

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 01 July 2016		2. REPORT TYPE Briefing Charts		3. DATES COVERED (From - To) 07 June 2016 - 01 July 2016	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE The Blended Finite Element Method for Multi-fluid Plasma Modeling				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) Eder M. Sousa and Uri Shumlak				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER Q1AM	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Air Force Research Laboratory (AFMC) AFRL/RQRS 1 Ara Drive Edwards AFB, CA 93524-7013				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NO.	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Air Force Research Laboratory (AFMC) AFRL/RQR 5 Pollux Drive Edwards AFB, CA 93524-7048				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) AFRL-RQ-ED-VG-2016-145	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for Public Release; Distribution Unlimited. The U.S. Government is joint author of the work and has the right to use, modify, reproduce, release, perform, display, or disclose the work.					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES For presentation at ICOSAHOM16; Rio de Janeiro, Brazil (June 27th - July 1st, 2016) PA Case Number: #16298; Clearance Date: 6/14/2016 Prepared in collaboration with ERC					
14. ABSTRACT Viewgraph/Briefing Charts					
15. SUBJECT TERMS N/A					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT SAR	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 29	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON J. Koo
a. REPORT Unclassified	b. ABSTRACT Unclassified	c. THIS PAGE Unclassified			19b. TELEPHONE NO (include area code) N/A

THE BLENDED FINITE ELEMENT METHOD FOR MULTI-FLUID PLASMA MODELING

Éder M. Sousa¹, Uri Shumlak²

¹ERC INC., IN-SPACE PROPULSION BRANCH (RQRS)
AIR FORCE RESEARCH LABORATORY
EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE, CA

²AEROSPACE AND ENERGETICS RESEARCH PROGRAM
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
SEATTLE, WA

ICOSAHOM16, June 27th - July 1st, 2016
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil



U.S. AIR FORCE





OUTLINE

1 THE MULTI-FLUID PLASMA MODEL

2 BLENDED FINITE ELEMENT METHOD

- Blended Finite Element Method
- Nodal Continuous Galerkin
- Modal Discontinuous Galerkin
- Model Verification


3 RESULTS

- 1D Soliton problem
- Electromagnetic Plasma Shock Problem


4 APPLICATION



THERE ARE MULTIPLE PLASMA MODELS.



- 3-Dimensions + 3-Velocities
- Evolve the particles position and velocity
- e.g. Particle-In-Cell models



- Ensemble average of particles distribution, $f_s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}, t)$
- Evolve the distribution function
- e.g. Vlasov-Maxwell models



PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION OF A FLUID.

- Modeling each particle velocity and position is not practical.
- Instead an average is performed to give a statistical description.
- Calculate the number of particles per unit volume having approximately the velocity $\mathbf{v}$ near the position $\mathbf{x}$ and at time t , distribution function $f(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}, t)$

$$\rho_s = m_s \int f_s(\mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{v}$$

$$\rho_s \mathbf{u}_s = m_s \int \mathbf{v} f_s(\mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{v}$$

$$\mathbb{P}_s = \mathbf{P}_s = m_s \int \mathbf{w} \mathbf{w} f_s(\mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{v}, \quad p_s = \frac{1}{3} m_s \int w^2 f_s(\mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{v}$$

$$\mathbf{H}_s = m_s \int \mathbf{w} \mathbf{w} \mathbf{w} f_s(\mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{v}, \quad \mathbf{h}_s = \frac{1}{2} m_s \int w^2 \mathbf{w} f_s(\mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{v}$$

$$\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}_s$$



BOLTZMANN EQUATION EVOLVES f_s .

- The Boltzmann eqn:

$$\frac{\partial f_s}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v} \cdot \frac{\partial f_s}{\partial \mathbf{x}} + \frac{q_s}{m_s} (\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B}) \cdot \frac{\partial f_s}{\partial \mathbf{v}} = \left. \frac{\partial f_s}{\partial t} \right|_c$$

- Take the 0^{th} , 1^{st} , 2^{nd} moments of the Boltzmann Eqn.

$$m_s \int \mathbf{v}^n \frac{\partial f_s}{\partial t} d\mathbf{v} + m_s \int \mathbf{v}^{n+1} \cdot \frac{\partial f_s}{\partial \mathbf{x}} d\mathbf{v} + q_s \int \mathbf{v}^n (\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B}) \cdot \frac{\partial f_s}{\partial \mathbf{v}} d\mathbf{v} = m_s \int \mathbf{v}^n \left. \frac{\partial f_s}{\partial t} \right|_c d\mathbf{v}$$

- Each moment of the Boltzmann eqn gives an equation for the moment variable, and introduces the next higher moment variable
- This process can go on indefinitely



BOLTZMANN EQUATION EVOLVES f_s .

$$\frac{\partial \rho_s}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\rho_s \mathbf{u}_s) = \frac{\partial \rho_s}{\partial t} \Big|_{\Gamma}$$

$$\frac{\partial \rho_s \mathbf{u}_s}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\rho_s \mathbf{u}_s \mathbf{u}_s + p_s \mathbf{I} + \Pi_s) = \frac{\rho_s q_s}{m_s} (\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{u}_s \times \mathbf{B}) - \sum_{s^*} \mathbf{R}_{s,s^*} + \frac{\partial \rho_s \mathbf{u}_s}{\partial t} \Big|_{\Gamma}$$

$$\frac{\partial \varepsilon_s}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (((\varepsilon_s + p_s) \mathbf{I} + \Pi_s) \cdot \mathbf{u}_s + \mathbf{h}_s) = \frac{\rho_s q_s}{m_s} \mathbf{u}_s \cdot \mathbf{E} + \sum_{s^*} \mathcal{Q}_{s,s^*} + \frac{\partial \varepsilon_s}{\partial t} \Big|_{\Gamma}$$

- System is truncated by relating higher moment variables to the lower ones
- The fluids are coupled to each other and to the electromagnetic fields through Maxwell's equations and interaction source terms.



ADVANTAGES OF THE MODEL



IDEAL MHD MODEL IS VALID WHEN:

- High collisionality, $\tau_{ii}/\tau \ll 1$
- Small Larmor radius, $r_{Li}/L \ll 1$
- Low Resistivity, $\left(\frac{m_e}{m_i}\right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{r_{Li}}{L}\right)^2 \frac{\tau}{\tau_{ii}} \ll 1$

MULTI-FLUID PLASMA MODEL

- Less computationally expensive than kinetic models
- Multi-fluid effects become relevant at small spacial and temporal scales
- Finite electron mass and speed-of-light effects are included
- There is charge separation is modeled
- Displacement current effects are resolved in the MFPM



1 THE MULTI-FLUID PLASMA MODEL

2 BLENDED FINITE ELEMENT METHOD

- Blended Finite Element Method
- Nodal Continuous Galerkin
- Modal Discontinuous Galerkin
- Model Verification

3 RESULTS

- 1D Soliton problem
- Electromagnetic Plasma Shock Problem

4 APPLICATION



THE MFPM HAS DISPERSIVE SOURCES.

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{Q}}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \overleftrightarrow{\mathbf{F}}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{S}$$

- The source Jacobian $\frac{\partial \mathbf{S}}{\partial \mathbf{Q}}$ has imaginary eigenvalues
- The equation system has dispersive sources
- The dispersion is physical (may be difficult to distinguish from numerical dispersion)
- This dispersion is due to plasma waves that result from ion and electron plasma interactions with electromagnetic fields
- An ideal numerical method for the MFPM should:
 - be high-order accurate
 - couple the flux and the sources
 - capture shocks
 - not impose strict time-step





Srinivasan et al, CCP 10 (2011)



BFEM SIMULTANEOUSLY USES CG AND DG.



- Solution to the electron and EM fields is smooth and does not shock



- Continuous Galerkin
- Electron fluid and EM fields

$$\mathbf{Q} = \sum_i \mathbf{q}_i v_i$$

- Discontinuous Galerkin
- Multiple ion and neutral fluids

$$\mathbf{Q} = \sum_i \mathbf{c}_i v_i$$



IMPLICIT CONTINUOUS GALERKIN

- For this implementation the balance law form is cast as

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{Q}}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \overleftrightarrow{\mathbf{F}}}{\partial \mathbf{Q}} \cdot \frac{\partial \mathbf{Q}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{S} + \kappa \nabla^2 \mathbf{Q}_d$$

- Lagrange polynomials are used for basis functions, v_r

$$\int_{\Omega} v_r \frac{\partial \mathbf{Q}}{\partial t} dV = \mathcal{L}_r(\mathbf{Q}) = \int_{\Omega} v_r \mathbf{S} dV - \int_{\Omega} v_r \frac{\partial \overleftrightarrow{\mathbf{F}}}{\partial \mathbf{Q}} \cdot \frac{\partial \mathbf{Q}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} dV + \kappa \int_{\Omega} v_r \nabla^2 \mathbf{Q}_d dV$$

- θ -method time integration

$$\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{Q}^n) = \overleftrightarrow{\mathbf{M}} \frac{\mathbf{Q}^{n+1} - \mathbf{Q}^n}{dt} - \theta \mathcal{L}_r(\mathbf{Q}^{n+1}) - (1 - \theta) \mathcal{L}_r(\mathbf{Q}^n) = 0$$

- $\theta = 0.5$ is used for 2nd order accuracy

$$\overleftrightarrow{\mathbf{J}}(\mathbf{Q}^n) = \frac{\partial \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{Q}^n)}{\partial \mathbf{Q}^n}, \quad \overleftrightarrow{\mathbf{J}}(\mathbf{Q}^n) \Delta \mathbf{Q} = -\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{Q}^n), \quad \mathbf{Q}^{n+1} = \mathbf{Q}^n + \Delta \mathbf{Q}$$



Reddy, An Introduction to the Finite Element Method (2006)



$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{Q}}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \overleftrightarrow{\mathbf{F}}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{S}$$

- Legendre polynomials are used for basis functions, v_p
- The hyperbolic equation is multiplied by the basis function,

$$\int_{\Omega} v_p \frac{\partial \mathbf{Q}}{\partial t} dV = \mathcal{L}_p(\mathbf{Q}) = \int_{\Omega} v_p \mathbf{S} dV - \oint_{\partial \Omega} v_p \overleftrightarrow{\mathbf{F}} \cdot d\mathbf{A} + \int_{\Omega} \overleftrightarrow{\mathbf{F}} \cdot \nabla v_p dV$$

- Explicit Runge-Kutta time integration
- $CFL = c\Delta t/\Delta x \leq 1/(2p - 1)$, p is the polynomial order

$$\mathbf{Q}^* = \mathbf{Q}^n + \Delta t \mathcal{L}_p(\mathbf{Q}^n),$$

$$\mathbf{Q}^{n+1} = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{Q}^* + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{Q}^n + \frac{1}{2}\Delta t \mathcal{L}_p(\mathbf{Q}^*).$$







CONVERGENCE OF THE BFEM.

$$\frac{\partial Q}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial Q}{\partial x} = 0, \quad Q(x, 0) = e^{-10(x-8)^2}, \quad \|\Delta Q\|_2 = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{Q} - Q_i)^2}$$

Spatial Convergence



Temporal Convergence



• Simulations at fixed time-step

• Simulations at fixed CFL=1



OUTLINE

1 THE MULTI-FLUID PLASMA MODEL

2 BLENDED FINITE ELEMENT METHOD

- Blended Finite Element Method
- Nodal Continuous Galerkin
- Modal Discontinuous Galerkin
- Model Verification

3 RESULTS

- 1D Soliton problem
- Electromagnetic Plasma Shock Problem

4 APPLICATION




1D SOLITON PROBLEM



- 1D soliton is a two-fluid plasma problem
- The solution is smooth, therefore artificial dissipation can be small
- The simulation uses 512 second-order elements
- $B_z = 1.0$, $T_e = T_i = 0.01$,
 $\mathbf{u}_i = \mathbf{u}_e = \mathbf{0}$
- $n_e = n_i = 1.0 + e^{-10(x-6)^2}$




Baboolal, Math. and Comp. Sim. 55 (2001)






DG AND BFEM COMPARISON WITH A SOLUTION

$$\frac{m_i}{m_e} = 1836, \frac{c}{c_{si}} = 1000\sqrt{2}, \text{FV 5000 cells}$$



- DG Solution is very dispersive



- BFEM is less dissipative than the converged solution




Hakim et al, JCP 219 (2006)




BFEM COMPUTATIONAL COST SAVINGS

case	m_i/m_e	c/c_{si}	DG time(s)	BFEM time (s)	BFEM cost over DG
1	25	$10/\sqrt{2}$	0.32	37.7	+11681%
2	100	$10/\sqrt{2}$	1.28	37.7	+2845%
3	500	$10/\sqrt{2}$	6.82	37.7	+452.8%
4	1000	$10/\sqrt{2}$	12.4	38.2	+208.1%
5	1836	$10/\sqrt{2}$	23.5	40.4	+71.91%
6	3672	$10/\sqrt{2}$	47.2	39.2	-16.95%
7	3672	$100/\sqrt{2}$	520	265	-49.04%
8	3672	$1000/\sqrt{2}$	5274	2735	-48.14%

- Per time-step explicit DG is faster than BFEM, but it requires many more time-steps
- BFEM is more efficient only when time-step are considerably larger than explicit DG



$$m_i/m_e = 1836$$



$$m_i/m_e = 1$$

- The BFEM seems to be less accurate than the DG implementation ($\sim 50\%$)
- When the mass ratio is one, the two methods have the same level of accuracy
- The discrepancy is due to the fact that the semi-implicit BFEM does not resolve the plasma frequency in this problem




ELECTROMAGNETIC PLASMA SHOCK PROBLEM

- Fast rarefaction wave (FR), a slow compound wave (SC), a contact discontinuity (CD), a slow shock (SS), and another fast rarefaction wave (FR)
- The problem exhibits limits of MHD and multi-fluid behavior by changing the Larmor radius, r_L
 - MHD: $r_L \rightarrow 0$
 - Multi-fluid: $r_L \sim L$




Brio and Wu, JCP 75 (1988)






SHOCK IN DENSITY BUT SMOOTH FIELDS.

- $t=0.05/\omega_{ci}$, $c/c_{si}=110$, $m_i/m_e=1836$



mass density



Magnetic field (y-comp.)


- The main features of the problem are captured by all three methods
- BFEM does not properly resolve the fast electromagnetic waves which require accurately resolving the electron dynamics



MAXIMUM BFEM TIME-STEP

$$\Delta t_{max} = \min \left(\frac{\Delta x}{c_{se}}, \frac{\Delta x}{c_{si}}, \frac{\Delta x}{c}, \frac{0.1}{\omega_{ce}}, \frac{0.1}{\omega_{ci}}, \frac{0.1}{\omega_{pe}}, \frac{0.1}{\omega_{pi}} \right)$$


- Δt_{max} corresponds to the maximum value allowed for explicit methods based on the CFL condition
- $\Delta t = 42.9 \Delta t_{max}$ is the maximum time step allowed by the BFEM due to ion dynamics





EFFECTS OF ARTIFICIAL DISSIPATION


- Varying the artificial dissipation on the electron fluid, κ_e
- Wave-like behavior of the problem is better resolved
- Amplitude of the compound wave increases
- Right fast rarefaction wave is not visible





EFFECTS OF ARTIFICIAL DISSIPATION

- Varying the artificial dissipation on the EM-field, κ_{EM}
- There is better agreement with the DG solution
- This reinforces the point that the wave-like behavior arises from the interaction of the electron fluid with the electromagnetic fields





OUTLINE

1 THE MULTI-FLUID PLASMA MODEL

2 BLENDED FINITE ELEMENT METHOD

- Blended Finite Element Method
- Nodal Continuous Galerkin
- Modal Discontinuous Galerkin
- Model Verification

3 RESULTS


- 1D Soliton problem
- Electromagnetic Plasma Shock Problem

4 APPLICATION




ICF SPECIES SEPARATION

- Deuterium and tritium are heated and compressed to fusion conditions
- The compression is laser-driven
- Deuterium can accelerate faster than the tritium
- Low neutron yield measurements point towards separation
- The phenomenon is not captured by single-fluid plasma models






$t=150\text{ps}$



Electron CFL=1



Electron CFL=20


- The ion species separation in both cases is the same although the solution behind the shock fronts differ



Bellei et al., PoP 20 (2013) SOUSA (AFRL)



COST VS. ACCURACY



- The solution error increases as the computational time decreases.



- The blended finite element method (BFEM) is presented
 - DG spatial discretization with explicit Runge-Kutta time integration Ions and neutrals
 - CG spatial discretization with implicit Crank-Nicolson time integration for the electrons and EM fields
 - DG captures shocks and discontinuities
 - CG is efficient and robust for smooth solutions
- Physics-based decomposition of the algorithm yields numerical solutions that resolve the desired timescales
- DG method takes less computational time to advance the solution by one time-step, however Δt is much smaller than that of the BFEM
- Computational cost savings using the BFEM will only occur for relatively large implicit time-steps compared to explicit time-steps

Thank You.