J Eng Math (2008) 60:351–363
DOI 10.1007/s10665-007-9164-4

A large-time-stepping scheme for balance equations

Kenneth Hvistendahl Karlsen · Siddhartha Mishra · Nils Henrik Risebro

Received: 22 May 2007 / Accepted: 25 June 2007 / Published online: 16 August 2007

Abstract A well-balanced, large-time-stepping method for conservation laws with source terms is presented. The numerical method is based on a local reformulation of the balance law as a conservation law with a discontinuous flux function, and the approximate solution of this equation by a front tracking method. This yields an unconditionally stable method which is particularly well suited to calculate stationary states. The viability of this approach is demonstrated by several numerical examples.

Keywords Conservation law · Discontinuous solution · Finite-volume scheme · Front tracking · Source term · Well-balanced scheme

1 Introduction

In this paper we propose a numerical scheme for conservation laws with source terms, often referred to as balance laws, a prototype of which is given by

$$\begin{cases} u_t + f(u)_x = A(x,u) & (x,t) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\ u(x,0) = u_0(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where u is the (scalar) unknown, f is the flux function, and A is the source term. Frequently the source term takes the form

$$A(x,u) = z'(x)b(u), \tag{1.2}$$

KHK has been supported in part by an Outstanding Young Investigators Award from the Research Council of Norway.

K. H. Karlsen · S. Mishra (✉) · N. H. Risebro
Centre of Mathematics for Applications (CMA), University of Oslo, P.O. Box 1053, Blindern, Oslo 0316, Norway
e-mail: siddharm@cma.uio.no

K. H. Karlsen
e-mail: kennethk@math.uio.no
URL: http://www.math.uio.no/∼kennethk

N. H. Risebro
e-mail: nilshr@math.uio.no

in which case (1.1) can be seen as a model equation for the Saint-Venant (shallow water) equations. We remark that the coefficient z in (1.2) can be discontinuous, which would correspond to a discontinuous bottom topography.

Formally (1.1) with the source (1.2) is equivalent to

$$U_t + AU_x = 0, \tag{1.3}$$

where $U = (u, z)$ and the matrix A is given by

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} f'(u) & -b \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The eigenvalues of the above matrix (wave speeds) are $f'(u)$ and 0, which can coincide and thereby result in so-called "resonance".

Independently of the smoothness of the initial data and of the flux or the source terms, solutions to (1.1) are in general discontinuous, and must therefore be interpreted in the weak sense. Consequently, so-called entropy conditions are used to select a unique weak solution to the initial-value problem. This solution is referred to as an entropy solution. Weak and entropy solutions of (1.1)–(1.2) are well defined when $z' \in L^\infty$.

One of the key issues in designing numerical schemes for (1.1) is the resolution of steady states. If we assume that the solution is smooth at a steady state $\bar{u} = \bar{u}(x)$, the flux function f and the source term A are balanced, i.e., $\bar{u}$ satisfies the equation

$$f(u)_x = A(x, u). \tag{1.4}$$

More detailed forms of (1.4) can be derived for (1.2). The usual strategy of devising numerical methods for (1.1) is to use a Godunov-type numerical flux in a finite-volume method coupled with a centered differencing of the source term. It is well known, see [1], that this does not preserve discrete steady states. Another alternative is provided by the so-called splitting or fractional-steps method, which is based on separating the updates for the flux and the source [1]. This method is also deficient with regard to preserving discrete steady states.

Due to these difficulties, so-called *well-balanced* schemes have been proposed. These schemes are designed to preserve steady states. A variety of well-balanced schemes can be found in literature, see [2–10] and the references cited therein. For a partial overview, see also the introductory part of [11].

In many applications the goal is to calculate steady states both accurately and quickly. Accurate transient values are not needed, as these are seen merely as intermediate steps in a time-marching algorithm to compute the steady states. In such cases, it is desirable to relax the CFL condition (i.e., the relation between the spatial and temporal discretization parameters) to reach the steady states as quickly as possible. One such class of problems is provided by the so-called quasi-steady problems (perturbations of steady states).

Our aim in this paper is to devise a well-balanced finite-volume scheme for (1.1) without an intrinsic CFL condition, thereby permitting the calculation of steady-state solutions with a minimal computational effort. Our finite-volume scheme is designed to find and preserve discrete steady states, and therefore we will refer to this scheme as well-balanced. At the same time, we wish to compute transients states with reasonable accuracy. The key element of our strategy will be a "local" transformation of the balance law (1.1) to a conservation law with a space–time-dependent discontinuous coefficient:

$$u_t + \tilde{f}(k(x, t), u))_x = 0, \tag{1.5}$$

where $\tilde{f}$ is the flux modified locally by the source. Equations of this type are by now mathematically and computationally well understood within a proper framework of entropy solutions, and various types of numerical methods have been devised and analyzed for these equations (see the list of references given above and for (1.5) in particular reference [12]). Our strategy is to employ numerical schemes designed for conservation laws with discontinuous coefficients (1.5) to approximate solutions of (1.1). Furthermore, since we concentrate on rapidly finding the stationary solutions, we propose a method in which the size of the time step is not limited by the spatial discretization, i.e., no CFL condition is needed.

The main features of the scheme are demonstrated by numerical experiments in Sect. 3. We believe that the approach of using a local discontinuous flux formulation for designing well-balanced schemes will lead to alternative numerical schemes for systems of conservation laws as well, and plan to address the extension to systems in a future work.

In a recent paper [13] we analyzed the convergence of a variant of the well-balanced scheme proposed herein. However, this scheme, being based on a Godunov-type finite-volume discretization of conservation laws with discontinuous flux, is restricted by the usual CFL condition. The purpose of the present paper is to suggest and demonstrate a large-time-stepping extension of the scheme from [13]. In addition, by means of numerical experiments, we want to compare the large-time-stepping scheme with other schemes from the literature. We will present a convergence analysis of our scheme elsewhere.

In this paper we use front tracking as a basis for a finite-volume- type approximation to the solution of the balance law (1.1). This is in contrast with the approach taken in [11]. In that paper we used the reformulation (1.3) to design a front-tracking algorithm to solve (1.1), with the source in the form (1.2), directly. Although this also gives a very efficient method, the drawback of this method is that the solution of the Riemann problem for (1.3) is quite complicated. Furthermore, this approach is limited to source terms on the form (1.2). The finite-volume approach used in the present paper also uses front tracking, but it is based on another reformulation of (1.1). This leads to Riemann problems that are much easier to solve. See Sect. 2 for details.

Although we will not perform a rigorous analysis of our scheme in this paper, it seems appropriate to make a few remarks regarding convergence analysis of well-balanced schemes in general. First of all, if $f' \neq 0$, it is possible to work within the standard BV (bounded variation) framework, see, e.g., [3,14]. If $f'(u) = 0$ for some u, the situation becomes more complicated. As is the case with conservation laws with discontinuous flux, there is generally no BV bound for the conserved variable u itself. In order to prove the convergence of approximate solutions (and existence of solutions), the so-called singular-mapping approach has been used for the last twenty years to achieve compactness of sequences of approximate solutions, in particular for problems with discontinuous coefficients, cf. [15–22]. More recently, other analytical tools have been utilized for discontinuous flux problems, including compensated compactness [12,23] and entropy-process solutions/kinetic solutions [24]. Regarding convergence analysis for conservation laws with source terms, there are only a few papers that deal with the resonant case where BV estimates are not available; see [25,6,18,13].

We have organized this paper as follows: In Sect. 2 we define the scheme. The scheme is based on front-tracking schemes for conservation laws with discontinuous coefficients, and we explain how this numerical method (front tracking) works. Front tracking in turn, depends on the solution of Riemann problems, and we devote a subsection to explaining how the Riemann problems arising in our setting are solved. In Sect. 3 we show how the scheme performs in various settings, and compare it with other schemes found in the literature. Finally, we summarize our findings in Sect. 4.

2 The large-time-stepping scheme

In this section we describe and define the large-time-stepping scheme. The starting point is the following idea. Let $B(x;u)$ be the function defined by

$$B(x;u) = \int^x A(y,u(y,t))\,\mathrm{d}y. \tag{2.1}$$

Fix $\Delta t > 0$, and set $t^n = n\Delta t$ for $n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$. Define $u^0 = u_0$ and u^n, $n > 0$, to be the (entropy) weak solution of

$$\begin{aligned} &u_t^n + \left(f\left(u^n\right) - B\left(x; u^{n-1}(\cdot, t^{n-1})\right)\right)_x = 0, \quad t \in (t^{n-1}, t^n] \\ &u^n\left(\cdot, t^{n-1}\right) = u^{n-1}(\cdot, t^{n-1}). \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

It is obvious that this semi-discrete scheme conserves steady states since these are given by

$$f(u) - B(x;u) = \text{constant}. \tag{2.3}$$

Note that the discrete steady state (2.3) reflects the flux-source balance that should characterize a steady state.

In order to use this idea to calculate approximate solutions, we need to choose a numerical method for the following conservation law with a spatially varying (discontinuous) coefficient:

$$u_t + F^n(x,u)_x = 0 \quad t \in (0,\Delta t], \quad u(x,0) = u^{n-1}(x), \tag{2.4}$$

where $F^n(x,u) := f(u) - B(x;u^{n-1})$. There are many methods to choose from, such as the aligned Godunov-type schemes of [15,16] and Staggered Enquist–Osher type schemes of [21,22,26], but to build an unconditionally stable (large time-stepping) method, we shall use a front-tracking method to solve (2.4). We now briefly describe the front-tracking method.

2.1 Front tracking

Front tracking is a numerical method for (2.4) that has no fixed time step, and is related to the method of characteristics.

To be concrete, consider Eq. 2.4 where we suppress the index n, i.e.,

$$u_t + F(x,u)_x = 0, \quad F(x,u) = f(u) - B(x),$$

for some piecewise smooth function $B(x)$. The conservation law is assumed to hold for $t > 0$, while we initially at $t = 0$ prescribe $u(x,0) = u_0(x)$.

To define a numerical method we choose (for simplicity) a uniform grid in the x-direction:

$$x_j = j\Delta x, \quad x_{j+1/2} = (j+1/2)\Delta x, \quad j \in \mathbb{Z},$$

where the spatial discretization parameter $\Delta x > 0$ is a given (small) number. Let I_j denote the interval $(x_{j-1/2}, x_{j+1/2}]$, and set

$$B_j = \frac{1}{\Delta x}\int_{I_j} B(x)\,\mathrm{d}x.$$

Next, fix a small parameter $\delta > 0$, let $u_i = i\delta$ for $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, and define the piecewise linear interpolation

$$f^\delta(u) = f(u_i) + (u - u_i)\frac{f(u_{i+1}) - f(u_i)}{u_{i+1} - u_i} \quad \text{for } u \in [u_i, u_{i+1}]. \tag{2.5}$$

Then define the approximate flux function $F^\delta_{\Delta x}$ by

$$F^\delta_{\Delta x}(x,u) = f^\delta(u) + \sum_j B_j \mathbf{1}_{I_j}(x), \tag{2.6}$$

where $\mathbf{1}_\Omega$ denotes the characteristic function of a set Ω, i.e., $\mathbf{1}_\Omega(x) = 1$ if $x \in \Omega$ and zero otherwise.

Next, let $u_{\Delta x,0}$ be an approximation to the initial function u_0 defined by

$$u_{\Delta x,0}(x) = \frac{1}{\Delta x}\int_{I_j} u_0(x)\,\mathrm{d}x, \quad x \in I_j, \tag{2.7}$$

if $|j| \le 1/\Delta x$, while we set $u_{\Delta x,0}(x) = 0$ otherwise.

Now we claim that we can construct the *exact* (entropy) solution $u^{\delta,\Delta x}$ to the initial value problem

$$\begin{aligned} &u_t^{\delta,\Delta x} + F^\delta_{\Delta x}\left(x, u^{\delta,\Delta x}\right)_x = 0, \quad t > 0, \\ &u^{\delta,\Delta x}(\cdot,0) = u_{\Delta x,0}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

by a finite number of operations. How this is done is explained below.

We observe that, initially, at each location $x = x_{j-1/2}$, we have a Riemann problem of the type

$$\begin{cases} u_t + \left(f^\delta(u) - B_{j-1}\right)_x = 0, & x < x_{j-1/2}, \\ u_t + \left(f^\delta(u) - B_j\right)_x = 0, & x > x_{j-1/2}, \end{cases} \qquad u(x,0) = \begin{cases} u_{j-1}, & x < x_{j-1/2}, \\ u_j, & x > x_{j-1/2}. \end{cases} \tag{2.9}$$

The solution of this Riemann problem (see Sect. 2.2 for details) is a piecewise constant function of the form

$$u(x,t) = \begin{cases} u_{j-1}, & x - x_{j-1/2} < \sigma_0 t, \\ \hat{u}_k, & \sigma_{k-1} t \le x - x_{j-1/2} < \sigma_k t, \quad k = 1, \dots, m, \\ u_j, & \sigma_m t \le t, \end{cases} \tag{2.10}$$

where $\{\sigma_k\}_{k=1}^m$ is an increasing sequence of numbers. This formula is valid for small t and for $\left|x - x_{j-1/2}\right|$ small. We can piece together the solutions of the (finitely many) Riemann problems to obtain an entropy solution for $t \le t_1$, where $t_1 > 0$ is defined to be the first time two discontinuities collide. The resulting function we call $u^{\delta,\Delta x}$. For a fixed t, $u^{\delta,\Delta x}$ is a piecewise constant function. We also see that the discontinuities in $u^{\delta,\Delta x}$ move at constant speeds, and we call these discontinuities *fronts*.

Assume that the two (or more) fronts collide at $t = t_1$ at a point $\hat{x}$. Since $u^{\delta,\Delta x}$ is piecewise constant, the collision defines a new Riemann problem of the type (2.9). Of course, the left and right initial values are no longer u_{j-1} and u_j, and it may happen that the B's to the left and right are equal. Nevertheless, we can solve this Riemann problem and the solution is defined by a fan of fronts moving with finite speeds. This means that we can define $u^{\delta,\Delta x}$ until the next time two fronts collide. In this way we propagate the solution in time.

Since we initially have only a finite number of fronts, for a large class of f's[1] it turns out that there will only be a finite number of collisions between fronts for all positive times t. In other words, for t larger than a collision time t_M, $u^{\delta,\Delta x}$ will have fronts that are moving apart, or are stationary. Thus the exact solution to (2.8) can be computed by a finite number of operations. For a proof of this, see [19], while for a thorough discussion of front tracking in general, see [27].

2.2 The solution of the Riemann problems

To complete our description of the front tracking algorithm, we now detail how the Riemann problems are solved. We start with the simpler case where $B_j = B_{j-1}$. In this case we have the Riemann problem

$$u_t + f^\delta(u)_x = 0, \quad u(x,0) = \begin{cases} u_l, & x < 0, \\ u_r, & x > 0. \end{cases} \tag{2.11}$$

Recall that f^δ is piecewise linear. The algorithm for solving this problem depends on whether $u_l < u_r$ or not. If $u_l < u_r$ we let $\hat{f}^\delta$ denote the lower convex envelope of f^δ between u_l and u_r, while if $u_l > u_r$ we let $\hat{f}^\delta$ denote the upper concave envelope of f^δ between u_r and u_l. Then $\hat{f}^\delta$ will be a piecewise linear function. We call the discontinuity points of $\mathrm{d}\hat{f}^\delta(u)/\mathrm{d}u$ breakpoints, and we have $\{\hat{u}_i\}_{i=1}^{N-1}$ of these inside the interval with endpoints u_l and u_r. If $u_l < u_r$ we set $\hat{u}_0 = u_l$ and $\hat{u}_N = u_r$, otherwise we set $\hat{u}_0 = u_r$ and $\hat{u}_N = u_l$, and arrange the breakpoints so that $i \mapsto \hat{u}_i$ is monotone. Define

$$\sigma_i = \frac{f^\delta\left(\hat{u}_i\right) - f^\delta\left(\hat{u}_{i-1}\right)}{\hat{u}_i - \hat{u}_{i-1}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N.$$

[1] It is sufficient that for large $|u|$, $|f(u)| > C\log(|u|+1)$.

Then the solution of (2.11) is given by

$$u(x,t)=\begin{cases}\hat{u}_0, & x<\sigma_1 t,\\ \hat{u}_i, & \sigma_i t\le x<\sigma_{i+1}t, \quad i=1,\dots,N-1,\\ \hat{u}_N, & \sigma_N t\le x.\end{cases} \tag{2.12}$$

Next, we turn to the more complicated situation where also B has a discontinuity at $x=0$. Since the solution only depends on the difference in B to the left and right, there is no loss of generality in considering the initial value problem

$$\begin{cases}u_t+\left(f^\delta(u)+B\right)_x=0, & u(x,0)=u_l, \quad x<0,\\ u_t+f^\delta(u)_x=0, & u(x,0)=u_r, \quad x>0,\end{cases} \tag{2.13}$$

for some (constant) $B\neq 0$. Let

$$u_l'=\lim_{x\to 0-}u(x,t), \quad \text{and} \quad u_r'=\lim_{x\to 0+}u(x,t).$$

The Rankine–Hugoniot condition implies that

$$f^\delta\left(u_l'\right)+B=f^\delta\left(u_r'\right). \tag{2.14}$$

The solution to (2.13) consists in finding $u_{l,r}'$ and then solving the Riemann problem (2.11) with $u_r=u_l'$ using only waves with non-positive speeds, and finally solving the Riemann problem (2.11) with $u_l=u_r'$ using only wave with non-negative speeds.

How this can be done depends on f^δ. The simplest case is when f, and consequently f^δ is monotone. For definiteness we assume that $u\to f(u)$ is increasing. In this case the solution of (2.11) will never contain fronts with negative speeds. Thus $u_l'=u_l$, and u_r' solves (2.14) with $u_l'=u_l$. Since f^δ is monotone, there exists a unique solution.

The case where f is not monotone is more complicated. For simplicity, we detail the solution in the case where f is an even convex function. In this case also f^δ will be even and convex.

In order to find a solution, we first find possible candidates for u_l' and u_r'. It is clear that u_l' must be sought among those values there the Riemann problem (2.11) with $u_r=u_l'$ has waves of non-positive speed only, label this set $H_l(u_l)$. We have that H_l is given by

$$H_l\left(u_l\right)=\begin{cases}(-\infty,0], & \text{if } u_l\le 0,\\ \{u_l\}\cup(-\infty,-u_l], & \text{if } u_l>0.\end{cases} \tag{2.15}$$

Similarly, we let H_r be the set of left states such that the Riemann problem (2.11) with $u_l=u_r'$ is solved by waves with non-negative speed. In our case we have that

$$H_r\left(u_r\right)=\begin{cases}[0,\infty), & \text{if } u_r\ge 0,\\ \{u_r\}\cup[-u_r,\infty), & \text{if } u_r<0.\end{cases} \tag{2.16}$$

$$f_l(u)=\begin{cases}f^\delta(u)+B, & \text{if } u\in H_l(u_l),\\ \min_{H_l}\left\{f^\delta(u)\right\}+B, & \text{otherwise,}\end{cases}$$

and

$$f_r(u)=\begin{cases}f^\delta(u), & \text{if } u\in H_r(u_r),\\ \min_{H_r}\left\{f^\delta(u)\right\}, & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

In Fig. 1 we indicate the sets $H_{l,r}$ in the various cases. Now the Rankine–Hugoniot condition says that u_l' and u_r' must solve the equation

$$f_l\left(u_l'\right)=f_r\left(u_r'\right). \tag{2.17}$$



Fig. 1 The set H_l and H_r in the two cases $u_{l,r} < 0$ and $u_{l,r} \geq 0$



Fig. 2 The solution of a Riemann problem in (u, f) (left) and in (x, u) (right)

Since f_l will be a convex non-increasing function and f_r will be a convex non-decreasing function, (2.17) will always have an infinite number of solutions. Indeed, for any value $\phi \geq \min\{f_l(u_l), f_r(u_r)\}$ we can find a unique pair (u_l', u_r') satisfying (2.14) with $f(u_l') = \phi$. We use the so-called *minimal jump entropy condition* which states that among all possible solutions, we choose the pair minimizing $|u_l' - u_r'|$. In our case this is the same as choosing the minimal possible flux across $x = 0$. Once u_l' and u_r' are determined, we can solve the Riemann problems to the left and right of $x = 0$ and piece together the solutions to form $u(x, t)$ as in (2.10).

Figure 2 shows an example of the solution, both in the (u, f) plane and in the (x, u) plane. The procedure for finding $u_{l,r}'$ in the general case is similar, but the formulas are more complicated, see [28] for details.

2.3 The large-time-stepping scheme

Now we are in a position to define a fully discrete scheme based of the semi-discrete scheme (2.2). To this end fix three independent (small) parameters δ, Δx, and Δt. Use δ to define the piecewise linear approximation f^δ from f by (2.5). The approximate initial data is defined as in (2.7). For an integrable function g, let Pg be defined as mapping to the piecewise constant functions by taking cell averages over I_j, i.e.,

$$(Pg)(x) = \frac{1}{\Delta x} \sum_j \left(\int_{I_j} g(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \right) \mathbf{1}_{I_j}(x).$$

Next, define the sequence $\left\{u^{\delta}_{\Delta x,n}\right\}_{n>0}$ by solving

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_t u^{\delta}_{\Delta x,n} + \partial_x \left(f^{\delta}\left(u^{\delta}_{\Delta x,n}\right) + B^{n-1}(x)\right) = 0,\\
&u^{\delta}_{\Delta x,n}(x,t^{n-1}) = (P u^{\delta}_{\Delta x,n-1}(\cdot,t^{n-1}))(x),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

while $u_{\Delta x,0}$ is defined by (2.7). The "coefficient" B^n is found by defining

$$B^n_j = B^n_{j-1} + \frac{\Delta x}{4}\left(A\left(x_{j-1/2}+,\bar{u}^n_{j-1}\right) + A\left(x_j-,\bar{u}^n_{j-1}\right) + A\left(x_j+,\bar{u}^n_j\right) + A\left(x_{j+1/2}-,\bar{u}^n_j\right)\right), \tag{2.19}$$

where we have set $\bar{u}^n_j = P(u^{\delta}_{\Delta x,n}(\cdot,t^n))|_{I_j}$. Recall, that since B is a primitive of A, the above formula for B is a discrete approximation to the primitive. The way in which B^n is defined is not unique and we can other equivalent definitions which agree up to truncation error of the scheme. For simplicity, we assume that $A(x,0) = 0$. This ensures that by finite speed of propagation, $B^n_j = 0$ for sufficiently negative j. Finally, define

$$B^n(x) = \sum_j B^n_j \mathbf{1}_{I_j}(x). \tag{2.20}$$

This is an approximation of the function $B(x, u^{\delta}_{\Delta x,n-1})$ defined in (2.1). Other approximations are also possible, and these would result in slightly different discrete steady states.

Note that the discrete steady state preserved by the fully discrete scheme satisfy

$$f^{\delta}(u^n_j) - B^n_j = \text{ constant}, \tag{2.21}$$

which is the fully discrete version of (2.3). The solution to (2.18) is computed using front tracking. We plan to return to the issue of theoretical convergence (as the three parameters δ, Δx, and Δt vanish) of this scheme in a forthcoming paper.

We remark that this scheme can be interpreted as a finite-volume scheme. To do this we observe that $\bar{u}^n_j$ is the cell average over I_j of the solution of (2.18). Thus

$$\bar{u}^n_j = \bar{u}^{n-1}_j - \frac{1}{\Delta x}\left(F^n_{j+1/2} - F^n_{j-1/2}\right),$$

where the numerical flux function is given by

$$F^n_{j+1/2} = \int_{t^{n-1}}^{t^n} f^{\delta}\left(u^{\delta}_{\Delta x,n}\left(x_{j+1/2},t\right)\right)\,\mathrm{d}t + \Delta t\, B^{n-1}_j.$$

Of course, we do *not* need to compute these integrals, but they can be interpreted as numerical fluxes.

3 Numerical experiments

In this section we present two numerical experiments where we have used the large-time-step method. In order to have fewer parameters, we have set $\delta = \Delta x/2$, and used the CFL number and Δx to parametrize the method. Let n be the number of points in the space discretization. In this context, the CFL number λ is defined as

$$\lambda = \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x}\max_u \left|f'(u)\right|. \tag{3.1}$$

We remark that by taking a CFL number of 0.5, the scheme proposed here is equivalent to the Godunov-type scheme proposed in our recent paper [13].



Fig. 3 Approximations to the solution u (z-axis) of (3.2) with different CFL numbers; $\lambda = 20$ (top left), $\lambda = 10$ (top right), $\lambda = 5$ (bottom left) and $\lambda = 2.5$ (bottom right)

3.1 Numerical experiment 1

In this experiment, we consider the following initial value problem:

$$u_t + \left(\frac{1}{2}u^2\right)_x = -z'(x)u, \quad z(x) = \begin{cases} \sqrt{4-x^2}, & |x| < 2 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$u(x,0) = \begin{cases} 1, & x < -3 \\ 0, & x > -3. \end{cases} \tag{3.2}$$

We consider (3.2) in the domain $x \in [-3.5, 3.5]$, $t \in [0, 8]$, and impose a constant inflow of 1 at $x = -3.5$ and an open boundary at $x = 3.5$.

The exact solution in this case is a right-moving shock which starts interacting with the bottom topography z and creates a smooth wave. The steady state is reached after the shock has moved out of the domain and is given by the function

$$\overline{u}(x) = 1 - z(x).$$

In order to test the method for various CFL numbers, we exhibit the results of computations for the CFL numbers 20, 10, 5, and 2.5. These are shown in Fig. 3. The errors at the time $t = 8$ are shown in Table 1. We show both the L^1 and L^∞ errors by comparing the computated solutions with the exact steady state. Based on these, it seems that the computations with $\lambda = 5$ and $\lambda = 2.5$ are acceptable, while for larger CFL numbers the results are inaccurate near $x = 2$. In all of these computations we used $\Delta x = 7/n$, where n is the number of cells. We also check how



Fig. 4 Approximations to the solution u of (3.2) (z-axis) with Δt constant, $\lambda = 2.5$ (top left), $\lambda = 5$ (top right), $\lambda = 10$ (bottom left) and $\lambda = 20$ (bottom right)

the approximate solutions vary when Δt is fixed and the spatial discretization Δx varies. We show the results of these computations in Fig. 4, while the errors are displayed in Table 1. Here the CFL numbers vary from 2.5 in the case where $\Delta x = 7/50$–20 in the case where $\Delta x = 7/400$. We see that the approximations are very similar despite the larger difference in CFL numbers. Hence the quality of the results are largely independent of Δx and the CFL number.

We also compare the small-time-step version of this method by taking the CFL number to be 0.5. As remarked earlier, this scheme is equivalent to the Godunov-type scheme proposed in [13]. Finally, we compare the above results with the solutions computed by the well-balanced scheme of [6], which is based on a projection to the local steady states. The numerical results are shown in Fig. 5. As expected, the scheme resolves the solution very well at this low CFL number and the steady state is approximated to very high degree of accuracy. On the other hand, the well-known well-balanced scheme of [6] leads to unphysical transients, although it also resolves the steady state to machine precision. From the above data, the large-step-method gives very good results at reasonable CFL numbers even with coarse discretizations in space. The results for both transients as well as steady states are very good at a CFL number of 5, thus leading to a order of magnitude speed-up compared to the standard time-step (CFL = 0.5) version of the scheme. For higher CFL numbers, the transients seem to be poorly resolved for coarse mesh discretizations. This is expected as interesting wave phenomena are averaged over longer periods of time. By going to finer meshes in space, the quality of the results improves significantly at even higher CFL numbers.

Table 1 $100 \times L^\infty$ error and $100 \times L^1$ error, where λ denotes the CFL number and $\Delta x = 7/n$

$\lambda \backslash n$	50	100	200
$100 \times L^\infty$ error			
20	163.1241	411.0398	49.6169
10	423.2284	48.1385	0.0326
5	13.5090	0.0583	0.0009
2.5	0.0003	0.0003	0.0005
$100 \times L^1$ error			
20	255.1162	176.5625	28.2192
10	169.1933	22.7572	0.0108
5	6.3836	0.0208	0.0007
2.5	0.0003	0.0006	0.0007



Fig. 5 Approximations to the solution u of (3.2) (z-axis) with $\Delta x = \frac{7}{100}$, $\lambda = 0.5$ (left) and the well-balanced scheme of [6] (right)

3.2 Numerical experiment 2

In this experiment we consider the equation

$$u_t + \left(\frac{1}{2}u^2\right)_x = -z'(x)u, \quad z(x) = -\cos(\pi x), \tag{3.3}$$

with the initial data

$$u(x, 0) = \cos(\pi x) + \frac{1}{10}\sin(4\pi x).$$

We consider the above problem in the domain $[-1, 1]$ with periodic boundary conditions. The exact steady state is given by

$$\overline{u}(x) = \cos(\pi x).$$

Thus the initial data is a periodic perturbation of the steady state and we expect the solution to converge to the steady state. This problem is a prototype for quasi-steady problems. The exact solution consists of small amplitudes waves which decay quickly to the steady state. We have computed the solution to this problem with both the small (CFL = 0.5) time-step version of our method and the well-balanced scheme of [6] and show the solutions in Fig. 6. Both schemes perform equally well and resolve the steady state to machine precision. But our interest in such quasi-steady problems is to compute the steady state accurately and quickly. Hence, we increase the CFL number in an attempt to take large time steps. We are not interested in an accurate resolution of the transients in this case. We show the results with a really large-time-step ($\lambda = 80$) version of our method in Fig. 7. From the figure, it is clear that the steady state is resolved accurately even at such high CFL numbers. As expected, there are some



Fig. 6 Approximations to the solution u of (3.3) (z-axis) with $\Delta x = 0.02$, $\lambda = 0.5$ (left) and the well-balanced scheme of [6] (right)



Fig. 7 The numerical solution u to (3.3), (z-axis), $\Delta x = 1/200$, $\lambda = 80$

oscillations in the transient as the averaging is over really large time steps. But we are interested in the resolution of the steady state and see that we can increase the size of time step to more than two orders of magnitude to obtain accurate resolutions of the steady state.

The above examples illustrate the effectiveness of this numerical method. It resolves steady states quite accurately. The method is fast as large time steps can be taken due to high CFL numbers. Taking large time steps can lead to incorrect transients but the solutions improves considerably by refining the space mesh as seen in Figs. 1 and 2.

4 Conclusion

We present a new numerical method for conservation laws with source terms. The main numerical issue is the accurate resolution of steady states. In order to preserve discrete steady states, the numerical method has to reflect the balance between the flux and the source at the steady state.

We propose a numerical scheme based on local reformulation the balance law as a conservation law with discontinuous coefficients. The resulting equations are solved by a front tracking method based on solutions of Riemann problems. The method preserves discrete steady states exactly, and is therefore well-balanced. Since we use front tracking, the method is unconditionally stable and we can take arbitrarily large time steps without blowup.

Numerical examples are presented and they illustrate the effectiveness of the method. In particular, the method resolves discrete steady states to a high degree of accuracy. The method is also fast since we can take very large

time steps. We have also compared the method with other existing well-balanced schemes. The method is very effective for quasi steady problems, i.e., perturbations from steady states. We plan to extend the large-stepping and well-balanced schemes of this paper to more interesting applications like shallow-water and Euler equations in a future work.

References

1. LeVeque RJ (2004) Finite volume methods for hyperbolic problems. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
2. Greenberg JM, Leroux A-Y (1996) A well-balanced scheme for the numerical processing of source terms in hyperbolic equations. SIAM J Num Anal 33:1–16
3. Gosse L, Leroux A-Y (1996) A well-balanced scheme designed for inhomogenous scalar conservation laws. C R Acad Sc Paris Ser 1, Math 323:543–546
4. Bale DS, LeVeque RJ, Mitran S, Rossmanith JA (2002) A wave propagation method for conservation laws and balance laws with spatially varying flux functions. SIAM J Sci Comp 24:955–973
5. Audusse E, Bouchut F, Bristeau MO, Klien R, Perthame B (2004) A fast and stable well-balanced scheme with hydrostatic reconstrution for shallow-water flows. SIAM J Sci Comp 25:2050–2065
6. Botchorishvili R, Perthame B, Vasseur A (2001) Equilibrium schemes for scalar conservation laws with stiff source terms. Math Comp 72(241):131–157
7. Castro M, Gallardo JM, Pares C (2006) High order finite volume schemes based on reconstruction of states for solving hyperbolic systems with non–conservative products. Math Comp 75(255):1103–1134
8. Noelle S, Pankratz N, Puppo G, Natvig JR (2006) Well-balanced finite volume schemes of arbitrary order of accuracy for shallow water flows. J Comp Phys 213(2):474–499
9. Xing Y, Shu C-W (2006) High order well-balanced WENO and DG methods for a class of hyperbolic systems with source terms. J Comp Phys 214(2):567–598
10. Russo G (2002) Central schemes for balance laws. WASCOM 2001: 11th conference on waves and stability in continuous media. World Scientific, pp. 503–514
11. Karlsen KH, Risebro NH, Towers JD (2004) Front tracking for balance equations. J Hyperbolic Diff Eqn 1:115–148
12. Karlsen KH, Towers JD (2004) Convergence of the Lax-Friedrichs scheme and stability of conservation laws with a discontinuous time-dependent flux. Chinese Ann Math Ser B 25:287–318
13. Karlsen KH, Risebro NH, Mishra S (2006) A well-balanced scheme based on a discontinuous flux formulation for conservation laws with source terms. Preprint
14. Gosse L (2002) Localization effects and measure source terms in numerical schemes for balance laws. Math Comp 71:553–582
15. Adimurthi, Jaffre J, Veerappa Gowda GD (2004) Godunov type methods for Scalar Conservation Laws with Flux function discontinuous in the space variable. SIAM J Numer Anal 42(1):179–208
16. Adimurthi , Mishra S, Veerappa Gowda GD (2005) Optimal entropy solutions for conservation laws with discontinuous flux functions. J Hyp Diff Eqns 2(4):1–56
17. Gimse T, Risebro NH (1992) Solution of Cauchy problem for a conservation law with discontinuous flux function. SIAM J Math Anal 23(3):635–648
18. Karlsen KH, Risebro NH, Towers JD (2003) L^1 stability for entropy solution of nonlinear degenerate parabolic convection-diffusion equations with discontinuous coefficients. Skr K Nor Vidensk Selsk 3:49 pp
19. Klingenberg C, Risebro NH (1995) Convex conservation laws with discontinuous coefficients: Existence, uniqueness and Asymptotic behavior. Comm Part Diff Eqns 20(11–12):1959–1990
20. Mishra S (2005) Convergence of upwind finite difference schemes for a scalar conservation law with indefinite discontinuities in the flux function. SIAM J Num Anal 43(2):559–577
21. Towers JD (2000) Convergence of a difference scheme for conservation laws with a discontinuous flux. SIAM J Numer Anal 38(2):681–698
22. Towers JD (2001) A difference scheme for conservation laws with a discontinuous flux-the nonconvex case. SIAM J Numer Anal 39(4):1197–1218
23. Karlsen KH, Mishra S, Risebro NH (2006) Convergence of finite volume schemes for triangular systems of conservation laws. Preprint
24. Bachmann F, Vovelle J (2006) Existence and uniqueness of entropy solution of scalar conservation laws with a flux function involving discontinuous coefficients. Comm Partial Diff Eqs 31(1–3):371–395
25. Noussair A (2001) Riemann problem with nonlinear resonance effects and well-balanced Godunov scheme for shallow fluid flow past an obstacle. SIAM J Numer Anal 39(1):52–72
26. Karlsen KH, Risebro NH, Towers JD (2002) Upwind difference approximations for degenerate parabolic convection-diffusion equations with a discontinuous coefficient. IMA J Numer Anal 22(4):623–664
27. Holden H, Risebro NH (2002) Front tracking for hyperbolic conservation laws. Springer Verlag, New York
28. Adimurthi, Mishra S, Veerappa Gowda GD (2005) Conservation laws with flux function discontinuous in the space variable — III, The general case. Preprint