

# Central Schemes for the Modified Buckley-Leverett Equation

Ying Wang<sup>a,b,\*</sup>, Chiu-Yen Kao<sup>a,c,1</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Department of Mathematics, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210*

<sup>b</sup>*School of Mathematics, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN55455*

<sup>c</sup>*Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Claremont Mckenna College, CA 91711*

---

## Abstract

In this paper, we extend the second and third order classical central schemes for the hyperbolic conservation laws to solve the modified Buckley-Leverett (MBL) equation which is of pseudo-parabolic type. The MBL equation describes two-phase flow in porous media, and it differs from the classical Buckley-Leverett (BL) equation by including a balanced diffusive-dispersive combination. The classical BL equation gives a monotone water saturation profile for any Riemann problem; on the contrast, when the dispersive parameter is large enough, the MBL equation delivers non-monotone water saturation profiles for certain Riemann problems as suggested by the experimental observations. Numerical results in this paper confirm the existence of non-monotone water saturation profiles consisting of constant states separated by shocks.

*Keywords:* conservation laws, dynamic capillarity, two-phase flows, porous media, shock waves, pseudo-parabolic equations, central schemes

*2008 MSC:* 35L65, 35L67, 35K70, 76S05, 65M06, 65M08

---

## 1. Introduction

The classical Buckley-Leverett (BL) equation [1] is a simple model for two-phase fluid flow in a porous medium. One application is secondary recovery by water-drive in oil reservoir simulation. In one space dimension the equation has the standard conservation form

$$\begin{aligned} u_t + (f(u))_x &= 0 & \text{in} & & Q = \{(x, t) : x > 0, t > 0\} \\ u(x, 0) &= 0 & & & x \in (0, \infty) \\ u(0, t) &= u_B & & & t \in [0, \infty) \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

---

\*Corresponding author

*Email addresses:* wang@umn.edu (Ying Wang), kao@math.ohio-state.edu, ckao@cmc.edu (Chiu-Yen Kao)

<sup>1</sup>This work was supported in part by NSF Grant DMS-0811003 and an Alfred P. Sloan Fellowship.

with the flux function  $f(u)$  being defined as

$$f(u) = \begin{cases} 0 & u < 0, \\ \frac{u^2}{u^2 + M(1-u)^2} & 0 \leq u \leq 1, \\ 1 & u > 1. \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

In this context,  $u : \bar{Q} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  denotes the water saturation (e.g.  $u = 1$  means pure water, and  $u = 0$  means pure oil),  $u_B$  is a constant which indicates water saturation at  $x = 0$ , and  $M > 0$  is the water/oil viscosity ratio. The classical BL equation (1.1) is a prototype for conservation laws with convex-concave flux functions. The graph of  $f(u)$  and  $f'(u)$  with  $M = 2$  is given in Figure 1.1.




Figure 1.1:  $f(u)$  and  $f'(u)$  with  $M = 2$ .

The classical BL equation (1.1) has been well studied (see [10] for an introduction). Let  $\alpha$  be the solution of  $f'(u) = \frac{f(u)}{u}$ , i.e.,

$$\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{M}{M+1}}. \quad (1.3)$$

The entropy solution of the classical BL equation can be classified into two categories:

1. If  $0 < u_B \leq \alpha$ , the entropy solution has a single shock at  $\frac{x}{t} = \frac{f(u_B)}{u_B}$ .
2. If  $\alpha < u_B < 1$ , the entropy solution contains a rarefaction between  $u_B$  and  $\alpha$  for  $f'(u_B) < \frac{x}{t} < f'(\alpha)$  and a shock at  $\frac{x}{t} = \frac{f(\alpha)}{\alpha}$ .

These two types of solutions are shown in Figure 1.2 for  $M = 2$ . In either case, the entropy solution of the classical BL equation (1.1) is a non-increasing function of  $x$  at any given time  $t > 0$ . However, the experiments of two-phase flow in porous medium reveal complex infiltration profiles, which may involve overshoot, i.e., profiles may not be monotone [4]. This suggests the need of modification to the classical BL equation (1.1).




Figure 1.2: The entropy solution of the classical BL equation ( $M = 2$ ,  $\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \approx 0.8165$ ). (a)  $0 < u_B = 0.7 \leq \alpha$ , the solution consists of one shock at  $\frac{x}{t} = \frac{f(u_B)}{u_B}$ ; (b)  $\alpha < u_B = 0.98 < 1$ , the solution consists of a rarefaction between  $u_B$  and  $\alpha$  for  $f'(u_B) < \frac{x}{t} < f'(\alpha)$  and a shock at  $\frac{x}{t} = \frac{f(\alpha)}{\alpha}$ .

Hassanzadeh and Gray [5, 6] have included a third order mixed derivatives dispersive term, which models the *dynamic* effects in the capillary pressure difference between the two phases. Following the linearization and rescaling in [14, 15, 16], the modified Buckley-Leverett equation (MBL) is derived as

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial f(u)}{\partial x} = \epsilon \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} + \epsilon^2 \tau \frac{\partial^3 u}{\partial x^2 \partial t}, \quad (1.4)$$

where  $\epsilon$  is the diffusion coefficient. Van Duijn et al. [15] showed how  $\epsilon$  and  $\tau$  determine the type of the solution profile. In particular, for certain Riemann problems, the solution profile of (1.4) is not monotone when  $\tau$  is larger than the threshold value  $\tau_*$ , where  $\tau_*$  was numerically determined to be 0.61 [15]. The non-monotonicity of the solution profile is consistent with the experimental observations [4].

The classical BL equation (1.1) is hyperbolic, and the numerical schemes for hyperbolic equations have been well developed (e.g. [10, 11, 2, 3, 13, 8]). The MBL equation (1.4), however, is pseudo-parabolic. Van Duijn et al. [15] have developed a first order finite difference scheme to solve the MBL equation (1.4). In this paper, we will illustrate how to extend the second and third order central schemes [13, 8, 9] to solve (1.4) numerically. The local discontinuous Galerkin method has been applied to solve equations involving mixed derivatives  $u_{xxt}$  term [18, 19]. To the best knowledge of the authors, the central schemes have not been applied to solve equations of this kind. The main advantage of the central schemes is the simplicity. The “direction of the wind” is not required to be identified, and hence the field-by-field decomposition can be avoided.

Unlike the finite domain of dependence for the classical BL equation (1.1), the domain of dependence for the MBL equation (1.4) is infinite. This naturally raises the question for the choice of computational domain. To answer this question, Wang et al [17] studied the MBL

equation equipped with two types of domains, one is the half line domain  $x \in [0, +\infty)$ , and the other one is finite interval domain  $x \in [x, L]$ . Wang et al [17] have shown that the difference between the solutions of these two types of problems decays exponentially with respect to the length of the interval  $L$  for practically interesting initial profiles. This provides a theoretical justification for the choice of the computational domain. Therefore, the numerical results in this paper are sought on the finite interval domain  $x \in [0, L]$  with sufficiently large  $L$ .

The organization of this paper is as follows. In section 2, the second and third order central schemes will be developed for MBL equation in the finite interval domain. We provide a detailed derivation on how to extend the central schemes [13, 8] for conservation laws to solve the MBL equation (1.4). The idea of adopting numerical schemes originally designed for hyperbolic equations to pseudo-parabolic equations is not restricted to central type schemes only ([18, 19]). The numerical results in section 3 show that the water saturation profile strongly depends on the dispersive parameter  $\tau$  value as studied in [15]. For  $\tau > \tau_*$ , the MBL equation (1.4) gives non-monotone water saturation profiles for certain Riemann problems as suggested by experimental observations [4]. Section 4 gives the conclusion of the paper and the possible future directions.

## 2. Numerical schemes

In this section, we show how to apply the central schemes [13, 8] originally designed for hyperbolic conservation laws to numerically solve the MBL equation (1.4), which is of pseudo-parabolic type. Specifically, we solve the following finite domain initial boundary value problem

$$\begin{aligned} u_t + (f(u))_x &= \epsilon u_{xx} + \epsilon^2 \tau u_{xxt} & x \in (0, L), \quad t > 0 \\ u(x, 0) &= u_B \chi_{\{x=0\}} + 0 \chi_{\{0 < x \leq L\}} \\ u(0, t) &= u_B, \quad u(L, t) = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

We first collect all the terms with time derivative and rewrite MBL equation (1.4) as

$$(u - \epsilon^2 \tau u_{xx})_t + (f(u))_x = \epsilon u_{xx}. \tag{2.2}$$

By letting

$$w = u - \epsilon^2 \tau u_{xx} \iff u = (I - \epsilon^2 \tau \partial_{xx})^{-1} w, \tag{2.3}$$

MBL equation (2.2) can be written as

$$w_t + (f(u))_x = \epsilon u_{xx}. \tag{2.4}$$

Now, the new form of MBL equation (2.4) can be viewed as a PDE in terms of  $w$ , and the occurrence of  $u$  can be recovered by (2.3). Equation (2.4) can be formally viewed as

$$w_t + (f((I - \epsilon^2 \tau \partial_{xx})^{-1} w))_x = \epsilon ((I - \epsilon^2 \tau \partial_{xx})^{-1} w)_{xx}, \tag{2.5}$$

which is a balance law in term of  $w$ . In this section, we demonstrate how to apply the second and third order central schemes to solve the MBL equation (2.2).

### 2.1. Second-order schemes

In this section, we show how to apply the classical second order central schemes [13] originally designed for hyperbolic conservation laws to numerically solve the MBL equation (1.4), which is of pseudo-parabolic type. To solve (2.4), we modify the central scheme given in [13]. As in [13], at each time level, we first reconstruct a piecewise linear approximation of the form

$$L_j(x, t) = w_j(t) + (x - x_j) \frac{w'_j}{\Delta x}, \quad x_{j-\frac{1}{2}} \leq x \leq x_{j+\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (2.6)$$

Second-order accuracy is guaranteed if the so-called vector of numerical derivative  $\frac{w'_j}{\Delta x}$ , which will be given later, satisfies

$$\frac{w'_j}{\Delta x} = \frac{\partial w(x_j, t)}{\partial x} + O(\Delta x). \quad (2.7)$$

We denote the staggered piecewise-constant functions  $\bar{w}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}(t)$  as

$$\bar{w}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}(t) = \frac{1}{\Delta x} \int_{x_j}^{x_{j+1}} w(x, t) dx. \quad (2.8)$$

Evolve the piecewise linear interpolant (2.6) by integrating (2.4) over  $[x_j, x_{j+1}] \times [t, t + \Delta t]$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{w}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}(t + \Delta t) &= \bar{w}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}(t) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{\Delta x} \left[ \int_t^{t+\Delta t} f(u(x_{j+1}, s)) ds - \int_t^{t+\Delta t} f(u(x_j, s)) ds \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{\epsilon}{\Delta x} \left[ \int_t^{t+\Delta t} \int_{x_j}^{x_{j+1}} \frac{\partial^2 u(x, s)}{\partial x^2} dx ds \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

We calculate each term on the right hand side of (2.9) below. For  $\bar{w}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}(t)$ , applying the definition of  $L_j(x, t)$  and  $L_{j+1}(x, t)$  given in (2.6) to (2.8), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{w}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}(t) &= \frac{1}{\Delta x} \int_{x_j}^{x_{j+\frac{1}{2}}} L_j(x, t) dx + \frac{1}{\Delta x} \int_{x_{j+\frac{1}{2}}}^{x_{j+1}} L_{j+1}(x, t) dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(w_j(t) + w_{j+1}(t)) + \frac{1}{8}(w'_j - w'_{j+1}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

The middle two integrands can be approximated by the midpoint rule

$$\begin{aligned} \int_t^{t+\Delta t} f(u(x_j, s)) ds &= f(u(x_j, t + \frac{\Delta t}{2}))\Delta t + O(\Delta t^3) \\ \int_t^{t+\Delta t} f(u(x_{j+1}, s)) ds &= f(u(x_{j+1}, t + \frac{\Delta t}{2}))\Delta t + O(\Delta t^3) \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

if the CFL condition

$$\lambda \cdot \max_{x_j \leq x \leq x_{j+1}} \left| \frac{\partial f(u(w(x, t)))}{\partial w} \right| < \frac{1}{2}, \quad \text{where } \lambda = \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x}$$

is met. For MBL equation (2.4), we have that at  $t > 0$ ,

$$u - \epsilon^2 \tau u_{xx} = w, \quad u(0) = w(0), \quad u(L) = w(L). \quad (2.12)$$

To solve the boundary value problem (2.12), we let  $v(x) = \frac{(L-x)w(0)+xw(L)}{L}$ , then

$$u(x) = [(I - \epsilon^2 \tau \partial_{xx})^{-1} w](x) = v(x) + \frac{1}{L} \int_0^L [w(y) - v(y)] K(x, y) dy$$

where

$$K(x, y) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\sin(\frac{k\pi x}{L}) \sin(\frac{k\pi y}{L})}{1 + (\frac{k\pi}{L})^2 \epsilon^2 \tau}.$$

Hence the eigenvalues for  $(I - \epsilon^2 \tau \partial_{xx})^{-1}$  are

$$\lambda_k = \frac{1}{1 + (\frac{k\pi}{L})^2 \epsilon^2 \tau} \leq 1, \quad k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$$

Therefore, the CFL condition is

$$\frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x} \cdot \max_{x_j \leq x \leq x_{j+1}} \left| \frac{\partial f(u(w(x, t)))}{\partial w} \right| = \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x} \cdot \max_{\substack{x_j \leq x \leq x_{j+1} \\ k=1,2,3,\dots}} \left| \frac{\partial f(u(x, t))}{\partial u} \right| \cdot \lambda_k \leq \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x} \cdot 2.2 < \frac{1}{2}$$

In the numerical computations in section 3, we chose  $\frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x} = 0.1$ . In (2.11), to estimate  $u(\cdot, t + \frac{\Delta t}{2})$ 's, we use Taylor expansion and the conservation law (2.4):

$$\begin{aligned} w(x_j, t + \frac{\Delta t}{2}) &= w_j(t) + \frac{\partial w}{\partial t} \frac{\Delta t}{2} + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^2) \\ &= w_j(t) + (\epsilon \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}) \frac{\Delta t}{2} + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^2) \\ &= w_j(t) + (\epsilon \Delta x D^2 u_j - f'_j) \frac{\lambda}{2}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

where  $D$  is the discrete central difference operator

$$D^2 u_j = \frac{u_{j-1} - 2u_j + u_{j+1}}{\Delta x^2},$$

and the second-order accuracy is met if

$$\frac{f'_j}{\Delta x} = \frac{\partial f(u(x_j, t))}{\partial x} + \mathcal{O}(\Delta x). \quad (2.14)$$

The choices for  $\{w'_j\}$  in (2.7) and  $\{f'_j\}$  in (2.14) can be found in [13], and we chose

$$w'_j = MM\{\Delta w_{j+\frac{1}{2}}, \Delta w_{j-\frac{1}{2}}\}, \quad f'_j = MM\{\Delta f_{j+\frac{1}{2}}, \Delta f_{j-\frac{1}{2}}\} \quad (2.15)$$

where  $MM\{x, y\} = \min\text{mod}(x, y) = \frac{1}{2}(\text{sgn}(x) + \text{sgn}(y)) \cdot \text{Min}(|x|, |y|)$  and  $\Delta w_{j+\frac{1}{2}} = w_{j+1} - w_j$ . Notice that (2.15) determines  $w'_j$  and  $f'_j$  values ultimately based on one-sided difference, which makes the proposed schemes not purely central. However, this choice ensures the proposed schemes to be non-oscillatory.

Combining (2.9)-(2.11), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{w}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}(t + \Delta t) = & \bar{w}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}(t) \\ & - \lambda [f(u_{j+1}(t + \frac{\Delta t}{2}) - f(u_j(t + \frac{\Delta t}{2})))] \\ & + \frac{\epsilon}{\Delta x} \left[ \int_t^{t+\Delta t} \int_{x_j}^{x_{j+1}} \frac{\partial^2 u(x, s)}{\partial x^2} dx ds \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

Next, we will re-write (2.16) in terms of  $u$ .  $(\overline{u_{xx}})_{j+\frac{1}{2}}$  is approximated as

$$(\overline{u_{xx}})_{j+\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{1}{\Delta x} \int_{x_j}^{x_{j+1}} u_{xx} dx = \frac{1}{\Delta x} (u_x(x_{j+1}, t) - u_x(x_j, t)),$$

and using the cell averages, it becomes

$$\begin{aligned} (\overline{u_{xx}})_{j+\frac{1}{2}} &= \frac{1}{\Delta x} \left( \frac{\bar{u}_{j+3/2} - \bar{u}_{j+1/2}}{\Delta x} - \frac{\bar{u}_{j+1/2} - \bar{u}_{j-1/2}}{\Delta x} \right) \\ &= \frac{\bar{u}_{j+3/2} - 2\bar{u}_{j+1/2} + \bar{u}_{j-1/2}}{(\Delta x)^2} \\ &= D^2 \bar{u}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

Notice that the linear interpolation (similar to (2.6))

$$\tilde{L}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}(x, t + \Delta t) = u_{j+\frac{1}{2}}(t + \Delta t) + (x - x_{j+\frac{1}{2}}) \frac{u'_{j+\frac{1}{2}}}{\Delta x} \quad \text{for } x_j \leq x \leq x_{j+1}$$

and the cell average definition (similar to (2.8))

$$\bar{u}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}(t + \Delta t) = \frac{1}{\Delta t} \int_{x_j}^{x_{j+1}} u(x, t + \Delta t) dx$$

ensures that

$$\bar{u}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}(t + \Delta t) = u_{j+\frac{1}{2}}(t + \Delta t),$$

and the conversion between  $u$  and  $w$  is done using the following relation

$$(I - \epsilon^2 \tau D^2)u = w. \quad (2.18)$$

Hence re-writting (2.16) in terms of  $u$  gives the staggered central scheme

$$\begin{aligned}
(I - \epsilon^2 \tau D^2)u_{j+\frac{1}{2}}(t + \Delta t) &= (I - \epsilon^2 \tau D^2)\bar{u}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}(t) \\
&\quad - \lambda[f(u_{j+1}(t + \frac{\Delta t}{2}) - f(u_j(t + \frac{\Delta t}{2})))] \\
&\quad + \frac{\epsilon}{\Delta x} \left[ \int_t^{t+\Delta t} \int_{x_j}^{x_{j+1}} \frac{\partial^2 u(x, s)}{\partial x^2} dx ds \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{2.19}$$

We will focus on the last integral in (2.19). There are many ways to numerically calculate this integral. We will show two ways to do this in the following two subsections, both of them achieve second order accuracy.

### 2.1.1. Trapezoid Scheme

In this scheme, we use the notion (2.8) and the trapezoid rule to calculate the integral numerically as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_t^{t+\Delta t} \int_{x_j}^{x_{j+1}} \frac{\partial^2 u(x, s)}{\partial x^2} dx ds &= \Delta x \int_t^{t+\Delta t} (\bar{u}_{xx})_{j+\frac{1}{2}}(s) ds \\
&= \frac{\Delta x \Delta t}{2} \left( (\bar{u}_{xx})_{j+\frac{1}{2}}(t) + (\bar{u}_{xx})_{j+\frac{1}{2}}(t + \Delta t) \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{2.20}$$

with  $\mathcal{O}(\Delta t^3)$  error. Combining with (2.17) and (2.19), we can get the trapezoid scheme

$$\begin{aligned}
\left( I - \left( \epsilon^2 \tau + \frac{\epsilon \Delta t}{2} \right) D^2 \right) u_{j+\frac{1}{2}}(t + \Delta t) &= \left( I - \left( \epsilon^2 \tau - \frac{\epsilon \Delta t}{2} \right) D^2 \right) \bar{u}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}(t) \\
&\quad - \lambda \left[ f(u_{j+1}(t + \frac{\Delta t}{2})) - f(u_j(t + \frac{\Delta t}{2})) \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

The flow chart of the trapezoid scheme is given in (2.22)

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
& & & \xrightarrow{(2.18)} \bar{w}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}(t) & \xrightarrow{(2.18)} \bar{u}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}(t) & & \\
& & & \nearrow (2.10) & & \searrow (2.21) & \\
u_j(t) & \xrightarrow{(2.18)} & w_j(t) & & & & u_{j+\frac{1}{2}}(t + \Delta t) \\
& & & \searrow (2.13) & & \nearrow (2.21) & \\
& & & w_j(t + \frac{\Delta t}{2}) & \xrightarrow{(2.18)} & u_j(t + \frac{\Delta t}{2}) & 
\end{array} \tag{2.22}$$

### 2.1.2. Midpoint Scheme

In this scheme, we use the notion (2.8) and the midpoint rule to calculate the integral numerically as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_t^{t+\Delta t} \int_{x_j}^{x_{j+1}} \frac{\partial^2 u(x, s)}{\partial x^2} dx ds &= \Delta x \int_t^{t+\Delta t} (\bar{u}_{xx})_{j+\frac{1}{2}}(s) ds \\
&= \Delta x \Delta t (\bar{u}_{xx})_{j+\frac{1}{2}}(t + \frac{\Delta t}{2}).
\end{aligned}$$



Combining with (2.17) and (2.19), we can get the midpoint scheme

$$\begin{aligned}
(I - \epsilon^2 \tau D^2)u_{j+\frac{1}{2}}(t + \Delta t) = & \bar{w}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}(t) \\
& - \lambda[f(u_{j+1}(t + \frac{\Delta t}{2}) - f(u_j(t + \frac{\Delta t}{2})))] \\
& + \epsilon \Delta t D^2 \bar{u}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}(t + \frac{\Delta t}{2}).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.23}$$

The flow chart of the midpoint scheme is given in (2.24)

$$\begin{array}{c}
\bar{w}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}(t) \xrightarrow{(2.23)} u_{j+\frac{1}{2}}(t + \Delta t) \\
\begin{array}{c}
(2.10) \nearrow \\
u_j(t) \xrightarrow{(2.18)} w_j(t) \\
(2.13) \searrow
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\bar{w}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}(t + \frac{\Delta t}{2}) \xrightarrow{(2.18)} \bar{u}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}(t + \frac{\Delta t}{2}) \\
\uparrow (2.10) \\
w_j(t + \frac{\Delta t}{2}) \xrightarrow{(2.18)} u_j(t + \frac{\Delta t}{2})
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
(2.23) \searrow \\
u_{j+\frac{1}{2}}(t + \Delta t)
\end{array}
\end{array} \tag{2.24}$$

## 2.2. A third order semi-discrete scheme

Similarly, we can extend the third order scheme to solve MBL equation (1.4), however, it is more involved. But the third order semi-discrete central scheme proposed in [8] can be extended to solve the MBL equation in a straightforward manner. In order to make the paper self-contained, we include the formulation below.

$$\frac{d\bar{w}_j}{dt} = -\frac{H_{j+1/2}(t) - H_{j-1/2}(t)}{\Delta x} + \epsilon Q_j(t)$$

where  $\bar{w}(x, t)$  denotes the cell average of  $w$

$$\bar{w}_j(t) = \frac{1}{\Delta x} \int_{x_{j-1/2}}^{x_{j+1/2}} w(x, t) dx,$$

$H_{j+1/2}(t)$  is the numerical convection flux and  $Q_j(t)$  is a high-order approximation to the diffusion term  $u_{xx}$

$$H_{j+1/2}(t) = \frac{f(u_{j+1/2}^+(t)) + f(u_{j+1/2}^-(t))}{2} - \frac{a_{j+1/2}(t)}{2} [w_{j+1/2}^+(t) - w_{j+1/2}^-(t)]$$

where  $u_{j+1/2}^-(t), u_{j+1/2}^+(t)$  denote the left and right intermediate values of  $u(x, t^n)$  at  $x_{j+1/2}$ , and their values are converted from the  $w_{j+1/2}^-(t), w_{j+1/2}^+(t)$  using (2.3). The way to calculate

$w_{j+1/2}^-(t)$ ,  $w_{j+1/2}^+(t)$  and  $a_{j+1/2}(t)$  is

$$\begin{aligned} w_{j+1/2}^+(t) &= A_{j+1} - \frac{\Delta x}{2} B_{j+1} + \frac{(\Delta x)^2}{8} C_{j+1}, \\ w_{j+1/2}^-(t) &= A_j + \frac{\Delta x}{2} B_j + \frac{(\Delta x)^2}{8} C_j, \\ a_{j+1/2}(t) &= \max \left\{ \frac{\partial f}{\partial u}(u_{j+1/2}^-(t)), \frac{\partial f}{\partial u}(u_{j+1/2}^+(t)) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_j &= \bar{w}_j^n - \frac{W_C^j}{12} (\bar{w}_{j+1}^n - 2\bar{w}_j^n + \bar{w}_{j-1}^n), \\ B_j &= \frac{1}{\Delta x} \left[ W_R^j (\bar{w}_{j+1}^n - \bar{w}_j^n) + W_C^j \frac{\bar{w}_{j+1}^n - \bar{w}_{j-1}^n}{2} + W_L^j (\bar{w}_j^n - \bar{w}_{j-1}^n) \right], \\ C_j &= 2W_C^j \frac{\bar{w}_{j-1}^n - 2\bar{w}_j^n + \bar{w}_{j+1}^n}{\Delta x^2}, \\ W_i^j &= \frac{\alpha_i^j}{\sum_m \alpha_m^j} \quad \alpha_i^j = \frac{c_i}{(\epsilon_0 + IS_i^j)^p}, \quad i, m \in \{C, R, L\} \\ c_L &= c_R = 1/4, \quad c_C = 1/2, \quad \epsilon_0 = 10^{-6}, \quad p = 2, \\ IS_L^j &= (\bar{w}_j^n - \bar{w}_{j-1}^n)^2, \quad IS_R^j = (\bar{w}_{j+1}^n - \bar{w}_j^n)^2, \\ IS_C^j &= \frac{13}{3} (\bar{w}_{j+1}^n - 2\bar{w}_j^n + \bar{w}_{j-1}^n)^2 + \frac{1}{4} (\bar{w}_{j+1}^n - \bar{w}_{j-1}^n)^2. \end{aligned}$$

The diffusion  $u_{xx}$  is approximated using the following fourth-order central differencing form

$$Q_j(t) = \frac{-\bar{u}_{j-2} + 16\bar{u}_{j-1} - 30\bar{u}_j + 16\bar{u}_{j+1} - \bar{u}_{j+2}}{12\Delta x^2}. \quad (2.25)$$

The boundary conditions (2.1) are extended to the ghost points at the boundaries. The scheme is semi-discrete in the sense that the discretization is done in space first, and then the time evolution equation can be solved as a system of ordinary differential equations using any ODE solver of third order or higher. In this paper, we simply use the standard fourth order Runge-Kutta methods. Notice that to achieve the third order accuracy, the linear solver that converts  $u$  from  $w$  using (2.3) need also to be high order, and (2.25) is used to discretize  $u_{xx}$  in our conversion.

### 3. Computational results

In this section, we show the numerical solutions to the MBL equation

$$\begin{aligned} u_t + (f(u))_x &= \epsilon u_{xx} + \epsilon^2 \tau u_{xxt} \quad x \in (0, L), \quad t > 0 \\ u(x, 0) &= u_B \chi_{\{x=0\}} + 0 \chi_{\{0 < x \leq L\}} \\ u(0, t) &= u_B, \quad u(L, t) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

To validate the order analysis given in section 2 for various schemes proposed, we first test the order of our schemes numerically with a smooth initial condition

$$u_0(x) = u_B H(x - 5, 5),$$

where

$$H(x, \xi) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x < -\xi \\ 1 - \frac{1}{2}\left(1 + \frac{x}{\xi} + \frac{1}{\pi} \sin\left(\frac{\pi x}{\xi}\right)\right) & \text{if } -\xi \leq x \leq \xi \\ 0 & \text{if } x > \xi \end{cases}.$$

The final time  $T = 1$  was employed, so that there was no shock created.  $\epsilon$  in the MBL equation (3.1) is taken to be 1,  $M$  is taken to be 2, and the computational interval is  $[-10, 20]$ . The  $L_1, L_2, L_\infty$  order tests of the trapezoid scheme and the third order semi-discrete scheme with different parameter  $\tau$  values and the initial condition  $u_B$  are given in Tables 3.1 and 3.2. Table 3.1 shows that the trapezoid rule achieved second order accuracy for all the tested cases in  $L_1, L_2, L_\infty$  sense. Table 3.2 shows that the semi-discrete scheme has the order of accuracy greater than 2.3 for all the cases, and exceeds 3 for some cases. This confirms the accuracy study given in sections 2.1.1 and 2.2 respectively.

We will now use examples to study the solutions to MBL equation (3.1) using the numerical schemes proposed in section 2. We first notice that if we scale  $t$  and  $x$  as follows

$$\tilde{t} = \frac{t}{\epsilon}, \quad \tilde{x} = \frac{x}{\epsilon},$$

then MBL (3.1) equation can be written in terms of  $\tilde{t}$  and  $\tilde{x}$  as follows

$$u_{\tilde{t}} + (f(u))_{\tilde{x}} = u_{\tilde{x}\tilde{x}} + \tau u_{\tilde{x}\tilde{x}\tilde{t}}. \quad (3.2)$$

The scaled equation (3.2) shows that it is the magnitude of  $\frac{t}{\epsilon}$  and  $\frac{x}{\epsilon}$  that determine the asymptotic behavior, not  $t$ ,  $x$ , neither  $\epsilon$  alone ([15]). In addition, (3.2) also shows that the dispersive parameter  $\tau$  denotes the relative importance of the dispersive term  $u_{xxt}$ . The bigger  $\tau$  is, the more dispersive effect equation (3.1) has. This can be seen from the computational results to be shown later in this section.

Duijn et al. [15] numerically provided a bifurcation diagram (Figure 3.1) of MBL (3.1) equation as the dispersive parameter  $\tau$  and the post-shock value  $u_B$  of the initial condition vary. The solution of (3.1) has been proven to display qualitatively different profiles for parameter values  $(\tau, u_B)$  falling in different regimes of the bifurcation diagram. In particular, for every fixed  $\tau$  value, there are two critical  $u_B$  values, namely,  $\bar{u}$  and  $\underline{u}$ . From the bifurcation diagram (Figure 3.1), it is clear that, when  $\tau < \tau_*$ ,  $\bar{u} = \underline{u} = \alpha$ . For a fixed  $\tau$  value, the solution has three different profiles.

- (a) If  $u_B \in [\bar{u}, 1]$ , the solution contains a plateau value  $u_B$  for  $0 \leq \frac{x}{t} \leq \frac{df}{du}(u_B)$ , a rarefaction wave connection  $u_B$  to  $\bar{u}$  for  $\frac{df}{du}(u_B) \leq \frac{x}{t} \leq \frac{df}{du}(\bar{u})$ , another plateau value  $\bar{u}$  for  $\frac{df}{du}(\bar{u}) < \frac{x}{t} < \frac{f(\bar{u})}{\bar{u}}$ , and a shock from  $\bar{u}$  down to 0 at  $\frac{x}{t} = \frac{f(\bar{u})}{\bar{u}}$  (see Figure 3.2(a)).

	N	$\ u_{\Delta x} - u_{\frac{\Delta x}{2}}\ _1$ order	$\ u_{\Delta x} - u_{\frac{\Delta x}{2}}\ _2$ order	$\ u_{\Delta x} - u_{\frac{\Delta x}{2}}\ _\infty$ order			
$u_B = 0.9$ $\tau = 0.2$	60	7.5416e-03	-	2.5388e-03	-	1.5960e-03	-
	120	1.9684e-03	1.9379	6.7288e-04	1.9157	4.4066e-04	1.8568
	240	4.9891e-04	1.9802	1.7645e-04	1.9311	1.2529e-04	1.8144
	480	1.2589e-04	1.9865	4.5366e-05	1.9596	3.3205e-05	1.9158
$u_B = 0.9$ $\tau = 1$	60	8.0141e-03	-	2.6069e-03	-	1.4989e-03	-
	120	2.1502e-03	1.8981	7.0452e-04	1.8876	4.2221e-04	1.8279
	240	5.5697e-04	1.9488	1.8259e-04	1.9480	1.1283e-04	1.9038
	480	1.4104e-04	1.9815	4.6109e-05	1.9855	2.8719e-05	1.9740
$u_B = 0.9$ $\tau = 5$	60	1.3102e-02	-	4.1784e-03	-	2.2411e-03	-
	120	3.6201e-03	1.8557	1.0994e-03	1.9263	6.1060e-04	1.8759
	240	9.6737e-04	1.9039	2.8089e-04	1.9686	1.5667e-04	1.9625
	480	2.5825e-04	1.9053	7.1250e-05	1.9790	3.9286e-05	1.9956
$u_B = \alpha$ $\tau = 0.2$	60	6.4427e-03	-	2.1578e-03	-	1.1682e-03	-
	120	1.6611e-03	1.9555	5.7775e-04	1.9011	3.6447e-04	1.6804
	240	4.3643e-04	1.9283	1.5215e-04	1.9250	1.0389e-04	1.8107
	480	1.1223e-04	1.9593	3.9170e-05	1.9577	2.7629e-05	1.9109
$u_B = \alpha$ $\tau = 1$	60	7.5867e-03	-	2.4101e-03	-	1.3364e-03	-
	120	2.0069e-03	1.9185	6.4998e-04	1.8906	3.7650e-04	1.8277
	240	5.1832e-04	1.9531	1.6801e-04	1.9519	1.0062e-04	1.9037
	480	1.3136e-04	1.9803	4.2497e-05	1.9831	2.5599e-05	1.9748
$u_B = \alpha$ $\tau = 5$	60	1.1959e-02	-	3.8026e-03	-	1.9938e-03	-
	120	3.2940e-03	1.8602	9.9527e-04	1.9338	5.4231e-04	1.8783
	240	8.7736e-04	1.9086	2.5358e-04	1.9727	1.3933e-04	1.9606
	480	2.3271e-04	1.9146	6.4252e-05	1.9806	3.4967e-05	1.9944
$u_B = 0.75$ $\tau = 0.2$	60	5.7714e-03	-	1.9358e-03	-	1.0481e-03	-
	120	1.5035e-03	1.9406	5.1617e-04	1.9070	2.8061e-04	1.9011
	240	3.9299e-04	1.9357	1.3616e-04	1.9225	7.9134e-05	1.8262
	480	1.0063e-04	1.9655	3.5080e-05	1.9566	2.1035e-05	1.9115
$u_B = 0.75$ $\tau = 1$	60	7.1823e-03	-	2.2843e-03	-	1.2069e-03	-
	120	1.8963e-03	1.9213	6.1315e-04	1.8974	3.4013e-03	1.8272
	240	4.8284e-04	1.9736	1.5796e-04	1.9567	9.0912e-04	1.9035
	480	1.2093e-04	1.9974	3.9783e-05	1.9894	2.3121e-05	1.9753
$u_B = 0.75$ $\tau = 5$	60	1.1042e-02	-	3.5020e-03	-	1.8299e-03	-
	120	3.0287e-03	1.8662	9.1181e-04	1.9414	4.8976e-04	1.9016
	240	8.0111e-04	1.9186	2.3118e-04	1.9797	1.2593e-04	1.9595
	480	2.1076e-04	1.9264	5.8358e-05	1.9860	3.1627e-05	1.9934

Table 3.1: The accuracy test for the trapezoid scheme for the MBL equation (3.1) with  $\epsilon = 1$  and  $M = 2$ .

- (b) If  $u_B \in (\underline{u}, \bar{u})$ , the solution contains a plateau value  $u_B$  for  $0 \leq \frac{x}{t} < \frac{f(\bar{u})-f(u_B)}{\bar{u}-u_B}$ , a shock from  $u_B$  up to  $\bar{u}$  at  $\frac{x}{t} = \frac{f(\bar{u})-f(u_B)}{\bar{u}-u_B}$ , another plateau value  $\bar{u}$  for  $\frac{f(\bar{u})-f(u_B)}{\bar{u}-u_B} < \frac{x}{t} < \frac{f(\bar{u})}{\bar{u}}$ , and a shock from  $\bar{u}$  down to 0 at  $\frac{x}{t} = \frac{f(\bar{u})}{\bar{u}}$  (see Figure 3.2(b)). The solution may exhibit a damped oscillation near  $u = u_B$ .
- (c) If  $u_B \in (0, \underline{u}]$ , the solution consists a single shock connecting  $u_B$  and 0 at  $\frac{x}{t} = \frac{f(u_B)}{u_B}$

	$N$	$\ u_{\Delta x} - u_{\frac{\Delta x}{2}}\ _1$ order		$\ u_{\Delta x} - u_{\frac{\Delta x}{2}}\ _2$ order		$\ u_{\Delta x} - u_{\frac{\Delta x}{2}}\ _\infty$ order	
$u_B = 0.9$ $\tau = 0.2$	120	2.6992e-03	-	1.1300e-03	-	7.2363e-04	-
	240	4.0403e-04	2.7400	1.7079e-04	2.7260	1.1283e-04	2.6811
	480	5.7504e-05	2.8127	2.4624e-05	2.7941	1.6242e-05	2.7963
	960	8.4934e-06	2.7592	3.0892e-06	2.9948	1.7607e-06	3.2055
$u_B = 0.9$ $\tau = 1$	120	4.7731e-03	-	2.0192e-03	-	1.7267e-03	-
	240	8.7205e-04	2.4524	3.6879e-04	2.4529	3.0632e-04	2.4949
	480	1.2006e-04	2.8606	5.0480e-05	2.8690	4.1985e-05	2.8671
	960	1.5942e-05	2.9129	6.6663e-06	2.9208	5.1464e-06	3.0282
$u_B = 0.9$ $\tau = 5$	120	3.7573e-03	-	1.2122e-03	-	7.9211e-04	-
	240	7.4624e-04	2.3320	2.4164e-04	2.3267	1.5061e-04	2.3949
	480	1.1994e-04	2.6373	3.8434e-05	2.6524	2.5089e-05	2.5857
	960	1.5565e-05	2.9460	4.9190e-06	2.9660	3.1363e-06	2.9999
$u_B = \alpha$ $\tau = 0.2$	120	2.1836e-03	-	9.1039e-04	-	5.7219e-04	-
	240	3.2729e-04	2.7381	1.3760e-04	2.7260	8.9550e-05	2.6757
	480	4.6856e-05	2.8043	1.9909e-05	2.7890	1.2935e-05	2.7914
	960	6.7382e-06	2.7978	2.3182e-06	3.1023	1.4109e-06	3.1965
$u_B = \alpha$ $\tau = 1$	120	3.9014e-03	-	1.6388e-03	-	1.3873e-03	-
	240	7.0517e-04	2.4680	2.9669e-04	2.4656	2.4272e-04	2.5149
	480	9.6528e-05	2.8690	4.0354e-05	2.8781	3.3125e-05	2.8733
	960	1.2890e-05	2.9047	5.3648e-06	2.9111	4.0754e-06	3.0229
$u_B = \alpha$ $\tau = 5$	120	3.0797e-03	-	9.9202e-04	-	6.4456e-04	-
	240	6.1133e-04	2.3328	1.9783e-04	2.3261	1.2277e-04	2.3924
	480	9.7351e-05	2.6507	3.1222e-05	2.6637	2.0263e-05	2.5990
	960	1.2396e-05	2.9733	3.9513e-06	2.9822	2.4962e-06	3.0210
$u_B = 0.75$ $\tau = 0.2$	120	1.8244e-03	-	7.5548e-04	-	4.6671e-04	-
	240	2.7262e-04	2.7425	1.1419e-04	2.7260	7.3299e-05	2.6707
	480	3.9198e-05	2.7980	1.6562e-05	2.7855	1.0681e-05	2.7788
	960	5.4739e-06	2.8401	1.9677e-06	3.0733	1.3232e-06	3.0129
$u_B = 0.75$ $\tau = 1$	120	3.2727e-03	-	1.3672e-03	-	1.1477e-03	-
	240	5.8671e-04	2.4798	2.4585e-04	2.4754	1.9866e-04	2.5304
	480	7.9974e-05	2.8750	3.3285e-05	2.8848	2.7033e-05	2.8775
	960	1.0724e-05	2.8987	4.4466e-06	2.9041	3.3341e-06	3.0193
$u_B = 0.75$ $\tau = 5$	120	2.5902e-03	-	8.3335e-04	-	5.3882e-04	-
	240	5.1342e-04	2.3348	1.6611e-04	2.3268	1.0271e-04	2.3913
	480	8.1062e-05	2.6630	2.6032e-05	2.6738	1.6813e-05	2.6109
	960	1.0173e-05	2.9944	3.2662e-06	2.9946	2.0473e-06	3.0377

Table 3.2: The accuracy test for the third order semi-discrete scheme for the MBL equation (3.1) with  $\epsilon = 1$  and  $M = 2$ .

(see Figure 3.2(c)). It may exhibit oscillatory behavior near  $u = u_B$ .

Notice that when  $\tau > \tau_*$  and  $\underline{u} < u_B < \bar{u}$ , the solution profiles ( Figure 3.2(b)) displays non-monotonicity, which is consistent with the experimental observations ([4]).

In the numerical computation we show below, we will therefore test the accuracy and capability of central schemes for different parameter values ( $\tau$  and  $u_B$ ) that fall into various




Figure 3.1: The bifurcation diagram of the MBL equation (1.4) with the bifurcation parameters  $(\tau, u_B)$ .




Figure 3.2: Given a fixed  $\tau$ , the three qualitatively different solution profiles due to different values of  $u_B$ . In particular, when  $\tau > \tau_*$  and  $\underline{u} < u_B < \bar{u}$ , the solution profiles (Figure (b)) displays non-monotonicity, which is consistent with the experimental observations ([4]). Figures (a), (b) and (c) are demonstrative figures.

regimes of the bifurcation diagram, and therefore display qualitatively different solution profiles. The numerical experiments were carried out for  $M = 2$ ,  $\epsilon = 0.001$  and  $T = 4000 \times \epsilon$ , i.e.  $\tilde{T} = 4000$  to get the asymptotic solution profiles, and  $\Delta x$  was chosen to be  $\frac{\epsilon}{10}$  and  $\lambda = \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x}$  was chosen to be 0.1. The scheme used in the computation is the second order Trapezoid scheme as shown in section 2.1.1. The Midpoint scheme delivers similar computational results, hence is omitted here. The solution profiles at  $\frac{T}{4}$  (blue),  $\frac{2*T}{4}$  (green),  $\frac{3*T}{4}$  (magenta) and  $T$  (black) are chosen to demonstrate the time evolution of the solutions. The red dashed lines are used to denote the theoretical shock locations and plateau values for comparison purpose.

We start with  $\tau > 0$ . Based on the bifurcation diagram (Figure 3.1), we choose three

representative  $u_B$  values, i.e.  $u_B = 0.9 > \alpha$ ,  $u_B = \alpha = \sqrt{\frac{M}{M+1}} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}$  (for  $M = 2$ ) and  $u_B = 0.75 < \alpha$ . For each fixed  $u_B$ , we choose three representative  $\tau$  values, i.e.  $\tau = 0.2 < \tau_* \approx 0.61$ ,  $\tau = 1 > \tau_*$  with  $u_B = 0.75 < \underline{u}_{\tau=1} < u_B = \alpha < \bar{u} < u_B = 0.9$ , and  $\tau = 5$  with  $u_B = 0.75, \alpha, 0.9 \in [\underline{u}_{\tau=5}, \bar{u}_{\tau=5}]$ . We first use this 9 pairs of  $(\tau, u_B)$  values given in Table 3.3 to validate the solution profiles with the demonstrative solution profiles given in Figure 3.2.

$(\tau, u_B)$	Example 4	Example 5	Example 6
Example 1	(0.2, 0.9)	(1, 0.9)	(5, 0.9)
Example 2	(0.2, $\alpha$ )	(1, $\alpha$ )	(5, $\alpha$ )
Example 3	(0.2, 0.75)	(1, 0.75)	(5, 0.75)

Table 3.3: 9 pairs of  $(\tau, u_B)$  values with either fixed  $\tau$  value or fixed  $u_B$  value used in Examples 1 – 6.

**Example 1**  $(\tau, u_B) = (0.2, 0.9), (\tau, u_B) = (1, 0.9), (\tau, u_B) = (5, 0.9)$ .

When  $u_B = 0.9 > \alpha$  is fixed, we increase  $\tau$  from 0.2 to 1 to 5 (Figures 3.3(a) , 3.3(b) , 3.3(c)), the dispersive effect starts to dominate the solution profile. When  $\tau = 0.2$  (Figure 3.3(a)), the solution profile is similar to the classical BL equation solution (see Figure 1.2(b)), with a rarefaction wave for  $\frac{x}{t} \in [f'(u = 0.9), f'(u = \alpha) = f'(u = \bar{u}_{\tau=0.2})]$  and a shock from  $u = \alpha$  to  $u = 0$  at  $\frac{x}{t} = f'(\alpha)$ . This corresponds to Figure 3.2(a) with  $\frac{df}{du}(\bar{u}_{\tau=0.2} = \alpha) = \frac{f(\bar{u}_{\tau=0.2})}{\bar{u}_{\tau=0.2}} = \frac{f(\alpha)}{\alpha}$ . When  $\tau = 1$  (Figure 3.3(b)), the rarefaction wave is between  $\frac{x}{t} \in [f'(u = 0.9), f'(u = \bar{u}_{\tau=1})]$  and the solution remains at the plateau value  $u = \bar{u}_{\tau=1}$  for  $\frac{x}{t} \in [f'(u = \bar{u}_{\tau=1}), \frac{f(\bar{u}_{\tau=1})}{\bar{u}_{\tau=1}}]$  and the shock occurs at  $\frac{x}{t} = \frac{f(\bar{u}_{\tau=1})}{\bar{u}_{\tau=1}}$ . This corresponds to Figure 3.2(a) with  $u_B = 0.9 > \bar{u}_{\tau=1} \approx 0.86$ . When  $\tau = 5$  (Figure 3.3(c)), the solution displays the first shock from  $u = 0.9$  to  $u = \bar{u}_{\tau=5}$  at  $\frac{x}{t} = \frac{f(\bar{u}_{\tau=5}) - f(u_B)}{\bar{u}_{\tau=5} - u_B}$ , and then remains at the plateau value  $u = \bar{u}_{\tau=5}$  for  $\frac{x}{t} \in [\frac{f(\bar{u}_{\tau=5}) - f(u_B)}{\bar{u}_{\tau=5} - u_B}, \frac{f(\bar{u}_{\tau=5})}{\bar{u}_{\tau=5}}]$  and the second shocks occurs at  $\frac{x}{t} = \frac{f(\bar{u}_{\tau=5})}{\bar{u}_{\tau=5}}$ . This corresponds to Figure 3.2(b) with  $\underline{u}_{\tau=5} \approx 0.68 < u_B = 0.9 < \bar{u}_{\tau=5} \approx 0.98$ . Notice that as  $\tau$  increases, the rarefaction region shrinks and the plateau region enlarges.

**Example 2**  $(\tau, u_B) = (0.2, \alpha), (\tau, u_B) = (1, \alpha), (\tau, u_B) = (5, \alpha)$ .

When  $u_B = \alpha$  is fixed, we increase  $\tau$  from 0.2 to 1 to 5 (Figures 3.3(d) , 3.3(e) , 3.3(f)), the dispersive effect starts to dominate the solution profile. When  $\tau = 0.2$ , the solution displays one single shock at  $\frac{x}{t} = \frac{f(\alpha)}{\alpha}$ . For both  $\tau = 1$  and  $\tau = 5$ , the solution has two shocks, one at  $\frac{x}{t} = \frac{f(\bar{u}_{\tau=1(\tau=5 \text{ respectively})}) - f(\alpha)}{\bar{u}_{\tau=1(\tau=5 \text{ respectively})} - \alpha}$ , and another one at  $\frac{x}{t} = \frac{f(\bar{u}_{\tau=1(\tau=5 \text{ respectively})})}{\bar{u}_{\tau=1(\tau=5 \text{ respectively})}}$ . For both  $\tau = 1$  and  $\tau = 5$  (Figures 3.3(e) 3.3(f)), the solutions correspond to Figure 3.2(b), which are consistent with the experimental observations. Notice that as  $\tau$  increases from 1 to 5, i.e., the dispersive effect increases, the inter-shock interval length increases at every fixed time (compare Figure 3.3(e) with Figure 3.3(f)). In addition, for fix  $\tau = 1$  ( $\tau = 5$  respectively), as time progresses, the inter-shock interval length increases in the linear fashion (see Figure 3.3(e) (Figure 3.3(f) respectively) ).




Figure 3.3: Numerical solutions to MBL equation with parameter settings fall in different regimes of the bifurcation diagram (Figure 3.1). The color coding is for different time:  $\frac{1}{4}T$  (blue),  $\frac{2}{4}T$  (green),  $\frac{3}{4}T$  (magenta) and  $T$  (black). The results are discussed in examples 1 – 6. In figures (d) – (f),  $\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{M}{M+1}} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}$  for  $M = 2$ .

**Example 3**  $(\tau, u_B) = (0.2, 0.75)$ ,  $(\tau, u_B) = (1, 0.75)$ ,  $(\tau, u_B) = (5, 0.75)$ .

When  $u_B = 0.75 \leq \alpha$  is fixed, we increase  $\tau$  from 0.2 to 1 to 5 (Figures 3.3(g), 3.3(h), 3.3(i)), the dispersive effects starts to dominate the solution profile in the similar fashion as  $u_B = 0.9$  and  $u_B = \alpha$ . Notice that when  $\tau = 1$ , since  $u_B = 0.75$  is very close to  $\underline{u}_{\tau=1}$ , the solution displays oscillation at  $\frac{x}{t} = \frac{f(u_B)}{u_B}$  (Figure 3.3(h)). If we increase  $\tau$  further to  $\tau = 5$ , the dispersive effect is strong enough to create a plateau value at  $\bar{u} \approx 0.98$  (see Figure 3.3(i)).



**Example 4**  $(\tau, u_B) = (0.2, 0.9), (\tau, u_B) = (0.2, \alpha), (\tau, u_B) = (0.2, 0.75)$ .

Now, we fix  $\tau = 0.2$ , decrease  $u_B$  from 0.9 to  $\alpha$ , to 0.75 (Figures 3.3(a), 3.3(d) 3.3(g)). If  $u_B > \alpha$  the solution consists a rarefaction wave connecting  $u_B$  down to  $\alpha$ , then a shock from  $\alpha$  to 0, otherwise, the solution consists a single shock from  $u_B$  down to 0. In all cases, since  $\tau = 0.2 < \tau_*$ , regardless of the  $u_B$  value, the solution will not display non-monotone behavior, due to the lack of dispersive effect.

**Example 5**  $(\tau, u_B) = (1, 0.9), (\tau, u_B) = (1, \alpha), (\tau, u_B) = (1, 0.75)$ .

Now, we fix  $\tau = 1$ , decrease  $u_B$  from 0.9 to  $\alpha$ , to 0.75 (Figures 3.3(b), 3.3(e), 3.3(h)). If  $u_B = 0.9 > \bar{u}_{\tau=1}$ , the solution consists a rarefaction wave connecting  $u_B$  and  $\bar{u}$ , and a shock connecting  $\bar{u}$  down to 0 (Figure 3.3(b)). Even if  $\underline{u} < u_B < \bar{u}$ , because  $\tau = 1 > \tau_*$ , the solution still has a chance to increase to the plateau value  $\bar{u}$  as seen in Figure 3.3(e). But, if  $u_B$  is too small, for example,  $u_B = 0.75 < \underline{u}$ , the solution does not increase to  $\bar{u}$  any more, instead, it consists a single shock connecting  $u_B$  down to 0 (Figure 3.3(h)).

**Example 6**  $(\tau, u_B) = (5, 0.9), (\tau, u_B) = (5, \alpha), (\tau, u_B) = (5, 0.75)$ .

Now, we fix  $\tau = 5$ , decrease  $u_B$  from 0.9 to  $\alpha$ , to 0.75 (Figures 3.3(c), 3.3(f), 3.3(i)). For all three  $u_B$ , they are between  $\underline{u}_{\tau=5}$  and  $\bar{u}_{\tau=5}$ , hence all increase to the plateau value  $\bar{u}_{\tau=5} \approx 0.98$  before dropping to 0. Notice that as  $u_B$  decreases, the inter-shock interval length decreases at every fixed time (compare Figures 3.3(c), 3.3(f) and 3.3(i)). This shows that when the dispersive effect is strong ( $\tau > \tau_*$ ), the bigger  $u_B$  is, the bigger region the solution stays at the plateau value.

**Example 7**  $(\tau, u_B) = (0, 0.9), (\tau, u_B) = (0, \alpha), (\tau, u_B) = (0, 0.75)$ .

We now show the solution profiles for the extreme  $\tau$  value, i.e.  $\tau = 0$  in Figures 3.4(a) ( $u_B = 0.9$ ), 3.4(b) ( $u_B = \alpha$ ) and 3.4(c) ( $u_B = 0.75$ ). Notice that these are cases of classical BL equation with small diffusion  $\epsilon u_{xx}$ . We compare Figures 3.4(a), 3.4(b) and 3.4(c) with the solution of the classical BL equation given in Figures 1.2(a) and 1.2(b), it is clear that they show qualitatively same solution profiles. The difference is that due to the diffusion term in the MBL equation, as shown in Figure 3.4, the solutions do not have sharp edges right at the shock, instead, the solutions smear out a little. Notice that this smearing effect is also partially introduced by the central scheme. It is well known that central scheme is non-oscillatory, i.e., it generates numerical viscosity. If we compare Figures 3.4(a), 3.4(b) and 3.4(c) with Figures 3.3(a), 3.3(d) and 3.3(g), there is no visible difference. This shows that once  $\tau < \tau_*$ , solution profile will stay the same for a fixed  $u_B$  value.

**Example 8**  $(\tau, u_B) = (5, 0.99), (\tau, u_B) = (5, 0.98), (\tau, u_B) = (5, 0.97)$ .

We also study the solution profiles for  $u_B$  close to  $\bar{u}$ . For example, when  $\tau = 5$ ,  $\bar{u} \approx 0.98$ , we hence choose  $u_B = 0.99, u_B = 0.98, u_B = 0.97$  and solutions are shown in Figures 3.5(a), 3.5(b), 3.5(c). If  $u_B = 0.99 > \bar{u}_{\tau=5} \approx 0.98$ , the solution drops to the plateau value  $\bar{u}$ , then drops to 0 (see Figure 3.5(a)). If  $u_B = 0.98 \approx \bar{u}_{\tau=5}$ , the solution remains at plateau value  $\bar{u}_{\tau=5}$  and then drop to 0 (see Figure 3.5(b)). If  $u_B = 0.97 < \bar{u}_{\tau=5}$ , the solution increases to




Figure 3.4: The numerical solutions of the MBL equation at  $T = 1$  with  $\tau = 0$  and different  $u_B$  values. The results are discussed in example 7.

the plateau value  $\bar{u}_{\tau=5} \approx 0.98$ , then drops to 0 (see Figure 3.5(c)). In all cases, the transition from  $u_B$  to  $\bar{u}_{\tau=5} \approx 0.98$  takes very small space. In the majority space, the solution keeps to be the plateau value  $\bar{u}_{\tau=5} \approx 0.98$ .




Figure 3.5: Numerical solutions to MBL equation with  $u_B$  close to  $\bar{u}_{\tau=5} \approx 0.98$ . The color coding is for different time:  $\frac{1}{4}T$  (blue),  $\frac{2}{4}T$  (green),  $\frac{3}{4}T$  (magenta) and  $T$  (black). The results are discussed in example 8.

**Example 9**  $(\tau, u_B) = (5, 0.7)$ ,  $(\tau, u_B) = (5, 0.69)$ ,  $(\tau, u_B) = (5, 0.68)$ ,  $(\tau, u_B) = (5, 0.67)$ ,  $(\tau, u_B) = (5, 0.66)$ .

In addition, we study the solution profiles for  $u_B$  close to  $\underline{u}$ . For example, when  $\tau = 5$ ,  $\underline{u} \approx 0.68$ , we hence choose  $u_B = 0.7$ ,  $u_B = 0.69$ ,  $u_B = 0.68$ ,  $u_B = 0.67$ ,  $u_B = 0.66$  and solutions are shown in Figures 3.6(a), 3.6(b), 3.6(c), 3.6(d), 3.6(e). As  $u_B$  decreases crossing  $\underline{u}_{\tau=5} \approx 0.68$ , the solution gradually stops increasing to the plateau value  $\bar{u}_{\tau=5}$ , and the inter-shock interval length decreases (compare Figures 3.6(a), 3.6(b) and 3.6(c)). The oscillation in Figures 3.6(d) and 3.6(e) are due to the fact that  $u_B$  values are too close to  $\underline{u}_{\tau=5}$ . This confirms that even with big dispersive effect (say  $\tau = 5$ ), if  $u_B$  is too small (e.g.  $u_B < \underline{u}$ ), the solution will not exhibit non-monotone behavior.




Figure 3.6: Numerical solutions to MBL equation with  $u_B$  close to  $\underline{u}_{\tau=5} \approx 0.68$ . The color coding is for different time:  $\frac{1}{4}T$  (blue),  $\frac{2}{4}T$  (green),  $\frac{3}{4}T$  (magenta) and  $T$  (black). The results are discussed in example 9.

**Example 10**  $(\tau, u_B) = (0.2, 0.6)$ ,  $(\tau, u_B) = (1, 0.6)$ ,  $(\tau, u_B) = (5, 0.6)$ .

We fix  $u_B$  to be small, and in this example, we take it to be  $u_B = 0.6$ . We vary the  $\tau$  value, from  $\tau = 0.2 < \tau_*$  to  $\tau = 1$  barely larger than  $\tau_*$  to  $\tau = 5 > \tau_*$ . The numerical solutions are given in Figures 3.7(a), 3.7(b), 3.7(c). As  $\tau$  increases, the post-shock value remains the same, but there will be oscillation generated as  $\tau$  becomes larger than  $\tau_*$ . Figures 3.7(d), 3.7(e) and 3.7(f) show that as  $\tau$  increases, the oscillation amplitude increases and oscillates more rounds. Notice that  $\tau$  is the dispersive parameter, and this means that even for small  $u_B$  value, different dispersive parameter values still give different dispersive effects, although none can bring the solution to the plateau value  $\bar{u}$ . Comparing Figures 3.7(d), 3.7(e) and 3.7(f) with Figures 3.7(g), 3.7(h) and 3.7(i), it is clear that the oscillation amplitude remains steady with respect to time.

**Example 11**  $\epsilon = 0.001, \epsilon = 0.002, \epsilon = 0.003, \epsilon = 0.004, \epsilon = 0.005$ .

In this example, we will compare the solution profiles for different  $\epsilon$  values. Fixing  $T = 0.5, \Delta x = 0.0001, \lambda = \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x} = 0.1$ , we show the numerical results in Figure 3.8 for  $\epsilon = 0.001$  (blue),  $\epsilon = 0.002$  (yellow),  $\epsilon = 0.003$  (magenta),  $\epsilon = 0.004$  (green), and  $\epsilon = 0.005$  (black). For the purpose of cross reference, we choose the same nine sets of parameter settings as in examples 1–6. To assist the observation, the figures in Figure 3.8 are zoomed into the regions where different  $\epsilon$  values introduce different solution profiles. The numerical solutions




Figure 3.7: Numerical solutions to MBL equation with small constant  $u_B = 0.6$  and different  $\tau$  values. The figures on the second and third rows are the magnified versions of the first row at  $t = \frac{1}{4}T$  and  $t = T$  respectively. The color coding is for different time:  $\frac{1}{4}T$  (blue),  $\frac{2}{4}T$  (green),  $\frac{3}{4}T$  (magenta) and  $T$  (black). The results are discussed in examples 10.

clearly show that as  $\epsilon$  increases, the numerical solution is smeared out, and the jump location becomes less accurate. Notice that  $\tau$  is responsible for the competition between the diffusion and dispersion, which in turn determines the plateau values. Hence varying  $\epsilon$  value doesn't affect the plateau location.




Figure 3.8: The numerical solutions of MBL equation at  $T = 0.5$  with  $\epsilon = 0.001$  (blue),  $\epsilon = 0.002$  (yellow),  $\epsilon = 0.003$  (magenta),  $\epsilon = 0.004$  (green), and  $\epsilon = 0.005$  (black). The view windows are zoomed into the regions where different  $\epsilon$  values impose different solution profiles. The results are discussed in example 11.

#### 4. Conclusion

We extended the second and third order classical central schemes originally designed for the hyperbolic systems to solve the MBL equation, which is of pseudo-parabolic type. The numerical solutions for qualitatively different parameter values  $\tau$  and initial conditions  $u_B$  show that the jump locations are consistent with the theoretical calculation and the plateau heights are consistent with the numerically obtained values given in [15]. In particular, when  $\tau > \tau_*$ , for  $u_B \in (\underline{u}, \bar{u})$ , the numerical solutions give non-monotone water saturation profiles,

which is consistent with the experimental observations. In addition, the order tests show that the proposed second and third order central schemes achieved the desired accuracies.

In [16, 14], the two-dimensional space extension of the modified Buckley-Leverett equation has been derived. One of the future directions is to develop high order numerical schemes to solve the two-dimensional MBL equation. Central schemes have been used to solve high dimensional hyperbolic problem and dispersive problem ([7, 12]), which makes it a good candidate for such a task.

## Acknowledgments

CYK would like to thank Prof. L.A. Peletier for introducing MBL equation.

## References

- [1] Buckley, S., Leverett, M., 1942. Mechanism of fluid displacement in sands. *Petroleum Transactions, AIME* 146, 107–116.
- [2] Cockburn, B., Johnson, C., Shu, C.-W., Tadmor, E., 1998. Advanced numerical approximation of nonlinear hyperbolic equations. Vol. 1697 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, papers from the C.I.M.E. Summer School held in Cetraro, June 23–28, 1997, Edited by Alfio Quarteroni, Fondazione C.I.M.E.. [C.I.M.E. Foundation].
- [3] Cockburn, B., Karniadakis, G. E., Shu, C.-W. E., 2000. *Discontinuous Galerkin Methods: Theory, Computation and Applications*. Lecture Notes in Computational Science and Engineering.
- [4] DiCarlo, D. A., Apr. 2004. Experimental measurements of saturation overshoot on infiltration. *Water Resources Research* 40, 4215.1 – 4215.9.
- [5] Hassanzadeh, S., Gray, W., 1990. Mechanics and thermodynamics of multiphase flow in porous media including interphase boundaries. *Adv. Water Resour.* 13, 169–186.
- [6] Hassanzadeh, S., Gray, W., 1993. Thermodynamic basis of capillary pressure in porous media. *Water Resour. Res.* 29, 3389–3405.
- [7] Jiang, G.-S., Tadmor, E., 1998. Nonoscillatory central schemes for multidimensional hyperbolic conservation laws. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* 19 (6), 1892–1917 (electronic).  
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/S106482759631041X>
- [8] Kurganov, A., Levy, D., 2000. A third-order semidiscrete central scheme for conservation laws and convection-diffusion equations. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* 22 (4), 1461–1488 (electronic).  
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/S1064827599360236>
- [9] Kurganov, A., Lin, C.-T., 2007. On the reduction of numerical dissipation in central-upwind schemes. *Commun. Comput. Phys.* 2 (1), 141–163.
- [10] LeVeque, R. J., 1992. *Numerical methods for conservation laws*, 2nd Edition. Lectures in Mathematics ETH Zürich. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel.
- [11] LeVeque, R. J., 2002. *Finite volume methods for hyperbolic problems*. Cambridge Texts in Applied Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [12] Levy, D., Puppo, G., Russo, G., 2000. Compact central WENO schemes for multidimensional conservation laws. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* 22 (2), 656–672.  
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/S1064827599359461>
- [13] Nessyahu, H., Tadmor, E., 1990. Nonoscillatory central differencing for hyperbolic conservation laws. *J. Comput. Phys.* 87 (2), 408–463.
- [14] Van Duijn, C. J., Mikelic, A., Pop, I., 2000. Effective Buckley-Leverett equations by homogenization. *Progress in industrial mathematics at ECMI*, 42–52.
- [15] van Duijn, C. J., Peletier, L. A., Pop, I. S., 2007. A new class of entropy solutions of the Buckley-Leverett equation. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 39 (2), 507–536 (electronic).  
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/05064518X>

- [16] Wang, Y., 2010. Central schemes for the modified buckley-leverett equation. Ph.D. thesis, The Ohio State University.
- [17] Wang, Y., Kao, C.-Y., 2011. Bounded domain problem for the modified buckley-leverett equation. Preprint.
- [18] Xu, Y., Shu, C.-W., 2008. A local discontinuous Galerkin method for the Camassa-Holm equation. SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 46 (4), 1998–2021.  
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/070679764>
- [19] Xu, Y., Shu, C.-W., 2008/09. Local discontinuous Galerkin method for the Hunter-Saxton equation and its zero-viscosity and zero-dispersion limits. SIAM J. Sci. Comput. 31 (2), 1249–1268.  
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/080714105>