

## A Note on the Operator Compact Implicit Method for the Wave Equation \*

By Melvyn Ciment\*\* and Stephen H. Leventhal\*\*\*

**Abstract.** In a previous paper a fourth order *compact implicit scheme* was presented for the second order wave equation. A very efficient factorization technique was developed when only second order terms were present. In this note we implement the *operator compact implicit* spatial discretization method for the second order wave equation when first order terms are present. The resulting algorithm is completely analogous to the compact implicit algorithm when lower order terms were not present. For this more general operator compact implicit spatial approximation the same factorization as in our previous paper is developed.

**Introduction.** In a previous paper [1] a factorization technique which utilized compact implicit spatial and temporal approximations to the second order wave equation was developed. The method proceeded by separately implementing the so-called compact implicit fourth order approximations for each of the individual derivative terms. Notwithstanding the implicit nature of the basic approximation involved, a factorization technique was described which allowed one to resolve higher space dimension problems by requiring merely the solution of tridiagonal equations. In Section VI of [1] we observed a peculiar aspect of our factorization approach. The same approach required twice as much work when mixed order (first and second) spatial derivative terms were present.

Upon further examination of this approach it became apparent that the problem was numerically improperly posed in requiring too much additional data to complete the factorization.

In this note, we observe that by changing the underlying spatial approximation when lower order terms are present it is possible to obtain an algorithm which completely resembles our algorithm for the case when no lower order terms are present.

In a future paper [2] the operator compact implicit method is developed, in much the same way as here, for parabolic problems.

**Spatial Discretizations.** The classical finite-difference approach for solving two point boundary value problems of the form

$$(2.1) \quad L(u) = au_{xx} + bu_x = f, \quad x \in [0, 1],$$

---

Received November 29, 1976.

AMS (MOS) subject classifications (1970). Primary 35L05, 65M05, 65M10; Secondary 65N10.  
Key words and phrases. Wave equation, higher order difference method.

\*This research supported by the Naval Surface Weapons Center Independent Research Fund.

\*\*Current address: Applied Mathematics Division, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D. C. 20239.

\*\*\*Current address: Simulation Research Section, Gulf Science and Technology Company, P. O. Drawer 2038, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15230.

with  $u(0)$ ,  $u(1)$  given is to separately substitute standard approximations for the first and second derivatives in (2.1) and then solve the resulting system of equations. Accordingly, the fourth order compact implicit scheme applied to the solution of (2.1), requires that one solve

$$(2.2) \quad L_h[U_j] = a_j \left( I + \frac{1}{12} \delta_x^2 \right)^{-1} \frac{\delta_x^2}{h^2} U_j + b_j \left( I + \frac{1}{6} \delta_x^2 \right)^{-1} \frac{\delta_0^x}{2h} U_j = f_j.$$

The notation here picks up from the notation of [1]. References to an equation in [1] will be superscripted with an asterisk. The appearance of two implicit matrices  $Q_x^{-1}$ ,  $R_x^{-1}$  (see (2.2)\*, (6.2)\*) "trapped inside the  $a_j$ ,  $b_j$ " creates problems in trying to solve the resulting linear system of equations. Several people have tried block methods when these basic terms appear in problems [3]. A suitable tridiagonal relationship however can be obtained by merely abandoning attempts to represent the separate derivative terms. The approach we adopt is to represent  $L(U_j)$  on three adjacent points up to highest order accuracy possible in relation to  $U_j$  on the same three points.

A Taylor series analysis shows that for  $L(u)$  on a uniform grid fourth order accuracy can be obtained by

$$(2.3a) \quad q_j^+ L(u)_{j+1} + q_j^0 L(u)_j + q_j^- L(u)_{j-1} = \frac{r_j^+ u_{j+1} + r_j^0 u_j + r_j^- u_{j-1}}{h^2},$$

where

$$(2.3b) \quad \begin{aligned} q_j^+ &= 6a_j a_{j-1} + h(5a_{j-1} b_j - 2a_j b_{j-1}) - h^2 b_j b_{j-1}, \\ q_j^0 &= 4[15a_{j+1} a_{j-1} - 4h(a_{j+1} b_{j-1} - b_{j+1} a_{j-1}) - h^2 b_{j+1} b_{j-1}], \\ q_j^- &= 6a_j a_{j+1} - h(5a_{j+1} b_j - 2a_j b_{j+1}) - h^2 b_j b_{j+1}, \\ r_j^+ &= \frac{1}{2} [q_j^+ (2a_{j+1} + 3hb_{j+1}) + q_j^0 (2a_j + hb_j) + q_j^- (2a_{j-1} - hb_{j-1})], \\ r_j^- &= \frac{1}{2} [q_j^+ (2a_{j+1} + hb_{j+1}) + q_j^0 (2a_j - hb_j) + q_j^- (2a_{j-1} - 3hb_{j-1})], \\ r_j^0 &= -[r_j^+ + r_j^-]. \end{aligned}$$

The above relationship can be expressed in an operator form by defining tridiagonal displacement operators  $Q_x$ ,  $R_x$  so that the equation (2.3) is represented by

$$(2.4) \quad Q_x L(U)_j = \frac{1}{h^2} R_x U_j.$$

Note well, for conciseness of notation we are using  $Q_x$  here to represent a different operator from what  $Q_x$  represented in [1]. (Indeed in the case that  $a \equiv 1$ ,  $b \equiv 0$  then both are identical.) Below, however, we will still retain the definition of  $Q_t = (I + \delta_t^2/12)$  from our previous paper. The above relationships (2.3) were first presented by Swartz [4]. The *operator compact implicit (OCI)* representation  $Q_x^{-1} R_x$  for  $L(u)$  presents the same formal appearance as  $Q_x^{-1} (\delta_x^2/h^2)$  did for  $u_{xx}$  alone. By noting this formal similarity it is clear that the OCI spatial discretization can be fully implemented into our factorization algorithm for the time dependent second order wave equation. This all depends on the underlying invertibility of  $Q_x$ . As Swartz observes, for the

case that  $a$  and  $b$  are constants,  $Q_x$  is invertible on  $l_2$  so long as the so-called mesh Reynolds number  $r$  satisfies (see [2])

$$(2.5) \quad |r| \equiv \left| \frac{hb}{a} \right| \leq \sqrt{12}.$$

**OCI Applied to the Wave Equation.** To solve (6.1)\*

$$(3.1) \quad u_{tt} = L_x(u) + L_y(u),$$

where initial and boundary data are prescribed and where

$$L_x(u) \equiv au_{xx} + bu_x, \quad L_y(u) \equiv cu_{yy} + du_y,$$

one substitutes the operator compact implicit approximation (2.4) for the respective spatial terms and the same compact implicit scheme as before for the temporal term to obtain

$$(3.2) \quad Q_t^{-1} \frac{\delta_t^2}{k^2} U_{j,m}^n = \frac{(Q_x^n)^{-1} R_x^n}{h^2} U_{j,m}^n + \frac{(Q_y^n)^{-1} R_y^n}{h^2} U_{j,m}^n,$$

where

$$(Q_x^n)^{-1} R_x^n U_{j,m}^n \sim L_x(u)_{j,m}^n, \quad (Q_y^n)^{-1} R_y^n U_{j,m}^n \sim L_y(u)_{j,m}^n.$$

Following our approach in [1], a factorization of (3.2) can be accomplished by adding the fourth order term

$$- \frac{k^4}{144} Q_t^{-1} \frac{\delta_t^2}{k^2} [(Q_x^n)^{-1} R_x^n (Q_y^n)^{-1} R_y^n] U_{j,m}^n.$$

The resulting form (analogous to (2.9)\*) is (where  $\lambda = k/h$ )

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} G_{j,m}^{n+1} &\equiv \left[ I - \frac{\lambda^2}{12} (Q_x^{n+1})^{-1} R_x^{n+1} \right] \left[ I - \frac{\lambda^2}{12} (Q_y^{n+1})^{-1} R_y^{n+1} \right] U_{j,m}^{n+1} \\ &= 2G_{j,m}^n - G_{j,m}^{n-1} + \lambda^2 [(Q_x^n)^{-1} R_x^n + (Q_y^n)^{-1} R_y^n] U_{j,m}^n. \end{aligned}$$

The numerical implementation of (3.3) above is completely analogous to the algorithm in [1] for equation (4.3)\*. Again with

$$(3.4) \quad \left[ I - \frac{\lambda^2}{12} (Q_y^{n+1})^{-1} R_y^{n+1} \right] U_{j,m}^{n+1} \equiv Z_{j,m}^{n+1}$$

solve first for  $Z_{j,m}^{n+1}$  and then for  $U_{j,m}^{n+1}$ .

The first two terms on the right-hand side are known from previous time steps and need not be computed. The other two terms on the right-hand side are obtained in a manner analogous to (4.5)\*, (4.6)\*. By observing from (3.4) that

$$(3.5) \quad \lambda^2 (Q_y^n)^{-1} R_y^n U_{j,m}^n = 12(U_{j,m}^n - Z_{j,m}^n)$$

the left-hand side is obtained without much work.  $V_{j,m}^n \equiv \lambda^2 (Q_x^n)^{-1} R_x^n U_{j,m}^n$  is obtained by solving a tridiagonal system.

**Remarks.** 1. Here too, the algorithm for (3.3) requires that one generate initial data for  $G_{j,m}^1, G_{j,m}^0$ . These are obtained by solving tridiagonal systems as in (4.9)\*.

2. *Boundary Data.* The computation of the intermediate boundary conditions may be obtained as in the previous paper. However, the following simplification is possible. As before, at the four corner points use the analytic representation of  $Z_{j,m}^{n+1}$  and one sided differences as an approximation for  $Z_{j,m}^{n+1}$ . Then on  $x = \text{constant}$  lines solve (3.4)

$$Q_y^{n+1} Z_{j,m}^{n+1} = \left[ Q_y^{n+1} - \frac{\lambda^2}{12} R_y^{n+1} \right] U_{j,m}^{n+1}.$$

Observe, that the  $x$ -sweep part of the algorithm may also be implemented on  $y = \text{constant}$  boundary lines as well as on the interior lines. However, this leads to a problem. Experiments reveal that it is necessary to compute  $Z_{j,m}^{n+1}$  on the  $y = \text{constant}$  boundaries as accurately as possible. Thus it is necessary to use the exact data for  $U_{j,m}^{n+1}$  that is given on these lines. However, the definition of  $G_{j,m}^{n+1}$  requires that

$$\lambda^2 [(Q_x^n)^{-1} R_x^n + (Q_y^n)^{-1} R_y^n] U_{j,m}^n$$

be evaluated and  $\lambda^2 (Q_y^n)^{-1} R_y^n$  must be obtained from (3.5), which includes  $Z_{j,m}^n$  which is not exact. However, this problem may be avoided by noting that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^2 [(Q_x^n)^{-1} R_x^n + (Q_y^n)^{-1} R_y^n] U_{j,m}^n \\ = k^2 [L_x u^n + L_y u^n + O(h^4)] = k^2 [u_{tt} + O(h^4)]. \end{aligned}$$

$G_{j,m}^{n+1}$  may then be redefined on  $y = \text{constant}$  boundary lines as

$$G_{j,m}^{n+1} = 2G_{j,m}^n - G_{j,m}^{n-1} + \left( I - \frac{\delta_t^2}{12} \right) \delta_t^2 U_{j,m}^n$$

before implementing the first step of the algorithm.

3. A Fourier stability analysis of (3.3) reveals, by a perturbation argument, that so long as  $r \sim h \sim k$  that again for  $C = \max(a, b)$  and  $\sqrt{C}\lambda \leq \sqrt{3} - 1$  the amplification factors  $\rho$  satisfy  $|\rho| \leq 1 + O(k)$  and so the scheme is stable in the sense of von Neumann.

**Numerical Example.** In this section a numerical example is presented demonstrating the accuracy, effectiveness and the stability of the method.

Let  $\Omega$  be defined by  $[0 \leq x, y \leq .5]$  and define the coefficients, initial conditions, and boundary conditions of (3.1) by

$$a(x, y, t) = \frac{(x+1)^2}{4(t+1)^2}, \quad b(x, y, t) = \frac{(x+1)^2(y+1)}{4(t+1)},$$

$$c(x, y, t) = \frac{(y+1)^2}{4(t+1)^2},$$

$$d(x, y, t) = \frac{(y+1)^2(x+1)}{4(t+1)}, \quad u(x, y, 0) = e^{(x+1)(y+1)},$$

$$u_t(x, y, 0) = (x + 1)(y + 1)e^{(x+1)(y+1)}, \quad u(x, y, t)|_{\partial\Omega} = e^{(x+1)(y+1)(t+1)}.$$

The exact solution is

$$u(x, y, t) = e^{(x+1)(y+1)(t+1)}.$$

The method was run for a sequence of spatial meshes and time steps, so that in each subsequent run we halved the mesh size and time step. In Table 1 the accuracy of the method is demonstrated for  $L_2$ -error and relative max-error.

# Time Steps	$h$	$k$	$L_2$ -Error	$L_2$ -Rate	Relative Max-Error	Relative Max-Rate
20	.1	.05	3.847-05		5.049-06	
				3.74		3.91
40	.05	.025	2.886-06		3.341-07	
				3.97		3.98
80	.025	.0125	1.843-07		2.118-08	
				3.87		3.86
160	.0125	.00625	1.264-08		1.455-09	

TABLE 1

Naval Surface Weapons Center  
White Oak Laboratory  
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

1. M. CIMENT & S. H. LEVENTHAL, "Higher order compact implicit schemes for the wave equation," *Math. Comp.*, v. 29, 1975, pp. 985-994.
2. M. CIMENT, S. H. LEVENTHAL & B. C. WEINBERG, "The operator compact implicit method for parabolic equations," *J. Computational Phys.* (To appear.)
3. R. HIRSH, "Higher order accurate difference solution of fluid mechanics problems by a compact differencing technique," *J. Computational Phys.*, v. 19, 1975, pp. 90-109.
4. B. K. SWARTZ, "The construction of finite difference analogs of some finite element schemes," *Mathematical Aspects of Finite Elements in Partial Differential Equations* (C. de Boor, Editor), Academic Press, New York, 1974, pp. 279-312.