



**HAL**  
open science

## Direct forcing immersed boundary method: Improvements to the Ghost Node Method

Antoine Michael Diego Jost, Stéphane Glockner

► **To cite this version:**

Antoine Michael Diego Jost, Stéphane Glockner. Direct forcing immersed boundary method: Improvements to the Ghost Node Method. 2019. hal-02341656v1

**HAL Id: hal-02341656**

**<https://hal.science/hal-02341656v1>**

Preprint submitted on 31 Oct 2019 (v1), last revised 8 Jan 2021 (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.

# Direct forcing immersed boundary method: Improvements to the Ghost Node Method

Antoine Michael Diego Jost\* and Stéphane Glockner

*I2M Bordeaux, UMR CNRS 5295, Université de Bordeaux, Art et Métiers  
ParisTech, Bordeaux INP, INRA, Talence, F-33400, France*

October 4, 2019

---

## Abstract

It has been previously shown that the ghost-cell immersed boundary methods (IBMs) with a maximum stencil size larger than 1 do not yield band matrices and as a result cannot use the more efficient geometric multi-grid algorithms and instead must rely on the more generic and less efficient algebraic multi-grid algorithms. To address these shortcomings and in the pursuit of smaller total run times, smaller memory requirements, and increased accuracy the current article proposes the linear square shifting and the quadratic ghost node methods for the ghost-cell IBM for Cartesian grids. The linear square shifting method guarantees a maximum stencil size of 1 for all immersed boundaries and the increases in accuracy and convergence of the proposed method are comprehensively verified with the canonical verification Poisson test problem. A comprehensive analysis of the effect of the quadratic ghost node method together with the shifting approach for various immersed boundary conditions is also performed with the Poisson test problem. The improved computational efficiency of these methods, and their various combinations, is also verified through the canonical validation test cases of laminar pipe flow and laminar flow past a sphere for various Reynolds numbers, wherein speed-ups of approximately three are achieved.

*Keywords:* Immersed boundary method, Direct forcing, Discretization stencil, Poisson problem, Incompressible Navier-Stokes, Boundary conditions

---

## 1 Introduction

Immersed boundary methods (IBMs) were first developed by Peskin [1] and are widely used in numerical simulations involving complex geometries and complex fluid-structure interactions, such as heart valves [1]. The term IBM refers to any method that solves the discretized governing

---

\*Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: `antoine.jost@bordeaux-inp.fr`(AMD. Jost), `glockner@bordeaux-inp.fr`(S. Glockner)

equations, such as the Navier-Stokes equations, on grids that do not conform to the boundary of the immersed boundary [2], i.e. non-body conformal grids. As IBMs can use Cartesian and rectilinear grids, regardless of the complexity of the geometry, some of the advantages associated with these methods are significantly simplified grid generation, sustained grid quality (and complexity), and stationary nondeforming grids for moving geometries (i.e. no-remeshing) [2]. These qualities become increasingly more advantageous as the underlying physics of the problem increases.

Depending on the approach followed to implement the immersed boundary conditions (IBCs), the IBMs are divided into either the continuous or the direct forcing method. The continuous forcing method implements the IBCs through a source term, denoted as *forcing function*, in the non-discretized governing equations while the direct forcing method imposes the IBCs through local modifications to the discretization of the governing equations [2], similar to the implementation of domain boundary conditions. Picot and Glockner [3] showed that the stencil sizes of numerical methods for IBMs are important as they greatly affect the linear solvers, computational memory requirements, and accuracy of the results. Although the *linear shifted* method proposed by [3] significantly reduces the stencil size for rectilinear grids these proposed improvements are not applicable to Cartesian grids, for which the linear shifted method cannot be differentiated from the *linear* method proposed by Mittal *et al.* [4]. This article fills the gap and focuses on improvements to the linear method for Cartesian grids that could potentially be extended to the shifted linear method [3] for rectilinear grids.

Although the extensively used linear method of Mittal *et al.* [4] uses one probe point to implement the IBCs, various other IBMs that use two probe points have been proposed. Sandberg and Jones [5] and Luo *et al.* [6] used two image points to evaluate the wall-normal derivatives of the fluid variables while Das *et al.* [7, 8] used two fluid cell values and two image points to implement the Dirichlet and Neumann IBCs, respectively. Limited information of the density flow field at the immersed boundary led Dhamankar *et al.* [9] to use a different number of image points based on the flow variables. Two image points were used for the linear extrapolation of density whilst only one image point was used for the velocity flow field. The use of two image points to evaluate the Dirichlet and Neumann IBCs was pursued by Chi *et al.* [10] and Auguste *et al.* [11]. It should be noted that despite the use of quadratic methods for both Dirichlet and Neumann IBCs, to the knowledge of the authors no comprehensive analysis (stencil size, increase in accuracy, computational performance, etc.) of these methods has been pursued.

To address the shortcomings of the linear method for Cartesian grids and the analysis of the quadratic methods, in this article we propose two IBMs to reduce the stencil requirements for square/cubic cells, a quadratic interpolation method with a reduced stencil size, and we perform a comprehensive analysis of the effect of quadratic interpolations for Dirichlet and Neumann IBCs. This article is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the canonical Poisson verification test problem and numerical discretization methods and is followed by an overview of the linear method [4]. In Section 3 the currently proposed *linear square shift* method that decreases the maximum stencil size obtained with the linear method for Cartesian grids is presented and is followed by a discussion on the proposed *quadratic* method in Section 4, that further increases the accuracy of the linear and linear square shift methods. Numerical results for the canonical 2D and 3D verification test problems for the linear square shift method and the various proposed improvements are subsequently presented in Section 5. Section 6 focuses on the Navier-Stokes equations and presents various 3D validation cases and discusses the results obtained with various IBMs. Lastly, Section 7 presents the conclusions.

In the spirit of reproducibility, the currently proposed methods are implemented and the various

verification and validation test cases considered are in the massively parallel incompressible open-source CFD code Notus [3, 12–14].

## 2 Immersed Boundary Method for the Poisson Problem

In this section the finite-difference direct forcing and numerical discretization schemes are presented. For the sake of clarity, the discussions are focused on the canonical 2D Poisson problem as the extensions to 3D and vector flow fields, such as velocity  $\vec{u}$ , are straightforward.

### 2.1 Poisson Problem

Figure 1(a) shows an immersed boundary  $\Gamma$  that divides the 2D computational domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  into an inner domain  $\Omega_i$  and an outer domain  $\Omega_o$ . As a result, the constant coefficient Poisson problem for a scalar field  $\phi$  with a source field  $f$  consists in

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\phi &= f, & \text{in } \Omega_i, \\ \phi &= 0, & \text{in } \Omega_o, \\ \phi &= \phi_D, & \text{on } \partial\Omega_D \cup \Gamma_D, \\ \frac{\partial\phi}{\partial\vec{n}} &= \phi_N, & \text{on } \partial\Omega_N \cup \Gamma_N, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where  $\partial\Omega$  and  $\Gamma$  are split into the Dirichlet and Neumann parts, and  $\phi_D$  and  $\phi_N$  are the known Dirichlet and Neumann boundary conditions, respectively.




Figure 1: (a) Inner and outer computational domains,  $\Omega_i$  and  $\Omega_o$ , respectively, for an immersed boundary  $\Gamma$  with an outward pointing local surface unit normal  $\vec{n}$  and domain boundary conditions  $\partial\Omega$ . (b) Finite volume discretization of (a) and classification of cells into inner (triangle), outer (circle), and ghost (diamond) cells.

## 2.2 Numerical Methods

As shown in Figure 1(b), the computational domain is discretized, with a finite volume method approach, into a Cartesian grid of size  $m \times n$  with  $\Delta h_\iota$  being the cell size in direction  $\iota$  and is constant throughout the domain. The domain boundary conditions are implemented through  $c$  domain ghost nodes at each domain boundary such that the grid size becomes  $(m + 2c) \times (n + 2c)$ . Although the current article focuses on Cartesian grids, for sake of completeness the proposed methods are presented for the general case of rectilinear grids.

The discretized inner domain is solely composed of inner cells while, as seen from Figure 1(b), the discretized outer domain  $\Omega_o$  is further divided into ghost and outer cells. A ghost cell is a cell  $\mathbf{X}_{i,j}$  in  $\Omega_o$  such that at-least one of its non-diagonal neighboring cells is an inner cell while an outer cell is a cell in  $\Omega_o$  whose non-diagonal neighbors are in  $\Omega_o$ . For 2D computational domains, a cell  $\mathbf{X}_{i,j}$  in  $\Omega_o$  is considered a ghost node if  $\{\mathbf{X}_{i+1,j}, \mathbf{X}_{i-1,j}, \mathbf{X}_{i,j+1}, \mathbf{X}_{i,j-1}\} \cap \Omega_i \neq \emptyset$ .

The standard second-order central difference is used to discretize equation (1) over the inner computational domain yielding

$$\frac{\Phi_{i+1,j} - 2\Phi_{i,j} + \Phi_{i-1,j}}{\Delta h_x^2} + \frac{\Phi_{i,j+1} - 2\Phi_{i,j} + \Phi_{i,j-1}}{\Delta h_y^2} = F_{i,j} + O(\Delta h^2), \quad (2)$$

where  $\Phi_{i,j} = \phi(\mathbf{X}_{i,j})$ ,  $F_{i,j} = f(\mathbf{X}_{i,j})$ , and  $\Delta h = \max(\Delta h_\iota)$ . Taking into account the domain and immersed boundary conditions, equation (2) is rewritten in matrix form as

$$\left( (L + E + G + O)\Phi \right)_{i,j} = F_{i,j} + B_{i,j} + R_{i,j}, \quad (3)$$

where  $L$  is the coefficient matrix for the matrix form of equation (2) without boundary conditions,  $E$  is the coefficient matrix that takes into account the boundary conditions,  $G$  and  $O$  are the coefficient matrices that take into account the IBCs (ghost and outer nodes, respectively),  $B_{i,j}$  contains the boundary condition values, and  $R_{i,j}$  is the truncation term for the IBCs (presented in subsequent sections) and the spatial discretization of equation (2). It should be noted that  $F_{i,j} + B_{i,j} + R_{i,j} = 0$  and  $\Phi_{i,j}$  is equal to the trivial solution of zero  $\forall (i,j) \in C_o$ , where  $C_o$  is the set of outer cell indices. Removing the truncation term from equation (3) results in the closed linear system evaluated for the numerical solution  $\hat{\Phi}_{i,j} \forall (i,j) \in C_{igo}$ , where  $C_{igo}$  is the set of inner, ghost, and outer cell indices.

## 2.3 Linear Method

For an accurate implementation of the linear IBM at a ghost node  $\mathbf{X}_{i,j}$ , the scalar field value at the normal reflection of  $\mathbf{X}_{i,j}$  about  $\Gamma$ , denoted as the image point  $\mathbf{x}_{IP}$ , the Euclidean distances  $\Delta l = \|\mathbf{x}_{IP} - \mathbf{X}_{i,j}\|_2$  and  $\Delta l_h = \Delta l/2 = \|\mathbf{x}_{BI} - \mathbf{X}_{i,j}\|_2$ , the boundary condition at the boundary intercept  $\mathbf{x}_{BI}$  (the intersection point of the line segment  $[\mathbf{X}_{i,j}, \mathbf{x}_{IP}]$  and  $\Gamma$ ), and the local surface unit normal  $\vec{n}$  of  $\Gamma$  at  $\mathbf{x}_{BI}$  are needed. Figure 2 shows representative locations of these supplemental data points relative to each other.

The linear method implements the IBCs along the linear segment  $[\mathbf{X}_{i,j}, \mathbf{x}_{IP}]$  using second-order linear approximations and second-order central difference for Dirichlet and Neumann boundary conditions, respectively. As the image point is a normal reflection of the ghost node about the boundary point, the Dirichlet boundary condition follows

$$\phi_{BI} = \frac{\Phi_{i,j} + \phi_{IP}}{2} + O(\Delta l_h^2), \quad (4)$$




Figure 2: Close up view of supplemental data points and values required for the linear method for a sample ghost node  $\mathbf{X}_{i,j}$ . *BI*: Boundary intercept; *IP*: Image point;  $\vec{n}$ : local surface unit normal;  $\Delta l = \|\mathbf{x}_{IP} - \mathbf{X}_{i,j}\|_2$ ;  $\Delta l_h = \|\mathbf{X}_{i,j} - \mathbf{x}_{BI}\|_2 = \|\mathbf{x}_{IP} - \mathbf{x}_{BI}\|_2$ .

where  $\phi_\chi = \phi(\mathbf{x}_\chi)$  is the exact scalar field value of  $\phi$  at  $\mathbf{x}_\chi$ . The Neumann boundary condition is given by

$$\left(\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial n}\right)_{BI} = \frac{\phi_{IP} - \Phi_{i,j}}{\Delta l} + O(\Delta l_h^2), \quad (5)$$

where  $(\partial\phi/\partial n)_{BI} = \partial(\phi(\mathbf{x}_{BI}))/\partial n$  is the exact derivative of the scalar field at  $\mathbf{x}_{BI}$ . As shown in Figure 2, the location of the IP may not coincide with  $\mathbf{X}_{i,j} \forall (i,j) \in \Omega_i$  and therefore the value at  $\mathbf{x}_{IP}$  is obtained through a  $p$ -th order Lagrange interpolation using the scalar field values of the surrounding cells following

$$\phi_{IP} = \sum_{(k,l) \in I_P} \rho_{k,l} \Phi_{k,l} + O(\Delta h^p), \quad (6)$$

where  $\rho_{k,l}$  are the interpolation coefficients and  $I_P$  is the set of interpolation indices that may include the ghost node value  $\Phi_{i,j}$  and excludes any outer nodes. Further discussions on the set of interpolation indices are found in [3].

Combining equations (4) to (6) results in the following discretized numerical approximations of the boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{BI} &= \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{(k,l) \in I_P} \rho_{k,l} \Phi_{k,l} + \Phi_{i,j} \right) + O(\Delta l_h^2) + O(\Delta h^p), \\ \left(\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial n}\right)_{BI} &= \frac{1}{\Delta l} \left( \sum_{(k,l) \in I_P} \rho_{k,l} \Phi_{k,l} - \Phi_{i,j} \right) + O(\Delta l_h^2) + O(\Delta h^{p-1}). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

One of the major drawbacks of the linear IBM is the need for a large discretization stencil, even for cell size ratios  $a = \Delta h / \Delta \mu = 1$ , where  $\Delta \mu = \min(\Delta h_l)$ . The stencil size measurement metrics presented in [3] are also used in this article: Figure 3 shows the domains for the stencil sizes of 1 and 2. Picot and Glockner [3] showed that for the linear method for a cell size ratio  $a = 1$  (Cartesian grids) and a second-order Lagrange interpolation ( $p = 2$ ) the maximum stencil size is 2, as shown in Figure 4, which is larger than the stencil size for second-order central difference of the

Laplacian operator. As IBMs rely heavily on Cartesian grids with adaptive mesh refinement (AMR) to resolve flow features with large gradients, such as boundary layers, and geometrical features with large curvatures, such as the leading and trailing edges of wings, reducing the stencil size of the method to 1 may improve the precision and reduce the computational effort.




Figure 3: Interpolation quadrants (colored regions) and domains around  $\mathbf{X}_{i,j}$  of stencil size 1 and 2. Dashed blue line: stencil size of 1; Dashed orange line: stencil size of 2; Red region: Q1 interpolation quadrant; Blue region: Q2 interpolation quadrant; Orange region: Q3 interpolation quadrant; Green region: Q4 interpolation quadrant.

### 3 Linear Square Shifting Method

Despite the stencil size improvements of the shifted linear method for rectilinear grids [3], this method reverts back to the linear method for Cartesian grids and therefore does not address the reduction of the stencil size for square/cubic cells. A stencil size larger than 1 does not yield band matrices with 9 or 27 points in 2D or 3D, respectively, and as a result the more efficient geometric multi-grid algorithms, such as the SMG [15] and PFMG [16] in the *hypr* library [17, 18], cannot be used. Instead the more generic, and less efficient [3, 19–23], preconditioned algebraic multi-grid algorithms, such as BoomerAMG [19] in the *hypr* library, must be used.

The currently proposed square/cubic shifting method, denoted as *linear square shift*, with its several variations presented in this section focus on decreasing the maximum stencil sizes for Cartesian grids through various methods. Modifications to the IBM result in a set of supplemental interpolated data points needed for the proper implementation of the IBCs. For sake of clarity the various modified supplemental data points and values required for the linear square shift method are shown in Figure 5 and are defined, in a staggered manner, in the subsequent sections.

#### 3.1 Quadrant Intersection Point

As shown in Figure 5, for a ghost node with a stencil size of 2 the intersection of the line segment  $[\mathbf{X}_{i,j}, \mathbf{x}_{IP}]$  and the domain of stencil size of 1 corresponds to the quadrant intersection point (QIP)  $\mathbf{x}_{QIP}$ . In fact  $\mathbf{x}_{QIP}$  is the upper threshold for a maximum stencil size of 1 and therefore any point located at  $\mathbf{x}_{QIP} + \alpha'\vec{n}$ , for  $\alpha' > 0$ , is at a stencil size larger than 1.




Figure 4: Close up view of an image point interpolation set and stencil size for a ghost node for Cartesian grids. Solid orange line:  $\Gamma$ ; Dashed blue line: stencil size of 1; Dashed orange line: stencil size of 2; Dashed red line: interpolation set for enclosed image point; Black diamond: ghost node; Black circle: outer node; Black triangle: inner node; Black  $\times$ : image point.




Figure 5: Close up view of the supplemental data points and values required for the linear (L) and linear square shift methods for a sample ghost node  $\mathbf{X}_{i,j}$ .  $\mathbf{x}_{GP}$ : ghost point (ghost node shift);  $\mathbf{x}_{IP}$ : image point (L);  $\mathbf{x}_{IP'}$ : image point (ghost node shift);  $\mathbf{x}_{IP''}$  (not shown): image point (image point shift) and  $\mathbf{x}_{IP''}=\mathbf{x}_{IP'}$  in this figure;  $\mathbf{x}_{QIP}$ : quadrant intersection point;  $\Delta l$ :  $\|\mathbf{X}_{i,j} - \mathbf{x}_{IP}\|_2$  (L);  $\Delta l'$ :  $\|\mathbf{x}_{GP} - \mathbf{x}_{IP'}\|_2$  (ghost node shift);  $\Delta l''_1$ :  $\|\mathbf{X}_{i,j} - \mathbf{x}_{BI}\|_2$  (image point shift);  $\Delta l''_2$ :  $\|\mathbf{x}_{BI} - \mathbf{x}_{IP''}\|_2$  (image point shift).

Consider the boundary intercept  $\mathbf{x}_{BI}$ , its local surface unit normal  $\vec{n}$ , and the four quadrants used to determine the set of interpolation indices for the boundary intercept  $I_{BI}$  [3]. The four quadrants, shown in Figure 3, are determined by  $\vec{n}=(n_x, n_y)$  and are

- Quadrant 1 (Q1):  $n_x \geq 0$  &  $n_y \geq 0$ ,
- Quadrant 2 (Q2):  $n_x < 0$  &  $n_y \geq 0$ ,
- Quadrant 3 (Q3):  $n_x < 0$  &  $n_y < 0$ ,
- Quadrant 4 (Q4):  $n_x \geq 0$  &  $n_y < 0$ .

As the relative location of  $\mathbf{x}_{QIP}$ , and not its absolute location, is necessary to calculate  $\|\mathbf{x}_{BI}-\mathbf{x}_{QIP}\|_2$  for the linear square shift method, Q2 to Q4 may be subsequently transformed into Q1. This change in coordinate direction simplifies the algorithm used to determine the  $\mathbf{x}_{QIP}$ . As seen from Figure 6, in Q1 and for a local coordinate axis centered at  $\mathbf{x}_{BI}$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_{QIP}$  must lay on either the line segment  $[\mathbf{X}_{k,l}, \mathbf{X}_{k,l+1}]$  or the line segment  $[\mathbf{X}_{i,l+1}, \mathbf{X}_{k,l+1}]$ .




Figure 6: Close up view of possible quadrant intersection points  $\mathbf{x}_{QIP}$  for Q1 interpolation quadrant for a sample boundary intercept  $\mathbf{x}_{BI}$ . Solid orange line:  $\Gamma$ ; Dotted red line: Local axis  $(x', y')$  with origin at  $\mathbf{x}_{BI}$ ; Solid green vector: sample local surface unit normal to intersect line segments  $[\mathbf{X}_{i,l+1}, \mathbf{X}_{k,l+1}]$  and  $[\mathbf{X}_{k,l+1}, \mathbf{X}_{k,l}]$ ; Black diamond: ghost node; Black triangle: inner node.

Two different approaches are currently pursued to maintain a maximum stencil size of 1, such that

$$\|\mathbf{X}_{i,j} - \mathbf{x}_{IP}\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{X}_{i,j} - \mathbf{x}_{QIP}\|_2. \quad (8)$$

The first approach, denoted as *ghost node shift (GS)* shifts the ghost node such that the mirror image point satisfies equation (8), while the second approach satisfies equation (8) but solely shifting the image point and is called *image point shift (IS)*.

### 3.2 Ghost Node Shift (GS)

Considering the ghost node  $\mathbf{X}_{i,j}$ , defined in Section 2.2, and the quadrant intersection point  $\mathbf{x}_{QIP}$ , a supplemental interpolated ghost point  $\mathbf{x}_{GP}$  is defined as

$$\mathbf{x}_{GP} = \mathbf{x}_{BI} - s\vec{n}, \quad (9)$$

where  $s = \min\{\|\mathbf{x}_{BI} - \mathbf{X}_{i,j}\|_2, \alpha\|\mathbf{x}_{BI} - \mathbf{x}_{QIP}\|_2\}$ ,  $\|\mathbf{x}_{BI} - \mathbf{X}_{i,j}\|_2 = \Delta l_h$  as  $\mathbf{x}_{BI}$  is the midpoint of the line segment  $[\mathbf{X}_{i,j}, \mathbf{x}_{IP}]$ , and  $\alpha$  is a constant with a value between 0 and 1, inclusive. In this article we choose  $\alpha=1$ .

As seen from Figure 5, equation (9) shifts the ghost point  $\mathbf{x}_{GP}$  towards its boundary intercept  $\mathbf{x}_{BI}$  such that its image point  $\mathbf{x}_{IP'}$  is located inside Q1 with a maximum stencil size of 1. As the ghost node shift of the linear square shift method maintains  $\mathbf{x}_{BI}$  as the midpoint of the line segment  $[\mathbf{x}_{GP}, \mathbf{x}_{IP'}]$ , the general form of the discretized numerical approximations of the IBCs in equation (7) remains the same. However, as  $\mathbf{x}_{GP}$  is not a node value, an additional  $p$ -th order Lagrange interpolation is required and results in a new set of IBCs that follow

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{BI} &= \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{IP'}} \beta_{k,l} \Phi_{k,l} + \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{GP}} \gamma_{k,l} \Phi_{k,l} \right) + O(\Delta l_h'^2) + O(\Delta h^p), \\ \left( \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial n} \right)_{BI} &= \frac{1}{\Delta l'} \left( \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{IP'}} \beta_{k,l} \Phi_{k,l} - \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{GP}} \gamma_{k,l} \Phi_{k,l} \right) + O(\Delta l_h'^2) + O(\Delta h^{p-1}), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where  $\Delta l_h' = \Delta l'/2$ ,  $\gamma_{k,l}$ , and  $\beta_{k,l}$  are the interpolation coefficients for the  $\mathbf{x}_{GP}$  and  $\mathbf{x}_{IP'}$ , respectively, and  $I_{GP}$  and  $I_{IP'}$  are the set of interpolation indices for  $\mathbf{x}_{GP}$  and  $\mathbf{x}_{IP'}$ , respectively. It should be noted that based on the definition of  $\mathbf{x}_{GP}$  in equation (9), a maximum stencil size of 1 is guaranteed for  $p=2$ .

**Remark** It is interesting to notice that as  $\Delta l' \rightarrow 0$  ( $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ ), the ghost node shift of the linear square shift method becomes the IBM proposed by Coco and Russo [24], hereby denoted as *direct* method. Indeed, as at  $\Delta l'=0$ , the interpolation coefficients of the image and ghost points are the same and the Dirichlet IBC becomes

$$\phi_{BI} = \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{BI}} \rho_{k,l} \Phi_{k,l} + O(\Delta h^p), \quad (11)$$

which corresponds to the direct method.

For the Neumann IBC, as  $\Delta l' \rightarrow 0$  the error of the second-order central difference becomes increasingly negligible and the finite-difference approximation approaches the analytical partial differential equation  $\partial \phi / \partial n = \phi_n = \nabla \phi \cdot \vec{n}$ . Therefore, the Neumann IBC becomes

$$\left( \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial n} \right)_{BI} = \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{BI}} \left( \frac{\partial \rho_{k,l}}{\partial x} n_x + \frac{\partial \rho_{k,l}}{\partial y} n_y \right) \Phi_{k,l} + O(\Delta h^{p-1}), \quad (12)$$

which corresponds to the direct method.

### 3.3 Image Point Shift (IS)

Reductions to the maximum stencil size can also be achieved by solely shifting the location of the image point such that it is located inside Q1 for a stencil size of 1. Considering the image point

$\mathbf{x}_{IP}$ , defined in Section 2.3, and the quadrant intersection point  $\mathbf{x}_{QIP}$  a modified image point  $\mathbf{x}_{IP''}$  is defined as

$$\mathbf{x}_{IP''} = \mathbf{x}_{BI} + s' \vec{n}, \quad (13)$$

where  $s' = \min\{\|\mathbf{x}_{BI} - \mathbf{x}_{IP}\|_2, \alpha\|\mathbf{x}_{BI} - \mathbf{x}_{QIP}\|_2\}$  and  $\alpha$  is a constant with a value between 0 and 1, inclusive. In this article we choose  $\alpha=1$ . As seen from Figure 5, equation (9) shifts the image point  $\mathbf{x}_{IP}$  towards its boundary intercept  $\mathbf{x}_{BI}$  such that it is located inside Q1 with a maximum stencil size of 1 for  $p=2$ . This method differs from the ghost node shift method in that the ghost node  $\mathbf{X}_{i,j}$  is used and no supplemental ghost point  $\mathbf{x}_{GP}$  is required, and instead only the image point  $\mathbf{x}_{IP}$  is shifted to the new image point  $\mathbf{x}_{IP''}$  if it falls outside Q1.

In this method the boundary intercept  $\mathbf{x}_{BI}$  is no longer the midpoint of the line segment  $[\mathbf{X}_{i,j}, \mathbf{x}_{IP''}]$  and to take in account that  $\Delta l_1'' \neq \Delta l_2''$ , where  $\Delta l_1'' = \|\mathbf{X}_{i,j} - \mathbf{x}_{BI}\|_2$  and  $\Delta l_2'' = \|\mathbf{x}_{BI} - \mathbf{x}_{IP''}\|_2$ , linear interpolation is used to generalize equations (4) and (5) such that the generalized second-order Dirichlet boundary condition follows,

$$\phi_{BI} = \zeta \Phi_{i,j} + \eta \phi_{IP''} + O(\Delta l_1'' \Delta l_2''), \quad (14)$$

where  $\zeta = \Delta l_2'' / (\Delta l_1'' + \Delta l_2'')$  and  $\eta = \Delta l_1'' / (\Delta l_1'' + \Delta l_2'')$ . The generalized first-order Neumann boundary condition follows,

$$\left(\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial n}\right)_{BI} = \frac{\phi_{IP''} - \Phi_{i,j}}{\Delta l_1'' + \Delta l_2''} + O(\Delta l_1'' |1 - r_{\Delta l}|) + O(\Delta l_3''), \quad (15)$$

where  $r_{\Delta l} = \Delta l_2'' / \Delta l_1''$  and has a values between 0 and 1, inclusive, and  $\Delta l_3'' = \Delta l_1''^2 |r_{\Delta l}^2 - r_{\Delta l} + 1|$ . Considering the generalized Dirichlet and Neumann boundary conditions, equations (14) and (15), respectively, the discretized numerical approximations of the IBCs for the image point shift of the linear square shift method follow

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{BI} &= \zeta \Phi_{i,j} + \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{IP''}} \eta \beta_{k,l} \Phi_{k,l} + O(\Delta l_1'' \Delta l_2'') + O(\Delta h^p), \\ \left(\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial n}\right)_{BI} &= \frac{1}{\Delta l_1'' + \Delta l_2''} \left( \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{IP''}} \beta_{k,l} \Phi_{k,l} - \Phi_{i,j} \right) + O(\Delta l_1'' |1 - r_{\Delta l}|) + O(\Delta l_3'') + O(\Delta h^{p-1}). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Similar to the ghost node shift of the linear square shift, based on the definition of the  $\mathbf{x}_{IP''}$  in equation (13), a maximum stencil size of 1 is guaranteed for  $p=2$ .

## 4 Quadratic Ghost Node Method

In this section accuracy improvements to the linear and ghost square shift methods through quadratic interpolation, denoted as the *quadratic* method, are presented. Although quadratic interpolation to increase the accuracy of the ghost node interpolation has been previously implemented for Dirichlet and Neumann IBCs, as discussed in Section 1, a detailed analysis of these benefits and its use in conjunction with the square shift methods have not yet been pursued. Figure 7, shows representative locations for the supplemental data points, including the second image point  $\mathbf{x}_{IP2}$ , for the quadratic method.




Figure 7: Close up view of the supplemental data points and values required for the quadratic methods for a sample ghost node  $\mathbf{X}_{i,j}$ . *BI*: Boundary intercept; *IP*: Image point; *IP2*: Second image point;  $\vec{n}$ : local surface unit normal.

Considering the boundary intercept  $\mathbf{x}_{BI}$ , its local surface unit normal  $\vec{n}$ , and the image point  $\mathbf{x}_{IP}$ , the second image point  $\mathbf{x}_{IP2}$  required for the current quadratic interpolation follows

$$\mathbf{x}_{IP2} = \mathbf{x}_{BI} + 3\Delta l_h \vec{n}. \quad (17)$$

The generalized Dirichlet, equation (14), is extended to the quadratic method and becomes

$$\phi_{BI} = \lambda\phi_{IP2} + \eta\phi_{IP} + \zeta\Phi_{i,j} + O(\Delta l_h^3) + O(\Delta h^p), \quad (18)$$

where  $\zeta$ ,  $\eta$ , and  $\lambda$  are the coefficients obtained from the 1D  $p$ -th order Lagrange interpolation. The generalized Neumann boundary condition, equation (15), is extended to the quadratic method through the use of second-order one-sided finite-difference and 1D third-order Lagrange interpolation ( $p=3$ ) [8]. As the Neumann IBC at  $\mathbf{x}_{BI}$  are known, the second-order forward finite-difference, which follows

$$\left(\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial n}\right)_{BI} = \frac{-\phi_{IP2}(\mathbf{x}_{IP} - \mathbf{x}_{BI})^2 + \phi_{IP}(\mathbf{x}_{IP2} - \mathbf{x}_{BI})^2 - \phi_{BI}[(\mathbf{x}_{IP2} - \mathbf{x}_{BI})^2 - (\mathbf{x}_{IP} - \mathbf{x}_{BI})^2]}{(\mathbf{x}_{IP} - \mathbf{x}_{BI})(\mathbf{x}_{IP2} - \mathbf{x}_{BI})(\mathbf{x}_{IP2} - \mathbf{x}_{IP})} + O(\Delta l_h^2), \quad (19)$$

is used to determine the value of the scalar field value at  $\mathbf{x}_{BI}$ , which is subsequently used to determine the value of the scalar field at the ghost node through equation (18). The discretized numerical approximations of the Dirichlet and Neumann IBCs therefore become

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi_{BI} &= \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{IP2}} \lambda \rho_{k,l} \Phi_{k,l} + \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{IP}} \eta \beta_{k,l} \Phi_{k,l} + \zeta \Phi_{i,j} + O(\Delta l_h^3) + O(\Delta h^p), \\
\left(\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial n}\right)_{BI} &= \sigma \left( - [(\mathbf{x}_{IP2} - \mathbf{x}_{BI})^2 - (\mathbf{x}_{IP} - \mathbf{x}_{BI})^2] \phi_{BI} - \right. \\
&\quad \left. (\mathbf{x}_{IP} - \mathbf{x}_{BI})^2 \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{IP2}} \rho_{k,l} \Phi_{k,l} + (\mathbf{x}_{IP2} - \mathbf{x}_{BI})^2 \sum_{(k,l) \in I_{IP}} \beta_{k,l} \Phi_{k,l} \right) + O(\Delta l_h^2) + O(\Delta h^{p-1}),
\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

where  $\sigma = 1/(\mathbf{x}_{IP} - \mathbf{x}_{BI})(\mathbf{x}_{IP2} - \mathbf{x}_{BI})(\mathbf{x}_{IP2} - \mathbf{x}_{IP})$ .

As shown in Figure 8, a ghost node  $\mathbf{X}_{i,j}$  with a stencil size of 2 with the linear method may need a stencil size of 3 for the quadratic method. To maintain a maximum stencil size of 2, the image point shift is re-purposed for the second image point such that

$$\mathbf{x}_{IP2} = \mathbf{x}_{BI} + s^* \vec{n}, \tag{21}$$

where  $s^* = \min\{\|\mathbf{x}_{BI} - \mathbf{x}_{IP2}\|_2, \alpha \|\mathbf{x}_{BI} - \mathbf{x}_{QIP2}\|_2\}$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_{QIP2}$  is the QIP for a stencil size of 2 (shown as the dashed red region in Figure 8), and  $\alpha$  is a constant with a value between 0 and 1, inclusive. In this article we choose  $\alpha = 1$ .

**Remark** The set of interpolation indices for the first and second image points may differ [6–8], potentially increasing the accuracy of the solution [9]. This is accomplished by again re-purposing the image point shift and using the following algorithm:

1.  $\|\mathbf{x}_{IP} - \mathbf{X}_{i,j+1}\|_c \leq 1$  &  $1 < \|\mathbf{x}_{IP2} - \mathbf{X}_{i,j+1}\|_c \leq 2$ ; **return**
2.  $\|\mathbf{x}_{IP} - \mathbf{X}_{i,j+1}\|_c \leq 1$  &  $\|\mathbf{x}_{IP2} - \mathbf{X}_{i,j+1}\|_c \leq 1$ 
  - $\mathbf{x}_{IP2} = \mathbf{x}_{BI} + s^{**} \mathbf{n}$ ,  $s^{**} = (2 - \alpha) \times \|\mathbf{x}_{BI} - \mathbf{x}_{QIP1}\|_2$ ;  $\alpha > 0$  and  $\alpha < 1$
3.  $1 < \|\mathbf{x}_{IP} - \mathbf{X}_{i,j+1}\|_c \leq 2$  &  $1 < \|\mathbf{x}_{IP2} - \mathbf{X}_{i,j+1}\|_c \leq 2$ 
  - $\mathbf{x}_{IP}$  follows equation (13)
  - $\mathbf{x}_{IP2}$  follows equation (21)

where the stencil norm  $\|x\|_c = \max\left\{\frac{|x|}{\Delta x_1}, \frac{|y|}{\Delta x_2}\right\}$  is used to determine the stencil as  $c_{i,j} = \max\{\|X_{k,l} - X_{i,j}\|_c \mid \forall (k,l) \in C_{ig}, L_{i,j}^{k,l} \neq 0\}$  [3].

As the definition of the second image point is based on the location of the boundary intercept, local surface unit normal, and first image point, the quadratic method is straightforwardly used in conjunction with the square shift method. To this end the appropriate boundary intercepts, first image points, and local surface unit normals associated with the ghost point/node in the square shift method must be used in equations (17) to (21).




Figure 8: Close up view of the supplemental data points and values required for the quadratic shift method for the sample ghost nodes  $\mathbf{X}_{i,j}$  and  $\mathbf{X}_{i,j+1}$ ;  $\mathbf{x}_{BI}$ : Boundary intercept;  $\mathbf{x}_{IP}$ : Image point;  $\mathbf{x}_{IP2}$ : Second image point;  $\mathbf{x}_{IP2}^*$ : Shifted second image point;  $\mathbf{x}_{QIP\Lambda}$ : quadrant intersection point for stencil size of  $\Lambda$ ;  $\vec{n}$ : local surface unit normal; Dashed red region: stencil size of 2 for  $\mathbf{X}_{i,j}$ ; Dashed green region: stencil size of 2 for  $\mathbf{X}_{i,j+1}$ ; Solid orange line:  $\Gamma$ . For plotting purposes for the ghost node  $\mathbf{X}_{i,j}$  the distance  $\|\mathbf{x}_{BI} - \mathbf{x}_{IP2}\|_2 < 3\Delta l_h$ .

## 5 Numerical Simulations for a Scalar Field

In this section the results of numerical simulations for the canonical 2D and 3D Poisson test problems with mixed domain boundary conditions and Dirichlet or Neumann IBCs for various immersed boundaries and IBMs are discussed. The nine IBMs used for the current verification and convergence studies are:

- L: linear method [4] (stencil size of 2),
- LGS: ghost node linear square shift method (stencil size of 1),
- LIS: image point linear square shift method (stencil size of 1),
- QX: quadratic ghost point with  $X \in \{GS, IS\}$  (stencil size of 2),
- QYO: quadratic ghost point with  $Y \in \{GS\}$  with different interpolation indices for  $\mathbf{x}_{IP}$  and  $\mathbf{x}_{IP2}$  (stencil size of 2),
- QISS1: quadratic ghost point with image point shift for a maximum stencil size of 1 (stencil size of 1).

For sake of clarity and compactness, the results for select representative methods are presented and discussed with appropriate comments on the results of the remaining methods. The set of representative methods depends on the analytical solution of the Poisson problem and the immersed boundary.

As the analytical solution to equation (3) with appropriate boundary conditions and source field can be determined, the  $L^\infty$  and  $L^2$  norms of the error fields are evaluated and follow,

$$L^\infty(\Phi_e) = \max(|\Phi_e|) \quad \forall(i, j) \in C_i, \quad L^2(\Phi_e) = \sqrt{\sum_{i,j} |\Phi_e|^2 V_{i,j}} \quad \forall(i, j) \in C_i, \quad (22)$$

where  $\Phi_e = \hat{\Phi}_{i,j} - \Phi_{i,j}$  is the error field and  $V_{i,j}$  is the inner volume of an inner cell, i.e. only the part of an inner cell that is located inside  $\Omega_i$ .

The numerical simulations have a computational domain of  $\Omega = [-1, 1]^\varsigma$  and  $\Omega = [0, 1]^\varsigma$ , where  $\varsigma$  is the number of spatial dimensions, for numerical simulations with parabolic and trigonometric analytical solutions, respectively. Dirichlet boundary conditions are used for the  $x$ -axis domain boundaries and Neumann boundary conditions are used for the remaining domain boundaries. Figure 9 shows the immersed boundaries  $\Gamma$ s are the canonical circle and sphere with a radius  $r = 0.325L_x$ , where  $L_x$  is the length of the  $x$ -axis domain edge, and the more complex, with convex and concave corners, flower-shaped geometries, denoted as *flower*, that follow

- 2D [3, 25]:  $(0.02\sqrt{5}, 0.02\sqrt{5}) + (0.5 + 0.2\sin(5\theta))e_r \quad \forall \theta \in [0, 2\pi]$ ,
- 3D:  $(\kappa x^2 + y^2 + z^2 = r_f^2) \cup (x^2 + \kappa y^2 + z^2 = r_f^2) \cup (x^2 + y^2 + \kappa z^2 = r_f^2)$ ,

where  $r_f = 0.40$  and  $\kappa = 0.185$  is the stretching constant and the centers of the immersed boundaries are at the centers of the computational domains. The Cartesian grid sizes considered are  $(16\nu)^\varsigma$ , where  $\nu = 2^{n-1}$  and  $n$  is the grid number in the grid convergence studies (i.e. first grid:  $n = 1$ , second grid:  $n = 2$ , etc.).

**Remark** The second-order linear interpolations and first-order central difference of the LGS and LIS for Dirichlet and Neumann IBCs, respectively, and stencil size requirements of the quadratic methods limit the use of third-order Lagrange interpolations ( $p=3$ ) to the QISS1 method only. As a result, unless stated otherwise second-order Lagrange interpolations ( $p=2$ ) are used to determine the value at the various image and ghost points.

## 5.1 Dirichlet IBCs

Dirichlet IBCs for parabolic and trigonometric analytical solutions are taken into account for the current series of verification and convergence studies. Calculating and keeping the appropriate values of  $R_{i,j}$  in equation (3) to remove all non-IBM truncation errors, denoted as *numerical correction*, is necessary for a complete analysis of the accuracy and convergence of IBMs [3], and will therefore be pursued. For sake of clarity, the results for select representative immersed boundaries for either a parabolic or a trigonometric analytic solution are presented and discussed in this section.

### 5.1.1 Parabolic Solution

One of the analytical solutions to the 3D Poisson problem follows

$$\phi(\mathbf{x}) = (1 + x)^2, \quad f(\mathbf{x}) = -2, \quad \forall(\mathbf{x}) \in \Omega_i \in \mathbb{R}^3, \quad (23)$$

given that




Figure 9: Computational domain for (a) circle, (b) 2D flower, (c) sphere, and (d) 3D flower immersed boundaries  $\Gamma$ s for (a,b) 2D and (c,d) 3D verification test problems with a parabolic analytical solution. Solid orange line/surface:  $\Gamma$ ;  $r$ : radius.

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi(\mathbf{x}) &= (1+x)^2 & \forall(\mathbf{x}) \in \Gamma, \\
\phi(-1, y, z) &= 0, \quad \phi(1, y, z) = 4 & \forall(y, z) \in [-1, 1], \\
\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial n}(x, -1, z) &= 0, \quad \frac{\partial\phi}{\partial n}(x, 1, z) = 0 & \forall(x, z) \in [-1, 1], \\
\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial n}(x, y, -1) &= 0, \quad \frac{\partial\phi}{\partial n}(x, y, 1) = 0 & \forall(x, y) \in [-1, 1],
\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

where numerical corrections are applied to the  $x$ -axis domain boundary conditions [3]. The analytical solution for the corresponding 2D Poisson problem follows equation (23) with the appropriate 2D source term (e.g.  $f(x, y) = -2$ ) and boundary conditions.

### 5.1.2 Trigonometric Solution

A second analytical solution to the Poisson problem is

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi(\mathbf{x}) &= \sin(\pi x)\cos(2\pi y), \quad f(\mathbf{x}) = -5\pi^2\sin(\pi x)\cos(2\pi y) & \forall(\mathbf{x}) \in \Omega_i \in \mathbb{R}^2, \\
\phi(\mathbf{x}) &= \sin(\pi x)\cos(2\pi y)\cos(2\pi z), \quad f(\mathbf{x}) = -9\pi^2\sin(\pi x)\cos(2\pi y)\cos(2\pi z) & \forall(\mathbf{x}) \in \Omega_i \in \mathbb{R}^3,
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

given that

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi(\mathbf{x}) &= \sin(\pi x)\cos(2\pi y) & \forall(\mathbf{x}) \in \Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^2, \\
\phi(0, y) &= 0, \quad \phi(1, y) = 0 & \forall(y) \in [0, 1], \\
\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial n}(x, 0) &= 0, \quad \frac{\partial\phi}{\partial n}(x, 1) = 0 & \forall(x) \in [0, 1], \\
\phi(\mathbf{x}) &= \sin(\pi x)\cos(2\pi y)\cos(2\pi z) & \forall(\mathbf{x}) \in \Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^3, \\
\phi(0, y, z) &= 0, \quad \phi(1, y, z) = 0 & \forall(y, z) \in [0, 1], \\
\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial n}(x, 0, z) &= 0, \quad \frac{\partial\phi}{\partial n}(x, 1, z) = 0 & \forall(x, z) \in [0, 1], \\
\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial n}(x, y, 0) &= 0, \quad \frac{\partial\phi}{\partial n}(x, y, 1) = 0 & \forall(x, y) \in [0, 1],
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

where numerical corrections are not needed for any of the domain boundary conditions.

### 5.1.3 Reduce Stencil Size to 1

Figure 10 shows the  $L^\infty$  and  $L^2$  norms of  $\Phi_e$  for various immersed boundaries for the Poisson problem with parabolic and trigonometric analytical solutions for the LGS and LIS methods and, as expected, they have a second-order limiting behavior. As seen from Figure 10(a), the LGS and LIS methods are more accurate than the L method, yield a more consistent second-order limiting behavior (especially for  $L^\infty$ ), and may be used interchangeably (i.e. negligible differences in the accuracy of the results). This similarity is attributed to the similar impact of the interpolation truncation errors of the ghost point in the LGS method and Dirichlet IBCs for the LIS method. For the LIS method  $X_{i,j} = \mathbf{x}_{GP}$  and, therefore, uses one Lagrange interpolation less than the LGS

method, but as  $\Delta l_1'' + \Delta l_2'' > \Delta l'$  the interpolation error associated with the Dirichlet IBCs is larger for the LIS method than the LGS method.

As seen from Figure 10(b), for the sphere immersed boundaries the improvements in accuracy in the  $L^\infty$  and  $L^2$  norms previously seen are increased and reduced, respectively. This behavior is not unique to the sphere immersed boundaries and is characteristic to all comparisons between 2D and 3D verification cases as it is also observed in the comparison of the error norms between the 2D and 3D flower immersed boundaries for a parabolic analytical solution (not shown). Despite this slight decrease in accuracy for the  $L^2$  norm for all 3D immersed boundaries currently considered, the LGS and LIS methods still yield results with significantly smaller maximum errors and have a maximum stencil size of 1.

Figure 10(c) shows that for a 3D flower immersed boundary with a trigonometric analytical solution the LGS and LIS methods only slightly improve the accuracy of the  $L^\infty$  norm, yield a  $L^\infty$  norm with a more consistent second-order limiting behavior, and have little to no impact on the  $L^2$  norm. This behavior is not unique to the 3D flower immersed boundary and is present for all comparisons between parabolic and trigonometric analytical solutions. It should be noted that despite the limited accuracy improvements of the LGS and LIS methods for the 3D flower immersed boundary for a trigonometric analytical solution, these methods have a maximum stencil size of 1.




Figure 10:  $L^\infty$  and  $L^2$  norms of  $\Phi_e$  for various IBMs for a (a) 2D flower, (b) sphere, and (c) 3D flower immersed boundary with Dirichlet IBC for a (a,b) parabolic and (c) trigonometric analytical solution. Black solid line: L; Blue dashed line: LGS; Orange dotted line: LIS;  $N$ : number of cells in the  $x$ -axis; Diamond symbols:  $L^\infty$  norm; Circle symbols:  $L^2$  norm. The  $L^2$  norms are shifted downwards by factor of 10 for ease of reading.

*Conclusion:* Although for Dirichlet IBCs the LGS and LIS methods result in, at best, signif-

icantly smaller error norms, and, at worst, negligible improvements these methods tend to yield error norms with a more consistent second-order limiting behavior, compared to the L method, and have a maximum stencil size of 1, whereas the L method has a maximum stencil size of 2.

#### 5.1.4 Improved Accuracy with the Quadratic Method

In this section the improvements to the accuracy of the numerical solutions obtained with the quadratic and square shift methods in conjunction with the quadratic method for various immersed boundaries for Poisson problems with parabolic and trigonometric analytical solutions are presented.

**QX Methods** Figure 11 shows the  $L^\infty$  and  $L^2$  norms of  $\Phi_e$  for various immersed boundaries for a Poisson problem with parabolic and trigonometric analytical solutions for the Q, QGS, and QIS methods (denoted as the QX methods) and, as expected, have a second-order limiting behavior. As seen from Figure 11(a), for the same stencil size of 2 the QX methods are more accurate than the L method, and similar to the errors norms for the LGS and LIS methods, the QGS and QIS methods yield more consistent second-order limiting behaviors (especially for  $L^\infty$ ) and may be used interchangeably. As seen by comparing the QX methods in Figures 11(a) and 11(b), the Q method is least adept at smoothing out the less consistent second-order convergence of the L method, yields the largest errors norms, and cannot be used interchangeably with the QGS or QIS methods.

The trends observed in Figures 11(a) and 11(b) are also observed for all immersed boundaries and for the parabolic and trigonometric analytical solutions except for the 3D flower immersed boundary for a parabolic analytical solution, shown in Figure 11(c). For this verification case the QX methods, which have the same stencil size of 2 as the L method, are more accurate than the L method, yield a slightly more consistent second-order behavior, and may be used interchangeably.

**Different Image Points Interpolation Sets** Figure 12(a) shows the  $L^\infty$  and  $L^2$  norms of  $\Phi_e$  for a circle immersed boundary for a Poisson problem with a parabolic analytical solution for QX and QYO methods, where the image points have different sets of interpolation indices. As seen by comparing the Q and QO methods, and the QGS and QGSO methods, the QYO methods do not results in a more accurate solution and as they may be used interchangeably with the QX methods all comparison in Section 5.1.4 are applicable to the QYO methods.

**Quadratic Method with Stencil Size of 1** Figures 12(b) and 12(c) show the  $L^\infty$  and  $L^2$  norms of  $\Phi_e$  for 2D flower and sphere immersed boundaries, respectively, for a Poisson problem with trigonometric analytical solution for the QIS and QISS1 methods. Although the QISS1 method with a maximum stencil size of 1 is more accurate and yields a more consistent second-order limiting behavior compared to the L method, it is marginally less accurate than the QIS method with a maximum stencil size of 2. It should be noted that the QISS1 method is a viable alternative to the QIS method as the slightly larger error norms of the former, compared to the latter, is accompanied by significant performance gains associated with its stencil size of 1.

**Third-Order Lagrange Interpolation** Although the  $L^\infty$  and  $L^2$  norms have a second-order convergence, the numerical error field for the parabolic analytical solution is not on the order of machine epsilon due to the linear interpolation used at the domain boundary conditions and the second-order Lagrange interpolations ( $p=2$ ) used for the ghost and image points. However, for the Poisson problem with the parabolic analytical solution, the combined used of the QISS1 method,




Figure 11:  $L^\infty$  and  $L^2$  norms of  $\Phi_e$  for various IBMs for a (a) circle, (b) sphere, and (c) 3D flower immersed boundary with Dirichlet IBC for a (a,b) trigonometric and (c) parabolic analytical solution. Black solid line: L; Red solid line: Q; Blue dotted line: QGS; Grey dashed line: QIS;  $N$ : number of cells in the  $x$ -axis; Diamond symbols:  $L^\infty$  norm; Circle symbols:  $L^2$  norm. The  $L^2$  norms are shifted downwards by factor of 10 for ease of reading. Blue dotted line and grey dashed line are superimposed on each other in (b) and (c).




Figure 12:  $L^\infty$  and  $L^2$  norms of  $\Phi_e$  for various IBMs for a (a) circle, (b) 2D flower, and (c) sphere immersed boundary with Dirichlet IBC for a (a) parabolic and (b,c) trigonometric analytical solution. Black solid line: L; Red solid line: Q; Grey dotted line: QO; Blue dashed line: QGS; Green dotted line: QGSO; Blue dotted line: QIS; Purple dashed line: QISS1;  $N$ : number of cells in the  $x$ -axis; Diamond symbols:  $L^\infty$ ; Circle symbols:  $L^2$  norms. The  $L^2$  norms are shifted downwards by factor of 10 for ease of reading.

third-order Lagrange interpolations ( $p=3$ ), and extending the quadratic method with second-order Lagrange interpolations ( $p=2$ ) to the domain boundaries yields error fields with values on the order of machine epsilon. As seen from Figure 13, the QISS1 method and  $p=3$  for equation (20) not only significantly increase the accuracy of the numerical solution regardless of the Poisson analytical solution, but also improves the order of convergence of the IBM to third-order (appropriate numerical corrections are used to isolate the IBM truncation errors). This behavior is expected as equation (20) now has a truncation error on the order of  $\max(O(\Delta l_h^3), O(\Delta h^3))$ .




Figure 13:  $L^\infty$  and  $L^2$  norms of  $\Phi_e$  for a (a) circle and a (b) sphere immersed boundary with Dirichlet IBC and trigonometric analytical solution. Black line:  $p=2$  ; Red line:  $p=3$ ;  $N$ : number of cells in the  $x$ -axis; Diamond symbols:  $L^\infty$  norm; Circle symbols:  $L^2$  norm. The  $L^2$  norms are shifted downwards by factor of 10 for ease of reading.

**Conclusion** For Dirichlet IBCs and a maximum stencil size of 1, the proposed shifted linear methods (LGS and LIS) result in a numerical solution with the smallest  $L^\infty$  and  $L^2$  norms for all immersed boundaries and analytical solutions currently considered, except for sphere immersed boundary with trigonometric analytical solution wherein the QISS1 method is slightly more accurate. These methods are also more accurate than the standard linear method and, as they have a smaller stencil size, yield more computationally efficient band matrices.

For Dirichlet IBCs and a maximum stencil size of 2, the proposed quadratic shifted methods (QGS and QIS) result in a numerical solution with the smallest  $L^\infty$  and  $L^2$  norms for all current verification cases. Given that the standard linear and QX methods have the same maximum stencil size of 2, the latter methods increase the accuracy of the solution without any significant

performance penalties. It should be noted that methods that use different interpolation sets (QYO) have negligible differences with the QX methods. As expected the QGS and QIS methods are more accurate than the LGS and LIS methods for all verification cases currently considered. By increasing the maximum stencil size of the QISS1 method from 1 to 2, through the use of third-order Lagrange interpolations ( $p=3$ ), a more accurate numerical solution with an improved order of convergence of the  $L^\infty$  and  $L^2$  norms of three is obtained without any significant performance penalty.

## 5.2 Neumann IBCs

Neumann IBCs for parabolic and trigonometric analytical solutions are also taken into account for the current series of verification and convergence studies. Similar to Dirichlet IBCs, numerical correction is taken into account to emphasise the accuracy of the IBMs currently considered.

### 5.2.1 Parabolic Solution

The analytical solution of the current 3D Poisson problem follows

$$\phi(\mathbf{x}) = (1+x)^2, \quad f(\mathbf{x}) = -2, \quad \forall(\mathbf{x}) \in \Omega_i, \quad (27)$$

given that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial\phi}{\partial n}(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{2x(1+x)}{\sqrt{x^2+y^2+z^2}} & \forall(\mathbf{x}) &\in \Gamma, \\ \phi(-1, y, z) &= 0, \quad \phi(1, y, z) = 4 & \forall(y, z) &\in [-1, 1], \\ \frac{\partial\phi}{\partial n}(x, -1, z) &= 0, \quad \frac{\partial\phi}{\partial n}(x, 1, z) = 0 & \forall(x, z) &\in [-1, 1], \\ \frac{\partial\phi}{\partial n}(x, y, -1) &= 0, \quad \frac{\partial\phi}{\partial n}(x, y, 1) = 0 & \forall(x, y) &\in [-1, 1], \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where numerical corrections only need to be applied to the  $x$ -axis domain boundary conditions [3]. The analytical solution for the corresponding 2D Poisson problem follows equation (28) with the appropriate 2D source term and boundary conditions (e.g.  $\partial\phi(\mathbf{x})/\partial n = 2x(1+x)/\sqrt{x^2+y^2}$ ).

### 5.2.2 Trigonometric Solution

A second analytical solution to the Poisson problem is

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(\mathbf{x}) &= \sin(\pi x)\cos(2\pi y), \quad f(\mathbf{x}) = -5\pi^2\sin(\pi x)\cos(2\pi y) & \forall(\mathbf{x}) &\in \Omega_i \in \mathbb{R}^2, \\ \phi(\mathbf{x}) &= \sin(\pi x)\cos(2\pi y)\cos(2\pi z), \quad f(\mathbf{x}) = -9\pi^2\sin(\pi x)\cos(2\pi y)\cos(2\pi z) & \forall(\mathbf{x}) &\in \Omega_i \in \mathbb{R}^3, \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

given that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial n}(\mathbf{x}) &= \pi \cos(\pi x) \cos(2\pi y) n_x - & \forall(\mathbf{x}) & \in \Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^2, \\
& 2\pi \sin(\pi x) \sin(2\pi y) n_y & & \\
\phi(0, y) = 0, \quad \phi(1, y) = 0 & & \forall(y) & \in [0, 1], \\
\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial n}(x, 0) = 0, \quad \frac{\partial\phi}{\partial n}(x, 1) = 0 & & \forall(x) & \in [0, 1], \\
\\
\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial n}(\mathbf{x}) &= \pi \cos(\pi x) \cos(2\pi y) \cos(2\pi z) n_x - & & (30) \\
& 2\pi \sin(\pi x) \sin(2\pi y) \cos(2\pi z) n_y - \\
& 2\pi \sin(\pi x) \cos(2\pi y) \sin(2\pi z) n_z & \forall(\mathbf{x}) & \in \Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^3, \\
\phi(0, y, z) = 0, \quad \phi(1, y, z) = 0 & & \forall(y, z) & \in [0, 1], \\
\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial n}(x, 0, z) = 0, \quad \frac{\partial\phi}{\partial n}(x, 1, z) = 0 & & \forall(x, z) & \in [0, 1], \\
\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial n}(x, y, 0) = 0, \quad \frac{\partial\phi}{\partial n}(x, y, 1) = 0 & & \forall(x, y) & \in [0, 1],
\end{aligned}$$

where  $n_x$ ,  $n_y$ , and  $n_z$  are the local surface unit normals in the  $x$ ,  $y$ , and  $z$ -direction, respectively, and numerical corrections are not needed for any of the domain boundary conditions.

For an appropriate comparison with the results obtained with the first-order LIS method for Neumann IBCs, second-order Lagrange interpolations ( $p=2$ ) for the ghost and image points are considered. As seen from equation (7), for Neumann IBCs a first-order limiting behavior is expected for second-order Lagrange interpolations.

### 5.2.3 Reduce Stencil Size to 1

Figure 14 shows the  $L^\infty$  and  $L^2$  norms of  $\Phi_e$  for a circle and sphere immersed boundary for a Poisson problem with the parabolic analytical solution for the LGS and LIS methods, and, as expected, have a first-order limiting behavior. Similar to the results for Dirichlet IBCs, the LGS and LIS methods may be used interchangeably (i.e. negligible differences in the accuracy of the results). The LGS and LIS methods also yield the same  $L^\infty$  norms and slightly smaller  $L^2$  norms compared to the L method. It should be noted that although the increase in accuracy obtained with the linear square shift methods for the parabolic analytical solution with Neumann IBCs is smaller than those obtained with their Dirichlet IBCs counterpart, the maximum stencil size of 1 of these methods lead to better performances compared to the maximum stencil size of 2 of the L method.

Figure 15 shows that for a circle and a sphere immersed boundary for a Poisson problem with a trigonometric analytical solution the  $L^\infty$  and  $L^2$  norms of  $\Phi_e$  for the LGS and LIS methods have between first and second-order limiting behavior. Unlike the behavior for a parabolic analytical solution with Neumann IBCs, for a trigonometric analytical solution the LGS and LIS methods are more accurate than the L method, increase the order of convergence from 1 to approximately 1.5 for a circle immersed boundary, and yield a more consistent first-order limiting behavior for a sphere immersed boundary (especially the LGS method). Although the LGS and LIS methods may




Figure 14:  $L^\infty$  and  $L^2$  norms of  $\Phi_e$  for various IBMs for a (a) circle and a (b) sphere immersed boundary with Neumann IBC. Black solid line: L; Blue dashed line: LGS; Orange dotted line: LIS;  $N$ : number of cells in the  $x$ -axis; Diamond symbols:  $L^\infty$  norm; Circle symbols:  $L^2$  norm. The  $L^2$  norms are shifted downwards by factor of 10 for ease of reading.

only be used interchangeably for a circle immersed boundary, the differences in the errors norms between the two methods for a sphere immersed boundary are limited.




Figure 15:  $L^\infty$  and  $L^2$  norms of  $\Phi_e$  for various IBMs for a (a) circle and a (b) sphere immersed boundary with Neumann IBC and trigonometric analytical solution. Black solid line: L; Blue dashed line: LGS; Orange dotted line: LIS;  $N$ : number of cells in the  $x$ -axis; Diamond symbols:  $L^\infty$ ; Circle symbols:  $L^2$  norms. The  $L^2$  norms are shifted downwards by factor of 10 for ease of reading.

#### 5.2.4 Improved Accuracy with the Quadratic Method

In this section the improvements to the accuracy of the numerical solutions obtained with the quadratic and square shift methods in conjunction with the quadratic method for various immersed boundaries for Poisson problems with parabolic and trigonometric analytical solutions are presented.

**QX Methods** Similar to the linear square shift methods for Neumann IBCs, the QX methods yield the same  $L^\infty$  as the L method and only the QGS method yields slightly smaller values for the  $L^2$  norm. As a result, the  $L^\infty$  and  $L^2$  norms of  $\Phi_e$  for the circle and sphere immersed boundaries for a Poisson problem with the parabolic analytical solution for the QX methods with Neumann IBCs have a first-order limiting behavior. The limited improvement in the accuracy of the results despite using the quadratic method is attributed to the large first-order truncation error of the second-order Lagrange interpolations for Neumann IBCs which masks any accuracy gains associated with the quadratic method. It should be noted that as the grid size increases the QGS method yields slightly more accurate results than the QIS method (and by extension the Q method).

Figure 11 shows the  $L^\infty$  and  $L^2$  norms of  $\Phi_e$  for a circle and a sphere immersed boundary for a Poisson problem with a trigonometric analytical solution for the Q, QGS, and QIS methods and have a first-order limiting behavior, except for the QGS method which increases the order of convergence from 1 to 1.6. Unlike the behavior observed for a parabolic analytical solution with Neumann IBCs, for a trigonometric analytical solution the QX methods may not be used interchangeably as the QGS method is more accurate than the Q and QIS methods.




Figure 16:  $L^\infty$  and  $L^2$  norms of  $\Phi_e$  for various IBMs for a (a) circle and a (b) sphere immersed boundary with Neumann IBC and trigonometric analytical solution. Black solid line: L; Red solid line: Q; Blue dotted line: QGS; Grey dashed line: QIS;  $N$ : number of cells in the  $x$ -axis; Diamond symbols:  $L^\infty$ ; Circle symbols:  $L^2$  norms. The  $L^2$  norms are shifted downwards by factor of 10 for ease of reading.

Similar to the results for Dirichlet IBCs, for Neumann IBCs with a parabolic and trigonometric analytical solution the QYO methods do not yield more accurate solutions and as they may be used interchangeably with the QX methods all comments on the latter methods are applicable to the former methods.

**Quadratic Method with Stencil Size of 1** For Neumann IBCs with a parabolic analytical solution the QISS1 method do not results in a more accurate solution and may be used interchangeably with the QX and QYO methods. Similar to the Dirichlet IBCs, the combined use of QISS1,  $p=3$  for equation (20), and extending the quadratic method with second-order Lagrange interpolations to the domain boundaries yields error fields with maximum values on the order of machine epsilon for the parabolic analytical solution.

Figure 17 shows the  $L^\infty$  and  $L^2$  norms of  $\Phi_e$  for a circle and a sphere immersed boundary for a Poisson problem with a trigonometric analytical solution for the QIS and QISS1 methods. The QISS1 method with second-order Lagrange interpolations ( $p=2$ ) is more accurate than the QIS method and increases the order of convergence from 1 to 1.6. It should be noted that a more accurate solution with the QISS1 is expected as the distances between the ghost node and image points decreases, thereby decreasing the error associated with the interpolations and discretizations. As seen from equation (20) and shown in Figure 17, by extending the maximum stencil size of QISS1 from 1 to 2, through the use of  $p=3$ , the order of convergence of the error norms also increase from 1.6 to 2 for a trigonometric analytical solution.




Figure 17:  $L^\infty$  and  $L^2$  norms of  $\Phi_e$  for a (a) circle and a (b) sphere immersed boundary with Neumann IBC and trigonometric analytical solution. Black line: L; Grey dotted line: QIS; Red line: QISS1  $p=2$  ; Orange line: QISS1  $p=3$ ;  $N$ : number of cells in the  $x$ -axis; Diamond symbols:  $L^\infty$  norm; Circle symbols:  $L^2$  norm. The  $L^2$  norms are shifted downwards by factor of 10 for ease of reading.

**Conclusion** For Neumann IBCs and maximum stencil sizes of 1 and 2, the improvements in the  $L^\infty$  and  $L^2$  norms of the error field  $\Phi_e$  obtained with the proposed shifted and quadratic methods varies with the analytical solution of the Poisson test problem.

For a maximum stencil size of 1 and a parabolic analytical solution, the proposed shifted methods (LGS, LIS, and QISS1) result in little to no improvements in the  $L^\infty$  and  $L^2$  norms compared to the L method. However, for a trigonometric analytical solution the proposed shifted methods yield smaller  $L^\infty$  and  $L^2$  norms and increase the order of convergence compared to the standard

linear method. Regardless of the similarity in numerical accuracy obtained for a parabolic analytical solution, these square shift methods have a maximum stencil size of 1 and thereby yield computational efficient band matrices.

For a maximum stencil size of 2 and a parabolic analytical, the proposed quadratic methods (QX and QYO) also result in little to no improvements in the  $L^\infty$  and  $L^2$  norms compared to the standard linear method and may be used interchangeably. However, for a trigonometric analytical solution the proposed quadratic methods result in smaller error norms and an increase in the order of convergence compared to the standard linear method. As expected, the proposed QISS1 method and third-order Lagrange interpolations result in significant decreases in the values of the  $L^\infty$  and  $L^2$  norms and leads to second-order convergence.

## 6 Numerical Simulations for a Vector Flow Field

In this section the results of numerical simulations for the 3D incompressible Navier-Stokes equations with constant density and viscosity for laminar pipe flow and flow past a sphere for various IBMs are presented. The governing equations follow

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u}) &= -\nabla p + \nu \Delta \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{f}, & \text{in } \Omega_i, \\
\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} &= 0, & \text{in } \Omega_i, \\
\mathbf{u} &= \mathbf{u}_D, & \text{on } \partial\Omega_D \cup \Gamma_D, \\
\nabla \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} &= \mathbf{u}_N, & \text{on } \partial\Omega_N \cup \Gamma_N,
\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

where  $\Omega_i \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ ,  $\mathbf{u}=(u, v, w)$  is the velocity flow field,  $p$  is the kinematic pressure,  $\mathbf{f}$  is a source flow field,  $\nu$  is the kinematic viscosity,  $\mathbf{u}_D$  is the Dirichlet domain boundary conditions, and  $\mathbf{u}_N$  is the Neumann domain boundary conditions. For sake of clarity, only the results for a subset of IBMs presented in previous sections are discussed.

The pressure-correction method of Timmermans *et al.* [26] on a staggered grid is used to solve the velocity/pressure coupling of the Navier-Stokes equations. Implicit second-order central difference is used for the non-linear advection and stress terms. Similar to the verification cases considered in Section 5.2, only second-order Lagrange interpolations ( $p=2$ ) for the ghost and image points are considered. Due to the current implicit advection scheme an additional immersed boundary extrapolation of the velocity field to the ghost nodes is required [3].

### 6.1 Pipe Flow

The first validation case is laminar pipe flow parallel to the  $x$ -axis with a Reynolds number  $Re=2Ru_m/\nu=20$  and a radius  $R=3/4$ . The computational domain is  $[-1, 1]^3$  with grid sizes of  $(16\nu)^3$  and with Dirichlet IBCs derived from their analytical solutions. The analytical solution of

pipe Poiseuille flow follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\vec{u} &= \vec{u}_i \vec{e}_i, \\
u_x(y, z) &= u_m \left( 1 - \frac{r^2}{R^2} \right), \\
p_x(x) &= p_0 - \frac{\partial p}{\partial x} x, \\
\frac{\partial p}{\partial x} &= -4u_m \frac{\nu}{R^2},
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

where  $p_0=0$  is the initial pressure,  $u_m=1/(2R)$  is the maximum velocity,  $\nu=1/Re$  is the dynamic viscosity, and  $r^2=(y - y_c)^2+(z - z_c)^2$  is the distance to the axis of the pipe ( $x$ -axis).

Figure 18 shows the  $L^\infty$  and  $L^2$  error norms of  $\mathbf{u}$  and pressure for various grid sizes and IBMs for laminar pipe flow and as expected the L method has a second and first-order limiting behavior, respectively. It should be noted that the first-order convergence for the  $L^\infty$  norm of pressure is expected as it is also encountered for the canonical validation case of 2D channel Poiseuille flow without immersed boundaries. Also as expected, the LIS and QIS methods are more accurate than the L method and have a slightly better order of convergence.

**Remark** As the analytical solution is parabolic, the combined use of QISS1, third-order Lagrange interpolations ( $p=3$ ), and extending the quadratic method with second-order Lagrange interpolations ( $p=2$ ) to the domain boundaries yields error fields with values close to machine epsilon.




Figure 18:  $L^\infty$  and  $L^2$  norms of (a)  $\mathbf{u}$  and (b) pressure for various IBMs for laminar pipe flow at  $Re=20$ . Black solid line: L; Blue dashed line: LIS; Orange dotted line: QIS;  $N$ : number of cells in the  $x$ -axis; Diamond symbols:  $L^\infty$  norm; Circle symbols:  $L^2$  norm. The  $L^2$  norms are shifted downwards by a factor of 10 for ease of reading.

Table 1 shows the total run times for the various IBMs considered for a grid size  $N^3=64^3$  and,

IBM	Stencil Size	Total Wall Clock time ( $\times 10^2$ )[s]	Speed-up (vs. L method)
L	2	5.02	—
LGS	1	1.18	4.25
LIS	1	1.21	4.15
QIS	2	4.12	1.22
QISS1	1	1.18	4.25

Table 1: Total wall clock time, stencil size, and speed-up with respect to the L method for various IBMs for laminar pipe flow at  $Re=20$  with a grid size  $N^3=64^3$ .

as expected, the methods with a maximum stencil size of 1 (LGS, LIS, and QISS1) are faster than those methods with a maximum stencil size of 2 (L and QIS). The significance of a maximum stencil size of 1 for computational performance can be best seen by comparing the total run times of the various methods in Table 1 for the less efficient AMG preconditioner BoomerAMG of hypre library, wherein the IBMs with a maximum stencil size of 1 are at least 4 times faster than the L method. It should be noted that while QIS and L have the same stencil size of 2 and yield similar total wall clock times, the former method is more accurate than the latter.

## 6.2 Laminar Flow past a Sphere

The second validation case, shown in Figure 19, is steady laminar flow past a sphere at  $Re=50$ , 100, and 150 with a diameter  $D=1.0$  placed at  $(x,y,z)=(12.5,8.5,8.5)D$  of a computational domain  $\Omega=[31.25D,17D,17D]$ . A non-uniform rectilinear grid of size  $275 \times 150^2$  with a uniform Cartesian grid of size  $160 \times 80^2$  for the region around the sphere enclosed by  $[-1.0,-1.0,-1.0]$  and  $[3.0,1.0,1.0]$  is used for all Reynolds numbers considered. Appropriate Dirichlet and Neumann IBCs for  $\mathbf{u}$  and pressure increment, respectively, for no slip condition at the immersed boundaries are chosen. The boundary conditions for the domain boundaries for velocity are a uniform flow  $\mathbf{u}=(1.0,0.0,0.0)$  at the inlet, zero-gradient at the outlet and slip boundary condition for the remaining domain boundaries, while pressure increment has Dirichlet boundary conditions of zero for the outlet and zero normal gradient for the remaining domain boundaries. Table 2 shows the good agreement in the coefficient of drag  $C_D$  and the non-dimensional wake bubble length  $L_w/D$ , where  $L_w$  is the wake bubble length. The need for a maximum stencil size of 1 is indeed important given that the LIS method is 3.1 times faster than the L method for steady flow at  $Re=50$ . Although the results in Table 2 are for the LIS method, similar results are obtained with the L method.

Reynolds Number	50		100		150	
	$C_D$	$L_w/D$	$C_D$	$L_w/D$	$C_D$	$L_w/D$
Mittal [27]	1.57	0.44	1.09	0.87	—	—
Johnson and Patel <i>et al.</i> [28]	1.57	0.40	1.08	0.86	0.90	1.20
Marella <i>et al.</i> [29]	1.56	0.39	1.06	0.90	0.85	1.19
Current	1.59	0.40	1.09	0.86	0.89	1.18

Table 2: Coefficient of drag  $C_D$  and non-dimensional wake bubble length  $L_w/D$  for steady flow past a sphere at  $Re=50$ , 100, and 150.




Figure 19: Streamlines coloured by velocity magnitude for steady laminar flow past a sphere immersed boundary at  $Re=150$ .

## 7 Conclusion

Although IBMs with a stencil size of 2 for Cartesian grids, such as the linear method [4], are widely used, they pose significant constraints in the pursuit of smaller total run times, smaller memory requirements, and increased accuracy. To address these shortcomings the ghost node and image point linear square shift methods are proposed to reduce the maximum stencil size to 1. The quadratic method [8], which increases the accuracy of the results through quadratic interpolations for the ghost point/node values is also implemented and used in conjunction with the square shift methods.

Numerical simulations of the canonical Poisson test problem with parabolic and trigonometric analytical solutions for various 2D and 3D immersed boundaries with Dirichlet and Neumann IBCs for nine combinations of the square shift and quadratic methods further emphasises the need for a maximum stencil size of 1 and more accurate interpolation methods for the ghost point/nodes. For Dirichlet IBCs the reduced stencil size of the linear square shift methods tends to yield more accurate results and improved second-order convergence when compared with the linear method. The increase in accuracy of the results due to the quadratic method is more significant when the quadratic method is used in conjunction with the square shift methods.

Although for Neumann IBCs the proposed methods yield smaller improvements in accuracy and negligible improvements in the first-order convergence of the linear method for the parabolic analytical solution to the Poisson test problem, the reduced stencil size results in smaller run times. For the trigonometric analytical solution, the proposed methods yield more accurate results and may improve the order of convergence from 1 to 1.6. However, the combined use of the QISS1 method and third-order Lagrange interpolations for the image and ghost points yields more accurate results and error norms with second-order convergence while maintaining the same maximum stencil size of 2 as the linear method, which results in first-order convergence.

The numerical accuracy and computational improvements of the square shift methods, quadratic method, and a combination of these methods is also observed for the velocity and pressure variables for laminar pipe flow and steady laminar flows past a sphere. As expected, the image point linear square shift method is more accurate than the linear method and the quadratic image point square shift method is more accurate than the former method. The linear square shift methods and the

quadratic square shift method with a maximum stencil size of 1 are at least 3 times faster than the linear method for the laminar pipe flow and laminar flow past a sphere.

## Acknowledgements

We acknowledge the French National Research Agency for its support (ANR-17-CE07-0029 - SUPERFON) and the MCIA (Mésocentre de Calcul Intensif Aquitaine) for the HPC resources.

## References

- [1] C. S. Peskin, “Flow patterns around heart valves: a numerical method,” *Journal of computational physics*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 252–271, 1972.
- [2] R. Mittal and G. Iaccarino, “Immersed boundary methods,” *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.*, vol. 37, pp. 239–261, 2005.
- [3] J. Picot and S. Glockner, “Reduction of the discretization stencil of direct forcing immersed boundary methods on rectangular cells: The ghost node shifting method,” *Journal of Computational Physics*, vol. 364, pp. 18–48, 2018.
- [4] R. Mittal, H. Dong, M. Bozkurttas, F. Najjar, A. Vargas, and A. Von Loebbecke, “A versatile sharp interface immersed boundary method for incompressible flows with complex boundaries,” *Journal of computational physics*, vol. 227, no. 10, pp. 4825–4852, 2008.
- [5] R. Sandberg and L. Jones, “Direct numerical simulations of low reynolds number flow over airfoils with trailing-edge serrations,” *Journal of Sound and Vibration*, vol. 330, no. 16, pp. 3818–3831, 2011.
- [6] K. Luo, Z. Zhuang, J. Fan, and N. E. L. Haugen, “A ghost-cell immersed boundary method for simulations of heat transfer in compressible flows under different boundary conditions,” *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer*, vol. 92, pp. 708–717, 2016.
- [7] S. Das, N. G. Deen, and J. Kuipers, “Direct numerical simulation for flow and heat transfer through random open-cell solid foams: Development of an ibm based cfd model,” *Catalysis Today*, vol. 273, pp. 140–150, 2016.
- [8] S. Das, A. Panda, N. Deen, and J. Kuipers, “A sharp-interface immersed boundary method to simulate convective and conjugate heat transfer through highly complex periodic porous structures,” *Chemical Engineering Science*, vol. 191, pp. 1–18, 2018.
- [9] N. S. Dhamankar, G. A. Blaisdell, and A. S. Lyrintzis, “Implementation of a sharp immersed boundary method in a 3-d multi-block large eddy simulation tool for jet aeroacoustics,” in *53rd AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting*, p. 0504, 2015.
- [10] C. Chi, B. J. Lee, and H. G. Im, “An improved ghost-cell immersed boundary method for compressible flow simulations,” *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Fluids*, vol. 83, no. 2, pp. 132–148, 2017.

- [11] F. Auguste, G. Réa, R. Paoli, C. Lac, V. Masson, and D. Cariolle, “Implementation of an immersed boundary method in the meso-nh v5. 2 model: applications to an idealized urban environment,” 2019.
- [12] A. Lemoine, S. Glockner, and J. Breil, “Moment-of-fluid analytic reconstruction on 2d cartesian grids,” *Journal of Computational Physics*, vol. 328, pp. 131–139, 2017.
- [13] M. Coquerelle and S. Glockner, “A fourth-order accurate curvature computation in a level set framework for two-phase flows subjected to surface tension forces,” *Journal of Computational Physics*, vol. 305, pp. 838–876, 2016.
- [14] Notus, “Notus computational fluid dynamics.” <https://notus-cfd.org/>, May 2019.
- [15] P. N. Brown, R. D. Falgout, and J. E. Jones, “Semicoarsening multigrid on distributed memory machines,” *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 1823–1834, 2000.
- [16] S. F. Ashby and R. D. Falgout, “A parallel multigrid preconditioned conjugate gradient algorithm for groundwater flow simulations,” *Nuclear Science and Engineering*, vol. 124, no. 1, pp. 145–159, 1996.
- [17] R. D. Falgout and U. M. Yang, “hypre: A library of high performance preconditioners,” in *International Conference on Computational Science*, pp. 632–641, Springer, 2002.
- [18] R. D. Falgout, J. E. Jones, and U. M. Yang, “The design and implementation of hypre, a library of parallel high performance preconditioners,” in *Numerical solution of partial differential equations on parallel computers*, pp. 267–294, Springer, 2006.
- [19] U. M. Yang *et al.*, “Boomerang: a parallel algebraic multigrid solver and preconditioner,” *Applied Numerical Mathematics*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 155–177, 2002.
- [20] U. Langer and D. Pusch, “Comparison of geometrical and algebraic multigrid preconditioners for data-sparse boundary element matrices,” in *International Conference on Large-Scale Scientific Computing*, pp. 130–137, Springer, 2005.
- [21] H. De Sterck, U. M. Yang, and J. J. Heys, “Reducing complexity in parallel algebraic multigrid preconditioners,” *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 1019–1039, 2006.
- [22] A. H. Baker, R. D. Falgout, T. V. Koley, and U. M. Yang, “Scaling hypres multigrid solvers to 100,000 cores,” in *High-Performance Scientific Computing*, pp. 261–279, Springer, 2012.
- [23] E. H. Müller and R. Scheichl, “Massively parallel solvers for elliptic partial differential equations in numerical weather and climate prediction,” *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, vol. 140, no. 685, pp. 2608–2624, 2014.
- [24] A. Coco and G. Russo, “Finite-difference ghost-point multigrid methods on cartesian grids for elliptic problems in arbitrary domains,” *Journal of Computational Physics*, vol. 241, pp. 464–501, 2013.
- [25] F. Gibou, R. P. Fedkiw, L.-T. Cheng, and M. Kang, “A second-order-accurate symmetric discretization of the poisson equation on irregular domains,” *Journal of Computational Physics*, vol. 176, no. 1, pp. 205–227, 2002.

- [26] L. Timmermans, P. Minev, and F. Van De Vosse, “An approximate projection scheme for incompressible flow using spectral elements,” *International journal for numerical methods in fluids*, vol. 22, no. 7, pp. 673–688, 1996.
- [27] R. Mittal, “A fourier–chebyshev spectral collocation method for simulating flow past spheres and spheroids,” *International journal for numerical methods in fluids*, vol. 30, no. 7, pp. 921–937, 1999.
- [28] T. Johnson and V. Patel, “Flow past a sphere up to a reynolds number of 300,” *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, vol. 378, pp. 19–70, 1999.
- [29] S. Marella, S. Krishnan, H. Liu, and H. Udaykumar, “Sharp interface cartesian grid method i: an easily implemented technique for 3d moving boundary computations,” *Journal of Computational Physics*, vol. 210, no. 1, pp. 1–31, 2005.