

# RAPID: A fast, high resolution, flux-conservative algorithm designed for planet-disk interactions

L. R. Mudryk\*, N. W. Murray

Canadian Institute for Theoretical Astrophysics, Toronto, ON, CANADA, M5S 3H8

---

## ARTICLE INFO

Published in *New Astronomy*

PACS:  
95.30.Lz  
95.75.Pq  
97.10.Gz  
97.82.Jw

Keywords:  
Accretion disks  
Hydrodynamics  
Methods: numerical  
Planetary systems: formation

---

## ABSTRACT

We describe a newly developed hydrodynamic code for studying accretion disk processes. The numerical method uses a finite volume, nonlinear, Total Variation Diminishing (TVD) scheme to capture shocks and control spurious oscillations. It is second-order accurate in time and space and makes use of a FARGO-type algorithm to alleviate *Courant-Friedrichs-Lewy* time step restrictions imposed by the rapidly rotating inner disk region. OpenMP directives are implemented enabling faster computations on shared-memory, multi-processor machines. The resulting code is simple, fast and memory efficient. We discuss the relevant details of the numerical method and provide results of the code's performance on standard test problems. We also include a detailed examination of the code's performance on planetary disk-planet interactions. We show that the results produced on the standard problem setup are consistent with a wide variety of other codes.

---

## 1. Introduction

The study of almost all astronomical objects relies on an understanding of their hydrodynamics. Indeed, for many such objects the involved hydrodynamics are complex enough to require numerical modeling. The process of numerical modeling usually proceeds by writing partial differential equations describing the behavior of a continuous medium as an equivalent set of algebraic equations for a finite set of discretized elements. This discretization can generally be performed in two different ways. In an Eulerian approach, one discretizes the spatial domain into volumes termed grid cells. The fluid is considered to move through this fixed background grid. By contrast, in a Lagrangian approach the fluid is discretized into fluid elements (or 'particles') which can then move freely according to their initial velocities, and only their interactions need to be modeled. Lagrangian methods work well in situations with large background flows where Eulerian methods would spend the bulk of their time advecting the (uninteresting) balanced flow, accumulating numerical errors with the numerous iterations required. Lagrangian methods have a large dynamic range in length but not in mass, achieving good spatial resolution in high-density

regions but performing poorly in low-density regions. In addition, the usual implementations of Lagrangian methods, based on Smoothed Particle Hydrodynamics (SPH), do not easily allow the higher spatial accuracy that grid methods can employ nor do they capture shocks as accurately as grid methods. By contrast, Eulerian methods provide a large dynamic range in mass but not in length. In general they are also computationally faster by several orders of magnitude, easier to implement, and easier to parallelize.

The RAPID code (Rapid Algorithm for Planets In Disks), which we present here, uses an Eulerian approach, adapted for a cylindrical grid. While we focus on planet-disk interactions in this paper, the code is intended for the general study of accretion disks containing a dominant central mass. In such systems the gas disk surrounding the central object is of a small enough mass that its self-gravity may be ignored. Such disks will have a roughly Keplerian velocity profile resulting from the mass of the central object. In order to obtain higher algorithm efficiency in the presence of this Keplerian flow, we make use of a FARGO-type algorithm (Masset, 2000). The algorithm's underlying strategy is to subtract off the bulk flow, which can be considered simply a translation of grid quantities, leaving the dynamically important residual velocity. RAPID is second-order accurate in space and time. Advection is accomplished through a nonlinear Total Variation Diminishing (TVD) scheme, which helps to control spurious oscillations. Time-stepping is accomplished through a standard Runge-Kutta scheme. Operator splitting is used to account for multiple dimensions and source terms such as those due to gravitational potentials and viscosity.

---

\* Corresponding author.

Email addresses: [mudryk@cita.utoronto.ca](mailto:mudryk@cita.utoronto.ca) (L.R. Mudryk), [murray@cita.utoronto.ca](mailto:murray@cita.utoronto.ca) (N.W. Murray).

In Section 2 we outline the fluid equations to be solved and discuss considerations of angular momentum important for accuracy on cylindrical grids. In Section 3 we discuss the details of the RAPID algorithm. We provide results of basic hydrodynamical tests in Section 4 and demonstrate the code's performance on typical planetary disk setups in Section 5. Conclusions are presented in Section 6.

## 2. Eulerian hydrodynamics

The Navier-Stokes equations may be written as

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot \rho \mathbf{u} = 0 \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{\partial \rho \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot [\rho \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u} + p \mathbf{I}] = -\rho \nabla \phi + \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} \quad (2)$$

$$\frac{\partial \rho e}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot [(\rho e + p) \mathbf{u}] = -\rho \mathbf{u} \cdot (\nabla \phi) + \nabla \cdot [\mathbf{u} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}] - \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\psi}, \quad (3)$$

for the mass density  $\rho$ , momentum density  $\rho \mathbf{u} = \rho(u_1, u_2, u_3)$ , and total energy density  $\rho e = \rho \varepsilon + \frac{1}{2} \rho \mathbf{u}^2$  of a fluid volume. The symbols  $\varepsilon$  and  $p$  represent the internal energy per mass and the pressure of the fluid,  $\phi$  represents the potential due to a body force (such as that from an external gravitational field),  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$  represents the non-isotropic component of the stress-strain tensor for the fluid, and  $\boldsymbol{\psi}$  represents any heat flux. We use the symbol  $\mathbf{I}$  for the identity matrix and note that the combination  $\rho \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u} \equiv \rho u_i u_j$  is a direct product yielding a matrix for the momentum fluxes.

These equations express the transfer of mass, linear momentum, and energy within the fluid volume written out in an arbitrary coordinate system. In terms of a general solution vector  $\mathbf{q} = (\rho, \rho u_1, \rho u_2, \rho u_3, \rho e)$ , flux tensor  $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{q})$ , and source vector  $\mathbf{S}$ , these equations all have the same formally simple form

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{q}}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{F} = \mathbf{S}. \quad (4)$$

In the case where  $\mathbf{S} = 0$  the equations reduce to the conservation form of the Euler equations, expressing non-dissipative advection of fluid quantities.

In Cartesian coordinates and for the solution vector  $\mathbf{q} = (\rho, \rho u_x, \rho u_y, \rho u_z, \rho e)$ , the Euler equations describe the evolution of five conserved scalar quantities. However, written in cylindrical coordinates, where  $\mathbf{x} = (r, \theta, z)$ , and for the natural choice of solution vector  $\mathbf{q} = (\rho, \rho u_r, \rho u_\theta, \rho u_z, \rho e)$ , only three components of this vector are conserved scalar quantities. The quantities  $\rho u_r$  and  $\rho u_\theta$  are not conserved. We thus choose to solve for the solution vector  $\mathbf{q} = (\rho, \rho u_r, \mathcal{H}, \rho u_z, \rho e)$ , where the quantity  $\mathcal{H} = \rho r(u_\theta + r\Omega)$  is the fluid's angular momentum in the inertial frame (we will refer to this quantity as the *inertial angular momentum*). It includes contributions from the fluid's angular velocity  $\omega = u_\theta/r$ , as well as the reference frame's angular velocity  $\Omega$ , assumed to be oriented along the z-axis. Because inertial angular momentum is conserved in a rotating system, it is a more natural physical variable to use and doing so improves the accuracy of the results (see §5.4). In the appendix we write out

modified versions of equations (1)–(3) for this choice of solution vector, expressed in cylindrical coordinates.

## 3. Numerical method

The solution method we describe is based on the relaxing Total Variation Diminishing (TVD) method by Jin and Xin (1995). This method has been successfully applied to solve the Euler equations on Cartesian grids in astrophysical simulations by Pen (1998) and Trac and Pen (2003, 2004).

### 3.1. Relaxation system

The relaxing TVD method solves the Euler equations by assuming the equations may be split into components corresponding to leftward and rightward travelling waves. In place of the Euler equations (eq. [4] with  $\mathbf{S} = 0$ ), the following coupled system is solved along a single grid direction for the solution vector  $\mathbf{q}$ :

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{q}}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x}(c\mathbf{w}) = 0 \quad (5)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{w}}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x}(c\mathbf{q}) = 0. \quad (6)$$

The relations  $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{q}^R + \mathbf{q}^L$ , and  $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{F}/c = \mathbf{q}^R - \mathbf{q}^L$ , define the solution variables in terms of the leftward and rightward-travelling waves. Equation (6) represents a separate equation for the evolution of the normalized flux vector  $\mathbf{w}$ . The variable  $c$  is a positive-definite function which has the interpretation of a speed associated with a particular grid cell. The solution is stable in the sense that its total variation (see §3.3) decreases as long as all values of  $c$  are greater than or equal to the largest eigenvalue of the flux Jacobian  $\partial \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{q})/\partial \mathbf{q}$  (Jin and Xin, 1995). Because the waves are split into separate rightward and leftward components, the maximum eigenvalue of the Jacobian is limited for both components by the value  $c_i = |u_i| + c_s$  where  $c_s$  is the sound speed for the cell. Substituting these definitions into equations (5) and (6) decouples the system and yields

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{q}}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{F}^R}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial \mathbf{F}^L}{\partial x} = 0, \quad (7)$$

where  $\mathbf{F}^L = c\mathbf{q}^L$ , and  $\mathbf{F}^R = c\mathbf{q}^R$ . The original coupled system, equations (5) and (6), is then equivalent to the solutions of the two separate leftward- and rightward-moving waves given in equation (7). It is now possible to separately solve for each of the travelling waves and add the results to determine the full solution along a single direction.

### 3.2. Solution of wave-split, one-dimensional Euler equations

In order to solve for the advection of the separately travelling waves, we implement a second-order Runge-Kutta scheme which uses a TVD flux-interpolation scheme to control spurious oscillations. Consider the integral form of the classical Euler equations (eq. [4] with  $\mathbf{S} = 0$ ) in one dimension and for a single

conserved fluid quantity so that  $q(\mathbf{x}, t) \equiv q(x, t)$ . We can write this form as

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int_{x_A}^{x_B} q(x, t) dx + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \int_{x_A}^{x_B} F(x, t) dx = 0. \quad (8)$$

We discretize the  $N$ -dimensional spatial domain into a uniformly spaced grid of points,  $\mathbf{x}_i$ , defined to be the centers of uniformly packed rectangular  $N$ -volumes (cells). Using this simple discretization, fluid quantities defined at cell-centered grid points may be interpreted as the cell-averaged value of the solution vector for that grid point. For a single one-dimensional cell at location  $x_i$  and with boundaries at  $x_A = x_{i-1/2}$  and  $x_B = x_{i+1/2}$ , the integrals  $\int_{x_A}^{x_B} q dx$  and  $\int_{x_A}^{x_B} F(x, t) dx$  in equation (8) represent the cell-averaged fluid quantities  $q_i$  and  $F_i$ . Discretizing equation (8) in terms of these cell-averaged quantities yields

$$\frac{q_i^{t+\Delta t} - q_i^t}{\Delta t} + \frac{F_{i+1/2}^t - F_{i-1/2}^t}{\Delta x} = 0, \quad (9)$$

where superscripts reference the specific time step and subscripts reference the spatial cell. Computing  $q_i^{t+\Delta t}$  for any grid cell thus requires interpolating a value for that cell's boundary fluxes  $F_{i\pm 1/2}$ , based on the cell-centered fluxes of neighboring cells.

The interpolation process introduces diffusive and dispersive errors. Diffusive errors result from excessive clipping and averaging occurring during the reconstruction process, resulting in the smearing of an initially sharp profile. Such errors are unavoidable in computational codes, but can be minimized. Dispersive errors result from spurious over- and undershoots occurring during the reconstruction process. They result in ringing-type oscillations occurring near sharp discontinuities. We control these latter errors by using a method whose total variation decreases at each successive time step. In order to update  $q_i^{t+\Delta t}$  in equation (9), we use a second-order Runge-Kutta method: for the half-timestep we interpolate the fluxes at the boundaries using the first-order upwind method; for the full time step, we use a second-order flux-limited correction to the upwind method. These details are described below.

### 3.3. TVD schemes

**Harten (1983)** introduced the Total Variation Diminishing (TVD) condition as a nonlinear stability condition to ensure monotonicity preservation. The *total variation* of an ordered series of  $n$  points,  $q_i$  at a given time step, may be defined as

$$TV(q^t) = |q_n^t - q_1^t| + 2 \left( \sum q_{max}^t - \sum q_{min}^t \right). \quad (10)$$

The variables  $q_{max}^t$  and  $q_{min}^t$  refer to local maxima and minima in the set. Spurious oscillations increase the number of extrema and thus increase the total variation. A solution is said to be TVD stable if its total variation at a given time step is less than or equal to that at the previous time step. A flux-assignment scheme to interpolate the fluxes at the boundaries of cells may be similarly designated as TVD if the total variation of the assigned fluxes decreases with each successive time step.

The only linear flux-assignment schemes that are TVD are upwind methods (**Godunov, 1959**). They assign flux based on

the direction in which fluid is advecting by assuming that all of the flux at a given cell boundary comes from the cell upwind of the boundary location. Considering a one-dimensional flow where flow to the right (larger indices) is positive, a simple upwind scheme can be described by

$$F_{i+1/2}^U = F_i, \quad u_i > 0 \quad (11)$$

$$F_{i+1/2}^U = F_{i+1}, \quad u_{i+1} < 0. \quad (12)$$

Equation (11) stipulates that for flow to the right, the flux at the rightward boundary of a given cell is assigned to be the value at the cell's center, that is, the flux as defined just upwind of the boundary location. Equation (12) stipulates that for flow to the left, the flux at the leftward boundary of a given cell is assigned to be the value at the cell's center, again, the flux upwind of the boundary location.

It is possible to improve upon the above first-order upwind scheme by considering second-order corrections to the assigned fluxes. For flow to the right there are two neighboring second-order corrections to equation (11):

$$\Delta F_{i+1/2}^L = \frac{F_i - F_{i-1}}{2} \quad (13)$$

$$\Delta F_{i+1/2}^R = \frac{F_{i+1} - F_i}{2}.$$

These two corrections consider the influence of flux from the cells further to the left and to the right of the  $i$ th (upwind) cell. In a similar manner, for flow to the left there are two neighboring second-order corrections to equation (12) that consider the influence of flux from cells to the left and right of the  $(i+1)$ -th (upwind) cell:

$$\Delta F_{i+1/2}^L = \frac{F_{i+1} - F_i}{2} \quad (14)$$

$$\Delta F_{i+1/2}^R = \frac{F_{i+2} - F_{i+1}}{2}.$$

To determine the actual value of the correction to the purely upwind flux, we apply a *flux limiter*  $\phi(\Delta F^L, \Delta F^R)$ , which specifies the relative weight of the two corrections. For a given limiter, the second-order boundary flux used for the full Runge-Kutta time step can be written as  $F_{i+1/2}^U + \Delta F_{i+1/2}$ , where  $\Delta F_{i+1/2} = \phi(\Delta F_{i+1/2}^L, \Delta F_{i+1/2}^R)$ .

We consider four established limiters: Minmod, Van Leer, Monotonized Central-difference (MC), and Superbee limiters, all designed to satisfy the TVD condition (eq. [10]), as well as a new scheme. These limiters are defined in terms of the leftward and rightward corrections in numerous sources; see **Leveque (2002)**, for example.

In **Figure 1** we portray these limiters graphically as a function of flux ratio  $\xi = \Delta F^L / \Delta F^R$  for the corresponding magnitude of the rightward flux correction  $\Delta F = \Delta F^R$ . Note that all the above limiters are zero when the flux corrections are of opposite sign (when  $\xi$  is negative) as occurs near an extremum. This feature prevents growth of the extremum and ensures the interpolation remains TVD. They are also all symmetric under exchange of  $\Delta F^L$  and  $\Delta F^R$  (in which case,  $\xi \rightarrow \Delta F^R / \Delta F^L$




Figure 1: Flux corrections for various limiters: Minmod (heavy, solid), Van Leer (dot-dashed), MC (fine, solid), mixed (fine, dashed), and Superbee (heavy, dashed).

and  $\Delta F \rightarrow \Delta F^L$ ).

The region defined by  $\Delta F < \max(0, \min(2, 2\xi))$  satisfies non-linear stability conditions determined to be in the general class of TVD-stable limiters (Sweby, 1984). Limiters that satisfy the above condition and that are also second-order accurate are found within the area bounded by the Superbee and Minmod limiters.

The Minmod limiter is the most diffusive because it always takes the minimum value of the possible second-order corrections; thus, any flux not assigned by the second-order reconstruction ends up being smeared out over more than one grid cell. The Van Leer, MC, and mixed limiters (see below) are progressively less diffusive, as they assign more and more of the possible flux correction to a definite cell. Superbee is the least diffusive second-order limiter possible but at the cost of increased instability. These tradeoffs are discussed further in Section 4.

Also shown on the graph is the mixed limiter we designed, which sometimes exhibits a better compromise between stability and higher-order accuracy. The mixed limiter is a normalized linear combination of the MC and Superbee schemes. In practice we usually weight the scheme as 80% MC and 20% Superbee as drawn in Figure 1.

### 3.4. Operator splitting

The above description suffices to solve the Euler equations in one dimension. Multiple dimensions and additional source terms present in the full Navier-Stokes equations are accounted for by using the operator splitting technique of Strang (1968). A full time step is performed as a double sweep through an ordered sequence of operators comprising the full equation, first in forward sequence, then in reverse. To illustrate this process for a

single double sweep, we write equation (4) using operators as

$$\frac{\partial q_j}{\partial t} + \sum_i^{N_D} L_i[q_j] - S_{g,\phi}[q_j] - V[q_j] = 0, \quad (15)$$

where  $N_D$  is the number of physical dimensions being modeling. The operators  $L_i[q_j]$  represent the update of  $q_j$  in a single direction due to advective terms  $\sum_i^{N_D} u_i \partial q_j / \partial x_i$ , performed by solving the relaxation system with the Runge-Kutta/TVD scheme outlined above. The operators  $S_{g,\phi}$  and  $V$  represent additional routines which differ numerically from the TVD algorithm. They account for source terms (due to both gravitational potentials and cylindrical geometry) and for viscosity, respectively. We have lumped the source terms due to gravity and geometry into the same operator as they are both accounted for in the same subroutine. This subroutine updates the solution vector due to the source forcing using a second-order Runge-Kutta routine. The update of the solution vector due to the viscosity is performed as a direct second-order accurate difference of the stress tensor (see §3.5 below). Updates of the solution vector accounting for each of the above operators are performed in the sequence

$$q_j^{t+\Delta t} = V S_{g,\phi} L_3 L_2 L_1 [q_j]. \quad (16)$$

A second sweep is then performed using the same time step  $\Delta t$  to yield the completely updated solution

$$q_j^{t+2\Delta t} = L_1 L_2 L_3 S_{g,\phi} V V S_{g,\phi} L_3 L_2 L_1 [q_j]. \quad (17)$$

As discussed in Strang (1968), this procedure ensures second-order accuracy.

### 3.5. Implementation of viscosity

Viscosity is implemented by updating the fluid quantities due to the viscosity operator equation  $\partial q_j / \partial t = V[q_j]$ , where  $V$  is written out explicitly in the appendix in terms of the stress-strain tensor  $\sigma_{ij}$ . Considering the update of the radial momentum component of the solution vector in two dimensions as an example, we have

$$\frac{\partial q_2}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial r \sigma_{rr}}{\partial r} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial \sigma_{\theta r}}{\partial \theta} - \frac{\sigma_{\theta\theta}}{r}, \quad (18)$$

which upon substituting  $\sigma_{ij}$  becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial q_2}{\partial t} = & \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left[ 2\rho r \nu \left( \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial r} - \frac{1}{3} \left( \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial r u_r}{\partial r} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial u_\theta}{\partial \theta} \right) \right) \right] \\ & + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \left[ \rho \nu \left( \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial \theta} + \frac{\partial u_\theta}{\partial r} - \frac{u_\theta}{r} \right) \right] \\ & - \left[ \frac{2\rho}{r} \nu \left( \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial u_\theta}{\partial \theta} + \frac{u_r}{r} - \frac{1}{3} \left( \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial r u_r}{\partial r} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial u_\theta}{\partial \theta} \right) \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

We implement the density and velocity derivatives which result on the right-hand side in the above equation as second-order accurate finite differences. We thereby include all components of the viscous tensor in calculations with added physical viscosity (where  $\nu \neq 0$ ).

### 3.6. Alterations for cylindrical grids

We can express the equations listed in the Appendix (for zero viscosity and no gravitational potential) in a form similar to equation (4) as

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{q}}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial r \mathbf{F}_r}{\partial r} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial \mathbf{F}_\theta}{\partial \theta} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{F}_z}{\partial z} = \mathbf{S}, \quad (20)$$

where  $\mathbf{S} = (0, \rho u_\theta^2/r + p/r, 0, 0, 0)$ . The discretization of equation (20) is computationally equivalent to that of the Euler equations on a Cartesian grid if we use  $(\Delta x_1, \Delta x_2, \Delta x_3) = (r_i \Delta r, r_i \Delta \theta, \Delta z)$  but for the source term in the  $q_2$ -equation and the extra  $r$ -multiplier in front of the radial flux. We account for the source term using a second-order Runge-Kutta scheme implemented with operator splitting as discussed in Section 3.4. The extra  $r$ -multiplier is included when solving in the radial direction; equivalently stated, while the azimuthal and vertical advection operators act directly on the solution vector as  $L_\theta[\mathbf{q}]$  and  $L_z[\mathbf{q}]$ , the radial advection operator acts on the solution vector scaled by  $r$  as  $L_r[r\mathbf{q}]$ .

### 3.7. Time step restrictions

*Courant-Friedrichs-Lewy* (CFL) conditions are imposed to insure that numerical information does not propagate at physically unrealistic speeds. In practise one limits the value used for the time step so that waves travel less than one grid cell per time step.

The one dimensional Euler equations support three types of waves: entropy waves which move at the fluid's flow speed  $u$ , and two types of acoustic waves which travel "rightward" and "leftward" at the speed of sound relative to the flow speed  $u + c_s$  and  $u - c_s$ , respectively. In a given cell, the maximum and minimum values of these three speeds determines the speed at which information can travel to the right and to the left, respectively. More generally one can limit the time step due to the two global speed extrema. These two speeds are equivalent to the largest and smallest eigenvalue of the flux Jacobian  $\partial \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{q})/\partial \mathbf{q}$  as demonstrated in Laney (1998). The time step may be further limited by other physical restrictions such as the CFL condition imposed by viscosity. Implementation of the fast-advection algorithm (§3.8) places a further restriction on the time step in order to ensure that differential rotation does not cause two adjacent annuli of fluid to shear past one another by more than a half grid cell.

Given these three restrictions, we determine our time step to be the global minimum from the entire grid of values, determined for each cell as  $\Delta t = (\Delta t_f^{-2} + \Delta t_{vis}^{-2} + \Delta t_{sh}^{-2})^{-1/2}$ , where  $\Delta t_f = \min[\Delta r/(|u_r| + c_s), r\Delta\theta/(|u_\theta| + c_s), \Delta z/(|u_z| + c_s)]$ ,  $\Delta t_{vis} = \min[\Delta r^2/4\nu, (r\Delta\theta)^2/4\nu, \Delta z^2/4\nu]$  and  $\Delta t_{sh} = (1/2)(\partial\omega/\partial\theta)^{-1}$ . In simulations of protoplanetary disks, the limitation imposed by acoustic waves is almost always the most restrictive.

### 3.8. FARGO algorithm

Accretion disks with dominant central masses have velocity profiles that are nearly Keplerian. In particular the azimuthal ve-

locity is dominated by the Keplerian value, which is azimuthally uniform at a given radius. We adopt the fast advection algorithm described by Masset (2000), in order to increase algorithm efficiency in the presence of such nearly azimuthally uniform background flows. The algorithm's underlying strategy is to subtract off the bulk background flow, which can be considered simply a translation of grid quantities in the angular direction, leaving the dynamically important residual velocity.

In decomposing the velocity, the cylindrical grid is broken up into a series of annuli, and an averaged background velocity in the azimuthal direction  $u_{AVG}(r)$  is calculated for each annulus. The first velocity component corresponds to the residual amount  $u_{RES}(r, \theta)$ , by which the total velocity differs from its azimuthally averaged value  $u_{AVG}(r)$ . The averaged background velocity is further decomposed as  $u_{AVG}(r) = u_{SH}(r) + u_{CR}(r)$ . The former component is constructed to correspond to the largest possible whole-number shift of grid cells in the azimuthal direction and the latter to the remaining partial-cell shift. Neither of these components depend on the angular variable. The whole-number shift is rounded to the nearest integer so that the partial-cell shift may be positive or negative, but will always correspond to a shift magnitude less than or equal to half a grid cell. The total velocity at any cell on the grid is then given as

$$u(r, \theta) = u_{SH}(r) + u_{CR}(r) + u_{RES}(r, \theta). \quad (21)$$

The transport of fluid quantities due to the  $u_{SH}$  component is easily accomplished by numerically shifting the fluid variables by the appropriate number of cells in the azimuthal direction. Because the shift is integral, the process does not introduce any numerical diffusion, nor does it limit the size of time step permitted by the CFL conditions.

Transport of a fluid quantity along an annulus due to the partial-cell velocity component, which is independent of the azimuthal grid cell number, may be accomplished by interpolating the function and redetermining the interpolation at a shifted location. This process is not unstable; therefore, it does not reduce the CFL-allowed time step, but it does introduce diffusion as peaks in the interpolated quantity are shifted by fractions of a grid cell and must then be redistributed among more than one cell.

Finally, transport of fluid quantities due to the residual azimuthal component is performed using the relaxing TVD algorithm, just as for the radial velocity sweep. This transport step contributes to the numerical viscosity and also lowers the size of the time step allowed for stability. However, if the flow is nearly azimuthally uniform, the residual velocity will be small compared to the average velocity at a given radius, and the corresponding time step will be much larger than that otherwise permitted by the full azimuthal velocity. In practise, the allowed time step is increased by a factor of 5 – 10 times that allowed without removing the background flow.

### 3.9. Boundary treatments

Special boundary conditions are only required in the non-azimuthal directions. The azimuth is treated as periodic by directly

mapping the  $(N_\theta+1)$ -th cell to the 1st cell when calculating the fluxes.

In non-azimuthal directions, we use  $n_b = 2^{N_D}$  ghost cells on the inner and outer edges of the computational domain. This number of additional cells prevents the effects of lower-order flux interpolations occurring at the first and last cells from propagating in towards the center of the domain. After the solution quantities are updated at the end of each double sweep, the values of these boundary cells are redetermined, depending on the physical effect being modeled. We consider three treatments here. The first simply re-initializes the quantities in the ghost cells to the initial conditions or some known, prescribed solution. The second re-assigns the cell values according to

$$\begin{aligned} q_{(n_b-i)} &= wq_{(n_b+i+1)}, & i &= 0, n_b - 1 \\ q_{(N-n_b+i+1)} &= wq_{(N-n_b-i)}, & i &= 0, n_b - 1, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where  $w = 1$  for all variables except the radial and vertical velocities for which  $w = -1$ . This boundary treatment approximates reflecting boundary conditions for which all scalar variables are symmetric around the boundary while vector variables are anti-symmetric. The third treatment re-assigns the cell values according to the prescription

$$\begin{aligned} q_{(i+1)} &= q_{(n_b+i+1)}, & i &= 0, n_b - 1 \\ q_{(N-n_b+i+1)} &= q_{(N-2n_b+i+1)}, & i &= 0, n_b - 1, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

2 for all variables. This treatment approximates a free-streaming outflow boundary.

In addition to the boundary treatments discussed above, we sometimes implement wave-damping conditions near the boundaries, but still inside the solution domain proper. These wave-damping conditions are described by

$$\mathbf{q}(\mathbf{r}, t) = \mathbf{q}(\mathbf{r}, 0) + [\mathbf{q}(\mathbf{r}, t) - \mathbf{q}(\mathbf{r}, 0)]e^{|\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}_b|t/(\tau R_0)}. \quad (24)$$

Such a treatment damps any perturbations about the initial equilibrium solution that are within the distance  $\mathbf{r}_b$  of the boundary, on a spatial scale  $R_0$  and on a time scale  $\tau$ .

### 3.10. Parallelization

The RAPID code may be parallelized for multi-processor machines with both shared memory or distributed memory. We have already implemented OpenMP directives for shared-memory machines using data parallelism. Because all the processors on such shared memory machines have access to all the variable arrays, parallelization on such machines is relatively straightforward. OpenMP *parallel do* directives are used for any loop-intensive subroutines which operate on the entire solution array at least once per timestep. At the beginning of each such subroutine, the task of updating the solution array is effectively split into several threads, each of which operates on a portion of the entire data structure. Each thread is handled by an available processor and each thread receives its own local copy of the data required to be updated. Once all the threads have updated their portion of the entire data structure, the code is effectively unsplit, individual pieces of the updated data are collated together, and

the code again proceeds sequentially in an unbranched manner. Because memory is shared amongst all the processors, much of the detail of the distribution process is handled by the OpenMP directives, themselves.

While not presently implemented as such, the RAPID code is also able to be parallelized on distributed memory machines using Message Passing Interface (MPI) protocols. This type of parallelization is somewhat more involved as more of the distribution details need to be explicitly specified. Typical strategies for this process would involve splitting the disk into different annular regions with overlapping boundaries. The entire solution process for each region of data is then handled by a separate machine with its own memory. Because the data is permanently split among different machines, it is necessary to communicate updated values of neighboring data cells between different machines. Furthermore, the timing of tasks performed on each of the machines must also be controlled to ensure blocks of code are performed in the correct sequence. If each machine (as distinguished by separate memory storage) has multiple processors, it is possible to implement both MPI and OpenMP directives. In the future we intend to implement such a combined MPI/OpenMP parallelization of the code.

## 4. Basic hydrodynamic tests

We perform a suite of three hydrodynamic tests: a two-dimensional oblique shock at three angles, a Kelvin-Helmholtz (KH) instability test and a cylindrical bow-shock test. The first two tests are performed in Cartesian coordinates and the last test is performed in cylindrical coordinates. An adiabatic equation of state with  $\gamma = 5/3$  is assumed for all three tests. The results of these tests are compared to those from the piece-wise parabolic method (PPM, [Colella and Woodward, 1984](#)), as implemented in *VH-1\**, and when possible with analytical solutions. When referring to results from the RAPID code, the limiter used for the simulation will be placed in parentheses. Due to the number and range of parameters we wish to explore, the tests presented in this paper are only two-dimensional. Various three-dimensional tests of the TVD algorithm have been performed and a three-dimensional test of a Sedov-Taylor blast wave may be found in [Trac and Pen \(2003\)](#).

### 4.1. Two-dimensional oblique shock

The two-dimensional oblique shock is a version of the one-dimensional Sod shock tube (see [Landau and Lifshitz, 1959](#), for example) set-up in a two-dimensional box at an angle to the box boundaries. In the one-dimensional version of a Sod shock, a jump discontinuity is initialized between two regions of fluid with an initial relative velocity by requiring that the pressure and density of two regions of fluid initially be disparate (say, separated by a membrane). In the two-dimensional oblique case, the fact that the initial density and pressure discontinuities are set across the grid at an angle causes the resulting shock front to

\* <http://wonka.physics.ncsu.edu/pub/VH-1/>




Figure 2: Normalized density differences between numerical and analytical solutions for the PPM (solid black), RAPID (SB, solid red) and RAPID (MM, dashed black) codes. Density differences (dark lines) are measured by the scale on the left. The analytical solution is shown in the solid grey line, measured by the scale on the right. Colored diamonds indicate the maximum and minimum differences from the analytical solution in the vicinity of the contact discontinuity (near  $x_{\text{diagonal}} = 0.5$ ) for the above codes, as well as for the RAPID code with Van Leer and mixed limiters. Inset: density differences for all codes over a limited region.

propagate obliquely across the box. Results of the TVD algorithm in the one dimensional case are described in [Trac and Pen \(2003\)](#). Here we implement the shock in a two-dimensional setup with initial conditions given by

$$\rho = \begin{cases} 1, & x < x_0 \\ 0.125, & x \geq x_0 \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

$$p = \begin{cases} 1, & x < x_0 \\ 0.1, & x \geq x_0 \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

with no initial relative velocity. For a shock with an angle of  $45^\circ$ , we set  $x_0 = 0.25$  along the vertical and horizontal box boundaries so that  $x_0 = \sqrt{2}(0.25)$  along the central diagonal. A resolution of  $N_x \times N_y = 180 \times 180$  was used.

Figure 2 shows, for the above setup, normalized differences between the computed density and that of the analytical solution. Results are shown for the PPM code as well as for RAPID with four different choices of limiters. All results are one-dimensional slices along the central diagonal of the box in the shock propagation direction. For clarity, only the Superbee and Minmod limiters are shown over the entire diagonal extent. Differences between the computed and analytical pressure show analogous results.

The PPM code does better than any of the RAPID runs at minimizing the diffusion near shock fronts and discontinuities. The diffusion at these points varies considerably for the RAPID code depending on the choice of limiter. Results from the Super-

bee (SB) limiter display the least diffusion, and are close to the PPM results except that they display some spurious oscillations before the shock fronts. These oscillations are indicative of instabilities and in practice, if the simulation has too many shocks, the Superbee limiter can force the size of the time step allowed by CFL conditions too small to be of practical use. Results using the Minmod (MM) limiter display the most diffusion, but none of the spurious oscillations.

The level of diffusion (measured roughly by the error incurred at discontinuities) and dispersion (measured roughly by the amplitude of the error oscillations) for the remaining limiters fall inbetween those of the Superbee and Minmod limiters. The mixed (MB) limiter scheme (shown in the inset) has only slightly more diffusion than the Superbee scheme and correspondingly has smaller pre-shock oscillations and higher stability. In practice the mixed scheme has not forced the time step size to be too small and has proved a good compromise between stability and lowered diffusion. The more diffusive MC limiter (not shown) has almost identical results to the Van Leer (VL) limiter.

The PPM code does not exhibit oscillations before shock fronts because it places further conditions on the dynamics that tend to flatten gradients both before and after a discontinuity. It should be noted that while these extra conditions may increase the stability of the PPM code, they are not necessarily physical constraints.

Because the Sod Shock Tube is propagating at an angle, it also proves a useful examination of any differences caused by dimensional splitting in the code. Figure 3 shows contour plots of the density from the RAPID(MC) and PPM codes run as above except with  $y_0 = 0.8$ , and  $x_0$  chosen as appropriate for the desired shock angle. For most of the length of the jump discontinuity, the shock front is straight and propagates at the same speed along the original diagonal. This observation indicates that the dimensional splitting is not leading to asymmetries. As one gets close to the ends of the shock front, the fluid is able to “bleed” away towards the open sides (and eventually out of the box once it reaches the boundaries). As a result the shock front begins to diffract at the edges; this bending increases as the front evolves in time. Note that for the  $30^\circ$  and  $15^\circ$  cases, both codes exhibit some type of pressure/density waves in the region trailing the contact discontinuity.

#### 4.2. Kelvin-Helmholtz instability

Here we compare results from the different RAPID limiters and the PPM code on simulations of the two-dimensional Kelvin Helmholtz (KH) instability. While this instability should develop in any two fluids with a strong enough velocity shear compared to the stratification, it is difficult to capture accurately in numerical simulations. Codes like the PPM code can overproduce the instability’s small-scale turbulent structure for a given resolution ([Dwarkadas et al., 2004](#)), while a code with too much diffusion will under-produce such structure, compared to experiments. SPH codes perform particularly poorly on such a test when there is a density jump across the shearing region. We find that our method produces a wide range of small-scale structure depending on the chosen limiter, enabling us to control the




Figure 3: Density contour plots illustrating propagation of an oblique shock at angles  $\theta = 45^\circ$ ,  $\theta = 30^\circ$ , and  $\theta = 15^\circ$  from left to right, respectively. Figures in the top row show RAPID(MC) results, figures in the bottom row, the PPM results. The dashed lines show the initial location of the discontinuity.

amount of small-scale structure in a simulation by choosing an appropriate limiter scheme.

The KH instability is initialized on a Cartesian grid of resolution  $N_x \times N_y = 400 \times 400$  that is periodic in the  $x$  direction and has reflecting boundaries on the top and bottom. The fluid in the top half of the box is set moving to the left at about one thirteenth of the sound speed and the fluid on the bottom is set moving to the right with the same speed. The densities of the two regions of fluid are set to values of 0.9 and 1.1 on the top and bottom, respectively, in order to help visualize the instability. The interface between the two fluids is initialized to a sine wave in order to excite the instability. Figure 4 shows results from the RAPID(MM,VL,MC,MB) and PPM codes. Each row has three panels showing density contour plots taken at  $t = 0.3$ ,  $t = 0.6$  and  $t = 1.5$ , respectively. Time is measured in units where the undisturbed fluid propagates completely across the box in unit time.

The Superbee limiter proves too unstable in this test and shortly after  $t = 0.3$  the time step becomes unreasonably small. The other limiters produce a range of small-scale structure. The Minmod limiter produces the least structure, developing only a single cusp along the interface and only a single, loose cat's eye structure. In comparison, the structures produced using the Van Leer limiter are more tightly wound at each time. The MC limiter begins to show small-scale KH instabilities forming along the interface at  $t=0.3$ . The final cat's eye is more tightly wound and shows increased substructure as well. The overall trend of increased substructure progresses through the sequence of limiters until finally the mixed (MB) limiter produces almost as much substructure as the PPM code. Indeed at the times  $t = 0.3$

and  $t = 0.6$ , the results look quite similar. At time  $t = 1.5$ , both codes show very complicated interfaces with much mixing between the two fluid layers. As in the oblique-shock test, the PPM code shows evidence of flattening or clipping of the density profile: the TVD runs exhibit larger variations in the density, not only near the interface, but also in the bulk regions of the fluids. By contrast, the density of the PPM code is very uniform in the bulk section of each fluid region.

The KH instability test readily demonstrates the differences between the different limiters and codes. Given its infinitely sharp interface, the KH problem is formally ill-posed, and infinitely small disturbances grow infinitely fast. Because there exists no small-scale cutoff for the dynamics, the numerics themselves dictate the evolution on the smallest scales. We emphasize that the above simulations are strictly two-dimensional. Because the KH instability can be viewed as the evolution of a single vortex sheet, it behaves very differently in two dimensions than in three dimensions where there are extra degrees of freedom along which the vorticity may evolve. By simulating a strictly two-dimensional fluid we are not able to observe its full range of behavior.

#### 4.3. Supersonic flow around a cylinder

In order to test the implementation of the Euler equations on a cylindrical grid, we examine the formation of a bow shock caused by supersonic flow around a cylinder. We initialize a cylindrical grid with a supersonic flow to the left at three times the sound speed. The grid spans an annular region from  $2 \leq r \leq 20$  and  $0 \leq \phi \leq 2\pi$  and has a resolution of  $N_r \times N_\phi = 600 \times 150$ .






Figure 4: Density contours for a KH instability taken at  $t = 0.3$ ,  $t = 0.6$ , and  $t = 1.5$ . The first four rows show results from RAPID using, in sequence, the Minmod, Van Leer, MC, and mixed limiters. The last row shows results from the PPM code.

The initial density and pressure on the grid are uniform: the density is set equal to a value of five-thirds, and the pressure is set to unity. The inner boundary of the grid is reflecting, sim-

ulating a solid cylinder around which a bow shock forms. The outer boundary allows outflow. Figure 5 shows the results from RAPID(VL) and PPM simulations.




Figure 5: Density contour plots of the steady-state density for the RAPID(VL) code (left) and the PPM code (right). The black circles represent the boundary of the cylinder.

The two codes both produce a density peak just in front of the cylinder with a value close to 6 (about 6 and 6.4, respectively, for the PPM and RAPID(VL) codes). These peak densities are about 90% and 96%, respectively, of the maximum-possible post-shock density  $\rho_s = 4\rho_0$  for an adiabatic shock of index  $\gamma = 5/3$ . Again RAPID displays small-scale oscillations in front of the shock, which the PPM code appears to have flattened. Both codes capture the smaller tail shocks produced at the rear of the cylinder.

## 5. The protoplanet problem

Planet-disk interactions in protoplanetary systems are one of the primary scenarios RAPID is designed to study. Here we provide a suite of simulations detailing its performance on a standard setup for such scenarios. We compare results for different choices of solution vector, levels of added viscosity, numerical resolution and choice of limiters. The purpose of such a comparison is to be able to better determine which details observed within a run are physically realistic and consistent between runs and which are likely due to numerical artifacts.

### 5.1. Protoplanet problem setup

The details of the setup are those used by [de Val-Borro et al. \(2006\)](#) and represent what is now a standard problem in accretion disk theory. A polar grid is setup with initial conditions (described below) using a given mesh resolution  $N_r \times N_\theta$ . The azimuthal range is always taken to be  $[-\pi, \pi]$ , and unless otherwise indicated, the radial range is  $[0.4a, 2.5a]$ , where  $a$  is the mean orbital radius of the protoplanet. A central star is modeled by calculating its gravitational potential at a grid position  $\mathbf{r} = (r, \theta)$  in terms of its mass  $M_*$  and location  $\mathbf{r}_*$  as  $\phi_* = -GM_*/|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_*|$ .

A protoplanet is represented by the softened potential

$$\phi_p = \frac{-Gm_p}{\sqrt{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_p|^2 + \epsilon^2}}. \quad (27)$$

The softening length is defined to be  $\epsilon = 0.6H(a)$ , where  $H(a)$  is the undisturbed disk's scale height at radius  $a$ . A ‘‘Jupiter-mass’’ planet is defined to have a mass ratio of  $\mu = m_p/(m_p + M_*) = 10^{-3}$ .

We assume a locally isothermal equation of state in the disk, set by the ideal gas law  $p = \rho c_s^2$ , where the sound speed  $c_s^2$  is set to be a fixed fraction of the Keplerian speed. This statement is equivalent to assuming a thin disk, with a scale height given by  $H/r = c_s/v_\kappa$ . We adopt the standard value of  $H/r = 0.05$  for the disk thickness. Because the pressure is prescribed in terms of the sound speed and density distribution, there is no need to solve for the energy equation.

Simulations with a single planet are calculated in the frame corotating with the planet, with the origin at the center of mass of the planet and central star. This choice of origin means that the star orbits a distance  $\mu a$  from the origin, the planet at a distance  $(1 - \mu)a$ . Additional simulations have been performed in the corotating frame with the origin held fixed on the star, as well as in the inertial frame with the origin fixed on the star, or at the planet and star's center of mass. All these simulations yield similar results.

We use dimensionless units where the unit of mass is taken to be  $M_* + m_p$ . Length is measured in units of the planet's initial radial separation from the star  $a$ , and we set the gravitational constant  $G$  to unity. Time is measured in units of

$$\tau = \sqrt{\frac{a^3}{G(M_* + m_p)}}. \quad (28)$$

With this definition, one orbital period takes  $2\pi$  units of simula-




Figure 6: Density contours for a standard Jupiter mass run using the VL limiter. Plots in sequence are taken after 5, 10, 20, 50, 100, and 300 orbits.

tion time.

Fiducial initial conditions are those of a uniform-density Keplerian disk, which is the equilibrium solution for a single central potential of mass  $M_*$ . We transform the azimuthal velocity into the corotating frame and correct for pressure support as  $u_\theta = \sqrt{(GM_*)/r}[(1 - (H/r)^2)^{1/2} - (r/a)^{3/2}]$ , where  $m_H = H/r$  is the disk thickness. In order to allow the Keplerian disk to gradually adjust to the additional potential of a planet, the potential of the planet is slowly “turned-on” according to the prescription

$$\phi_p(\mathbf{r}, t) = \sin^2 \left[ \frac{t}{4\mathcal{N}\tau} \right] \phi_p(\mathbf{r}), \quad (29)$$

where  $t$  is the simulation time and  $\mathcal{N} = 10$  is the number of orbits over which the potential is turned on. After the prescribed number of orbits the full value of the potential  $\phi_p(\mathbf{r})$  is held constant.

## 5.2. Standard run

We present a standard comparison run of the code for a Jupiter-mass planet, run for 300 orbits using the VL limiter scheme and with resolution  $N_r \times N_\theta = 384 \times 384$ . The calculation is performed in the corotating frame, advecting the solution set  $(\rho, \rho u_r, H)$ , where  $\mathcal{H} = \rho r(u_\theta + r\Omega)$  is the inertial angular momentum (combined gas and frame momentum).

In Figure 6 we show density contours after 5, 10, 20, 50, 100 and 300 orbits. Appearance of the spiral arms occurs very quickly (within a few dynamical times) with two trailing arms outside the planet’s orbital radius and three arms inside the orbital radius. They are close to steady-state in the sense that they occur at fixed locations within the disk when time-averaged over a few orbits although they exhibit small spatial and temporal oscillations in simulations with low-viscosity.

As the simulation progresses, the planet begins to clear gas from its orbit but not uniformly. Gas is more readily cleared in two orbital tracks,  $1 - 2$  Hill radii ( $R_H \equiv (\mu/3)^{1/3}$ ) to the inside and the outside of the planet’s orbit. These locations are the approximate distance at which the averaged torque density due to neighbouring resonances peaks (around resonance order,  $m = 10$ ; see [Ward \(1996\)](#) for details). There is a further asymmetry in the efficiency of the gas clearing for locations trailing and leading the planet as demonstrated in Figure 7. It shows the density, averaged along the full azimuth direction, at five different times during the simulation. Especially during the initial formation of the gap, the total density in the trough outside the planet’s orbit is much lower relative to the density in the trough inside its orbit. In the inset, solid lines show the averaged density as before, while the broken lines show the averages separated into halves for  $\theta > 0$  (dashed) and  $\theta < 0$  (dotted). While the gap region leading the planet seems to clear approximately equally inside and outside the planet’s orbit, the region trailing the planet to the outside clears more quickly than elsewhere, and the region trailing the planet to the inside clears more slowly.

Note that there are regions of fluid within the gap which persist over time. These regions surround the  $L_4$  and  $L_5$  Lagrangian equilibrium points located at  $\theta = \pm\pi/3$ . In Figure 6 these are the circularly shaped overdensities which remain within the gap. We illustrate the evolution of these regions in Figure 7. The density plotted has been radially averaged at each azimuth from  $r = 0.9a$  to  $r = 1.1a$ . Again there is a leading-trailing asymmetry. This asymmetry has been observed in most planet codes to varying degrees (see [de Val-Borro et al., 2006](#)).

In addition to the above libration islands at the  $L_4$  and  $L_5$  points, there are large over-densities which begin to develop due to the generation of vortices to either side of the gap region. Initially several small vortices develop at roughly the same radii




Figure 7: Left: azimuthally averaged density for the standard Jupiter mass run using the VL limiter. The inset displays the same averaged densities for the 5 different times in the solid curves along with averages for  $\theta > 0$  in the dotted curves and  $\theta < 0$  in the dashed curves. Right: radially average density within the gap region ( $|r - a| \leq 0.1a$ ). Note the asymmetry between the  $L_4$  and  $L_5$  equilibrium points.

but spaced in azimuth. These vortices appear as roughly concentric overdensities in the density contour plots (in Fig. 6 at 20 orbits there are two such regions at both  $r/a = 0.75$  and  $r/a = 1.3$ ). As the simulation progresses the vortices grow and begin to merge, depending on their radial location within the disk. In disks with large viscosity ( $\nu \gtrsim 10^{-5}$ ), the vortices do not form. Similar structures have been observed in other codes at low viscosity. The vortices are possibly the result of Rossby-wave instabilities (Li et al., 2000, 2001; Lovelace et al., 1999; Papaloizou and Lin, 1989, and references therein).

In Figure 8 we present the total torque summed over various regions of the disk, showing its evolution over the course of the simulation. A running average over a period of 10 orbits has been performed to smooth out some of the oscillations. As per the treatment in de Val-Borro et al. (2006), material within the Hill sphere is excluded, mimicking the effect of the torque-cutoff. The gas within this region feels the softened gravitational potential of the planet, rather than the long-range singular potential. As theoretically predicted (Goldreich and Tremaine, 1980; Ward, 1986), the torque inside the planet’s orbit is positive (transferring angular momentum to the planet), while that outside the planet’s orbit is negative (angular momentum is transferred from the planet to the exterior disk). Also as predicted, there is an asymmetry in the magnitudes of these torques (Ward, 1996). The net torque on the planet is negative and would cause it to migrate inwards, were its orbit not held fixed.

The initially smooth and more broad-scale oscillations of the total torque (on a time scale of  $\sim 20$  orbits) are consistent with Phase I evolution, as described by Koller et al. (2003). The frequency of the subsequent rapid variations that develop matches the inverse period of the large vortex outside the planet’s orbit as measured in the frame of the planet.

### 5.3. Effects of viscosity

The presence of physical viscosity tends to smooth perturbations of physically conserved quantities. We parametrize the viscosity as a uniform alpha-disk model, whereby the viscosity coefficient  $\nu$  and turbulent efficiency  $\alpha$  are related to one another by  $\nu = \alpha(H/r)^2\sqrt{GM_*r}$ . We substitute this relationship for the parameter  $\nu$  in our implementation of viscosity (see eq. [19]). For a range of  $\alpha$ -values taken to be  $\alpha = 10^{-2} - 10^{-3}$  (Hartmann et al., 1998) and  $H/r = 0.05$ , one finds  $\nu \approx$




Figure 8: Time evolution of the torque on the planet’s orbit due to the disk. The torque is broken up into components from the disk material inside (dotted) and outside (dashed) the planet’s orbit. Also plotted is the total net torque (solid). Torque shown excludes material within one Hill radius,  $R_H = (\mu/3)^{1/3}$ , of the planet.




Figure 9: Snapshots of the density after 20, 100 and 300 orbits, respectively from left to right. The top row shows results from the standard (inviscid) run. The second row shows those from the viscous run ( $\nu = 10^{-5}, \alpha \approx 0.004$ ).




Figure 10: Comparisons of the azimuthally averaged density and the radially averaged density in the gap region. The dark lines have  $\nu = 1 \times 10^{-5}$ ; the pale lines have no added viscosity. The viscosity makes the islands of fluid surrounding the  $L_4$  and  $L_5$  points unmaintainable.

$10^{-4.5} - 10^{-5.5}$ . Figure 9 shows the evolution of the density for a simulation with  $\nu = 1 \times 10^{-5}$  (at  $r = 1$ ; all subsequent values of  $\nu$  are quoted for  $r = 1$ ). While the evolution of the spiral arms occurs on the same timescale as in the inviscid run, many of the structures in the simulation are no longer present when viscosity is added: the  $L_4$  and  $L_5$  libration islands are less marked and the vortex lines seen previously are absent. Figure 10 compares the radially and azimuthally averaged densities at several orbital times for runs with and without added physical viscosity. While it appears that there are libration islands and

vortices in the viscous run which begin to develop, their radial and azimuthal structure is smoothed out by the viscosity. Note that if the added physical viscosity is reduced in order by another half-magnitude, the libration islands and vortices are once again present (see below).

### 5.3.1. Calibration of viscosity

Any numerical algorithm exhibits numerical viscosity due to the combined results of diffusive and dispersive errors (discussed in §3.2). While physical viscosity is characterized by the form of




Figure 11: Comparisons of the azimuthally averaged density and the radially averaged density in the gap region at different values of added physical viscosity. All results use the VL limiter and are taken at 100 orbits. The addition of physical viscosity, even at the level of  $\sim 10^{-6}$ , alters the results of the simulation, especially within the gap region, suggesting the numerical viscosity of the simulation is at the same level or lower.

the stress-strain tensor (in a Newtonian fluid there is a presumed linear relationship between stress and strain), an algorithm’s numerical viscosity will differ from the physical viscosity, not only in the amplitude or spatial dependence of the viscosity coefficient, but also in the relationship between the stress and strain. Except for the most diffusive schemes, the numerical viscosity of an algorithm usually displays a nonlinear dependence on the velocity gradient. These higher order terms tend to introduce dispersion.

Despite this potential incongruity between physical and numerical viscosity, it is useful to have an estimate for the value of the viscosity coefficient at which the two viscosities may be considered approximately equal in their effects. In order to determine this value, we compare the results of several simulations with various levels of added physical viscosity (implemented as described in §3.5). By reducing the value of the viscosity coefficient  $\nu$  to a point where the results of the simulations are approximately the same irrespective of its addition, we obtain an estimate for the numerical viscosity present in the simulation. We note that the measure of viscosity obtained in this manner depends on the particulars of the setup. In higher resolution runs, for example, we would expect the actual numerical viscosity exhibited to be smaller than the value we obtain from lower resolution runs. Likewise, we note it would likely be different in three dimensional simulations where there exist extra degrees of freedom.

Figure 11 shows the results of decreasing the value of the physical viscosity coefficient from  $\nu = 3 \times 10^{-4}$  to  $\nu = 1 \times 10^{-6}$  in roughly half-magnitude increments. These simulations are performed using the VL limiter scheme run for 100 orbits. Increasing the level of viscosity present narrows the gap width, decreases its depth, and softens the density gradient at its edges. Even when introduced at a level of  $10^{-6}$  there is a difference in the averaged density profile, especially in the gap region. This suggests the numerical viscosity of the code is of approximately the same magnitude or less. Results using other limiter schemes are analogous and suggest a similar level of diffusion with more

or less dispersion. They are discussed further in Section 5.6.

In Figure 12 we show the variation of the torques with viscosity. All the torques are similar for the three lowest values of added viscosity. Only at values of  $\nu = 1 \times 10^{-5}$  or larger are the differences discernible—the torques from the inner and outer parts of the disk both increase in magnitude, but the net torque decreases for large enough viscosities. In addition, the rapid oscillations damp beyond  $\nu = 10^{-5}$  because the large outer vortex is no longer able to form. The increase of material within the gap region with larger viscosity could explain the increase in




Figure 12: Time evolution of the torque on the planet from the disk. The torque is broken up into components from the disk material inside (dotted) and outside (dashed) the planet’s orbit. Also plotted is the total net torque (solid). The torque calculated is only that from material further out than one Hill radius from the planet. The palest lines have no added viscosity and from there the viscosity increases in half-magnitude increments from  $\nu = 1 \times 10^{-6}$  to  $3 \times 10^{-4}$  for the heavy black lines.




Figure 13: Density contours after 20, 100 and 300 orbits, respectively from left to right. The top row shows results from a run which does not use the fast-advection algorithm while the second row shows results from the standard run (which implements the fast-advection algorithm); both of these two runs use the standard solution set  $(\rho, \rho u_r, \mathcal{H})$ . The third and fourth rows show results from runs using the fast-advection algorithm but which use the solution sets,  $(\rho, \rho u_r, \mathcal{H}/r)$  and  $(\rho, \rho u_r, \rho u_\theta)$ , respectively. The two vortices still present in the last plot of the top row have merged into a single vortex by 400 orbits as in the standard run.

magnitude of the inner and outer torques. With a large enough viscosity, the asymmetry of the density profile causing the inner and outer torques on the planet are smoothed out, and the net torque decreases.

#### 5.4. Influence of fast-advection algorithm and choice of solution vector

Using the fast-advection algorithm reduces the required simulation time by approximately the ratio of the residual azimuthal velocity to the full azimuthal velocity, but this reduction comes at the expense of increased diffusion introduced by the transport

of quantities by the background flow. This increased diffusion influences the formation of intermittent structures such as the vortices and libration islands observed in the standard run.

Further differences may also appear as a result of the choice of solution variables. In particular, Kley (1998) showed that advecting the inertial angular momentum  $\mathcal{H} = \rho r(u_\theta + r\Omega)$  (that of both the corotating fluid and the frame), as written in equation (32), produces better results than just advecting the angular velocity in the corotating frame  $\rho u_\theta$  (unless otherwise marked,  $u_\theta$  refers to the fluid velocity in the corotating frame). In practice this distinction is between accounting for the Coriolis and centripetal accelerations using the Euler equation solver or ac-




Figure 14: Azimuthally averaged density after 100 orbits (left) and 300 orbits (right). Runs with standard resolution (fine lines) show progressive numerical diffusion as in Figure 13. High resolution runs (heavy lines) for the two alternate choices of solution variables show markedly less diffusion.

counting for them as source terms. We perform a comparison among three simulations that use the solution sets  $(\rho, \rho u_r, \mathcal{H})$ ,  $(\rho, \rho u_r, \mathcal{H}/r)$ , and  $(\rho, \rho u_r, \rho u_\theta)$ . The first of these sets uses the inertial angular momentum as the choice of angular variable, the second uses the inertial angular velocity as the choice of angular variable and the third uses the corotating frame (local) angular velocity as the choice of angular variable. We argue that the difference in the results caused by the choice of solution variables does not reflect differences in accuracy, but rather differences in the amount of numerical viscosity that is present in each of the simulations.

In Figure 13 we compare the density after 20, 100 and 300 orbits for the standard run (which makes use of the fast-advection algorithm and which uses the inertial angular momentum as the angular variable) against one run which does not make use of the fast-advection algorithm, and against two additional runs which do but which implement the two alternate choices of angular variables. The standard run using the fast-advection routine requires 7.8 times fewer iterations to reach 100 orbits and finishes 6.6 times faster. While all simulations properly capture the locations of the spiral arms, the overall level of detail present and both the strength and number of vortices present decrease in each successive row. This observation suggests that the use of the fast-advection algorithm introduces extra diffusion into the simulation, and that the two alternate choices of angular variables also yield more diffusion.

In Figure 14 we compare results for the azimuthally averaged density in the gap region after 100 and 300 orbits. The progressive increase in diffusion caused by the FARGO algorithm and then by the alternate choices of solution vectors is apparent. Also shown for the two alternate choices of solution vectors are results from simulations run at resolution  $N_r \times N_\theta = 768 \times 1252$ . These high resolution results suggest that the shallow gap profile seen in the runs using the inertial and corotating angular velocities is due to high levels of diffusion and numerical viscosity in the sim-

ulation. When run at higher resolution, they show profiles much closer to that of the standard run. Comparison with Figure 11 suggests that the numerical viscosity using the alternate solution sets  $(\rho, \rho u_r, \mathcal{H}/r)$  or  $(\rho, \rho u_r, \rho u_\theta)$  is at least an order of magnitude higher. This interpretation of the results, which suggests that the alternate solution variables are simply more numerically diffusive, differs from that argued by Kley (1998) in a similar analysis.

Figure 15 shows the total angular momentum in the simulation as a function of time. The standard solution set loses angular




Figure 15: Conservation of angular momentum measured relative to the initial amount present in the entire disk. Heavy lines show results from the high resolution runs with the alternate solution variables.






Figure 16: Left to right: azimuthally averaged density, radially averaged density in the gap region, and time evolution of the torque for different resolutions. All results use the VL limiter and density averages are taken at 100 orbits. Results in the top row have no added viscosity, those in the bottom row have  $\nu = 10^{-5}$ . The torque is broken up into components from the disk material inside (dotted) and outside (dashed) the planet’s orbit. Also plotted is the total net torque (solid). The palest lines show the lowest resolution of the five runs. The darkest lines show the highest resolution.




Figure 17: Left to right: azimuthally averaged density, radially averaged density in the gap region, and time evolution of the torque for different limiters. All runs have resolution  $N_r \times N_\theta = 384 \times 384$  and density averages are taken at 100 orbits. The torque is broken up into components from the disk material inside (dotted) and outside (dashed) the planet’s orbit. Also plotted is the total net torque (solid). The lines from darkest to palest correspond to the Minmod, Van Leer, MC, mixed (MB), and Superbee limiters, respectively.

momentum at a rate of 1%/100 orbits, using the inertial angular velocity causes a loss rate of 4%/100 orbits and using the local angular velocity causes a loss rate of 8%/100 orbits.

### 5.5. Effects of resolution and evidence of numerical convergence

The effects of numerical viscosity become more pronounced at lower resolutions. Figure 16 shows the azimuthally and radially averaged densities for several different resolutions above and below that of the standard run. The effects of increasing the resolution are most apparent inside the planet’s orbit. Low radial resolution appears to make the slope of the gap shallower on the inside edge of the planet’s orbit. For the two runs with the lowest radial resolution  $N_r = 128$ , the libration islands of fluid do not exist—likely the numerical viscosity at these resolutions is too large for them to be maintained. Also, as the radial resolution increases, two distinct vortex lines and corresponding

overdensities (at approximately  $r = 0.55$  and  $r = 0.70$ ) become apparent inside the planet’s orbit, rather than just a single line, or none.

Note that increasing the azimuthal resolution relative to the radial resolution widens the gap profile. At resolutions where the results have not yet converged, it also affects some of the details of the structures present within the disk—the vortex lines and the the libration islands—in a more complicated manner because the number of iterations required to reach 100 orbits differs amongst differing resolutions by as much as a factor of three. Thus, the effects of numerical resolution are the result of a competition between an increased amount of diffusion from an increased number of iterations required, and a decreased amount of numerical viscosity due to the increased grid resolution.

Figure 16 also shows the torques as the resolution is varied. The runs with the three or four highest resolutions are consistent with one another. Note that while the magnitudes of the torques

from the inner and outer disk still increase slightly with higher resolution, the total torque remains the same, except for the two lowest resolution runs.

### 5.6. Effects of the limiter scheme

The results from the Sod shock tube test and the Kelvin-Helmholtz instability in Section 4 have already illustrated that the different limiters exhibit different levels of numerical viscosity—both differing diffusion and dispersion. Figure 17 shows the azimuthally and radially averaged densities for the Minmod, Van Leer, MC, mixed (MB), and Superbee schemes used in the standard run. As in Section 4, the Superbee scheme shows the least diffusion, but the most dispersion. This conclusion is evident from the increased mass of the fluid in the gap region, as well as the oscillatory density structure exhibited there. The mixed and MC schemes also show a fair amount of dispersion. The Van Leer limiter seems to show diffusion comparable to that of the MC and mixed limiters but substantially less dispersion. As before, the Minmod limiter shows the most diffusion. Simulations run with  $\nu = 10^{-5}$  (not presented) show analogous results. Figure 17 also shows the calculated torques for each choice of limiter. Again, these results are consistent with those previous.

## 6. Conclusions

We have developed a new, efficient, parallelized hydrodynamic code for studying accretion disk processes. The current incarnation is optimized to study planetary disk-planet interactions. A FARGO-type algorithm is implemented to help alleviate CFL time step restrictions imposed by the rapidly rotating inner disk region. Open-MP directives are also implemented to obtain faster computations on shared memory machines. Parallelization on distributed memory machines (such as with Message Passing Interface (MPI) protocols) requires further development.

We have shown that the RAPID code performs comparably to the well-established piece-wise parabolic method (PPM) on standard hydrodynamic tests. The largest difference observed between the two algorithms is the level of pre- and postshock oscillations that are allowed. PPM codes flatten such oscillations quite stringently. We note that this procedure is not necessarily physically motivated and may lead to a decrease in the amount of structure present in some simulations. We have also compared how results from our code differ depending on the choice of flux limiter. The amounts of diffusion and dispersion vary quite substantially, but the relative amounts amongst limiters are observed to be qualitatively consistent on all tests.

In addition, we presented a large series of comparisons on the standard protoplanet problem, showing results that are consistent with ensemble results from a wide variety of other codes documented in the protoplanet comparison project (de Val-Borro et al., 2006). In particular we confirmed the existence of libration islands at the  $L_4$  and  $L_5$  points, an asymmetry in the density of those islands, the sign and magnitude of the torque exerted on the planet by the disk and the growth and merging of vortices outside the planet’s orbit at low viscosity.

We found that the large vortex which forms outside the planet’s orbit causes substantial torque oscillations on the planet. These oscillations correspond to repeated passes of the vortex by the planet. Increasing the viscosity beyond  $\nu \geq 10^{-5}$  damps the formation of the vortex thereby removing the oscillatory signature from the torque. The existence of additional *vortex lines* to the inside of the planet’s orbit are demonstrated.

We have shown that the FARGO-like fast-advection algorithm reduces the required simulation time by a factor of 6.5 in standard planet-disk setups. We also illustrated that using the inertial angular momentum rather than angular velocity as a solution variable decreases the numerical viscosity present in the simulations by an order or magnitude or more. This finding supplements previous work by Kley (1998). In addition, the choice of inertial angular momentum as a solution variable conserves the total angular momentum on the grid to higher precision.

We determined the level of numerical viscosity present within the code to be  $\nu < 10^{-6}$  ( $\alpha < 10^{-3.5}$ ), enabling the simulation of scenarios with Reynolds numbers on the order of  $Re = UL \times 10^6$ .

## Acknowledgements

We thank L.J. Dursi for helpful discussions and a careful read of this manuscript.

## A. Appendix

Written out in component form for  $\mathbf{u} = (u_r, u_\theta, u_z)$  and  $\mathbf{x} = (r, \theta, z)$ , the equations solved for are

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} [\rho r u_r] + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} [\rho u_\theta] + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} [\rho u_z] = 0 \quad (30)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \rho u_r}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} [\rho r u_r^2 + p r] + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} [\rho u_\theta u_r] + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} [\rho u_z u_r] \\ = -\rho \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial r} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial r \sigma_{rr}}{\partial r} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial \sigma_{\theta r}}{\partial \theta} + \frac{\partial \sigma_{zr}}{\partial z} - \frac{\sigma_{\theta\theta}}{r} + \frac{p}{r} + \frac{\rho u_\theta^2}{r} \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} [r u_r \mathcal{H}] + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} [u_\theta \mathcal{H} + p r] + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} [u_z \mathcal{H}] \\ = -\rho \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \theta} + \frac{\partial r \sigma_{r\theta}}{\partial r} + \frac{\partial \sigma_{\theta\theta}}{\partial \theta} + r \frac{\partial \sigma_{z\theta}}{\partial z} + \sigma_{\theta r} \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \rho u_z}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} [\rho r u_r u_z] + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} [\rho u_\theta u_z] + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} [\rho u_z^2 + p] \\ = -\rho \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial z} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial r \sigma_{rz}}{\partial r} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial \sigma_{\theta z}}{\partial \theta} + \frac{\partial \sigma_{zz}}{\partial z} \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \rho e}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} [r u_r (\rho e + p)] + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} [u_\theta (\rho e + p)] + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} [u_z (\rho e + p)] \\ = -\rho \left[ u_r \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial r} + \frac{u_\theta}{r} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \theta} + u_z \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial z} \right] \\ + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} [r u_i \sigma_{ir}] + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} [u_i \sigma_{i\theta}] + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} [u_i \sigma_{iz}], \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where  $\mathcal{H} = \rho r (u_\theta + r\Omega)$  is the fluid’s inertial angular momentum, and we use the notation  $u_i \sigma_{ij} = u_r \sigma_{rj} + u_\theta \sigma_{\theta j} + u_z \sigma_{zj}$ .

The stress tensor for a compressible Newtonian fluid under the Stoke's assumption is

$$\sigma_{ij} = \rho\nu \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial r} - \frac{1}{3} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} & \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial \theta} + \frac{\partial u_\theta}{\partial r} - \frac{u_\theta}{r} \right) & \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial r} \right) \\ \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial \theta} + \frac{\partial u_\theta}{\partial r} - \frac{u_\theta}{r} \right) & \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial u_\theta}{\partial \theta} + \frac{u_r}{r} - \frac{1}{3} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} & \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\partial u_\theta}{\partial z} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial \theta} \right) \\ \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial r} \right) & \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\partial u_\theta}{\partial z} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial \theta} \right) & \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial z} - \frac{1}{3} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} \end{bmatrix},$$

where

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial r u_r}{\partial r} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial u_\theta}{\partial \theta} + \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial z}.$$

In order to close the above equations, one requires an equation of state relating the internal energy and pressure of the fluid. For adiabatic fluids,

$$p = (\gamma - 1) \rho \varepsilon, \quad (35a)$$

in terms of the adiabatic index  $\gamma$ . For isothermal fluids, the pressure is defined independently of the internal energy as

$$p = \rho c_s^2, \quad (35b)$$

and a set prescription is used to define the sound speed.

## References

- Colella, P., Woodward, P. R., 1984. *J. Comput. Phys.* 54, 174.
- de Val-Borro, M., Edgar, R. G., Artymowicz, P., Ciecielag, P., Cresswell, P., D'Angelo, G., Delgado-Donate, E. J., Dirksen, G., Fromang, S., Gawryszczak, A., Klahr, H., Kley, W., Lyra, W., Masset, F., Mellema, G., Nelson, R. P., Paardekooper, S.-J., Peplinski, A., Pierens, A., Plewa, T., Rice, K., Schäfer, C., Speith, R., 2006. *MNRAS* 370, 529.
- Dwarkadas, V., Plewa, T., Weirs, G., Tomkins, C., Marr-Lyon, M., 2004. *ArXiv Astrophysics e-prints*.
- Godunov, S. K., 1959. *Math. Sbornik* 47, 271.
- Goldreich, P., Tremaine, S., 1980. *ApJ* 241, 425.
- Harten, A., 1983. *J. Comput. Phys.* 49, 357.
- Hartmann, L., Calvet, N., Gullbring, E., D'Alessio, P., 1998. *ApJ* 495, 385.
- Jin, S., Xin, Z., 1995. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.* 48, 235.
- Kley, W., 1998. *A&A* 338, L37.
- Koller, J., Li, H., Lin, D. N. C., 2003. *ApJ* 596, L91.
- Landau, L. D., Lifshitz, E. M., 1959. *Fluid mechanics. Course of theoretical physics*, Springer, Pergamon Press.
- Laney, C. B., 1998. *Computational Gas Dynamics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Leveque, R. J., 2002. *Finite Volume Methods for Hyperbolic Problems*. Cambridge University Press.
- Li, H., Colgate, S. A., Wendroff, B., Liska, R., 2001. *ApJ* 551, 874.
- Li, H., Finn, J. M., Lovelace, R. V. E., Colgate, S. A., 2000. *ApJ* 533, 1023.
- Lovelace, R. V. E., Li, H., Colgate, S. A., Nelson, A. F., 1999. *ApJ* 513, 805.
- Masset, F., 2000. *A&AS* 141, 165.
- Papaloizou, J. C. B., Lin, D. N. C., 1989. *ApJ* 344, 645.
- Pen, U.-L., 1998. *ApJS* 115, 19.
- Strang, G., 1968. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 5, 506.
- Sweby, P. K., 1984. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 21, 995.
- Trac, H., Pen, U.-L., 2003. *PASP* 115, 303.
- Trac, H., Pen, U.-L., 2004. *New Astronomy* 9, 443.
- Ward, W. R., 1986. *Icarus* 67, 164.
- Ward, W. R., 1996. *Icarus* 126, 261.