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Abstract

Two finite element methods on hybrid meshes containing tetrahedral, pyramidal, prismatic and hexahedral elements are considered. The first method is based on a conforming subdivision of pyramids, prisms and hexahedra into pure tetrahedra without introducing any new node, namely, in a pure geometrical way. The second one is constructed by a conforming subdivision of pyramids, prisms and hexahedra into pure tetrahedra with new nodes on the quadrilateral face centers and on the non-tetrahedral volume centers, where each introduced additional nodal degree of freedom is eliminated by local averaging over those degrees of freedom associated to its original neighbouring nodes, namely, in an algebraic way. Both methods preserve the same number of nodal degrees of freedom as the number of original nodes of the hybrid mesh. The methods are used and compared with each other in the finite element discretization of the structure and fluid sub-problems which appear in partitioned algorithms for solving the fluid-structure interaction problems.
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1. Introduction

Hybrid meshes have appeared in many applications, e.g., see [4, 11] in the computational fluid dynamics. Constructing finite elements on such hybrid meshes is a nontrivial task. In this note, we consider two finite element methods applicable to the hybrid meshes containing four types of elements: tetrahedron, pyramid, prism and hexahedron.

The first finite element is a standard $P_1$ element constructed on the conforming subdivision of pyramids, prisms and hexahedra into pure tetrahedra without introducing any new node. Such a subdivision method turns out to be fully local without any communication with neighbouring elements. Thus it is efficient and robust to implement in an element-wise manner except that special care has to be taken into account due to different splitting possibilities for each non-tetrahedral element (for other types of polyhedral elements, there may exist many splitting possibilities). This is resolved by splitting each quadrilateral face into two triangles with the diagonal line going through the node with the smallest (or largest) identifier (e.g. global nodal numbering) on that face. Then for each non-tetrahedral element it has very limited subdivision possibilities which could be tabularized.

The second finite element is an extended linear element on hybrid meshes. For this we first make a conforming subdivision of pyramids, prisms and hexahedra into pure tetrahedra by splitting each quadrilateral face into four triangles with added quadrilateral face center node and then in each non-tetrahedral element connecting the original nodes and the new face center nodes with its added volume center node. Afterwards, we take the standard $P_1$ finite element on the tetrahedral subdivision and substitute the nodal degrees of freedom associated to the added nodes by averaging over neighbouring nodes of the original hybrid mesh. Each resulting nodal basis function turns out to be a weighted linear combination of the standard $P_1$ basis functions on the subdivision, with larger support.

The reminder of this paper is organized in the following way. In Section 2, we describe how to construct the standard $P_1$ element on the conforming subdivision of a hybrid mesh. Section 3 deals with the extended linear finite element on a hybrid mesh. Finally, in Section 4, a few numerical results on the fluid-structure interaction (FSI) problem with these two finite elements on hybrid meshes and the comparison of their performance are presented.
2. The $P_1$ finite element on the conforming subdivision of a hybrid mesh

Let $\mathcal{M}_h$ be an admissible triangulation of a computational domain $\Omega$ into tetrahedral, pyramidal, prismatic and hexahedral elements (see Fig. 1), i.e. any two elements from $\mathcal{M}_h$ either have no intersection, or have a common node, or have a common edge, or have a common face.

![Figure 1: Hybrid elements](image)

2.1. Conforming subdivision of a hybrid mesh without additional nodes

As is known, arbitrary splitting of quadrilateral faces into two triangles may lead to discontinuities across element faces, resulting in non-conforming meshes. On the other hand the subdivision of some elements into tetrahedra may require additional nodes. However, for the first finite element method, we need to preserve the conformity of the subdivided tetrahedral mesh without introducing new nodes. This procedure is performed in the following two steps.

First, let nodal numbering be an identifier of each node. We split each quadrilateral face into two triangles by connecting the diagonal including the node with the smallest identifier from the four nodes on this face, which keeps the subdivision conforming across element faces. See Fig. 2, where the
face $V_1V_2V_3V_4$ is split into two triangles $V_1V_2V_3$ and $V_1V_3V_4$, or $V_1V_2V_4$ and $V_2V_3V_4$.

![Figure 2: A schematic representation of two subdivisions of a quadrilateral face into triangles: $V_1$ or $V_3$ has the smallest identifier on the face $V_1V_2V_3V_4$ (left), $V_2$ or $V_4$ has the smallest identifier on the face $V_1V_2V_3V_4$ (right).](image)

Second, we verify that further subdivisions of pyramids, prisms and hexahedra into tetrahedra only require proper local nodal connections inside each element. So no new nodes are added during this step.

2.1.1. Pyramid

According to the first step, the quadrilateral face $V_1V_2V_3V_4$ is split into two triangles by connecting two nodes $V_1$ and $V_3$ if $V_1$ or $V_3$ has the smallest identifier on face $V_1V_2V_3V_4$, or by connecting two nodes $V_2$ and $V_4$ if $V_2$ or $V_4$ has the smallest identifier on face $V_1V_2V_3V_4$. See Fig. 3.

The subdivision results for each case are listed in Table 1.

![Figure 3: A schematic representation of subdivisions of a pyramid into two tetrahedra.](image)

Without loss of generality, from now on, for each prism and hexahedron, we always assume that the low front left node has the smallest identifier of this element.
2.1.2. **Prism**

According to the first step, faces $V_1V_2V_5V_4$ and $V_1V_3V_6V_4$ are split into triangles by diagonal lines $V_1V_5$ and $V_1V_6$, respectively. Depending on the identifiers of $V_2$, $V_3$, $V_5$ and $V_6$, only two possibilities forming the subdivision remain. See Fig. 4.

The subdivision results for each case are listed in Table 2.

### Table 1: Subdivisions of a pyramid.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Subdivisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 3(a)</td>
<td>$V_1V_2V_3V_5$, $V_1V_3V_4V_5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 3(b)</td>
<td>$V_1V_2V_4V_5$, $V_2V_3V_4V_5$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.3. **Hexahedron**

First of all, faces $V_1V_2V_6V_5$, $V_1V_4V_6V_5$ and $V_1V_2V_3V_4$ are split into triangles by diagonal lines $V_1V_6$, $V_1V_8$ and $V_1V_3$, respectively. According to the number of diagonal lines going through node $V_7$, which depends on the identifier of nodes on the faces $V_2V_3V_7V_6$, $V_5V_6V_7V_8$ and $V_4V_5V_7V_8$, there exist eight
subdivision possibilities. See Fig. 5(a) where no diagonal line going through $V_7$, see Fig. 5(b) where three diagonal lines going through $V_7$, see Fig. 5(c)-5(e) where for each case one diagonal line going through $V_7$, and see Fig. 5(f)-5(h) where for each case two diagonal lines going through $V_7$.

The subdivision results for all eight cases are listed in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Subdivisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 5(a)</td>
<td>$V_1V_2V_3V_6$, $V_1V_2V_4V_8$, $V_3V_5V_7V_8$, $V_1V_5V_6V_8$, $V_1V_3V_4V_8$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 5(b)</td>
<td>$V_1V_2V_3V_7$, $V_1V_2V_6V_7$, $V_1V_3V_6V_7$, $V_1V_5V_7V_8$, $V_1V_4V_7V_8$, $V_1V_3V_4V_7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 5(c)</td>
<td>$V_1V_2V_3V_6$, $V_1V_3V_6V_7$, $V_1V_3V_4V_7$, $V_1V_5V_6V_8$, $V_1V_6V_7V_8$, $V_1V_4V_7V_8$, $V_1V_3V_4V_7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 5(d)</td>
<td>$V_1V_3V_6V_7$, $V_1V_4V_6V_7$, $V_1V_2V_3V_6$, $V_1V_5V_7V_8$, $V_1V_3V_4V_8$, $V_1V_3V_4V_7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 5(e)</td>
<td>$V_1V_3V_6V_8$, $V_1V_4V_6V_8$, $V_1V_2V_6V_7$, $V_1V_2V_3V_7$, $V_1V_3V_7V_8$, $V_1V_3V_4V_8$, $V_1V_3V_4V_7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 5(f)</td>
<td>$V_1V_5V_6V_7$, $V_1V_2V_6V_7$, $V_1V_2V_3V_6$, $V_1V_5V_7V_8$, $V_1V_3V_7V_8$, $V_1V_3V_4V_8$, $V_1V_3V_4V_7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 5(g)</td>
<td>$V_1V_5V_6V_7$, $V_1V_2V_6V_7$, $V_1V_2V_3V_6$, $V_1V_5V_7V_8$, $V_1V_3V_7V_8$, $V_1V_4V_7V_8$, $V_1V_3V_4V_7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 5(h)</td>
<td>$V_1V_2V_3V_7$, $V_1V_2V_3V_7$, $V_1V_3V_4V_7$, $V_1V_5V_6V_8$, $V_1V_6V_7V_8$, $V_1V_4V_7V_8$, $V_1V_3V_4V_7$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Subdivisions of a hexahedra.

It is easy to see, the above described conforming subdivision is performed on each element locally, without any communication with its neighbouring elements. For a more sophisticated implementation, we refer to [2].

2.2. The finite element space of the $P_1$ element on the subdivided tetrahedral mesh

Let $T_h$ be the conforming subdivision of the original hybrid mesh for the domain $\Omega$ using the above described method. On each element $T \in T_h$, let $\varphi$ denote the standard nodal basis function of the $P_1$ element on $T$ associated with the node $x$. Then the finite element space of the $P_1$ element on $T_h$ is constructed by a span of the local basis functions on each element $T$, i.e.,

$$V_h^T = \{v \in C(\overline{\Omega}) : v|_T \in \Phi_T, \forall T \in T_h\},$$

where

$$\Phi_T = \text{span}\{\varphi : T \in T_h\}.$$  

Let $H^1(\Omega)$ and $L^2(\Omega)$ denote the standard Sobolev and Lebesgue spaces (see [1]) on $\Omega$, respectively. Let $h$ denote the discretized mesh parameter. Under the assumption that the subdivided tetrahedral mesh is regular, we have the following approximation properties for the standard $P_1$ element on the tetrahedral mesh:
Figure 5: A schematic representation of subdivisions of a hexahedron into tetrahedra.
Theorem 1.  
1. There is an interpolation operator $I^T_C : L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow V^T_h$ such that 
\[
\| v - I^T_C v \|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c |v|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \text{for all } v \in L^2(\Omega),
\]
and 
\[
\| v - I^T_C v \|_{L^2(\Omega)} + h |v - I^T_C v|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq c h |v|_{H^1(\Omega)} \quad \text{for all } v \in H^1(\Omega)
\]
with a mesh-independent constant $c$.

2. There is an interpolation operator $I^T_L : H^2(\Omega) \rightarrow V^T_h$ such that 
\[
\| v - I^T_L v \|_{L^2(\Omega)} + h |v - I^T_L v|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq c h^2 |v|_{H^2(\Omega)} \quad \text{for all } v \in H^2(\Omega)
\]
with a mesh-independent constant $c$.

The operators $I^T_C$ and $I^T_L$ are the Clément-type interpolation operator and the Lagrange-type interpolation operator, respectively. See e.g. [3].

3. The extended linear finite element on a hybrid mesh

The second approach is to keep the topology of the hybrid mesh, but extend the standard $P_1$ element on such a mesh in an algebraic way.

3.1. Conforming subdivision of a hybrid mesh with additional nodes

First, let $T'_h$ be the admissible subdivision of $M_h$ into tetrahedra, obtained in the following way: we add nodes at the centers of quadrilateral faces and subdivide each of them into four triangles, then add a node at the center of the element, and finally connect this center node with all the original nodes and the face center nodes.

By this means, a pyramid is split into eight tetrahedra, a prism into fourteen tetrahedra and a hexahedra into twenty-four tetrahedra, see Fig. 6 for an illustration. One easily sees that such a subdivision results in an admissible refinement $T'_h$ of the original hybrid mesh $M_h$. So it leads to a conforming mesh with additional nodes, i.e. introducing new nodal degrees of freedom which will be eliminated in the next step.
3.2. The finite element space of the extended linear element

For constructing the extended linear element on $\mathcal{M}_h$, we firstly consider a nodal basis function on an element $M$ from $\mathcal{M}_h$ as follows: Let $x$ be a node of $M$, let $x_{F_i}$, $i = 1, ...,$, denote the center node of those non-triangular faces $F_i$ which contain $x$ as a node, and let $x_M$ denote the center node of $M$.

As our finite element space on the hybrid mesh $\mathcal{M}_h$ we first take the standard $P_1$ finite element space on the underlying tetrahedral mesh $\mathcal{T}_h$ and then replace the degrees of freedom associated to the added nodes by averaging over neighboring nodes of the original mesh. Thus it keeps the same number of nodal degrees of freedom as the number of original nodes of the hybrid mesh.

Then on the element $M$, the nodal basis function $\varphi$ associated with the node $x$ is given by

$$\varphi = \hat{\varphi} + \sum_i \frac{1}{N_{F_i}} \hat{\varphi}_{F_i} + \frac{1}{N_M} \hat{\varphi}_M,$$

where $\hat{\varphi}$, $\hat{\varphi}_{F_i}$, and $\hat{\varphi}_M$ denote the nodal basis functions of the $P_1$ element on the subdivision of $M$ associated with the nodes $x$, $x_{F_i}$ and $x_M$, respectively.
and $N_{F_i}$ and $N_M$ are the numbers of nodes of the face $F_i$ and the element $M$, respectively. It is easy to see that such a constructed piece-wise linear basis function has larger support compared to a standard linear basis function.

Then the finite element space of the extended linear element on $\mathcal{M}_h$ is constructed by a span of the local basis functions on each element $M$, i.e.,

$$V_h^M = \{ v \in C(\bar{\Omega}) : v|_M \in \Phi_M, \forall M \in \mathcal{M}_h \},$$

where

$$\Phi_M = \text{span}\{ \varphi : M \in \mathcal{M}_h \}. $$

One easily sees that the extended linear element is an $H^1(\Omega)$-conforming finite element and the following approximation properties as the standard $P_1$ element on tetrahedral meshes hold:

Theorem 2. 1. There is an interpolation operator $I_C^M : L^2(\Omega) \longrightarrow V_h^M$ such that

$$\| v - I_C^M v \|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c |v|_{L^2(\Omega)}$$

for all $v \in L^2(\Omega)$,

and

$$\| v - I_C^M v \|_{L^2(\Omega)} + h |v - I_C^M v|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq c h |v|_{H^1(\Omega)}$$

for all $v \in H^1(\Omega)$

with a mesh-independent constant $c$.

2. There is an interpolation operator $I_L^M : H^2(\Omega) \longrightarrow V_h^M$ such that

$$\| v - I_L^M v \|_{L^2(\Omega)} + h |v - I_L^M v|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq c h^2 |v|_{H^2(\Omega)}$$

for all $v \in H^1(\Omega)$

with a mesh-independent constant $c$.

The operators $I_C^M$ and $I_L^M$ are the Clément-type interpolation operator and the Lagrange-type interpolation operator, respectively. For details, see [8, 11].

Compared with the first finite element method, the second one is more expensive although its conforming subdivision is easier to realize: it produces much more tetrahedra and the extended linear basis function has much larger support. Thus in computation, the first finite element method will be faster than the second one due to the less costly finite element assembly procedure. However, for hybrid meshes containing arbitrary types of polyhedral elements, the second finite element method might be easier to adapt.
4. Applications on the fluid-structure interaction problem

In [10, 11, 9], the second finite element method has been applied to the FSI problem on hybrid meshes, where the partitioned Newton and partitioned Robin-Neumann preconditioned GMRES algorithms are used to solve the FSI problem for the outer iteration, and for the inner iteration, extended versions of special algebraic multigrid (AMG) methods ([7, 6]) are used to solve the fluid and structure sub-problems discretized by this particular finite element method. We refer to [9, 11] for details of numerical results.

The aim of this note is to compare numerical solutions of the FSI problem and the performance using these two finite element methods on hybrid meshes. Thus we take the same FSI benchmark as the one from [9, 11], i.e. we use the same computational domain (a cylinder), the same hybrid meshes, the same FSI solvers, the same AMG solvers, etc., except that we use these two finite element methods to discretize both sub-problems.

4.1. Subdivision of the hybrid meshes for the first finite element method

Hybrid meshes are generated for the fluid and the structure domains with matching nodes at the common interface (see [5]). Two meshes are used for simulations, see Fig. 7. The coarse hybrid mesh contains 4,176 nodes and 2,021 fluid elements.

Figure 7: Two meshes for the FSI computational domain: Coarse mesh (first row) and fine mesh (second row).
3,965 elements (1,944 structure elements and 2,021 fluid elements), and the fine hybrid mesh contains 17,904 nodes and 17,489 elements (7,434 structure elements and 10,055 fluid elements). The overall degrees of freedom for these two meshes are about 16,000 and 70,000, respectively.

For the first finite element method, we need to make a conforming subdivision of each hybrid mesh without adding new nodes. See Fig. 8. The resulting coarse tetrahedral mesh includes 22,474 elements (11,520 structure elements and 10,954 fluid elements), and the resulting fine tetrahedral mesh includes 98,158 elements (44,388 structure elements and 53,770 fluid elements).

![Figure 8: Two tetrahedral meshes subdivided from the hybrid meshes for the FSI computational domain: Coarse mesh (first row) and fine mesh (second row).](image)

(a) 11,520 structure elements  (b) 10,954 fluid elements  
(c) 44,388 structure elements  (d) 53,770 fluid elements

It is easy to see the subdivision of the original hybrid meshes into pure tetrahedral meshes produces about six times as many tetrahedral elements as the original hybrid elements. This is due to the fact that most of elements in these two hybrid meshes are hexahedron. On the other hand, recall that for the second finite element method, each non-tetrahedral element is subdivided according to Section 2.1. Thus the subdivision for the second finite element produces about twenty-four times as many tetrahedral elements as the original hybrid elements.

Note in principle, that it is not required to generate the subdivision ex-
plicitly for both finite element methods. The finite element assembly is performed element-wise on the original hybrid mesh, with special care of the corresponding subdivision of each non-tetrahedral element.

4.2. Comparison of the numerical solutions

For these two finite element methods on hybrid meshes, we compare the numerical solutions of the pressure wave propagations along the center line of the computational domain for different time levels. We choose the time step size $\Delta t = 0.125$ ms. The results are plotted in Fig. 9 for the coarse mesh, and in Fig. 10 for the fine mesh.

As expected, on both meshes, the numerical results from these two finite element methods are almost identical to each other.
4.3. Comparison of the performance

For measuring the performance, the code is tested on a laptop with an Intel Core of 2.67 GHz and 4 GB memory. We solve the FSI problem with the Robin-Neumann preconditioned GMRES solver (see [9]) and the Newton based solver (see [11]), respectively, each of which is performed on the coarse and fine meshes. On each mesh, we compare the CPU time in seconds for the cost of one time step using these two finite element methods (FEMs): the first finite element method (I) and the second finite element method (II). We choose time step sizes $\Delta t = 0.0625, 0.125, 0.25, 0.5$ ms.

See the cost in Table 4. As expected, the first finite element method (I) is much more efficient than the second one (II) for all these test cases due to its faster finite element assembly procedure. For each finite element method, as was already observed in [9], that the cost of one time step is independent of the time step size for both solvers, and the RN preconditioned GMRES
Table 4: Comparison of cost for solving the FSI problem at one time step using two finite element methods (I and II) on hybrid meshes.

5. Conclusions

In this note, we construct a $P_1$ finite element on the conforming subdivision of hybrid meshes, which is compared with our previously extended linear finite element on such meshes in the FSI applications. It turns out to be more efficient than the previous one. Thus it is considered as a good alternative of the finite element discretization for the FSI problem developed in [8].

References


