1453
	20	20	20	2800	$2.6476e-7$	1.9878	20	200	100	2800	$2.6789e-7$	2.0491
	40	40	40	11200	$6.5958e-8$	2.0051	40	400	200	11200	$6.6501e-8$	2.0102
$r = 1/6$	5	5	5	150	$4.4890e-7$	*	5	50	25	150	$1.0395e-6$	*
	10	10	10	600	$2.7992e-8$	4.0033	10	100	50	600	$6.6581e-8$	3.9647
	20	20	20	2400	$1.7891e-9$	3.9677	20	200	100	2400	$4.1608e-9$	4.0002
	40	40	40	9600	$1.1179e-10$	4.0003	40	400	200	9600	$2.6039e-10$	3.9981
$r = 1/4$	5	5	5	100	$1.4041e-5$	*	5	50	25	100	$1.2207e-5$	*
	10	10	10	400	$3.5797e-6$	1.9717	10	100	50	400	$3.5630e-6$	1.7765
	20	20	20	1600	$9.2056e-7$	1.9593	20	200	100	1600	$9.1782e-7$	1.9568
	40	40	40	6400	$2.3047e-7$	1.9979	40	400	200	6400	$2.3151e-7$	1.9871
$r = 1/3.99$	5	5	5	100	$7.6526e-5$	*	5	50	25	100	$7.9323e-5$	*
	10	10	10	399	$3.6070e-6$	4.4071	10	100	50	399	$3.5901e-6$	4.4656
	20	20	20	1596	$9.2751e-7$	1.9594	20	200	100	1596	$9.2475e-7$	1.9569
	40	40	40	6384	$6.5576e-7$	0.5002	40	400	200	6384	$2.8248e-2$	-14.899

Table 12: The errors in L^∞ -norm versus grid sizes reduction and convergence orders of the classical Euler difference scheme (6.4) for the three-dimensional linear diffusion equation in Example 7

$\begin{matrix} \text{P} \\ \text{R} \end{matrix}$	Case I						Case II					
	m_1	m_2	m_3	n	$E_\infty(h_x, h_y, h_z, \tau)$	Ord_G	m_1	m_2	m_3	n	$E_\infty(h_x, h_y, h_z, \tau)$	Ord_G
$r = 1/6$	5	5	5	150	$1.1712e-4$	*	5	50	25	150	$4.3049e-4$	*
	10	10	10	600	$3.0760e-5$	1.9289	10	100	50	600	$1.1084e-4$	1.9574
	20	20	20	2400	$7.9604e-6$	1.9501	20	200	100	2400	$2.7742e-5$	1.9984
	40	40	40	9600	$1.9963e-6$	1.9955	40	400	200	9600	$6.9490e-6$	1.9972
$r = 1/5.9$	5	5	5	148	$8.6896e-6$	*	5	50	25	148	$3.1252e-4$	*
	10	10	10	590	$3.1401e-5$	-1.8535	10	100	50	590	$1.1285e-4$	1.4696
	20	20	20	2360	$1.9419e+8$	-42.492	20	200	100	2360	$3.2653e+13$	-58.006
	40	40	40	9440	$2.7614e+108$	-332.70	40	400	200	9440	$1.6859e+114$	-334.56

8 Concluding remarks

In closing, we propose a unified framework to construct explicit numerical schemes for convection-diffusion problems in high dimension based on the forward Euler discretization. We obtain the superconvergence with the step-ratio $r = 1/6$ for the corrected difference scheme and display much better numerical behavior, which serve to the theoretical results. Another advantage of the present scheme is that it is an fully explicit numerical method without any matrix by vector operation and pretty convenient in practical implementation.

Moreover, the corrected difference schemes have essentially improved **CFL** condition and convergence rate of the classical difference scheme, see e.g. [12] or [7]. The detailed theoretical results with respect to **CFL** conditions and the convergence rate of the corrected difference scheme and classical difference scheme in different settings are listed in Tables 13 and 14.

In terms of theoretical analysis, we only discuss the constant convection case in current paper. As for the general nonlinear convection-diffusion equations, it remains an open challenge for the convergence and stability because of the complex discretization of the nonlinear terms, which will leave as the future work.

Table 13: The **CFL** conditions for the diffusion problems in different dimensions with different difference schemes

$\begin{smallmatrix} \text{S} \\ \text{D} \end{smallmatrix}$	Corrected difference scheme	Classical difference scheme, [7]
1D	$r_x \leq \frac{1}{2}, [15]$	$r_x \leq \frac{1}{2}$
2D	$\max\{r_x, r_y\} \leq \frac{1}{2}$	$r_x + r_y \leq \frac{1}{2}$
3D	$\max\{r_x, r_y, r_z\} \leq \frac{1}{4}$	$r_x + r_y + r_z \leq \frac{1}{2}$

* “S” denotes the difference scheme and “D” the dimension.

Table 14: The convergence rates for the diffusion problems in different dimensions with different difference schemes

$\begin{smallmatrix} \text{S} \\ \text{D} \end{smallmatrix}$	Corrected difference scheme		Classical difference scheme, [7]	
	$r \neq \frac{1}{6}$	$r = \frac{1}{6}$	$r \neq \frac{1}{6}$	$r = \frac{1}{6}$
1D	2, [15]	4, [15]	2	2
2D	2	4	2	2
3D	2	4	2	2

Acknowledgements The first author is very grateful to Dr. Zhifeng Weng in Huaqiao Unviersity for his useful suggestion and comments for the nonlinear problem.

References

1. Chafee, N., Infante, E.F.: A bifurcation problem for a nonlinear partial differential equation of parabolic type. *Appl. Anal.* **4**, 17–37 (1974)
2. Guo, B.: Finite difference methods for partial differential equations. Science Press, Beijing (1988)
3. Hairer, E., Nösett, S.P., Wanner, G.: Solving Ordinary Differential Equations I, nonstiff problems, Springer, Berlin (1987)
4. Hanna, O.T.: New explicit and implicit improved Euler methods for the integration of ordinary differential equations. *Comput. Chem. Engng.* **12**(11), 1083–1086 (1988)
5. Karlsen, K.H., Risebro, N.H.: An operator splitting method for nonlinear convection-diffusion equations. *Numer. Math.* **77**, 365–382 (1997)
6. Kovacs, A., Kawahara, M.: A finite element scheme based on the velocity correction method for the solution of the time-dependent incompressible Navier-Stokes equations. *Int. J. Numer. Methods Fluids.* **13**(4), 403–423 (1991)
7. Larsson, S., Thomée, V.: Partial Differential Equations with Numerical Methods, Springer, Berlin (2003)
8. Meerschaert, M.M., Tadjeran, C.: Finite difference approximations for two-sided space-fractional partial differential equations. *Appl. Numer. Math.* **56**, 80–90 (2006)
9. Mohanty, R.K., Singh, S.: A new two-level implicit discretization of $O(k^2 + kh^2 + h^4)$ for the solution of singularly perturbed two-space dimensional non-linear parabolic equations. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* **208**, 391–403 (2007)
10. Qiu, Y., Sloan, D.M.: Numerical solution of Fisher’s equation using a moving mesh method. *J. Comput. Phys.* **146**(2), 726–746 (1998)
11. Spiteri, R.J., Ruuth, S.J.: A new class of optimal high-order strong-stability-preserving time discretization methods. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **40**(2), 469–491 (2002)
12. Sun, Z.: Numerical Methods of Partial Differential Equations, the third edition. Science Press, Beijing (2022)
13. Thomas, J.W.: Numerical Partial Differential Equations: Finite Difference Methods, Springer, Berlin (1995)
14. Villatoro, F.R., Ramos, J.I.: On the method of modified equations. I: Asymptotic analysis of the Euler forward difference method. *Appl. Math. Comput.* **103**, 111–139 (1999)
15. Zhang, Q., Zhang, J., Sun, Z.: Optimal convergence rate of the explicit Euler method for convection-diffusion equations. *Appl. Math. Lett.* **131**, 108048 (2022)