

Transcritical flow of a stratified fluid : the forced extended Korteweg – de Vries model

by

R. H. J. Grimshaw¹, K. H. Chan² and K. W. Chow²

¹Department of Mathematical Sciences, Loughborough University

Loughborough, Leicestershire, LE11 3TU, United Kingdom

²Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Hong Kong

Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong

ABSTRACT

Transcritical, or resonant, flow of a stratified fluid over an obstacle is studied using a forced extended Korteweg - de Vries model. This model is particularly relevant for a two-layer fluid when the layer depths are near critical, but can also be useful in other similar circumstances. Both quadratic and cubic nonlinearities are present and they are balanced by third order dispersion. We consider both possible signs for the cubic nonlinear term but emphasise the less-studied case when the cubic nonlinear term and the dispersion term have the same-signed coefficients. In this case, our numerical simulations show that two kinds of solitary waves are found in certain parameters regimes. One kind is similar to those of the well-known forced Korteweg - de Vries model and occurs when the cubic nonlinear term is rather small, while the other kind is irregularly generated waves of variable amplitude, which may continually interact. To explain this phenomenon, we develop a hydraulic theory in which the dispersion term in the model is omitted. This theory can predict the occurrence of upstream and downstream undular bores, and these predictions are found to agree quite well with the numerical simulations.

I. Introduction

The evolution of weakly nonlinear long waves, in both homogenous and density-stratified fluid environments, is of great interest in many branches of fluid mechanics, notably in oceanographic applications. When the leading balance is between quadratic nonlinearity and dispersion, the dynamics is typically governed by the well-known Korteweg - de Vries (KdV) equation. For larger waves, or for certain special configurations in stratified fluids, it has been found useful to include cubic nonlinearity, leading to the extended KdV (eKdV) equation. Such model systems have been derived in the literature for stratified fluids, and the localized solitary waves have been identified¹.

In many geophysical and marine applications it is necessary to include a forcing term; typical examples are when the waves are generated by moving ships, or by flow over bottom topography. Previous studies²⁻⁵ have identified some interesting features of the forced eKdV equation. These include undular bores propagating upstream in the subcritical regime, and monotonic bores in the transcritical regime; such bores may remain stationary. These features differ sharply from the solution of the forced KdV equation, where in the transcritical regime solitary waves are generated continually and propagate upstream. Locally steady flow is observed for sufficiently large Froude numbers in the supercritical range of such eKdV systems, while stationary lee waves are formed for sufficiently low Froude numbers in the subcritical regime. For the forced KdV equation Grimshaw and Smyth⁵ (GS) showed that the upstream and downstream wavetrains could be well described by the modulation theory for the KdV equation,

which, in turn, is a development from the hydraulic approximation in which the dispersive term is neglected. However, it seems that the modulation theory for the eKdV equation is not fully available, except for sufficiently small amplitude waves³.

Further, numerical simulations of the full equations for stratified flow over topography have been performed for a two-layer stratification and for a linearly stratified Boussinesq fluid^{4, 9}. Flows past an obstacle in a horizontal channel will reach criticality if the linear long wave speed of one mode is equal to the upstream flow speed. The energy of the waves excited by the obstacle cannot propagate away from it, and hence a strongly nonlinear response occurs. Indeed it is this feature which leads to the necessity for such nonlinear theoretical models as those provided by the forced KdV and eKdV equations. These full numerical simulations broadly support the behaviour types seen in the model equations. Further, we note that a forced eKdV equation has been discussed in the context of the generation of capillary-gravity waves in a two-layer fluid⁸; also a set of coupled forced KdV equations have been discussed for surface waves, with a view to retaining a (weak) interaction with the non-resonant wave mode⁶.

It is known that the solutions of the eKdV equation will depend on the relative signs of the coefficient of the cubic nonlinear and dispersive terms. Most studies of the forced eKdV equation mentioned above, with one exception⁸, deal with the case where these terms are of opposite sign. In this case the eKdV equation supports a single family of solitary waves, whose polarity is determined by the relative signs of the coefficient of the quadratic nonlinear and dispersive terms, which for small amplitudes resemble those of the KdV equation, but for large amplitudes become “thick” solitary waves with a limiting amplitude¹. On the other hand when the cubic nonlinear and dispersive terms

have the same-signed coefficients, the eKdV equation supports two families of solitary waves; one resembles the KdV solitary waves at small amplitudes, but the other, with opposite polarity, can exist only for large amplitudes. Since the coefficient of the cubic nonlinear term in the eKdV equation can have either sign for various layered and stratified fluids^{7, 8}, the objective of the present work is to study waves generated by the forced eKdV for both signs of the cubic nonlinear term, with a particular emphasis on the less-studied case when the cubic nonlinear and dispersive terms have the same sign. As the procedure for deriving such forced eKdV equation is standard, and well-known, we shall proceed directly with a study of a nondimensional forced eKdV equation. Formats and signs for this forced eKdV will conform as far as possible with the forms used in earlier studies.

The strategy will be a combined analytical and computational study. Firstly, based on the usefulness of the hydraulic approximation used by GS⁵ in their study of the forced KdV equation, an analogous hydraulic approximation for the forced eKdV equation will be developed here and used to study the transcritical regime. Secondly, the forced eKdV equation will be solved numerically, and the results compared with the hydraulic approximation. The most interesting result is that two kinds of solitary waves can be emitted and travel upstream in certain parameter regimes. The first type is generated at regular intervals when the cubic nonlinear term is relatively unimportant, while the second type is produced irregularly and occurs when the cubic nonlinear term plays a crucial role.

II. Forced extended Korteweg-de Vries equation

We begin the analytical formulation by considering the forced eKdV equation for an appropriate field variable $u(x, t)$,

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \Delta \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} - \alpha u \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} - \beta u^2 \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial^3 u}{\partial x^3} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}. \quad (1)$$

For instance, in a two-layer fluid, u is the interfacial displacement¹. Here Δ measures the deviation from the long wave phase speed, and is the parameter which controls the flow regime; $f(x)$ is the representation of the localized topographic forcing; α and β are the coefficients of the quadratic and cubic nonlinear terms respectively, and can be determined explicitly in terms of the basic state of the stratified fluid^{1, 2, 4, 5, 7}. For initial condition, we set $u(x, 0) = 0$ which corresponds to turning on the basic flow at the initial time. The forcing function used in our numerical simulations is

$$f = f_m \exp(-\xi^2 x^2), \quad (2)$$

where ξ is a shape parameter. In general, we assume that f has a single maximum and decays rapidly in the far field. Only positive forcing is considered in this study, (i.e. $f_m > 0$ in Eqn. (2)) and α is kept constant (equal to 2 without loss of generality) for all the numerical simulations. However, we vary the coefficient β and allow it to be both positive and negative. A typical sequence of numerical simulations for $\Delta = 0$, $f_m = 1$ is shown in Figure 1 for $\beta > 0$.

III. Hydraulic approximation

To explain the features shown in Figure 1 and all our other numerical simulations, we follow the approach of GS⁵ and consider here the hydraulic approximation. Formally

this is valid for broad forcings ($\xi \rightarrow 0$ in Eqn. (2)), and can be expected to lead to a combination of locally-steady state solutions together with shocks. As in GS, we expect the shocks to be indicative of the presence of wavetrains in the full equations (1), although, as far as we aware, there is currently no counterpart for the eKdV equation to the modulation theory for the KdV equation used by GS. On omission of the dispersive term, Eqn. (1) becomes,

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \Delta \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} - \alpha u \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} - \beta u^2 \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}. \quad (3)$$

Eqn. (3) can be solved by the method of characteristics. These are given by

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = \Delta - \alpha u - \beta u^2, \quad \frac{du}{dt} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}, \quad (4)$$

where on a given characteristic at $t = 0$, $x = x_0$, $u = 0$. Here x_0 is a parameter defining each characteristic. Eqns. (4) are readily solved numerically, although we note that analytically the solution can be written in the form

$$\Delta u - \frac{1}{2} \alpha u^2 - \frac{1}{3} \beta u^3 = f(x) - f(x_0) \quad (5)$$

which gives u in terms of x and x_0 . Substitution into the first of equations (4) then gives $x = x(x_0, t)$, and subsequent elimination of x_0 then yields the solution of Eqn. (3).

However, if the characteristics intersect, then a shock must be inserted. The shock speed V can be determined by integrating Eqn. (3) across the shock, and is

$$V = \Delta - \frac{1}{2} \alpha (u_a + u_b) - \frac{1}{3} \beta (u_a^2 + u_a u_b + u_b^2) \quad (6)$$

where $u_{a,b}$ are the values of u on each side of the shock. However, in our numerical solutions of Eqns. (4) we allow the characteristics to intersect, and the shocks are inserted only schematically, i.e. we determine numerically the points (X) where characteristics

first intersect, and sketch a curve (solid line) whose slope at the initial intersection point is given by Eqn. (5).

Next, to determine the criteria for a steady hydraulic solution, we ignore the unsteady term in Eqn. (3) which then becomes

$$\Delta \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} - \alpha u \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} - \beta u^2 \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}. \quad (7)$$

We shall assume that $\alpha > 0$ without loss of generality, and also in the subsequent discussion, we shall assume that $\beta > 0$. The case $\beta < 0$ can be recovered by the transformation $u \rightarrow -u$, $\Delta \rightarrow -\Delta$. At the local maximum of the forcing, located at $x = 0$, $f(0) = f_m$, $f_x = 0$ and we let $u = u_m$. Then Eqn. (7) shows that either $u_x = 0$, or that

$$\Delta = \alpha u_m + \beta u_m^2, \quad \text{i.e.} \quad \beta u_m = -\frac{\alpha}{2} \pm \left\{ \frac{\alpha^2}{4} + \Delta \beta \right\}^{1/2}. \quad (8)$$

Since we are interested only in asymmetric steady hydraulic solutions, we assume here that $u_x \neq 0$ at $x = 0$, and so Eqn. (8) holds; later we will show that only the upper sign in Eqn. (8) is relevant. In the far field, where $f \rightarrow 0$ we let $u \rightarrow u_{\pm}$, where u_- and u_+ represent the upstream ($x \rightarrow -\infty$) and downstream ($x \rightarrow +\infty$) values respectively, and we will require that $u_+ \neq u_-$. Later we will show that $u_- > u_+$. Integrating Eqn. (7) with respect to x gives

$$\Delta u - \frac{\alpha u^2}{2} - \frac{\beta u^3}{3} - f = C, \quad (9)$$

where C can be determined by the far field conditions, or by the condition at $x = 0$, so that

$$C = \Delta u_{\pm} - \frac{\alpha}{2} u_{\pm}^2 - \frac{\beta}{3} u_{\pm}^3 = \Delta u_m - \frac{\alpha u_m^2}{2} - \frac{\beta u_m^3}{3} - f_m. \quad (10)$$

Further, since $u_- \neq u_+$, we obtain

$$\Delta = \frac{\alpha}{2}(u_+ + u_-) + \frac{\beta}{3}(u_+^2 + u_+ u_- + u_-^2) . \quad (11)$$

First, for simplicity, let $\Delta = 0$. In this case, Eqn. (8) implies that $u_m = 0$, or $u_m = -\alpha/\beta$. If $u_m = 0$, then $C = -f_m$ and the solution of Eqn. (9) becomes

$$f_m - f = \frac{1}{2}\alpha u^2 + \frac{1}{3}\beta u^3 ,$$

which is plotted in Figure 2. Clearly,

$$\frac{\alpha}{2}u_{\pm}^2 + \frac{\beta}{3}u_{\pm}^3 = f_m < \frac{\alpha^3}{6\beta^2} \quad (12)$$

must hold for this solution to exist and furthermore,

$$\frac{\alpha}{2\beta} > u_- > 0 > u_+ > -\frac{\alpha}{\beta} .$$

In the other case, if $u_m = -\alpha / \beta$, it can be shown that there is no solution, most obviously by again using Figure 2.

Then, in the general case, we consider $\Delta \neq 0$ for $\alpha > 0$, $\beta > 0$. First Eqn. (8) shows that u_m will not exist unless

$$\Delta > -\frac{\alpha^2}{4\beta} . \quad (13)$$

Since $u_m = 0$ when $\Delta = 0$, we choose u_m by the upper sign in Eqn. (8). Eqns. (9) and (10) then give

$$f_m - f + g(\Delta) = -\Delta u + \frac{\alpha u^2}{2} + \frac{\beta u^3}{3} , \quad (14)$$

where

$$g(\Delta) = -\Delta u_m + \frac{\alpha}{2} u_m^2 + \frac{\beta}{3} u_m^3, \quad \text{or} \quad g(\Delta) = \frac{\alpha\Delta}{2\beta} + \frac{\alpha^3}{12\beta^2} - \frac{2}{3\beta^2} \left\{ \frac{\alpha^2}{4} + \Delta\beta \right\}^{3/2}.$$

We now plot $f_m - f + g(\Delta)$ as a function of u in Figure 3, and see that there are two turning points

$$u = u_m, \quad u_m = -\frac{\alpha}{2\beta} + \frac{1}{\beta} \left\{ \frac{\alpha^2}{4} + \Delta\beta \right\}^{1/2}, \quad (\text{a local minimum}), \quad (15)$$

$$u = u'_m, \quad u'_m = -\frac{\alpha}{2\beta} - \frac{1}{\beta} \left\{ \frac{\alpha^2}{4} + \Delta\beta \right\}^{1/2}, \quad (\text{a local maximum}). \quad (16)$$

Thus a solution with $u_- > u_m > u_+$ exists until f_m reaches a value such that

$$f_m = -\Delta(u'_m - u_m) + \frac{\alpha}{2}(u_m'^2 - u_m^2) + \frac{\beta}{3}(u_m'^3 - u_m^3) = -g(\Delta) - \Delta u'_m + \frac{\alpha}{2} u_m'^2 + \frac{\beta}{3} u_m'^3. \quad (17)$$

From Eqns. (15, 16),

$$u'_m - u_m = -\frac{2}{\beta} \left\{ \frac{\alpha^2}{4} + \Delta\beta \right\}^{1/2}, \quad u'_m + u_m = -\frac{\alpha}{\beta}$$

and we find that this hydraulic solution exists provided that

$$f_m \leq \frac{4}{3\beta^2} \left\{ \frac{\alpha^2}{4} + \Delta\beta \right\}^{3/2}. \quad (18)$$

Note here that

$$g(\Delta) = \frac{\alpha^3}{12\beta^2} \left\{ 1 + \frac{6\Delta\beta}{\alpha^2} - \left(1 + \frac{4\Delta\beta}{\alpha^2} \right)^{3/2} \right\} \leq 0 \quad (19)$$

holds for all Δ in the allowed range, $\Delta > -\frac{\alpha^2}{4\beta}$ and $g(\Delta) = 0$ at $\Delta = 0$.

The shock velocities upstream (V_-) and downstream (V_+) are found from Eqn. (6)

with $u_{a,b} = (0, u_-)$ and $(0, u_+)$ respectively, so that

$$V_{\pm} = \Delta - \frac{\alpha u_{\pm}}{2} - \frac{\beta u_{\pm}^2}{3} = \frac{-(f_m + g(\Delta))}{u_{\pm}}.$$

Since we require that $V_+ > 0$ and $V_- < 0$, it follows that $u_- > 0 > u_+$ and that (see Figure 3)

$$f_m > -g(\Delta), \quad (20)$$

which defines the transcritical regime. The results Eqn. (18) and Eqn. (20) are the main conclusion from this study of the steady hydraulic solutions. Eqn. (18) is the condition for the existence of the downstream steady state u_+ , while Eqn. (20), together with Eqn. (13), define the range of Δ for which this asymmetric hydraulic solution can be obtained. We reiterate that when both Eqn. (18) and Eqn. (20) are satisfied we anticipate that in the full equation (1) the shocks $u_{\pm}$ are replaced by wavetrains, as in GS.

The case

$$f_m > \frac{4}{3\beta^2} \left[\frac{\alpha^2}{4} + \Delta\beta \right]^{3/2} \quad (21)$$

requires a different treatment. Instead of the treatment above, we assume now that a stationary shock forms over the front face of the forcing at $x = x'_m$ (Figure 4). The structure to the left of this shock is similar to that described above:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \phi(u) &= -\Delta u + \frac{\alpha u^2}{2} + \frac{\beta u^3}{3} = -C - f, \quad x < x'_m, \\ \text{where } -C &= f_m + g(\Delta), \quad g(\Delta) = \phi(u_m). \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (22)$$

Then as $x = x'_m$, it is clear from Figure 3 that $u = u'_m$ (see Eqn. (16)), and this is sufficient to also determine x'_m . Then since the shock speed is now zero, one has $\phi(u'_m) = \phi(u''_m)$

which determines u_m'' . Downstream of the shock ($x > x_m'$) one seeks a steady solution where $u \rightarrow u_+' as $x \rightarrow \infty$, and $u \rightarrow u_m'' as $x \rightarrow x_m' +$. It is readily shown that this is also given by Eqn. (22), so that in fact $u_+' = u_-$, i.e. the downstream steady state level is identical to that upstream. However, in the downstream case, this is not a shock, and instead is resolved by a rarefaction wave.$$

IV. Numerical simulations

We now discuss some numerical studies of the forced eKdV equation for various flow regimes. A numerical code is developed using the Adams-Bashforth-Moulton predictor and corrector method to integrate Eqn. (1) forward in time, and central finite difference formulas are employed in the spatial discretization process. The code is validated by comparing the numerical result with the exact solitary wave solutions of the eKdV equation.

The localized forcing is switched on impulsively when the time integration starts. We keep α constant ($\alpha = 2$), and fix the forcing to be given by Eqn. (2) for all simulations. Δ and β are then varied to generate different flow regimes. In order to study the mass fluctuation in front of and behind the forcing, we split the mass of the whole system into two parts, namely, $-\infty < x < 0$ (M_{front}) and $0 \leq x < +\infty$ (M_{behind}). As the total mass of the system is conserved, $M_{front} + M_{behind} = M_{total} = 0$ since the null initial condition is used here.

Part 1, forced eKdV, $\beta > 0$

Case (A) : $\Delta < 0$

The transcritical range for Δ is defined by Eqn. (20) which depends on f_m , α and β . One particular value of β , namely, $\beta = 1.4$ will be chosen for the purpose of discussion. The transcritical range is then given by $-0.71 < \Delta < 2.35$.

We first consider a large negative value of Δ ($\Delta = -3$) which is outside the transcritical regime. Figure 5a shows a typical solution of Eqn. (1) with $\xi = 0.3$, and $f_m = 1$. The critical value of β found from Eqn. (18) is given by $\beta_c = 0.28$, and so there is no steady hydraulic solution available, since here $\beta > \beta_c$. Nevertheless, this case is quite similar to that of the usual forced KdV equation⁵. A localized stationary depression is observed just downstream of the forcing region followed by a stationary lee wavetrain. A solitary wavetrain is generated in the upstream direction with one very dominant leading wave. Figure 5b illustrates the mass fluctuation of the system. The upstream solitary wave, formed at a very early stage, is represented by the plot of M_{front} and reaches six units very soon after the integration starts; M_{total} stays equal to zero steadily as time proceeds, as the total mass of the system is conserved. Outside the transcritical regime, the introduction of the cubic nonlinearity does not generate any dramatic influence on the solution as compared with the usual forced KdV model.

Next we consider a case closer to the transcritical regime, $\Delta = -1$, but still with $\xi = 0.3$ and $\beta = 1.4$ (Figure 6a). There is now an undular bore upstream, although, the oscillatory wavetrain downstream is the dominant feature. The critical value of β given by Eqn. (18) is here $\beta_c = 0.59$, and here also $\beta > \beta_c$. It is therefore not surprising that there is no stationary depression just downstream of the forcing region. Instead, there is a downstream wavetrain, which is highly oscillatory. The mass fluctuation is shown in Figure 6b, while the characteristics obtained from Eqns. (4) are shown in Figure 6c.

There are two shocks formed, one upstream which leads to the observed undular bore in Figure 6a, while the other is over the forcing and leads to the unsteadiness of the downstream wavetrain. Figure 6d shows the snap plots at $t = 60$, revealing the regime transitions as β is increased. At $\beta = 0.3$, well below β_c , the solution is similar to that for the usual forced KdV equation, with an upstream undular bore, a depression just behind the obstacle, followed by a modulated wavetrain. This behaviour persists until $\beta > \beta_c$ and for $\beta = 0.6$ we see some variability in the downstream wavetrain, possibly indicative of a rarefaction type of modulation. On further increasing the value of β beyond β_c , the irregular oscillatory wavetrain becomes the dominant feature downstream while the number of upstream waves in the undular bore decreases.

Case (B) : $\Delta = 0$

We now consider the resonant case of $\Delta = 0$, $\xi = 0.3$ and $f_m = 1$, where the critical value $\beta_c = 1.15$. For $\beta < \beta_c$, our numerical simulations show good agreement with the hydraulic approximation in that there is an upstream undular bore composed of solitary waves of nearly uniform amplitude, a stationary downstream depression terminated by a modulated wavetrain. The scenario is analogous to that described by GS for the forced KdV equation. Figure 1 shows the snap plots at $t = 60$ for different values of β . When β is only slightly greater than the critical value ($\beta = 1.2$), the downstream depressed region ceases to exist, and instead a localized minimum develops. There are still regularly generated solitary waves upstream, and a modulated downstream wavetrain remains. On further increasing the value of β , two systems of upstream solitary waves are observed. They are regular ones, which are generated at an early stage and irregular ones, which are apparently generated in accordance with the fluctuations in the depression just in the lee

of the forcing region. These irregular solitary waves, and the accompanying irregularly downstream waves are the most striking results of the present work, and differ drastically from the forced KdV model.

When the cut-off criterion (Eqn. (18)) is exceeded (i.e. $\beta > \beta_c$), one can construct another steady hydraulic solution. This new solution has a stationary shock on the downstream side of the forcing, and is followed by a transition to a rarefaction. In the full Eqn. (1) we interpret the presence of the stationary shock with the fluctuations seen just in the lee of the forcing, leading to the irregular generation of the higher amplitude solitary waves (HASW) observed in the numerical simulations, while the rarefaction becomes a rather weak downstream wavetrain. In this regime, we find that the hydraulic approximation is again useful in predicting the criterion for the presence of a steady lee depression, which is directly related to the structure of the upstream solitary waves. For $\beta = 1.4$, five regular and two irregular HASWs are generated at $t = 60$. The time development in the numerical simulation for $\beta = 1.4$ is shown in Figure 7a. The first HASW, generated at $t \approx 30.5$, travels faster than the regularly generated solitary waves and interacts with them. We are proposing that the generation of this kind of HASW is due to the presence of a stationary shock on the downstream side of the forcing in the hydraulic approximation. Simultaneously, an oscillatory wavetrain is sent downstream. Once the localized depressed region possesses enough negative mass, it is apparently pushed upstream and undergoes a transformation. Simultaneously, one can recognize several fluctuations of mass in the upstream region (Figure 7b), i.e. M_{front} is no longer a straight line. If these localized and large negative disturbances near the forcing region have insufficient mass, they will decay into radiation and be sent back downstream.

Figure 7c illustrates the characteristics for the case of $\beta = 1.4$, which shows evidence to support these interpretations. Some characteristics curves, from the downstream side of the forcing region, bend towards the upstream direction, and have more than one turning point. When we increase the value of β to 1.6 (Figure 1), the number of regularly generated solitary waves drops to three. For $\beta = 3.6$, only one regular solitary wave is formed at an early stage. Consequently, we infer that increasing the cubic nonlinearity hinders the generation of the regular solitary waves, and at the same time triggers the formation of the HASWs.

Case (C) : $\Delta > 0$

Figure 8a shows the snap plots at $t = 60$ for different values of β with $\Delta = 1$, $\xi = 0.3$ and $f_m = 1$. This is still in the transcritical regime, while $\beta_c = 3.67$. For the fixed time period chosen the number of solitary waves generated is proportional to the value of β before it reaches the cut-off criterion of 3.67. When β exceeds the critical value, the depression cannot be maintained, and according to our hydraulic approximation, a stationary shock is formed behind the forcing region. Some HASWs are also observed for the case of $\beta = 4.2$. Figure 8b shows the time history of the case $\beta = 4.2$ and the characteristic curves are shown in Figure 8c. Stationary shocks develop just behind the forcing region, and they form upstream advancing HASWs.

Finally consider the case $\Delta = 2$, $\xi = 0.3$ and $f_m = 1$ which is also in the transcritical regime, while $\beta_c = 0.38$. This case shown in Figure 8d, illustrates the nonlinear character of the solitary wave formation. The generation period decreases and the number of the solitary waves increases if we choose a larger value of β (Figure 8d), but are all still the

irregular regime. However, the amplitudes of the solitary waves generated decrease from about 3.2 at $\beta = 1.2$ to about 2.4 at $\beta = 3.6$.

For an example outside the transcritical range, let $\Delta = 3$, $\beta = 1.4$, $\xi = 0.3$ and $f_m = 1$. A locally stationary elevation forms over the forcing region, and a downstream modulated wavetrain is obtained (Figure 8e). The characteristics curves of this case are shown in Figure 8f.

Part 2, eKdV, $\beta < 0$

Case (A): $\Delta < 0$

We first consider $\Delta = -3$, $\xi = 0.3$ and $f_m = 1$. Figure 9a shows a series of snap plots at $t = 60$. The cut-off criterion for this case is $\beta_c \approx -48.99$, so that we must have $|\beta| < |\beta_c|$ to have a steady hydraulic solution. Only one upstream solitary wave is generated and a depression develops in the forcing region. These results are quite similar to those of the forced KdV equation, and indeed Figure 9b shows the time history of the case $\beta = -1.4$, which is very similar to the result of the case $\beta = +1.4$ (Figure 5a).

For $\Delta = -1$, there is a transition from the undular bore solution to the monotonic bore solution as $|\beta|$ is increased. Figure 10a shows quite dramatically a series of pictures representing this transition. The undular bore solution is obtained for $\beta = -1.0$ and the monotonic bore solution is found for $\beta = -3.2$; here $\beta_c \approx -3.67$ and so $|\beta| < |\beta_c|$ implies that the steady hydraulic solutions hold. But, as $|\beta|$ increases, the upstream shock resolution into an undular bore is converted into resolution as a monotonic bore. Even when $|\beta| > |\beta_c|$, e.g. $\beta = -4.2$, the monotonic bore solution can still be observed. The undular and monotonic bore solutions are globally unsteady, but do ultimately give new

locally steady conditions immediately upstream of the forcing region². Earlier work in the literature shows that the qualitative form of the solution depends on the Froude number (Δ in our case) and the strength of the forcing. We find here that it also depends on the strength of the cubic nonlinearity. The time history for a particular value of β , $\beta = -3.2$, is shown in Figure 10b.

Case (B) : $\Delta = 0$

This case is shown in Figure 11a, b, where now $\beta_c = -1.15$. However, even for $|\beta| > |\beta_c|$ (say $\beta = -2.0$ or $\beta = -3.6$), a monotonic bore solution is still found. A transition similar to that for the case $\Delta = -1$ is also obtained in this regime in that as $|\beta|$ decreases, the upstream monotonic bore becomes an undular bore, e.g. an undular bore is observed at $\beta = -0.6$. But note that the structure of the upstream monotonic bore changes near the forcing, once the cut-off criterion is reached (Figure 11a). The hydraulic approximation is highly effective and precise in predicting the transition point in this case. Figure 11b shows the time history of the monotonic bore solution with $\beta = -1.4$.

Case (C) : $\Delta > 0$

In Figure 12a, b we consider $\Delta = 1$, which is within the transcritical regime, while $\beta_c = -0.59$. For $\beta = -0.3$ (below the cut-off criterion), three well-developed upstream solitary waves are emitted. A stable depression just behind the forcing is found. Further increasing $|\beta|$ results in a stable solution of elevation at the forcing. The amplitude of the elevation continues to decrease as one increases the numerical values β (Figure 12a). Figure 12b shows the time history for the case $\Delta = 1$ and $\beta = -1.4$.

For $\Delta = 3$, a steady supercritical solution is obtained for all the simulations within and outside of the steady depression regime (Figures 13a, b), as the value of Δ considered in this case is outside the transcritical range. A localized elevation is generated and located at the forcing with constant amplitude (≈ 0.35) for the different values of β considered. The amplitude of the elevation is quite insensitive to changes in β , in marked contrast with the previous case.

V. Conclusions

Transcritical flows of a stratified fluid over topography are considered using a forced extended Korteweg – de Vries model (eKdV). The present paper extends the earlier studies by allowing the cubic nonlinear and dispersive terms to have the same sign for their coefficients. A hydraulic approximation (HA) is developed by ignoring the dispersion term. This simplified model of the dynamics is shown to agree remarkably well with independent, direct numerical simulations (DNS) of the full forced eKdV over most parameters regimes. A very interesting result is that two kinds of solitary waves are emitted in certain parameters regimes. Besides the regularly generated ones similar to those in the forced KdV model, there are irregularly generated solitary waves of variable amplitudes. The velocities of the two types of waves are different, and interactions among them are observed.

A further contribution of the present work is to unite these two approaches (HA and DNS) to enhance the understanding of the underlying fluid physics. More precisely, the hydraulic approximation computes a cut-off criterion for the absence of a downstream depression, a lower bound for Δ for any such hydraulic solution, and a determination of

the transcritical regime. Indeed we claim that once this cut-off criterion is exceeded, one can construct another steady hydraulic solution. This new steady solution has a stationary shock on the downstream side of the forcing, and is followed by a transition to a rarefaction. The stationary shock is associated with the irregular, large waves observed in the numerical results, while the rarefaction becomes a rather weak downstream wavetrain. Otherwise the upstream propagating shock which terminates the upstream steady hydraulic solution becomes the observed upstream train of solitary waves, and likewise downstream when the hydraulic solution extends downstream.

We consider briefly the more usual case where the cubic and dispersive terms have opposite signs, and the hydraulic approximation are demonstrated to work there as well. Only positive forcing has been considered here. The effects of negative forcing will be reported in a separate work.

Acknowledgement

Partial financial support has been provided by the Research Grants Council contracts HKU 7067/98E and HKU 7066/00E.

References

- ¹R. H. J. Grimshaw, “Internal solitary waves”, *Advances in Coastal and Ocean Engineering*, ed. P. L. -F. Liu, World Scientific Publishing Company, Singapore, **3**, 1 – 30 (1995).
- ²W. K. Melville and K. R. Helfrich, “Transcritical two-layer flow over topography”, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, **178**, 31 – 52 (1987).

³T. R. Marchant and N. F. Smyth, “Extended Korteweg - de Vries equation and the resonant flow of a fluid over topography”, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, **221**, 263 – 288 (1990).

⁴H. Hanazaki, “A numerical study of nonlinear waves in a transcritical flow of stratified fluid past an obstacle”, *Physics of Fluids A*, **4**, 2230 – 2243 (1992).

⁵R. H. J. Grimshaw and N.F. Smyth, “Resonant flow of a stratified fluid over topography”, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, **169**, 429 – 464 (1986).

⁶T. R. Marchant, “Coupled Korteweg - de Vries equations describing, to high order, resonant flow of a fluid over topography”, *Physics of Fluids*, **11**, 1797 – 1804 (1999).

⁷R. H. J. Grimshaw, E. Pelinovsky and T. Talipova, “The modified Korteweg - de Vries equation in the theory of large amplitude internal waves”, *Nonlinear Processes in Geophysics*, **4**, 237 – 250 (1997).

⁸J. W. Choi, S. M. Sun and M. C. Shen, “Internal capillary-gravity waves of a two-layer fluid with free surface over an obstruction - Forced extended KdV equation”, *Physics of Fluids*, **8**, 397 – 404 (1996).

⁹J. W. Rottman, D. Broutman and R. H. J. Grimshaw, “Numerical simulations of uniformly-stratified fluid flow over topography”, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, **306**, 1 – 30 (1996).

Figures Captions

Figure 1: The snap plots of the flow at $t = 60$ with $\Delta = 0$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$ for $\beta > 0$.

Figure 2: f_m versus u for $\Delta = 0$.

Figure 3: $f_m - f + g(\Delta)$ versus u for $\Delta \neq 0$, for $\Delta < 0$. The case $\Delta > 0$ is similar.

Figure 4: Configuration for a stationary downstream shock.

Figure 5a: The numerical solution with $\Delta = -3.0$, $\beta = 1.4$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$.

Figure 5b: The mass fluctuation with $\Delta = -3.0$, $\beta = 1.4$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$.

Figure 6a: The numerical solution with $\Delta = -1.0$, $\beta = 1.4$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$.

Figure 6b: The mass fluctuation with $\Delta = -1.0$, $\beta = 1.4$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$.

Figure 6c: The characteristics configuration for the hydraulic approximation with $\Delta = -1.0$, $\beta = 1.4$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$.

Figure 6d: The snap plots of the flow at $t = 60$ with $\Delta = -1.0$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$ for $\beta > 0$.

Figure 7a: The numerical solution with $\Delta = 0$, $\beta = 1.4$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$.

Figure 7b: The mass fluctuations with $\Delta = 0$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$ (only M_{front} is shown).

Figure 7c: The characteristics configuration for the hydraulic approximation with $\Delta = 0$, $\beta = 1.4$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$.

Figure 8a: The snap plots of the flow at $t = 60$ with $\Delta = 1.0$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$ for $\beta > 0$.

Figure 8b: The numerical solution with $\Delta = 1.0$, $\beta = 4.2$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$.

Figure 8c: The characteristics configuration for the hydraulic approximation with $\Delta = 1.0$, $\beta = 4.2$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$.

Figure 8d: The snap plots of the flow at $t = 60$ with $\Delta = 2.0$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$ for $\beta > 0$.

Figure 8e: The numerical solution with $\Delta = 3.0$, $\beta = 1.4$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$.

Figure 8f: The characteristics configuration for the hydraulic approximation with $\Delta = 3.0$, $\beta = 1.4$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$.

Figure 9a: The snap plots of the flow at $t = 60$ with $\Delta = -3.0$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$ for $\beta < 0$.

Figure 9b: The numerical solution with $\Delta = -3.0$, $\beta = -1.4$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$.

Figure 10a: The snap plots of the flow at $t = 60$ with $\Delta = -1.0$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$ for $\beta < 0$.

Figure 10b: The numerical solution with $\Delta = -1.0$, $\beta = -3.2$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$.

Figure 11a: The snap plots of the flow at $t = 60$ with $\Delta = 0$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$ for $\beta < 0$.

Figure 11b: The numerical solution with $\Delta = 0$, $\beta = -1.4$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$.

Figure 12a: The snap plots of the flow at $t = 60$ with $\Delta = 1.0$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$ for $\beta < 0$.

Figure 12b: The numerical solution with $\Delta = 1.0$, $\beta = -1.4$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$.

Figure 13a: The snap plots of the flow at $t = 60$ with $\Delta = 3.0$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$ for $\beta < 0$.

Figure 13b: The numerical solution with $\Delta = 3.0$, $\beta = -1.4$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$.




Figure 1: The snap plots of the flow at $t = 60$ with $\Delta = 0$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$ for $\beta > 0$.

$$\Delta = 0$$




Figure 2: f_m versus u for $\Delta = 0$.

$$\Delta < 0$$




Figure 3: $f_m - f + g(\Delta)$ versus u for $\Delta \neq 0$, for $\Delta < 0$. The case $\Delta > 0$ is similar.




Figure 4: Configuration for a stationary downstream shock.




Figure 5a: The numerical solution with $\Delta = -3.0$, $\beta = 1.4$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$.




Figure 5b: The mass fluctuation with $\Delta = -3.0$, $\beta = 1.4$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$.




Figure 6a: The numerical solution with $\Delta = -1.0$, $\beta = 1.4$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$.




Figure 6b: The mass fluctuation with $\Delta = -1.0$, $\beta = 1.4$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$.




Figure 6c: The characteristics configuration for the hydraulic approximation
 □ with $\Delta = -1.0$, $\beta = 1.4$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$.




Figure 6d: The snap plots of the flow at $t = 60$ with $\Delta = -1.0$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$ for $\beta > 0$.




Figure 7a: The numerical solution with $\Delta = 0$, $\beta = 1.4$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$.




Figure 7b: The mass fluctuations with $\Delta = 0$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$ (only M_{front} is shown).




Figure 7c: The characteristics configuration for the hydraulic approximation
 □ with $\Delta = 0$, $\beta = 1.4$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$.




Figure 8a: The snap plots of the flow at $t = 60$ with $\Delta = 1.0$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$ for $\beta > 0$.




Figure 8b: The numerical solution with $\Delta = 1.0$, $\beta = 4.2$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$.




Figure 8c: The characteristics configuration for the hydraulic approximation
 □ with $\Delta = 1.0$, $\beta = 4.2$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$.




Figure 8d: The snap plots of the flow at $t = 60$ with $\Delta = 2.0$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$ for $\beta > 0$.




Figure 8e: The numerical solution with $\Delta = 3.0$, $\beta = 1.4$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$.




Figure 8f: The characteristics configuration for the hydraulic approximation
 □ with $\Delta = 3.0$, $\beta = 1.4$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$.




Figure 9a: The snap plots of the flow at $t = 60$ with $\Delta = -3.0$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$ for $\beta < 0$.




Figure 9b: The numerical solution with $\Delta = -3.0$, $\beta = -1.4$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$.




Figure 10a: The snap plots of the flow at $t=60$ with $\Delta = -1.0$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$ for $\beta < 0$.




Figure 10b: The numerical solution with $\Delta = -1.0$, $\beta = -3.2$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$.




Figure 11a: The snap plots of the flow at $t = 60$ with $\Delta = 0$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$ for $\beta < 0$.




Figure 11b: The numerical solution $\Delta = 0$, $\beta = -1.4$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$.




Figure 12a: The snap plots of the flow at $t = 60$ with $\Delta = 1.0$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$ for $\beta < 0$.




Figure 12b: The numerical solution with $\Delta = 1.0$, $\beta = -1.4$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$.




Figure 13a: The snap plots of the flow at $t = 60$ with $\Delta = 3.0$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$ for $\beta < 0$.




Figure 13b: The numerical solution with $\Delta = 3.0$, $\beta = -1.4$, $f_m = 1.0$ and $\xi = 0.3$.