3D simulation of radionuclide transport in porous media
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SUMMARY

We present an efficient and easily implementable finite volume method simulating radionuclide transport through highly heterogeneous grounds in three space dimensions. The numerical concentration of the transported chemicals are proved to remain nonnegative and stable.

Then, we run a realistic test case in which some radioactive iodine I\textsuperscript{129} particles are released from a leak in an underground nuclear waste disposal site. The question of whether the radionuclide invades the underground and reach the ground surface is investigated.

Because of the 3D nature of the problem, a particular emphasis is made on the control of CPU time.
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1. INTRODUCTION

While the interest in atom splitting technology keeps constantly growing, underground nuclear waste storage has been more and more considered as a threat. The issue people are getting aware of is that the radionuclides that require to be stored usually have a very long life span and remain dangerous for millions of years. In the meantime, nuclear waste disposal sites might undergo geological constraints due to any kind of Earth’s activity, possibly resulting in fractures or leaks in some of the containers in which radioelements are locked in.

Underground nuclear waste disposal sites might be created shortly in Europe. In France, a safety study began about 10 years ago to consider implementing a storage site in the North of France.
the country. Indeed, as real time/scale experiments would last too long and be harmful to the environment, the numerical simulation seems to be an appropriate tool to handle a part of that study. For this purpose, the research group MoMaS (CNRS, France, cf. [1]) has been in charge to develop numerical methods, simulates various phenomenons that may happen in and around a site, and test feasibility of radionuclide storage.

In this paper, we assume that a leak occurs in a disposal site, and set up a numerical method simulating the motion of the escaped radionuclides through the underground along time. In particular, a relevant question is whether the radionuclides can invade an underground region and eventually reach the ground surface, constituting a danger for populations living thereon. Several works have been published about this matter (see [2–7], and their references). The main feature of the present work is that the domain of simulation is 3D, which is a realistic way of modeling a ground. However, this main feature is also the main difficulty. Indeed, care must be taken on the control of computation time, which might become extremely long otherwise. Further difficulties include the presence of multiple transport phenomena in the model, and great heterogeneities of geological data that realistic grounds usually feature.

The outline of the paper is the following: our mathematical model is presented in Section 2. This model features an elliptic equation modeling ground water flow and a parabolic equation modeling the displacement of radioactive contaminant through the flow. This system is closed by assuming that the ground water is incompressible. In the third section, our numerical strategy is described schematically. The details of the numerical schemes are provided in Section 4. The method is constructed so as to provide nonnegative contaminant concentrations. Section 5 presents a realistic numerical simulation, as an application of our numerical method. The computational effort that was necessary to perform this test is analyzed in Section 6 is an analysis. The end of the paper is composed of a conclusion and technical appendix.

2. MODEL

Let a space domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be a saturated porous medium representing a 3D ground. The ground water flow is characterized by its velocity, $V$, and hydrodynamic load, $H$. A radionuclide with concentration $c$ is transported through this flow. A widely used PDE system modeling these phenomena (cf. [8, 9] and their references) is:

\[
\omega(X) \frac{\partial c}{\partial t}(t,X) + \text{div}(c(t,X)V(X)) - \text{div}(D(X,V(X)) \nabla c(t,X)) + \lambda c(t,X) = f(t,X) \quad (1)
\]

\[
V(X) = -K(X) \nabla H(X) \quad (2)
\]

\[
\text{div} V(X) = 0 \quad (3)
\]

with $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $X = (x, y, z) \in \Omega$ denoting time and space independent variables. This system is added an initial condition at $t = 0$ and appropriate boundary conditions on $\partial \Omega$ that will be specified later.

The unknowns of this system are $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $H \in \mathbb{R}$ and $V = (u, v, w) \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Equation (1) models the radionuclide transport, Equation (2) is Darcy’s law, and Equation (3) is the incompressibility assumption of the ground water.

In Equation (1), the positive coefficient $\omega$ is the product of the porosity of the medium, the solubility of the chemical and retardation factor due to linear adsorption. The positive coefficient $\lambda$
is the radioactive decay factor due to atom splitting, and the nonnegative function $f$ is the source of contaminant coming from the leak in the nuclear waste disposal site. The diffusion–dispersion tensor in (1) is defined by

$$D(X, V) = d_m(X)I + |V| (\varepsilon(X) E(V) + \zeta(X) (I - E(V)))$$

where the nonnegative coefficients $d_m$, $\varepsilon$, $\zeta$ are the effective diffusion, longitudinal mechanical dispersion and transversal mechanical dispersion coefficients, respectively, $I$ is the three dimensional identity matrix, and

$$E(V) = \frac{1}{|V|^2} \begin{pmatrix} u^2 & uv & uw \\ uv & v^2 & vw \\ uw & vw & w^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

for all $V = (u, v, w)$.

In Equation (2), $K \in \mathbb{R}_+$ denotes the effective permeability of the ground.

We assume that the boundary conditions are constant in time and the presence of radionuclide does not impact the flow. This way, $H$ and $V$ are independent of $t$. In the following, we come up with numerical methods discretizing (1)–(3) with providing nonnegative and stable concentrations.

### 3. APPROXIMATION STRATEGY

#### 3.1. Notations and mesh

Throughout the paper, the domain $\Omega$ is the parallelepiped $[0, L_x] \times [0, L_y] \times [0, L_z]$, with $L_x$, $L_y$ and $L_z$ being three positive constants. It is discretized with a regular mesh composed of parallelepiped cells. Our interest is to perform far-field simulations over very large space domains. By contrast, the size of the disposal site is very small, and therefore, the support that the source term $f$ is acting in is very localized in space, compared with the whole domain. Indeed, the mesh must be very fine in and around the disposal site so as to capture the source term accurately, whereas for computation time restriction purposes it shall not be reasonable to use a very fine mesh over the whole 3D domain. Thus, we decide to use mesh refinements in each direction. More precisely, we let $N_x \in \mathbb{N}$ be the number of subdivisions of $L_x$ with $\Delta x_i$ being the step in the $x$-direction for $i = 1, \ldots, N_x$. In the same way, we define $N_y$ and $N_z$ with $\Delta y_j$ and $\Delta z_k$ being, respectively, the $j$th step in the $y$-direction and the $k$th step in the $z$-direction, for $j = 1, \ldots, N_y$, $k = 1, \ldots, N_z$. The interval $(0, T)$ is partitioned into subintervals $(t_n, t_{n+1})$ and the time steps are defined by $\Delta t_n = t_{n+1} - t_n$. When no confusion arises, $\Delta t_n$ will be denoted by $\Delta t$.

The meshpoints $Q_{i,j,k} = (x_i, y_j, z_k)$ are the centroids of the cells $Q_{i,j,k}$, with

$$Q_{i,j,k} = (x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}, x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}) \times (y_{j-\frac{1}{2}}, y_{j+\frac{1}{2}}) \times (z_{k-\frac{1}{2}}, z_{k+\frac{1}{2}})$$

$$x_i = \sum_{l=1}^{i-1} \Delta x_l, \quad y_j = \sum_{l=1}^{j-1} \Delta y_l, \quad z_k = \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \Delta z_l$$

$$x_i = x_i - \frac{1}{2} \Delta x_i, \quad y_j = y_j - \frac{1}{2} \Delta y_j, \quad z_k = z_k - \frac{1}{2} \Delta z_k$$
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We also denote the distances between two meshpoints by Δx\(_{i+\frac{1}{2}}\) = x\(_{i+1}\) − x\(_{i}\), Δy\(_{j+\frac{1}{2}}\) = y\(_{j+1}\) − y\(_{j}\), Δz\(_{k+\frac{1}{2}}\) = z\(_{k+1}\) − z\(_{k}\), see Figure 1. The boundary of Q\(_{i,j,k}\) is denoted by: \(\partial Q_{i,j,k}=\Gamma_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k} \cup \Gamma_{i,j+\frac{1}{2},k} \cup \Gamma_{i,j,k+\frac{1}{2}} \cup \Gamma_{i,j,k-\frac{1}{2}}\), where \(\Gamma_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k}\) is the shared face between the cells Q\(_{i,j,k}\) and Q\(_{i+1,j,k}\), \(\Gamma_{i,j+\frac{1}{2},k}\) is the shared face between the cells Q\(_{i,j,k}\) and Q\(_{i,j,k+1}\) and \(\Gamma_{i,j,k+\frac{1}{2}}\) is the shared face between the cells Q\(_{i,j,k}\) and Q\(_{i,j,k+1}\).

For every function \(\xi\) defined on \(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \Omega\), the notation \(\xi^n_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}\) stands for the approximation of \(\xi(t_n,(x_\alpha,y_\beta,z_\gamma))\), for \(\alpha=i,i+\frac{1}{2}\), \(\beta=j,j+\frac{1}{2}\), \(\gamma=k,k+\frac{1}{2}\). Moreover, we denote \(\xi^n\) as the sequence \(\{\xi^n_{i,j,k}\}_{i,j,k}\).

### 3.2. Algorithm

At the beginning, the constant in time hydrodynamic load \(H\) is calculated by combining Equations (2) and (3) as follows:

\[
\text{div} \left( K(X) \nabla H(X) \right) = 0
\]  

(4)

Once \(H\) is known, the velocity \(V\) is then computed from Equation (2). The details of the discretization are provided in Section 4.1.

Once \(V\) is known, the concentration \(c\) is calculated from Equation (1), which contains two kinds of differential operators: a convection operator and a reaction/diffusion operator. These two operators are isolated by splitting Equation (1) into

\[
\omega \partial_t c + \text{div}(c V) = 0
\]  

(5)

\[
\omega \partial_t c - \text{div}(D(X, V) \nabla c) + \omega \lambda c = f
\]  

(6)
Then, the approximation of \( c^{n+1} \) is obtained from \( c^n \) by using Strang’s splitting algorithm, cf. [10]:

\[
c^{n+1} = \mathcal{S}_1 \left( \frac{\Delta t}{2}, \mathcal{S}_2 \left( \Delta t, \mathcal{S}_1 \left( \frac{\Delta t}{2}, c^n \right) \right) \right)
\]

where \( \mathcal{S}_1 \) and \( \mathcal{S}_2 \) are approximation schemes for (5) and (6), respectively. This technique allows us to develop specific numerical schemes that are adapted to each operator. The time step \( \Delta t \) is restricted by a CFL condition providing stability of the explicit scheme \( \mathcal{S}_1 \). The scheme \( \mathcal{S}_2 \) is implicit and does not require such a time-step selection. The details of the discretization are expounded in Sections 4.2 and 4.3.

4. NUMERICAL SCHEMES

4.1. Discretization of Darcy’s equation

The aim of this section is to approximate the filtration velocity \( V \). The first step consists of calculating the hydrodynamic load \( H \) with a finite volume technique. Integrating (4) and using Stokc’s formula over any cell \( Q_{i,j,k} \) yields:

\[
\int_{\Gamma_{i+1/2,j,k}} K(X) \partial_z H(X) \, dy \, dz - \int_{\Gamma_{i-1/2,j,k}} K(X) \partial_z H(X) \, dy \, dz \\
+ \int_{\Gamma_{i,j+1/2,k}} K(X) \partial_y H(X) \, dx \, dz - \int_{\Gamma_{i,j-1/2,k}} K(X) \partial_y H(X) \, dx \, dz \\
+ \int_{\Gamma_{i,j,k+1/2}} K(X) \partial_z H(X) \, dx \, dy - \int_{\Gamma_{i,j,k-1/2}} K(X) \partial_z H(X) \, dx \, dy = 0
\]

The derivatives in each direction are discretized by a centered finite difference technique, and \( H \) is then approximated at the cell centroids by:

\[
\Delta y_j \Delta z_k \left( K_{i+1/2,j,k} \frac{H_{i+1,j,k} - H_{i,j,k}}{\Delta x_i + \frac{1}{2}} - K_{i-1/2,j,k} \frac{H_{i,j,k} - H_{i-1,j,k}}{\Delta x_i - \frac{1}{2}} \right) \\
+ \Delta x_i \Delta z_k \left( K_{i,j+1/2,k} \frac{H_{i+1,j,k} - H_{i,j,k}}{\Delta x_i + \frac{1}{2}} - K_{i,j-1/2,k} \frac{H_{i,j,k} - H_{i-1,j,k}}{\Delta x_i - \frac{1}{2}} \right) \\
+ \Delta x_i \Delta y_j \left( K_{i,j,k+1/2} \frac{H_{i,j,k+1} - H_{i,j,k}}{\Delta z_k + \frac{1}{2}} - K_{i,j,k-1/2} \frac{H_{i,j,k} - H_{i,j,k-1}}{\Delta z_k - \frac{1}{2}} \right) = 0
\]

The harmonic mean permeability value is preferred to classical interpolation:

\[
K_{i+1/2,j,k} = \frac{K_{i,j,k} K_{i+1,j,k} \Delta x_i \Delta x_i + 1}{K_{i,j,k} \Delta x_i + 1 + K_{i+1,j,k} \Delta x_i}
\]

In the same way, we define \( K_{i,j+1/2,k} \) and \( K_{i,j,k+1/2} \), respectively, on \( \Gamma_{i,j+1/2,k} \) and \( \Gamma_{i,j,k+1/2} \).
The numerical scheme (7) involves solving a linear system in the form $AH = L$, where $L$ contains Dirichlet or Neumann boundary conditions, and the matrix $A$ is seven diagonal and strongly dominant. The resolution of this system is carried out by a standard gradient method. In practice (see Section 5), it is crucial that it be pre-conditioned in order to face permeability’s sharp gradients. We use incomplete Cholesky’s factorization on that purpose. Once $H$ is known, the velocity $V = (u, v, w)$ is finally computed from (2) at the centroids of the interfaces:

$$
\begin{align*}
    u_{i+\frac{1}{2}, j, k} &= -K_{i+\frac{1}{2}, j, k} \frac{H_{i+1, j, k} - H_{i, j, k}}{\Delta x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}}, \\
    v_{i, j+\frac{1}{2}, k} &= -K_{i, j+\frac{1}{2}, k} \frac{H_{i, j+1, k} - H_{i, j, k}}{\Delta y_{j+\frac{1}{2}}}, \\
    w_{i, j, k+\frac{1}{2}} &= -K_{i, j, k+\frac{1}{2}} \frac{H_{i, j, k+1} - H_{i, j, k}}{\Delta z_{k+\frac{1}{2}}}
\end{align*}
$$

(9)

Notice that the velocity satisfies the discrete free-divergence property:

$$
\frac{u_{i+\frac{1}{2}, j, k} - u_{i-\frac{1}{2}, j, k}}{\Delta x_j} + \frac{v_{i, j+\frac{1}{2}, k} - v_{i, j-\frac{1}{2}, k}}{\Delta y_j} + \frac{w_{i, j, k+\frac{1}{2}} - w_{i, j, k-\frac{1}{2}}}{\Delta z_k} = 0
$$

(10)

4.2. Discretization of the transport equation

The results obtained in this paragraph are justified in Appendix A. First, a first-order accurate numerical scheme approximating (5) is obtained by solving approximate Riemann problems on each interface of a cell (see Appendix A):

$$
\omega_{i, j, k} c_{i, j, k}^{n+1} = \omega_{i, j, k} c_{i, j, k}^n - \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x_j} (u_{i+\frac{1}{2}, j, k}^+ c_{i, j, k}^n + u_{i-\frac{1}{2}, j, k}^- c_{i, j, k}^{n+1} - u_{i-\frac{1}{2}, j, k}^+ c_{i, j, k}^{n+1} - u_{i+\frac{1}{2}, j, k}^- c_{i, j, k}^n)
$$

$$
- \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta y_j} (v_{i, j+\frac{1}{2}, k}^+ c_{i, j, k}^n + v_{i, j-\frac{1}{2}, k}^- c_{i, j, k}^{n+1} - v_{i, j-\frac{1}{2}, k}^+ c_{i, j, k}^{n+1} - v_{i, j+\frac{1}{2}, k}^- c_{i, j, k}^n)
$$

$$
- \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta z_k} (w_{i, j, k+\frac{1}{2}}^+ c_{i, j, k}^n + w_{i, j, k-\frac{1}{2}}^- c_{i, j, k}^{n+1} - w_{i, j, k-\frac{1}{2}}^+ c_{i, j, k}^{n+1} - w_{i, j, k+\frac{1}{2}}^- c_{i, j, k}^n)
$$

$$
:= \mathcal{M}_{i, j, k}
$$

(11)

This scheme is conservative, first-order accurate, $l^\infty$-stable and positivity preserving under the CFL condition

$$
\frac{\Delta t}{\omega_{i, j, k}} \left( \frac{u_{i+\frac{1}{2}, j, k}^+ + u_{i-\frac{1}{2}, j, k}^-}{\Delta x_j} + \frac{v_{i, j+\frac{1}{2}, k}^+ + v_{i, j-\frac{1}{2}, k}^-}{\Delta y_j} + \frac{w_{i, j, k+\frac{1}{2}}^+ + w_{i, j, k-\frac{1}{2}}^-}{\Delta z_k} \right) \leq \eta
$$

(12)
with $\eta = 1$ for all $i, j, k$. Then, we reduce the spurious numerical diffusion by adding antidiffusion terms in each direction. Setting

$$\Delta c_{i+\frac{1}{2}, j, k} := c_{i+\frac{1}{2}, j, k} - c_{i, j, k}, \quad \Delta c_{i, j+\frac{1}{2}, k} := c_{i, j+\frac{1}{2}, k} - c_{i, j, k}, \quad \Delta c_{i, j, k+\frac{1}{2}} := c_{i, j, k+\frac{1}{2}} - c_{i, j, k}$$

$$
\begin{align*}
\zeta_{i+\frac{1}{2}, j, k}^+ &= u_{i+\frac{1}{2}, j, k}^+ \left( 1 - \frac{\Delta t u_{i+\frac{1}{2}, j, k}^+}{\omega_{i+\frac{1}{2}, j, k} \Delta x_i} \right), \\
\zeta_{i+\frac{1}{2}, j, k}^- &= u_{i+\frac{1}{2}, j, k}^- \left( 1 - \frac{\Delta t u_{i+\frac{1}{2}, j, k}^-}{\omega_{i+\frac{1}{2}, j, k} \Delta x_i} \right), \\
\zeta_{i, j+\frac{1}{2}, k}^+ &= v_{i, j+\frac{1}{2}, k}^+ \left( 1 - \frac{\Delta t v_{i, j+\frac{1}{2}, k}^+}{\omega_{i, j+\frac{1}{2}, k} \Delta y_j} \right), \\
\zeta_{i, j+\frac{1}{2}, k}^- &= v_{i, j+\frac{1}{2}, k}^- \left( 1 - \frac{\Delta t v_{i, j+\frac{1}{2}, k}^-}{\omega_{i, j+\frac{1}{2}, k} \Delta y_j} \right), \\
\zeta_{i, j, k+\frac{1}{2}}^+ &= w_{i, j, k+\frac{1}{2}}^+ \left( 1 - \frac{\Delta t w_{i, j, k+\frac{1}{2}}^+}{\omega_{i, j, k+\frac{1}{2}} \Delta z_k} \right), \\
\zeta_{i, j, k+\frac{1}{2}}^- &= w_{i, j, k+\frac{1}{2}}^- \left( 1 - \frac{\Delta t w_{i, j, k+\frac{1}{2}}^-}{\omega_{i, j, k+\frac{1}{2}} \Delta z_k} \right), \\
\phi_{i+\frac{1}{2}, j, k}^+ &= \phi \left( r_{i+\frac{1}{2}, j, k}^+, \frac{\Delta x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}}{\Delta x_i} \right), \\
\phi_{i+\frac{1}{2}, j, k}^- &= \phi \left( r_{i+\frac{1}{2}, j, k}^-, \frac{\Delta x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}}{\Delta x_i} \right), \\
\phi_{i, j+\frac{1}{2}, k}^+ &= \phi \left( r_{i, j+\frac{1}{2}, k}^+, \frac{\Delta y_{j+\frac{1}{2}}}{\Delta y_j} \right), \\
\phi_{i, j+\frac{1}{2}, k}^- &= \phi \left( r_{i, j+\frac{1}{2}, k}^-, \frac{\Delta y_{j+\frac{1}{2}}}{\Delta y_j} \right), \\
\phi_{i, j, k+\frac{1}{2}}^+ &= \phi \left( r_{i, j, k+\frac{1}{2}}^+, \frac{\Delta z_{k+\frac{1}{2}}}{\Delta z_k} \right), \\
\phi_{i, j, k+\frac{1}{2}}^- &= \phi \left( r_{i, j, k+\frac{1}{2}}^-, \frac{\Delta z_{k+\frac{1}{2}}}{\Delta z_k} \right)
\end{align*}
$$

where $\phi$ is a function satisfying $0 \leq \phi(a, b) \leq 2b \max(0, \min(1, a))$ for all $(a, b) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+$, our advection scheme $\mathcal{S}_1$ is defined by

$$
\omega_{i, j, k} c_{i, j, k}^{n+1} = \mathcal{M}_{i, j, k}
$$

$$
= \frac{1}{2} \Delta t \left( \frac{1}{\omega_{i+\frac{1}{2}, j, k}} \phi_{i+\frac{1}{2}, j, k}^- \Delta c_{i+\frac{1}{2}, j, k} \Delta x_{i+\frac{1}{2}} - \phi_{i+\frac{1}{2}, j, k}^- \Delta c_{i+\frac{1}{2}, j, k} \Delta x_{i+\frac{1}{2}} \right). \frac{\Delta x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}}{\Delta x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}}
$$

Copyright © 2009 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
The exact solution of this problem remains constant on the spiral characteristic lines imposed by \( (13) \) after one revolution (at \( t = 0 \)).

A simpler (but more restrictive) way of implementing \( (12) \) in this case is to select \( \eta = \frac{1}{2} \) instead of \( (15) \), see Appendix A.

In the following, the function \( \varphi \) is derived from the Superbee limiter [11] and writes:

\[
\varphi(a, b) = 2b \max(0, \min(1, 2a), \min(a, 2))
\]

Spiral velocity advection test. Our numerical scheme is tested against an academic problem. We let \( \Omega \) be the unit cube \((0, 1) \times (0, 1) \times (0, 1)\), meshed with the nonuniform grid in Figure 2. The initial condition is discontinuous: its value is 1 inside the ball with center \((0.3, 0.5, 0.15)\) and radius 0.1, and 0 everywhere else. The velocity field is spiral: \( V(x, y, z) = (-2\pi(y - \frac{1}{4}), 2\pi(x - \frac{1}{4}), 0.65)\).

The exact solution of this problem remains constant on the spiral characteristic lines imposed by the velocity field. Notice that the transported ball passes through the parallelepiped \((0.2, 0.5) \times (0.2, 0.4) \times (0.3, 0.4)\) where the mesh is refined. This test is reputedly hard because it propagates a discontinuous front. To account for the use of numerical anti-diffusion, we compare the exact solution and the numerical solutions obtained with the first-order Murman scheme \((11)\) and the limited scheme \((13)\) after one revolution (at \( t = 1 \)). The exact solution is 1 inside the ball

\[
\mathcal{B} = \{(x, y, z), \ (x-0.3)^2+(y-0.5)^2+(z-0.8)^2\geq0.1^2\}
\]
Figure 2. Mesh (65 × 47 × 50 elements, left) and initial condition (right) for the spiral velocity advection test case.

Figure 3. Spiral velocity advection test: Top: from left to right, numerical solution computed with the limited scheme (13) at times \(t = 0.25\), \(t = 0.5\) and \(t = 0.75\). Bottom: from left to right, numerical solution computed with the limited scheme (13), Murman scheme (11), and exact solution at time \(t = 1\). The contour values are 0.01, 0.02, 0.05, 0.1, 0.5, 0.7.

and 0 elsewhere. In Figure 3, both numerical schemes offer stable and component-wise nonnegative concentrations. When using the first-order Murman scheme (11), the numerical diffusion is so strong that the numerical solution barely approximates the exact solution. However, our limitation
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and nonconstant mesh-sizes semi-discretized in time by using implicit Euler’s scheme: In this section, we develop a finite volume numerical scheme approximating (6). Equation (6) is

4.3. Discretization of the reaction-diffusion equation (6)

In this section, we develop a finite volume numerical scheme approximating (6). Equation (6) is semi-discretized in time by using implicit Euler’s scheme:

\[
\frac{c(t_{n+1}, X) - c(t_n, X)}{\Delta t} - \text{div}(D(X, V(X)) \nabla c(t_{n+1}, X)) + \lambda \omega(X)c(t_{n+1}, X) = f(t_{n+1}, X) + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t)
\]

Integrating this equation over any cell \(Q_{i,j,k}\) along with using Stokes’ formula, we obtain the numerical scheme

\[
\omega_{i,j,k}(1 + \lambda \Delta t)c_{i,j,k}^{n+1} - \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x_i \Delta y_j \Delta z_k} \mathcal{L}_{i,j,k}^{c} c^{n+1}_{i,j,k} = \omega_{i,j,k} c_{i,j,k}^{n} + \Delta t f_{i,j,k}^{n+1}
\]
Figure 4. The order of $L^1$-convergence for the Murman (11) and limited scheme (13) is the slope of the line plotting $-\ln(||C_h(1,\cdot) - C(1,\cdot)||_{L^1(\Omega)})$ versus $-\ln(s)$. 

where the discrete divergence operator

$$ D_{i,j,k} := F_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k} - F_{i-\frac{1}{2},j,k} + F_{i,j+\frac{1}{2},k} - F_{i,j-\frac{1}{2},k} + F_{i,j,k+\frac{1}{2}} - F_{i,j,k-\frac{1}{2}} $$

is the sum of the numerical diffusive fluxes across the interfaces:

$$ F_{x,\beta,\gamma} \approx \int_{\Gamma_{x,\beta,\gamma}} D(X, V(X)) \nabla c(t_{n+1}, X) \cdot v_{x,\beta,\gamma} \, d\Gamma $$

for $x = i, i \pm \frac{1}{2}, j, j \pm \frac{1}{2}, \gamma = k, k \pm \frac{1}{2}$. Notice that the tensor $D$ is symmetric but not diagonal. We decide to evaluate the diagonal terms $D^{1,1}$, $D^{2,2}$ and $D^{3,3}$ at the centroids $(x_{i \pm \frac{1}{2}, y_j, z_k}, (x_i, y_{j \pm \frac{1}{2}}, z_k), (x_i, y_j, z_{k \pm \frac{1}{2}})$ of the interfaces. The nondiagonal terms $D^{1,2}$, $D^{1,3}$ and $D^{2,3}$ are evaluated on the edges of the interfaces, a 3D counterpart of Reference [3]. The derivatives of $c(t_{n+1}, X)$ are approximated by centered finite difference formulas. Our numerical fluxes in the $x$-direction are then defined by:

$$ F_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k} = \Delta y_j \Delta z_k \left( D^{1,1}_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k} \frac{c^n_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k} - c^n_{i,j,k}}{\Delta x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left( D^{1,2}_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k} \frac{c^n_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k} - c^n_{i,j,k}}{\Delta y_{j+\frac{1}{2}}} + D^{1,2}_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k} \frac{c^n_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k} - c^n_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k-\frac{1}{2}}}{\Delta y_{j-\frac{1}{2}}} \right) $$

$$ + \frac{1}{2} \left( D^{1,3}_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k} \frac{c^n_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k} - c^n_{i,j,k}}{\Delta z_{k+\frac{1}{2}}} + D^{1,2}_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k} \frac{c^n_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k} - c^n_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k-\frac{1}{2}}}{\Delta z_{k-\frac{1}{2}}} \right) $$
The fluxes in the other directions, \( F_{i,j,k} \) and \( F_{i,j,k} \), are defined in the same fashion. Inside the domain, the concentrations at the interfaces are linearly interpolated from their values at the meshpoints, for instance,

\[
c^n_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k} = c^n_{i,j,k} + \frac{1}{2} \Delta x_i (c^n_{i+1,j,k} - c^n_{i,j,k})
\]

(17)

\[
c^n_{i+\frac{1}{2},j+\frac{1}{2}} = c^n_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k} + \frac{1}{2} \Delta y_j (c^n_{i+\frac{1}{2},j+1,k} - c^n_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k})
\]

Then, to calculate the terms \( D^1_{i+\frac{1}{2},j+\frac{1}{2}} \), \( D^1_{i+\frac{1}{2},j+\frac{1}{2}} \), \( D^2_{i+\frac{1}{2},j+\frac{1}{2}} \) and \( D^2_{i+\frac{1}{2},j+\frac{1}{2}} \), the values of the geological coefficients \( z_l \), \( z_t \) and \( d_m \) are evaluated at the interfaces with the same interpolation procedure as the concentrations in (17) from their values at the meshpoints. The velocities at the edges of the interfaces are interpolated from their values obtained by the numerical scheme (9). For example, the velocity in the \( x \)-direction is interpolated as

\[
u_{i+\frac{1}{2},j+\frac{1}{2},k} = \nu_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k} + \frac{1}{2} \Delta y_j (\nu_{i+\frac{1}{2},j+1,k} - \nu_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k})
\]

\[
u_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k+\frac{1}{2}} = \nu_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k} + \frac{1}{2} \Delta y_j (\nu_{i+\frac{1}{2},j+1,k+1} - \nu_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k+1})
\]

\[
u_{i,j+\frac{1}{2},k} = \frac{1}{2} (\nu_{i+\frac{1}{2},j+\frac{1}{2},k} + \nu_{i-\frac{1}{2},j+\frac{1}{2},k})
\]

After multiplying the implicit scheme (16) by \( \Delta x_i \Delta y_j \Delta z_k \), a linear system is to be solved, the matrix of which is symmetric 19-diagonal. With realistic data, the term \( \omega/\Delta t \) often dominates the cross terms containing \( D^1_{i+\frac{1}{2},j+\frac{1}{2}} \), \( D^1_{i+\frac{1}{2},j+\frac{1}{2}} \), \( D^2_{i+\frac{1}{2},j+\frac{1}{2}} \) when using the CFL condition (12), (14); this makes the matrix strongly diagonal dominant and the present scheme nonnegativity preserving (see for example [12] and its references) in the applications.

The gradient method is used to inverse this system that is improved by incomplete Choleski pre-conditioning procedure.

5. APPLICATION: THE 3D COUPLEX TEST-CASE

In this section we perform a 3D extension of the well-known 2D Couplex 1 benchmark. \( f \) coming from a leak in a nuclear waste repository that lies in a clay layer. This clay layer is surrounded by two limestone layers (from Oxfordian and Dogger era), while a Marl layer represents the near ground on the top of the domain, see Figure 5.

The domain of simulation is the parallelepiped \( \Omega = (0, 25000 m) \times (0, 25000 m) \times (0, 695 m) \), which is split into four subdomains:

- The Dogger subdomain is the set \( \{ (x,y,z) \in \Omega, 0 \leq z \leq 200 \} \).
- The clay subdomain is \( \{ (x,y,z) \in \Omega, 200 \leq z \leq \frac{55}{25000} (x+y) + 295 \} \).

• The limestone subdomain is \( \{(x, y, z) \in \Omega, \frac{55}{2500}(x+y) + 295 \leq z \leq 595\} \).

• The marl subdomain is the set \( \{(x, y, z) \in \Omega, 595 \leq z \leq 695\} \).

The repository \( \mathcal{R} \) is modeled by the parallelepiped

\[
\mathcal{R} = \{(x, y, z) \in [18440, 21680] \times [3320, 4320] \times [244, 250]\}
\]

Notice that the depth of the domain is quite small compared with its length and width. The dimensions of the repository are also very small compared with the whole domain. Consequently, the mesh is refined around the repository to capture the source of contaminant accurately. In our code, the mesh is handled manually: the user has the option to split the length, width and height of the domain into distinct sub-intervals and select how many cells each sub-interval will be partitioned into. This way, we use a very fine mesh on the intervals \( \{x \in (18440, 21680)\}, \{y \in (3320, 4320)\} \) and \( \{z \in (244, 250)\} \) so that the repository is captured by several mesh elements. In the rest of the domain we let the mesh coarser in order for the computation time to be fast, see Figure 6.

The data set is entirely provided by the benchmark and is realistic, implying that the geological coefficients \( \alpha, k, \varphi_l, \alpha_k \) and \( d_m \) are sharply discontinuous (see Table II). The pollution is simulated...
Table II. Geological coefficients.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>$\omega$</th>
<th>$K$ (m/year)</th>
<th>$d_m$ (m$^2$/year)</th>
<th>$x_l$ (m)</th>
<th>$x_t$ (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dogger</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>25.2288</td>
<td>$5 \times 10^{-4}$</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>$3.1536 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>$9.48 \times 10^{-7}$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>6.3072</td>
<td>$5 \times 10^{-4}$</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marl</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>$3.1536 \times 10^{-5}$</td>
<td>$5 \times 10^{-4}$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7. Source term $\bar{f}$ (mol·m$^{-3}$) versus time (years).

over one million years, while the leak lasts for about a hundred thousand years. The source term $f$, modeling the leak, vanishes outside the repository and is assumed to be constant in space inside. More precisely, we set

$$f(t, X) = \frac{\bar{f}(t)}{|\mathcal{R}|} \chi_{\mathcal{R}}(X)$$

where $\chi_{\mathcal{R}}$ stands for the characteristic function of the repository $\mathcal{R}$, $|\mathcal{R}|$ is the volume of $\mathcal{R}$, and $\bar{f}$ is a piecewise linear function whose graph is plotted in Figure 7 and values are imposed by the benchmark. The period of the element $^{129}\text{I}$ is $T = 1.57 \times 10^7$ years, and the radioactive decay factor is given by $\lambda = \ln 2 / T$.

We assume that there is no contamination at time $t=0$: our initial condition is $c(0, \cdot) \equiv 0$ over the whole domain. The boundary conditions are summarized on Table III.

Our numerical result for the hydrodynamic load (expressed in m) and velocity (expressed in m/year) are displayed in Figures 8 and 9. The hydrodynamic load accounts for the pressure on the fluid. Hence, the flow will be directed from the higher loads to the lower loads. The speed
Table III. Boundary conditions (the symbol ‘n.a.’ means ‘not applicable’).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boundary</th>
<th>Dogger</th>
<th>Clay</th>
<th>Limestone</th>
<th>Marl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bottom boundary</td>
<td>( \nabla c \cdot \mathbf{v} - c \mathbf{V} = 0 )</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((z = 0))</td>
<td>( \mathbf{V} \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0 )</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top boundary</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>( c = 0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((z = 695))</td>
<td>( \mathbf{V} \cdot \mathbf{m} = 0 )</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left boundary</td>
<td>( \mathbf{H} = 250 + \frac{90}{25000} \mathbf{x} - \frac{20}{25000} \mathbf{y} )</td>
<td>( \nabla c \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0 )</td>
<td>( \nabla c \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0 )</td>
<td>( \nabla c \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((x = 0))</td>
<td>( \mathbf{V} \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0 )</td>
<td>( \mathbf{V} \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0 )</td>
<td>( \mathbf{V} \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0 )</td>
<td>( \mathbf{V} \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right boundary</td>
<td>( \nabla c \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0 )</td>
<td>( \nabla c \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0 )</td>
<td>( \nabla c \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0 )</td>
<td>( \mathbf{V} \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((x = 25000))</td>
<td>( \mathbf{H} = 287 - \frac{2}{25000} \mathbf{y} )</td>
<td>( \nabla c \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0 )</td>
<td>( \mathbf{V} \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0 )</td>
<td>( \mathbf{V} \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front boundary</td>
<td>( \nabla c \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0 )</td>
<td>( \nabla c \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0 )</td>
<td>( \nabla c \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0 )</td>
<td>( \mathbf{V} \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((y = 0))</td>
<td>( \mathbf{H} = 287 + \frac{2}{25000} \mathbf{x} )</td>
<td>( \nabla c \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0 )</td>
<td>transparent in ( c )</td>
<td>( \nabla c \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back boundary</td>
<td>( \nabla c \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0 )</td>
<td>( \nabla c \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0 )</td>
<td>( \nabla c \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0 )</td>
<td>( \mathbf{V} \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((y = 25000))</td>
<td>( \mathbf{H} = 286 + \frac{2}{25000} \mathbf{x} )</td>
<td>( \mathbf{V} \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0 )</td>
<td>( \mathbf{H} = 200 + \frac{50}{25000} \mathbf{x} )</td>
<td>( \mathbf{V} \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8. Hydrodynamic load contours for the 3D COUPLEX test case with 10 isovales between 180 m (light) and 340 m (dark).

Figure 9. Velocity (m/year) for the 3D COUPLEX test case \( (8.11 \times 10^{-10} \leq |\mathbf{V}| \leq 0.022) \).

ranges from \( 8.11 \times 10^{-10} \) m/year to 0.022 m/year. It is the fastest in the limestone layer, while it is negligible in both clay and Marl layer, as an outcome of very small permeabilities. Our computed concentrations are displayed in Figures 10–14. The convection phenomenon can be observed in
Figure 10. Numerical concentrations of $^{129}$I from top to bottom at times $t=0$, $t=10^{110}$, $t=70000$ years. The left column in an oblique view of the domain and the right column is a view of the domain from the top. The contour values are $10^{-12}$ (light), $10^{-10}$ (medium), $10^{-8}$ (dark) mol/m$^3$.

the Dogger and limestone layers, while diffusion is dominant in the clay and Marl layers due to a very small velocity.

First, the pollutant progressively invades the clay layer, in which the permeability and velocity are very weak and avoid advection/dispersion phenomena. After about $10^{110}$ years, the pollutant diffuses out of its storage clay layer to the Dogger layer, see Figure 10. After about 70000 years, some radio-elements also reach the limestone layer. In Figures 11 and 12, the radioelements progressively invade the underground.

In the limestone and Dogger layers, the molecular diffusion still plays a role. However, the velocity in these layers is significant and most of the motion is then due to advection and mechanical dispersion. Indeed, the invasion progresses the fastest in the limestone layer, where the speed is the highest.
Figure 11. Numerical concentrations of $^{129}$I from top to bottom at times $t = 100 000$, $t = 200 000$ and $t = 300 000$. The left column in an oblique view of the domain and the right column is a view of the domain from the top. The contour values are $10^{-12}$ (light), $10^{-10}$ (medium), $10^{-8}$ (dark) mol/m$^3$.

We can observe that some radionuclides hit the Marl layer after about 500 000 years and eventually reach the surface of the ground. When the source of contaminant is no longer active, the pollution progressively dissipates as the concentrations become too weak to counter the effect of the radioactive decay phenomenon, see Figures 13 and 14. The particles are then destroyed along time as a result of radioactive decay.

The behavior of our 3D numerical solutions matches former 2D results [2, 3] and confirms our expectations: some radionuclides reach the ground surface before being destroyed.

However, our results should be considered more realistic than 2D results, as real grounds are 3D. Indeed, since the top of the clay layer is an inclined plane whose slopes are different in the $x$-and $y$-directions, the geometry of the present test case cannot be described by a 2D domain.

Figure 12. Numerical concentrations of $^{129}$I from top to bottom at times $t = 500000$, $t = 10^6$ and $t = 2 \times 10^6$ years. The left column in an oblique view of the domain and the right column is a view of the domain from the top. The contour values are $10^{-12}$ (light), $10^{-10}$ (medium), $10^{-8}$ (dark) mol/m$^3$.

6. COMPUTATIONAL RESOURCES

All the simulations presented in this paper were performed on a MacBookPro machine, featuring a 2.33 GHz Intel Core 2 Duo processor with a clock rate of 667 MHz and a total memory of 2000 MBbytes.

Indeed, a main concern with 3D simulations is whether the numerical solutions are computed fast enough.

In order to test the performance of our method, we compare the runtimes for the 3D COUPLEX test case over 100 000 years on three different independent grids: grid 1: 159,936 (68 $\times$ 49 $\times$ 48) mesh elements, grid 2: 236,250 (75 $\times$ 70 $\times$ 45) mesh elements and grid 3: 1,347,597 (131 $\times$ 127 $\times$ 81) mesh elements.

Figure 13. Numerical concentrations of $^{129}$I from top to bottom at times $t = 4 \times 10^6$, $t = 7 \times 10^6$ and $7.5 \times t = 10^6$ years. The left column in an oblique view of the domain and the right column is a view of the domain from the top. The contour values are $10^{-12}$ (light), $10^{-10}$ (medium), $10^{-8}$ (dark) mol/m$^3$.

Table IV shows that our numerical solutions are calculated in a reasonable time. The CPU time per iteration per grid point is almost constant, hence showing that the rate of convergence is independent of time and mesh. Note that the three grids are not related to each other, and grid 2 offers the smallest CFL ratio in the left-hand side of (12). Therefore, it requires the most iterations.

7. CONCLUSION

3D numerical simulations involving heterogeneous data have always been an interesting mathematical and engineering challenge.
We have developed an effective method to simulate the radionuclide transport through highly heterogeneous 3D grounds. Indeed, our method makes it possible to handle realistic data, as shown in Section 5.

The use of mesh refinements in each direction enables us to discretize the source term without much impacting the computation time.

Our anti-diffusive technique reduces the spurious numerical diffusion, so the advection operator is discretized accurately. Advection and reaction/diffusion schemes are then plugged into an operator splitting procedure gathering all the phenomena in the model.

For sustainable development concerns, we observed that geological coefficients and pressure conditions can be such that escaped radionuclides reach the ground surface. Therefore, underground...
Table IV. Comparison of CPU time on three grids for a simulation time of 100,000 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grid 1</th>
<th>Grid 2</th>
<th>Grid 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meshes</td>
<td>159,936</td>
<td>259,008</td>
<td>1,347,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory used (MBytes)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of iterations</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPU (s)</td>
<td>1,038</td>
<td>2,570</td>
<td>10,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPU/iteration/grid point</td>
<td>$9.02 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>$9.31 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>$9.72 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disposal sites might be unsafe for populations and yield a disaster if not carefully implemented. For this reason, we feel that this paper might be used as an illustration within a politico-social context.

An interesting possible extension to this work is to study whether a change in the data can reduce the threat. Indeed, other pressure conditions would influence the flow through pervious rocks, hence modifying the particle transport pattern. However, the molecular diffusion effect only depends on the nature of the rocks and would remain unchanged. So, we feel that even a suitable flow would not be enough to prevent the radionuclide from reaching the surface. Other alternatives include changing the storage environment and investigating what permeability, storage depth and rocks surrounding the disposal site might yield a safer outcome.

APPENDIX A: CONSTRUCTION OF THE SCHEME (13)

To place matters in perspective, consider Equation (5) in one space dimension, denote $x$ as the independent space variable in a space domain $(0, L_x)$, that is an interval. The meshpoints are denoted by $x_i$, as defined as in Section 3.1, with steps $\Delta x_i$ and $\Delta x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}$. We construct a numerical scheme from the widely used transport-projection technique (see [3, 19]).

Denoting $c^n_i$ as an approximation of $\frac{1}{\Delta x_i} \int_{x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}}^{x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}} c(t_n, x) \, dx$, we integrate Equation (5) over one cell $(x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}, x_{i+\frac{1}{2}})$:

$$\Delta x_i \omega_i c^{n+1}_i = \Delta x_i \omega_i c^n_i - \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} u_{i+\frac{1}{2}} c(t, x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}) - u_{i-\frac{1}{2}} c(t, x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}) \, dt$$

(A1)

Then, the concentration $c(t, x_{i+\frac{1}{2}})$ at the interface $x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}$ is approximated by $\hat{c}(t, 0)$, where $\hat{c}$ is the solution to the following exact Riemann problem with constant velocity field:

$$\begin{cases}
\hat{c}_t + \frac{u_{i+\frac{1}{2}}}{\omega_{i+\frac{1}{2}}} \hat{c}_x = 0, & (t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R} \\
\hat{c}(0, x) = c^n_i, & x \in (-\infty, 0) \\
\hat{c}(0, x) = c^n_{i+1}, & x \in (0, +\infty) 
\end{cases}
$$

Repeating this process on the interface $x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}$ and plugging the results into (A1) yield the Murman scheme with nonconstant velocity:

$$\omega_i c_i^{n+1} = \omega_i c_i^n - \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x_i} (u_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^+ c_i^n + u_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^- c_{i+1}^n - u_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^- c_i^n - u_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^+ c_{i-1}^n)$$  \hspace{1cm} (A2)

To increase the accuracy, we notice that $\partial_t c = -(1/\omega) \partial_x (uc)$ and if $c$ is regular enough,

$$\partial_t^2 c = \frac{1}{\omega} \partial_x \left( \frac{u}{\omega} \partial_x (uc) \right)$$

Therefore, integrating the second degree Taylor polynomial for $c$ with respect to $t$ over one cell leads to:

$$\int_{x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}}^{x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}} \omega(x) c(t_{n+1}, x) \, dx = \int_{x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}}^{x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}} \omega(x) c(t_n, x) \, dx$$

$$- \Delta t \left( u_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^+ c(t_n, x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}) - u_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^- c(t_n, x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}) \right)$$

$$+ \frac{\Delta t^2}{2} \left( \frac{u_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^+}{\omega_{i+\frac{1}{2}}} \partial_x c(t_n, x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}) - \frac{u_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^-}{\omega_{i-\frac{1}{2}}} \partial_x c(t_n, x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}) \right)$$

$$+ \frac{\Delta t^2}{2} \left( c(t_n, x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}) \frac{u_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^+}{\omega_{i+\frac{1}{2}}} \partial_x u(x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}) - c(t_n, x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}) \frac{u_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^-}{\omega_{i-\frac{1}{2}}} \partial_x u(x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}) \right)$$

$$+ O(\Delta t^3)$$ \hspace{1cm} (A3)

Then, $c(t_n, x_{i+\frac{1}{2}})$ is approximated by interpolating $c^n$ linearly on the interface $x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}$ and the derivative of $c$ is discretized centrally:

$$c_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^n = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\Delta x_{i+1}}{\Delta x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}} c_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^n + \frac{\Delta x_i}{\Delta x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}} c_{i+1}^n \right), \quad \partial_x c(t_n, x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}) \approx \frac{c_{i+1}^n - c_i^n}{\Delta x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^n}$$

Neglecting $\partial_x u$ in (A3) (since in three space dimensions our velocity is divergence free), we obtain the Lax-Wendroff-like numerical scheme:

$$\omega_i c_i^{n+1} = \omega_i c_i^n - \frac{\Delta t}{2\Delta x_i} \left( u_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^+ \left( \frac{\Delta x_{i+1}}{\Delta x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}} c_i^n + \frac{\Delta x_i}{\Delta x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}} c_{i+1}^n \right) - u_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^- \left( \frac{\Delta x_{i-1}}{\Delta x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}} c_i^n + \frac{\Delta x_i}{\Delta x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}} c_{i-1}^n \right) \right)$$

$$+ \frac{\Delta t^2}{2\Delta x_i} \left( \frac{u_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^+}{\omega_{i+\frac{1}{2}}} c_{i+1} - c_i - \frac{u_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^-}{\omega_{i-\frac{1}{2}}} c_i - c_{i-1} \right)$$ \hspace{1cm} (A4)
In three space dimensions, the scheme (11) is obtained in the same fashion as (A2), by integrating (5) over one cell and solving Riemann problems in each direction \(x, y, z\). That scheme can be rewritten as

\[
\frac{\omega_{i,j,k} c_{i,j,k}^{n+1} - \omega_{i,j,k} c_{i,j,k}^n}{\Delta t} = -\frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x_i} \left( u_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k}^n \Delta c_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k}^n - u_{i-\frac{1}{2},j,k}^n \Delta c_{i-\frac{1}{2},j,k}^n \right) \\
- \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta y_j} \left( v_{i,j+\frac{1}{2},k}^n \Delta c_{i,j+\frac{1}{2},k}^n - v_{i,j-\frac{1}{2},k}^n \Delta c_{i,j-\frac{1}{2},k}^n \right) \\
- \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta z_k} \left( w_{i,j,k+\frac{1}{2}}^n \Delta c_{i,j,k+\frac{1}{2}}^n - w_{i,j,k-\frac{1}{2}}^n \Delta c_{i,j,k-\frac{1}{2}}^n \right)
\]

where \(\Delta c_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k}^n\), \(\Delta c_{i,j+\frac{1}{2},k}^n\), and \(\Delta c_{i,j,k+\frac{1}{2}}^n\) are defined in Subsection 4.2 and

\[
\frac{\omega_{i,j,k}}{\Delta x_i} \left( u_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k} - u_{i-\frac{1}{2},j,k} \right) + \frac{\omega_{i,j,k}}{\Delta y_j} \left( v_{i,j+\frac{1}{2},k} - v_{i,j-\frac{1}{2},k} \right) + \frac{\omega_{i,j,k}}{\Delta z_k} \left( w_{i,j,k+\frac{1}{2}} - w_{i,j,k-\frac{1}{2}} \right) = 0
\]

from (10). The right-hand side of (A5) is then a convex combination of the discrete concentrations at time \(t_n\) as long as condition (12) holds, implying nonnegativity preservation and stability of the scheme (11).

Then, using the notations

\[
c_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k}^n = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\omega_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k}}{\Delta x_i} c_{i,j,k}^n + \frac{\omega_{i-\frac{1}{2},j,k}}{\Delta x_i} c_{i+1,j,k}^n \right), \quad c_{i,j+\frac{1}{2},k}^n = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\omega_{i,j+\frac{1}{2},k}}{\Delta y_j} c_{i,j,k}^n + \frac{\omega_{i,j-\frac{1}{2},k}}{\Delta y_j} c_{i+1,j,k}^n \right)
\]

our 3D antidiffusive scheme is defined by writing the numerical fluxes of (A4) in each direction:

\[
\frac{\omega_{i,j,k} c_{i,j,k}^{n+1} - \omega_{i,j,k} c_{i,j,k}^n}{\Delta t} = -\frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x_i} \left( \frac{u_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k}^2 c_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k}^n \Delta c_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k}^n}{\omega_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k}} - \frac{u_{i-\frac{1}{2},j,k}^2 c_{i-\frac{1}{2},j,k}^n \Delta c_{i-\frac{1}{2},j,k}^n}{\omega_{i-\frac{1}{2},j,k}} \right) \\
- \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta y_j} \left( \frac{v_{i,j+\frac{1}{2},k}^2 c_{i,j+\frac{1}{2},k}^n \Delta c_{i,j+\frac{1}{2},k}^n}{\omega_{i,j+\frac{1}{2},k}} - \frac{v_{i,j-\frac{1}{2},k}^2 c_{i,j-\frac{1}{2},k}^n \Delta c_{i,j-\frac{1}{2},k}^n}{\omega_{i,j-\frac{1}{2},k}} \right) \\
- \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta z_k} \left( \frac{w_{i,j,k+\frac{1}{2}}^2 c_{i,j,k+\frac{1}{2}}^n \Delta c_{i,j,k+\frac{1}{2}}^n}{\omega_{i,j,k+\frac{1}{2}}} - \frac{w_{i,j,k-\frac{1}{2}}^2 c_{i,j,k-\frac{1}{2}}^n \Delta c_{i,j,k-\frac{1}{2}}^n}{\omega_{i,j,k-\frac{1}{2}}} \right) 
\]
\[
- \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta z_k} \left( w_{i,j,k+\frac{1}{2}} c_{i,j,k+\frac{1}{2}}^{n+1} - w_{i,j,k-\frac{1}{2}} c_{i,j,k-\frac{1}{2}}^{n+1} \right) \\
- \frac{\Delta t}{2} \left( \frac{w_{i,j,k+\frac{1}{2}}^2 \Delta c_{i,j,k+\frac{1}{2}}^n}{\Delta z_{k+\frac{1}{2}}} - \frac{w_{i,j,k-\frac{1}{2}}^2 \Delta c_{i,j,k-\frac{1}{2}}^n}{\Delta z_{k-\frac{1}{2}}} \right)
\]  

(A6)

Notice that scheme (13) can be obtained from the second degree Taylor polynomial for \( c \) as in (A3), using \( \text{div}\vec{V} = 0 \) and neglecting all the terms in the form \( \Delta t^2 \partial_{ab}^2 c \) with notations \( a = x, y, z \), \( b = x, y, z \) and \( a \neq b \). Hence, this scheme is still first-order accurate. However, it is more accurate than (11). Indeed, our antidiffusion technique cuts down the numerical diffusion considerably, as observed in the spiral velocity test case (Section 4.2).

Finally, we stabilize the numerical scheme (A6) by limiting the antidiffusion terms (we refer, for example, to [3, 19–21] and their references). Scheme (A6) is written as a perturbation of Murman-3D scheme (11):

\[
\omega_{i,j,k} c_{i,j,k}^{n+1} = \omega_{i,j,k} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x_i} \left( \alpha_{i-\frac{1}{2},j,k}^c \Delta c_{i-\frac{1}{2},j,k}^n \frac{\Delta x_{i+1}}{\Delta x_i} - \alpha_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k}^c \Delta c_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k}^n \frac{\Delta x_i}{\Delta x_{i+1}} \right) \\
+ \frac{1}{2} \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta y_j} \left( \alpha_{i,j-\frac{1}{2},k}^c \Delta c_{i,j-\frac{1}{2},k}^n \frac{\Delta y_{j+1}}{\Delta y_j} - \alpha_{i,j+\frac{1}{2},k}^c \Delta c_{i,j+\frac{1}{2},k}^n \frac{\Delta y_j}{\Delta y_{j+1}} \right) \\
+ \frac{1}{2} \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta z_k} \left( \alpha_{i,j,k-\frac{1}{2}}^c \Delta c_{i,j,k-\frac{1}{2}}^n \frac{\Delta z_{k+1}}{\Delta z_k} - \alpha_{i,j,k+\frac{1}{2}}^c \Delta c_{i,j,k+\frac{1}{2}}^n \frac{\Delta z_k}{\Delta z_{k+1}} \right)
\]

Multiplying each anti-diffusion term by an appropriate limiter, we obtain the numerical scheme (13), for which

\[
\omega_{i,j,k} c_{i,j,k}^{n+1} = \omega_{i,j,k} + A_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k} \Delta c_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k}^n - B_{i-\frac{1}{2},j,k} \Delta c_{i-\frac{1}{2},j,k}^n + A_{i,j+\frac{1}{2},k} \Delta c_{i,j+\frac{1}{2},k}^n - B_{i,j-\frac{1}{2},k} \Delta c_{i,j-\frac{1}{2},k}^n
\]

Copyright © 2009 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
with

\[
A_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k} = -\frac{\Delta t u^-_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k}}{\omega_{i,j,k} \Delta x_i} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{\Delta t u^-_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k}}{\omega_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k} \Delta x_i+1} \right) \frac{\Delta x_{i+1}}{\Delta x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}} \phi^-_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k} \right)
+ \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{\Delta t u^-_{i-\frac{1}{2},j,k}}{\omega_{i-\frac{1}{2},j,k} \Delta x_i} \right) \frac{\Delta x_i}{\Delta x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}} \phi^-_{i-\frac{1}{2},j,k}
\]

\[
B_{i-\frac{1}{2},j,k} = \frac{\Delta t u^+_{i-\frac{1}{2},j,k}}{\omega_{i,j,k} \Delta x_i} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{\Delta t u^+_{i-\frac{1}{2},j,k}}{\omega_{i-\frac{1}{2},j,k} \Delta x_i-1} \right) \frac{\Delta x_{i-1}}{\Delta x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}} \phi^+_{i-\frac{1}{2},j,k} \right)
+ \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{\Delta t u^+_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k}}{\omega_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k} \Delta x_i} \right) \frac{\Delta x_i}{\Delta x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}} \phi^+_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k}
\]

\[
A_{i,j+\frac{1}{2},k} = -\frac{\Delta t v^-_{i,j+\frac{1}{2},k}}{\omega_{i,j,k} \Delta y_j} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{\Delta t v^-_{i,j+\frac{1}{2},k}}{\omega_{i,j+\frac{1}{2},k} \Delta y_j+1} \right) \frac{\Delta y_{j+1}}{\Delta y_{j+\frac{1}{2}}} \phi^-_{i,j+\frac{1}{2},k} \right)
+ \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{\Delta t v^-_{i,j-\frac{1}{2},k}}{\omega_{i,j-\frac{1}{2},k} \Delta y_j} \right) \frac{\Delta y_j}{\Delta y_{j-\frac{1}{2}}} \phi^-_{i,j-\frac{1}{2},k}
\]

\[
B_{i,j-\frac{1}{2},k} = \frac{\Delta t v^+_{i,j-\frac{1}{2},k}}{\omega_{i,j,k} \Delta y_j} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{\Delta t v^+_{i,j-\frac{1}{2},k}}{\omega_{i,j-\frac{1}{2},k} \Delta y_j-1} \right) \frac{\Delta y_{j-1}}{\Delta y_{j-\frac{1}{2}}} \phi^+_{i,j-\frac{1}{2},k} \right)
+ \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{\Delta t v^+_{i,j+\frac{1}{2},k}}{\omega_{i,j+\frac{1}{2},k} \Delta y_j} \right) \frac{\Delta y_j}{\Delta y_{j+\frac{1}{2}}} \phi^+_{i,j+\frac{1}{2},k}
\]

\[
A_{i,j,k+\frac{1}{2}} = -\frac{\Delta t w^-_{i,j,k+\frac{1}{2}}}{\omega_{i,j,k} \Delta z_k} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{\Delta t w^-_{i,j,k+\frac{1}{2}}}{\omega_{i,j,k+\frac{1}{2}} \Delta z_{k+1}} \right) \frac{\Delta z_{k+1}}{\Delta z_{k+\frac{1}{2}}} \phi^-_{i,j,k+\frac{1}{2}} \right)
+ \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{\Delta t w^-_{i,j,k-\frac{1}{2}}}{\omega_{i,j,k-\frac{1}{2}} \Delta z_k} \right) \frac{\Delta z_k}{\Delta z_{k-\frac{1}{2}}} \phi^-_{i,j,k-\frac{1}{2}}
\]

\[
B_{i,j,k-\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{\Delta t w^+_{i,j,k-\frac{1}{2}}}{\omega_{i,j,k} \Delta z_k} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{\Delta t w^+_{i,j,k-\frac{1}{2}}}{\omega_{i,j,k-\frac{1}{2}} \Delta z_{k-1}} \right) \frac{\Delta z_{k-1}}{\Delta z_{k-\frac{1}{2}}} \phi^+_{i,j,k-\frac{1}{2}} \right)
+ \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{\Delta t w^+_{i,j,k+\frac{1}{2}}}{\omega_{i,j,k+\frac{1}{2}} \Delta z_k} \right) \frac{\Delta z_k}{\Delta z_{k+\frac{1}{2}}} \phi^+_{i,j,k+\frac{1}{2}}
\]
\[
B_{i,j,k} = \frac{\Delta t w_{i,j,k-\frac{1}{2}}^+}{\omega_{i,j,k} \Delta z_k} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{\Delta t w_{i,j,k-\frac{1}{2}}^+}{\omega_{i,j,k} \Delta z_k} \right) \frac{\Delta z_k}{\Delta z_k-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\phi_{i,j,k-\frac{1}{2}}^+}{\omega_{i,j,k} \Delta z_k} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{\Delta t w_{i,j,k+\frac{1}{2}}^+}{\omega_{i,j,k+\frac{1}{2}} \Delta z_k} \right) \frac{\Delta z_k}{\Delta z_k+\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\phi_{i,j,k+\frac{1}{2}}^+}{\omega_{i,j,k+\frac{1}{2}} \Delta z_k}
\]

Define
\[
R_{i,j,k} = \frac{1}{\omega_{i,j,k}} \left( \frac{-u_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k}^- + u_{i-\frac{1}{2},j,k}^+}{\Delta x_i} + \frac{-v_{i,j+\frac{1}{2},k}^- + v_{i,j-\frac{1}{2},k}^+}{\Delta y_j} + \frac{-w_{i,j,k+\frac{1}{2}}^- + w_{i,j,k-\frac{1}{2}}^+}{\Delta z_k} \right)
\]

and
\[
S_{i,j,k} = \frac{u_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k}^- + u_{i-\frac{1}{2},j,k}^+}{\omega_{i,j,k} \Delta x_i} + \frac{v_{i,j+\frac{1}{2},k}^- + v_{i,j-\frac{1}{2},k}^+}{\omega_{i,j,k} \Delta y_j} + \frac{w_{i,j,k+\frac{1}{2}}^- + w_{i,j,k-\frac{1}{2}}^+}{\omega_{i,j,k} \Delta z_k}
\]

Since \( \frac{1}{b} \phi(a,b) \geq -2 \) and
\[
\frac{1}{b} \frac{\phi(a,b)}{a} \leq 2
\]

for all \( a, b \), the coefficients \( A_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k}, B_{i-\frac{1}{2},j,k}, A_{i,j+\frac{1}{2},k}, B_{i,j-\frac{1}{2},k}, A_{i,j,k+\frac{1}{2}}, B_{i,j,k-\frac{1}{2}} \) are all nonnegative under (14), and
\[
A_{i+\frac{1}{2},j,k} + B_{i-\frac{1}{2},j,k} + A_{i,j+\frac{1}{2},k} + B_{i,j-\frac{1}{2},k} + A_{i,j,k+\frac{1}{2}} + B_{i,j,k-\frac{1}{2}} \leq 2R_{i,j,k} \Delta t - \Delta t^2 S_{i,j,k}
\]

Therefore, \( c_{i,j,k}^{n+1} \) is a convex combination of \( c_{i,j,k}^n, c_{i-1,j,k}^n, c_{i+1,j,k}^n, c_{i,j-1,k}^n, c_{i,j+1,k}^n, c_{i,j+1,k}^n, c_{i,j-1,k}^n, c_{i,j,k+1}^n, c_{i,j,k-1}^n \) as long as (12) holds with \( \eta \) defined in (15) or alternatively, \( \eta = \frac{1}{2} \); the numerical scheme (13) is \( l^\infty \)-stable and positivity preserving.
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