Department Matematisk institutt (Rapport) of APPLIED MATHEMATICS

UNIVERSITETET I BERGEN

NUMERICAL SOLUTION OF THE BUCKLEY-LEVERETT EQUATION WITH A GENERAL FRACTIONAL FLOW FUNCTION

by

Øystein Pettersen

Report no. 76

November 1984

D61



# UNIVERSITY OF BERGEN Bergen, Norway



-105010042

Department of Mathematics University of Bergen 5000 Bergen, Norway ISSN-0084-778X

NUMERICAL SOLUTION OF THE BUCKLEY-LEVERETT EQUATION WITH A GENERAL FRACTIONAL FLOW FUNCTION

by

Øystein Pettersen

Report no. 76

November 1984

#### Abstract

A dispersion-free numerical procedure for the solution of nonlinear conservation equations based on exact solutions of the Riemann Problem by the Random Choice Method is reviewed. This paper is concentrated on the displacement of oil by water in a onedimensional porous rock, however, the technique applies equally well to a variety of physical problems where accurate modelling of the evolution of discontinuities/shock waves is imperative.

For immiscible displacement, the nonlinear part of the conservation equation is an empirical function with error bounds. The effect of representing the (unknown) smooth nonlinearity function by a tabulated version is studied, accompanied with a proof for the structural stability of the problem with respect to small perturbations in the nonlinear function. TESH-0081-178X

Department of Mathemathas University of Sargen 5000 Sargan, Korway

NUMERICAL SOLUTION OF THE

ITH A GENERAL FRACTIONAL FLOW FUNCTION

Report no. 76

# dassisd4.

# 1 Introduction

The Buckley-Leverett Equation of reservoir dynamics is a special case of a non-linear conservation equation. The development of discontinuities that such equations permit, traditionally has been difficult to describe numerically by finite difference methods, as the discontinuities (shock fronts) inevitably are smoothened by the FDE algorithm (numerical dispersion).

1

Based on a work by Glimm<sup>7</sup>, several authors have contributed to the development of a numerical procedure where the analytical solution of the <u>Riemann problem</u> is used to construct a global solution which is free for numerical dispersion. (See references at end of paper.) The positions of the shock fronts are computed without error, and the method is close to being second order accurate. A thorough description of the method is given in the first part of the text.

The nonlinear part of the Buckley-Leverett Equation is basically a function of the mobility ratio of the two fluids present. This ratio is virtually an empirical function of the wetting fluid saturation. Previous authors have, however, assumed a given analytical dependence on saturation in their works. We generalize the method by allowing the fractional flow function to be given by empirical table values. Inaccurate measurements introduce sources of error into the description of the nonlinearity function. The method therefore must be structurally stable with respect to perturbations in this function, a demand which we will show is fulfilled.

Another extension of previous theory is that, restricted to physical possible situations, we permit the nonlinear function to have a quite general shape.

The problem will be studied in one dimension only, for applications in multidimensional problems we refer to the list of references.

I latroduction

The Buckley-Leverett Equation of reservoir dynamics is a special case of a non-linear conservation equation. The development of discontinuities that such equations permit, traditionally has been difficult to describe numerically by finite difference methods, as the discontinuities (shock fronts) inevitably are smootheaed by the FUE algorithm (numerical dispersion).

Based on a work by Glimm', several authors have contributed to the development of a numerical proceedure where the analytical solution of the <u>Birmann problem</u> is used to construct a global solution which is free for numerical dispersion. (See references at end of paper.) The positions of the shock fronts are computed without error, and the method is close to being second order accurate. A thorough description of the method is given in the first part of the text.

The nonlinear part of the Buckley-Leverett Equation is basically a fametion of the mobility ratio of the two fluids present. This ratio is sirtually an empirical function of the wetting fluid saturation. Frevious suthors have, however, assumed a given analytical dependence on saturation in their works. We generalize the method by allowing the fractional flow function to be given by empirical hable values. Inaccurate measurements introduce sources of error into the description of the nonlinearity function. The method therefore must be errorized with respect to perturbations in this function, a description of the nonlinearity function.

Another extension of previous theory is that, restricted to physical possible situations, we permit the combineer function to have a quite general shape.

The problem will be studied in one dimension only, for applications in multidimensional problems we refer to the list of references.

#### 2 Basic Equations

Our object shall be the description of one-dimensional flow of two immiscible and incompressible fluids (water and oil). Sources and sinks are located only at the boundary of the model, and will be described by the boundary conditions, not included in the governing equations.

The basic equations are:

- (1)  $\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x} + \Phi(x) \frac{\partial S_i}{\partial t} = 0$  (Continuity Equation)
- (2)  $u_i = -\frac{K(x)k_{ri}(S_i)}{\mu_i} \left\{ \frac{\partial p_i}{\partial x} \rho_i g \cos \theta \right\}$  (Darcy's law)

(Completely saturated

rock.)

(4)  $p_c = p_c(S_w) = p_o - p_w$ 

(3)  $S_w + S_o = 1$ 

(Capillary Pressure Equation)

In these equations subscript i denotes the two phases o (oil) and w (water),  $u_i$  is the Darcy velocity,  $S_i$  denotes saturation, K the rock permeability and  $k_{ri}$  relative permeability.  $p_c$  is the capillary pressure,  $\Phi$  = rock porosity,  $\rho$  = density, g = gravity,  $\mu$  = viscosity, and  $\theta$  is the angle between the positive x-axis and the gravity vector.

We define the mobility of phase i by  $\lambda_i = k_{ri}/\mu_i$  and the specific gravity by  $\gamma_i = \rho_i g$ .

Let S = S<sub>w</sub> (hence S<sub>0</sub> = 1 - S by Eq. (3)), and  $p = p_w$ .

#### 2. Basic Equations

Our object shall be the description of one-dimensional flow of two immiscible and incompressible fluids (water and oil). Sources and sinks are located only at the boundary of the model, and will be described by the boundary conditions, not included in the governing equations.

The basic equations area

(1) 
$$\frac{\delta u_1}{\delta x} + s(x) \frac{\delta x_1}{\delta x} = 0$$
  
(Constants Equation)  
 $\frac{\delta u_1}{\delta x} + \frac{s(x) \frac{\delta x_1}{\delta x}}{\delta x} = 0$   
(Constants Equation)  
 $\frac{\delta u_1}{\delta x} + \frac{s(x) \frac{\delta x_1}{\delta x}}{\delta x} = 0$   
(Constants Equation)

Setting
Setting
Setting

In these equations subscript 1 denotes the two phases o (oil) and w (water):  $u_1$  is the later velocity,  $z_1$  denotes saturation. X the rock permeability and  $k_{r1}$  relative permeability,  $p_0$  is the depiliary decessure. It = rock parastry, b = density, g = gravity, a = viscostry, and 5 is the angle between the positive x-sis and the resulty vector.

We define the mobility of phase 1 by  $\lambda_1 = k_{r1}/n_1$  and the specific gravity by  $Y_1 = p_1 q_1$ :

Let 5 = 5, (nance 5, = 1 - 5 by Eq. (3) ), and p = p.

Equations (1)-(4) are then written:

- (5)  $u_w = K\lambda_w \left\{ \frac{\partial p}{\partial x} \gamma_w \cos\theta \right\}$
- (6)  $u_0 = -K\lambda_0 \left\{ \frac{\partial p}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial p_c}{\partial x} \gamma_0 \cos\theta \right\}$

(7) 
$$\frac{\partial u_w}{\partial x} + \Phi(x) \frac{\partial S}{\partial t} = 0$$

(8) 
$$\frac{\partial u_0}{\partial x} - \Phi(x) \frac{\partial S}{\partial t} = 0$$

If we introduce the total Darcy velocity  $u = u_w + u_o$ , we see from Eqs. (7) and (8) that u is constant. From Eqs. (5) and (6) we have:

(9) 
$$u = -K \left[ (\lambda_{w} + \lambda_{o}) \frac{\partial p}{\partial x} - (\lambda_{w} \gamma_{w} + \lambda_{o} \gamma_{o}) \cos\theta + \lambda_{o} \frac{\partial p_{c}}{\partial x} \right]$$

which gives the Pressure Equation:

(10) 
$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left\{ K \cdot (\lambda_{w} + \lambda_{o}) \frac{\partial p}{\partial x} \right\} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} K \cdot (\lambda_{w} \gamma_{w} + \lambda_{o} \gamma_{o}) \cos \theta - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} K \cdot \lambda_{o} \frac{\partial p_{c}}{\partial x}$$

By solving Eq. (9) with respect to the pressure gradient, combining Eqs. (5) and (7), and inserting the expression for the pressure gradient, we arrive at:

(11) 
$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left\{ \frac{\lambda_w}{\lambda_w + \lambda_o} u + \frac{K\lambda_w\lambda_o}{\lambda_w + \lambda_o} \right\| \frac{\partial p_c}{\partial x} - (\gamma_o - \gamma_w)\cos\theta \right\| + \frac{\partial S}{\partial t} = 0$$

Equations (1)-(4) are then written:

$$(5) \quad u_{\alpha} = -K \lambda_{\alpha} \left( \frac{\partial p}{\partial x} - \gamma_{\alpha} c a \rho B \right)$$

(6) 
$$u_0 = -\kappa \lambda_0 \left[ \frac{36}{3\pi} + \frac{36}{3\pi} - \kappa_0 \cos \theta \right]$$

$$0 = \frac{36}{32} + \frac{3}{36} + \frac{3}{36} = 0$$

$$0 = \frac{2^{0}}{2^{0}}(x)^{0} = \frac{2^{0}}{x^{0}}$$
 (8)

Lt we introduce the total Barcy velocity u = u, + uo, we see from Equ. (7) and (8) that u is constant. From Equ. (5) and (6) we have:

which gives the Pressure Equation:

$$\frac{35}{32}(x+x_0)\frac{5}{32} = \frac{1}{32}(x+x_0)\frac{5}{32} = \frac{1}{32}(x+x_0)\frac{5}{32}(x+$$

av solving Eq. (9) with respect to the pressure gradient, combining Eqs. (5), and (7), and inserting the expression for the pressure gradient, we arrive at:

$$a = \frac{26}{36} + \left[ \frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{$$

Denoting the derivative with respect to S by a dash, Eq. (11) can be expressed as:

 $(12) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left\{ K \frac{\lambda_{w} \lambda_{o}}{\lambda_{w} + \lambda_{o}} p_{c} (S) \frac{\partial S}{\partial x} \right\} + \\ + \left\{ \left[ \frac{\lambda_{w}}{\lambda_{w} + \lambda_{o}} \right] (u + K(\gamma_{o} - \gamma_{w}) \cos \theta \left[ \frac{\lambda_{w} \lambda_{o}}{\lambda_{w} + \lambda_{o}} \right] \right\} \frac{\partial S}{\partial x} + \\ + (\gamma_{o} - \gamma_{w}) \cos \theta \frac{\lambda_{w} \lambda_{o}}{\lambda_{w} + \lambda_{o}} \frac{\partial K}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial S}{\partial t} = 0$ 

Equation (12) is known as the Saturation Equation.

We now assume that the rock is homogeneous, that u is time independent, and that capillary pressure is negligible. Under these assumptions Eq. (12) is reduced to the well-known <u>Buckley-</u> Leverett Equation:

(13) 
$$\frac{\partial S}{\partial t} + \frac{u}{\Phi} \frac{d}{dS} \left[ \frac{\lambda_w}{\lambda_t + \lambda_o} - (1 + \frac{K}{u} (\gamma_o - \gamma_w) \lambda_o \cos \theta) \right] \frac{\partial S}{\partial x} = 0$$

Equation (13) is a special case of the conservation equation:

(14)  $\frac{\partial S}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial f(S)}{\partial x} = 0$ 

The nonlinearity function f(S) defined by Eq. (13) is known as the fractional flow function. We shall study Eq. (14) for a general nonlinearity function in the following.

## 3 The Riemann problem

In this section we will examine the properties of the solutions of the nonlinear hyperbolic conservation equation for a special initial condition. We use u as the dependent variable and denote differentials by subscripts. The model problem is then: Denoting the derivative with raspect to S by a dash. Eq. (11) can be

$$+ \frac{26}{28} + \frac{3}{28} + \frac{3}{28} + \frac{6}{28} + \frac{6}{2$$

Equation (12) is known as the Saturation Equation.

We now assume that the rock is homogeneous, that u is time independent, and that capillary pressure is negligible. Under these assumptions Eq. (12) is raduced to the well-known <u>Buckley-</u> Leverett Equation:

$$0 = \frac{26}{\sqrt{6}} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{1000} + \frac{1}{10} + \frac{1}{10$$

Equation (13) is a special case of the conservation equation:

$$0 = \frac{(2)16}{36} + \frac{36}{36}$$
 (41)

The continuarity function f(S) defined by Eq. (13) is known as the fractional flow function. We shall study Eq. (14) for a general continuarity function in the following.

#### The Riemann problem

In this section we will examine the properties of the solutions of the conlinear hyperbolic conservation equation for a special initial condition. We use u as the decendent variable and denote differentials by subscripts. The model problem is then:

(15) 
$$u_t + f(u)_x = 0$$
  
(16)  $u_0 = u(t=0) = \begin{cases} u_L, & x < 0 \\ u_R, & x \ge 0 \end{cases}$ 

where u<sub>L</sub> and u<sub>R</sub> are constant cases.

The initial value problem (15)-(16) is known as the Riemann problem.

By defining  $a(u) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial u}$ , equation (15) may be written:

(17)  $u_t + a(u)u_x = 0$ 

The linear case (a = pos. const.) has the solution:

(18) 
$$u = \begin{cases} u_L, & x \le at \\ u_R, & x \ge at \end{cases}$$

i.e. a discontinuity moving to the right with the velocity a = dx/dt. In the x-t plane the solution is composed by two constant cases separated by the discontinuity line x = at. (Fig. 1.)





Returning to the general case, we note that if  $u_0 = \text{const.}$ ,  $u = u_0$  is a global solution of the Riemann problem.

For large positive x we hence may infer that the solution of the problem for small times is a wave  $u = u_R$  propagating with a velocity  $a(u_R)$ , and for large negative x we will have a wave  $u = u_L$  propagating

(15) 
$$u_{t} + f(u)_{x} = 0$$

(16) 
$$u_0 = u(t=0) = \begin{cases} u_t & x<0 \\ u_{g_1} & x>0 \end{cases}$$

where ut and up are constant cases.

The initial value proview (15)-(16) is known as the Riemann problem.

By defining,  $a(u) = \frac{31}{2u}$ , equation (15) may be written:

$$(17) u_{\rm c} + u(u)u_{\rm x} = 0$$

The linear case (a = pos. const.) has the solution:

1.e. A discontinuity maving to the right with the velocity a = dx/dt. In the x-t plane the solution is composed by two constant cases



1 .91

Returning to the general case, we note that if  $u_0 = cunst$ ,  $u = u_0$  is a global solution of the Riemann problem. For large positive x we hence may infer that the solution of the problem for small times is a wave  $u = u_R$  propagating with a velocity a( $u_R$ ); and for large negative x we will have a wave  $u = u_1$  propagating with a velocity  $a(u_{I})$ .

These modes are, however, valid only for a limited time, depending on the absolute magnitude of x. As t increases or/and x approaches zero, this simple approach ceases to be valid. When  $a(u_R) < a(u_L)$  the solution will become multiple-valued in finite time. (Fig. 2a) The case  $a(u_R) > a(u_L)$  implies that a sector expanding from the origin exists where no solution is defined. (Fig. 2b)



The Riemann problem has been intensively studied the last few decades, leading to a theoretical basis which can be looked upon as complete for one case, namely when f(u) is strict nonlinear, i.e.  $a'(u) \neq 0$  for all u. The main contributors to the theory are Glimm et al, Lax, and Oleinik.

A complete description is found in e.g. Smoller<sup>21</sup>.

We shall present a brief summary of the main results: When  $u_L \neq u_R$  we have a jump discontinuity at the origin of the x-t system. This discontinuity, which seperates the constant states  $u_L$  and  $u_R$ , will propagate as a centered expansion wave or a shock (which may be a contact discontinuity.) It is readily shown that the Riemann problem permits several solutions, see e.g. Smoller<sup>21</sup>. We seek the unique weak solution that is physically feasible. Then the following must hold:

Let x = x(t) be a curve of discontinuity for a solution u(x,t) of the Riemann problem. Let  $u_{-}$  be the limiting value of u as x(t) is approached from the left, and  $u_{+} = \lim u(x,t)$  as x tends to x(t)from the right. Standard shock theory then provides: hase modes are, however, valid only for a limited time, depending he absolute magnitude of x. As t increases of/and x approaches zer his simple approach ceases to be valid. When  $a(u_{\rm R})$  (  $a(u_{\rm L})$  t olution will become multiple-valued in finite time. (Fig. 2a)

ine case atuga / atuga implies that a sector expanding from the origin exists where an uniction is defined. (Fig. 2b)



F10. 2.

The Riomann problem has been intensively studied the last few decades, leading to a theoretical basis which can be looked upon as complete for one case, namely when f(u) is strict nonlinear, i.e. atu) \* 0 for all u. The main contributors to the theory are Glimm et al, (ax, and Distaik.

A complete description is found in e.g. Smoller

We shall present a brief summary of the main results: when  $q_1 = q_2$  we have a jump discontinuity at the origin of the x-t system. This discontinuity, which separates the constant states  $u_1$  and  $u_2$ , will propagate as a centered expansion wave or a shock (which way be a contaat discontinuity.) It is readily shown that the Riscann problem permits several solutions, see e.g. Smoller<sup>21</sup>. We seek the anique week solution that is physically feasible. Then the following must hold.

Let x = x(t) be a curve of discontinuity for a solution u(x,t) of the Riemann problem. Let  $u_{-}$  be the limiting value of u as x(t) is approached from the left, and  $u_{-} = \lim u(x,t)$  as x tends to x(t)from the right. Standard shock theory then provides: 1) The curve of discontinuity is a straight line with slope

(19) 
$$S_{+-} = \frac{dx}{dt} = \frac{f(u_{+}) - f(u_{-})}{u_{+} - u_{-}}$$

(Rankine-Huginot jump condition)

2)

(20) 
$$\frac{f(u_{+}) - f(u)}{u_{+} - u} \leq \frac{f(u_{+}) - f(u_{-})}{u_{+} - u_{-}}$$

for every u between u<sub>+</sub> and u<sub>-</sub>. (E-condition of OleInik<sup>17,18</sup>, or the entropy condition.)

If u<sub>1</sub> and u<sub>2</sub> are two arbitrary values of u, we define

$$S_{12} = \frac{f(u_1) - f(u_2)}{u_1 - u_2}$$

as the slope of the straight line connecting the two points  $(u_1, f(u_1))$ and  $(u_2, f(u_2))$ . The entropy condition then reads:

 $S_{+,*} \leq S_{+,-}$  for every u between  $u_{+}$  and  $u_{-}$ .

If conditions (19) and (20) are not fulfilled, the appropriate solution must be continuous. Contrary to the linear case we here have a situation where discontinuous initial data may generate a smooth solution. On the other hand, discontinuities (shocks) can develop from smooth initial data.

Having described the conditions under which shocks are permitted to develop, we turn to the smooth solution case.

The situation is depicted in Fig. 2b. The two constant cases  $u_L$  and  $u_R$  are seperated by a region where for the time being no solution is defined. Looking at the physics, we have two waves propagating in the same direction, where the "first" wave has a greater velocity than the "second" one. In other words: The "first" wave is "running away" from the "second" one. This leads to the definition of the so-called

i) The curve of discontinuity is a straight line with slope

(19) 
$$S_{+-} = \frac{dx}{dx} = \frac{f(u_{+}) - f(u_{-})}{u_{+} - u_{-}}$$

(Rankine-Ruginor jump condicion)

(20) 
$$\frac{f(u_{+}) - f(u)}{u_{+} - u} + \frac{f(u_{+}) - f(u_{-})}{u_{+} - u_{-}}$$

for every a between a, and a... (E-condition of Olelnik <sup>17, 18</sup>, or the entropy condition.).

if u, and u, are two arbitrary values of u. we define

$$S_{12} = \frac{E(u_3) - E(u_2)}{v_1 - v_2}$$

as the slope of the straight line connecting the two doints (n\_if(u\_i)) and (u\_if(u\_i)). The entropy condition them reads:

## 1, . 4 Section every a between a. and u.

If annultions (19) and (20) are not fulfilled, the appropriate solution must be continuous. Contrary to the linear case we here have a situation where discontinuous initial data may generate a smooth solution. On the other hand, discontinuities (shocks) can develop from smooth initial data.

Having described the conditions under which shocks are permitted to develop, we turn to the smooth solution case. The situation is depicted in Pig. 25. The two constant cases up and in are seperated by a region where for the time baing no solution is defined. Looking at the physics, we have two waves propagating in the same direction, where the "first" wave has a graater velocity than the "second" one. In other words' The "first" wave is "running away" from the water of the leads to the definition of the so-called rarefaction wave. This wave is implemented as a smooth curve connecting the two constant states, so that the total solution is continuous.

More accurately: The sector that separates the constant states  $u_L$  and  $u_R$  is bounded by the straight lines  $x = a_L \cdot t$  and  $x = a_R \cdot t$ , where  $a_L = a(u_L)$  and  $a_R = a(u_R)$ .

We seek the rarefaction solution for  $t = \tau > 0$  at a point  $x = \xi$  within the sector. The desired solution is then  $u(\tau,\xi) = a^{-1}(\xi)$ . As  $\xi$  runs from  $a_R$  to  $a_L$  along the line segment  $t = \tau$  inside the sector, we see indeed that the solution is everywhere continuous.

From the analysis so far, we conclude that only four permitted cases can exist as solutions of the strictly nonlinear Riemann problem. We shall denote these cases as the four primitive modes of the problem:

Mode	1:	f(u)	convex and $u_L > u_R$ .	(Rarefaction)
Mode	2:	f(u)	convex and $u_L < u_R$ .	(Shock)
Mode	3:	f(u)	concave and $u_L > u_R$ .	(Shock)
Mode	4:	f(u)	concave and $u_{L} < u_{R}$ .	(Rarefaction)

The primitive modes are shown pictorially in Figs. 3-6, where a) shows the nonlinearity function, b) the solution in the x-t plane, and c) is a qualitative picture of the solution along the line  $t = \tau$ .



rarefaction wave. This wave is implemented as a smooth curve connecting the two constant states, so that the total solution is continuous.

More accurately: The sector that separates the constant states  $u_L$  and  $u_R$  is bounded by the straight lines  $x = a_L \cdot t$  and  $x = a_R \cdot t$ , where  $a_r = a(u_r)$  and  $a_R = a(u_r)$ .

We seek the raretaction solution for  $t = \tau > 0$  at a point  $x = \varepsilon$  within the sector. The desired solution is then  $u(\tau, \varepsilon) = a^{-1}(\varepsilon)$ , as  $\varepsilon$  runs from a<sub>2</sub> to a<sub>1</sub> along the line sugment  $t = \tau$  inside the sector, we see indeed that the solution is everywhere continuous.

From the analysis so tar, we conclude that only four permitted cases can exist as solutions of the strictly nonlinear Riemann problem. We shall denote these cases as the four <u>primitive podes</u> of the problem:

The primitive modes are shown pictorially in Figs. 3-6, where a) shows the nonlinearity function, b) the solution in the  $x^{-1}$  plane, and c) is a qualitative picture of the solution signs the line t = r.



Fig. 3. (Mode L.)



## Composite solutions.

When the condition of strict nonlinearity is violated, the solution is composed by several of the primitive modes. This case lacks the solid theoretical foundation that supplies the strict nonlinear case, but by physical reasoning and application of the conditions (19) and (20), it is possible to construct a solution that is unique and physically











Composite solutions.

when the condition of strict nonlinearity is violated, the solution is composed by several of the primitive modes. This case lacks the solid theoretical foundation that supplies the strict ponlinear case, but by physical reasoning and application of the conditions (19) and (20). It is possible to construct a solution that is unique and obvsically



acceptable. Fig. 7 shows a rather complex nonlinearity function.

. Fig. 7.

The u-axis is divided into regions, so that each region contains exactly one primitive mode. From the E-condition we deduce that the classification into primitive modes always starts at the  $u_R$ -end of the diagram. The physical statement we use as basis for constructing the composite solution is: Different shock waves starting simultaneously from the origin of the x-t system must be ordered so that the waves with the greater shock velocity at every time precede waves with lower shock velocities. In the x-t plane this statement is interpreted as: When x runs from  $+\infty$  to  $-\infty$  along the line t =  $\tau$ , the different wavemodes composing the solution must be encountered in the same sequential order as when u runs from  $u_R$  to  $u_L$  along the nonlinearity function. I.e. the shock speeds must form a decreasing sequence when u varies as mentioned.

This request is satisfied if (and only if) we replace f(u) by its <u>convex hull</u> when  $u_R < u_L$ , and the <u>concave hull</u> if  $u_L < u_R$ . This procedure is based on a result by Harten<sup>15</sup>, namely that the solution is independent of the actual shape of the nonlinearity function in the concave (convex) regions when  $u_R < (>) u_L$ .

The construction of the composite wave is then a simple task. The case shown in Fig. 7a will as an example be composed by a constant state  $u_R$ , a shock wave separating  $u_R$  from  $u_1$ , a rarefaction wave connecting



acceptable. Fig. 7 shows a rather complex monitoearity function.

Edge V.

This request is satisfied if (and only (1)) as replace f(u) by its <u>convex hull</u> when  $u_0 < u_0$ , and the <u>concave hull</u> if  $u_0 < u_0$ . This procedure is based on a result by Hattau<sup>13</sup>, namely that the solution is independent of the actual shape of the nonlinearity function in the concave (convex) regions when  $u_0 < (2)^{-}u_0$ .

the construction of the composite wave in them a simple task. The case shown in Fig. 72 will as an example be composed by a constant state way a shock wave separating up from u., a rarefaction wave connecting  $\mathbf{u_1}$  and  $\mathbf{u_2},$  and so on, resulting in a solution which is qualitatively shown in Fig. 8.



Fig. 8

The solution corresponding to Fig. 7b is shown in Fig. 9:



## 4 The Random Choice Method.

We now turn to the actual problem we are attempting to solve, namely:

(21) 
$$u_t + f(u)_t = 0$$

$$(22)$$
 u(t=0) = I(x)

(23) 
$$u(x=0) = B_0(t), \quad u(x=1) = B_1(t)$$

A method developed by  $\operatorname{Glimm}^7$  to prove the existence and boundedness of solutions to the Riemann problem, was during the 70's used in a constructive manner to obtain a numerical solution to the problem

 $u_1$  and  $u_2$ , and so on, resulting in a solution which is qualitatively shown in Fig. 8.



The solution corresponding to Fig. 7b is shown in Fig. 9:



The Eandom Chaine Method.

he now furn to the actual problem we are attempting to solve, namely

 $(1)_{a} = (1=x)_{a} = (1=x)_$ 

A mechod developed by Glimm to prove the existence and boundadness of solutions to the Riemann problem, was during the 70's used in a constructive manner to obtain a numerical solution to the problem (21)-(23). The procedure has been developed and studied by Glimm, Marchesin, McBryan, Chorin and others 1-5, 7-13, 16, 20. An excellent description of the method is given by Concus and Proskurowski<sup>4</sup>.

We seek a solution u(x,t) at the points  $x_i = ih$ , i=1,2,..., and  $t_j = jk$ , j=1,2,..., where h is the spatial increment  $\Delta x$  and  $k = \Delta t$ . In the following we shall denote the numerical solution by capital letters, and the analytical results by lowercase. The solution is advanced one complete time step in two cycles.

Starting with the known array U(ih, jk), we first compute the solution half a time step ahead on a shifted grid, i.e. U is evaluated in the points  $\{(i+1/2)h, (j+1/2)k\}$ . The second cycle is similar, so that at the end of a complete time step, we obtain  $U\{ih, (j+1)k\}$ . In the following we concentrate on the first time cycle, the other half is analogeous.

The grid system is shown in Fig. 10:





We use a control volume interpretation of the discrete approximation, i.e. U(x, jk) is taken as constant on each interval  $(i-1/2)h \le x \le (i+1/2)h$ , and similar for  $U\{x, (j+1/2)k\}$ .

For the grid points (ih, jk) and {(i+1)h, jk} we thus have the problem:

(24) 
$$u_t + f(u)_x = 0$$
  $t \ge jk$ 

(25) 
$$U(t=jk) = \begin{cases} U(ih, jk), & x \leq (i+1/2)h \\ \\ U\{(i+1)h, jk\}, & x > (i+1/2)h \end{cases}$$

(21)-(23). The procedure has been developed and studied by Glimm, Marchesin, McBryan, Chorin and others<sup>1-5</sup>, <sup>7</sup>-1<sup>3</sup>, 1<sup>5</sup>, 2<sup>9</sup>. An excellent description of the method is given by Concus and Proskurowski<sup>4</sup>.

We seek a solution u(x, t) at the points  $x_1 = 1h$ , t=1, 7, ..., and $t_1 = jk$ , j=1, 2, ..., where h is the spatial increment is and <math>k = 1t. In the following we shall denote the numerical solution by capital letters, and the analytical results by lowercase.

The solution is advanced one complete time step in two cycles. Starting with the known array U(ih.jk), we first compute the solution half a time step shead on a shifted grid, i.e. U is evaluated in the points ((i+1/2)h, (j+1/2)k). The second cycle is similar, so that at the and of a complete time step, we obtain U(ih, (j+1)k). In the following we concentrate on the first time cycle, the other half is analogeous.

The grid system is shown in Fig. 10:



118. 10.

We use a control volume interpretation of the discrete approximation. i.e. U(x, jk) is taken as constant on each interval  $(1-1/2)h \leq x \leq (1+1/2)h$ , and similar for U(x, (j+1/2)k).

For the grid points (ih, jk) and ((i+1)h, jk) we thus have the problem:

AL & 1 (0) = 0 (0) 1 + 30 (05)

25) U(t=jk) = (U(th, jk), x < (t+1/2)h

In order to simplify both the notation and the computer programs, we shift the point  $\{(i+1/2)h, jk\}$  to the origin. The original Riemann problem is then recognized. Our task is hence to solve one Riemann problem for each grid point.

If the size of the time step is restricted by imposing the <u>Courant</u> condition:

(26) max |a(u)| < h/k

we are guaranteed that none of the separate Riemann problems will interfer with each other, hence assuring that waves propagated from the discontinuity of different Riemann problems do not intersect.

The Riemann problem generates a complex solution composed of at least one of the primitive modes, defined on the line segment t = k/2,  $-h/2 \le x \le h/2$ .

This analytical solution must be represented by one single value appointed to the point t = k/2, x = 0 in the numerical procedure. The straightforward angle of attack is to utilize the analytical solution directly, hence defining U(0, k/2) = u(0, k/2). No stable method is, however, obtained by this approach.

In order to achieve stable results, a point on the given line segment is chosen randomly, and the u-value taken at that point is assigned to the point x = 0, t = k/2. I.e. a uniformly distributed random variable 0 is sampled from the interval (-1,1), and we define the solution at x = 0, t = k/2 as:

(27)  $U(0, k/2) = u(\Theta h/2, k/2)$ 

(Hence the name Random Choice Method, also referred as the Uniform Sampling Method.)

As an example, a rarefaction solution of the Riemann problem is shown in Fig. 11. Once  $\Theta$  is sampled, the numerical solution to be assigned to the point x = 0, t = k/2 is defined by: In order to simplify both the notation and the computer programs, we shift the point ((1+1/2)h,jk) to the origin. The original Riemann problem is then recognized. Our task is hence to solve one Riemann problem for each grid point.

If the size of the time step is restricted by imposing the Courant condition:

### (26) max 1a(u)1 < h/k

we are guaranteed that none of the separate Riemann problems will interfer with each other, hence assuring that waves propagated from the discontinuity of different Riemann problems do not intersect.

The Riemann problem generates a complex solution composed of at least one of the primitive modes, defined on the line segment t = k/2,  $-b/2 \le x \le h/2$ .

This analytical solution must be represented by one single value appointed to the point t = k/2, x = 0 in the numerical procedure. The straightforward angle of attack is to utilize the analytical solution directly, hence defining U(0, k/2) = u(0, k/2). No stable mathod is, however, obtained by this approach.

In order to achieve stable results, a point on the given line segment is chosen randomly, and the u-value taken at that point is assigned to the point x = 0, t = k/2. I.e. a uniformly distributed random variable 0 is sampled from the interval (-1,1), and we define the solution at x = 0, t = k/2 as:

## (27) - U(0, k/2) = u(0h/2, k/2)

(Hance the name Random Choice Method, also referred as the Uniform Sampling Method.)

As an axample, a rarefaction solution of the Riemann problem is shown in Fig. 11. Once G is sampled, the numerical solution to be assigned to the point x = 0, t = k/2 is defined by:

1.3

(28) 
$$U(0,k/2) = u(\Theta h/2,k/2) = \begin{cases} u_L & \text{if } \Theta h/k \leq a_L \\ u^* & \text{if } a_L \leq \Theta h/k \leq a_R \\ u_R & \text{if } \Theta h/k \geq a_R \end{cases}$$

where u is defined by the equation:  $a(u^*) = \Theta h/k$ .



Fig. 11.

# 5 The Sampling Procedure. Boundaries.

The convergence and stability of the Random Chioce Method is sensitive to the sampling procedure, as pointed out by  $\operatorname{Chorin}^{1, 2}$ . He found that stable results were obtained only if the <u>same</u> value of  $\Theta$  is used for every spatial point of a given time step.  $\Theta$  is most naturally sampled by a pseudo random generator. We require from this generator that the  $\Theta$ -distribution converges rapidly to a uniform distribution, without too small repetitive patterns, and have chosen to use a random generator proposed by Paulsen<sup>19</sup> that serves our purpose:

$$R_{j+1/2} \equiv 32768 * R_j \pmod{16775723}, j = 0, 1/2, 1, 3/2, \dots$$

To prevent loss of information at the boundaries, Chorin suggests the following procedure:

Let  $K_1 < K_2$  be mutually prime integers with  $K_2$  odd, and let  $N_1 < K_2$  be an integer. Construct the sequence of integers

(28) 
$$B(0,k/2) = u(0h/2,k/2) = \begin{bmatrix} a_1 & 16 & 0h/8 & a_2 \\ a_1 & 25 & a_2 & 0h/8 & c_{R} \end{bmatrix}$$

where u is defined by the equation: a(u) = 0h/k.



#### 5 The Sampling Procedure. Boundaries.

The convergence and stability of the Kandom Chines Method is sensitive to the sampling procedure, as pointed out by Cherin<sup>1, 2</sup>. He found that stable results were obtained only if the same value of 0 is used for wery spatial point of a given time size. O is most naturally sampled by a peando random genemator, we require from this generator that the octatribution converges rapidly to a uniform distribution, without too small repetitive patterns, and have chosen to gas a random generator proposed by Saulsen<sup>19</sup> that serves our purpose

To prevent loss of information at the boundaries, Chorin suggests the foundaries, Chorin suggests the

Let  $K_1 \in K_2$  be mutually prime totagers with  $K_2$  odd, and let  $N_1 < M_2$  be an integer. Construct the sequence of integers (29)  $N_{s+1} \equiv (N_s + K_i) \pmod{K_2}$ .

Then for the Riemann problem solutions in the first half-step we use

(30) 
$$\Theta_{j+1/2} = (N_{2j+1} + R_{j+1/2})/K_2 - 1$$

when sampling at time t = (j + 1/2)k. In the second half-step we use

(31) 
$$\Theta_{j+1} = (N_{2j+1} + R_{j+1})/K_2$$

when sampling at time t = (j+1)k,  $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ 

With this procedure,  $-1 \leq \Theta_{j+1/2} \leq 0$  and  $0 \leq \Theta_{j+1} \leq 1$ .

Chorin showed that boundary conditions should be treated in the following manner:

When the Dirichlet condition  $u_0 = B_0$  is prescribed we set  $U\{-1/2, (j+1/2)\} = 2B_0 - U\{1/2, (j+1/2)\}$ , and similar for the boundary at x = 1.

If we impose a Neuman condition  $(\partial u/\partial n)_0 = C_0$  the image point is defined by  $U\{-1/2, (j+1/2)\} = U\{1/2, (j+1/2)\} - h \cdot C_0$ .

Note that this way of defining the image points may require an extension of the domain of definition for the nonlinearity function. In our study, u represents saturation, which is certainly a number between 0 and 1. U(x = -h/2) as defined above may however exceed 1. For waves travelling to the right, e.g. water displacing oil, the left-end-point condition reduces to  $U(0,j) = u_0$ , while the right-end condition is superfluous, as the waves travel out of the medium at this end.

If the nonlinearity function has a minimum, a(u) will be negative in some domain, and we have waves travelling to the left. In this case the last mentioned treatment of the boundary may be insufficient. (29)  $N_{g+1} = (N_g + X_1) \pmod{N_g}$ 

Then for the Riemann problem solutions in the first half-step we use

(30) 01+1/2 = (R23+1 + R3+1/2)/K2 - 1

when sampling at time t = (j + 1/2)k. In the second half-step we use

(31) 01+1 - (N21+1 + R1+1)/K

when sampling at time t = .(j+1)k, j = 0, 1, 2, ...

With this procedure, -1 & 0 + 1/2 < 0 and 0 < 0 + 1 + 1

Chorin showed that boundary conditions should be treated in the following manner:

When the Otrichlet condition up = By is prescribed

we set 0[-1/2, (]+1/2) [ =  $22_0$  = 0[1/2, (]+1/2)], and similar for the boundary at x = 1.

If we impose a Neuman condition  $(3\alpha/3n)_0 = C_0$  the image point is defined by  $U[-1/2, (j+1/2)] = U[1/2, (j+1/2)] = h \cdot C_0$ .

Note that this way of defining the image points may require an axtension of the domain of definition for the nonlinearity function. In our study, a represente esturation, which is certaining reacher between 0 and 1. V(x = -h/2) as defined above may however exceed 1. For vaves travelling to the right, e.g. water displacing off, the left-end-point condition reduces to  $V(0, 1) = w_0$ , while the right-end to condition is superfluous, as the waves travel out of the medium at this and.

If the nonlinearity function has a minimum, a(q) will be negative in some domain, and we have waves traveling to the left. In this case, the last mentioned treatment of the boundary may be insufficient.

Solution of the multidimensional conservation equation demands an extension of the method which is not straightforward. One angle of attack is the "operator splitting" scheme of Sethian, Chorin, and Concus, where the problem is split into two or three one-dimensional Riemann problems which are solved sequentially. As the x-y-z components of the computed wave speeds in the different sweeps may be inconsistent with the actual displacement, an additional routine is required to analyze the propagation topology<sup>20</sup>.

Another approach is the front tracking scheme of Glimm et al, where the Random Choice Method is used solely to determine the velocity vector of the saturation discontinuity, a one-dimensional problem. Away from the front the solution is smooth, and can be found by a finite element solver on a moving grid <sup>13</sup>.

# 6 Discretization of the nonlinearity function.

The authors of the referenced papers all assume the nonlinearity function f(u) to be given in a closed form. This is a valid approach e.g. for the non-viscous Burger's Equation where  $f(u) = \beta u^2$ . In our case, namely immiscible displacement of oil by water, the most common approach has been to define the relative permeability curves for water and oil by (u being water saturation):

(32) 
$$k_{rw} = u^2$$
,  $k_{ro} = (1-u)^2$ 

Hence the nonlinearity function is:

(33) 
$$f(u) = \frac{u^2}{u^2 + \alpha(1-u)^2}$$

This approach is less satisfactory if we wish to study a real case. A very special form of the relative permeability relationship has been assumed. This functional form will seldom or never be fulfilled in practice. Moreover, it is highly improbable that we are able to obtain any closed expression for f(u) at all. The normal case is that we are given a table of measured values for relative permeabilities as a

 $\alpha = \mu_w / \mu_o$ 

Solution of the multidimensional conservation equation demands an extension of the method which is not straightforward. One angle of attack is the "operator splitting" scheme of Sathian, Chorin, and Concus, where the problem is split into two of three one-dimensional Riemann problems which are solved sequentially. As the x-y-z components of the computed wave speeds in the different sweeps may be inconsistent with the actual displacement, an additional routige is required to analyze the propagation topolocy 20

Another approach is the front tracking scheme of Glimm et al, where the Random Choice Method is used solely to determine the vélocity vector of the saturation discontinuity, a one-dimensional problem. Away from the front the solution is smooth, and can be found by a finite element solver on a moving grid<sup>13</sup>.

#### 6 Discretization of the nonlinearity function.

The authors of the referenced papers all assume the nonlinearity function f(u) to be given in a closed form. This is a valid approach e.g. for the non-viscous Burger's Equation where  $f(u) = Bu^2$ . In our case, namely immiscible displacement of oil by water, the most common approach has been to define the collitive permeability curves for water and oil by (u being water saturation):

(32)  $k_{TW} = u^2$ ,  $k_{TO} = (1-u)^2$ 

Hence the soulinearity function is:

(33) 
$$f(u) = \frac{u^2}{u^2 + \alpha(1-u)^2}$$
,  $g = h_0 f_{0,0}$ 

This approach is less satisfactory if we wish to study a real case. A very special form of the relative permeability relationship has been assumed. This functional form will seldom or never be fulfilled in practice. Horeover, it is highly improbable that we are able to obtain any closed expression for ((u) at all. The normal case is that we are given a table of measured values for relative permeabilities of
function of saturation. Viscosity is in this discussion assumed to be constant.

We shall henceforth discuss the algorithm for the Riemann problem when f(u) is given only at a finite number of points  $\{u_i, f(u_i)\}, i=0,1,2,\ldots,n.$ 

Dafermos<sup>5</sup> has studied the case where f(u) is a polygon-line. Our approach is, however, somewhat different. We still assume that f(u) is  $C^2$ , with known values only at selected points. The differential a(u)is computed on the node points  $u_i$  with second order accuracy. This procedure differs from Dafermos, who obtains a piecewise constant differential, while a(u) will be a discrete approximation to a continous function in our case.

Another generalization of the cases studied in the litterature hitherto, is that we permit a larger class of nonlinearity functions than previously assumed. Concus & Proskurowski<sup>4</sup> e.g., assume that f(u) is strictly increasing with at most one inflection point. For the time being we will allow a quite general nonlinear function, although the class of permitted fractional flow functions is restricted by physical reasoning and computational simplification later in the text.

We are concerned with the stability and convergence of the numerical procedure for the modified problem. Although the discussion is concentrated on the case of interest, namely that f(u) is approximated by a polygon-line, the argument holds equally well for an arbitrary perturbation of f(u). Hence we will show that <u>the Riemann problem is structurally stable</u> with respect to small perturbations of the nonlinearity function. This is an important result as f(u), the fractional flow function, always will be a result of measurements with error bounds.

We define F(u) as the polygon-line passing through the points  $(u_i, f_i)$ , i=0,1,...,n. In the same manner A(u) is defined as the polygon-line approximation to a(u). F and A are used exclusively in the procedure in place of f and a, i.e. all function values between node points are determined by linear interpolation. function of saturation. Viscoulty is in this discussion assumed to be constant.

We shall henceforth discuss the algorithm for the Riemann problem when f(u) is given only at a finite number of points  $\{u_1, f(u_1)\}$ ,  $i=0,1,2,\ldots,n$ .

Dafermos has studied the case where f(u) is a polygon-line. Our approach is, however, somewhat differents. We still assume that f(u) is C<sup>2</sup>, with known values only at selected points. The differential 4(u) is computed on the node points u<sub>1</sub> with second order accuracy. This procedure different from Dafermos, who obtains a piecewise constant differential, while 3(u) will be a discrete approximation to a continous function in our case.

Another generalization of the cases studied in the litterature hitherto, is that we permit a larger class of nonlinearity functions than previously assumed. Concus & Prosturowski e.g., assume that F(a) is strictly increasing with at nost and inflection point. For the time being we will allow a quite general conlinear function, withough the class of permitted fractional flow functions is restricted by physical reasoning and computational simplification later in the text.

We are concerned with the stability and convergence of the discussion is procedure for the modified problem. Although the discussion is concentrated on the case of interest, namely that ('u') is approximated by a polygon-lice, the argument holds equally well for an arbitrary perturbation of ('u'). Hence we will show that the Alemann problem is attracturally stable with respect to small perturbations of the nonlinearity function. This is an important result of measurements with tractional flow function, always will be a result of measurements with error bounds.

### 6.1 Stability analysis.

In this section we compare the numerical solution obtained by the reference method with the "perturbed solution", achieved by using the polygon-line approximation. We denote the difference between the results obtained as the "deviation of the modified method". The main goal is to show that the discretization of the nonlinearity function is permitted if the node points are properly chosen.

# The Shock Wave.

Detoting the reference results with lowercase letters, and the corresponding polygon line approximations with capital letters, we have: The shock velocity is defined by:

$$(34) \quad s = \frac{f_L - f_R}{u_L - u_R} \qquad (reference)$$

$$(35) \quad S = \frac{F_L - F_R}{u_L - u_R} \qquad (perturbed)$$

When  $\rm u_R < u_L$  the situation is shown in Fig. 12. We discuss this case in the following. The case  $\rm u_L < \rm u_R$  is analogeous.



### 6.1 Stability analysis.

In this section we compare the summarical solution obtained by the reference method with the "perturbed solution", achieved by using the polygon-line approximation. We denote the difference between the results obtained as the "deviation of the modified method". The main goal is to show that the discretization of the mailmearity function is permitted if the onde points are properly chosen.

### The Shock Mave.

Deroting the reference results with lowercase letters, and the corresponding polygod line approximations with capital letters, we have: The shock velocity is defined by:

(34) 
$$a = \frac{1}{v_0} - \frac{1}{a_R}$$
 (24)  
 $a = \frac{1}{v_0} - \frac{1}{a_R}$  (perturbed  
 $v_0 - \frac{1}{v_0}$ 

When up < up the situation is shown in Fig. 12. We discuss this cana in the rollowing. The case up to analogeous.



Define  $T = \Delta x / \Delta t$ , where  $\Delta x$  and  $\Delta t$  are the space and time increments. Then the reference solution of the Riemann problem is:

(36) 
$$v = \begin{cases} u_R & \text{when } \Theta T \ge s \\ \\ u_T & \text{when } \Theta T < s \end{cases}$$

while the perturbed solution is:

$$(37) \quad V = \begin{cases} u_R & \text{when} & \text{OT} \ge S \\ \\ u_T & \text{when} & \text{OT} < S \end{cases}$$

i.e. a nonzero deviation occurs if S < OT < s % or % s < OT < S.

We see that a deviation in the shock mode will result in a wave propagating with a shifted front velocity. We therefore discuss this case thoroughly. Symmetry considerations permit us to assume S < s. See Fig. 13.



Fig. 13.

Refering to the figure, we easily deduce:

$$S/T < \Theta < s/T <=> 2x_1/\Delta x < \Theta < 2x_2/\Delta x$$

 $<=> 0 < 0 < 2(x_2 - x_1)/\Delta x <=> 0 < 0 < (s - S)/T$ 

Define  $T = \Delta x / \Delta t$ , where  $\Delta x$  and  $\Delta t$  are the space and time increments. Then the reference solution of the Riemann problem is:

$$(36) = \begin{cases} u_R & when GT > s \\ u_L & when GT < s \end{cases}$$

while the parturbed solution is:

1.e. a monzero deviation occurs if S ( ST < s or s C CT < S.

We see that a deviation in the shock node will result in a wave propagating with a shifted front velocity. We therefore discusa this case thoroughly. Symmetry considerations permit us to assume 5 < s. See Fig. 11.



Refering to the figure, we easily deduce:

5/T < 0 < 8/T <=> 2x / 4x < 0 < 2x / 4x ?

(=) 0 < 0 < 2(x; - x, )/dx <=> 0 < 0 < (x - 5)/2</p>

Hence the conditional probability that the solution is perturbed, given S < s is given by: (using "PS" for "perturbed solution")

$$(38) P\{PS \mid S < s\} = P\{S/T < \Theta < s/T \mid S < s\}$$
$$= P\{0 < \Theta \le (s-S) \cdot \Delta t / \Delta x\}$$

Define the node points  $u_i$  and  $u_j$  so that  $u_i < f_R < u_{i+1}$  and  $u_j < f_L < u_{j+1}$ . Denote the increment  $u_{i+1} - u_i$  by  $h_R$ , and similar for  $h_L$ , and let  $h_{Ri} = u_R - u_i$ ,  $h_{Lj} = u_L - u_j$ . (See Fig. 12)

We first need an expression for  $F_R$  and  $f_R$ :

(39) 
$$F_R = f_i + h_{Ri} \frac{f_{i+1} - f_i}{h_R}$$
  
(40)  $f_R = f_i + h_{Ri} \cdot \left\{ \frac{f_{i+1} - f_{i-1}}{2h_R} \right\} + \frac{h_{Ri}^2}{2} \left\{ \frac{f_{i+1} + f_{i-1} - 2f_i}{h_R^2} \right\} + O(h_R^3)$ 

Hence

$$(41) \quad f_{R} - F_{R} = 0.5 \cdot \left\{ \frac{h_{Ri}}{h_{R}} (\frac{h_{Ri}}{h_{R}} - 1) \right\} \left\{ f_{i+1} - 2f_{i} + f_{i-1} \right\} + O(h_{R}^{3})$$
$$= 0.5 \cdot \left\{ \frac{h_{Ri}}{h_{R}} (\frac{h_{Ri}}{h_{R}} - 1) \right\} \cdot h_{R}^{2} \cdot f_{i}'' + O(h_{R}^{3})$$
$$\approx 0.5 \cdot \left\{ \rho(\rho-1) \right\} \cdot \alpha$$

where  $\rho = h_{Ri}/h_R$  and  $\alpha$  is defined by  $\alpha = h_R^2 \cdot f''_i = h_L^2 \cdot f''_j$ .

Hence the conditional probability, that the solution is perturbed, given 5 < s is given by: (using "PS" for "perturbed solution")

Define the node points  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  so that  $u_1 < f_2 < u_{1+1}$  and  $u_1 < f_1 < u_{1+1}$ . Denote the increment  $u_{1+1} - u_1$  by  $b_8$ , and similar for  $b_1$ , and let  $b_{81} - u_8 - u_4$ ,  $b_{1,2} - u_8 - u_5$ . (See Fig. 12)

We first need an expression for To and for

(39) 
$$F_R = E_L + \log \frac{E_{L+L} - E_L}{\log}$$

$$(40) \quad t_{\rm B} = t_{\rm I} + \ln_{\rm BL} \left[ \frac{1+t_{\rm I}}{2} + \frac{1+t_{\rm I}}{2} \right] + \frac{18t_{\rm I}}{2} \left[ \frac{1+t_{\rm I}}{2} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \right] + 0.05$$

Hence

$$(41) \quad f_{R} = F_{R} = 0.5 \cdot \left[\frac{h_{R}}{h_{R}} - \frac{h_{R}}{h_{R}} - 1\right] \left[\left[f_{1+1} - 2f_{1} + f_{1-1}\right] + 0(h_{R}^{2})\right] \\ = 0.5 \cdot \left[\frac{h_{R}}{h_{R}} + \frac{h_{R}}{h_{R}} - 1\right] \cdot h_{R}^{2} \cdot f_{1}^{2} + 0(h_{R}^{2}) \\ = 0.5 \cdot \left[\frac{h_{R}}{h_{R}} + \frac{h_{R}}{h_{R}}\right] + 0(h_{R}^{2})$$

where  $\rho = h_{RI}/h_R$  and a is defined by  $\alpha = h_R^{2} \cdot f^{m_1} = h_I^{2} \cdot f^{m_1}$ .

In a similar way,  $\lambda$  is defined by  $\lambda = h_{L_i}/h_L$ .

The constant  $\alpha$  determines the increment sizes of the discretization of f(u). In short the definition states that the smallest increments should be used in regions where f changes rapidly, a conclusion which is intuitively reasonable.

From the expressions above we can calculate the difference between exact and approximate shock speed:

(42) 
$$s-S = \frac{\{(f_L-F_L) - (f_R-F_R)\}}{u_L - u_R} \approx \frac{\alpha}{2(u_L-u_R)} \{\lambda(1-\lambda) - \rho(1-\rho)\}$$

The positions of  $u_R$  and  $u_L$  between two successive node points are not known, we assume that  $H_{Ri}$  and  $H_{Lj}$  will take values between 0 and  $H_R$  or  $H_L$  more or less at random. More precisely we assume that  $\lambda$  and  $\rho$  are uniformly distributed random variables on [0,1].

Inserting Eq. (41) into Eq. (38) and rearranging gives:

(43) 
$$P\{PS \mid S \leq s\} \simeq \frac{\alpha}{2(u_L - u_R)} \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x} \{(1/2 - \rho)^2 - (1/2 - \lambda)^2\}$$

Define the variables  $k_R = 1/2 - \rho$  and  $k_L = 1/2 - \lambda$ , uniformly distributed on (-1/2, 1/2), and let

$$\beta^{2} = \frac{\Delta t \cdot \alpha}{2 \Delta x (u_{L} - u_{R})}$$

Then

(44) 
$$P\{PS \mid S \leq s\} \simeq P\{0 < 0 \leq \beta^2 \cdot [[k_R^2 - k_L^2]]\}$$

Define the random variables X and Y by:

(45) 
$$X = \beta^2 \cdot k_R^2 \qquad Y = \beta^2 \cdot k_L^2$$

a similar way,  $\lambda$  is defined by  $\lambda = h_1 \sqrt{h_1}$ 

The constant a determines the increment sizes of the discretization of f(u). In short the definition states that the smallest increments should be used in regions where f changes rapidly, a conclusion which is intuitively reasonable.

From the expressions above we can calculate the difference between exact and approximate shock speed:

$$(+2) \quad z=z = \frac{\left[\frac{(z_{L}-z_{L}) - (z_{R}-z_{R})\right]}{u_{L} - u_{R}} = \frac{q}{2(u_{L}-u_{R})} \left[\frac{\lambda(1-\lambda) - p(1-p)}{\lambda(1-\lambda) - p(1-p)}\right]$$

The positions of  $u_g$  and  $u_i$  between two successive node points are not known, we assume that  $H_{B1}$  and  $H_{ij}$  will take values between 0 and  $H_g$  or  $H_i$  more or less at random. More precisally we assume that 1 and 2 are uniformly distributed random variables on [0,1].

Inserting Eq. (41) into Eq. (38) and rearranging gives:

(43) 
$$P(PS \mid S(a)) = \frac{a}{2(u_L - u_R)} \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x} \{ (1/2 - p)^2 - (1/2 - \lambda)^2 \}$$

Define the variables  $k_R = 1/2 - \rho$  and  $k_L = 1/2 - \lambda$ , uniformly distributed on (-1/2, 1/2), and let

$$s^2 = \frac{\Delta t + u}{2\Delta x (u_1 - u_2)}$$

Then

Define the random variables X and Y by:

$$(45)$$
 X =  $8^2 \cdot k_B^2$  Y =  $8^2 \cdot k_B^2$ 

BE.

Our next task is to determine the distribution of the stochastic variables X and Y:

(46) 
$$P\{X \le x\} = P\{\beta^2 \cdot k_R^2 \le x\} = P\{\frac{\sqrt{x}}{\beta} \le k_R \le \frac{\sqrt{x}}{\beta}\} = \frac{2\sqrt{x}}{\beta}$$
  
where  $0 \le x \le \frac{\beta^2}{4}$  and similar for Y.

Hence the density functions are:

(47) 
$$f_X(x) = \frac{1}{\beta \sqrt{x}}$$
  $f_Y(y) = \frac{1}{\beta \sqrt{y}}$ 

A deviated solution is found if the stochastic variable E = X-Y is positive and  $\Theta$  is less than E. To proceed, we hence need the density function g(E) for E:

(48) 
$$g(E) = \int_{0}^{B} f_{X}(y+E) \cdot f_{Y}(y) dy = \frac{1}{\beta^{2}} \int_{0}^{B} \frac{dy}{\sqrt{y+E} \sqrt{y}}$$
  
$$= \frac{1}{\beta^{2}} \log \left\{ \frac{\beta^{2}/2 - E + \beta \sqrt{\beta^{2}/4 - E}}{E} \right\}$$

where  $B = \beta^2/4 - E$ .

As the conditional probability  $P\{\ \Theta < E \ I \ E \ \}$  is simply equal to E, we have:

(49) 
$$P\{E > 0, \Theta \in (0, E)\} = \int_{0}^{\beta^{2}/4} g(E) \cdot P\{\Theta < E \mid E\} dE$$
  
$$= \frac{\beta^{2}}{32} \{8\log(2) - \log(\beta^{2}) + 1/6\}$$

Our next task is to determine the distribution of the stochastic variables X and Y:

(46) 
$$P[X \le x] = P[B^2 \cdot k_R^2 \le x] = P[\frac{\sqrt{x}}{B} \le k_R \le \frac{\sqrt{x}}{B}] = \frac{2\sqrt{x}}{B}$$
  
where  $0 \le x \le \frac{B^2}{4}$  and similar for  $Y$ .

Hence the density functions are

$$(47) \quad f_X(x) = \frac{1}{8\sqrt{x}} \qquad f_Y(y) = \frac{1}{8\sqrt{y}}$$

A deviated solution is found if the stochastic variable E = X-Y is positive and 0 is less than E. To proceed, we hence need the density function g(E) for E:

$$(48) \quad g(E) = \int_{0}^{1} \frac{e_{X}(y+E) \cdot e_{Y}(y)}{e_{Y}(y)} \frac{dy}{dy} = \frac{1}{e^{2}} \int_{0}^{1} \frac{dy}{(y+E+E)} \frac{dy}{dy}$$

$$= \frac{1}{e^{2}} \log \left( \frac{e^{2}/4}{e^{2}} - \frac{1}{e^{2}} + \frac{1}{e^{2}} \right)$$

where  $B = 6^2/4 - E$ .

As the conditional probability  $P_1^{(i)} \in \mathbb{C} \mid \mathbb{E} \mid 1$  is simply equal to E, we have:

The total probability that the discretization of f(u) implies a nonzero perturbation in the solution is therefore:

$$(50) P\{PS\} = P\{PS \mid S < s\} \cdot P\{S < s\} + P\{PS \mid s < S\} \cdot P\{s < s\}$$

$$\frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x} \frac{\alpha}{256(u_L - u_R)} \left\{ 8\log(2) + 1/6 - \log\left[\frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x} \frac{\alpha}{2(u_L - u_R)}\right] \right\}$$

# The rarefaction wave

 $\simeq$ 

In the same manner as above we have the reference and approximate solutions:

$$(51) \quad v = \begin{cases} u_{R} & OT \ge a_{R} \\ u_{L} & OT \le a_{L} \\ u^{*} & a_{L} < OT < a_{R} \end{cases}$$

$$(52) \quad V = \begin{cases} u_{R} & OT \ge A_{R} \\ u_{L} & OT \le A_{L} \\ U^{*} & A_{L} < OT < A_{R} \end{cases}$$

where  $u^*$  and  $U^*$  are defined by  $a(u^*) = A(U^*) = OT$ 

If we assume the ordering  $a_L \leqslant A_L < a_R \leqslant A_R,$  the situation is depicted in Fig. 14.



The total probability that the discretization of f(u) implies a nonzero perturbation in the solution is therefore:

(50) 
$$P[PS] = P[PS] PS P[S] + P[PS] + P[PS] PS P[S] + P[S] PS P[S] + P[S] PS P[S] + P[S] PS P$$

### The rarefaction wave

In the same manner as above we have the reference and approximate solutions:

$$(51) \quad v = \begin{bmatrix} u_R & 0T & a_R \\ u_L & 0T & a_L \\ u_L & 0T & a_L \\ u_R & 0T & A_R \\ (52) \quad v = \begin{bmatrix} u_R & 0T & A_R \\ u_L & 0T & A_R \\ (53) \quad v = \begin{bmatrix} u_L & 0T & u_R \\ u_L & u_L & u_R \\ u_L & u_R & u_R \\ u_L & u_R & u_R \\ u_R & u_R \\ u_R & u_R & u_R & u_R \\ u_R & u_R & u_R \\ u_R & u_R & u_R \\ u_R & u_R$$

where u\* and U\* are defined by a(u\*) = A(U\*) = OT

If we desume the ordering at  $^{4}$  At  $^{4}$  as  $^{4}$  Ag, the situation is depicted in Fig. (4.



### 8.5

This ordering is discussed in the following, other situations are treated in a similar manner. The deviation due to the discretization of f is then:

$$(53) E = \begin{cases} u_R - U^* & a_R \leq \Theta T \leq A_R \\ U^* - u^* & A_L \leq \Theta T \leq a_R \\ u_L - u^* & a_L \leq \Theta T \leq A_L \end{cases}$$

We take a(u) and A(u) as exact in the node points. (a(u) is really a second order approximation to the derivative of the nonlinearity function.)

The deviation (U\* - u\*) is discussed first, see Fig. 15.



Denoting the difference  $(u_{i+1} - u_i)$  by h, and using the same notation as in the previous section, we have:

(54) OT = A(U\*) = 
$$a_i + \frac{U* - u_i}{h}(a_{i+1} - a_i) =$$
  
=  $a(u*) = a_i + (u* - u_i)a_i + \frac{(u* - u_i)^2}{2}a_i'' + 0[(u*-u_i)^3]$ 

Replacing  $h^2a_i$  by  $\alpha$ , and utilizing the approximation

$$a_{i+1} = a_i + ha_i' + \frac{h^2}{2}a_i'' + O(h^3)$$
 in Eq. (54), we have:

(55) 
$$(U^* - u^*)\frac{\alpha}{h^2} = a_i'' \left\{ \frac{(u^* - u_i)^2}{2} - \frac{(U^* - u_i)h}{2} \right\} + O(h^3)$$

This otdering is discussed in the following, other situations are treated in a similar manner. The deviation due to the discretization of f is then:

$$(53) = \begin{bmatrix} u_R - U^n & a_R < a_I < a_R \\ U^n - u^n & A_L < a_I < a_R \\ u_L - u^n & A_L < a_I < a_R \\ u_L - u^n & a_L < a_I < A_L \end{bmatrix}$$

We take a(u) and A(u) as exact in the node points. (a(u) is really a second order approximation to the derivative of the conlinearity function.)

The deviation (U\* - u\*) is discussed first, see Fig. 15.



Denoting the difference  $(u_{1+1} - u_1)$  by h. and using the same notation as in the previous section, we have:

(34) 
$$GT = A(U^{m}) = a_1 + \frac{Gn - u_1}{b}(a_{1+1} - a_1) =$$

$$[{}_{n}(t_{n-n})]_{0} + {}_{n}^{T_{n}} + {}_{n}^{T_{n}} + {}_{n}^{T_{n}}(t_{n} - s_{n}), + T_{n} = (s_{n})_{n} + {}_{n}$$

Replacing hay by a, and utilizing the approximation

$$a_{1+1} = a_1 + b_{2} + \frac{b^2}{2}a_1^{-1} + 0(b^2) = 1a Eq. (24), we have$$

(55) 
$$(0^* - u^*)_{\frac{1}{12}} = u_1^{u_1} \left( \frac{(u^* - u_1)^2}{2} - \frac{(0^* - u_1)u}{2} \right) + o(u^2)$$

Using the inequality  $(u^* - u_i) \le h$  and solving for  $(U^* - u^*)$  we have

(56) 
$$U^* - u^* \le \frac{O(h^3)}{\frac{\alpha}{h^2} + \frac{h}{2}a_i''} = O(h^2)$$

i.e. the deviation is of the second order, and is therefore comparable with the error inherent in the numerical procedure.

From Fig. 16 we see directly that  $|u_R - U^*| \le |u^* - U^*|$ (as  $a_R < OT < A_R$ ), hence we conclude that the deviation in the rarefaction wave is always of the second order.



Fig. 16.

# The composite wave

The solution of the Riemann problem in this case is composed by shock and rarefaction waves, the mode appointed to the numerical result hence depending on the random variable 0. The deviation in the primitive modes is discussed above, an additional source of error is, however, introduced when we construct the convex or concave hull. As previously mentioned, the exact procedure consists of drawing a tangent from the "right" state to the curve f = f(u). More precisely, the hull is constructed so that  $s_{Rm}$ , the slope of the straight line between points  $(u_R, f_r)$  and  $(u_m, f_m)$  equals the derivative  $a_m = a(u_m)$ . In the numerical procedure, the point  $u_m$  is searched <u>only</u> among candidate node points. The hull will hence be given by the straight line from  $(u_R, F_R)$  to  $(u_M, f_M)$ , where  $u_M$  and the slope  $S_{RM}$  are defined by the expression

(57) 
$$S_{RM} = \max_{i} \frac{f_i - F_R}{u_i - u_R} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{f_M - F_R}{u_M - u_R}$$

Using the inequality  $(u^* - u_1) \leq h$  and solving for  $(U^* - u^*)$  we have

(56) 
$$U^* - u^* < \frac{O(h^3)}{h^2 + \frac{h}{2}t^n} = O(h^2)$$

itat the deviation is of the second order, and is therefore comparable with the error inherent in the numerical procedure.

From Fig. 16 we see directly that  $\log_{10} - \log_{10} < 1$  s = 0\* 1 (as an < 0T < A<sub>R</sub>), hence we conclude that the deviation is the tarefaction wave is always of the second order.



#### The composite wave

The solution of the Riemann problem in this case is composed by shock and rarefaction waves, the mode appointed to the mmerical result bence depending on the random variable 0. The deviation in the primitive modes is discussed above, an additional source of error is, however, introduced when we construct the convex or concave hull. As previously mentioned, the eract procedure consists of drawing a tangent from the "right" state to the curve f = f(u). Hore precisely, the hull is constructed so that  $s_{\rm Hm}$ , the slope of the straight line between points  $(u_{\rm R}, f_{\rm c})$  and  $(u_{\rm m}, f_{\rm m})$  equals the derivative  $a_{\rm m} = a(u_{\rm m})$ . In the numerical procedure, the point  $u_{\rm m}$  is searched only emong the form  $(u_{\rm R}, f_{\rm R})$  to  $(u_{\rm M}, f_{\rm M})$ , where  $u_{\rm H}$  and the slope  $S_{\rm RM}$  are defined by the appression

For simplicity we set  $f_R = F_R$  in the analysis. The case is shown in Fig. 17.

We seek the probability that the deviation between the computed shock velocity  $S_{\rm RM}$  and the reference velocity  $s_{\rm Rm}$  has consequences for the solution of the problem.

By definition,  $s_{Rm}^{} > \, S_{RM^{\bullet}}^{}$  Let h =  $u_m^{}$  -  $u_{M^{\bullet}}^{}$  We then have:

$$S_{RM} = \frac{f_M - f_R}{u_M - u_R} = \frac{a_m(u_m - u_R) + f_M - f_m}{u_M - u_R}$$

$$=> a_{m} \left\{ \frac{u_{m} - u_{R}}{u_{M} - u_{R}} \right\} - S_{RM} = \frac{f_{m} - f_{M}}{u_{M} - u_{R}} = \frac{h \cdot a_{m} - h^{2} a_{m}^{2} / 2}{u_{M} - u_{R}} + O(h^{3})$$

As  $a_m = \frac{f_m - f_R}{u_{11} - u_R} = s_{Rm}$  we hence have:

(58) 
$$s_{Rm} - S_{RM} = -\frac{h^2 a_m}{2(u_m - u_R)} = \frac{k_m^2 \cdot \alpha}{2(u_m - u_R)}$$

 $k_m$  is a uniformly distributed random variable taking values between -1 and +1. In the same manner as by the analysis following Eq. (38), it is easily shown that the probability that a nonzero deviation evolves due to the approximate construction of the hull is given by: For simplicity we set  $f_R = F_R$  in the analysis. The case is shown in Fig. 17.



Fig. 17.

We seek the probability that the deviation between the computed shock velocity S<sub>RH</sub> and the reference velocity s<sub>Rm</sub> has consequences for the solution of the problem.

By definition,  $s_{Bm} > S_{BM}$  . Let  $h = u_m - u_M$ . We then have:

$$S_{RH} = \frac{S_H}{u_H} = \frac{S_m}{u_R} = \frac{M_m}{u_H} \frac{(u_R) + S_H}{u_R} = \frac{K_H}{u_R} = \frac{K_H}{u_R} = \frac{K_H}{u_R}$$

$$= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{u_n - u_n}{u_n - u_n} + \sum_{RH} = \frac{c_n - c_N}{u_N - u_R} = \frac{h^* a_n - h^2 a_n^2 / 2}{u_N - u_R} + O(h^3)$$

$$h = \frac{h}{u_1} - \frac{h}{u_2} = s_{Rm}$$
 we hence have:

(58) 
$$a_{Rm} - b_{RH} = -\frac{n^2 a_{m}}{2(u_{m} - u_{R})} - \frac{k_{m}^2 a_{m}}{2(u_{m} - u_{R})}$$

in is a uniformly distributed random variable taking values between -1 and +1. In the same manner as by the analysis following Eq. (38). It is easily shown that the probability that a nonzero deviation evolves due to the approximate construction of the built is clusted built

(59) 
$$P\{PS\} \simeq \frac{\Delta t}{6\Delta x} \frac{\alpha}{u_m - u_R}$$

# Conclusion

1. The deviation in the rarefaction wave is small and comparable to the error in the numerical method. (The Random Choice Method is close to being second order accurate.) Moreover, it is to be expected that the element of randomization that is inherent in the method will tend to stabilize the small deviations that occur, so that the perturbed solution will in some sense oscillate with the reference solution as mean value. Experience has shown that this is actually the case.

2. A perturbation in the shock wave is observed as a displacement of the shock of magnitude one grid point at a given time step, relative to the reference solution. This displacement is observed to persist for following times, and may in some instances grow larger.

Hence it is of vital interest to choose node points for the discretization of the nonlinearity function so that the probability that a perturbed shift in the shock speed occurs, is as small as possible.

We have found that the discretization process will imply a shift in the shock speed relative to the reference method with probability p. (where p is given e.g. by Eq. (50).) Define q = 1-p, and denote the number of shock discontinuities on a given time level by J. By elementary analysis we infer that the probability that some shock velocity is shifted at the given time step is  $1-q^{J}$ . From the analysis it is clear that a deviation can arise in <u>one</u> of the two half steps only.

After K time steps we hence have a probability  $q^{JK}$  that no shock speed deviates from the reference solution in this time interval. We therefore conclude that the probability that the first shift in the shock speed emerges during the first K time steps is given by:

$$(59) \quad P\{PS\} = \frac{\Delta c}{6dx} \quad \frac{\Delta}{m_{ee}} - \frac{\Delta}{\mu_{R}}$$

#### Conclusion

L. The deviation in the tarefaction wave is small and comparable to the arror is the numerical mathod. (The Aandom Choice Mathod is close to being second order accurate.) Moreover, it is to be expected that the aleaent of randomization that is inherent in the method will tend to stabilize the small deviations that occur, so that the perturbed solution will in some sense oscillate with the reference solution as mean value. Experience has shown that this is actually the case.

2. A percorbation in the shock wave is observed as a displacement of the shock of sugnitude one grid point at a given time step, relative to the reference solution. This displacement is observed to persist for following times, and may in some instances grow larger.

Hence it is of vital interest to choose node points for the discretization of the nonlinearity function so that the probability that a perturbed shift in the shock speed occurs, is as small as possible.

We have found that the discretization process will imply a shift in the shock speed relative to the reference method with probability p. (where p is given e.g. by Eq. (50).) Define q = 1-p, and denote the number of shock discontinuities on a given time level by J. By elementary analysis we infer that the probability that some shock velocity is shifted at the given time step (s-1- $q^2$ . From the analysis it is clear that a deviation can arise to one of the the two is steps

After X time steps we hence have a probability of that no shock speed deviates from the reference solution in this time interval. We therefore conclude that the probability that the first shift in the shock speed emerges during the first X time steps is given by:

(60) P{ PS during K time steps } = 1 -  $q^{J(K-1)}$ 

Demanding that this probability shall be less than a prescribed  $\varepsilon$  and solving for K, gives:

(61) K-1 
$$\ge \frac{\log(1-\varepsilon)}{J \cdot \log(q)}$$

By this expression we can estimate the number of time steps, and hence elapsed time, until the solution deviates from the reference solution, with a level of significance  $\varepsilon$ . As q will depend on the number of nodes in the discretization of f(u), Eq. (61) gives the number of node points necessary to obtain an acceptable solution up to time  $t_K$ , with probability  $(1-\varepsilon)$ .

# Example.

For the fractional flow function defined by Eq. (33) the maximum value of the second derivative f"(u) is approximately 2. An appropriate average value of  $\alpha$  is hence  $\alpha = n^{-2}$ , where n is the total number of discretization node points. Comparing Eqs. (50) and (59), we see that the deviation predicted by Eq.(59) is larger than the one predicted by Eq.(50) as long as n is less than approx. 100, a condition that is fulfilled in practice. Inserting the values we have utilized in our test runs, namely  $\Delta x = .02$ ,  $\Delta t = .009$ , into Eq. (59) gives  $p = 0.15/n^2$ . This value of p is used in Eq. (61) to produce the "stability regions" shown in Fig. 18. (60) P PS during K time steps | = 1 - q<sup>1(K-1</sup>)

Demanding that this probability shall be less than a prescribed 5 and solving for K, gives:

By this expression we can estimate the number of time steps, and hance slapsed time, until the solution deviates from the reference solution, with a level of significance  $\varepsilon$ . As q will depend on the number of nodes in the discretization of f(u), Eq. (b1) gives the number of node points necessary to obtain an acceptable solution up to time  $t_X$ , with probability (1-z).

### Example.

For the fractional flow function defined by Eq. (33) the maximum value of the second derivative f''(a) is approximately 2. An appropriate average value of a is hance  $a = a^{-2}$ , where a is the total number of discretization mode paints. Comparing Eqs. (30) and (59), we see that the deviation predicted by Eq.(39) is (arger than the one predicted by Eq.(50) as long as a is less than approx. 100, a condition that in fulfilled in practice. Inserting the values we have utilized in our test rune, manely  $\Delta x = .02$ ,  $\Delta t = .009$ , into Eq. (59) gives



Fig. 18.

For a given "deviation-free" time interval, the minimum number of nodes demanded is read directly from the figure. a) is for a 1% level of significance, while b) is valid for  $\varepsilon = 0.05$ , the value we have found to be appropriate.

Example runs are shown in Figs. 19 and 20, where the reference solution is shown with a solid line, utilizing the fractional flow function defined by Eq. (33). The dotted curves refer to results obtained using a discrete version of the same function with 10 node points.

A problem with constant initial saturation of u = 0.05 with boundary value u(x=0) = 1.0 is shown in Fig. 19, while the sequence shown in Fig. 20 has a sinusoidal initial saturation.

The first case only permits one shock to emerge, hence we use the curve J = 1 in Fig. 18b). With n = 10 we find  $t_{max} = 0.315$ . This value agrees with the front curves in Fig. 19, where the first deviation in shock position is observed for  $0.243 \le t \le 0.324$ .

For the second case, J = 3, and in the same manner we infer that  $t_{max} = 0.112$ , which is in agreement with the sequence in Fig. 20.





For a given "deviation-free" time interval, the minimum number of nodes demanded is read directly from the figure, a) is for a 1% lavel of significance, while b) is valid for  $\varepsilon = 0.05$ , the value we have found to be appropriate.

Example runs are shown in Figs. 19 and 20, where the reference solution (a shown with a solid line, utilizing the fractional flow function defined by Eq. (33). The dotted curves refer to results obtained using a discrete version of the same function with 10 node points.

A problem with constant initial saturation of u = 0.05 with boundary value u(x=0) = 1.0 is shown in Fig. 19, while the sequence shown in Fig. 20 has a sinusoidal initial saturation.

The first case only permits one shock to emerge, hence we use the curve J = 1 in Fig. 18b). Mish n = 10 we find teax = 0.315. This value agrees with the front curves in Fig. 19, where the first deviation in shock position is observed for 0.243 < r < 0.324.

For the second case, J = 3, and in the same manner we infer that  $r_{max} = 0.112$ , which is in agreement with the sequence in Fig. 20.

From the numerical experiments we have found that the "stability regions" in practice are at least as great as the ones depicted by Eq. (61) with  $\varepsilon = 0.05$ . The results using 10 equidistant node points (Fig. 19) are shown with dashed lines. Utilizing an optimal discretization, the deviation between the reference case and the case n = 10 (opt.) is hardly detectable on the plots (dotted lines). In the same manner, the second case could be treated with a deviation less than the plotter pen thickness with 25 optimally chosen node points.

The criterion for choosing the optimal node points given in the theory may be difficult to use in practice. We recommend the following "rule of the thumb", which successfully has been applied in our test runs: Let d(i) be the maximum normal distance from F(u) to f(u) between node points  $u_i$  and  $u_{i+1}$ . The node points should be chosen so that d(i) is constant as i varies. In addition, it is advantegous to define nodes at the inflection points.

When the number of node points in the given table for the fractional flow function is insufficient, additional points may be determined by interpolation, possibly by inspection of a plotted figure. This is equally well done manually, as the qualitative look of the nonlinear function is the critical property in the procedure. From the numerical experiments we have found that the "stability

regions" in practice are at least as great as the ones depicted by Eq. (61) with  $\varepsilon = 0.05$ . The results using 10 equidistant node points (Fig. 19) are shown with dashed lines. Utilizing an optimal discretization, the deviation between the reference case and the case n = 10 (opt.) is hardly detectable on the plots (dotted lines). In the same manner, the second case could be treated with a deviation less than the plotter pen thickness with 25 optimally chosen node points.

The criterion for choosing the optimal node points given in the theory may be difficult to use in practice. We recommend the following "rule of the thumb", which successfully has been applied in our test runa: Let d(i) be the maximum normal distance from F(u) to f(u) between node points u<sub>i</sub> and u<sub>i+1</sub>. The node points should be chosen so that d(i) is constant as i varies. In addition, it is advantegous to define nodes at the inflection points.

When the number of node points in the given table for the fractional flow function is insufficient, additional points may be determined by interpolation, possibly by inspection of a plotted figure. This is equally well done manually, as the qualitative look of the nonlinear function is the critical property in the procedure.



Saturation distribution versus x for various (nondimensional) times with 10 equidistant node points with 10 optimally chosen node points Solid line: Reference method Dashed line: Discrete f(u) Constant initial saturation

f(u)

Dotted line: Discrete









# 7 The computational procedure.

### 7.1 Permitted fractional flow functions

From Eq. (13) we find that the fractional flow function can be expressed as

(62) 
$$f(u) = \frac{\lambda_w}{\lambda_w + \lambda_o} (1 + C \cdot \lambda_o)$$

where all parameters that are independent of u are collected in the constant C. Fractional flow curves for different values of C are shown in Fig. 21.



Fig. 21.

C = 0 corresponds to horizontal flow, the two upper curves represent downdip flow, and the two lower updip. The effect of gravity is exaggerated, C-values will be significant smaller in practice, except for extremely slow flow.

Example runs with C = 0, +3, and -3 are shown in Fig. 22. In the updip case the downward bend of the fractional flow function is due to gravity. For small values of water saturation a(u) is negative. The oil will hence be opposed to the displacement, and the front velocity is reduced. For larger values of u, a(u) is greater than for

7 The computational procedure.

#### 7.1 Peraitted fractional flow functions

From Eq. (13) we find that the fractional flow function can be

$$(62) \quad f(u) = \frac{1}{\lambda_{v} + \lambda_{v}} (1 + C \cdot \lambda_{v})$$

where all parameters that are independent of u are collected in the constant C. Practional flow curves for different values of C are shown in Fig. 21.



C = 0 corresponds to horizontal flow, the two uppur curves represent downdip flow, and the two lower uplips. The effect of gravity is exeggerated, C-values will be significant smaller in practice, vacept for extremely slow flow.

Example runs with C = 0, +3, and -3 are shown in Fig. 22. In the updip case the downward bend of the fractional flow function is due to gravity. For small values of water saturation a(u) is negative. The oil will hence be opposed to the displacement; and the front relative is reduced. For larger values of u, a(u) is greater than for C = 0. This results in an increased jump in the saturation discontinuity, so that the sample is flooded out with greater efficiency. This is clearly seen in Fig. 22 b).

The upward bend of f(u) in the downdip case also results in an interval near the residual oil region where a(u) is negative. This is due to buoyancy, as a large water volume resides upon the lighter oil, an unstable situation which cannot persist. For small values of u, a(u) is increased compared to the horizontal case, which in this case results in an increased front velocity. In Fig. 22 c) we observe that the saturation is decrased to the stable interval instantaneously at the start of the experiment. The overall result is a rapid, but less efficient flood-out, an intuitively expected result.



C = 0. This results in an increased jump in the saturation discontinuity, so that the sample is flooded out with greater efficiency. This is clearly seen in Fig. 22 b).

The upward bead of f(u) in the downdip case also results in an interval near the realdual oil region where a(u) is negative. This is due to buoyancy, as a large water volume resides upon the lighter, oil, an unstable situation which cannot persist. For small values of u, a(u) is increased compared to the horizontal case, which in this case results in an increased front valecity. In Fig. 22 c) we observe that the start of the experiment. The overall result is a rapid, but less the start of the experiment. The overall result is a rapid, but less efficient flood-out, an intuitively expected result.






Fig. 22









In a real case the range of saturation is restricted by the existence of connate water and residual oil. When the initial saturation is defined within the permitted interval, saturation remains in this interval for all subsequent times. The part of the fractional flow function outside this interval is hence never used in the procedure, and need not be taken account of. Note that the procedure may produce non-possible physical results if initial or boundary values are improperly given, e.g. by defining  $u(x=0) > 1 - S_{or}$ . This is clearly seen in Fig. 23, where we have used North Sea data for relative permeabilities and viscosities to compute f(u). In this case  $S_{wc} =$ 0.05 and  $S_{or} = 0.3$ . The "valid" run, with u(x=0) = 0.7 is shown in Fig. 23 a), in b) we have put u(x=0) equal to 1. Unphysical saturation values occur in the inlet end of the sample, note however that the figures are identical for x > 0.35.



Fig. 23

In a real case the range of saturation is restricted by the existence of connate water and residual oil. When the initial saturation is defined within the permitted interval, saturation remains in this interval for all subsequent times. The part of the fractional flow function outside this laterval is hence never used in the procedure, and need not be taken account of. Note that the procedure may produce improperly given, e.g. by defining  $u(x=0) > 1 - S_{0T}$ . This is clearly seen in Fig. 23, where we have used North Ses data for relative permeabilities and viscostities to compute f(u). In this case  $S_{0T} =$ 0.05 and  $S_{0T} = 0.3$ . The "valid" run, with u(x=0) = 0.7 is shown in Fig. 23 a), in b) we have put u(x=0) equal to 1. Unphysical securation figures are identical for x > 0.35.



F1g. 23

3.6

From the foregoing argument we conlude that all occuring situations are covered if we permit f(u) to have at most one interior extremal point and two inflection points. This restriction is pleasant from a computational viewpoint, as the construction of a general hull (with both tangent points unknown) is avoided. This task is not at all straightforward, and may consume appreciable processor time. (See e.g. Graham<sup>14</sup>.) Whenever a hull is constructed in the procedure, the hull will hence be a line from a known point on F(u) that touches F. To speed up the computation, the tangent points are only searched among candidate node points. As shown in the theory, this approximation is consistent with other approximations that enter the procedure.

# 7.2 Algorithm.

The computer program is split into two parts, a preprosessor and the main program.

# 7.2.1 The Preprosessor.

In advance of passing input data to the main procedure, the nonlinearity function is handled by a separate routine, which returns the differential a(u) = f'(u) and a classification vector.

For consistency reasons, a(u) is evaluated by a second order difference formula. Nevertheless, false "oscillations" in f(u) may be evaluated by this routine, mainly in the intervals with water saturation less than connate water, and oil saturation less than residual oil.

As a (u) is generally discontinuous at  $u = S_{wc}$  and  $u = 1 - S_{or}$ , a(u) may be poorly evaluated at these points, which may have great significance in the procedure. This weakness can be met by utilizing the property that only node points within the interval  $[S_{wc}, 1-S_{or}]$ enter the computation, hence allowing for an arbitrary definition of f(u) outside this interval, affecting the evaluation of a(u) only. From the loregoing argument we coolude that all occuring situations are covered if we permit ((u) to have at most one interior extremal polat and two inflection polata. This restriction is pleasant from a computational viewpoint, as the construction of a general huli (with both taugent points unknown) is availed. This task is not at all straightforward, and may consume appreciable processor time. (See e.g. Graham<sup>10</sup>.) Whenever a hull is constructed in the procedure, the hull speed up the computation, the tangent points are only scarched among consistent with other approximations in the procedure for the consistent with other approximations that enter the procedure is no consistent with other approximations that enter the procedure.

# 7.2 Algorithm.

The computer program is split into two parts, a <u>preprozessor</u> and the main program.

# .2.1 The Freprosessor.

In advance of passing input data to the main procedure, the nonlinearity function is handled by a separate routine, which returns the differential a(u) = 1°(u) and a classification vector.

For consistency reasons, a(u) is evaluated by a second order difference formula. Severthelass, false "escillations" in f(a) may be evaluated by this routine, mainly in the intervals with water saturation less than connate water, and oil saturation less than residual oil.

As a (u) is generally discontinuous as  $u = S_{uc}$  and  $u = 1 - S_{cr}$  a(u) may be poorly evaluated at these points, which may have great significance in the procedure. This weekness that he net by utilizing the property that only node points within the interval  $\{S_{uc}, 1^{+}S_{or}\}$ enter the computation, hence allowing for an arbitrary definition of f(u) outside this interval, affective the evaluation of a(u) only.

τ¢.

The classification vector is a string containing information on the inflection points of f(u), the zones where f is concave resp. convex, and indices of the u-values included in each zone.

At this point the significance of using linear interpolation when evaluating f-values between node points should be mentioned. One could a priori assume that a better algorithm could be constructed by using a higher order curve-fit to approximate f(u), e.g. a spline function. Such a procedure will inevitably introduce "false" inflection points and thereby superfluous convex/concave zones, which in turn will have a tremendous effect on the results. We use <u>only</u> the node values of f to construct the "classification vector", thereby guaranteeing that the correct <u>wavetype</u> is found for each Riemann problem. Errors introduced by the procedure will hence affect only wave speeds, not types, and the qualitative picture of the evolution is preserved.

Results from the preprosessor are written to a "metafile", which in turn is redirected as input to the next task. This can be either the main program, or normally an "analyzer", which plots the output information (f(u), a(u), inflection points and zones) for inspection. With some experience, knowledge of the fractional flow function and the initial saturation is sufficient to estimate the number of shocks that will evolve in the process. The theory then provides the appropriate number of node points in the discretization. Inspection of the preprosessor output allows one to accept the discretization and classification, reject the results and start from scratch, or most often accept the results after manually adjusting some quantities. Our experience is that a(u) frequently needs some "refreshing" in critical regions. On rarer occasions it may be desireable to move the inflection points slightly. (Superfluous or missing inflection points have never occured in our runs.)

Whether the preprosessor output data have been adjusted or not, the next stage is to use the metafile as input for the main program. The advantage with the preprosessor, aside the possibility of having influence on the handling of the nonlinearity function, is that normally a series of problems will be run with the same fractional flow function. The preprosessor is then used only prior to the first numerical experiment. The classification vector is a string containing information on the inflection points of f(a), the sones where f is concave resp. convex,

At this point the significance of using linear interpolation when evaluating f-values between node points should be mentioned. One could a priori assume that a better algorithm could be constructed by using a higher order curve-fit to approximate f(u), e.g. a spline function. Such a procedure will inevitably incroduce "false" inflection points and thurshy superfluous conver/concave gones, which in turn will have a cremendous effect on the results. We use <u>only</u> the node values of f to construct the "classification vector", thereby guaranteeing that the correct waverype is found for each Riemann problem. Errors introduced by the procedure will hence affect only wave speeds, not

Results from the preprocessor are vritten to a "metafile", which in turn is redirected as isput to the next task. This can be either the dain program, or normally an "analyzer", which plots the antput histormation (f(a), a(a), isfiection points and zones) for inspection, with some experience, knowledge of the fractional flow function and that unitial saturation is sufficient to estimate the number of shocks appropriate number of node points in the discruitation. Inspection of the ampropriate number of node points in the discruitation. Inspection of classification, reject the results and start from scratch, or most elassification, reject the results and start from scratch, or most appropriate number 'occasions it may be desirentie to cove the sate time the results aligntly. (Superflucous or alssing inflaction points indication points aligntly. (Superflucous or alssing inflaction points have never occured in our rons.)

Whether the proprosessor output data inve been adjusted or not. the next stage is to use the metallie as input for the main program. The advantage with the preprosessor, saids the possibility of having influence on the handling of the monitmentity function, is that accounty a series of problems will be run with the same fractional fior function. The preprosessor is then used only prior to the first

8.6

The structure of the procedure, with

preprosessor -> analyzer -> graphics output -> adjustment -> main prog, possibly skipping some of the steps, is extremely well suited for the "redirection" and "piping" facilities of the Unix operating system, in which any route we may choose among the mentioned is simply treated with a single command. Although more commands may be necessary, the structure should nevertheless easily be adapted on any system.

# 7.2.2 The main program.

The dominating part of the procedure is the calculation of the solution to the Riemann problem. For each time step a random number is drawn, and passed as argument to a sequence of calls to the procedure Riemann, one call for each grid point. The first part of this procedure classifies the configuration, determined by the positions of  $u_L$  and  $u_R$ . The configuration type (0 - 16) is passed to a procedure which evaluates the appropriate solution according to the parameters determined by the wavetype.

A flow chart for the configuration type classification is shown in Fig. 24, the 16 different nonconstant configuration types that can occur in Fig. 25, and the possible wavetypes in Fig. 26.

Abbreviations used in Fig. 24 are defined as follows:

 $\begin{array}{c} f_{R} \mbox{ concave :} & f \mbox{ is concave in the region surrounding } f_{R} \\ \hline zone_{R} = zone_{L} : & u_{R} \mbox{ and } u_{L} \mbox{ lie in the same concave/convex zone} \\ \hline \hline Convex \mbox{ hull: } & Construct \mbox{ the convex hull with slope SRM from } u_{R} \\ \hline SRM & to F(u), \mbox{ touching } F \mbox{ in the point } u_{M} \end{array}$ 

"T" and "F" by the "choice-boxes" point to the appropriate route to follow, according to whether the statement in the box is true or false.

The structure of the procedure, with

preprosessot -> analyzer -> graphics output -> adjustment -> main prog possibly skipping some of the steps, is extremely well suited for the "redirection" and "piping" facilities of the Unix operating system, in which any routs we may choose among the mentioned is simply treated with a single command. Although more commands may be necessary, the structure should nevertheless savily be adapted on any system.

## 7.2.2 The main program.

The dominating part of the procedure is the calculation of the solution to the Kiemann problem. For each time step a random number is drawn, and passed as argument to a sequence of calls to the procedure <u>Riemann</u>, one call for each grid point. The first part of this procedure of and ug. The <u>configuration type</u> (0 - 10) is passed to a procedure which evaluates the appropriate solution according to the parameters determined by the parameters

A flow chart for the configuration type classification is shown in Fig. 24, the 16 different nonconstant configuration types that can occur in Fig. 25, and the possible wavetypes in Fig. 26.

Abbreviations used in Fig. 24 are defined as follows:

"I" and "F" by the "chatce-boxes" point to the appropriate route to

In Fig. 25 the locations of occurring inflection points are shown by solid circles. Hull tangents are drawn with a solid line when they are explicitly used in the procedure, elsewise the tangents are dashed.

Evaluation of the rarefaction wave requires the solution of a nonlinear equation GT =  $A(U^*)$ . As A is approximated by a polygon line, this equation is explicite once the node indices on each side of the root is known. Search for particular indices also enter the routine for construction of hulls. The procedure that determines the desired nodes must hence be efficient, as it is frequently called. The search interval is first restricted by knowledge of the configuration, and the desired index is then found by binary search. The combined work to determine the appropriate index and evaluate U\* is nevertheless less time consuming than the direct solving of a nonlinear equation. Such an angle of attack is mandatory when f(u) is explicitly given, as in the reference method. In this case we use an efficient root-solver, the so-called Illinois-routine<sup>6</sup>, a modified version of the "regula falsi" method.

# 8 Conclusion.

The Random Choice Method can be successfully applied also to cases where the fractional flow function is defined in terms of a table, if only the table values provide sufficient information on the qualitative behaviour of the displacement process. Knowledge of the physics in the model we endeavor to simulate permits the inclusion of these characteristics in the nonlinear function by manual adjustment when the given table contains an insufficient number of node points. The most general fractional flow functions occuring in practice are treated with the same ease as those studied hitherto in the litterature. Although the computer programs are more complicated than the reference programs, only small portions of the programs are used for the solution of each Riemann problem, thus the processor time is not increased. On the contrary, the test runs indicate that the discretization implies a reduction in CPU-time, as the solution of nonlinear equations is avoided.

In Fig. 25 the locations of occurring inflection points are shown by solid circles. Hull tangents are drawn with a solid line when they are explicitely used in the procedure, elsewise the tangents are dashed.

Evaluation of the carefaction wave requires the solution of a nonlinear equation  $\Im$  -  $A(U^{4})$ . As A is approximated by a polygon line, this equation is explicite once the node indices on each side of the root is known. Search for particular indices also enter the routine for construction of hulis. The procedure that determines the desired addes must hence be efficient, as it is frequently called. The search interval is first restricted by knowledge of the configuration, and determine the appropriate index and evaluate  $U^{4}$  is nevertheless less the desired index is then found by binary search. The combined work to determine the appropriate index and evaluate  $U^{4}$  is nevertheless less the reference method. In this case we use an efficient root-spiver, the reference method. In this case we use an efficient foot-spiver, athe so-called illinois-routine<sup>6</sup>, a modified version of the "regula faist" method.

# 8 Conclusion.

The Mandom Choice Method can be successfully applied also to cases where the fractional flow function is defined in terms of a table, if only the table values provide sufficient information on the qualitative behaviour of the displacement process. Knowledge of the physics in the model we andeavor to simulate permits the inclusion of these characteristics in the nonlinear function by manual adjustment of the most general fractional flow functions occuring in practice are treated with the same ease as those studied hitharto in the flitterature. Although the computer programs are nore complicated than the reference programs, only small portions of the programs are used for the solution of each Alemann problem, thus the programs are used discretization implies a reduction in GPU-time, as the solution of

40



Fig. 24



N. 9



Wave type	Sd	Sd	C-1d	Rđ	Rd	Sd	C-2d	Sd
Configuration		u u u	L M M M M	u L	u M	n n m	с	u u u
Configuration TYPE	-2d - Ro	2	e la	4	Q	9	7	æ

Fig. 25





57.5. 32

Crypt	Wave type	Pos. in x-t plan	Qualitative shape
	Increasing waves		
Si	Shock	u <sub>L</sub> / u <sub>R</sub>	
Ri	Rarefaction	u <sub>L</sub> u* u <sub>R</sub>	
C-li	Composite. Shock followed by rarefaction	u <sub>L</sub> u <sup>*</sup> u <sub>R</sub>	
C-2i	Composite. Rarefaction followed by shock	u <sub>L</sub> u <sup>*</sup> u <sub>R</sub>	
C-3i	Composite. Two shocks separated by rarefaction	u <sub>L</sub> u <sup>*</sup> u <sub>R</sub>	
	Decreasing waves	68-171	
Sd	Shock	u <sub>L</sub> / u <sub>R</sub>	ear Hyperbolk
	8 Theoretical Pro		L Results for
Rd	Rarefaction	u <sub>L</sub> u* u <sub>R</sub>	
	9. J. Glimm, D. Marchesin, O. Hel		Nold Dragates:
C-1d	Composite. Shock followed by rarefaction	u <sub>L</sub> u* u <sub>R</sub>	
C-2d	Composite. Rarefaction followed by shock	u <sub>L</sub> u <sup>*</sup> u <sub>R</sub>	

Classification of possible wave types emerging from the permitted class of fractional flow functions.

In the x-t charts a thin line represents continuous transition from a constant state into a rarefaction wave. A heavy line separates two adjacent states by a shock discontinuity. The waves in the rightmost column are travelling to the right.

Classification of possible wave types emerging from the permitted class of fractional flow functions.

In the x-t charts a thin line represents continuous transition from a constant state into a rarefaction wave. A heavy line suparatas two adjacent states by a shock discontinuity. The waves in the rightmost column are travelling to the right

# References

	1.	A.J. Chorin:	Random Choice Solution of Hyperbolic Systems J Comp Phys <u>22</u> (1976) 517-533
	2.	-	Random Choice Methods with Applications to Reacting Gas Flow J Comp Phys <u>25</u> (1977) 253-272
	3.	P. Lötstedti	The Instability of Fronts in a Porous Medium Comm Math Phys <u>91</u> (1983) 103-116
	4.	P. Concus, W.	Proskurowski: Numerical Solutions of a Nonlinear Hyperbolic Equation by the Random Choice Method J Comp Phys <u>30</u> (1979) 153-166
	5.	C.M. Dafermos:	Polygonal Approximations of Solutions of the Initial Value Problem for a Conservation Law J Math Anal Appl <u>38</u> (1972) 33-41
	6.	M. Dowell & P.	Jarratt: A Modified Regula Falsi Method for Computing the Root of an Equation BIT <u>11</u> (1971) 168-171
	7.	J. Glimm:	Solutions in the Large for Nonlinear Hyperbolic Systems of Equations Comm Pure Appl Math <u>XVIII</u> (1965) 697-715
	8.	J. Smoller:	Theoretical Problems and Numerical Results for Nonlinear Conservation Laws Contemporary Mathematics Vol 17 (1983) 1-8
	9.	J. Glimm, D. M	Marchesin, O. McBryan: Statistical Fluid Dynamics: Unstable Fingers Comm Math Phys <u>74</u> (1980) 1-13
]	.0.	-	Unstable Fingers in Two Phase Flow Comm Pure Appl Math <u>XXXIV</u> (1981) 53-75
]	11.	-	A Numerical Method for Two Phase Flow with an Unstable Interface J Comp Phys <u>39</u> (1981) 179-200
]	12.	J. Glimm, D. N	Marchesin, O. McBryan, E. Isaacson: Front Tracking for Hyperbolic Systems Adv Appl Math 2 (1981) 91-119

#### References

12. J. Glimm, D. Marchesin, O. McBryan, E. Isaacson: Front Tracking for Hyperbolic Systems Adv Appl Math 2 (1981) 91-119

- 13. J. Glimm, B. Lindquist, O. McBryan, B. Plohr, S. Yaniv: Front Tracking for Petroleum Reservoir Simulation Proc 7. SPE Symp Res Sim (1983) 41-49
- 14. R.L. Graham: An Efficient Algorithm for Determining the Convex Hull of a Finite Planar Set. Inform Proc Lett 1 (1972) 132-133

15. A. Harten: The Artificial Compression Method for Computation of Shocks and Contact Discontinuities. I. Single Conservation Law Comm Pure Appl Math XXX (1977)

16. P. Lötstedt: A Front Tracking Method Applied to Burger's Equation and Two Phase Porous Flow J Comp Phys 47 (1982) 211-228

17. O.A. Oleinik: Discontinuous Solutions of Nonlinear Differential Equations Amer Math Soc Transl Ser 2 26 (1957) 95-172

18.

Uniqueness and a Stability of the Generalized Solution of the Cauchy Problem for a Quasilinear Equation Amer Math Soc Transl Ser 2 33 (1964) 285-290

19. J. Paulsen: Impact of Random Number Generators in Time Series Monte Carlo Simulation Stat Report 5 Dept Math, Univ of Bergen

20. J.A. Sethian, A.J. Chorin, P. Concus: Numerical Solution of the Buckley-Leverett Equations Proc 7. SPE Symp Res Sim (1983) 197-204

21. J. Smoller: St

Shock Waves and Reaction-Diffusion Equations Springer Verlag 1983

antion of a stationary Romates ant set of a stationary Romates

on in the second second

1. Jan Kasa Lainapins induisi y ile des tainapins induisi y ile dependent induisi y ile dependent induisi Minimeri concels for arises get, by 1973.

Anno elle segurit Merindiation about constant mainfilos derring in simor flows to refratified, sobur presentate and simote livide dance elle 14. R.L. Grahan: Proof N. SPE Symp Res Sin (1953) 51-49 an efficient Algorithm for Anternating the Convex indi of a Finite Planar Sar. Inform Fron Lett 1 (1971) 132-133 and the Artificial Compression Mathed For Compatanton of Shocks and Contact MissionLand for Compatantion 15. A. Harten: 16. P. Lätetedei 20. Shocks and Contact MissionLand for Compatantion 17. O.A. OleIndia: 17. O.A. OleIndia: 18. -19. J. Pauleen: 19. J. Pauleen: 19. J. Pauleen: 19. J. Pauleen: 19. J. Pauleen: 10. J. Sciller and Stand Son Panel Sor 2 11 (1954) 255-290 Sciller Son Panel Son Panel Sor 2 11 (1954) 255-290 Sciller Son Panel Son Panel Sor 2 11 (1954) 255-290 Sciller Son Panel Son Panel Sor 2 11 (1954) 255-290 Sciller Son Panel Son Panel Sor 2 11 (1954) 255-290 Sciller Son Panel Son Panel Son 2 11 (1954) 255-290 Sciller Son Panel Son Panel Son 2 11 (1954) 255-290 Sciller Son Panel Son Panel Son 2 11 (1954) 255-290 Sciller Son Panel Son Panel Son 2 11 (1954) 255-290 Sciller Son Panel Son 2 10 (1954) 255-290 Son Panel Simulation Son Panel Son 1 Son Panel Son 2 11 (1954) 255-290 Son Panel Simulation Son Panel Son 1 Son Panel Son 2 11 (1954) 255-290 Son Panel Simulation Son Panel Simulation Son Panel Simulation Son Panel Son 1 Son Panel Son 2 11 (1954) 255-290 Son Panel Simulation Son Panel Simulation

Buckley-Leverett Equations Proc 7. SPE Symp Res Sim (1983) 197-205

11. J. Smoller: Shock waves and Reaction-Dittusion Equations Springer Variag 1983

# REPORTS PUBLISHED BY THE

# DEPARTMENT OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS

# UNIVERSITY OF BERGEN

# BERGEN, NORWAY

No. l. A. Kildal and S. Tjøtta. On acoustic streaming in magnetohydrodynamics, February 1964.

No. 2. G. Berge. On the stability of a magnetized plasma with a continuous density force field, June 1964.

No. 3. J. Falnes. Coaxial waveguide consisting of a circular metal tube surrounding a coaxial unidirectionally conducting sheet. August 1965.

No. 4. K.B. Dysthe. On nonlinear interaction between two beams of plane electromagnetic waves in an anisotropic medium, December 1964.

No. 5. K.J. Overholt. Extended Aitken acceleration. March 1965.

No. 6. G. Berge. On the stability of a rotating plasma from the two fluid equations including finite radius of gyration effects, May 1965.

No. 7. A. Svardal. On acoustical streaming between two coaxial cylinders, May 1965.

No. 8. K.B. Dysthe. On convective and absolute instability, November 1965.

No. 9. L. Engevik. On linear and non-linear hydromagnetic vortex motion generated by the interaction of a gravity wave with a solid boundary, April 1966.

No. 10. S. Tjøtta. Some non-linear effects in sound fields, July 1966.

No. 11. L. Engevik. On a stability problem in hydrodynamics. Part I, November 1966.

No. 12. L. Engevik. On the stability of plane inviscid Couette flow, November 1966.

No. 13. L. Engevik. On a stability problem in hydrodynamics. Part II, January 1967.

Report NTNF. L. Storesletten. On non-linear magneto-hydrodynamic wave motion in dissipative media, September 1967.

No. 14. K.B. Dysthe. Self-trapping and self-focusing of electromagnetic waves in a plasma, May 1968.

Report no. 15 not written.

No. 16. K.B. Dysthe. Force on a small inclusion in a standing acoustic wave, July 1968.

No. 17. A. Svardal and S. Tjøtta. Öscillatory viscous flows in the vicinity of a cylinder, June 1969.

No. 18. A.H. Oien and J. Naze Tjøtta. Kinetic theory of a weakly coupled and weakly inhomogeneous gas, June 1969.

No. 19. M.S. Espedal. Hydrodynamic equations for a F.L.R. plasma, August 1969.

No. 20. J. Naze Tjøtta and A.H. Øien. Kinetic theory of a weakly coupled and weakly inhomogeneous plasma in a magnetic field. August 1969.

No. 21. K.S. Eckhoff. On stability. Part I: General theory. November 1969.

No. 22. K.S. Eckhoff. On stability. Part II: Linear problems, December 1969.

No. 23. K.S. Eckhoff. On stability. Part III: The energy principle in MHD, December 1969.

No. 24. K.B. Dysthe. On the stability of a cylindrical surface-film, December 1969.

No. 25. M.S. Espedal. The effects of ion-ion collision on a ion-acoustic plasma pulse, April 1970.

No. 26. A.H. Oien. Derivation of kinetic equations of a plasma using a multiple time and space scale method, September 1970.

No. 27. K.S. Eckhoff. On stability. Part IV: Nonlinear partial differential equations, October 1970.

No. 28. O. Faltinsen and S. Tjøtta. Interaction between sound waves propagating in the same direction, April 1971.

No. 29. T. Leversen and J. Naze Tjøtta. Solution of a stationary Fokker-Plank equation, June 1971.

No. 30. E. Meland. Application of the Galerkin's method on the problem of cellular convection induced by surface tension gradients, November 1971. No. 31. S. Missen-Meyer. A note on the problem of reversibility of mathematical models. (Preliminary issue.), December 1971.

No. 32. L. Hinderaker. On the foundations of the method of matched asymptotic approximations to two meeting orthogonal boundary-layers, December 1971.

No. 33. A. Bertelsen, A. Svardal and S. Tjøtta Non-linear streaming effects associated with oscillating cylinders, December 1971.

No. 34. S. Nisson-Meyer. Some theorems on the problem of reversibility of mathematical models. (This report is a revised issue of report no. 31.), April 1972.

No. 35. I. Eidhammer. A minimum resource sorting method, June 1972.

No. 36. T.O. Espelid. On the behaviour of the secant method near a multiple root, September 1971.

No. 37. H.B. Drange. The linearized Boltzmann collision operator for cut-off potentials, December 1972.

No. 38. J. Naze Tjøtta and S. Tjøtta Sur le transport de masse produit par des oscillations en milieu compressible, dissipatif et inhomogene, December 1972.

No. 39. M. Aksland. On the twodimentional birth and death process with mutation, January 1973

No. 40. A. H. Cien. Kinetic theory for evolution of a plasma in external electromagnetic fields toward a state characterized by balance of forces transverse to the magnetic field, April 1973.

No. 41. H.B. Drange. On the Boltzmann equation with external forces. April 1973.

No. 42. J. Naze Tjøtta and <u>5. Tjøtta</u>. On the mass transport induced by time-dependent oscillations of finite amplitude in a nonhomogeneous fluid. I General results for a perfect gas, May 1973.

No. 43. L. Engevik. Pertubation about neutral solutions occuring in shear flows in stratified, incompressible and viscid fluids, June 1973.

## REPORTS PUBLISHED BY THE

## DEPARTMENT OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS

#### UNIVERSITY OF BERGEN

BERGEN NORWAY

No. 1. A. Milidal and S. Tierra. On accuatic arreaalog in angherohydrodynamica, february 1964.

Ho. 2. G. herge. On the statility of a sugnation plasma with a continuous deseicy forces field, Juna 1956.

(a. b. is folgen, bargai wavaquide consisting of sirraist metal tube mercunding saxial unitractiongily conducting sheet, August 1963.

No. -- S. A. Systha. No monither interaction bitment two impacts interaction bitment interaction and subscriptic estimation. Normaber 1964.

> Mor S. E.J. Overbals. Extended Altres acceleration. March 1965.

no. 61 6. 19739; 61 chu atability of a rotating fiama from the fun finid equations feeleding listis redut of presion siferen, may 1365.

Me. 7: A. Drarazi. A. scoutical streaming between Eug costal criindere, May 1965.

> Mar & S. B. Dractor. De convective and absoluce Locability, Naviabar 1953.

No. 10. N. 7,8679. None conditors ellects to mound fields. July 1965.

> 10. (). L. Lagevik. 10. a stability gradies in bydrodynamics. fart 1. November (965.

> > No. 12. L. Esperit. As the stability of plane invited Coupts flow, Seventer 1966.

No. 13. 1. Fagerix. Os a stabillir problem in hydrodynamics. Perc 11. January 1965.

heners him i. Soureelerse. Do nos-iinee magestarbydtaheningte ive?

> No. (- . . ). No strano (- . . . ). San all-facuates of electromagness and anit-facuates of glasma, tag 19ab.

> > Supers na. 15 not weitred.

No. 15. E.S. Dusting Force on a shall inclusion to a standing accounts where July 196

Vor 11. A. Svardal and 5. Tjarra. Userilatory viscous figus in fim

10. 18. A.H. Oken and J. Marn Tinria Kinetic theory of a weekly coupled and 1960.

> Mo. 19. ii.d. Sayning. Nydrodynamic aquatinas for a Privel plants, insacr 1909.

No. 10. 1. Ners Classe and A.H. Orm Winerso (Newers of a vestig volume is and weakly interaceptaneous plasmit is a suprote field

> No. 21, K.S. Eaknoff. On scabilley. Part 1 Canucal chaoty November 1969.

No. 11. K.S. Schneff. On stability. Part 11: Under problems December 1963.

30. 21. 20 2. Activet. 30. stability. 34rt 111: The energy principle (a 1960. Secender 1969.

Mr. 24. K. S. Dyerne. An the architiky of a critedrical successfully. December 1999.

No. 25. M.S. Especial Side effects of Person collination and a Personantic planear pulse, Special 1970.

ho est and other. Heringerich of Lamerick reputerions of a pissue the source of the source of the space resis method. Ropember 1970.

> De attaility De attaility Date IV Bolicer parelai Alfferential equations October (200

Internet in faithern and 5. Tister, Interneting between sound waves proceeding in the ward differing Anril 1971.

bor 28. It inverses and 2. More Elected

bei De Veland. Austication of the Galactia's method on the galacticatic conversion tablesed by turkets tablaton gradients, the manket [97].

No. 11. 5. 21 9420-16 years h mote ad the proving of coveralbility of astronautical models. (Presidently (soud-).

19. 12. de di nineraker. On ein faundelions el che mechad of michiel assuptation apprantamationa de los anering urtragental benedery darers. Desember 1971.

to 10, 6, <u>Bertelen, A. Borerst</u> new Joseph Marminda Marminda Associated outs catiliaring cylinders, Borestor 1971.

Mo. 260 S. Makers Three . Man Chartens of the Aradian of activities and a second for models (This second on 10.1 April 602)

99-13. (. Einfluiner. 4 minimum reagnized marting marked Tuna 1975.

na in anti anti a contra a n the contractor al the metant ather over a matriale root. aptember 1971.

b) 17. 8.3. Trends. The linewrings fullmann calletan basenor is burnik pountials.

10.10 Mark Transa and N. Takes and the remembers de ansam preduct and the negative compression desautant at intercompress Security 1972.

> in <u>1997, 1997, Australia</u> In the secondance react becco ben destroperation Materia VIII.

30. 10. 1. 0. 0. 2002 a Minacia cianty int evaluation of a plaining in taitathal electric magnetic cialita compart a cast cinerecterized by taitance of nortcas transvester to the approximation cialit, april 1972.

no. <u>Als B.B. Dranne</u> Un tim Soltmann squatlog vice ceturnal increas April 1833.

Ten tin Ar Mar Terring An tin Value transport inveded a time value transport interemi time evaluation and a netimergeneous fluid. I fematai temalai fat a method gan tar (97).

11. 11. 11. 100000 . "Writing the store insuration to be iden store in the store inve in screeting in the screation and visit fluids. Inve 1933. No. 44. J. Naze Tjøtta and S. Tjøtta. On the mass transport induced by time-dependent oscillations of finite amplitude in a nonhomogeneous fluid. II General results for a liquid. August 1973.

No. 45. C.Dahl and S. Storøy. Enumeration of vertices in the linear programming problem, October 1973.

No. 46. M. S. Espedal. The effects of trapped and untrapped particles on an electrostatic wave packet. December 1973.

No. 47 M. S. Espedal. A procedure to solve the Fokker-Planck - Poisson equations consistently, April 1974

No. 48. E. Mjølhus. Application of the reductive perturbation method to long hydromagnetic waves parallel to the magnetic field in a cold plasma, May 1974.

No. 49. K. S. Eckhoff. The propagation of discontinuities for linear hyperbolic partial differential equations, August 1974.

No. 50. T. O. Espelid. An algorithm for internal merging of two subsets with small extra storage requirements, September 1974.

No. 51. E. Mæland. Mass transport induced by wave motion in a rotating fluid, October 1974.

No. 52. I.S. Helland. A random exchange model with constant decrements, December 1974.

No. 53. A. H. Cien. On the evolution of a two component, two temperature, fully ionized plasma in electromagnetic fields, January 1975.

No. 54. K.S. Eckhoff. Stability problems for linear hyperbolic systems, May 1975. No. 55. K. S. Eckhoff. On stability in ideal compressible hydrodynamics, May 1975.

No. 56. L. Storesletten. A note on the stability of horizontal shear flow of an inviscid compressible fluid, July 1975.

No. 57. K. S. Eckhoff and L. Storesletten. On the stability of shear flow in a rotating compressible and inviscid fluid, July 1975.

No. 58. E.N. Håland and C. Berge. Dynamic stabilization of the m = l instability in a diffuse linear pinch, July 1975.

No. 59. E. Mæland. Mass transport induced by wave motion in a stratified and rotating fluid, August 1975.

No. 60. T. O. Espelid. On replacement-selection and Dinsmore's improvement, August 1975.

No. 61. L. Storesletten. A note on the stability of steady inviscid helical gas tlows, January 1976.

No. 62. E. Mæland. A time-dependent model of coastal currents and upwelling, June 1976.

No. 63. A. H. Oien. Corrections to classical kinetic and transport theory for a twotemperature, fully ionized plasma in electromagnetic fields, June 1977.

No. 64. S. D. Flåm. Convergence in law of a series of  $\phi$ -mixing random variables implies convergence in probability, August 1977.

No. 65. A. H. Dien. Kinetic equation for an electron gas (non-neutral) plasma in strong fields and inhomogenities, June 1978. No. 66. H. Hobæk and S. Tjøtta. Theory of parametric acoustic arrays, July 1978.

No. 67. T.O. Espelid. On floating-point summation, December 1978.

No. 68. E.N. Håland. Stability of an inverted pendulum with hard spring and oscillating support, December 1978.

No. 69. S. Storøy. An efficient least distance algorithm based on a general quadratic programming method, November 1979.

No. 70. L. E. Engevik. Amplitude evolution equation for linearly unstable modes in stratified shear flows, November 1979.

No. 71. F. Oliveira-Pinto. Argument reduction for elementary mathematical functions : An overview, July 1980.

No. 72. A. H. Oien. A quasi moment description of the evolution of an electron gas towards a state dominated by a reduced transport equation, September 1980.

J. Berntsen. User-documentation. Program HALF. A subroutine for numerical evaluation of three-dimensional complex integrals, spring 1983.

No. 73. S.I. Aanonsen. Numerical computation of the nearfield of a finite amplitude sound beam, September 1983.

No. 74. L.K. Sandal. Influence of equilibrium flows on viscous tearing modes, December 1983.

No. 75. 0. Pettersen. The nearfield of a high frequency amplitude shaded baffled piston. An analytical/numerical investigation, July 1981.

No. 76. Ø. Pettersen. Numerical solution of the Buckley-Leverett equation with a general fractional flow function, November 1984.

ISSN-0084-778X Department of Applied Mathematics University of Bergen Allágaten 53-55, 5000 Bergen, Norway.

 Tjøtta.
Tjøtta.
The masa transport induced by time-dependent onciliations of ninhomogeneous fisids.
Ti Genetal remits for a liquid.
August 1973.

No. . 4 5. G. Dant and 5. Storay . Enumeration of vertices in the linear programming problem. Detober 1973.

> No. 46. N. 5. Sapodal The effects at trabled and untraped particles on an alectrostatic veve packat. Datambar 1973.

Mo. 47 M. 5: Especial A procedure to solve the Faveer Plance - Foleson equations consistencity, april 1975

c) bil 5. Nalbus: (poincation of the reductive percarbasion method to long updromagnatic waves parailal to the magnetic fiele in a cold plasma. (a) 1976.

ta, 43, 2, 5, Schloff, the propagation of discontinuitios to: linear hyperbolic partial differential equations, August (324

Mo. <sup>9</sup>C. 7. O. <u>Espelis</u>. An algorithm for internal merging of two rubacts with small safet atomage requirements, September 1974.

> No. 31. 5. Mmland. Mass transport induced by vava mation in a rotating fiuld. October 19741

> > No. 52, 1.3. Helland. A randou exchange nudel wir constant decrements. December 1974.

Mo. 13, A. H. Disa. On the evalution of a two component, two temperature, tully toniced plame in electronage have troub, innuer 1975.

> M. R. S. Eckhoff.
> Stability problems for linear hyperbolic systems, May 1995.

Mai 23. K. 3. Eckhoff. On stability in itemi compresathis hydrodynamics, May 1975.

(a) 26. L. Scorealerens A more an the scalificy of norizoatal shear flow of an invisoid compressible fluid, helv (975.

6. 37. 5. 5. Echioff and <u>Scotsaletten</u>. In the stability of shear flow in rotacing compressible and second laid. July 1975.

Ho. 58. E.H. Miland and C. Barger Dynamic scabilization of the or - instabilization and finaninfear pinch. July 1975.

No. 19. 5. Imiand. Mass reasoner induced by wave outlow in a stratified and recering fuild, wignest 1975.

60. 60. 7. 0. Espelid. In ceplacement-selection and Hamore 5 instruments August 1973

No. 31 L. Stranizzan A nois on the stability of stabiy intistic this field towa, lanuary 1976.

o. ols 5. Inimad. film dependent model of anstel currents and upweiling. une 1975.

er out an an item ortresting to classical single and transpart theory for a twocoperators, fully insided plauma a sectromagnetic fields.

b. 54. 5. 0. film. Savignace in low of a series of Patring random variables implicu sovergence to probability. Savar 1977.

No. 65. A: H. Clark Atmatic equation for an electron as foor meutral) plagma in strong fields and inhomogenicies, June 1978.

No. 09: 4: Tobak and 3: Tjerra. (heary of parametric acquaric arraya, July 1978.

> 0. 5/1 T.O. Expelid. M floating-point summation. ecceber 1978.

no, 66, 5.5, Håland. Stability of av lavertad pandalta stöd mars pyring and ancillating nurgart Saturabar 1973.

him ob. <u>S. Storey</u> Am adribition inexa distance algorithm annua of a gunaral quadratic programming machod. November 1979,

201 <u>11.14.004restartatu</u> Angument Francisco Súr elementery addressical francisco an reversion. 117 1300.

10. 2.1 A. A. Olan. V. Staal nonest description of the evolution of an victicut pas counts a state fomilated by a reduced transfer equartan.

<u>Lo Mettersen</u> Veervoormentelide, Program UALF, A Muhroutine los American evaluation of citrer-dumentonal complex integrala, spring 1981.

c. 23. 3.1. Association interficial computation of the earthand of a finite amplitude ound buse, includent 1941.

No. Str. Luke. Sandal. Influence of equilibrium flows. On ultration setting source.

10. 13. J. Forterson. The marking of a high frequency and the state of the state. An analysis (and ball of the state. parties, July 1981.

No. 161 G. Percersen. Honerical solution of the Buckey Laberett equation with a general fractional flow function. Sources 106-

> 1558-0084-7785 Department of Applied Hatbenstics University of Surges Alliesto 57-55, 2000 hereau Norsev





