The flux integral method for multidimensional convection and diffusion
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The flux integral method is a procedure for constructing an explicit single-step forward-in-time conservative control-volume update of the unsteady multidimensional convection-diffusion equation. The convective-plus-diffusive flux at each face of a control-volume cell is estimated by integrating the transported variable and its face-normal derivative over the volume swept out by the convecting velocity field. This yields a unique description of the fluxes, whereas other conservative methods rely on nonunique, arbitrary pseudodifference splitting procedures. The accuracy of the resulting scheme depends on the form of the subcell interpolation assumed, given cell-average data. Cellwise constant behavior results in a (very artificially diffusive) first-order convection scheme. Second-order convection-diffusion schemes correspond to cellwise linear (or bilinear) subcell interpolation. Cellwise quadratic subcell interpolants generate a highly accurate convection-diffusion scheme with excellent phase accuracy. Under constant coefficient conditions, this is a uniformly third-order polynomial interpolation algorithm (UTOPIA).
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1. The flux integral

Consider the cell-average value of the transported scalar, $\phi$, at a reference (central) cell, $C$. In two dimensions, an exact single-step explicit update can be written for the "new" (superscript +) cell value:

$$
\phi_C^+ = \phi_C + \text{FLUX}_w(i, j) - \text{FLUX}_w(i + 1, j) + \text{FLUX}_n(i, j) - \text{FLUX}_n(i, j + 1)
$$

using standard index and compass-point notation. Note that this is strictly conservative in that the east-face convective-plus-diffusive flux of cell $C$, at $i, j$, is identical to the west-face flux at $(i + 1, j)$; similarly for the north- and south-face fluxes. In equation (1), the west-face flux, for example, is given by

$$
\text{FLUX}_w(i, j) = \langle c_{w, w} \phi \rangle - h \left( x_w \left( \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x} \right)_w \right)
$$

where the angle brackets represent time averages over $\Delta t$, and, assuming (for convenience) a uniform square mesh of side $h$, the west-face normal-component Courant number is

$$
c_{w, w} = \frac{u_w(t)\Delta t}{h}
$$

and the west-face nondimensional diffusion parameter is written in terms of the (scalar) diffusivity, $D_w$, as

$$
d_w = \frac{D_w(t)\Delta t}{h^2}
$$

with analogous definitions for the south face.

The convective contribution in equation (2) is equivalent to the total "mass" of $\phi$ swept through the west face along particle paths (or streamlines, in steady flow) over $\Delta t$. In principle, one could trace the particle paths backward to the earlier time level, for each face. This is shown, schematically, in Figure 1. Then the (exact) purely convective contribution is equivalent to integrating $\phi(x, y)$ at the earlier time level over the area (or volume, in three dimensions) swept out by the particle paths:

$$
\langle c_{w, w} \phi \rangle = \int_{\text{PPA}} \phi(x, y) \, d(x/h) \, d(y/h)
$$

where PPA stands for particle path area.

The flux integral method now approximates equation (5) by replacing the particle path area by the flux integral...
Figure 1. Schematic drawing of particle paths flowing into the west face of cell $C$ is shown.

Figure 2. The flux integral parallelogram in the vicinity of the west face of cell $C$. $c_{xw}$, $cyw > 0$.
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parallelogram (FIP) by assuming the convecting velocity field to be locally constant (in both space and time) in the vicinity of the face in question. This is shown in Figure 2; note that the parallelogram is defined by the local (space-time-averaged) Courant number components, $c_{xw}$ and $cyw$ (taken as both positive in the case shown). The flux integral convective approximation is thus

$$\langle c_{xw} \phi_w \rangle \approx \iint_{\text{FIP}} \phi(x, y) \, d(x/h) \, d(y/h)$$

(6)

A similar approximation for the diffusive contribution results in

$$-h \left( c_{xw} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x} \right)_w \approx -c_{xw} \int_{\text{FIP}} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x} \, d(x/h) \, d(y/h)$$

(7)

where $\alpha_w$ is an appropriate average. If the subcell behavior at the earlier time level, $\phi(x, y)$, were known in complete detail, equation (6) would represent an exact flux due to pure convection by a constant velocity field. For nonzero diffusion, it turns out that equation (7) represents the diffusive flux to third order, provided the subcell behavior is known in enough detail. The major task in the flux integral method is thus an interpolation problem:

Given a set of cell-average values, estimate subcell behavior in an accurate (and, ideally, shape-preserving) manner, while observing the cell-average constraint:

$$\iint_{\text{cell}} \phi(x, y) \, d(x/h) \, d(y/h) = \bar{\phi}_{\text{cell}}$$

for all cells

(8)

with an analogous formula in three dimensions.

For constant-density flow, the face-normal component Courant numbers used in constructing the flux integral parallelograms should satisfy a discrete continuity equation for each cell:

$$c_{xw}(i, j) - c_{xw}(i + 1, j) + c_{yw}(i, j) - c_{yw}(i, j + 1) = 0$$

(9)

Since the area of a flux integral parallelogram is proportional to the face-normal Courant number component (e.g., the shaded area in Figure 2 is $c_{xw}h^2$), an initially constant scalar field will remain constant everywhere (to machine accuracy). This can be seen in Figure 3, where the sum of the “inflow areas” equals the sum of the “outflow areas” (irrespective of the local individual face transverse Courant number components). The appearance of “overlapping” characteristics in Figure 3 should be no cause for concern. The important thing to note is that the spatial extent of characteristics passing through any given face is uniquely defined.

In the following sections, a number of different subcell interpolants are explored. A cellwise constant interpolant (locally equal to the cell average) results in a (very artificially diffusive) first-order convection scheme; modelled physical diffusion is absent, to a consistent order. This is not a viable scheme for practical CFD calculations. But, because of its simplicity, it is instructive to explore the flux integral method in this case. Bilinear

Figure 3. Flux integral parallelograms on each face of cell $C$. 334 Appl. Math. Modelling, 1995, Vol. 19, June
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downwind-weighted subcell interpolation results in a two-dimensional analog of the Lax–Wendroff scheme. A cellwise quadratic interpolant over each cell generates a convection–diffusion scheme that is formally third-order accurate under constant coefficient conditions. These three methods are briefly compared using the well-known “rotating hill” test problem.

2. First-order convection

Fluxes will be calculated for the west face of cell C. Entirely analogous fluxes for the south face can be written down using appropriate (x, y) permutations. Unless otherwise noted, the Courant number components will be taken as both positive. Referring to Figure 4, the west-face convective flux integral corresponding to equation (6) can be thought of as consisting of a combination of three separate integrals

\[
{\text{FLUX}}_w(i, j) = I_1 - I_2 + I_3
\]

where \( I_1 \) is the integral over the rectangular area, 12461, in cell \( W \); \( I_2 \) is over the triangular area, 1231, in cell \( W \); and \( I_3 \) is over a similar triangular area, 6456, in cell \( SW \). Assuming \( \phi \) to be cellwise constant (equal to the respective cell average), the integrals in equation (1) are proportional to the respective areas times the local cell average value. This gives a first-order FIM of

\[
{\text{FLUX}}_w(i, j) = c_{xw} \phi_w - \frac{c_{xw} c_{yw}}{2} \phi_w + \frac{c_{xw} c_{yw}}{2} \phi_{SW}
\]

or, on rearrangement,

\[
{\text{FLUX}}_w(i, j) = c_{xw} \left[ \phi_w - \frac{c_{xw}}{2} (\phi_w - \phi_{SW}) \right]
\]

The term in square brackets can be considered the effective average convected face value. Note that it consists of the one-dimensional, first-order upwind (“donor-cell”) value, \( \phi_w \), modified by a transverse gradient term proportional to the transverse Courant number component at the face. It should be clear how the formula changes for other combinations of signs of \( c_{xw} \) and \( c_{yw} \). To a consistent order, there is no (physical) diffusive flux, since cellwise constant behavior implies a zero gradient within each cell.

Substituting equation (12) and the analogous formula for \( {\text{FLUX}}_s \) into equation (1) gives an overall (constant coefficient) convective update equation:

\[
\phi_C = \phi_C - c_x (\phi_C - \phi_w) - c_y (\phi_C - \phi_s) + c_x c_y (\phi_C - \phi_w - \phi_s + \phi_{SW})
\]

This is identical to a semi-Lagrangian update, using bilinear interpolation around the departure point, collocated at node values: \( \phi_C, \phi_w, \phi_{SW}, \) and \( \phi_s \) (located at the centroids of the respective cells). (For cellwise constant, linear, or bilinear interpolants, node values are equal to the respective cell average values. This is not the case for higher order interpolants.)

Using an appropriate upwinding strategy for other convecting velocity directions, it is not hard to show that the von Neumann stability condition for this scheme is given by a square region in the \( (c_x, c_y) \) plane:

\[
|c_x| \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad |c_y| \leq 1
\]

3. Second-order methods

Second-order convection–diffusion methods result from assuming cellwise linear or bilinear subcell behavior. In this case, it is convenient to introduce local, normalized coordinates in cell \( W \):

\[
\xi = \frac{x}{h} - (i - 1)
\]

and

\[
\eta = \frac{y}{h} - j
\]

as shown in Figure 5. Note that the central cell, \( C \), is located at \((i, j)\). The top of the flux integral parallelogram (line 3 to 1 in Figure 4) is represented by

\[
\eta_{top}(\xi) = 0.5 + \frac{c_{yw}}{c_{xw}} (\xi - 0.5)
\]

Figure 4. Twelve cells in the vicinity of the west face of cell C. \( c_{xw}, c_{yw} > 0 \).

Figure 5. Definition of local normalized coordinates within cell W.
A general bilinear subcell interpolant within cell \( W \) takes the form

\[
\phi(\xi, \eta) = C_1 + C_2 \xi + C_3 \eta + C_4 \xi \eta
\]  

(18)

The cell-average constraint, equation (8), implies that

\[
C_1 = \bar{\phi}_w
\]  

(19)

The slope constants, \( C_2 \) and \( C_3 \), and the twist constant, \( C_4 \), can be chosen in a number of different ways. For example, a two-dimensional analog of Fromm's method\(^3\) results from choosing

\[
C_2 = \frac{1}{2} (\bar{\phi}_C - \bar{\phi}_{CW})
\]  

(20)

\[
C_3 = \frac{1}{2} (\bar{\phi}_{NW} - \bar{\phi}_{SW})
\]  

(21)

and

\[
C_4 = 0
\]  

(22)

Note that this involves a symmetrical node distribution with respect to cell \( W \), independent of the velocity direction. Upwind or downwind weighting can also be used. In the interest of brevity, only one second-order scheme will be considered here in detail. This is based on downwind-weighted bilinear interpolation. For example, throughout cell \( W \), the interpolant is collocated (for \( c_{sw}, c_{cw} > 0 \)) at node values: \( \bar{\phi}_C, \bar{\phi}_N, \) and \( \bar{\phi}_{NW} \) (in addition to \( \bar{\phi}_w \)). This turns out to be a two-dimensional generalization of the Lax–Wendroff method. For positive Courant number components, the interpolant within cell \( W \) is

\[
\phi(\xi, \eta) = \bar{\phi}_w + (\bar{\phi}_C - \bar{\phi}_w)\xi + (\bar{\phi}_{NW} - \bar{\phi}_w)\eta
\]  

with a corresponding normal gradient, within cell \( W \),

\[
\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \xi} = (\bar{\phi}_C - \bar{\phi}_w) + (\bar{\phi}_N - \bar{\phi}_{NW} - \bar{\phi}_C + \bar{\phi}_w)\eta
\]  

(23)

Using local, cell-centered coordinates, similar formulas hold for each cell; in particular, cell \( SW \) formulas can be obtained from equations (23) and (24) by shifting all indexes “south” by one unit in equations (16), (23), and (24).

As before, the convective flux integral is split into three geometrically distinct parts, in this case.

\[
I_1 = \int_{0.5-c_{cw}}^{0.5} \int_{-0.5}^{0.5} \phi(\xi, \eta) \, d\eta \, d\xi
\]  

(25)

\[
I_2 = \int_{0.5}^{0.5} \left[ \bar{\phi}_w + (\bar{\phi}_C - \bar{\phi}_w)\xi \right] \, d\xi
\]  

(26)

\[
I_3 = \frac{c_{sw}}{2} \left( \frac{\bar{\phi}_C - \bar{\phi}_{SW}}{2} \right) \bar{\phi}_w
\]  

(27)

When rearranged as

\[
I_1 = c_{sw} \left[ \frac{1}{2} (\bar{\phi}_C + \bar{\phi}_w) - \frac{c_{sw}}{2} (\bar{\phi}_C - \bar{\phi}_w) \right]
\]  

(28)

this will be recognized as the one-dimensional Lax–Wendroff flux.\(^4\) The second (negative) contribution over the triangular area in cell \( W \) is

\[
- I_2 = - \int_{0.5-c_{sw}}^{0.5} \int_{0.5}^{0.5} \phi(\xi, \eta) \, d\eta \, d\xi
\]  

(29)

Using equation (17), this becomes, after some rearrangements,

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\frac{1}{8} (\bar{\phi}_C + \bar{\phi}_w + \bar{\phi}_N + \bar{\phi}_{NW}) \\
- \frac{c_{sw}}{6} (\bar{\phi}_N + \bar{\phi}_C - \bar{\phi}_{NW} - \bar{\phi}_w) \\
- \frac{c_{sw}}{12} (\bar{\phi}_N + \bar{\phi}_{NW} + \bar{\phi}_C - \bar{\phi}_w) \\
+ \frac{c_{sw} c_{cy}}{8} (\bar{\phi}_N - \bar{\phi}_{NW} - \bar{\phi}_C + \bar{\phi}_w)
\end{bmatrix}
\]  

(30)

Then, \( I_3 \) is obtained from \( I_2 \) by shifting all indexes south by one unit.

The diffusive flux is computed in a similar way. In particular

\[
- \alpha_w \left( \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \xi} \right)_{AVG} = - \frac{c_{sw}}{c_{sw}} \int_{W} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \xi} \, d\xi \, d\eta
\]  

(31)

This is also conveniently split into three parts. In this case

\[
- \frac{\alpha_w}{c_{sw}} I_1 = - \alpha_w (\bar{\phi}_C - \bar{\phi}_w)
\]  

(32)

which will be recognized as the classical, second-order, one-dimensional expression for the diffusive flux across the west face. But there are also contributions from transverse convective coupling. In particular,

\[
+ \frac{\alpha_{cy}}{c_{sw}} I_2 = \frac{c_{cy}}{4} (\bar{\phi}_N + \bar{\phi}_C - \bar{\phi}_{NW} - \bar{\phi}_w)
\]  

(33)

and the corresponding \( I_3 \) term is again obtained by shifting all indexes south by one unit.

The total west-face convective-plus-diffusive flux is:
BILINEAR DOWNWIND

\[
\text{FLUX}_{w}(i, j) = c_{w}\left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left( \phi_{c} + \phi_{w} \right) - \frac{c_{2w}}{2} \left( \phi_{c} - \phi_{w} \right) \right. \\
- \frac{c_{2w}}{8} \left[ (\phi_{N} - \phi_{S}) + (\phi_{NW} - \phi_{SW}) \right] \\
+ \frac{c_{2w}}{6} \left[ (\phi_{N} - \phi_{S}) - (\phi_{NW} - \phi_{SW}) \right] \\
+ \frac{c_{2w}}{12} \left[ (\phi_{N} - 2\phi_{c} + \phi_{S}) + (\phi_{NW} - 2\phi_{w} + \phi_{SW}) \right] \\
- \frac{c_{2w}}{8} \left[ (\phi_{N} - 2\phi_{c} + \phi_{S}) - (\phi_{NW} - 2\phi_{w} + \phi_{SW}) \right] \\
\left. \right\}
\]

Within cell $W$, the quadratic interpolation takes the (velocity-direction-independent) form:

\[
\phi(\xi, \eta) = \phi_{w} - \frac{1}{24} \left( \phi_{c} + \phi_{SW} + \phi_{EW} + \phi_{NW} - 4\phi_{w} \right) \\
+ \left( \frac{\phi_{c} - \phi_{EW}}{2} \right) \xi + \left( \frac{\phi_{c} - 2\phi_{w} + \phi_{SW}}{2} \right) \eta^2 \\
+ \left( \frac{\phi_{NW} - \phi_{SW}}{2} \right) \eta + \left( \frac{\phi_{NW} - 2\phi_{w} + \phi_{SW}}{2} \right) \eta^2
\]

Note that this satisfies the cell-average constraint of equation (8). Also note that the nodal value, $\phi_{w}$, is not the same as the cell average; in fact:

\[
\phi_{w} = \phi(0, 0)
\]

\[
= \phi_{w} - \frac{1}{24} \left( \phi_{c} + \phi_{SW} + \phi_{EW} + \phi_{NW} - 4\phi_{w} \right)
\]

The x-direction gradient within cell $W$ is

\[
\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \xi} = \left( \frac{\phi_{c} - \phi_{EW}}{2} \right) + \left( \frac{\phi_{c} - 2\phi_{w} + \phi_{SW}}{2} \right) \xi
\]

4. Uniformly third-order polynomial interpolation algorithm, UTOPIA

Assuming a velocity-direction-independent cellwise quadratic subcell interpolation within each cell leads to a polynomial interpolation algorithm for convection and diffusion that is uniformly third-order accurate under constant-coefficient conditions. In a variable (but solenoidal) convecting velocity field, with possibly variable diffusivity, the algorithm is no longer formally third-order accurate; however, the practical accuracy is significantly better than that of formally second-order schemes. Phase accuracy, in particular, is excellent, just as in the case of the corresponding one-dimensional QUICKFST scheme.\(^{5-7}\)

Within cell $W$, the quadratic interpolation takes the (velocity-direction-independent) form:

\[
\phi(\xi, \eta) = \phi_{w} - \frac{1}{24} \left( \phi_{c} + \phi_{SW} + \phi_{EW} + \phi_{NW} - 4\phi_{w} \right) \\
+ \left( \frac{\phi_{c} - \phi_{EW}}{2} \right) \xi + \left( \frac{\phi_{c} - 2\phi_{w} + \phi_{SW}}{2} \right) \eta^2 \\
+ \left( \frac{\phi_{NW} - \phi_{SW}}{2} \right) \eta + \left( \frac{\phi_{NW} - 2\phi_{w} + \phi_{SW}}{2} \right) \eta^2
\]

Note that this satisfies the cell-average constraint of equation (8). Also note that the nodal value, $\phi_{w}$, is not the same as the cell average; in fact:

\[
\phi_{w} = \phi(0, 0)
\]

\[
= \phi_{w} - \frac{1}{24} \left( \phi_{c} + \phi_{SW} + \phi_{EW} + \phi_{NW} - 4\phi_{w} \right)
\]

The x-direction gradient within cell $W$ is

\[
\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \xi} = \left( \frac{\phi_{c} - \phi_{EW}}{2} \right) + \left( \frac{\phi_{c} - 2\phi_{w} + \phi_{SW}}{2} \right) \xi
\]

4.1 Convective flux in the absence of diffusion

For pure convection, the west face flux is computed in the usual way. As is perhaps by now expected, the first component of the flux integral generates the one-dimensional (in this case, QUICKFST) formula:

\[
I_{1} = c_{xw} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \left( \phi_{c} + \phi_{w} \right) - \frac{c_{2w}}{2} \left( \phi_{c} - \phi_{w} \right) \right] \\
- \left( \frac{1 - c_{2w}}{6} \right) \left( \phi_{c} - 2\phi_{w} + \phi_{SW} \right)
\]

Note the appearance of the upwind-weighted normal-curvature term (resulting from the natural upwinding
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inherent in the flux integral. Integration over the respective triangular areas in cells $W$ and $SW$ introduces several cross-difference terms. The final form of the purely convective flux is (referring to Figure 4)

QUADRATIC (CONVECTION)

\[
\text{FLUX}_w(i, j) = c_{sww} \left( \frac{1}{2} (\phi_c + \phi_w) - \frac{c_{sw}}{2} (\phi_c - \phi_w) - \frac{1}{6} c_{sww} (\phi_c - 2\phi_w + \phi_{ww}) - \frac{c_{sw}}{2} (\phi_w - \phi_{SW}) \right)
\]

It is instructive to identify the role played by each of these terms. The first three terms represent the one-dimensional (QUICKEST) contribution; note that all the remaining terms contain a $c_{sw}$ coefficient. The fourth term in equation (39) is the transverse gradient that previously appeared in the first-order scheme. This is, in fact, a second-order term, as is the normal gradient (second term). The fifth term represents twist, an interaction between normal and transverse convection. The next term is a transverse-curvature contribution. The final two terms in equation (39) are actually fourth-order contributions. Dropping these terms does not affect the formal (constant-coefficient) third-order accuracy of the overall update equation. However, they do affect the stability of the scheme. Without the higher-order terms, the purely convective stability region is approximately the diamond-shaped region

\[|c_x| + |c_y| < 1 \]  

Including these terms (that arise naturally in the flux-integral formulation) results once again in the square stability region given by equation (14).

4.2 Third-order diffusive flux

Applying the usual three-part-integral procedure to equation (37) results in the following diffusive flux:

\[
-\alpha_w \left( \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x} \right)_{avg} = -\alpha_w \left( \begin{array}{l}
\frac{c_{sw}}{2} (\phi_c - 2\phi_w + \phi_{ww}) \\
- \frac{c_{sw}}{2} (\phi_c - \phi_w - \phi_s + \phi_{SW}) \\
+ \frac{c_{sw}c_{sww}}{3} \left[ (\phi_c - 2\phi_w + \phi_{ww}) \right]
\end{array} \right)
\]

The first term is the classical (one-dimensional) second-order first-difference across the face. The second, normal-curvature, term represents the effect of normal convection on the time-averaged normal gradient; this is a third-order convection-diffusion cross-coupling term that also appears in the one-dimensional QUICKEST formula. The third, twist, term represents the coupling effect of transverse convection; this is a (two-dimensional) third-order term. The final term is actually a (partial) fourth-order cross-coupling term, kept once again, because of enhanced stability properties.

4.3 Diffusive contribution to the convective flux

The convection-diffusion coupling terms just described represent the effects of convection in estimating the diffusive flux. They arise naturally in the flux integral formulation. For uniformly third-order consistency, one also needs to estimate the analogous cross-coupling effects of diffusion on the convective flux. Because of the assumed curvature in the subcell interpolation, diffusion changes the value of $\phi$ over $\Delta t$ as it is being convected through a particular cell face. As shown in Ref. 8, this change is given by $(a/2)V^2\phi$. Performing the usual
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A three-part flux-integral calculation leads to an additional diffusive contribution to the convective flux of the form

\[
\begin{align*}
C_{sw} = & \frac{3}{2} \left[ (\hat{\phi}_C - 2\hat{\phi}_W + \hat{\phi}_NW) + (\hat{\phi}_NW - 2\hat{\phi}_W + \hat{\phi}_SW) \right] \\
& - \frac{3}{4} \left[ (\hat{\phi}_C - 2\hat{\phi}_W + \hat{\phi}_NW) - (\hat{\phi}_S - 2\hat{\phi}_SW + \hat{\phi}_SW) \right],
\end{align*}
\]

which must be added to equation (39) to give the total convective flux. The convective-plus-diffusive flux at the west face is thus the sum of equations (39), (41), and (42).

A von Neumann stability analysis of the constant-coefficient overall update algorithm shows that the useful region in \((c_X, c_Y, c_Z)\) space is given, as a minimum, by the "cylinder":

\[
|c| \leq 1, \quad 0 \leq \alpha \leq 0.25
\]

5. Comparison with other methods

Because fluxes are estimated directly, (for a given subcell interpolation) the flux integral method produces unique formulas for the fluxes. This is in contrast to other methods that have been used to construct conservative multidimensional convection (or convection-diffusion) schemes. For example, Ekebjerg and Justesen developed a nominally third-order, two-dimensional convection-diffusion scheme by successive elimination of truncation error terms arising from a lower-order scheme. The nonconservative single-step explicit update was then rewritten in a conservative pseudoflux-difference form. But the pseudofluxes chosen by Ekebjerg and Justesen are not unique; except for first-order (and some simple second-order) schemes, there is, in general, no unique way of rewriting a nonconservative update in a conservative flux-difference form.

Recently, Rasch has used, as a starting point, a (constant-coefficient) third-order semi-Lagrangian convection scheme, and then rewritten the update in conservative, pseudoflux-difference form. Recognizing the nonuniqueness problem, Rasch uses weighting parameters to generate a family of possible pseudoflux-difference algorithms. For certain choices of the weights, the (purely convective form of the) Ekebjerg-and-Justesen scheme can be retrieved. For other weights, Rasch's convection scheme is equivalent to (the convective part of) that used by the present authors in Ref. 8; this is also the form used by Rasch. For still other choices of the weights, a nominally third-order convective flux equivalent to equation (39) but with the last two (higher-order) terms removed—can be obtained. The conservatively rewritten semi-Lagrangian approach does not generate diffusive fluxes.

6. Convective test problem

The three schemes described here have been applied to the rotating Gaussian hill problem under purely convective conditions \((\alpha = 0)\). The convecting velocity field is that of solid-body rotation at an angular velocity of 0.2 rad/sec, with the axis at the center of a \(61 \times 61\) square mesh. The Gaussian is initially centered at a point \(1.5\)\(h\) above the center of rotation, with \(\sigma = 3h\). Figure 6 shows the initial state in a superfine-grid rendering. This is also the exact solution after an integral number of rotations. The cell-average initial data is shown in Figure 7 as a two-dimensional histogram. The time step is chosen so that the maximum component Courant numbers (at the corners of the domain) are \(\pi/10\). Figure 6.

![Figure 6. Initial Gaussian distribution, \(\phi(x, y)\), shown on a very fine grid. This is also the exact (purely convective) solution after an integral number of rotations. \(\phi_{\text{max}} = 1.000\).](image-url)
Figure 7. Initial state of cell-average values, $\bar{\phi}_{ij}$, shown as a two-dimensional histogram on the $61 \times 61$ computational grid.

Figure 8. Solution after one (anticlockwise) rotation for the first-order method. In this case, the histogram of cell-average values also represents the cellwise constant subcell interpolation. $\phi_{\text{max}} = 0.152; \phi_{\text{min}} = 0.000$.

Figure 9. Solution of cell-average values after one rotation using the second-order convection scheme. $\phi_{\text{max}} = 0.787; \phi_{\text{min}} = -0.149$.

8 shows the first-order cell-average results after one (anticlockwise) rotation, or 600 time steps. This also represents the (piecewise constant) subcell interpolants. The “Lax–Wendroff” cell-average results are shown in Figure 9, with a close-up of the peak region, showing the (downwind-weighted) subcell behavior, in Figure 10. Note the discontinuities across cell faces and the change in behavior where $c_i$ changes sign. Figures 11 and 12 give the corresponding UTOPIA results.

As mentioned before, the first-order scheme is far too artificially diffusive to even be considered for practical application. As in one dimension, the Lax–Wendroff-type scheme is excessively dispersive, showing significant phase-lag errors in the “wake.” By contrast, UTOPIA has good accuracy and excellent phase behavior, just as in the one-dimensional case.5,7

Other extensive studies of purely convective and convective-diffusive test problems at a number of grid refinements have consistently shown the superiority of UTOPIA. Not surprisingly, it is more accurate than lower-order schemes. It is also more expensive, per mesh point calculation. The important conclusion, however, is that, for a prescribed accuracy, UTOPIA can be used on a much coarser mesh (with a concomitantly larger time-step); the overall cost is then much lower than that of lower-order schemes.

6. Conclusion

The flux-integral method has been shown to be a useful technique for estimating genuinely multidimensional convective-plus-diffusive fluxes in a strictly conservative...
Figure 10. Close-up of the downwind-weighted bilinear subcell interpolation in the peak region, showing discontinuities across cell faces. \( \phi_{\max} = 0.823; \phi_{\min} = -0.176 \). The horizontal scales have been expanded by a factor of four in each direction.

Figure 11. Solution of cell-average values after one rotation using the purely convective form of UTOPIA. \( \phi_{\max} = 0.804; \phi_{\min} = -0.008 \).

Figure 12. Close-up of the quadratic subcell interpolation in the peak region, showing (small) discontinuities across cell faces. \( \phi_{\max} = 0.810; \phi_{\min} = -0.010 \) (not shown). Same scale as Figure 10.

transported scalars. Variable diffusivity would typically be lagged and therefore only first-order accurate in time. However, spatial accuracy is enhanced by using higher order subcell interpolation. Under constant-coefficient conditions, an \( N \)th order subcell interpolation leads to an \((N + 1)\)th order accurate convection–diffusion scheme in both space and time.

For the purely convective test problem considered here, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Cellwise constant subcell interpolation leads to an unworkable (artificially diffusive) first-order convection scheme.
2. Cellwise linear or bilinear interpolants generate second-order convection–diffusion schemes. Downwind-weighted bilinear interpolation gives a multi-dimensional analog of the Lax–Wendroff scheme. However, because of the velocity-direction-dependent weighting of the interpolant, this leads to a highly dispersive convection scheme with strong phase-lag errors, just as in one dimension.
3. Cellwise quadratic interpolation (independent of velocity direction) leads to a very accurate convection–diffusion scheme with excellent phase behavior. Under constant coefficient conditions, this is a uniformly third-order polynomial interpolation algorithm (UTOPIA). Since highly accurate solutions can be obtained on relatively coarse grids, UTOPIA is much more cost-effective than lower-order methods.

For simplicity, the present paper has been confined to two dimensions. It should be clear that the flux integral
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method generalizes to three dimensions in a straightforward manner. The technique can be used with even higher-order subcell interpolation (presumably using velocity-direction independent interpolants in order to minimize dispersion); higher order diffusive-diffusive and convective-diffusive cross-coupling terms are fairly complex but can be derived in a straightforward manner (e.g., using automatic symbolic manipulation). Further research is needed to extend the method to larger time steps. Finally, it should be pointed out that shape preservation in the subcell interpolation automatically results in a positivity preserving conservative multidimensional formulation, thus obviating the need for ad hoc flux-limiter constraints. This is an area of current research.
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