


*Communications in  
Applied  
Mathematics and  
Computational  
Science*

Volume 3

No. 1

2008



**CORRECTION TO THE ARTICLE**

**A COMPARISON OF THE EXTENDED FINITE ELEMENT  
METHOD WITH THE IMMERSSED INTERFACE METHOD FOR  
ELLIPTIC EQUATIONS WITH DISCONTINUOUS  
COEFFICIENTS AND SINGULAR SOURCES  
BY VAUGHAN ET AL.**

J. THOMAS BEALE, DAVID L. CHOPP, RANDALL J. LEVEQUE AND ZHILIN LI



**mathematical sciences publishers**

**CORRECTION TO THE ARTICLE  
A COMPARISON OF THE EXTENDED FINITE ELEMENT  
METHOD WITH THE IMMERSED INTERFACE METHOD FOR  
ELLIPTIC EQUATIONS WITH DISCONTINUOUS  
COEFFICIENTS AND SINGULAR SOURCES  
BY VAUGHAN ET AL.**

J. THOMAS BEALE, DAVID L. CHOPP, RANDALL J. LEVEQUE AND ZHILIN LI

Volume 1:1 (2006), 207–228

A recent paper by Vaughan, Smith, and Chopp [Comm. App. Math. & Comp. Sci. 1 (2006), 207–228] reported numerical results for three examples using the immersed interface method (IIM) and the extended finite element method (X-FEM). The results presented for the IIM showed first-order accuracy for the solution and inaccurate values of the normal derivative at the interface. This was due to an error in the implementation. The purpose of this note is to present correct results using the IIM for the same examples used in that paper, which demonstrate the expected second-order accuracy in the maximum norm over all grid points. Results now indicate that on these problems the IIM and X-FEM methods give comparable accuracy in solution values. With appropriate interpolation it is also possible to obtain nearly second order accurate values of the solution and normal derivative at the interface with the IIM.

### 1. Introduction

The immersed interface method (IIM) [3; 5; 4] is a method for solving PDE's with discontinuous coefficients and singular sources at an interface using values at grid points. For elliptic problems, uniform second-order accuracy is obtained at all grid points, including those near and on the interface, by correcting the truncation error at the interface to first order using jump conditions. This second-order accuracy has been well established in computational practice and theoretical analysis; see for example, [1; 2; 3; 4; 5].

---

*MSC2000:* 65N06, 65N30, 65N50.

*Keywords:* immersed interface method (IIM), elliptic interface problems, finite difference methods, discontinuous coefficients, singular source term, convergence order.

The work of Beale and Li was supported by the Program on Random Media at S.A.M.S.I.

The paper [7] presented numerical results for three test problems using the IIM as well as the extended finite element method. The reported results with the IIM showed only first-order accuracy for the solution and inaccurate values of the normal derivative at the interface. This was due to error in the implementation.

The purpose of this note is to present correct versions of the Tables in [7]. These results confirm that the IIM gives second-order accuracy in the maximum norm at the grid points for all the examples. Values at the interface are obtained to second order by interpolation. Furthermore, the normal derivative of the solution at the interface, also interpolated from values at grid points, is also nearly second order accurate. This agrees with the theoretical prediction of Beale and Layton [1].

The corrected results indicate that on these problems the IIM and X-FEM methods give comparable accuracy in solution values, although the IIM and the X-FEM results are no longer solved using the same interpolation scheme for locating the interface from a discrete implicit representation. The IIM results presented here are using a cubic spline reconstruction, while the X-FEM results are from using a linear interpolant. The IIM with appropriate interpolation also gives much more accurate normal derivatives at the interface than those reported for X-FEM in [7]. However, as noted in [6], X-FEM solutions can be significantly improved by using more specialized enrichment functions. These extra enrichment functions were not used for the results presented here.

The computer codes used are available on request.

## 2. Corrected Tables

The examples in the paper [7] are taken from the original IIM paper [3] and the tables in [3] are correct and indicate second order accuracy. For this note we have repeated these experiments using a new version of the IIM developed in 2001 by Li and Ito [4]. With the new code we have also computed the error in the normal derivative of the solution at the interface for corrected versions of Tables 4, 7, and 10. These errors were not presented in the original paper [3].

The problems and notation are presented in [7] and not repeated here. The error displayed in the tables is the maximum error over all grid points,

$$\|E_n\|_\infty = \max_{i,j} |u(x_i, y_j) - u_{ij}|,$$

where  $u_{ij}$  is the computed approximation at the grid point  $(x_i, y_j)$ . In [7] this was denoted by  $T_n$ , but we are now being consistent with the notation of LeVeque and Li [3] where  $T_n$  denotes the truncation error rather than the global error. The statement made at the bottom of page 219 in [7] about the notation of LeVeque and Li is incorrect. We use  $E_n^I$  to denote the error at the interface (when appropriate interpolation is used), and  $E_n^D$  to denote the error in the normal derivative at the interface.

The ratios of successive errors,  $\|E_n\|_\infty/\|E_{2n}\|_\infty$ , are displayed to show the order of convergence. A ratio of 2 corresponds to first order accuracy, while a ratio of 4 indicates second order accuracy. Note that we do not necessarily expect ratios of exactly 4 since the accuracy seen on a particular grid is sensitive to how the interface cuts between the grid points.

Below are the corrected tables that should be inserted in [7] in place of the tables presented there. We give new versions of all tables except Table 2, which concerned the system size rather than the errors. We have extended the tables to  $n = 640$  for the IIM to better demonstrate the asymptotic rate of convergence.

$n$	Step Enrichment		Ramp Enrichment		IIM		
	$\ E_n\ _\infty$	ratio	$\ E_n\ _\infty$	ratio	$n$	$\ E_n\ _\infty$	ratio
19	$3.8397 \cdot 10^{-3}$		$7.8138 \cdot 10^{-3}$		20	$3.4796 \cdot 10^{-3}$	
39	$9.3782 \cdot 10^{-4}$	4.0943	$3.9577 \cdot 10^{-3}$	1.9743	40	$9.6364 \cdot 10^{-4}$	3.6109
79	$2.3034 \cdot 10^{-4}$	4.0715	$1.9029 \cdot 10^{-3}$	2.0798	80	$2.0531 \cdot 10^{-4}$	4.6935
159	$6.4061 \cdot 10^{-5}$	3.5956	$9.3797 \cdot 10^{-4}$	2.0287	160	$6.0650 \cdot 10^{-5}$	3.3852
319	$1.5619 \cdot 10^{-5}$	4.1015	$4.7646 \cdot 10^{-4}$	1.9686	320	$1.5702 \cdot 10^{-5}$	3.8626
					640	$3.7712 \cdot 10^{-6}$	4.1636

**Table 1.** Errors at grid points for example 1.

$n$	Step Enrichment		Ramp Enrichment		IIM		
	$\ E_n\ _\infty$	ratio	$\ E_n^I\ _\infty$	ratio	$n$	$\ E_n^I\ _\infty$	ratio
19	$5.1857 \cdot 10^{-3}$		$2.1871 \cdot 10^{-2}$		20	$3.6675 \cdot 10^{-3}$	
39	$1.2444 \cdot 10^{-3}$	4.1672	$1.1708 \cdot 10^{-2}$	1.8680	40	$9.9843 \cdot 10^{-4}$	3.6733
79	$3.0043 \cdot 10^{-4}$	4.1421	$6.0996 \cdot 10^{-3}$	1.9482	80	$2.0727 \cdot 10^{-4}$	4.8172
159	$8.8146 \cdot 10^{-5}$	3.4083	$3.1101 \cdot 10^{-3}$	1.9612	160	$6.1075 \cdot 10^{-5}$	3.3936
319	$1.9315 \cdot 10^{-5}$	4.5636	$1.6142 \cdot 10^{-3}$	1.9267	320	$1.5816 \cdot 10^{-5}$	3.8615
					640	$3.7840 \cdot 10^{-6}$	4.1799

**Table 3.** Interface errors for example 1.

$n$	Step Enrichment		Ramp Enrichment		IIM		
	$\ E_n\ _\infty$	ratio	$\ E_n^D\ _\infty$	ratio	$n$	$\ E_n^D\ _\infty$	ratio
19	$4.1828 \cdot 10^{-1}$		$1.8292 \cdot 10^{-0}$		20	$3.8809 \cdot 10^{-3}$	
39	$1.6067 \cdot 10^{-1}$	2.6033	$1.6479 \cdot 10^{-0}$	1.1100	40	$1.6169 \cdot 10^{-3}$	2.4002
79	$9.3826 \cdot 10^{-2}$	1.7124	$1.3096 \cdot 10^{-0}$	1.2583	80	$3.8618 \cdot 10^{-4}$	4.1870
159	$4.5301 \cdot 10^{-2}$	2.0712	$1.4733 \cdot 10^{-0}$	0.8889	160	$1.5042 \cdot 10^{-4}$	2.5673
319	$2.2290 \cdot 10^{-2}$	2.0323	$1.3818 \cdot 10^{-0}$	1.0662	320	$4.0937 \cdot 10^{-5}$	3.6744
					640	$1.0109 \cdot 10^{-5}$	4.0497

**Table 4.** Interface derivative errors for example 1.

$n$	Step Enrichment		$n$	IIM	
	$\ E_n\ _\infty$	ratio		$\ E_n\ _\infty$	ratio
19	$1.7613 \cdot 10^{-3}$		20	$1.7445 \cdot 10^{-3}$	
39	$4.1771 \cdot 10^{-4}$	4.2166	40	$4.8638 \cdot 10^{-4}$	3.5867
79	$1.0289 \cdot 10^{-4}$	4.0598	80	$1.4476 \cdot 10^{-4}$	3.3598
159	$3.0164 \cdot 10^{-5}$	3.4110	160	$3.0120 \cdot 10^{-5}$	4.8063
319	$6.7960 \cdot 10^{-6}$	4.4385	320	$8.2255 \cdot 10^{-6}$	3.6618
			640	$2.0599 \cdot 10^{-6}$	3.9932

**Table 5.** Errors at grid points for example 2.

$n$	Step Enrichment		$n$	IIM	
	$\ E_n^I\ _\infty$	ratio		$\ E_n^I\ _\infty$	ratio
19	$1.6517 \cdot 10^{-3}$		20	$1.6370 \cdot 10^{-3}$	
39	$3.3824 \cdot 10^{-4}$	4.8832	40	$4.5883 \cdot 10^{-4}$	3.5678
79	$8.2238 \cdot 10^{-5}$	4.1129	80	$1.2910 \cdot 10^{-4}$	3.5540
159	$3.1568 \cdot 10^{-5}$	2.6051	160	$2.5791 \cdot 10^{-5}$	5.0058
319	$7.4612 \cdot 10^{-6}$	4.2310	320	$6.7347 \cdot 10^{-6}$	3.8295
			640	$1.5924 \cdot 10^{-6}$	4.2292

**Table 6.** Interface errors for example 2.

$n$	Step Enrichment		$n$	IIM	
	$\ E_n^D\ _\infty$	ratio		$\ E_n^D\ _\infty$	ratio
19	$2.7307 \cdot 10^{-1}$		20	$1.0232 \cdot 10^{-2}$	
39	$1.2776 \cdot 10^{-1}$	2.1374	40	$5.2912 \cdot 10^{-3}$	1.9337
79	$6.1203 \cdot 10^{-2}$	2.0875	80	$3.6363 \cdot 10^{-3}$	1.4551
159	$4.8216 \cdot 10^{-2}$	1.2694	160	$9.3114 \cdot 10^{-4}$	3.9052
319	$2.4790 \cdot 10^{-2}$	1.9450	320	$2.7492 \cdot 10^{-4}$	3.3869
			640	$6.8856 \cdot 10^{-5}$	3.9927

**Table 7.** Interface derivative errors for example 2.

$n$	Step Enrichment		$n$	IIM	
	$\ E_n\ _\infty$	ratio		$\ E_n\ _\infty$	ratio
19	$1.7648 \cdot 10^{-4}$		20	$4.37883 \cdot 10^{-4}$	
39	$6.0109 \cdot 10^{-5}$	2.9360	40	$1.07887 \cdot 10^{-4}$	4.0587
79	$1.7769 \cdot 10^{-5}$	3.3828	80	$2.77752 \cdot 10^{-5}$	3.8843
159	$4.8626 \cdot 10^{-6}$	3.6542	160	$7.49907 \cdot 10^{-6}$	3.7038
319	$1.2362 \cdot 10^{-6}$	3.9335	320	$1.74001 \cdot 10^{-6}$	4.3098
			640	$4.50600 \cdot 10^{-7}$	3.8614

**Table 8.** Errors at grid points for example 3.

$n$	Step Enrichment		$n$	IIM	
	$\ E_n^I\ _\infty$	ratio		$\ E_n^I\ _\infty$	ratio
19	$4.7842 \cdot 10^{-4}$		20	$2.7671 \cdot 10^{-3}$	
39	$1.0659 \cdot 10^{-4}$	4.4884	40	$4.5255 \cdot 10^{-4}$	6.1143
79	$2.8361 \cdot 10^{-5}$	3.7583	80	$7.7651 \cdot 10^{-5}$	5.8280
159	$7.3603 \cdot 10^{-6}$	3.8532	160	$1.3988 \cdot 10^{-5}$	5.5512
319	$2.0634 \cdot 10^{-6}$	3.5671	320	$2.7647 \cdot 10^{-6}$	5.0596
			640	$6.5488 \cdot 10^{-7}$	4.2217

**Table 9.** Interface errors for example 3.

$n$	Step Enrichment		$n$	IIM	
	$\ E_n^D\ _\infty$	ratio		$\ E_n^D\ _\infty$	ratio
19	$5.6520 \cdot 10^{-2}$		20	$3.8100 \cdot 10^{-3}$	
39	$2.4190 \cdot 10^{-2}$	2.3365	40	$1.7600 \cdot 10^{-3}$	2.1648
79	$9.4512 \cdot 10^{-3}$	2.5595	80	$5.2150 \cdot 10^{-4}$	3.3749
159	$7.1671 \cdot 10^{-3}$	1.3187	160	$1.4000 \cdot 10^{-4}$	3.7250
319	$2.6865 \cdot 10^{-3}$	2.6678	320	$3.6260 \cdot 10^{-5}$	3.8610
			640	$9.1910 \cdot 10^{-6}$	3.9452

**Table 10.** Interface derivative errors for example 3.

## References

- [1] J. Thomas Beale and Anita T. Layton, *On the accuracy of finite difference methods for elliptic problems with interfaces*, Commun. Appl. Math. Comput. Sci. **1** (2006), 91–119. [MR 2244270](#)
- [2] Huaxiong Huang and Zhilin Li, *Convergence analysis of the immersed interface method*, IMA J. Numer. Anal. **19** (1999), no. 4, 583–608. [MR 2000j:65073](#) [Zbl 0940.65114](#)
- [3] Randall J. LeVeque and Zhilin Li, *The immersed interface method for elliptic equations with discontinuous coefficients and singular sources*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **31** (1994), no. 4, 1019–1044. [MR 95g:65139](#) [Zbl 0811.65083](#)
- [4] Zhilin Li and Kazufumi Ito, *Maximum principle preserving schemes for interface problems with discontinuous coefficients*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput. **23** (2001), no. 1, 339–361. [MR 2002h:65166](#) [Zbl 1001.65115](#)
- [5] ———, *The immersed interface method: Numerical solutions of pdes involving interfaces and irregular domains*, Frontiers in Applied Mathematics, no. 33, SIAM, Philadelphia, 2006. [MR 2007g:65005](#) [Zbl 1122.65096](#)
- [6] Bryan G. Smith, Benjamin L. Vaughan, and David L. Chopp, *The extended finite element method for boundary layer problems in biofilm growth*, Commun. Appl. Math. Comput. Sci. **2** (2007), 35–56. [MR 2327082](#) [Zbl 1131.65092](#)
- [7] Benjamin L. Vaughan, Bryan G. Smith, and David L. Chopp, *A comparison of the extended finite element method with the immersed interface method for elliptic equations with discontinuous coefficients and singular sources*, Commun. Appl. Math. Comput. Sci. **1** (2006), 207–228. [MR 2008c:65353](#)

Received July 7, 2008.

J. THOMAS BEALE: [beale@math.duke.edu](mailto:beale@math.duke.edu)

*Department of Mathematics, Duke University, Box 90320, Durham, NC 27708, United States*

DAVID L. CHOPP: [chopp@northwestern.edu](mailto:chopp@northwestern.edu)

*Engineering Sciences and Applied Mathematics Dept., Northwestern University, 2145 Sheridan Road, Evanston, IL 60208, United States*

RANDALL J. LEVEQUE: [rjl@amath.washington.edu](mailto:rjl@amath.washington.edu)

*Department of Applied Mathematics, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195-2420, United States*

ZHILIN LI: [zhilin@math.ncsu.edu](mailto:zhilin@math.ncsu.edu)

*Center for Research in Scientific Computation, and Department of Mathematics, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 27695, United States*