

Domain Decomposition Techniques for Boundary Elements

Application to Fluid Flow

WIT*PRESS*

WIT Press publishes leading books in Science and Technology.

Visit our website for the current list of titles.

www.witpress.com

WIT*eLibrary*

Home of the Transactions of the Wessex Institute, the WIT electronic-library provides the international scientific community with immediate and permanent access to individual papers presented at WIT conferences. Visit the eLibrary at

<http://library.witpress.com>

Advances in Boundary Elements Series

Objectives

The continuing interest in the application of the Boundary Element Method has generated a series of books and numerous scientific papers. In spite of all their advantages, the need exists for a serial publication in which the most recent advances in the method are demonstrated in a more complete form.

Each volume in the Series comprises authored or edited books written by leading researchers in the field. The volumes are all self contained and cover a particular topic in sufficient detail for the analyst to understand the subject. Some books report on practical applications of the technique.

The Series covers topics such as:

Fluid Mechanics	Acoustics
Heat Transfer	Cathodic Protection Problems
Stress Analysis	High Performance Computing
Fracture Mechanics	Sparse Methods
Contact Mechanics	Numerical Integration
Structural Dynamics	Industrial Applications
Inelastic Problems	Basic Principles
Optimization and Sensitivity	Electrical and Electromagnetic Problems
Plate Bending	Mathematical & Computational Aspects

Series Editor

C.A. Brebbia

Wessex Institute of Technology,
Ashurst Lodge, Ashurst, Southampton, SO40 7AA, UK

Email: carlos@wessex.ac.uk
Telephone: 44 (0) 238 029 3223
Fax: 44 (0) 238 029 2853

Associate Editors

C. Alessandri

Universita di Ferrara
Italy

D.E. Beskos

University of Patras
Greece

M. Bonnet

Ecole Polytechnique, Palaiseau
France

M.B. Bush

The University of Western Australia
Australia

C.S. Chen

The University of Southern
Mississippi
USA

A.H.-D. Cheng

The University of Southern
Mississippi
USA

D.E. Cormack

University of Toronto
Canada

T.G. Davies

Glasgow University
Scotland

G. De Mey

Ghent State University
Belgium

J. Dominguez

University of Seville
Spain

Q.H. Du

Tsinghua University
China

A.El-Zafrany

Cranfield University
UK

P. Fedelinski

Silesian Technical University
Poland

J.I. Frankel

University of Tennessee
USA

L. Gaul

Universitat Stuttgart
Germany

G.S. Gipson

Oklahoma State University
USA

M. Golberg

Las Vegas
USA

S. Grilli

University of Rhode Island
USA

K.Hayami

National Institute of Informatics
Japan

D.B. Ingham

The University of Leeds
UK

N.Kamiya

Nagoya University
Japan

D.L. Karabalis

University of Patras
Greece

A.J. Kassab

University of Central Florida
USA

J.T. Katsikadelis

National Technical University
of Athens, Greece

V. Leitao

Inst. Superior Tecnico
Portugal

W.J. Mansur

COPPE
Federal University of Rio de Janeiro
Brazil

R.A. Meric

Research Institute for Basic Sciences
Turkey

K. Onishi

Ibaraki University
Japan

F. Paris

University of Seville
Spain

M. Predeleanu

Universite Paris VI
France

J.J. Rencis

University of Arkansas
USA

T.J. Rudolphi

Iowa State University
USA

J.T. Katsikadelis

National Technical University
of Athens, Greece

P. Skerget

University of Maribor
Slovenia

V. Sladek

Slovak Academy of Sciences
Slovakia

S. Syngellakis

University of Southampton
UK

M. Tanaka

Shinshu University
Japan

N. Tosaka

Nihon University
Japan

T. Tran-Cong

University of Southern
Queensland
Australia

W.S. Venturini

University of Sao Paulo
Brazil

J.L. Wearing

University of Sheffield
UK

Domain Decomposition Techniques for Boundary Elements

Application to Fluid Flow

V. Popov

Wessex Institute of Technology, UK

H. Power

University of Nottingham, UK

L. Škerget

University of Maribor, Slovenia

WITPRESS Southampton, Boston



Editors:

V. Popov

Wessex Institute of Technology, UK

H. Power

University of Nottingham, UK

L. Škerget

University of Maribor, Slovenia

Published by

WIT Press

Ashurst Lodge, Ashurst, Southampton, SO40 7AA, UK

Tel: + 44 (0) 238 029 3223; Fax: + 44 (0) 238 029 2853

E-Mail: witpress@witpress.com

<http://www.witpress.com>

For USA, Canada and Mexico

WIT Press

25 Bridge Street, Billerica, MA 01821, USA

Tel: 978 667 5841; Fax: 978 667 7582

E-Mail: infousa@witpress.com

<http://www.witpress.com>

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A Catalogue record for this book is available
from the British Library

ISBN-13: 978-1-84564-100-9

ISSN: 1460-1419

LOC: 2007922337

No responsibility is assumed by the Publisher, the Editors and Authors for any injury and/or damage to persons or property as a matter of products liability, negligence or otherwise, or from any use or operation of any methods, products, instructions or ideas contained in the material herein.

© WIT Press 2007

Printed in Great Britain by Cambridge Printing

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the Publisher.

Contents

Preface	xiii
Chapter 1	
Diffusion–convection problems	1
<i>A.E. Taigbenu</i>	
1 Introduction	1
2 Boundary element formulations	3
2.1 Formulation with the ED operator	3
2.2 Formulation with the elliptic diffusion–convection (EDC) operator	4
2.3 Formulation with the transient diffusion (TD) operator	5
2.4 Formulation with the transient diffusion–convection (TDC) operator	6
3 Numerical implementation	8
3.1 Dual reciprocity method	10
3.2 The Green element method	11
4 Numerical stability for homogeneous diffusion–convection	12
5 Numerical examples of diffusion–convection problems	16
5.1 Example 1	16
5.2 Example 2	17
5.3 Example 3	17
5.4 Example 4	19
5.5 Example 5	19
6 Burgers’ equation	20
7 Numerical formulations of Burgers’ equation	21
7.1 ED formulation for Burgers’ equation	21
7.2 TD formulation for Burgers’ equation	23
7.3 TDC formulation for Burgers’ equation	24
8 Numerical examples of Burgers’ equation	25
8.1 Example 1 of Burgers’ equation	25

8.2	Example 2 of Burgers' equation	26
8.3	Example 3 of Burgers' equation	27
9	Conclusion.....	29

Chapter 2

Viscous compressible fluid dynamics..... 33

L. Škerget & M. Hriberšek

1	Introduction	33
2	Conservation equations	34
3	Linear gradient type of constitutive models	35
4	Primitive variables formulation.....	36
5	Velocity–vorticity formulation.....	38
5.1	Velocity vector equation	38
5.2	Vorticity transport equation	39
6	Pressure equation.....	41
7	Boundary-domain integral equations	42
7.1	Preliminary comments	42
7.2	Integral representation of flow kinematics.....	42
7.3	Integral representation of flow kinetics	49
7.4	Integral representation of pressure equation	52
7.5	Integral representation of heat energy kinetics	53
8	Discrete models	55
8.1	Single domain model	55
8.2	Subdomain model	56
8.3	Hybrid approaches	58
9	Test example: differentially-heated tall enclosure	58
10	Conclusions	66

Chapter 3

Multi-domain DRM boundary element method for the numerical simulation of non-isothermal Newtonian and non-Newtonian flow problems..... 69

H. Power & W.F. Florez

1	Introduction	69
2	Thermal convection Newtonian flow problems	72
2.1	Governing equations	73
2.2	Integral representation formulae	74
2.3	Approximation of the domain integrals	76
2.4	Particular solution	78
2.5	Discretization and numerical solution.....	80
2.6	Numerical results	82
3	Non-isothermal non-Newtonian Stokes flow with viscous dissipation.....	84
3.1	Governing equations	85

3.2	Multi-domain integral formulation	87
3.3	Non-isothermal Couette flow with viscous dissipation	88
4	Conclusion.....	96

Chapter 4

Modelling flow and solute transport in fractured porous media

using the DRM multidomain technique	99
--	-----------

A. Peratta & V. Popov

1	Introduction.....	99
1.1	General.....	99
1.2	Fractured porous media	100
1.3	Overview	100
1.4	The continuum approach	101
1.5	The discrete fracture model.....	101
1.6	Historical development of porous media modelling.....	102
2	Governing equations	103
2.1	Flow.....	103
2.2	Transport.....	106
3	Numerical method.....	109
3.1	The boundary element method	109
3.2	The dual reciprocity method.....	112
3.3	Miscellaneous	115
4	Numerical implementation.....	116
4.1	Introduction	116
4.2	Space discretisation	116
4.3	Blocks and 3D subdomains	117
4.4	2D subdomains	117
4.5	1D subdomains	118
4.6	Flow in the porous matrix.....	119
4.7	Flow in fractures.....	120
4.8	Flow in pipes	120
4.9	Transport in the porous matrix	122
4.10	Transport in fractures.....	123
4.11	Transport in pipes	124
5	Coupling strategy	128
5.1	Interconnected fracture network.....	128
5.2	Coupling the porous matrix with the fracture network.....	129
6	Numerical results	132
6.1	Introduction	132
6.2	Test case: 3D block without fractures	133
6.3	Test case: fractures represented as 3D or 2D entities.....	135
6.4	Case study: application to 3d fractured crystalline rocks	138
7	Conclusion.....	143

Chapter 5

Parallel domain decomposition boundary element method approach for large-scale transient and steady nonlinear heat conduction..... 147

E. Divo, A.J. Kassab & K. Erhart

1	Introduction	147
2	Explicit domain decomposition.....	149
3	Iterative solution algorithm	151
4	Parallel implementation on a PC cluster	154
5	Applications in heat transfer.....	157
5.1	3D nonlinear heat conduction.....	157
5.2	Transient heat conduction.....	160
6	Numerical validation and examples	165
6.1	3D nonlinear heat conduction verification examples	165
6.2	Transient heat conduction verification examples	173
7	Conclusions	182

Chapter 6

Computational implementation for 3D problems..... 187

B. Natalini & V. Popov

1	Introduction	188
2	Equations and DRM formulation	189
3	The dual reciprocity method multidomain approach.....	192
4	Schematic view of a DRM code for Poisson's problems	195
5	General aspects of DRM-MD implementation for Poisson's problems....	196
5.1	Input data	196
5.2	Set geometrical information	197
5.3	Set boundary conditions and NCOL.....	198
5.4	Assemble system of equations.....	198
6	A 3D DRM-MD implementation for Poisson's problems using discontinuous elements.....	198
6.1	Input data	200
6.2	Set geometrical information	201
6.3	Set boundary conditions and NCOL.....	202
6.4	Assemble system of equations.....	202
7	A 3D DRM-MD implementation for Poisson's problems using continuous elements	204
8	A 3D DRM-MD implementation for advection–diffusion problems.....	206
9	A convenient arrangement.....	208
10	Examples	210
10.1	The interpolation functions tested in this section	210
10.2	A 1D Poisson problem with constant source term.....	212
10.3	A 1D steady state advection–diffusion problem with non-uniform velocity field.....	217

10.4	The effect of the size of the problem	220
10.5	Internal DRM nodes	225
11	Transient advection–diffusion	227
11.1	Governing equation and DRM formulation.....	227
11.2	Computational implementation	228
11.3	Comparison with analytical solution	230
12	Conclusions	233

Chapter 7

Iterative schemes for the solution of systems of equations arising from the DRM in multidomains	237
<i>M.I. Portapila & H. Power</i>	

1	Introduction	237
2	Preliminary remarks on the BEM.....	240
2.1	The BEM and the domain integrals	241
3	The dual reciprocity approximation	242
3.1	Analysis of the convection–diffusion equation using DRM	245
3.2	Overview of DRM in multidomains.....	247
4	Approximating functions f_j	250
5	Iterative solution methods for sparse linear systems.....	252
5.1	Krylov subspace methods	252
5.2	CG-type methods	253
5.3	Generalized minimum residual method.....	254
5.4	LSQR, algorithm for sparse least-squares problems	258
6	Numerical analysis	265
6.1	Computer implementation	269
6.2	Performance of Krylov iterative solvers.....	270
6.3	Direct methods.....	290
7	Conclusions	293

Preface

The Finite Difference Method (FDM), the Finite Element Method (FEM) and the Finite Volume Method (FVM) currently exist as the principal numerical techniques used to solve fluid flow boundary value problems. Although there are analytical solutions for some simplified cases, mainly in one dimension, in many real-world applications, where an accurate prediction of the flow and transport processes is required, the above-mentioned numerical methods have provided significant contributions.

On the other hand, the Boundary Element Method (BEM), whilst being recognised as a very efficient tool in various types of engineering applications, e.g. heat transfer, electrostatics, wave scattering and propagation, stress analysis, crack propagation etc., has not been extensively used in fluid flow problems.

The BEM relies on transforming the governing partial differential equations (PDEs) through Green's second identity into an equivalent system of integral equations, which are in turn evaluated over the boundaries of the domain. Necessarily, the BEM requires the fundamental solution for the governing PDE in closed form. In the case when this is not possible, or is very difficult to be achieved, the terms of the original PDE that are not considered when the fundamental solution is derived would appear in a domain integral. For the engineering applications noted above, there exist fundamental solutions in a closed form and therefore in absence of body loads the integrals are evaluated only over the boundaries of the problem domain. This provides an opportunity for the use of the BEM relative to domain methods as only the boundary of the problem domain needs to be discretized, thereby saving time in preparation of the model input data. The advantage of the BEM is most pronounced for model domains extending to infinity, e.g. wave radiation and scattering. Using the BEM only the near-field finite surface needs to be discretized since a fundamental solution that naturally obeys the radiation condition exists, consequently avoiding the need for discretization of an infinite domain. These features, combined with the second-order accuracy of the BEM, have allowed the BEM to remain a favourite engineering analysis/designing tool for certain types of problems.

When the domain integrals cannot be avoided, there are several options available. The most commonly used technique in the past was to employ domain integration. Whilst being quite accurate this approach can also be time consuming for large problems, as the integration is not just over the boundaries but also over the domain of interest. An alternative is to convert the domain integrals into integrals over the boundary, by using, for example, the dual reciprocity (*Nardini and Brebbia, 1983*)

(DRM) or the multipole reciprocity (MRM) methods (*Nowak and Brebbia*, 1989; *Nowak and Partridge*, 1992). The dual reciprocity method appears to be the preferred approach nowadays when transforming the domain integrals to the boundary and its application will be explained in more detail in several chapters in this book.

One of the earliest works on the application of boundary integral equation methods (BIEM) to the flow in porous media is due to *Liggett* (1977). Other early efforts include *Butterfield and Tomlin* [1972] and *Lafe et al.* [1981], who have used the so-called zoning technique to solve anisotropic problems. When the domain of the problem is non-homogeneous, as is often the case in groundwater problems, the BEM formulation requires the use of sub-domains. *Liggett and Liu* (1983) mentioned that the BIEM could be used for non-homogeneous porous media with a large number of sub-regions: ‘... the BIEM could be broken into sub-regions as small as elements. If such division proves necessary, however, the finite element method would be a better choice.’ That the BEM would lose its attractiveness if the number of sub-domains becomes large was certainly the view of the majority of the BEM users in the past. This view is easy to understand considering that the most important feature associated with the BEM is that the discretization requirements are restricted to the boundary of the problem. However, for certain applications, e.g., large problems, the BEM has a high CPU demand due to integration over the boundaries and solution of fully populated system matrix. Therefore, for very large problems, the main advantage of the BEM seems to be lessened and alternative BEM formulations are typically sought, e.g., the fast multipole BEM, BEM with domain subdivision, or other alternatives.

Among the first efforts on the use of BEM with a large number of sub-regions, resulting in a mesh that looks like a FEM mesh, is the work of *Taigbenu* (1990) who called the numerical scheme the Green element method (GEM). The GEM uses the fundamental solution of the Laplace equation and accounts for the remaining terms of the governing equation using domain integration. The advantages of this approach relative to the conventional BEM are a consequence of the fewer number of integrations over elements evaluated per source node, the global coefficient matrix is sparse, and the GEM more readily accommodates flow and medium inhomogeneities. The disadvantages are related to the complications associated with the mesh generation, common for all domain methods, and since the GEM ensures only one degree of freedom per node, the flux at the internal node is expressed in terms of the primary dependent variable by a difference expression thereby compromising the second order accuracy commonly associated with the BEM. *Taigbenu* (1991) demonstrated that the accuracy can be improved with the use of higher interpolating function (quadratic) while still performing the boundary and domain integrals analytically. The method has been applied to 1D and 2D heterogeneous flow problems, Helmholtz and Boussinesq equations, diffusion and advection-diffusion problems using linear and quadratic interpolating functions (*Taigbenu*, 1995) and also to the nonlinear unsaturated flow using linear interpolating function (*Taigbenu and Onyejekwe*, 1995).

Škerget and collaborators developed another BEM sub-domain approach, which is known as the Boundary-Domain Integral Method (BDIM). This approach has

been used to solve convection-diffusion problems (•*agar et al.*, 1994) using the fundamental solution of the convection-diffusion equation with constant coefficients, resulting in domain integrals with a convective term due to the perturbation velocity field. The formulation has been tested for high values of Pe ($\gg 10^6$) and shows good accuracy. The BDIM has also been applied to transient non-linear convection-diffusion problems (*Škerget and Rek*, 1995) using the parabolic diffusion fundamental solution. The BDIM has the advantage over the GEM in that the fluxes are obtained directly from the integral equations, thereby preserving the inherent accuracy of the BEM. The advantage of the GEM with respect to BDIM is that for a same domain discretization the GEM would result in a smaller system matrix.

Another BEM sub-domain approach is the Dual Reciprocity Method - Multi-Domain (DRM-MD) approach, which has been introduced by *Popov and Power*. This formulation was a logical step after Popov and Power noticed substantial improvement in the performance of the DRM when used with sub-domains. The improvement relates to the accuracy and stability of the method. It also eliminates the problem of distribution of internal DRM nodes, usually used to improve the DRM approximation, since the distribution of the internal nodes in the DRM-MD is not any more an issue. The initial problem solved using this formulation was the flow of a mixture of gases through a porous media. The DRM-MD has also been applied to linear and non-linear advection-diffusion problems, driven cavity flow governed by the Navier-Stokes equations, flow of polymers inside mixers with complex geometries, flow through fractured porous media, two phase flow in porous media, etc.

We must emphasize that the sub-domain techniques in the BEM are nowadays finding its place in the toolbox of numerical modellers, especially when dealing with complex 3D problems. We see their main application in conjunction with the classical BEM approach, which is based on a single domain, when part of the domain needs to be solved using a single domain approach, the classical BEM, and part needs to be solved using a domain approach, BEM subdomain technique. This has usually been done in the past by coupling the BEM with the FEM, however, it is much more efficient to use a combination of the BEM and a BEM sub-domain technique. The advantage arises from the simplicity of coupling the single domain and multi-domain solutions, and from the fact that only one formulation needs to be developed, rather than two separate formulations based on different techniques.

There are still possibilities for improving the BEM sub-domain techniques. However, considering the increased interest and research in this approach we believe that BEM sub-domain techniques will become a logical choice in the future substituting the FEM whenever an efficient solution requires coupling of the BEM with a domain technique.