Numerical experiments carried out with a wide class of functions showed results similar to those above and confirmed the reliability and effectiveness of the method.

NOTATION

 Δ , Laplacian operator; $\Delta u = \partial^2 u / \partial x^2 + \partial^2 u / \partial y^2$; Γ , boundary of the rectangle.

LITERATURE CITED

- 1. R. Bellman and R. Kalaba, Quasilinearization and Nonlinear Boundary-Value Problems, Amer. Elsevier (1965).
- 2. A. I. Panarin and V. V. Shchennikov, "Tensor uncoupling of multidimensional difference boundary-value problems," in: Mathematical Physics, No. 3, Moscow State Pedagogical Institute, Moscow (1976), p. 183.
- 3. V. S. Drovozyuk and N. Ya. Lyashchenko, "Numerical solution for a first boundary-value problem for a nonlinear Poisson equation," in: Computational and Applied Mathematics, No. 15, Kiev State Univ. (1971).

FINITE-ELEMENT CALCULATIONS ON NONSTATIONARY

HEAT TRANSFER

A. M. Anikeenko and O. N. Litvin

UDC 532.529:518:517.946.9

A finite-element technique has been used in solving a boundary-value problem for a two-dimensional nonstationary turbulent-diffusion equation.

The deposition and transport of particles in a flow of liquid can be described by a turbulent-diffusion equation if the concentration of the solid is low and the particles are sufficiently small. Rose [1] has defined the limits to the application of the diffusion theory with regard to particle size by experiment.

The models of [2,3] are relevant to the description of these processes, and some features of these are used here. The model of [3] describes the steady-state deposition of a solid material in a planar semiinfinite channel in the form of a boundary-value problem for a stationary equation in turbulent diffusion. A numerical solution was obtained by finitedifference methods and this is compared with experiment. Other studies [4-6] deal with models for water quality, in which the equations of hydrodynamics and turbulent diffusion are employed.

There are also other discussions [7-9] of nonstationary equations for turbulent diffusion; it has been suggested [8,9] that Galerkin's method should be used together with the finite-element technique, and the relevant systems of equations have been derived, but numerical treatments have been given only for the one-dimensional case [9] and for the twodimensional case but neglecting convective terms [8]. In [7] we find a solution to a twodimensional boundary-value problem subject to homogeneous Dirichlet conditions on the assumption that the turbulent-diffusion coefficients are constants and that there is a source of the minor component within the region only at the start.

Here we consider a model for the transport and deposition of a material suspended in a planar flow; we assume that the velocity components and the turbulent-diffusion coefficients are known functions of time and the coordinates, in which case the model can be represented as a boundary-value problem:

$$\frac{\partial c'}{\partial t'} + U(x, z, t') \frac{\partial o'}{\partial x} + W(x, z, t') \frac{\partial c'}{\partial z} + \omega' \frac{\partial c'}{\partial z} =$$

Kharkov Branch, All-Union Hydrogeology Research Institute. Translated from Inzhenerno-Fizicheskii Zhurnal, Vol. 36, No. 6, pp. 1080-1087, June, 1979. Original article submitted January 30, 1978.

$$= \frac{\partial}{\partial x} D_x(x, z, t') \frac{\partial c'}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} D_z(x, z, t') \frac{\partial c'}{\partial z} + F'(x, z, t'), (x, z, t') \in \Omega_1 \cap \{t' > 0\},$$
(1)

$$\Omega_{i} = \{ (x, z) : 0 < x < L, \quad H(x) < z < 0 \}, \Gamma_{i} : c'(0, z, t') = c_{0}(z, t'), \quad H(0) \leq z \leq 0,$$
(2)

$$\Gamma_2: D_z \left. \frac{\partial c'(x, z, t')}{\partial z} \right|_{r=0} = \omega' c'(x, 0, t'), \quad 0 \leqslant x \leqslant L, \tag{3}$$

$$\Gamma_{\mathbf{s}}: D_{\mathbf{x}} \left. \frac{\partial c'\left(x, z, t'\right)}{\partial x} \right|_{\mathbf{x}=L} = 0, \quad H\left(L\right) \leqslant z \leqslant 0, \tag{4}$$

$$\Gamma_4: \left[D_x \frac{\partial c'}{\partial x} \cos(n, 0x) + D_z \frac{\partial c'}{\partial z} \cos(n, 0z) \right]_{z=H(x)}^{t} = (1-\alpha) \omega' c'(x, H(x), t')$$
(5)

subject to the initial conditions

$$c'(x, z, 0) = \psi'(x, z)$$
 (6)

...

(the origin is taken on the free surface, while the Ox axis is directed along the main flow, and Oz is upwards).

For simplicity, we consider the problem of (1)-(6) for a planar channel with $H(x) \equiv const = -H$; then W = 0 and the distribution of the velocity U may be taken as logarithmic or some other empirical form [14].

We introduce the scale factors $U = U_m U_1$, $\omega' = U_m \omega$, $x = Lx_1$, $z = Lx_2$, $D_x = D_1 L U_*$, $D_z = D_2 L U_*$, $c' = c_1 c$, $t' = (L/U_m)t$ to reduce the equations of (1)-(6) to dimensionless form:

$$\frac{\partial c}{\partial t} + U_{1}(x_{1}, x_{2}, t) \frac{\partial c}{\partial x_{1}} + \omega \frac{\partial c}{\partial x_{2}} = \beta \sum_{l=1}^{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{l}} D_{l}(x_{1}, x_{2}, t) \frac{\partial c}{\partial x_{l}} + \beta_{1}F(x_{1}, x_{2}, t),$$

$$(x_{1}, x_{2}, t) \in \Omega \cap \{t > 0\}, \quad \Omega = \{(x_{1}, x_{2}) : 0 < x_{1} < 1, -H/L < x_{2} < 0\}, \quad (7)$$

$$c(0, x_2, t) = c_0(x_2, t), -H/L \leq x_2 \leq 0,$$
 (8)

$$\beta D_1 \frac{\partial c(x_1, x_2, t)}{\partial x_1} \bigg|_{x_1=1} = 0, \quad -H/L \leqslant x_2 \leqslant 0, \tag{9}$$

$$\beta D_2 \frac{\partial c(x_i, x_2, t)}{\partial x_2} \Big|_{x_t=0} = \omega c(x_i, 0, t), \quad 0 \leq x_i \leq L,$$
(10)

$$\beta D_2 \frac{\partial c(x_1, x_2, t)}{\partial x_2} \Big|_{x_1 = -\frac{H}{L}} = (1 - \alpha) \omega c(x_1, -H/L, t), \quad 0 \leq x_1 \leq L,$$
(11)

$$c(x_1, x_2, 0) = \psi(x_1, x_2), \qquad (12)$$

where $\beta = U_*/U_m$, $\beta_1 = L/(U_mc_1)$.

The results of [10] are then used to reduce (7)-(12) to minimization of

$$I(t) = \iint_{\Omega} \left\{ \sum_{l=1}^{2} \frac{\beta}{2} D_{l} \left(\frac{\partial c}{\partial x_{l}} \right)^{2} + U_{1} \frac{\partial c^{0}}{\partial x_{1}} c + \omega \frac{\partial c^{0}}{\partial x_{2}} c + \left(\frac{\partial c^{0}}{\partial t} - \beta_{1}F \right) c \right\} dx_{1} dx_{2} + \frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{1} (1 - \alpha) \omega c^{2} \left(x_{1}, -\frac{H}{L}, t \right) dx_{1} - \frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{1} \omega c^{2} \left(x_{1}, 0, t \right) dx_{1}$$
(13)

in a class of functions $c(x_1, x_2, t)$ that satisfy the conditions of (8) and (12); here superscript 0 denotes the desired variables, which are not used in variation in the local-potential method in (13).

In the finite-element method, we divide the region Ω into rectangular finite elements uniformly along the $0x_1$ and $0x_2$ direction by means of a grid having steps of Δ_1 and Δ_2 , respectively. The solution is sought in the class of functions that satisfy (8):

$$\tilde{c}(x_1, x_2, t) = \sum_{i,j} C_{ij}(t) h_i\left(\frac{x_1}{\Delta_1}\right) h_j\left(\frac{x_2}{\Delta_2}\right), \qquad (14)$$

where $h_i(x_1/\Delta_1)$, $h_j(x_2/\Delta_2)$ are finite piecewise-linear functions of the type

$$h_p\left(\frac{x_i}{\Delta_i}\right) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\left| \frac{x_i}{\Delta_i} - p - 1 \right| - 2 \left| \frac{x_i}{\Delta_i} - p \right| + \left| \frac{x_i}{\Delta_i} - p + 1 \right| \right), \tag{15}$$

for which the following inequality can be proved [11]:

$$\|\boldsymbol{c}-\boldsymbol{\tilde{c}}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}_{2}(\Omega)} \leqslant K(t) \Delta^{2},$$

where K(t) is a function independent of Δ , and $\Delta = \max(\Delta_1, \Delta_2)$; note that $\widetilde{c}(x_1, x_2, t)$ has the following features:

$$\vec{c}(x_{1p}, x_{2q}, t) = C_{pq}(t), \quad \forall (x_{1p}, x_{2q}) \in \overline{\Omega}, \ x_{ip} = p\Delta_{i}, \ i = 1, 2$$

The functions $U_1(x_1, x_2, t)$, $D_1(x_1, x_2, t)$, i = 1, 2, $F(x_1, x_2, t)$ are represented in the same form as the function $c(x_1, x_2, t)$:

$$\vec{U}_{1}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1}, \boldsymbol{x}_{2}, t) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{p}, \boldsymbol{q}} U_{\boldsymbol{p}\boldsymbol{q}}^{(1)}(t) h_{\boldsymbol{p}}\left(\frac{x_{1}}{\Delta_{1}}\right) h_{\boldsymbol{q}}\left(\frac{x_{2}}{\Delta_{2}}\right),$$

$$\vec{D}_{i}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1}, \boldsymbol{x}_{2}, t) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{p}, \boldsymbol{q}} D_{\boldsymbol{p}\boldsymbol{q}}^{(i)}(t) h_{\boldsymbol{p}}\left(\frac{x_{1}}{\Delta_{1}}\right) h_{\boldsymbol{q}}\left(\frac{x_{2}}{\Delta_{2}}\right), \quad i = 1, 2,$$

$$\vec{F}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1}, \boldsymbol{x}_{2}, t) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{p}, \boldsymbol{q}} f_{\boldsymbol{p}\boldsymbol{q}}(t) h_{\boldsymbol{p}}\left(\frac{x_{1}}{\Delta_{1}}\right) h_{\boldsymbol{q}}\left(\frac{x_{2}}{\Delta_{2}}\right).$$
(16)

We substitute (14) and (16) into (13) and equate the derivatives $\partial I(t)/\partial C_{\mu\nu}(t)$, $\mu = \overline{1, N}$, $\nu = \overline{1, M}$ to zero to get a Cauchy problem for the system of ordinary differential equations:

$$A \frac{d\mathbf{C}(t)}{dt} + B\mathbf{C}(t) = \mathbf{\Phi}(t), \qquad (17)$$

where $\underline{C}(t) = (C_{11}(t), \ldots, C_{1N}(t), \ldots, C_{M1}(t), \ldots, C_{MN}(t))^{T}$, $C_{pq}(0) = \psi(x_{1p}, x_{2q}), \forall (x_{1p}, x_{2q}) \in \Omega$; here A and B are matrices of dimensions MN whose elements are, respectively,

$$a_{\mu+(\nu-1)N,i+(j-1)N} = \iint_{\Omega} \Theta_{ij}(x_{1}, x_{2}) \Theta_{\mu\nu}(x_{1}, x_{2}) dx_{1} dx_{2},$$

$$b_{\mu+(\nu-1)N,i+(j-1)N} = \sum_{p,q} \left\{ \sum_{l=1}^{2} \beta D_{pq}^{(l)}(l) \iint_{\Omega} \frac{\partial \Theta_{ij}(x_{1}, x_{2})}{\partial x_{l}} \Theta_{pq}(x_{1}, x_{2}) \times \frac{\partial \Theta_{\mu\nu}(x_{1}, x_{2})}{\partial x_{l}} dx_{1} dx_{2} + U_{pq}^{(1)}(l) \iint_{\Omega} \frac{\partial \Theta_{ij}(x_{1}, x_{2})}{\partial x_{1}} \Theta_{pq}(x_{1}, x_{2}) \times \frac{\partial \Theta_{\mu\nu}(x_{1}, x_{2})}{\partial x_{l}} \partial x_{l} dx_{1} dx_{2} + U_{pq}^{(1)}(l) \iint_{\Omega} \frac{\partial \Theta_{ij}(x_{1}, x_{2})}{\partial x_{1}} \Theta_{pq}(x_{1}, x_{2}) \times \frac{\partial \Theta_{ij}(x_{1}, x_{2})}{\partial x_{l}} \Theta_{\mu\nu}(x_{1}, x_{2}) = \Theta_{\mu\nu}(x_{1}, x_{2}) dx_{1} dx_{2} + i\delta_{\mu\nu}(1 - \alpha) = \delta_{\mu\nu} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\partial \Theta_{ij}(x_{1}, x_{2})}{\partial x_{1}} dx_{2} dx_{2} dx_{3} dx_{4} dx_{5} dx_{6} dx_{$$

$$\times \Theta_{\mu\nu}(x_1, x_2) dx_1 dx_2 + \omega \left\{ \iint_{\Omega} \frac{\partial \Theta_{ij}(x_1, x_2)}{\partial x_2} \Theta_{\mu\nu}(x_1, x_2) dx_1 dx_2 + [\delta_{\nu i}(1-\alpha) - \delta_{\nu M}] \int_{0}^{\infty} h_i\left(\frac{x_1}{\Delta_i}\right) h_{\mu}\left(\frac{x_1}{\Delta_i}\right) dx_1 \right\};$$

and $\Phi(t)$ is a column vector having the components

$$\begin{split} \varphi_{\mu+(\nu-1)N} &= \sum_{p,q} \beta_{i} f_{pq}(t) \iint_{\Omega} \Theta_{pq}(x_{1}, x_{2}) \Theta_{\mu\nu}(x_{1}, x_{2}) dx_{1} dx_{2}, \\ \Theta_{ij}(x_{1}, x_{2}) &= h_{i} \left(\frac{x_{1}}{\Delta_{1}}\right) h_{j} \left(\frac{x_{2}}{\Delta_{2}}\right), \quad \mu = \overline{1, N}, \quad \nu = \overline{1, M}, \\ i, \ p &= \overline{\mu - 1 + \delta_{\mu i}, \ \mu + 1 - \delta_{\mu N}}, \quad j, \ q = \overline{\nu - 1 + \delta_{\nu i}, \ \nu + 1 - \delta_{\nu M}}; \end{split}$$

and C(t) is the column vector for the unknown functions. A novel algorithm for incorporating (8) was used in solving (17).

An Algol program for the BESM-6 has been written to solve (7)-(12).

Various difficulties arise in solving this type of problem [15], which cannot be discussed here; a standard procedure (RUKUT) was used in solving (17) for integrating ordinary differential equations by the Runge-Kutta method, with automatic step-size choice. The choice is designed to provide a reasonably stable computation, and the results confirm that this is so.

The following are some numerical results.

Example 1. The algorithm was checked out by solving (7)-(12) with

$$\beta_{i}F = \lambda \left(1 - x_{i}\right) \exp\left(-\lambda t\right) - U_{i}\left[1 - \exp\left(-\lambda t\right)\right],$$

$$c_0(x_2, t) = 1 - \exp(-\lambda t),$$

$$c(1, x_2, t) = 0, \quad \beta D_2 \frac{\partial c}{\partial x_2}\Big|_{x_2=0} = 0, \quad \beta D_2 \frac{\partial c}{\partial x_2}\Big|_{x_3=-H/L} = 0,$$

and $\psi(x_1, x_2) = 0$, which has the exact solution $c = (1 - x_1)[1 - \exp(-\lambda t)]$; in that case, the steady-state longitudinal velocity distribution is given in [14, p. 100], viz., $U_{aV} = 0.02 \text{ m/sec}$, $U_m = 0.025 \text{ m/sec}$, where D_1 and D_2 are constants: $D_1 = 0.4 \cdot 10^{-5}$, $D_2 = 0.1237 \cdot 10^{-5}$. Table 1 shows that the approximate solution is essentially the same as the accurate one. The run time was 8 min.

Example 2. Problem (7)-(12) was solved for L = 1000 m, H = 1.75 m to give the longitudinal velocity distribution as in Example 1, with $\alpha = 0.5$, $-\omega = 0.00252$, $\psi(0, x_2) = 1$; $\psi(x_1, x_2) = 0$, $(x_1 > 0)$; the coefficients D_x and D_z were taken as the following constants [12,13]:

$$D_{\rm x} = 0.22 H U_{\rm *}, \quad D_{\rm x} = 0.068 H U_{\rm *}.$$
 (18)

We also solve the stationary-state problem corresponding to (7)-(12), for which similar steps give the system of algebraic equations

$BC = \Phi$.

If t is sufficiently large (t = 2), the solution to the nonstationary problem approaches that for the stationary one (Table 2). The run time was 4 min for the stationary problem with the region divided into 72 finite elements (91 nodes), as against 8 min for the nonstationary case.

Example 3. The problem of [3] was solved for the stationary case in order to check the algorithm. Figure 1 shows that our finite-element solution agrees with the finite-difference solution of [3] (the origin was set at the bottom, $x_2 = z/H$ in [3]). The model used for the steady state in Example 2 was also checked by using the constant coefficients of (18), as well as with

$$D_{x} = 0.22 H U_{*}, \quad D_{z} = k U_{*} z \left(1 + \frac{z}{H} \right).$$
 (19)

Figure 1 shows the results. The solution with the coefficients of (19) coincides within the accuracy allowed by the graph with our finite-element solution of [3], which indicates that the D_z distribution derived by experiment in [3] is only slightly better than that provided by (19). Figure 1 also shows that the D_z averaged over the depth of (18) gives entirely satisfactory results. All the results obtained in this example were with Ω divided into 100 finite elements (124 nodes). The run time for one form was 5 min.

Example 4. Finally we give results from numerical solution of (7)-(12) with $c_0(x_2, t) = exp(-\lambda t)$ and with the U₁ and coefficients D₁, i = 1, 2, and initial conditions of Example 2, with $\alpha = 0.5$; Fig. 2 gives the results.

The model has been checked out on experimental data (Example 3), because the algorithm was written for a reasonably general case (variable D_x and D_z , various U and W as functions of time and coordinate), so it can be used in numerous practical instances. For instance, Examples 2 and 4 are derived from attempts to forecast the distribution and deposition of suspended matter in a fairly broad channel or extended pond. Solutions to such problems indicate ways of preventing silting-up in irrigation systems and reservoirs. In hydroelectric power engineering, the content of solid matter in the water has a considerable effect on the

TABLE 1. Lengthwise Concentration Distribution (Example 1), λ = 10 and t = 1

<i>x</i> ₁	0	1/6	2/6	3/6	4/6	5/6	1
A pproximate solution Exact	0,9999546 0,9999546	0,8332941 0,8332955	0,6666438 0,6666364	0,4999802 0,1999773	0,3333269	0,1666570 0,1666591	0

TABLE 2. Results from Numerical Solution of the Nonstationary Problem (A) and Stationary Problem (B) of Example 2

Туре	x2	x ₁							
		0	1/6	2/6	3/6	4/6	5/6	1	
A B	0	1	0,3172 0,3151	0,1809 0,1786	0,1171 0,1163	0,0805 0,0801	0,0569 0,0564	0,0410 0,0401	
A B	— H/6L	1	0,5159 0,4959	0,3034 0,2993	0,1996 0,1983	0,1380 0,1374	0,0972 0,0970	0,0686 0,0689	
A B	— H/3L	1	0,6989 0,6894	0,4482 0,4449	0,3062 0,3048	0,2151 0,2142	0,1530 0,1520	0,1096 0,1083	
A B	— H/2L	1	0,8494 0,8511	0,6145 0,6120	0,4388 0,4377	0,3136 0,3125	0,2239 0,2231	0,1594 0,1594	
A B	-2H/3L	1	0,9918 1,0027	0,8054 0,8059	0,5996 0,5990	0,4353 0,4338	0,3131 0,3114	0,2247 0,2230	
A B	—5H/6L	1	1,1911 1,2093	1,0387 1,0435	0,7929 0,7927	0,5805 0,5789	0,4182 0,4166	0,2990 0,2984	
A B	— <i>H/L</i>	1 1	1,5460	1,3636 1,3688	1,0454 1,0453	0,7667 0,7642	0,5532 0,5504	0,3970 0,3943	



Fig. 1. Depth distribution of suspended matter (Example 3): a) at inlet $(x_1 = 0)$; b-d) for $x_1 = 0.1351$, 0.2696, 0.6804, respectively; the points are from experiment [3]; 1) finitedifference solution [3]; 2, 3) our solution $(D_x \text{ and } D_z \text{ in}$ accordance with (18)).



Fig. 2. Distributions of suspended-matter concentration for t = 1 (a) and t = 4.5 (b) (Example 4).

working life of the turbines, and here the prediction of the behavior of solid material is particularly important.

NOTATION

 Ω_1 , domain of spatial variables with boundary Γ ; Γ_1 and Γ_3 , boundary segments parallel to Oz (inlet and outlet, respectively); Γ_2 , free surface; Γ_4 , bottom of contour; n, direction of the exterior normal to the boundary of Ω_1 ; L and H, channel length and depth; x and z, horizontal and vertical coordinates; t', time; U and W, horizontal and vertical velocity components; c', impurity concentration; ω' , hydraulic parameter; D_X and D_Z , turbulent-diffusion coefficients; F', source (sink) function; $0 \le \alpha \le 1$, bottom-absorption coefficient; U*, dynamic velocity, U_m , free-surface value of U; U_{aV} , average value of U; c_1 , characteristic inlet value of impurity concentration; $\Delta_1(\Delta_2)$, step size along $0x_1(0x_2)$; δ_{ij} , Kronecker symbol; k, Karman constant.

LITERATURE CITED

- 1. M. A. Velikanov, The River-Bed Process [in Russian], GIFML, Moscow (1958).
- 2. K. Cecen and M. Sumer, Proc. 14th Congress IAHR, Vol. 1, 9 (1971).
- 3. H. E. Jobson and W. W. Sayre, Proc. ASCE, Hydraul. <u>96</u>, 1983 (1970).
- 4. O. F. Vasil'ev, Trans. Int. Inst. Systems Anal., 1, 106 (1974).
- 5. Zh. N. Kudryasheva, Inzh.-Fiz. Zh., 31, 105 (1976).
- 6. R. V. Pyaskovskii and V. N. Molchanov, Meteorol. Gidrol., No. 3, 68 (1976).
- 7. K. Muraoka and K. Nakatsuji, Technol. Repts. Osaka Univ., 24, 827 (1974).
- 8. R. T. Cheng and D. S. Hodge, J. Int. Assoc. Math. Geol., 8, 43 (1976).
- 9. R. Ariathurai and R. B. Krone, Proc. ASCE, Hydraul. Div., 102, 323 (1976).
- 10. I. Djarmati. Nonequilibrium Thermodynamics [Russian translation], Mir, Moscow (1974).
- 11. G. Birkhoff, M. H. Schultz, and R. S. Varga, Numer. Math., 11, 232 (1968).
- 12. W. J. Elder, Fluid Mech., 5, 544 (1959).
- 13. K. Cecen, M. Bayazit, and M. Sumer, Proc. 13th Congress IAHR, Vol. 4, 215 (1969).
- 14. A. V. Karaushev, River-Bed Hydraulics [in Russian], Gidrometeoizdat, Leningrad (1969).
- 15. J. Douglas and T. Dupont, Lect. Notes Phys., <u>58</u>, 207 (1976).

CHARACTERISTIC METHOD IN HEAT TRANSPORT IN FAST

NONSTATIONARY PROCESSES

V. A. Makagonov

The characteristic method has been used in numerical solution of a hyperbolic heat-transport equation.

The following hyperbolic equation is involved in heat-transfer calculation for fast nonstationary processes of one-dimensional type:

$$c\rho \frac{\partial T}{\partial \tau} + c\rho\tau_r \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial \tau^2} = \lambda \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial x^2}$$
(1)

UDC 536.2

subject to the appropriate initial and boundary conditions. As a rule, the boundary conditions are nonlinear, and then there are major difficulties in obtaining an analytic solution. A network method (explicit difference scheme) has been used [1] to solve (1). Studies have been made [2,3] on the construction of difference schemes for equations of hyperbolic type on the basis of characteristic relationships, particularly with regard to the stability; here we show that the characteristic method can be applied in heat-transfer calculations for fast nonstationary processes.

We first put

$$V = \frac{\partial T}{\partial \mathbf{r}} , \quad W = \frac{\partial T}{\partial x} , \tag{1}$$

Translated from Inzhenerno-Fizicheskii Zhurnal, Vol. 36, No. 6, pp. 1088-1092, June, 1979. Original article submitted June 21, 1978.