Chobeau, Pierre; Savioja, Lauri

Memory cost of absorbing conditions for the finite-difference time-domain method

Published in:
Journal of the Acoustical Society of America

DOI:
10.1121/1.4958977

Published: 01/07/2016

Please cite the original version:
Memory cost of absorbing conditions for the finite-difference time-domain method

Pierre Chobeau, and Lauri Savioja

Citation: The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 140, EL119 (2016); doi: 10.1121/1.4958977
View online: https://doi.org/10.1121/1.4958977
View Table of Contents: http://asa.scitation.org/toc/jas/140/1
Published by the Acoustical Society of America

Articles you may be interested in

Tonal noise of a controlled-diffusion airfoil at low angle of attack and Reynolds number
The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 140, EL113 (2016); 10.1121/1.4958916

Passive fathometer reflector identification with phase shift modeling
The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 140, EL125 (2016); 10.1121/1.4958983

Sediment sound speed inversion with time-frequency analysis and modal arrival time probability density functions
The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 140, EL131 (2016); 10.1121/1.4958934

Coherent perfect absorption induced by the nonlinearity of a Helmholtz resonator
The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 140, EL94 (2016); 10.1121/1.4954869

Acoustic performance of boundaries having constant phase gradient
The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 140, EL7 (2016); 10.1121/1.4954754

The effect of sound speed profile on shallow water shipping sound maps
The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 140, EL84 (2016); 10.1121/1.4954712
Abstract: Three absorbing layers are investigated using standard rectilinear finite-difference schemes. The perfectly matched layer (PML) is compared with basic lossy layers terminated by two types of absorbing boundary conditions, all simulated using equivalent memory consumption. Lossy layers present the advantage of being scalar schemes, whereas the PML relies on a staggered scheme where both velocity and pressure are split. Although the PML gives the lowest reflection magnitudes over all frequencies and incidence angles, the most efficient lossy layer gives reflection magnitudes of the same order as the PML from mid- to high-frequency and for restricted incidence angles.
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1. Introduction

Simulations of free-field condition using a truncated numerical domain require a truncation that shows both significant absorption of outgoing waves and a low memory consumption. The numerical techniques used for the domain truncation can be split into two categories: absorbing boundary conditions and absorbing layers. Whereas absorbing boundary conditions are usually applied on a single node, absorbing layers are defined over the range of nodes constituting the layer thickness. Although absorbing conditions have been tested under various types of configuration with time-domain methods, their efficiency is not often related to their relative memory requirements.

Modern finite-difference time-domain (FDTD) simulations are often computed on massively parallel computation hardware such as graphics processing units (GPUs). In those environments, the computational performance is typically limited by the memory bandwidth as opposed to being compute-bound. For this reason, our main focus is on memory usage although numbers of required operations are reported as well. The selected absorbing techniques are tested for equivalent memory consumption using standard rectilinear- (SRL-) FDTD updates, also known as standard leapfrog. The numerical results, simulated using two-dimensional (2D) domains, give an estimate of the absorbing efficiency as a function of frequency, incidence angle and layer thickness. The theory related to absorbing conditions is briefly reviewed in Sec. 2. The numerical results are presented in Sec. 3.

2. Theory

2.1 Absorbing boundary conditions

In this section, a 2D Cartesian coordinate system (x, y) is considered. The boundary is parallel to the y-axis, and perpendicular to the propagation direction that follows the x-axis.

The first-order Engquist and Majda boundary condition\(^3\) (EM-BC) at \(x = x(b)\) is given by

\[
\frac{\partial p}{\partial x(b)} - \frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial p}{\partial t} = 0,
\]

where \(c\) is the sound speed. Equation (1) can be written as a two-step (in time) SRL-FDTD update

\[
\hat{p}^{n+1}_i = \left[1 + \frac{N(b) \Delta t}{2}\right]^{-1} \left(\hat{p}^{n}_i - \sum_{j=1}^{N-b} \frac{N-b}{N} \hat{p}^{n}_j + 2 \hat{p}^{n}_i - \left[1 + \frac{N(b) \Delta t}{2}\right] \hat{p}^{n-1}_i \right),
\]

where \(\hat{p}^{n}_i\) is the discretized pressure at the node \(i\) and at the discrete time \(n\), \(j\) corresponds to the axial nodes, \(N\) is the total number of axial nodes, \(N_b\) is an indicator

\(\Delta t\) is the time step and \(\Delta x\) is the spatial step.
function giving the number of boundary nodes, and $\lambda$ is the Courant number defined by
\[ \lambda = \frac{cT_s}{h}, \]  
(3)
where $T_s$ is the time step and $h$ is the spatial step.

The second-order Taylor series (T-BC) defined for the digital waveguide method\(^1\) can be applied to numerical methods that use rectilinear topologies such as the SRL-FDTD method. The T-BC is defined as follows:
\[ \tilde{p}_i^{n+1} = \frac{5}{2}\tilde{p}_i^n - 2\tilde{p}_i^{n-1} + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{p}_i^{n-2}, \]  
(4)
where the subscript $i(b)$ corresponds to the location of the boundary. Compared to EM-BC, it requires an additional step: $\tilde{p}_i^{n-3}$. The SRL-FDTD update form of the T-BC is a three-step scheme written as
\[ \tilde{p}_i^{n+1} = \lambda^2 \left( \sum_{j=1}^{N-N(b)} \tilde{p}_j^n - (N - N(b))\tilde{p}_i^n \right) + 2\tilde{p}_i^n - \tilde{p}_i^{n-1} \]
\[ + N(b) \left( \frac{5}{2}\tilde{p}_{i(b)} - 2\tilde{p}_{i(b)-2} + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{p}_{i(b)-3} \right). \]
(5)

### 2.2 Absorbing layers

An absorbing layer can be seen as an anisotropic media that gradually decreases the pressure field magnitude along a given direction.

The basic lossy layer (LL) can be derived from the lossy wave equation
\[ \frac{\partial^2 p}{\partial t^2} - c^2 \Delta p + 2\sigma \frac{\partial p}{\partial t} = 0, \]  
(6)
where $\sigma$ is the attenuation factor that gradually increases following the main propagation direction inside the absorbing layer, i.e., the direction normal to the boundary. It is defined as
\[ \sigma_x = \sigma_{\text{max}} \left( \frac{x - x_0}{e_{\text{AL}}} \right)^2, \]  
(7)
where $e_{\text{AL}}$ is the layer thickness, $x_0$ the beginning of the absorbing layer, $x \in [x_0, x_{e_{\text{AL}}}]$. The attenuation factor is equal to zero outside the absorbing layer. The value of $\sigma_{\text{max}}$ in Eq. (7) is empirically determined for given layer thickness by minimizing both the round-trip and the transition reflections.\(^5\) The quadratic shape is chosen as a compromise between linear and higher orders shape to minimize the transition reflection and increase the performance of the layer.\(^6\) The SRL-FDTD update for Eq. (6) can be written
\[ \tilde{p}_i^{n+1} = \left[ 1 + \sigma T_s \right]^{-1} \left( \lambda^2 \left( \sum_{j=1}^{N-N(b)} \tilde{p}_j^n - N\tilde{p}_i^n \right) + 2\tilde{p}_i^n - \left[ 1 - \sigma T_s \right]\tilde{p}_i^{n-1} \right). \]
(8)

The perfectly matched layer (PML) can be defined using different approaches as reminded by Osokoi et al.\(^5\) It is chosen here to use a staggered finite difference scheme,\(^3\) where the velocity and pressure grids are interleaved in both space and time. In 2D, the update can be written as
\[ \tilde{v}_{x,i+0.5}^{n+0.5} = \tilde{e}_x^{0}(\tilde{v}_{x,i+1}^{n} - \tilde{v}_{x,i}^{n}), \]  
(9a)
\[ \tilde{v}_{y,i+0.5}^{n+0.5} = \tilde{e}_y^{n}(\tilde{v}_{y,i+1}^{n} - \tilde{v}_{y,i}^{n}), \]  
(9b)
followed by the pressure update
\[ \tilde{p}_{x,i+0.5}^{n+0.5} = \tilde{e}_x^{n}\tilde{p}_{x,i}^{n} - \tilde{e}_x^{0}(\tilde{v}_{x,i+1}^{n+0.5} - \tilde{v}_{x,i}^{n+0.5}), \]  
(10a)
\[ \tilde{p}_{y,i+0.5}^{n+0.5} = \tilde{e}_y^{n}\tilde{p}_{y,i}^{n} - \tilde{e}_y^{0}(\tilde{v}_{y,i+1}^{n+0.5} - \tilde{v}_{y,i}^{n+0.5}), \]  
(10b)
where $\tilde{p}_{x,i}^{n+1} = \tilde{p}_{x,i}^{n+1} + \tilde{p}_{y,i}^{n+1}$. The factors $\tilde{e}_x^{0}$, $\tilde{e}_x^{n}$, $\tilde{e}_y^{n}$, and $\tilde{e}_y^{0}$ are defined for the $x$ coordinate as
Table 1. Memory requirements for each absorbing condition for a layer thickness of \(N\) pressure-nodes, \(n_{\text{dim}}\) dimensional space, and \(n_{\text{dir}}\) the number of attenuation factor directions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EM-BC</th>
<th>T-BC</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>PML</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thickness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pressure-node)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>(5 + n_{\text{dim}})</td>
<td>(6 + 2n_{\text{dim}})</td>
<td>(5 + 2n_{\text{dim}})</td>
<td>(4n_{\text{dim}} + (n_{\text{dim}} - 1))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplications</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(4n_{\text{dim}})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total operations per pressure-node</td>
<td>(14 + 2n_{\text{dim}})</td>
<td>(13 + 2n_{\text{dim}})</td>
<td>(N(12 + 2n_{\text{dim}}))</td>
<td>(N(8n_{\text{dim}} + (n_{\text{dim}} - 1)))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory consumption (stored values)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(N(2 + n_{\text{dir}}))</td>
<td>(N(2n_{\text{dir}} + 4n_{\text{dir}}))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
e^x = e^{-\sigma_x T_x \rho c^2}, \quad e^\beta = \frac{1 - e^{-\sigma_x T_x \rho c^2}}{h \sigma_x},
\]

\[
e^\gamma = e^{-\sigma_y T_y}, \quad e^\gamma = \frac{1 - e^{-\sigma_y T_y}}{h \rho \sigma_x},
\]

Equations (11) for \(y\) and \(z\) coordinates follow a similar form and are not given here for brevity. The attenuation factor \(\sigma_x\) is defined following Eq. (7), and the maximum value is set using \(\sigma_{\text{max-PML}} = \frac{\log R}{\rho c h}\),

where the value of the reflection coefficient \(R\) is set to be at the lowest and adjusted by minimizing the round-trip and the transition reflections\(^7\) for the average layer thickness.

2.3 Memory requirements

The number of operations and the memory consumption per pressure-node is given in Table 1 for \(n_{\text{dim}}\) dimensional space. The thickness of the layer \(N\) and the number of attenuation directions \(n_{\text{dir}}\) are taken into account in the estimation of the final memory consumption of each layer. Both boundary conditions EM-BC and T-BC present similar memory consumption. The PML, because of the staggered scheme and the split pressure field in Eqs. (9) and (10), presents a larger memory cost than the LL. For instance, a 2D \((n_{\text{dim}} = 2)\) and single direction \((n_{\text{dir}} = 1)\) PML of \(N = 4\) pressure-node thickness is equivalent in memory to a 10 nodes LL (Sec. 3.2).

3. Numerical results

Both boundaries and layers can be numerically tested by taking advantage of the geometrical symmetry that allows to reduce the dimension of the domain from 3D to 2D, without loss of information. The following simulations are implemented using 2D schemes, which still enables to test several incidence angles and layer thicknesses.

3.1 Simulation settings and principle

The numerical domain used for 2D simulations is made of a propagation domain and an absorbing condition, as depicted in Fig. 1. The source and the receivers are located at the same distance from the absorbing boundary or from the entrance of the absorbing layer.
Eighty-one receivers are located along a line parallel to the boundary or the layer at distances that correspond to angle of incidence \( \theta \) ranging from 0° to 80°.

The propagation domain is made of a scalar pressure scheme computed over a grid of regularly spaced pressure-nodes. The PML is the only absorbing condition that requires interleaved pressure and velocity grids, i.e., the scheme is staggered. In this case, SRL scalar and staggered schemes are equivalent and can be directly connected to each other.

The sampling frequency is set equal to \( F_s = 8000 \text{ Hz} \), which is equivalent to a time step \( T_s = 1.25 \times 10^{-4} \text{ s} \). The simulations are carried out at the Courant limit \( \lambda = 1/\sqrt{2} \). Using a sound speed \( c = 340 \text{ m s}^{-1} \) gives a spatial step equal to \( h = 6.00 \times 10^{-2} \text{ m} \). The total number of time steps for a simulation is set equal to 448, i.e., 0.056 s. The source is soft type that emits a pulse with a constant frequency content in the range \( f = [0, 2000] \text{ Hz} \), that corresponds to a normalized frequency range of \( f_{\text{norm}} = f/F_s = [0, 0.25] \).

The thicknesses of the studied layers are constricted in \( e_{\text{AL}} = [4–32] \text{ pressure-nodes} \) [0.24–1.92] m. The maximum value of the lossy layer attenuation factor is empirically set at \( \sigma_{\text{max}} = 3000 \text{ s}^{-1} \). In the case of the PML, \( \sigma_{\text{max-PML}} = 0.18 \text{ s}^{-1} \) that corresponds to a reflection coefficient \( R = 0.01 \) in Eq. (12).

The reflection magnitude is calculated in two steps: first, the free-field pressure \( \tilde{P}_{\text{free}} \) is calculated using an extended propagation domain where outgoing waves do not collide with any boundary during the simulation duration. Second, the acoustic pressure \( \tilde{P} \) is calculated at the same location in presence of absorbing conditions. The acoustic pressures \( \tilde{P} \) and \( \tilde{P}_{\text{free}} \) are windowed and transformed in the frequency-domain that gives \( \tilde{P} \) and \( \tilde{P}_{\text{free}} \), respectively. The absolute value of the difference between the two frequency-variables gives the reflection magnitude as a function of frequency. This reflection magnitude is presented in dB as

\[
R(f) = 20 \log_{10}(|\tilde{P}_{\text{free}} - \tilde{P}|).
\] (13)

### 3.2 Preliminary observations on the absorbing conditions

The basic LL, because of its simplistic approach, presents only poor absorbing properties compared with the PML that has already proved to be a highly absorbing layer.

![Fig. 2. (Color online) Reflection magnitude (dB) obtained with the LL-EM-BC, the LL-T-BC, and the PML, for three angles of incidence 0°, 45°, and 80°.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1121/1.4958977)

![Fig. 3. (Color online) Reflection magnitude in dB for incidence angles ranging from 0° to 80° along frequency for the LL-T-BC (left) and the PML (right).](http://dx.doi.org/10.1121/1.4958977)
However, absorbing properties of the LL can be improved using an absorbing termination such as the EM-BC or the T-BC [Fig. 1(a)], which gives two layers: the LL-EM-BC and the LL-T-BC, respectively. The following numerical results focus on the reflection magnitude given by the three absorbing layers: the LL-EM-BC, the LL-T-BC, and the PML, all for equal memory consumption.

Considering a 2D ($n_{\text{dim}} = 2$) and single direction ($n_{\text{dir}} = 1$) PML of $N_{\text{PML}}$ pressure-nodes, the equivalence between $N_{\text{PML}}$ and $N_{\text{LL}}$ for equal memory consumption is given by $8N_{\text{PML}} = 3N_{\text{LL}} + 3N_{\text{EM-BC}} = 3N_{\text{LL}} + 4N_{\text{T-BC}}$, where $N_{\text{EM-BC}} = N_{\text{T-BC}} = 1$. Averaging the number of nodes $N_{\text{LL}}$ between the LL-EM-BC and the LL-T-BC, for a range of $N_{\text{PML}} = [4, 8, 12, 16]$ nodes, gives a unique equivalent set of $N_{\text{LL}} = [10, 20, 31, 42]$ nodes.

3.3 Results
The reflection magnitudes obtained with the three layers LL-EM-BC, LL-T-BC, and PML, are shown in Fig. 2, at three incidence angles and for equal memory consumption. Among the three layers, the LL-EM-BC presents the highest reflection magnitudes. Although the LL-T-BC presents for specific frequencies the lowest reflection, the PML remains on average overall frequencies and angles the most absorbing layer as shown in Fig. 3.

Four layer thicknesses are compared in Fig. 4 between the LL-T-BC and the PML for three angles of incidence $\theta = 0^\circ$ (left), $\theta = 45^\circ$ (middle), and $\theta = 80^\circ$ (right).

4. Conclusions
Three absorbing layers have been compared to each other using the SRL-FDTD schemes of equivalent memory consumption. The PML and the LL-T-BC present the lowest reflection magnitudes. The PML performs better than the LL-T-BC at low frequencies for all incidence angles, and for large incidence angles at all frequencies. The LL-T-BC gives similar or better performance than the PML at mid- and high-frequencies for low incidence angles. In terms of memory, the PML is the only approach that requires a staggered pressure and velocity scheme, where the pressure field is split following each direction. In comparison, the LL-T-BC only requires a scalar pressure grid and an additional stored value at the boundary. Considering both the absorbing efficiency and the memory cost, for specific geometries where low incidence angles are predominant, the LL-T-BC can be an alternative absorbing scheme of interest.
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