



HAL
open science

Junction of models of different dimension for flows in tube structures by Womersley-type interface conditions

Cristobal Bertoglio, Carlos Conca, David Nolte, Grigory Panasenko,
Konstantin Pileckas

► To cite this version:

Cristobal Bertoglio, Carlos Conca, David Nolte, Grigory Panasenko, Konstantin Pileckas. Junction of models of different dimension for flows in tube structures by Womersley-type interface conditions. 2018. hal-01882000v1

HAL Id: hal-01882000

<https://hal.science/hal-01882000v1>

Preprint submitted on 26 Sep 2018 (v1), last revised 26 Oct 2018 (v2)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Junction of models of different dimension for flows in tube structures by Womersley-type interface conditions

Cristóbal Bertoglio^{1,2}, Carlos Conca², David Nolte^{1,2}
Grigory Panasenko^{2,3}, Konstantin Pileckas⁴

¹Bernoulli Institute, University of Groningen, 9747AG Groningen, The Netherlands

²University of Chile, Center of Mathematical Modeling, UMI CNRS 2807, 8370459 Santiago, Chile

³Univ Lyon, UJM, Institute Camille Jordan UMR CNRS 5208 and SFR MODMAD FED 4169, F-42023 Saint-Etienne, France

⁴Faculty of Mathematics and Informatics, Vilnius University, Naugarduko Str., 24, LT-03225b Vilnius, Lithuania

Abstract

The method of asymptotic partial decomposition of a domain (MAPDD) proposed and justified earlier for thin domains (rod structures, tube structures consisting of a set of thin cylinders) generates some special interface conditions between the three-dimensional and one-dimensional parts. In the case of fluid mechanics these conditions prescribe a pre-computed Poiseuille-type shape of a solution at the interface, which however are not generalizable to the case with a boundary layer in time. In this work we present a new more general version of the method which considered and justified for the transient Navier-Stokes equations. Although theoretical justification (well posedness, asymptotic analysis) can be shown only for moderate Reynolds numbers, the provided numerical tests show good accuracies for higher values.

Keywords: Stokes and Navier-Stokes equations, thin structures, asymptotic partial decomposition, hybrid dimension models

AMS classification: 35Q35; 76D07; 65N55

1 Introduction

The Stokes and Navier-Stokes equations in thin tube structures are the most classical models for a viscous flow in pipelines or blood vessels. Tube structures are domains which are tree-like sets of thin cylinders (or thin rectangles in two-dimensional setting). The ratio of the diameters of cylinders to their heights (or ratio of the sides of rectangles) is a small parameter ε . The method of asymptotic partial decomposition of a domain (MAPDD) allows to reduce essentially the computer resources needed for the numerical solution of such problems. This method combines the full-dimensional description in some neighborhoods of bifurcations and a reduced-dimensional description out of these small subdomains and it prescribes some special junction conditions at the interface between these 3D and 1D submodels (see [14], [5], [16], [20]). In particular, for the non-steady Navier-Stokes equations these interface conditions prescribe a pre-computed Poiseuille type shape. To this end one has to solve a Jordanian chain of elliptic equations on the section and take their linear combination (see [20]). This condition is justified for the Navier-Stokes equation without a boundary layer in time, when the data of the problem have vanishing all derivatives in

time at the initial moment. However in the case of a general setting (see [21]) the question on the high order interface conditions is still open. The goal of the paper is to give and justify a more general interface condition which is applicable for the problems with a boundary layer in time. Such condition is constructed for the steady state Stokes equations and then is generalized for the non-stationary Navier-Stokes equations. In this new version the trial and test functions have vanishing transversal components of the velocity and vanishing normal derivative of the normal component inside the cylinders, instead of the pre-computed Poiseuille-type shape. This also leads to a easy-to-implement finite element formulation of the MAPDD and to assess it numerically in dependance of the Reynolds number.

The reminder of paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 the full-dimensional Dirichlet's problem for the non-stationary Navier-Stokes equations and stationary Stokes equations in a thin tube structure are formulated. We give two weak formulations: one containing only the unknown velocity (formulation "without pressure" which is convenient for the asymptotic analysis) and one formulation containing both unknown velocity and unknown pressure which is convenient for the numerical solution. In Section 3 the original MAPDD method is revisited. In Section 4 the new version of MAPDD for the steady Stokes and transient Navier-Stokes equations is introduced and the main theorems summarized. For the sake of readability by a wide range of specialists the proofs are moved to the Appendices. Finally, we present some numerical examples in Section 5 where the theoretical results are confirmed.

2 The full dimensional fluid flow problem in a tube structure

In this section we will introduce the full dimensional fluid flow problem in a tube structure. Further its solution will be approximated using partial dimension reduction.

2.1 Thin tube structure domain

Let us remind the definition of a thin tube structure [15, 17, 20], and graphically exemplified in Figure 1.




Figure 1: Illustration of the computational domain for $N = 2$ and $M = 1$.

Let O_1, O_2, \dots, O_N be N different points in \mathbb{R}^n , $n = 2, 3$, and e_1, e_2, \dots, e_M be M closed segments each connecting two of these points (i.e. each $e_j = \overline{O_{i_j} O_{k_j}}$, where $i_j, k_j \in \{1, \dots, N\}, i_j \neq k_j$). All points O_i are supposed to be the ends of some segments e_j . The segments e_j are called edges of the graph. The points O_i are called nodes. Any two edges e_j and e_i , $i \neq j$, can intersect only at

the common node. A node is called vertex if it is an end point of only one edge. Assume that the set of vertices is $O_{N_1+1}, O_{N_1+2}, \dots, O_N$, where $N_1 < N$.

Denote $\mathcal{B} = \bigcup_{j=1}^M e_j$ the union of edges and assume that \mathcal{B} is a connected set. The graph \mathcal{G} is defined as the collection of nodes and edges.

Let e be some edge, $e = \overline{O_i O_j}$. Consider two Cartesian coordinate systems in \mathbb{R}^n . The first one has the origin in O_i and the axis $O_i x_1^{(e)}$ has the direction of the ray $[O_i O_j]$; the second one has the origin in O_j and the opposite direction, i.e. $O_j \tilde{x}_1^{(e)}$ is directed over the ray $[O_j O_i]$.

With every edge e_j we associate a bounded domain $\sigma_j \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ having a C^2 -smooth boundary $\partial\sigma^j, j = 1, \dots, M$. For every edge $e_j = e$ and associated $\sigma_j = \sigma^{(e)}$ we denote by $B_\varepsilon^{(e)}$ the cylinder

$$B_\varepsilon^{(e)} = \{x^{(e)} \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_1^{(e)} \in (0, |e|), \frac{x^{(e)'}}{\varepsilon} \in \sigma^{(e)}\},$$

where $x^{(e)'} = (x_2^{(e)}, \dots, x_n^{(e)})$, $|e|$ is the length of the edge e and $\varepsilon > 0$ is a small parameter. Notice that the edges e_j and Cartesian coordinates of nodes and vertices O_j , as well as the domains σ_j , do not depend on ε .

Denoting $\sigma_\varepsilon^{(e)} = \{x^{(e)'} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} : \frac{x^{(e)'}}{\varepsilon} \in \sigma^{(e)}\}$ we can write $B_\varepsilon^{(e)} = (0, |e|) \times \sigma_\varepsilon^{(e)}$.

Let $\omega^1, \dots, \omega^N$ be bounded independent of ε domains in \mathbb{R}^n with Lipschitz boundaries $\partial\omega^j$; introduce the nodal domains $\omega_\varepsilon^j = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \frac{x - O_j}{\varepsilon} \in \omega^j\}$. Denote $d = \max_{1 \leq j \leq N} \text{diam}\omega^j$.

By a tube structure we call the following domain

$$B_\varepsilon = \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^M B_\varepsilon^{(e_j)} \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^N \omega_\varepsilon^j \right).$$

So, the tube structure B_ε is a union of all thin cylinders having edges as the heights plus small smoothing domains ω_ε^j in the neighborhoods of the nodes. Their role is to avoid artificial corners in the boundary of intersecting cylinders. Furthermore, we will assume that B_ε is a bounded domain (connected open set) with a C^2 -smooth boundary.

2.2 The full dimension fluid flow problem

Through the paper we will consider the stationary Stokes or the non-stationary Navier-Stokes equations in B_ε with the no-slip conditions at the boundary ∂B_ε except for some parts γ_ε^j of the boundary where the velocity field is given as known inflows and outflows (for alternative boundary conditions on the inlet and outlet boundaries of the domain, the reader is referred to [2, 3]).

Let us define these parts of the boundary. Denote $\gamma_\varepsilon^j = \partial\omega_\varepsilon^j \cap \partial B_\varepsilon$, $\gamma^j = \partial\omega^j \cap \partial B_1^j$ where $B_1^j = \{y : y\varepsilon + O_j \in B_\varepsilon\}$ and $\gamma_\varepsilon = \bigcup_{j=N_1+1}^N \gamma_\varepsilon^j$.

Let us introduce first the Cauchy problem for the non-stationary Navier-Stokes equations.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon}{\partial t} - \nu \Delta \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon + (\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon + \nabla p_\varepsilon &= 0, \\ \text{div} \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon &= 0, \\ \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon|_{\partial B_\varepsilon} &= \mathbf{g}_\varepsilon, \quad \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon(x, 0) = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where \mathbf{u}_ε is the unknown velocity vector, p_ε is the unknown pressure, \mathbf{g}_ε is a given vector-valued function satisfying the following conditions: $\mathbf{g}_\varepsilon(x, t) = \mathbf{g}_j(\frac{x - O_j}{\varepsilon}, t)$ if $x \in \gamma_\varepsilon^j, j = N_1 + 1, \dots, N$

and equal to zero for the remaining part of the boundary $\partial B_\varepsilon \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon$. Here $\mathbf{g}_j : \gamma_j \times [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ belonging to $C^{[\frac{j+4}{2}]+1}([0, T]; \mathbf{H}_0^{3/2}(\gamma_j))$, T is a positive number. Assume that $\mathbf{g}_j|_{t=0} = 0$ and (the compatibility condition)

$$\int_{\partial B_\varepsilon} \mathbf{g}_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{n} ds = 0. \quad (2)$$

i.e.

$$\sum_{j=N_1+1}^N \int_{\gamma_\varepsilon^j} \mathbf{g}_j\left(\frac{x - O_j}{\varepsilon}, t\right) \cdot \mathbf{n} ds = 0.$$

Remark 1. *In this case one can prove that \mathbf{g}_ε has a divergence free extension $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$ defined in $B_\varepsilon \times [0, T]$ which we denote by the same symbol \mathbf{g}_ε , $\mathbf{g}_\varepsilon \in C^{[\frac{j+4}{2}]+1}([0, T]; H^2(B_\varepsilon))$ satisfying for all $t \in [0, T]$ the following asymptotic estimates*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{g}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(B_\varepsilon)} + \|\mathbf{g}_{\varepsilon,t}\|_{L^2(B_\varepsilon)} + \|\mathbf{g}_{\varepsilon,tt}\|_{L^2(B_\varepsilon)} &\leq c\varepsilon^{\frac{n-1}{2}}; \\ \|\nabla \mathbf{g}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(B_\varepsilon)} + \|\nabla \mathbf{g}_{\varepsilon,t}\|_{L^2(B_\varepsilon)} &\leq c\varepsilon^{\frac{n-3}{2}}, \\ \|\Delta \mathbf{g}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(B_\varepsilon)} &\leq c\varepsilon^{\frac{n-5}{2}}, \quad n = 2, 3, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where the constant c is independent of ε (See Lemma 1 in Appendix).

There are two equivalent weak formulations of the problem: "with pressure" and "without pressure" which differ by the space of test functions; in the formulation "without pressure" test functions are divergence free and so the integral containing the pressure disappears; the only unknown function is the vector of velocity. In the formulation "with pressure" the space of test functions is wider, they may not be divergence free, so that the pressure participates in the formulation as an unknown function. The formulation "without pressure" is used mainly in analysis while the definition "with pressure" is more convenient for the numerical approximation using finite elements because it doesn't require construction of divergence free bases in the space of test functions.

Introduce the space $\mathbf{H}_{div0}^1(\partial B_\varepsilon \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon)(B_\varepsilon)$ as the subspace of vector valued functions from $\mathbf{H}^1(B_\varepsilon)$ satisfying the conditions $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v} = 0$, $\mathbf{v}|_{\partial B_\varepsilon \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon} = 0$, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{H}_{div0}^1(\partial B_\varepsilon \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon)(B_\varepsilon) = \left\{ \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}^1(B_\varepsilon) \mid \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v} = 0; \mathbf{v}|_{\partial B_\varepsilon \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon} = 0 \right\}.$$

We consider as well the smaller subspace $\mathbf{H}_{div0}^1(B_\varepsilon) = \mathbf{H}_{div0}^1(\partial B_\varepsilon \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon)(B_\varepsilon) \cap \mathbf{H}_0^1(B_\varepsilon)$ of divergence free vector-valued functions vanishing at the whole boundary.

Definition 1.1.

By a weak solution we understand the couple of the vector-field \mathbf{u}_ε and a scalar function p_ε such that $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon(x, 0) = 0$, $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \in L^2(0, T; \mathbf{H}_{div0}^1(\partial B_\varepsilon \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon)(B_\varepsilon))$, $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon t} \in L^2(0, T; \mathbf{L}^2(B_\varepsilon))$, $p_\varepsilon \in L^2(0, T; L^2(B_\varepsilon))$, $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon = \mathbf{g}_\varepsilon$ on γ_ε and $(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, p_\varepsilon)$ satisfy the integral identity for every vector-field $\phi \in \mathbf{H}_0^1(B_\varepsilon)$ for all $t \in (0, T)$,

$$\int_{B_\varepsilon} \left(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon t} \cdot \phi + \nu \nabla \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon : \nabla \phi + ((\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, \nabla \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon) \cdot \phi) \right) dx = \int_{B_\varepsilon} p_\varepsilon \operatorname{div} \phi dx. \quad (4)$$

Replacing the space of test functions by a subspace of divergence free functions we get another weak formulation without the integral $\int_{B_\varepsilon} p_\varepsilon \operatorname{div} \phi dx$.

Definition 1.2.

By a weak solution we understand the vector-field \mathbf{u}_ε such that $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon(x, 0) = 0$, $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \in L^2(0, T; \mathbf{H}_{div0(\partial B_\varepsilon \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon)}^1(B_\varepsilon))$, $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon t} \in L^2(0, T; \mathbf{L}^2(B_\varepsilon))$, $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon = \mathbf{g}_\varepsilon$ on γ_ε and \mathbf{u}_ε satisfies the integral identity for every vector-field $\phi \in \mathbf{H}_{div0}^1(B_\varepsilon)$ for all $t \in (0, T)$,

$$\int_{B_\varepsilon} \left(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon t} \cdot \phi + \nu \nabla \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon : \nabla \phi + ((\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, \nabla \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon) \cdot \phi) \right) dx = 0. \quad (5)$$

For sufficiently small ε there exists a unique solution to this problem (see [20]). The equivalence of these formulations follows from [9], see also De Rham theorem [25].

Consider the Dirichlet's boundary value problem for the stationary Stokes equation:

$$\begin{cases} -\nu \Delta \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon + \nabla p_\varepsilon = 0, & x \in B_\varepsilon, \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon = 0, & x \in B_\varepsilon, \\ \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon = \mathbf{g}_\varepsilon, & x \in \partial(B_\varepsilon), \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

ν is a positive constant, \mathbf{g}_ε is a given vector-valued function satisfying the following conditions: $\mathbf{g}_\varepsilon(x) = \mathbf{g}_j(\frac{x - O_j}{\varepsilon})$ if $x \in \gamma_\varepsilon^j$, $j = N_1 + 1, \dots, N$ (O_j are vertices!) and equal to zero for the remaining part of the boundary $\partial B_\varepsilon \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon$. Here $\mathbf{g}_j : \gamma_j \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ belonging to $\mathbf{H}_0^{3/2}(\gamma_j)$. Assume that (the compatibility condition)

$$\int_{\partial B_\varepsilon} \mathbf{g}_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{n} ds = 0. \quad (7)$$

i.e.

$$\sum_{j=N_1+1}^N \int_{\gamma_\varepsilon^j} \mathbf{g}_j(\frac{x - O_j}{\varepsilon}) \cdot \mathbf{n} ds = 0.$$

Remark 2. In the stationary case as well one can prove that \mathbf{g}_ε has a divergence free extension $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$ defined in B_ε which we denote by the same symbol \mathbf{g}_ε , $\mathbf{g}_\varepsilon \in \mathbf{H}^2(B_\varepsilon)$ (see Lemma 1 in Appendix).

Let us give two equivalent definitions of a weak solution. First one is "with pressure".

Definition 1.1'.

By a weak solution we understand the couple of the vector-field \mathbf{u}_ε and a scalar function p_ε such that $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \in \mathbf{H}_{div0(\partial B_\varepsilon \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon)}^1(B_\varepsilon)$, $p_\varepsilon \in L^2(B_\varepsilon)$, $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon = \mathbf{g}_\varepsilon$ on γ_ε and $(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon, p_\varepsilon)$ satisfy the integral identity: for any test function $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}_0^1(B_\varepsilon)$

$$\nu \int_{B_\varepsilon} \nabla \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon(x) : \nabla \mathbf{v}(x) dx = \int_{B_\varepsilon} p_\varepsilon \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v} dx. \quad (8)$$

The second is "without pressure".

Definition 1.2'.

By a weak solution we understand the vector-field \mathbf{u}_ε such that $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \in \mathbf{H}_{div0(\partial B_\varepsilon \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon)}^1(B_\varepsilon)$, $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon = \mathbf{g}_\varepsilon$ on γ_ε and \mathbf{u}_ε satisfies the integral identity: for any test function $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}_{div0}^1(B_\varepsilon)$

$$\nu \int_{B_\varepsilon} \nabla \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon(x) : \nabla \mathbf{v}(x) dx = 0. \quad (9)$$

It is well known that there exists a unique solution to this problem (see [9]). The equivalence of these formulations follows from [9], see also De Rham theorem [25].

3 MAPDD: the classical version

3.1 The reduced domain and classical version of MAPDD

Let us remind first the definition of the steady Poiseuille flow in a cylinder $B_\varepsilon^{(e)}$.

If the local variables $x^{(e)}$ for the edge e coincide with the global ones x then the Poiseuille flow is defined as

$$\mathbf{V}_P^{(e)}(x) = \text{const} (v_P(x'/\varepsilon), 0, \dots, 0)^T,$$

where $v_P(y)$ is a solution to the Dirichlet's problem for the Poisson equation on $\sigma^{(e)}$:

$$-\nu \Delta v_P(y) = 1, \quad y \in \sigma^{(e)}, \quad v_P(y) = 0, \quad y \in \partial\sigma^{(e)}. \quad (10)$$

If e has the cosines directors k_{e1}, \dots, k_{en} and the local variables $x^{(e)}$ are related to the global ones by equation $x^{(e)} = x^{(e)}(x)$ then the Poiseuille flow is

$$\mathbf{V}_P^{(e)}(x) = \text{const} (k_{e1}v_P((x^{(e)}(x))'/\varepsilon), \dots, k_{en}v_P((x^{(e)}(x))'/\varepsilon))^T,$$

$x' = (x_2, \dots, x_n)$. In the case $\text{const} = 1$ denote the Poiseuille flow $\mathbf{V}_P^{0,(e)}$; it is the normalized Poiseuille flow.

Let δ be a small positive number much greater than ε but much smaller than 1. For any edge $e = \overline{O_i O_j}$ of the graph introduce two hyperplanes orthogonal to this edge and crossing it at the distance δ from its ends, see Figure 1.

Denote the cross-sections of the cylinder $B_\varepsilon^{(e)}$ by these two hyperplanes respectively, by $S_{i,j}$ (the cross-section at the distance δ from O_i), and $S_{j,i}$ (the cross-section at the distance δ from O_j), and denote the part of the cylinder between these two cross-sections by $B_{ij}^{dec,\varepsilon}$. Denote $B_i^{\varepsilon,\delta}$ the connected truncated by the cross sections $S_{i,j}$, part of B_ε containing the vertex or the node O_i .

Define the subspace $\mathbf{H}_{div0}^{1,\delta}(B_\varepsilon)$ (and respectively, $\mathbf{H}_{div0(\partial B_\varepsilon \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon)}^{1,\delta}(B_\varepsilon)$) of the space $\mathbf{H}_{div0}^1(B_\varepsilon)$ (respectively of $\mathbf{H}_{div0(\partial B_\varepsilon \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon)}^1(B_\varepsilon)$) such that on every truncated cylinder $B_{ij}^{dec,\varepsilon}$ its elements described in local variables $x^{(e)}$ for the edge e (vector-valued functions) have a form of the Poiseuille flow $\mathbf{V}_P^{(e)}(x)$.

The MAPDD replaces the original full-dimensional problem for the steady Stokes equations (6) by the following weak formulation:

Find $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \in \mathbf{H}_{div0(\partial B_\varepsilon \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon)}^{1,\delta}(B_\varepsilon)$ such that $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} = \mathbf{g}_\varepsilon$ on γ_ε and for all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}_{div0}^{1,\delta}(B_\varepsilon)$,

$$\nu \int_{B_\varepsilon} \nabla \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}(x) : \nabla \mathbf{v}(x) dx = 0. \quad (11)$$

For the non-stationary Navier-Stokes equations the Poiseuille flow has more complicated structure: it is a linear combination of vector-valued functions $\mathbf{V}_{P,1}(x), \dots, \mathbf{V}_{P,J}(x)$ such that in local variables their first component $v_{P,j}(y)$ satisfies a Jordanian chain of equations

$$-\nu \Delta v_{P,j+1}(y) = -v_{P,j}(y), \quad y \in \sigma^{(e)}, \quad v_{P,j+1}(y) = 0, \quad y \in \partial\sigma^{(e)}. \quad (12)$$

while the transversal components of vectors $\mathbf{V}_{P,1}(x), \dots, \mathbf{V}_{P,J}(x)$ are equal to zero, $\mathbf{V}_{P,1}(x) = \mathbf{V}_P(x)$ (the steady Poiseuille flow), and so the space of test functions for the MAPDD $\mathbf{H}_{div0}^{1,\delta}(B_\varepsilon)$ is a

subspace of $\mathbf{H}_{div0}^1(B_\varepsilon)$ such that on every truncated cylinder $B_{ij}^{dec,\varepsilon}$ its elements described in local variables $x^{(e)}$ for the edge e (vector-valued functions) have a form of linear combinations of these functions $\alpha_1 \mathbf{V}_{P,1}(x) + \dots + \alpha_J \mathbf{V}_{P,J}(x)$, $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_J$ are real numbers.

Define as well the space $\mathbf{H}_{div0(\partial B_\varepsilon \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon)}^{1,\delta}(B_\varepsilon)$ as a similar subspace of $\mathbf{H}_{div0(\partial B_\varepsilon \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon)}^1(B_\varepsilon)$. The weak formulation of the classical version of MAPDD for the non-stationary Navier-Stokes problem is given in [20]. It is equivalent to the following formulation without pressure:

By a weak solution we understand the vector-field $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ such that $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}(x, 0) = 0$, $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \in L^\infty(0, T; \mathbf{H}_{div0(\partial B_\varepsilon \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon)}^{1,\delta}(B_\varepsilon))$, $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta,t} \in L^2(0, T; \mathbf{L}^2(B_\varepsilon))$, $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} = \mathbf{g}_\varepsilon$ on γ_ε and $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ satisfies the integral identity for every vector-field $\phi \in \mathbf{H}_{div0}^{1,\delta}(B_\varepsilon)$ for all $t \in (0, T)$,

$$\int_{B_\varepsilon} \left(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta,t} \cdot \phi + \nu \nabla \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} : \nabla \phi + ((\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \nabla \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \phi) \right) dx = 0. \quad (13)$$

Existence and uniqueness of a solution for sufficiently small ε is proved as in [20] by Galerkin method.

3.2 Summary of main results on the classical version

For the classical version of MAPDD the theorem on the error estimates is proved. Namely, it was proved that given J there exists a constant C independent of ε such that if $\delta = CJ\varepsilon |\ln(\varepsilon)|$ then for the Stokes equations the following estimate holds [16], [5]:

$$\|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{H^1(B_\varepsilon)} = O(\varepsilon^J). \quad (14)$$

For the non-stationary Navier-Stokes equations we have the following result [20]:

Given natural number J , if $\mathbf{g}_j \in C^{[\frac{J+4}{2}]+1}([0, T]; W^{3/2,2}(\partial\omega_j))$ and there exists an interval $(0, \tau)$, $\tau > 0$ such that $\mathbf{g}_j = 0$ for $t \in (0, \tau)$ then there exists a constant C (independent of ε and J) such that if $\delta = CJ\varepsilon |\ln \varepsilon|$ then

$$\sup_{t \in (0, T)} \|\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(B_\varepsilon)} + \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \nabla \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2((0, T); L^2(B_\varepsilon))} = O(\varepsilon^J). \quad (15)$$

Although this classical version of the MAPDD is an effective method reducing considerably the computational costs it does not work in the situation when the above condition $\mathbf{g}_j = 0$ for $t \in (0, \tau)$ is not satisfied. Indeed, in [21] it was shown that for small values of time of order ε^2 linear combinations of functions $\mathbf{V}_{P,i}$ are no more a good approximations for the velocity inside the tubes, they should be replaced by the "boundary layer-in-time". Moreover, the coordinate change from velocity degrees-of-freedom to $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_J$ involves intrusive modifications of the numerical simulation software, for both system assembly and linear algebra parts.

4 MAPDD: the new junction conditions

We now propose a new, more general, way of formulate and solve for the junction conditions. The advantages are twofold: (1) it removes the condition $\mathbf{g}_j = 0$ for $t \in (0, \tau)$, therefore being applicable for arbitrary transient regimes, and (2) it considerable simplifies the numerical implementation in the context of finite elements since only additional, easy-to-build integral terms need to be added to a standard weak form.

4.1 Formulation of the new version

Let us define the subspace $\mathbf{H}_{div0}^{1,\delta}(B_\varepsilon)$ (and respectively, $\mathbf{H}_{div0(\partial B_\varepsilon \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon)}^{1,\delta}(B_\varepsilon)$) of the space $\mathbf{H}_{div0}^1(B_\varepsilon)$ (respectively of $\mathbf{H}_{div0(\partial B_\varepsilon \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon)}^1(B_\varepsilon)$) in a different way, so that on every truncated cylinder $B_{ij}^{dec,\varepsilon}$ its elements described in local variables (vector-valued functions) have vanishing trasversal (tangential) components while the longitudinal (normal) component has vanishing longitudinal (normal) derivative. Namely, if the local variables $x^{(e)}$ for the edge e coincide with the global ones x then they have a form of the Womersley-Poiseuille flow

$$\mathbf{W}_{\mathbf{P}}^{(e)}(x) = (v_1(x'/\varepsilon), 0, \dots, 0)^T .$$

$$v_1 \in H_0^1(\sigma^{(e)}) .$$

If e has the cosines directors k_{e1}, \dots, k_{en} and the local variables $x^{(e)}$ are related to the global ones by equation $x^{(e)} = x^{(e)}(x)$ then they are

$$\mathbf{W}_{\mathbf{P}}^{(e)}(x) = const (k_{e1}v_1((x^{(e)}(x))'/\varepsilon), \dots, k_{en}v_1((x^{(e)}(x))'/\varepsilon))^T ,$$

$$x' = (x_2, \dots, x_n) .$$

As in the classical version the method of asymptotic partial domain decomposition (MAPDD) replaces the problem (6) by its projection on this newly defined space $\mathbf{H}_{div0(\partial B_\varepsilon \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon)}^{1,\delta}(B_\varepsilon)$. Note that this space is wider than the space of test functions in the classical version because the steady Poiseuille flow is a particular case of functions $\mathbf{W}_{\mathbf{P}}^{(e)}$.

The weak formulations repete literally the formulations of the previous section but with respect to the newly defined space $\mathbf{H}_{div0(\partial B_\varepsilon \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon)}^{1,\delta}(B_\varepsilon)$.

4.2 Stokes equations

Consider the Stokes equations (6).

The new version of the method of asymptotic partial domain decomposition (MAPDD) replaces the problem (6) by its projection on $\mathbf{H}_{div0(\partial B_\varepsilon \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon)}^{1,\delta}(B_\varepsilon)$: to find $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \in \mathbf{H}_{div0(\partial B_\varepsilon \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon)}^{1,\delta}(B_\varepsilon)$, such that $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} = \mathbf{g}_\varepsilon$ on γ_ε and satisfies the following integral identity

$$\nu \int_{B_\varepsilon} \nabla \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}(x) : \nabla \mathbf{v}(x) dx = 0 \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}_{div0}^{1,\delta}(B_\varepsilon) . \quad (16)$$

Applying the Lax-Milgram argument one can prove that there exists a unique solution $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ of the partially decomposed problem.

Remark 3. *The classical version of MAPDD differs from this new one by the definition of the space on which we project the problem. Namely, in the new version the projection is taken onto the space $\mathbf{H}_{div0(\partial B_\varepsilon \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon)}^{1,\delta}(B_\varepsilon)$, while in the classical case [17] it is a subspace of $\mathbf{H}_{div0(\partial B_\varepsilon \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon)}^1(B_\varepsilon)$ such that on every truncated cylinder $B_{ij}^{dec,\varepsilon}$ its elements are equal to a Poiseuille flow $\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{P}}^{(e)}$.*

4.3 Estimate for the difference between the exact solution and the MAPDD solution: asymptotic analysis of the Stokes equations

Theorem 1. *Given natural number J there exists a constant C (independent of ε and J) such that if $\delta = CJ\varepsilon |\ln \varepsilon|$, then*

$$\|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(B_\varepsilon)} = O(\varepsilon^J) . \quad (17)$$

Proof. This estimate is the same as in the classical version of the MAPDD. The proof is similar to that of the classical version. However, for the sake of completeness we give it in the Appendix.

4.4 Navier-Stokes equations

Consider the Navier-Stokes equations (1).

The new version of the method of asymptotic partial domain decomposition (MAPDD) replaces the problem (1) by (13), where the space $\mathbf{H}_{div0(\partial B_\varepsilon \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon)}^{1,\delta}(B_\varepsilon)$ is replaced by the newly defined space of divergence free vector-functions having the Womersley–Poiseuille form within cylinders $B_{ij}^{dec,\varepsilon}$: by a weak solution we understand the vector-field $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ such that $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}(x,0) = 0$, $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \in L^\infty(0,T; \mathbf{H}_{div0(\partial B_\varepsilon \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon)}^{1,\delta}(B_\varepsilon))$, $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta,t} \in L^2(0,T; \mathbf{L}^2(B_\varepsilon))$, $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} = \mathbf{g}_\varepsilon$ on γ_ε and $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ satisfies the integral identity for every vector-field $\phi \in \mathbf{H}_{div0}^{1,\delta}(B_\varepsilon)$ for all $t \in (0,T)$,

$$\int_{B_\varepsilon} \left(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta,t} \cdot \phi + \nu \nabla \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} : \nabla \phi + ((\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \nabla \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \phi) \right) dx = 0. \quad (18)$$

The existence and uniqueness of its solution is proved as in [20].

Let us give the formulation "with pressure". Note that it is less evident than for the full dimension problem. First note that knowing the velocity field $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$, solution to problem (18) we can reconstitute some function $p_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ which is interpreted as the MAPDD pressure. Namely, let us denote $\mathbf{U}_{ij}(x^{(e)'}, t)$ the trace of the solution $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ to problem (18) at every cross-section S_{ij} . Then we get a standard Navier-Stokes problem in each domain $B_i^{\varepsilon,\delta}$ with the known boundary value $\mathbf{U}_{ij}(x^{(e)'}, t)$ on S_{ij} , the no-slip boundary condition on $\partial B_i^{\varepsilon,\delta} \setminus \Sigma_i$ if $i = 1, \dots, N_1$, or on $\partial B_i^{\varepsilon,\delta} \setminus (\Sigma_i \cup \gamma_i^\varepsilon)$ if $i = N_1 + 1, \dots, N$ and respectively with condition $\mathbf{U}_{ij} = \mathbf{g}_\varepsilon$ at γ_i^ε in the last case; the initial condition is $\mathbf{U}_{ij}(x, 0) = 0$. Here Σ_i is a union $\cup_{j: \overline{O_i O_j} \in \{e_1, \dots, e_M\}} S_{ij}$ of all cross-sections S_{ij} belonging to the boundary of $B_i^{\varepsilon,\delta}$. This problem admits a unique solution-velocity (coinciding with $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$) and a pressure $p_{\varepsilon,\delta,i}$ unique up to an additive function θ_i of t . So, we can introduce an extended space of the test functions

$$\mathbf{H}_0^{1,\delta}(B_\varepsilon) = \{ \phi \in \mathbf{H}_0^1(B_\varepsilon) | \phi(x) = \mathbf{W}_P^{(e)}(x), x \in B_{ij}^{dec,\varepsilon}, e = \overline{O_i O_j}; \int_{\partial B_i^{\varepsilon,\delta}} \phi \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0, i = 1, \dots, N \}$$

and extend the integral identity (18) for test functions of this space:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_\varepsilon} \left(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta,t} \cdot \phi + \nu \nabla \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} : \nabla \phi + ((\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \nabla \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \phi) \right) dx = \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\int_{B_i^{\varepsilon,\delta}} \left(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta,t} \cdot \phi - \nu \Delta \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \cdot \phi + ((\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \nabla \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \phi) \right) dx + \sum_{j: \overline{O_i O_j} \in \{e_1, \dots, e_M\}} \int_{\partial B_i^{\varepsilon,\delta} \cap S_{ij}} \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}}{\partial \mathbf{n}} \cdot \phi ds \right) + \\ & \quad + \sum_{l=1}^M d_l \int_{\sigma_\varepsilon^{(e_l)}} \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta,t} \cdot \phi + \nu \nabla_{x^{(e_l)'}} \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} : \nabla_{x^{(e_l)'}} \phi dx^{(e_l)'} = \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \left(- \int_{B_i^{\varepsilon,\delta}} \nabla p_{\varepsilon,\delta,i} \cdot \phi dx + \sum_{j: \overline{O_i O_j} \in \{e_1, \dots, e_M\}} \int_{\partial B_i^{\varepsilon,\delta} \cap S_{ij}} \nu \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}}{\partial \mathbf{n}} \cdot \phi ds \right) + \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \sum_{l=1}^M d_l \int_{\sigma_\varepsilon^{(e_l)}} \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta,t} \cdot \phi + \nu \nabla_{x^{(e_l)'}} \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} : \nabla_{x^{(e_l)'}} \phi dx^{(e_l)'} = \\
= & \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\int_{B_i^{\varepsilon,\delta}} p_{\varepsilon,\delta,i} \operatorname{div} \phi dx + \sum_{j: \overline{O_i O_j} \in \{e_1, \dots, e_M\}} \int_{\partial B_i^{\varepsilon,\delta} \cap S_{ij}} \left(\nu \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}}{\partial \mathbf{n}} - p_{\varepsilon,\delta} \mathbf{n} \right) \cdot \phi ds \right) + \\
& + \sum_{l=1}^M d_l \int_{\sigma_\varepsilon^{(e_l)}} \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta,t} \cdot \phi + \nu \nabla_{x^{(e_l)'}} \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} : \nabla_{x^{(e_l)'}} \phi dx^{(e_l)'},
\end{aligned}$$

Here for $e_l = \overline{O_i O_j}$, d_l is the distance between the cross sections S_{ij} and S_{ji} , \mathbf{n} is an outer normal vector for $B_i^{\varepsilon,\delta}$. We will prove in the Appendix that the sum of the last two sums of integrals is equal to zero.

So, the variational formulation is: find the vector-field $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ and the pressure $p_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ such that $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}(x, 0) = 0$, $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \in L^\infty(0, T; \mathbf{H}_{\operatorname{div}0}^{1,\delta}(\partial B_\varepsilon \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon)(B_\varepsilon))$, $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta,t} \in L^2(0, T; \mathbf{L}^2(B_\varepsilon))$, $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} = \mathbf{g}_\varepsilon$ on γ_ε , $p_{\varepsilon,\delta} \in L^2(0, T; L^2(B_i^{\varepsilon,\delta}))$ for all $i = 1, \dots, N$, and the couple $(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, p_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ satisfies the integral identity for every vector-field $\phi \in \mathbf{H}_0^{1,\delta}(B_\varepsilon)$ for all $t \in (0, T)$:

$$\int_{B_\varepsilon} \left(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta,t} \cdot \phi + \nu \nabla \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} : \nabla \phi + (\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \nabla \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \phi \right) dx = \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{B_i^{\varepsilon,\delta}} p_{\varepsilon,\delta} \operatorname{div} \phi dx \quad (19)$$

Note that so defined pressure is not unique, it is defined up to N functions $\theta_i(t)$, $i = 1, \dots, N$ in each subdomain $B_i^{\varepsilon,\delta}$.

A similar weak formulation with pressure can be given for the Stokes equations.

Note that if $N = M + 1$ (number of nodes and vertices is equal to the number of edges plus one) then the restriction

$$\int_{\partial B_i^{\varepsilon,\delta}} \phi \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0, i = 1, \dots, N \quad (20)$$

can be removed from the definition of space $\mathbf{H}_0^{1,\delta}(B_\varepsilon)$ and then the number of undetermined constants $\theta_i(t)$ in the variational formulation (19) will be reduced to one $\theta_N(t)$, so that the pressure in the reduced geometry is defined up to a constant as in the case of full geometry. It will be proved in the Appendix. The numerical tests are held for such geometries. In this case it is possible to apply the restrictions on the solution directly in equation (19) so that a considerably simpler-to-implement formulation holds true: find the vector-field $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ and the pressure $p_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ such that $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}(x, 0) = 0$, $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \in L^\infty(0, T; \mathbf{H}^1(B_i^{\varepsilon,\delta}))$, for all $i = 1, \dots, N$, $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta,t} \in L^2(0, T; \mathbf{L}^2(B_i^{\varepsilon,\delta}))$, $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} = \mathbf{g}_\varepsilon$ at γ_ε , $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} = \mathbf{0}$ at $(\partial B_i^{\varepsilon,\delta} \cap \partial B_\varepsilon) \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon$, $p_{\varepsilon,\delta} \in L^2(0, T; L^2(B_i^{\varepsilon,\delta}))$ for all $i = 1, \dots, N$, and the couple $(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, p_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ satisfies for all $t \in (0, T)$ the integral identity for every vector-field $\phi \in \mathbf{H}^1(B_i^{\varepsilon,\delta})$, $q \in L^2(B_i^{\varepsilon,\delta})$, for all $i = 1, \dots, N$, such that $\phi = 0$ at $\partial B_i^{\varepsilon,\delta} \cap \partial B_\varepsilon$, and for all edges $O_i O_j$, $\phi \cdot \mathbf{t} = 0$ at $S_{ij} \cup S_{ji}$ and $(\phi \cdot \mathbf{n})|_{S_{ij}} + (\phi \cdot \mathbf{n})|_{S_{ji}} = 0$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{B_i^{\varepsilon,\delta}} \left(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta,t} \cdot \phi + \nu \nabla \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} : \nabla \phi + ((\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \nabla \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \phi - p_{\varepsilon,\delta} \operatorname{div} \phi + q \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \right) dx \\
& + \sum_{l=1}^M d_l \int_{\sigma_\varepsilon^{(e_l)}} \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta,t} \cdot \phi + \nu \nabla_{x^{(e_l)'}} \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} : \nabla_{x^{(e_l)'}} \phi dx^{(e_l)'} = 0, \quad (21)
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \cdot \mathbf{t} = 0 \quad \text{on } S_{ij} \cup S_{ji},$$

where \mathbf{t} is the unit tangent vector, and with

$$(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \cdot \mathbf{n})|_{S_{ij}} + (\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \cdot \mathbf{n})|_{S_{ji}} = 0.$$

Finally, note that the last two terms in (21) are analogous to the ones obtained in the context the so called *Stokes-consistent* methods for backflow stabilization at open boundaries [4].

4.5 Estimate for the difference between the exact solution and the MAPDD solution for the non-stationary Navier-Stokes equations

The result of the previous section can be generalized for the non-stationary problem for the Navier-Stokes equations (1) using the approach of [20] and [21].

Assume that \mathbf{g}_ε introduced in the second section has a divergence free extension $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\varepsilon$ defined in B_ε with $\tilde{\mathbf{g}} \in C^{[\frac{J+4}{2}]+1}([0, T]; \mathbf{H}^2(B_\varepsilon))$ satisfying for all $t \in [0, T]$ the following asymptotic estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\mathbf{g}}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(B_\varepsilon)} + \|\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_t\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(B_\varepsilon)} + \|\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{tt}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(B_\varepsilon)} &\leq c\varepsilon^{\frac{n-1}{2}}; \\ \|\nabla\tilde{\mathbf{g}}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(B_\varepsilon)} + \|\nabla\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_t\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(B_\varepsilon)} &\leq c\varepsilon^{\frac{n-3}{2}}, \\ \|\Delta\tilde{\mathbf{g}}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(B_\varepsilon)} &\leq c\varepsilon^{\frac{n-5}{2}}, \quad n = 2, 3, \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where the constant c is independent of ε .

As before,

$$\int_{\partial B_\varepsilon} \mathbf{g}_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{n} ds = 0. \tag{23}$$

Theorem 2. *Let $\mathbf{g}_j \in C^{[\frac{J+4}{2}]+1}([0, T]; W^{3/2,2}(\partial\omega_j))$. Given natural number J there exists a constant C (independent of ε and J) such that if $\delta = CJ\varepsilon|\ln\varepsilon|$, then*

$$\sup_{t \in (0, T)} \|\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(B_\varepsilon)} + \|\nabla(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon)\|_{L^2((0, T); \mathbf{L}^2(B_\varepsilon))} = O(\varepsilon^J). \tag{24}$$

5 Numerical examples

In this section, the previous analysis is complemented by numerical experiments for the new MAPDD formulation applied to the stationary Stokes problem and the transient Navier-Stokes problem, for a sequence of values of ε .

The errors of the MAPDD solutions obtained in the truncated domain with respect to reference solutions computed in the full domain are evaluated in the norms given by Eqs. (17), (24).

5.1 Problem setup

Consider the two-dimensional geometry illustrated in Fig. 1. Two junctions are connected by a straight tube. This straight tube (labeled $B_{1,2}^{dec,\varepsilon}$) is included in the full reference model, or truncated when the reduced MAPDD model is used.

The radius of the tube is proportional to ε (we set $R = \varepsilon$). For each value of ε , the junction domains are contracted homothetically by a factor of ε with respect to the center points marked with plus signs in Fig. 1. The distance between these points, L , remains the same for all values of ε . Straight tube extensions (blue areas, $B_{1;2}^{\varepsilon,\delta}$) are added to the junction domains. Theorem 1 requires the associated distance, δ , from the centers of the junction domains to the interfaces, to be

$$\delta = C\varepsilon|\ln(\varepsilon)|. \quad (25)$$

C is a user parameter.

Pairs of full and reduced domains are created for a sequence of values $\varepsilon = 2^{-k}$, $k = 1, \dots, 6$.

In the particular examples of the investigated geometry and our selection of ε , $1/\ln(2) < C < 6/\ln(2)$ is necessary for $B_{1;2}^{\varepsilon,\delta} \neq \emptyset$ and for $B_{1;2}^{dec,\varepsilon} \neq \emptyset$, respectively. In what follows, we choose the values $C = K/\ln(2)$, $K = 2, 3$ and 4 . The factor $1/\ln(2)$ is added for convenience, to cancel with the $\ln(\varepsilon)$ terms and leave rational numbers as the interface coordinates.

5.2 Stationary Stokes test case

Since one of our main motivations is the numerical simulation of blood flows, we choose for the viscosity and the density values that represent physiologically relevant conditions, assuming the fluid is incompressible and Newtonian. Typical parameters of blood are a dynamic viscosity of $\mu = 0.035 \text{ cm}^2/\text{s}$ and a density of $\rho = 1 \text{ g/cm}^3$. At the inlet Γ_{in} of the upstream junction domain a Dirichlet boundary condition for the velocity is defined as

$$\mathbf{g}_\varepsilon = \left(0, 1.5U_0(1 - (x_1 - c_0)^2/\varepsilon^2)\right)^T,$$

where c_0 is the x_1 coordinate of the center of the boundary and U_0 is chosen such that $Re = 2\rho\varepsilon U_0/\mu = 1$. A homogeneous Neumann boundary condition for the normal stress is applied on the outlet Γ_{out} of the downstream junction domain.

5.3 Transient Navier-Stokes test case

In the transient Navier-Stokes test case, the physical constants are set to the same values as for the Stokes problem, i.e., $\mu = 0.035 \text{ cm}^2/\text{s}$ and $\rho = 1 \text{ g/cm}^3$.

A pulsating inflow velocity is defined on Γ_{in} via Dirichlet boundary conditions as

$$\mathbf{g}_\varepsilon = \left(0, 1.5U_0(1 - (x_1 - c_0)^2/\varepsilon^2) \sin(\pi t/T)\right)^T,$$

where t is the actual time and $T = 0.8 \text{ s}$ is the duration of a cycle. U_0 is computed from the Reynolds number, $Re = 2\rho\varepsilon U_0/\mu$. As for the Stokes problem, a homogeneous Neumann boundary condition defines the outflow on Γ_{out} .

For the convergence study, Reynolds numbers $Re = 1, 25, 50, 80$ and 100 are considered. In addition, we analyze the MAPDD model for a high Reynolds number of $Re = 2500$.

5.4 Numerical discretization

A mixed finite element method is adopted for discretizing the Stokes and Navier-Stokes equations. We use monolithic velocity–pressure coupling with inf-sup stable second order Taylor-Hood elements on unstructured, uniform triangle meshes. The transient Navier-Stokes problem is discretized in time with the implicit Euler method. The convection term, written in skew-symmetric form, is treated semi-implicitly. The time step size is $\Delta t = 0.01$ s. The time interval of the simulations is a half cycle, i.e., $0 \leq t \leq T/2$.

The numerical meshes of the domains are created such that the number of elements along the tube diameter is approximately 20 for each value of ε . The average grid size at the boundaries is therefore $h = \varepsilon/10$. This results in 170592 elements in the full domain for the smallest value of $\varepsilon = 2^{-6}$ and $C = 2/\ln(2)$, which corresponds to 784037 degrees of freedom in the Navier-Stokes system. The triangulation of the corresponding reduced domain consists of 15366 elements and the solution space contains 70741 degrees of freedoms.

The problem is implemented and solved using the FEniCS finite element library [1]. The numerical meshes are generated with Gmsh [7].

5.5 Results

5.5.1 Stationary Stokes test case

The velocity and pressure field of the stationary Stokes problem, computed with the full model and with the MAPDD method, are illustrated in Fig. 2 for the largest value of $\varepsilon = 0.5$. No visible differences exist between the full and the MAPDD results.

The velocity error of the MAPDD model with respect to the full reference solution is analyzed quantitatively in Fig. 3 for the full range of values of ε . The error is computed in the $\mathbf{H}^1(B_\varepsilon)$ norm, cf. (17) in Theorem 1. Note that the error estimate depends on the solutions in the full domain, B_ε . The mesh nodes of the MAPDD and the full domains match for the junctions. In the truncated tube, the MAPDD solution was interpolated from the interfaces, $\Sigma_{1,2}$, to the mesh nodes of the full mesh. The rate of convergence can be estimated from the numerical results as

$$J_k = \frac{\log e_k/e_{k-1}}{\log \varepsilon_k/\varepsilon_{k-1}}$$

where $e_k = \|\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon_k} - \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon_k, \delta}\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(B_{\varepsilon_k})}$, $\varepsilon_k = 2^{-k}$, $k = 2, \dots, 6$. While not constant, for $C = 2/\ln(2)$, J_k is in the range $3 \lesssim J_k \lesssim 6$. The error drops at least with cubic convergence (in the investigated cases). For $C = 3/\ln(2)$ the convergence rate is greatly improved, and even more so using $C = 4/\ln(2)$, namely we obtain $J \approx 8$ and $J \approx 11$, respectively, discarding the points where the error stagnates. The stagnation of both cases for $\varepsilon < 2^{-4}$ or 2^{-3} is due to the precision of the numerical method being reached. Rounding errors gain importance for very small values of ε .

5.5.2 Transient Navier-Stokes test case

The asymptotic behavior of the error of the MAPDD method with respect to the full model is shown for different Reynolds numbers in Fig. 4, for $C = 2/\ln(2)$. The error is evaluated in the norm (24). For the lowest investigated Reynolds number $Re = 1$, the rate of convergence J was computed (omitting the two largest values of ε). The line ε^J is included in the figure for comparison. With increasing Reynolds numbers the rate of convergence decreases. Exponential increase of the error




Figure 2: Pressure fields and velocity magnitude and vectors at the outflow boundaries obtained for the stationary Stokes problem using $\varepsilon = 0.5$ with the full model (top row) and with the MAPDD model (bottom row).

was observed for $Re = 100$. Using $C = 3/\ln(2)$ (see Fig. 5), the rate of convergence obtained for Reynolds numbers $Re > 1$ is improved. In particular, for $Re = 100$ the error now decreases with ε , at least for small values of ε .

The errors of the case $Re = 100$ obtained for $C = K/\ln(2)$, $K = 2, 3, 4$, are shown in Fig. 6. Indeed, for higher K , the errors are lower and convergence is improved for $\varepsilon \lesssim 2^{-4}$.

While the error estimate assumes a low Reynolds number, the MAPDD method can still be applied to these cases. Figures 7 and 8 show velocity streamlines and the pressure field obtained with the full reference model and the MAPDD method applied to the case $\varepsilon = 1/4$ and for a Reynolds number of $Re = 2500$, as an example. The boundary mesh size was set to $h = \varepsilon/20$, furthermore $C = 2/\ln(2)$. The results match very well visually. The MAPDD model is able to recover the recirculation zones in both junctions accurately (Fig. 7(a) and (b)). For a more detailed comparison, the axial velocity profiles at the interfaces for the MAPDD solution and for the full solution in the corresponding location are shown in Figs. 9. At the left interface, the velocity interface conditions produce a pressure overshoot near the upper corner, since the Womersley hypothesis is in disagreement with the high Reynolds number flow conditions. This can be seen more clearly in Fig. 10a, where the pressure profile at the interface is shown for both the MAPDD and the full solution. However, analyzing the pressure distribution along the cross-section the tube in a slightly more upstream position (shifted upstream by 2ε), the MAPDD recovers the behavior observed for the full solution with an error of $< 8\%$ (Fig. 11). The pressure on the right interface does not suffer any nonphysical oscillations, as can be seen in Fig. 10b, and the discrepancy between both models is within 2%.




Figure 3: Stationary Stokes test case: convergence of the error with respect to ε for different values of C (see legend).

5.6 Conclusion

The MAPDD was shown to be an efficient and accurate method for the steady Stokes problem and for the low Reynolds number Navier-Stokes problem. In these cases, the error of the MAPDD method was in agreement with theoretical error estimates, (17) and (24), respectively. For slightly larger Reynolds numbers, the convergence can be improved by modifying the computational domain and adjusting the constant in Eq. (25).

Although the theory is only valid for small Reynolds numbers, the method yields very good results also for high Reynolds numbers. For the (arbitrary) example of $Re = 2500$, $\varepsilon = 1/4$, the MAPDD velocity and pressure solutions were in good agreement with the full solution, except for pressure oscillations that occur near the upstream interface.

6 Acknowledgments

The work was funded by the European Social Fund according to the activity "Improvement of researchers qualification by implementing world-class R and D projects" of Measure No. 09.3.3-LMT-K-712. The work was partially supported by the grant number 14-11-00306 of Russian Scientific Foundation operated by the Moscow Power Engineering Institute (Technical University) and and by LABEX MILYON (ANR-10-LABX-0070) of University of Lyon, within the program "Investissements d'Avenir" (ANR-11-IDEX-0007) operated by the French National Research Agency (ANR). The first and second authors were partially supported by PFBasal-001 and AFBasal170001 projects.




Figure 4: Errors (Eq. (24)) of the Navier-Stokes MAPDD model w.r.t. to the full solution for different Reynolds numbers, with $C = 2/\ln(2)$; the line $\epsilon^{J=0.45}$ for reference.

7 Appendix 1. Proofs of the main theorems

Consider the steady state Stokes equations (6). Let us give a weak formulation from equivalent to Definitions 1.1' and 1.2' introducing a new unknown function $\mathbf{v}_\epsilon = \mathbf{u}_\epsilon - \mathbf{g}_\epsilon$, which is divergence free and vanishing at the whole boundary.

Definition 1.3'

By a weak solution we understand the vector-field $\mathbf{u}_\epsilon \in \mathbf{H}_{div0(\partial B_\epsilon \setminus \gamma_\epsilon)}^1(B_\epsilon)$ such that the difference $\mathbf{v}_\epsilon = \mathbf{u}_\epsilon - \mathbf{g}_\epsilon$ belongs to $\mathbf{H}_{div0}^1(B_\epsilon)$ and satisfies the following integral identity: for all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}_{div0}^1(B_\epsilon)$,

$$\nu \int_{B_\epsilon} \nabla \mathbf{v}_\epsilon(x) : \nabla \mathbf{v}(x) dx = -\nu \int_{B_\epsilon} \nabla \mathbf{g}_\epsilon(x) : \nabla \mathbf{v}(x) dx. \quad (26)$$

It is well known that there exists a unique solution to this problem (see [9]).

Further we will need as well a modification of this problem containing a right hand side $\mathbf{f}_\epsilon = \mathbf{f}_{0\epsilon} - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}_{i\epsilon}}{\partial x_i}$ where $\mathbf{f}_{i\epsilon} \in \mathbf{L}^2(B_\epsilon)$, $i = 0, 1, \dots, n$:

$$\begin{cases} -\nu \Delta \mathbf{v}_\epsilon + \nabla p_\epsilon = \mathbf{f}_\epsilon, & x \in B_\epsilon, \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_\epsilon = 0, & x \in B_\epsilon, \\ \mathbf{v}_\epsilon = 0, & x \in \partial(B_\epsilon), \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

with variational formulation: to find a vector-valued function $\mathbf{v}_\epsilon \in \mathbf{H}_{div0}^1(B_\epsilon)$ such that for any test function $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}_{div0}^1(B_\epsilon)$ it satisfies the following integral identity: for all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}_{div0}^1(B_\epsilon)$,

$$\nu \int_{B_\epsilon} \nabla \mathbf{v}_\epsilon(x) : \nabla \mathbf{v}(x) dx = \int_{B_\epsilon} \mathbf{f}_{0\epsilon} \cdot \mathbf{v}(x) + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{f}_{i\epsilon} \cdot \frac{\partial \mathbf{v}}{\partial x_i}(x) dx. \quad (28)$$




Figure 5: Errors (Eq. (24)) of the Navier-Stokes MAPDD model w.r.t. to the full solution for different Reynolds numbers, with $C = 3/\ln(2)$; the line $\varepsilon^{J=0.4}$ for reference.

This problem as well admits a unique solution and using the well-known Poincaré-Friedrichs inequality with a constant proportional to ε (see for example [17]) we get an a priori estimate:

$$\|\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(B_\varepsilon)} \leq \bar{C} \sum_{i=0}^n \|\mathbf{f}_{i\varepsilon}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(B_\varepsilon)}, \quad (29)$$

where \bar{C} does not depend on \mathbf{f}_ε .

7.1 Divergence free extension of boundary value function having the steady Poiseuille shape in the cylinders

Let us prove that there exists a divergence free extension g_ε such that within some interior part of the cylinders $B_\varepsilon^{(e)}$ it is a Poiseuille flow. Let us remind the definition of the steady Poiseuille flow in a cylinder $B_\varepsilon^{(e)}$.

If the local variables $x^{(e)}$ for the edge e coincide with the global ones x then the Poiseuille flow is defined as

$$\mathbf{V}_P(x) = \text{const} (v_P(x'/\varepsilon), 0, \dots, 0)^T,$$

where $v_P(y)$ is a solution to the Dirichlet's problem for the Poisson equation on $\sigma^{(e)}$:

$$-\nu \Delta v_P(y) = 1, \quad y \in \sigma^{(e)}, \quad v_P(y) = 0, \quad y \in \partial\sigma^{(e)}. \quad (30)$$

If e has the cosines directors k_{e1}, \dots, k_{en} and the local variables $x^{(e)}$ are related to the global ones by equation $x^{(e)} = x^{(e)}(x)$ then the Poiseuille flow is

$$\mathbf{V}_P(x) = \text{const} (k_{e1} v_P((x^{(e)}(x))'/\varepsilon), \dots, k_{en} v_P((x^{(e)}(x))'/\varepsilon))^T,$$

$x' = (x_2, \dots, x_n)$. In the case $\text{const} = 1$ denote the Poiseuille flow \mathbf{V}_P^0 .




Figure 6: Comparison of the Navier-Stokes error with different values of C for $Re = 100$.

Lemma 1. Function \mathbf{g}_ε can be extended to B_ε so that its extension $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\varepsilon \in H^1(B_\varepsilon)$, in each subdomain $\tilde{\omega}_\varepsilon^j = \omega_\varepsilon^j \cup (B_\varepsilon^{(e)} \cap \{x_1^{(e)} < \varepsilon d\})$ (here e is the edge containing $O_j, j = N_1 + 1, \dots, N$) it is equal to

$$\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\varepsilon(x) = \mathbf{g}_j\left(\frac{x - O_j}{\varepsilon}\right),$$

and for any cylinder $B_\varepsilon^{(e)} \cap \{3\varepsilon d < x_1^{(e)} < |e| - 3\varepsilon d\}$ it is equal in local coordinates to a Poiseuille flow $\mathbf{V}_P(x)$.

Proof:

Let us consider a problem for the pressure p (in this proof we omit for simplicity the index ε) in the nodes (see [20]) with the continuity condition for the pressure on the graph and with given derivatives of the pressure at the vertices (corresponding to the flow rates $\int_{\gamma_\varepsilon^j} \mathbf{g}_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{n} ds$):

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_j \frac{\partial^2 p}{\partial x_1^{(e_j)}{}^2} &= 0, x \in e_j, j = 1, \dots, M, \\ \sum_{j: e_j \in O_i} \kappa_j \frac{\partial p}{\partial x_1^{(e_j)}} &= 0, i = 1, \dots, N_1, \\ \kappa_j \frac{\partial p}{\partial x_1^{(e_j)}} &= \int_{\gamma_\varepsilon^j} \mathbf{g}_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{n} ds, i = N_1 + 1, \dots, N, \\ p &\text{ is continuous function on the graph } \mathcal{B}. \end{aligned}$$

Here $\kappa_j = \varepsilon^{n-1} \int_{\sigma_j} v_P(y') dy'$, and the local axes have the origin O_i . This problem admits a unique (up to an additive constant) solution, linear function on every edge, see [18]. The slope of this solution at each edge defines the Poiseuille flow in the corresponding cylinder: \mathbf{V}_P , such that

$$\kappa_j \frac{\partial p}{\partial x_1^{(e_j)}} = \int_{\sigma_{j\varepsilon}} \mathbf{V}_P \cdot \mathbf{n} ds,$$

$\sigma_{j\varepsilon} = \{x \in B_j^\varepsilon | x_1 = 0\}$. Then for every domain $\tilde{\omega}_\varepsilon^j$ we construct a divergence free extension equal to the determined Poiseuille flows on the parts of the boundary coinciding with the sections of the




Figure 7: Velocity stream lines of the transient Navier-Stokes test case at peak time $t = 0.2$ s, for $Re = 2500$, $\varepsilon = 0.25$. Full model (a) versus MAPDD model (b).

cylinders. The possibility of this construction is insured by the flow balance in every node of the graph (see [11], [22], [23], [6]). \square

Lemma 2. *The extension may be constructed in such a way that it belongs to $\mathbf{H}^2(B_\varepsilon)$. Indeed, for every edge e_j multiply constructed Poiseuille flow \mathbf{V}_P by a cut-off function $\zeta(\frac{x_1^{(e_i)}}{3d\varepsilon})\zeta(\frac{|e_i| - x_1^{(e_i)}}{3d\varepsilon})$, where $\zeta(\tau)$ is a smooth cut-off function independent of ε with $\zeta(\tau) = 0$ for $\tau \leq 1/3$ and $\zeta(\tau) = 1$ for $\tau \geq 2/3$, $0 \leq \zeta(\tau) \leq 1$. Denote $\psi_\varepsilon = \operatorname{div}(\zeta(\frac{x_1^{(e_i)}}{3d\varepsilon})\zeta(\frac{|e_i| - x_1^{(e_i)}}{3d\varepsilon})\mathbf{V}_P(x))$. Then for every domain $\tilde{\omega}_\varepsilon^j$ we can construct a function \mathbf{w}_ε such that $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{w}_\varepsilon = -\psi_\varepsilon$ and $\mathbf{w}_\varepsilon \in \mathbf{H}_0^2(\tilde{\omega}_\varepsilon^j)$, $j = 1, \dots, N_1$ (see [6], [8]) and $\mathbf{w}_\varepsilon \in \mathbf{H}_0^2(\tilde{\omega}_\varepsilon^j)$, $j = N_1 + 1, \dots, N$, moreover, \mathbf{w}_ε and its gradient vanish on the part of $\partial\tilde{\omega}_\varepsilon^j$ belonging to B_ε , and $\mathbf{w}_\varepsilon = \mathbf{g}_\varepsilon$ on γ_ε^j . We take $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\varepsilon = \mathbf{w}_\varepsilon + \zeta(\frac{x_1^{(e_i)}}{3d\varepsilon})\zeta(\frac{|e_i| - x_1^{(e_i)}}{3d\varepsilon})\mathbf{V}_P(x)$. \square*

7.2 Estimate for the difference between the exact solution and the MAPDD solution: asymptotic analysis of the Stokes equations

Theorem 1. *Given natural number J there exists a constant C (independent of ε and J) such that if $\delta = CJ\varepsilon|\ln \varepsilon|$, then*

$$\|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(B_\varepsilon)} = O(\varepsilon^J) . \quad (31)$$

Proof.

1. Consider an asymptotic expansion of the solution (see [15], [5]). For the velocity it has the following shape: a Poiseuille flow $\mathbf{V}_P(x)$ within the cylinders $B_\varepsilon^{(e)}$ plus some functions depending




Figure 8: Pressure fields of the transient Navier-Stokes test case at peak time $t = 0.2$ s, for $Re = 2500$, $\varepsilon = 0.25$. Full model (a) versus MAPDD model (b).

on the variable $\frac{x - O_j}{\varepsilon}$ exponentially tending to zero in the cylinders as the variable $\frac{x - O_j}{\varepsilon}$ tends to infinity. One can write this expansion as a uniform approximation of order J in a form

$$\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon^{(J)}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^M \zeta\left(\frac{x_1^{(e_i)}}{3d\varepsilon}\right) \zeta\left(\frac{|e_i| - x_1^{(e_i)}}{3d\varepsilon}\right) \mathbf{V}_P^{[i,J]}(x^{(e)}/\varepsilon) + \sum_{l=1}^N \left(1 - \zeta\left(\frac{|x - O_l|}{|e|_{min}}\right)\right) \mathbf{V}^{[BLO_l, J]}(\frac{x - O_l}{\varepsilon}). \quad (32)$$

Here $\mathbf{V}_P^{[i,J]}(y^{(e')}) = C^{[i,J]}(k_{e1}v_P(y^{(e')}), \dots, k_{en}v_P(y^{(e')}))^T$ (as above, e has the cosines directors k_{e1}, \dots, k_{en} and the local variables $x^{(e)}$ are related to the global ones by the equation $x^{(e)} = x^{(e)}(x)$), $C^{[i,J]}$ are constants such that for any node O_l the flux conservation law is satisfied:

$$\sum_{i: O_l \in e_i} C^{[i,J]} \int_{\sigma^{(e_i)}} v_P(y^{(e')}) dy^{(e')} = 0 \quad (33)$$

(the local coordinate system $x^{(e_i)}$ has its origin in O_l) and for vertices O_l , the end points of only one edge e_i ,

$$C^{[i,J]} \int_{\sigma^{(e_i)}} v_P(y^{(e')}) dy^{(e')} + \int_{\gamma_l^\varepsilon} \mathbf{g}_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{n} ds \varepsilon^{1-n} = 0 \quad (34)$$

(\mathbf{n} is an outer normal vector). Every $\mathbf{V}_P^{[i,J]}(y^{(e')})$ is defined only within the cylinder $B_\varepsilon^{(e)}$ associated to the edge e . Here $|e|_{min}$ is the minimal length of the edges; the boundary layer term, vector valued function $\mathbf{V}^{[BLO_l, J]}(y)$, exponentially vanishes as $|y|$ tends to infinity: in the sense that the product $\mathbf{V}^{[BLO_l, J]}(y)e^{\beta|y|}$ belongs to the space $\mathbf{H}^1(\Omega_l)$ with some positive β independent of ε , $\Omega_l = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n | \varepsilon(y + O_l) \in \tilde{B}_l^{\varepsilon, \delta}\}$, and $\tilde{B}_l^{\varepsilon, \delta}$ is an extension of $B_l^{\varepsilon, \delta}$ behind the cross-sections S_{ij} as semi-infinite cylinders: $\tilde{B}_l^{\varepsilon, \delta} = B_l^{\varepsilon, \delta} \cup_{e: O_l \in e} \{x_1^{(e)} > \varepsilon d; x^{(e)}/\varepsilon \in \sigma^{(e)}\}$. So, Ω_l is an unbounded




Figure 9: Axial velocity component u_0 at the interfaces for the MAPDD and the full solutions computed for $Re = 2500$, $\varepsilon = 1/4$.

domain obtained from the bounded domain $\{\varepsilon(y + O_l) \in B_l^{\varepsilon, \delta}\}$ with truncated at the distance δ from the node cylinders by extension of them behind the truncations, so that they become the cylindrical outlets to infinity. Functions $\mathbf{V}^{[BLO_l, J]}$ satisfy an integral identity:

$$\int_{\Omega_l} \nu \nabla \mathbf{V}^{[BLO_l, J]}(y) : \nabla \Phi(y) dy + \sum_{i: O_l \in e_i} \int_{\tilde{\Omega}_l} \nu \nabla \left(\mathbf{V}_P^{[i, J]}(y^{(e)}) \zeta \left(\frac{y_1^{(e_i)}}{3d} \right) \right) : \nabla \Phi(y) dy = 0 \quad (35)$$

for all divergence free vector valued test functions Φ from $\mathbf{H}_0^1(\Omega_l)$ and

$$\operatorname{div} \left(\mathbf{V}^{[BLO_l, J]}(y) + \sum_{i: O_l \in e_i} \left(\mathbf{V}_P^{[i, J]}(y^{(e)}) \zeta \left(\frac{y_1^{(e_i)}}{3d} \right) \right) \right) = 0.$$

$\mathbf{V}^{[BLO_l, J]}$ satisfy the homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions if O_l is an end point for at least two edges:

$$\mathbf{V}^{[BLO_l, J]}(y) = 0, \quad y \in \partial\Omega_l; \quad (36)$$

or the non-homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions

$$\mathbf{V}^{[BLO_l, J]}(y) = g_l(y), \quad y \in \gamma_l; \quad \mathbf{V}^{[BLO_l, J]}(y) = 0, \quad y \in \partial\Omega_l \setminus \gamma_l; \quad (37)$$

in the case if O_l is a vertex (i.e. an end-point for only one edge), $\gamma_l = \partial\Omega_l \cap \partial\omega_l$.

For the asymptotic expansion the following estimate (see [17], [5])

$$\|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon^{(J)}\|_{H^1(B_\varepsilon)} = O(\varepsilon^J) \quad (38)$$

holds.




Figure 10: Pressure along the interfaces for the MAPDD and the full solutions computed for $Re = 2500$, $\varepsilon = 1/4$.

2. Let us multiply all boundary layers by a cut-off function passing from value one within the distance less than $\delta/3$ from the nodes to the value zero if the distance from the nodes is greater than $2\delta/3$, i.e. we replace $\mathbf{v}^{(J)}(x)$ by the new asymptotic approximation

$$\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon^a(x) = \sum_{i=1}^M \zeta\left(\frac{x_1^{(e_i)}}{3d\varepsilon}\right) \zeta\left(\frac{|e_i| - x_1^{(e_i)}}{3d\varepsilon}\right) \mathbf{V}_P^{[i,J]}(x^{(e)}/\varepsilon) + \sum_{l=1}^N \left(1 - \zeta\left(\frac{|x - O_l|}{\delta}\right)\right) \mathbf{V}^{[BLO_l,J]}(\frac{x - O_l}{\varepsilon}). \quad (39)$$

This new approximation consists only from the Poiseille flow within the cylinders $B_\varepsilon^{(e)}$ at the distance δ from the ends of e because the cutt-off function $1 - \zeta(\frac{|x - O_l|}{\delta})$ vanishes in this area. Let us choose δ equal $C_J \varepsilon |\ln \varepsilon| |e|_{min}$ and choose constant C_J such that the residual in the right-hand side of the equations has the order $O(\varepsilon^J)$. To this end notice that the boundary layer functions decay exponentially, i.e. $\mathbf{V}^{[BLO_l,J]}(y)e^{\beta|y|}$ belongs to the space $\mathbf{H}^1(\Omega_l)$ with some positive β independent of ε . Let us find δ such that

$$\mathcal{F}_{l,\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}} = O(\varepsilon^{J+2}) \quad (40)$$

where

$$\mathcal{F}_{l,R} = \|\mathbf{V}^{[BLO_l,J]}\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(\Omega_{l,R})},$$

and $\Omega_{l,R} = \Omega_l \cap \{|y| > R\}$. Indeed, the inclusion $\mathbf{V}^{[BLO_l,J]}(y)e^{\beta|y|} \in H^1(\Omega_l)$ implies

$$e^{\beta\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}} \mathcal{F}_{l,\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}} \leq \|e^{\beta|y|} \mathbf{V}^{[BLO_l,J]}(y)\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(\Omega_{l,\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}})} \leq \|e^{\beta|y|} \mathbf{V}^{[BLO_l,J]}(y)\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(\Omega_l)}$$

and the last norm is bounded by a constant, denote it C_l . So, we can write

$$e^{\beta\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}} \mathcal{F}_{l,\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}} \leq C_l,$$




Figure 11: Pressure along the tube cross-section, at 2ε upstream of Σ_1 , for the MAPDD and the full solutions computed for $Re = 2500$, $\varepsilon = 1/4$.

i.e.

$$\mathcal{F}_{l, \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}} \leq C_l e^{-\beta \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}}.$$

Let us take

$$\delta = \frac{1}{\beta}(J+2)\varepsilon |\ln \varepsilon|,$$

then we get the estimate (40), and so, making the change of variables $x - O_l = \varepsilon y$, we get that the difference $\mathbf{v}^{(J)} - \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon^a$ has support belonging to the cylinders $B_\varepsilon^{(e), \delta/3} = B_\varepsilon^{(e)} \cap \{\delta/3 < x_1^{(e)} < |e| - \delta/3\}$ and

$$\|\mathbf{v}^{(J)} - \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon^a\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(B_\varepsilon^{(e), \delta/3})} = O(\varepsilon^J).$$

Thus,

$$\|\mathbf{v}^{(J)} - \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon^a\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(B_\varepsilon)} = O(\varepsilon^J).$$

3. Unfortunately, \mathbf{u}_ε^a may be not divergence free within the parts $B_\varepsilon^{(e), \delta/3, -} = B_\varepsilon^{(e), \delta/3} \cap \{x_1^{(e)} < 2\delta/3\}$ and $B_\varepsilon^{(e), \delta/3, +} = B_\varepsilon^{(e), \delta/3} \cap \{x_1^{(e)} > |e| - 2\delta/3\}$ of the cylinders $B_\varepsilon^{(e), \delta/3}$ because the products $(1 - \zeta(\frac{|x - O_l|}{\delta}))\mathbf{V}^{[BLO_l, J]}(\frac{x - O_l}{\varepsilon})$ have the divergence equal to

$$h_l(x) = -\operatorname{div}\left(\zeta\left(\frac{|x - O_l|}{\delta}\right)\mathbf{V}^{[BLO_l, J]}(\frac{x - O_l}{\varepsilon})\right) = -\delta^{-1}\zeta'\left(\frac{|x - O_l|}{\delta}\right)\nabla|x - O_l| \cdot \mathbf{V}^{[BLO_l, J]}(\frac{x - O_l}{\varepsilon}).$$

The vector field $\mathbf{V}^{[BLO_l, J]}$ belongs to $\mathbf{H}_0^1(\Omega_l)$ and, therefore, the flux of it in every outlet to infinity is equal to zero. Let us show that $\int_{B_\varepsilon^{(e), \delta/3, \pm}} h_l(x) dx = 0$. Indeed,

$$\int_{B_\varepsilon^{(e), \delta/3, \pm}} \operatorname{div}\left(\zeta\left(\frac{|x - O_l|}{\delta}\right)\mathbf{V}^{[BLO_l, J]}(\frac{x - O_l}{\varepsilon})\right) dx = \int_{\partial B_\varepsilon^{(e), \delta/3, \pm}} \zeta\left(\frac{|x - O_l|}{\delta}\right)\mathbf{V}^{[BLO_l, J]}(\frac{x - O_l}{\varepsilon}) \cdot \mathbf{n} ds =$$

$$= \int_{\sigma_\varepsilon^{(e)}(x_1^{(e)}=2\delta/3)} \mathbf{V}^{[BLO_l, J]} \left(\frac{x - O_l}{\varepsilon} \right) \cdot \mathbf{n} dS = 0,$$

where $\sigma_\varepsilon^{(e)}(x_1^{(e)} = 2\delta/3)$ is the section of $B_\varepsilon^{(e)}$ corresponding to $x_1^{(e)} = 2\delta/3$, and we have used that $\zeta\left(\frac{|x - O_l|}{\delta}\right) = 0$ for $\frac{|x - O_l|}{\delta} \leq 1/3$, $\zeta\left(\frac{|x - O_l|}{\delta}\right) = 1$ for $\frac{|x - O_l|}{\delta} \geq 2/3$, and that $\mathbf{V}^{[BLO_l, J]}$ is equal to zero on the lateral boundary of $B_\varepsilon^{(e)}$.

Thus, we can apply the results from [19] (see Lemma 3.1 and the change of variables from Lemma 3.6 in [19]) and prove that there exists $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{H}_0^1(B_\varepsilon^{(e), \delta/3, \pm})$ such that

$$\operatorname{div} \mathbf{w} = -h_l(x)$$

and

$$\|h_l\|_{L^2(B_\varepsilon^{(e), \delta/3, \pm})} \leq \frac{c}{\delta} \|\mathbf{V}^{[BLO_l, J]}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(B_\varepsilon^{(e), \delta/3, \pm})} = O\left(\frac{1}{\delta} \varepsilon^{J+2+s/2}\right)$$

and so,

$$\|\mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(B_\varepsilon^{(e), \delta/3, \pm})} = O(\varepsilon^J).$$

Extending \mathbf{w} by zero outside the domains $B_\varepsilon^{(e), \delta/3, \pm}$ we get an approximation $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon^{(J)} = \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon^a + \mathbf{w}$ which belongs to the space $\mathbf{H}_{div0(\partial B_\varepsilon \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon)}^{1, \delta}(B_\varepsilon)$.

4. Evidently the difference $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon^{(J)} - \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon$ satisfies the homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition on ∂B_ε and the Stokes equations in B_ε with a residual of order $O(\varepsilon^J)$. There holds the following integral identity

$$\nu \int_{B_\varepsilon} \nabla(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon^{(J)}(x) - \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon(x)) : \nabla \mathbf{v}(x) dx = -\nu \int_{B_\varepsilon} \nabla \mathbf{r}_\varepsilon(x) : \nabla \mathbf{v}(x) dx \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}_{div0}^1(B_\varepsilon), \quad (41)$$

where

$$\mathbf{r}_\varepsilon(x) = \nabla(\mathbf{w}(x) + (\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon^a(x) - \mathbf{v}^{(J)}(x)) + (\mathbf{v}^{(J)}(x) - \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon(x))).$$

Due to the previous estimates the norms $\|\mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(B_\varepsilon)}$, $\|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon^a - \mathbf{v}^{(J)}\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(B_\varepsilon)}$ and $\|\mathbf{v}^{(J)} - \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(B_\varepsilon)}$ are of order $O(\varepsilon^J)$ and we get that

$$\|\mathbf{r}_\varepsilon\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(B_\varepsilon)} = O(\varepsilon^J).$$

So, applying the a priori estimate (29), we get the following inequality

$$\|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon^{(J)}\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(B_\varepsilon)} = O(\varepsilon^J). \quad (42)$$

5. Consider now the projection of problem (6) on the subspace $\mathbf{H}_{div0(\partial B_\varepsilon \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon)}^{1, \delta}(B_\varepsilon)$. By the Lax-Milgram theorem there exists a unique solution $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon, \delta}$ to this projection and the difference $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon^{(J)} - \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon, \delta}$ belongs to the space $\mathbf{H}_{div0(\partial B_\varepsilon \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon)}^{1, \delta}(B_\varepsilon)$ and satisfies, as before (see (41)), variational formulation with a residual of order $O(\varepsilon^J)$:

$$\nu \int_{B_\varepsilon} \nabla(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon^{(J)}(x) - \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon, \delta}(x)) : \nabla \mathbf{v}(x) dx = -\nu \int_{B_\varepsilon} \nabla \mathbf{r}_\varepsilon(x) : \nabla \mathbf{v}(x) dx \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}_{div0}^{1, \delta}(B_\varepsilon). \quad (43)$$

Now applying an a priori estimate (29) we get

$$\|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon^{(J)} - \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(B_\varepsilon)} = O(\varepsilon^J). \quad (44)$$

Estimates (38), (44) imply (31). \square

Remark 4. Notice that in [15], [5], [17] an asymptotic expansion $p_\varepsilon^{(J)}$ of the pressure p_ε was as well constructed and it has similar to (32) structure a linear pressure depending on the longitudinal variable for each cylinder $B_\varepsilon^{(e)}$ multiplied by a cut-off function plus the boundary layer terms exponentially decaying as $\frac{|x - O_l|}{\varepsilon}$ tends to infinity. For the linear pressure the second order differential equation on the graph with the Kirchhoff type junction conditions in the nodes holds. The couple $(\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon^{(J)}, p_\varepsilon^{(J)})$ satisfies equations (6) in classical sense with a residual of order $O(\varepsilon^J)$ in the norm $L^2(B_\varepsilon)$. Moreover, the couple $(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon^{(J)}, p_\varepsilon^a)$, where p_ε^a is obtained from $p_\varepsilon^{(J)}$ replacing the cut-off factor of boundary layers by $1 - \zeta(\frac{|x - O_l|}{\delta})$, as well satisfies equations (6) in classical sense with a residual of order $O(\varepsilon^J)$ in the norm $\mathbf{L}^2(B_\varepsilon)$:

$$-\nu \Delta \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon^{(J)}(x) + \nabla p_\varepsilon^a(x) = \mathbf{r}_\varepsilon(x), \quad x \in B_\varepsilon, \quad (45)$$

where

$$\|\mathbf{r}_\varepsilon\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(B_\varepsilon)} = O(\varepsilon^J).$$

The boundary conditions are satisfied exactly.

7.3 Navier-Stokes equations

Consider the Navier-Stokes equations (1). Remind a weak formulation from [20] equivalent to Definitions 1.1 and 1.2. It introduces a new unknown function $\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon = \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - \mathbf{g}_\varepsilon$, which is divergence free and vanishing at the whole boundary.

Definition 1.3. By a weak solution we understand the vector-field $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon = \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon + \mathbf{g}_\varepsilon$, where $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon = 0$, $\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon(x, 0) = 0$, $\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon \in L^\infty(0, T; \mathbf{H}_0^1(B_\varepsilon))$, $\mathbf{v}_t \in L^2(0, T; \mathbf{L}^2(B_\varepsilon))$, and \mathbf{v}_ε satisfies the integral identity

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_\varepsilon} (\mathbf{v}_{\varepsilon t} \cdot \phi + \nu \nabla \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla \phi - ((\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon + \mathbf{g}_\varepsilon) \cdot \nabla) \phi \cdot \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon - (\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla) \phi \cdot \mathbf{g}_\varepsilon) dx \\ & = -\nu \int_{B_\varepsilon} \nabla \mathbf{g}_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla \phi dx - \int_{B_\varepsilon} ((\mathbf{g}_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{g}_\varepsilon + \mathbf{g}_{\varepsilon t}) \cdot \phi dx \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

for every vector-field $\phi \in \mathbf{H}_0^1(B_\varepsilon)$ and for all $t \in (0, T)$.

The proof of the existence of a solution for sufficiently small values of ε repeats literally the proof from [20].

The new version of the method of asymptotic partial domain decomposition (MAPDD) replaces the problem (1) by (13), where the space $\mathbf{H}_{\operatorname{div}0(\partial B_\varepsilon \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon)}^{1,\delta}(B_\varepsilon)$ is replaced by the newly defined space of divergence free vector-functions having the Womersley-Poiseuille form within cylinders $B_{ij}^{dec,\varepsilon}$.

Let us justify the weak MAPDD formulation with pressure (19). First let us construct the orthogonal complement of this space in $L^2(B_\varepsilon)$.

Lemma 3. Let $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ be a solution to problem (18). For all test functions $\phi \in \mathbf{H}_0^{1,\delta}(B_\varepsilon)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j: \mathcal{O}_i \mathcal{O}_j \in \{e_1, \dots, e_M\}} \int_{\partial B_i^{\varepsilon,\delta} \cap S_{ij}} \left(\nu \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}}{\partial \mathbf{n}} - p_{\varepsilon,\delta} \mathbf{n} \right) \cdot \phi ds + \\ & + \sum_{l=1}^M d_l \int_{\sigma_\varepsilon^{(e_l)}} \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta,t} \cdot \phi + \nu \nabla_{x^{(e_l)'}} \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} : \nabla_{x^{(e_l)'}} \phi dx^{(e_l)'} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Consider in (18) the divergence free test functions ϕ vanishing in all cylinders $B_{ij}^{\varepsilon,\delta}$ except for one of them and two adjacent domains $B_i^{\varepsilon,\delta}$ and $B_j^{\varepsilon,\delta}$. We get

$$\int_{B_i^{\varepsilon,\delta} \cup B_{ij}^{\varepsilon,\delta} \cup B_j^{\varepsilon,\delta}} \left(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta,t} \cdot \phi + \nu \nabla \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} : \nabla \phi + ((\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \nabla \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \phi) \right) dx = 0,$$

i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_i^{\varepsilon,\delta} \cup B_{ij}^{\varepsilon,\delta} \cup B_j^{\varepsilon,\delta}} \left(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta,t} \cdot \phi - \nu \Delta \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \phi + ((\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \nabla \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \phi) \right) dx + \\ & + \nu \int_{S_{ij}} \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}}{\partial \mathbf{n}} \cdot \phi ds + \nu \int_{S_{ji}} \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}}{\partial \mathbf{n}} \cdot \phi ds = 0, \end{aligned}$$

i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_i^{\varepsilon,\delta}} (-\nabla p_{\varepsilon,\delta,i}) \cdot \phi dx + \int_{B_j^{\varepsilon,\delta}} (-\nabla p_{\varepsilon,\delta,j}) \cdot \phi dx + \int_{B_{ij}^{\varepsilon,\delta}} \left(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta,t} \cdot \phi - \nu \Delta \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \cdot \phi + ((\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \nabla \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \phi) \right) dx + \\ & + \nu \int_{S_{ij}} \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}}{\partial \mathbf{n}} \cdot \phi ds + \nu \int_{S_{ji}} \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}}{\partial \mathbf{n}} \cdot \phi ds = 0, \end{aligned}$$

i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_i^{\varepsilon,\delta}} p_{\varepsilon,\delta,i} \operatorname{div} \phi dx + \int_{B_j^{\varepsilon,\delta}} p_{\varepsilon,\delta,j} \operatorname{div} \phi dx + \int_{B_{ij}^{\varepsilon,\delta}} \left(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta,t} \cdot \phi - \nu \Delta \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \cdot \phi + ((\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \nabla \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \phi) \right) dx + \\ & + \int_{S_{ij}} \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, p_{\varepsilon,\delta,i}) \cdot \phi ds + \int_{S_{ji}} \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, p_{\varepsilon,\delta,j}) \cdot \phi ds = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Here $\sigma_n(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, p_{\varepsilon,\delta,i}) = (\nu (\nabla \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} + (\nabla \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta})^T) - p_{\varepsilon,\delta,i} I) \mathbf{n} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}}{\partial \mathbf{n}} - p_{\varepsilon,\delta,i} \mathbf{n}$, \mathbf{n} is an outer normal vector with respect to $B_i^{\varepsilon,\delta}$ (respectively $B_j^{\varepsilon,\delta}$), I is the identity matrix. Note that ϕ has only the first component (in local variables) which may be different from zero and it depends on x' only, so $\int_{B_{ij}^{\varepsilon,\delta}} ((\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, \nabla \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \cdot \phi) dx = 0$. On the other hand the first component of ϕ is an arbitrary function with vanishing mean. So, in every $B_{ij}^{\varepsilon,\delta}$ we get an equation for $u_{\varepsilon,\delta,1}$, the first component of $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$:

$$(|e_{ij}| - 2\delta) \left(u_{\varepsilon,\delta,1,t} - \nu \Delta u_{\varepsilon,\delta,1} \right) + \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, p_{\varepsilon,\delta,i})|_{S_{ij}} + \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}, p_{\varepsilon,\delta,j})|_{S_{ji}} = D_{ij}(t), \quad (47)$$

where $D_{ij}(t)$ are "constants" depending on time only. If we take now an arbitrary test function from the space $\mathbf{H}_{div0}^{1,\delta}(B_\varepsilon)$, we get as above

$$\sum_{i,j:i < j, \overline{O_i O_j} \in \{e_1, \dots, e_M\}} \int_{B_{ij}^{dec, \varepsilon}} D_{ij}(t) \phi_1 dx = 0. \quad (48)$$

Varying ϕ we get that for any arbitrary set of fluxes $F_{ij} = \int_{B_{ij}^{dec, \varepsilon}} \phi_1 ds / (|e_{ij}| - 2\delta)$ satisfying equation

$$\sum_{j:e_{ij} \subset \mathcal{B}} F_{ij} = 0 \quad (49)$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, N$, the following relation holds:

$$\sum_{j:e_{ij} \subset \mathcal{B}} (|e_{ij}| - 2\delta) D_{ij}(t) F_{ij} = 0. \quad (50)$$

Consider now an arbitrary function of the space $\mathbf{H}_0^{1, \delta}(B_\varepsilon)$ and the sum

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j:\overline{O_i O_j} \in \{e_1, \dots, e_M\}} \int_{\partial B_i^{\varepsilon, \delta} \cap S_{ij}} \left(\nu \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon, \delta}}{\partial \mathbf{n}} - p_{\varepsilon, \delta} \mathbf{n} \right) \cdot \phi ds + \\ & + \sum_{l=1}^M d_l \int_{\sigma_\varepsilon^{(e_l)}} \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon, \delta, t} \cdot \phi + \nu \nabla_{x^{(e_l)}, \prime} \mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon, \delta} : \nabla_{x^{(e_l)}, \prime} \phi dx^{(e_l), \prime}. \end{aligned}$$

Using now relations (47), (50), we get that this expression is equal to

$$\sum_{i,j:i < j, \overline{O_i O_j} \in \{e_1, \dots, e_M\}} \int_{B_{ij}^{dec, \varepsilon}} D_{ij}(t) \phi_1 dx = 0.$$

Lemma 3 is proved.

Note that in case $N = M + 1$ condition (20) can be removed from the definition of the reduced space, and we can take $D_{ij} = 0$ without condition (49), only controlling constants θ_i . Indeed, in (47) every stress $\sigma_n(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon, \delta}, p_{\varepsilon, \delta, i})|_{S_{ij}}$ is defined up to an additive constant $\theta_i(t)$, so relations (47) define uniquely some constants $\mathcal{F}_{ij}(t)$ equal to $\theta_i(t) - \theta_j(t) - D_{ij}(t)$. Setting $D_{ij} = 0$, we get a system of equations for θ_i :

$$\theta_i(t) - \theta_j(t) = \mathcal{F}_{ij}(t), i < j, e_{ij} \subset \mathcal{B}. \quad (51)$$

The sum of all these equations gives $0 = 0$ because the sum of all fluxes in all nodes and vertices is equal to zero. So, one equation should be deleted. Setting $\theta_N = 0$ and deleting the equation containing θ_N , we get the system of $N - 1$ equations with non-degenerate matrix. Indeed, the homogeneous system is $\theta_i = \theta_j, i < j, e_{ij} \subset \mathcal{B}$. It means that due to the connectedness of the graph \mathcal{B} the unique solution to the homogeneous system is: all $\theta_i = 0$. So, system (51) admits a unique solution such that $\theta_N = 0$. Consequently, constants θ_i can be chosen in such a way that $D_{ij} = 0$. This choice of θ_i is unique up to one constant θ_N . So, integral identity (19) holds true for a wider subspace of test functions with removed condition (20).

7.4 Estimate for the difference between the exact solution and the MAPDD solution for the non-stationary Navier-Stokes equations

The result of the previous section can be generalized for the non-stationary problem for the Navier-Stokes equations (1) using the approach of [20] and [21].

Assume that \mathbf{g}_ε introduced in the second section has a divergence free extension $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\varepsilon$ defined in B_ε with $\tilde{\mathbf{g}} \in C^{[\frac{J+4}{2}]+1}([0, T]; \mathbf{H}^2(B_\varepsilon))$ satisfying for all $t \in [0, T]$ the following asymptotic estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\mathbf{g}}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(B_\varepsilon)} + \|\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_t\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(B_\varepsilon)} + \|\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{tt}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(B_\varepsilon)} &\leq c\varepsilon^{\frac{n-1}{2}}; \\ \|\nabla\tilde{\mathbf{g}}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(B_\varepsilon)} + \|\nabla\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_t\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(B_\varepsilon)} &\leq c\varepsilon^{\frac{n-3}{2}}, \\ \|\Delta\tilde{\mathbf{g}}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(B_\varepsilon)} &\leq c\varepsilon^{\frac{n-5}{2}}, \quad n = 2, 3, \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

where the constant c is independent of ε .

As before,

$$\int_{\partial B_\varepsilon} \mathbf{g}_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{n} ds = 0. \quad (53)$$

The proof of the existence of the unique solution to (1) for sufficiently small values of ε repeats literally the proof from [20].

A complete asymptotic expansion of order J to this problem is constructed in [20], [21] and it has the form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon^{(J)}(x, t) &= \sum_{i=1}^M \zeta\left(\frac{x_1^{(e_i)}}{3d\varepsilon}\right) \zeta\left(\frac{|e_i| - x_1^{(e_i)}}{3d\varepsilon}\right) (\mathbf{V}_P^{[i, J, NSI]}(x^{(e)}/\varepsilon, t) + \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{V}_P^{[i, J, NSII]}(x^{(e)}/\varepsilon, t/\varepsilon^2)) + \\ &+ \sum_{l=1}^N (1 - \zeta\left(\frac{|x - O_l|}{|e|_{\min}}\right)) (\mathbf{V}^{[BLO_l, J, NSI]}(\frac{x - O_l}{\varepsilon}, t) + \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{V}^{[BLO_l, J, NSII]}(\frac{x - O_l}{\varepsilon}, t/\varepsilon^2)), \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

where the functions $\mathbf{V}_P^{[i, J, NSI]}$ and $\mathbf{V}_P^{[i, J, NSII]}$ are C^2 -smooth "quasi-Poiseuille" functions such that in local variables only the longitudinal component of the velocity may be different from zero and its longitudinal derivative is equal to zero, while $\mathbf{V}^{[BLO_l, J, NSI]}$ and $\mathbf{V}^{[BLO_l, J, NSII]}$ are the boundary layer correctors belonging to the spaces $L^2((0, T); \mathbf{H}^1(\Omega_l))$ and $L^2((0, \infty); \mathbf{H}^1(\Omega_l))$ respectively, and such that for some positive β , $e^{\beta|y|} \mathbf{V}^{[BLO_l, J, NSI]}$ and $e^{\beta|y|} \mathbf{V}^{[BLO_l, J, NSII]}$ also belong to these spaces. The corresponding norms of these four terms are bounded by constants independent of ε . The vector function $\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon^{(J)}$ satisfies the estimate

$$\sup_{t \in (0, T)} \|\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon^{(J)} - \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(B_\varepsilon)} + \|\nabla \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon^{(J)} - \nabla \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2((0, T); L^2(B_\varepsilon))} = O(\varepsilon^{J-2})$$

For more details see [20], [21].

Remark 5. An asymptotic expansion for the pressure was as well constructed in [20], [21] and has a similar structure:

$$\begin{aligned} p_\varepsilon^{(J)}(x, t) &= \sum_{i=1}^M \zeta\left(\frac{x_1^{(e_i)}}{3d\varepsilon}\right) \zeta\left(\frac{|e_i| - x_1^{(e_i)}}{3d\varepsilon}\right) (p^{[i, J, NSI]}(x_1^{(e)}, t) + p^{[i, J, NSII]}(x_1^{(e)}, t/\varepsilon^2)) + \\ &+ \sum_{l=1}^N (1 - \zeta\left(\frac{|x - O_l|}{|e|_{\min}}\right)) (P^{[BLO_l, J, NSI]}(\frac{x - O_l}{\varepsilon}, t) + P^{[BLO_l, J, NSII]}(\frac{x - O_l}{\varepsilon}, t/\varepsilon^2)), \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

where the terms $p^{[i,J,NSI]}(x_1^{(e)}, t)$ and $p^{[i,J,NSII]}(x_1^{(e)}, t)$ are linear in $x_1^{(e)}$, while $P^{[BLOI,J,NSI]}$ and $P^{[BLOI,J,NSII]}$ are the boundary layer terms belonging to the spaces $L^2((0, T); L^2(\Omega_l))$ and $L^2((0, \infty); L^2(\Omega_l))$ respectively and such that for some positive β , $e^{\beta|y|}P^{[BLOI,J,NSI]}$ and $e^{\beta|y|}P^{[BLOI,J,NSII]}$ also belong to these spaces. (Standard theorems on the asymptotic behavior of the pressure in domains with outlets at infinity establish that it tends to some constants, however the construction of asymptotic expansion in [20] subtracts these constants so that the pressure terms belong to the space L^2). The couple $(\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon^{(J)}, p_\varepsilon^{(J)})$ satisfies the Navier-Stokes equations in classical sense with a residual of order $O(\varepsilon^{J-2})$ in the norm $H^1((0, T); \mathbf{L}^2(B_\varepsilon))$. The boundary and the initial conditions are satisfied exactly.

Consider the following setting:

to find $\mathbf{v}_{\varepsilon, \delta} \in L^2(0, T; \mathbf{H}_{div0(\partial B_\varepsilon \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon)}^{1, \delta}(B_\varepsilon))$ such that $\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon, \delta} = \mathbf{v}_{\varepsilon, \delta} + \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\varepsilon$, $\mathbf{v}_{\varepsilon, \delta}(x, 0) = 0$, $\mathbf{v}_{\varepsilon, \delta} \in L^2(0, T; \mathbf{H}_{div0}^{1, \delta}(B_\varepsilon))$, $\mathbf{v}_{\varepsilon, \delta, t} \in L^2(0, T; L^2(B_\varepsilon))$, and $\mathbf{v}_{\varepsilon, \delta}$ satisfies the integral identity

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_\varepsilon} \left(\mathbf{v}_{\varepsilon, \delta, t} \cdot \Phi + \nu \nabla \mathbf{v}_{\varepsilon, \delta} \cdot \nabla \Phi - ((\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon + \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\varepsilon) \cdot \nabla) \Phi \cdot \mathbf{v}_{\varepsilon, \delta} - (\mathbf{v}_{\varepsilon, \delta} \cdot \nabla) \Phi \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\varepsilon \right) dx \\ = -\nu \int_{B_\varepsilon} \nabla \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla \Phi dx - \int_{B_\varepsilon} ((\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla) \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\varepsilon + \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{\varepsilon t}) \cdot \Phi dx \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

for every divergence free vector-field $\Phi \in \mathbf{H}_{div0}^{1, \delta}(B_\varepsilon)$. Here an extension $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_\varepsilon$ is such that it belongs to $L^2(0, T; \mathbf{H}_{div0(\partial B_\varepsilon \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon)}^{1, \delta}(B_\varepsilon))$.

Existence and uniqueness of a solution to an analogous problem set in the usual Sobolev spaces is proved in [20] by Galerkin method. For the problem (56) the proof is just the same. Note only that an orthogonal base exists due to the separability of the space $\mathbf{H}_{div0(\partial B_\varepsilon \setminus \gamma_\varepsilon)}^{1, \delta}(B_\varepsilon)$ (as a subspace of a separable space).

Theorem 2. Let $\mathbf{g}_j \in C^{[\frac{J+4}{2}]+1}([0, T]; W^{3/2, 2}(\partial \omega_j))$. Given natural number J there exists a constant C (independent of ε and J) such that if $\delta = C_J \varepsilon |\ln \varepsilon|$, then

$$\sup_{t \in (0, T)} \|\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon, \delta} - \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(B_\varepsilon)} + \|\nabla(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon, \delta} - \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon)\|_{L^2((0, T); \mathbf{L}^2(B_\varepsilon))} = O(\varepsilon^J) . \quad (57)$$

Proof:

The idea of the proof is similar to that of Theorem 4.1. Replace $\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon^{(J)}$ by a new approximation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon^{(J, a)}(x, t) = \sum_{i=1}^M \zeta\left(\frac{x_1^{(e_i)}}{3d\varepsilon}\right) \zeta\left(\frac{|e_i| - x_1^{(e_i)}}{3d\varepsilon}\right) (\mathbf{V}_P^{[i, J, NSI]}(x^{(e)'} / \varepsilon, t) + \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{V}_P^{[i, J, NSII]}(x^{(e)'} / \varepsilon, t / \varepsilon^2)) + \\ + \sum_{l=1}^N \left(1 - \zeta\left(\frac{|x - O_l|}{\delta}\right)\right) (\mathbf{V}^{[BLOI, J, NSI]}(\frac{x - O_l}{\varepsilon}, t) + \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{V}^{[BLOI, J, NSII]}(\frac{x - O_l}{\varepsilon}, t / \varepsilon^2)), \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

where $\delta = C_J \varepsilon |\ln \varepsilon| |e|_{min}$ and C_J is chosen in such a way that

$$\|\mathbf{V}^{[BLOI, J, NSI]}\|_{L^2((0, T); \mathbf{H}^2(\Omega_{l, \delta/\varepsilon}))} + \|\mathbf{V}_t^{[BLOI, J, NSI]}\|_{L^2((0, T); \mathbf{H}^2(\Omega_{l, \delta/\varepsilon}))} = O(\varepsilon^{3J+6})$$

and

$$\|\mathbf{V}^{[BLOI, J, NSII]}\|_{L^2((0, \infty); \mathbf{H}^2(\Omega_{l, \delta/\varepsilon}))} + \|\mathbf{V}_\tau^{[BLOI, J, NSII]}\|_{L^2((0, \infty); \mathbf{H}^2(\Omega_{l, \delta/\varepsilon}))} = O(\varepsilon^{3J+6}).$$

Namely, $C_J = \frac{9(J+2)}{\beta|e|_{min}}$, see [20], p.158. (In fact, the order $3J+6$ is too much for the estimate of Theorem 2, $J+2$ is enough¹). Then we use the same arguments as in the proof of Theorem 6.2 of [20]: we check that this new approximation $\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon^{(J+2,a)}$ with the modified in the same way approximation $p_\varepsilon^{(J+2,a)}$ satisfy the Navier-Stokes equations in the classical sense with a residual of order $O(\varepsilon^J)$ in the norm $H^1((0,T);L^2(B_\varepsilon))$, and that the velocity approximation satisfies the boundary and initial conditions exactly. In the same way the pair $(\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon^{(J+2,a)}, p_\varepsilon^{(J+2,a)})$ satisfies the problem (56) with the same error. Applying results from the paper [20] (see the inequality (5.7) in the proof of Theorem 5.1 in [20], we get the estimate

$$\sup_{t \in (0,T)} \|\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon^{(J+2)}\|_{L^2(B_\varepsilon)} + \|\nabla(\mathbf{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon^{(J+2)})\|_{L^2((0,T);L^2(B_\varepsilon))} = O(\varepsilon^J).$$

Applying now the estimate of Theorem 5.3 in [20] and the triangle inequality we derive (57). \square

References

- [1] M. S. Alnaes, J. Blechta, J. Hake, A. Johansson, B. Kehlet, A. Logg, C. Richardson, J. Ring, M. E. Rognes and G. N. Wells, The FEniCS Project Version 1.5, *Archive of Numerical Software*, **3**, No. 100, 2015, 9–23.
- [2] C. Bogue, C. Conca, F. Murat, O. Pironneau. Going back to Stokes and Naiver-Stokes equations with boundary conditions on the pressure. *Comptes Rendus de l'Academie des Sciences. Serie I-Mathematique*, **304**, 1987.
- [3] C. Bertoglio, A. Caiazzo, Y. Bazilevs, M. Braack, M. Esmaily, V. Gravemeier, L. Marsden, O. Pironneau, I.E. Vignon-Clementel, W.A. Wall. Benchmark problems for numerical treatment of backflow at open boundaries. *International journal for numerical methods in biomedical engineering*, **34**, 2018, p.e2918.
- [4] C. Bertoglio, A. Caiazzo. A Stokes-residual backflow stabilization method applied to physiological flows, *Journal of Computational Physics*, **313**, 2016, 260-278.
- [5] F. Blanc, O. Gipouloux, G. Panasenko, A.M. Zine, Asymptotic analysis and partial asymptotic decomposition of the domain for Stokes equation in tube structure, *Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences*, **9**, No. 9, 1999, 1351-1378.
- [6] Bogovskii, M.E., Solutions of some problems of vector analysis related to operators *div* and *grad*, *Proc. Semin. S.L. Sobolev*, **1**, 1980, 5-40 (in Russian).
- [7] C. Geuzaine, J.-F. Remacle. Gmsh: a three-dimensional finite element mesh generator with built-in pre- and post-processing facilities. *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering*, **79**, No. 11, 2009, pp. 1309–1331

¹ Note that in Remark 5.1 of the paper [20] at the pages 158, 159 a misprint is found: everywhere $\zeta\left(\frac{|x - O_l| |\ln \varepsilon|}{|e_{min}|}\right)$ should be read as $\zeta\left(\frac{|x - O_l|}{\delta}\right)$, where $\delta = C_J \varepsilon |\ln \varepsilon| |e|_{min}$ and respectively inequality $\frac{|x - O_l| |\ln \varepsilon|}{C_J |e_{min}|} \geq 1/3$ should be read as $\frac{|x - O_l|}{C_J \varepsilon |\ln \varepsilon| |e_{min}|} \geq 1/3$. This misprint although doesn't influence the further reasoning.

- [8] L.V. Kapitanskii, K. Pileckas, Certain problems of vector analysis, *Zapiski Nauchn. Sem. LOMI*, **138**, 1984, 65-85. English Transl.: *J. Sov. Math.*, **32**, No. 5, 1986, 469-483.
- [9] O.A. Ladyzhenskaya, *The Mathematical Theory of Viscous Incompressible Fluid*, Gordon and Breach, 1969.
- [10] O. A. Ladyzhenskaya. *Boundary Value Problems of Mathematical Physics*, Springer-Verlag, 1985.
- [11] O.A. Ladyzhenskaya, V.A. Solonnikov, On some problems of vector analysis and generalized formulations of boundary value problems for the Navier–Stokes equations, *Zapiski Nauchn. Sem. LOMI*, **59**, 1976, 81-116. English Transl.: *J. Sov. Math.* **10**, No. 2, 1978, 257-285.
- [12] V. Maz`ya, A. Slutski, Asymptotic analysis of the Navier-Stokes system in a plane domain with thin channels, *Asymptotic. Anal.*, **23**, No. 1, 2000, 59-89.
- [13] S.A. Nazarov, B.A. Plamenevskiy, *Elliptic Problems in Domains with Piecewise-Smooth Boundary*, Nauka, Moscow, 1991.
- [14] G. Panasenko, Method of asymptotic partial decomposition of domain, *Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences*, **8**, No. 1, 1998, 139-156.
- [15] G. Panasenko, Asymptotic expansion of the solution of Navier-Stokes equation in a tube structure, *C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, **326**, Série IIb, 1998, 867-872.
- [16] G. Panasenko, Partial asymptotic decomposition of domain: Navier-Stokes equation in tube structure, *C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, **326**, Série IIb, 1998, 893-898.
- [17] G. Panasenko, *Multi-scale Modeling for Structures and Composites*, Springer, Dordrecht, 2005.
- [18] G. Panasenko, K. Pileckas, Flows in a tube structure: equation on the graph, *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, **55**, 081505 (2014); <http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.4891249>
- [19] G. Panasenko, K. Pileckas, Divergence equation in thin-tube structure, *Applicable Analysis*, **94**, No. 7, 2015, 1450-1459.
- [20] G. Panasenko, K. Pileckas, Asymptotic analysis of the non-steady Navier-Stokes equations in a tube structure. I. The case without boundary layer-in-time. *Nonlinear Analysis, Series A, Theory, Methods and Applications*, **122**, 2015, 125-168,
- [21] G. Panasenko, K. Pileckas, Asymptotic analysis of the non-steady Navier-Stokes equations in a tube structure. II. General case. *Nonlinear Analysis, Series A, Theory, Methods and Applications*, **125**, 2015, 582-607,
- [22] K. Pileckas, Three-dimensional solenoidal vectors, *Zapiski Nauchn. Sem. LOMI*, **96**, 1980, 237-239. English Transl.: *J. Sov. Math.*, **21**, 1983, 821-823.
- [23] K. Pileckas, On spaces of solenoidal vectors, *Trudy Mat. Inst. Steklov*, **159**, 1983, 137-149. English Transl.: *Proc. Math. Inst. Steklov*, **159**, issue 2, 1984, 141-154.
- [24] K. Pileckas, Weighted L^q -solvability of the steady Stokes system in domains with incompact boundaries, *Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences*, **6**, No. 1, 1996, 97-136.

- [25] R. Temam, *Navier-Stokes equations; theory and numerical analysis*, Amsterdam, North-Holland, 1984.