Thursday, October 13, 2022 9:41 AM

Material needed for HW1 (elliptic) + 1D r-1 ch $\sum_{t=1}^{t} T_{t} = T_{t} T_{t}$ $\begin{bmatrix} T \end{bmatrix} = T_{n}^{-}, T_{n}^{\dagger} = T_{n}^{-} + T_{n}^{-} = T_{n}^{-} = T_{n}^{-}$ 1D $\int \phi$ en Nuz Xutl-XN ez 93194 L. X_{h+1} \land - X_{\land} 051 $M_{Q_n} = [2n - 1, 2n]$ $T_{-2}^{p_1} = Q_{2n-1} + Q_{2n} \chi_n$

We want to form the global stiffness matrix and all the forces.

A. Interior of element contributions

$$k_{int}^{a} = \frac{k}{h} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

If we want to solve the parabolic PDE we need to add capacity matrix

want to solve the parabolic PDE we need to add
ity matrix

$$M = \int \hat{T}CTdX = \int_{0}^{1} \left[\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \pi \end{pmatrix} e[1 \\ \pi \end{pmatrix} e[1 \\ \pi \end{pmatrix} (hd_{x}) \int_{0}^{1} \frac{1}{2} \left[\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \end{pmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \end{pmatrix}$$

 \rightarrow



B. Essential BC:

$$B_{u}(f,T) = \int (fq - \varepsilon Tq) \cdot n \, ds \qquad f_{u}^{n} = \int (fq - \varepsilon Tq) \cdot f(fq - \varepsilon Tq) \quad f_{u}^{n} = \int (fq - \varepsilon Tq) \cdot f(fq - \varepsilon Tq) \cdot f($$

DG Page 3

$$(C) = -\epsilon \left\{ \hat{q} \right\} \begin{bmatrix} T \\ T \end{bmatrix} = -\epsilon \left((Q) \right)^{T}$$

By adding terms a), b), c) we get a 4x4 interface stiffness matrix that needs to subsequently assembled to the global system K



After the assembly, we get K and F (and M for parabolic PDE)



Parabolic Case (HW2), only the mass (capacity) matrix is added We'll use a forward Euler scheme



In practice, we don't form a global C, and only solve the equations at the element level. We basically solve 1 element at a time. -> Ideal for parallel computing As noted, we never form any stiffness matrix for explicit schemes.



Some points about elliptic and parabolic PDEs

1. Single versus two-field formulations PDE CT + V.9 = Q2 field formilar $\overline{\int} = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 - \alpha_1 + \alpha_3 X_2$ $q = \begin{bmatrix} q_1 \\ q_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} a_1 + a_2 + a_3 + a_4 + a_6 + a_7 \\ a_7 + a_8 + a_1 + a_9 + a_7 \end{bmatrix}$ γ_{1}

Interpolating vector q significantly increases the number of global unkowns in 2D and 3D

We need to add a compatibility condition between q and T

$$k\nabla T = -q \rightarrow \nabla T = -kq$$

$$\int f(CT + \nabla - q - Q) dv + \int f(q_n - q_n) ds$$

$$= + \epsilon \left(\int q \left(\nabla T + kq \right) dv + \int q_n (T - T) ds \right)$$

$$= \int f(CT + kq) dv + \int q_n (T - T) ds$$

$$= \int f(CT + kq) dv + \int q_n (T - T) ds$$

$$= \int f(CT + kq) dv + \int q_n (T - T) ds$$

We can solve for T and q as independent fields by assembling the global K and F and solving for the unknowns of T and q.

There are 2 approaches to only solve for T at the global level.

Approach a:

Approach b: Remove q dofs from the global system

In this case, we have a genuine 2F formulation but at the global level, we only solve for T, go back to the elements and solve q's





Kie as t Kii Qi = fi K - Kee - Kei Kii Kie Fe - Fe - Kii Kii fi The are to

We need to apply condensation to q dofs and remove them from element dofs when assembling to the global K

9-2 /9/ + p/g/+ d) not having this term allows us to T= STS + STS = T andonse 9 aut

Why do we want to have a 2F formulation anyway

IT_TexachII < Ch reastant T -> pth polynomial L² noin aptimel q Vade z-KVT 1F (19-9erod 11 < C hP 1 der for 9 q is interpolated 25 decelly say again with pith order 119-90xod 11 201 P+1 Stassility & limit on Z = dk , d = no reason il Arneld 2002 TABLE 3.1 Some DG methods and their numerical fluxes. Method $\hat{\sigma}_K$ \hat{u}_K 6 is The in this Bassi-Rebay [9] $\{u_h\}$ $\{\sigma_h\}$ 2F TJB, inderpolated paper Brezzi et al. [18] $\{\sigma_h\} - \alpha_r(\llbracket u_h \rrbracket)$ $\{u_h\}$ $\{u_h\} - \beta \cdot \llbracket u_h \rrbracket$ $\{\sigma_h\} + \beta \llbracket \sigma_h \rrbracket - \alpha_i(\llbracket u_h \rrbracket)$ LDG [35] 1F T, GEVT $\{\nabla_h u_h\} - \alpha_j(\llbracket u_h \rrbracket)$ IP [43] $\{u_h\}$ Bassi et al. [10] $\{u_h\}$ $\{\nabla_h u_h\} - \alpha_r(\llbracket u_h \rrbracket)$ Baumann–Oden [12] $\{u_h\} + n_K \cdot \llbracket u_h \rrbracket$ $\{\nabla_h u_h\}$ NIPG [53] $\{\nabla_h u_h\} - \alpha_j(\llbracket u_h \rrbracket)$

 $-\alpha_{i}(\llbracket u_{h} \rrbracket)$

 $-\alpha_{\mathbf{r}}(\llbracket u_{h} \rrbracket)$

Babuška–Zlámal [6]

Brezzi et al. [19]

 $\{u_h\} + n_K \cdot [\![u_h]\!]$

 $(u_{\hbar}|_{K})|_{\partial K}$

 $(u_h|_K)|_{\partial K}$

Babuška–Zlámal [6]	$(u_{\hbar} _{K}) _{\partial K}$	$-\alpha_{\mathbf{j}}(\llbracket u_{h} \rrbracket)$
Brezzi et al. [19]	$(u_{\hbar} _{K}) _{\partial K}$	$-\alpha_{\mathbf{r}}(\llbracket u_{h} \rrbracket)$

TABLE 6.1 Properties of the DG methods

Method	cons.	a.c.	stab.	type	cond.	H^1	L^2
Brezzi et al. [18]	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	α^{r}	$\eta_0 > 0$	h^p	h^{p+1}
LDG [35]	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	α^{j}	$\eta_0 > 0$	\mathcal{E}, h^p	h^{p+1}
IP [43]	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	ajF	$\eta_0 > \eta^*$	h^p	h^{p+1}
Bassi et al. [10]	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	α^r	$\eta_0 > 3$	h^p	h^{p+1}
NIPG [53]	\checkmark	×	\checkmark	α^{j}	$\eta_0 > 0$	h^p	h^p
Babuška–Zlámal [6]	×	×	\checkmark	α^{j}	$\eta_0 \approx h^{-2p}$	h^p	h^{p+1}
Brezzi et al. [19]	×	×	\checkmark	α^{r}	$\eta_0 \approx h^{-2p}$	h^p	h^{p+1}
Baumann–Oden $(p = 1)$	\checkmark	×	×	-	-	×	×
Baumann–Oden $(p \ge 2)$	\checkmark	×	×	-	-	h^p	h^p
Bassi–Rebay [9]	\checkmark	\checkmark	×	-	-	$[h^p]$	$[h^{p+1}]$

Hybridizable DG methods (HDG) is a relatively new DG method, whose dofs (unknows) are the target values on element interfaces (i.e. they are already at the skeleton of the mesh). Accordingly getting rid of "interior dofs" is much easier (like CFEM) and there is no need to have I and r operators of the LDG method to get rid of q dofs.

Discussing this the next time

