

Adjoint-based optimization of the Rayleigh-Bénard instability with melting boundary

Tomas Fullana^{1,2*}, Alejandro Quirós Rodríguez¹,
Vincent Le Chenadec³, Taraneh Sayadi^{1,4*}

¹Institut Jean le Rond d'Alembert, Sorbonne Université, CNRS, Paris,
F-75005, France.

²Laboratory of Fluid Mechanics and Instabilities, EPFL, Laussane,
CH-1015, Switzerland.

³MSME, Université Gustave Eiffel, UPEC, CNRS, Marne-la-Vallée,
F-77454, France.

⁴Mathematical and Numerical Modelling Laboratory, Conservatoire
National des Arts et Métiers, Paris, F-75003, France.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): tomas.fullana@epfl.ch;
taraneh.sayadi@lecnam.net;

Abstract

In this work, we propose an adjoint-based optimization procedure to control the onset of the Rayleigh-Bénard instability with a melting front. A novel cut cell method is used to solve the Navier-Stokes equations in the Boussinesq approximation and the convection-diffusion equation in the fluid layer, as well as the heat equation in the solid phase. To track the interface we use the level set method where its evolution is simply governed by an advection equation. An incomplete continuous adjoint problem is then derived by considering that the velocity field is a check-pointing variable. The results of the minimization problem with a tracking-type cost-functional show that our adjoint method is well suited to optimize the shapes of the fronts in this configuration.

Keywords: Rayleigh-Bénard instability, melting boundary, level set method, cut cell method, continuous adjoint, gradient-based descent

1 Introduction

Stefan problem [1] models transport and transfer phenomena, in particular solid-liquid phase change in evaporating or chemically reacting flows. Such phenomena govern the interface motion in many engineering related problems such as dendritic solidification [2, 3], phase transformation in metallic alloys [4], and solid fuel combustion [5]. At the interface, the Stefan condition arises from the interaction of liquid and solid phases (both considered incompressible), resulting in a moving liquid-solid interface (freezing or melting front). The speed of the front is directly related to the jump in the conductive heat flux across the interface. In one dimension, this problem has been studied in depth [6–8]; in higher dimensions, however, due to the unstable pattern formation [9–11] specific numerical methods, such as the level set method [2, 12–18], have been used to predict the motion and shape of the interface. In crystal growth, for example, under-cooling triggers an instability mechanism, causing the solid phase of the material to grow into the liquid phase in a finger-like or dendritic fashion, resulting in complex interfacial shapes and possible topography changes. Moreover, while convection with a fixed topography is usually studied in the classical Rayleigh-Bénard setup [19], many natural phenomena such as erosion or melting involve a coupling between the flow and the moving boundary [20, 21].

The shape of the resulting interface may strongly affect the outcome and time-frame of the production processes in many industrial applications involving phase change. As a result, it is desirable to extract efficient control strategies to manipulate the motion of the interface, for instance, by tracking a prescribed trajectory. Two major types of optimization methods in use today are (i) gradient-based, and (ii) derivative free methods. While an efficient class of generic algorithms (belonging to the class of derivative free methods) based on the surrogate management framework [22] and artificial neural networks [23] have been used for optimization in fluid mechanics, mainly in the area of aerodynamic shape optimization, they could require many function evaluations, for training purposes for example. When detailed simulations of interfacial flows are concerned, each function evaluation commands a full (potentially unsteady) CFD computation, causing gradient-based methods to be at an advantage. Most common methods in extracting the gradient information, on the other hand, are analytical or use finite differences, neither of which are suited to the configuration of interest to this work. Adjoint-based algorithms present a suitable alternative, as they allow the determination of the gradient at a cost comparable to a single function evaluation [24]. The use of adjoint methods for design and optimization has been an active area of research which started with the pioneering work of Pironneau [25] with applications in fluid mechanics, and has been extensively used in aeronautical shape optimization by Jameson and co-workers [26, 27]. Ever since these groundbreaking studies, adjoint-based methods have been widely used in fluid mechanics particularly in the areas of aero- and thermo-acoustics [28, 29]. More recently flow regimes dominated by nonlinear dynamics, such as separation and mixing have also been analysed using adjoint-based techniques [30–33]. Adjoint-based methods have also been employed for the purpose of sensitivity analysis or control in flows in the presence of large gradients (flames or interfaces) [34–37], showing great promise, and therefore are adopted here to carry out the optimization procedure.




Fig. 1: Schematic of the melting boundary problem.

In the context of Stefan problems various control strategies have been employed to track the location of the interface. In a one-dimensional setting, for example, set-valued fixed point equations [38] or linear-quadratic defect minimization [39] have been used to control the location of the front. Adjoint-based algorithms have also been applied to a Stefan problem caused by heterogeneous reactions on a surface of a one-dimensional solid particle [5] to extract sensitivities with respect to various kinetic parameters. Alternatively, in a two-dimensional setting, adjoint-based algorithms have been utilized previously together with finite element and finite difference approaches to track and control the location of interface by imposing heat flux (or temperature) at the boundary in order to realize the desired interface motion [40–42]. In particular, Bernauer & Herzog [43], making use of shape calculus tools, derived the set of adjoint equations to extract control strategies for Stefan problems with a sharp representation of the interface.

Similar to the approach of [43] shape calculus tools have been employed to extract the corresponding adjoint equations in our previous work [16]. However, contrary to the previous studies, control strategies are extracted here to control the interface shape resulting from the melting boundary. In this case, an incomplete adjoint – by considering the velocity field in the fluid layer as a check-pointing variable – is derived and used to minimize a tracking-type cost functional through a gradient-based algorithm. We will show that the derived incomplete adjoint is sufficient to retrieve meaningful information of the system and drive the cost functional towards its minimum.

The paper is organized as follows; in the first section we will define the forward problem and present validation cases, in the second section we will derive the continuous adjoint equations and in the last section we present the optimization results resulting from the solution of the minimization of a tracking-type cost functional.

2 Governing equations

Following the recent studies on the Rayleigh-Bénard instability in the presence of a melting boundary [12, 44], we consider the evolution of an initially flat liquid layer

heated from below and comprised between a wall and a solid layer. As the solid melts, the liquid layer will grow vertically until a critical height where convection kicks in. A schematic of this configuration is shown in Fig. 1. The gravity is pointing downwards $\mathbf{g} = -g\mathbf{e}_y$ and the horizontal size of the domain is bH , where b is the aspect ratio and where $H = 1$ is the height of the system. The temperature at the bottom wall is $T_b = 0.7$, and the one at the top wall is our control variable $w(x) < 0$, such that $w(x) < T_M < T_b$ where $T_M = 0$ is the melting temperature at the front. The initial flat interface is located at $h_0 = 0.05$ and the initial temperature field is set to zero.

To model this phenomena, we consider two immiscible phases (liquid and solid) of equal densities and thermal conductivities. In the fluid phase, we solve the Navier-Stokes equations in the Boussinesq approximation coupled to the convection-diffusion equation for the temperature field

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Pr}^{-1} \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} \right) &= -\nabla p + \text{Ra} T_L \mathbf{e}_y + \nabla^2 \mathbf{u}, \\ \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} &= 0, \\ \frac{\partial T_L}{\partial t} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla T_L &= \nabla^2 T_L, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where T_L is the dimensionless temperature field in the liquid phase. The dimensionless numbers governing this equation are the Prandtl number

$$\text{Pr} = \frac{\nu}{k}, \tag{2}$$

defined by the ratio of the liquid kinematic viscosity ν and thermal diffusivity k , and the Rayleigh number

$$\text{Ra} = \frac{g \alpha_t \Delta T H^3}{\nu k}, \tag{3}$$

where g is the constant gravitational acceleration, α_t the coefficient of thermal expansion, H a characteristic length of the system and $\Delta T = T_b - T_M$. In the solid phase, the heat equation applies

$$\frac{\partial T_S}{\partial t} = \nabla^2 T_S, \tag{4}$$

where T_S is the dimensionless temperature field in the solid phase. At the interface, both temperature fields are equal to the melting temperature

$$T_L(\mathbf{x}, t) = T_S(\mathbf{x}, t) = T_M \quad \mathbf{x} \in \Gamma, \tag{5}$$

where Γ denotes the front position. In the present example, we disregard surface tension effects in the thermodynamic boundary condition at the front (ie. the Gibbs-Thomson relation).

Finally, as phase change occurs, there will appear a latent heat which is either absorbed or released. The condition of heat conservation at a given point on the moving interface corresponds to the rate at which heat is generated at the boundary,

balanced by the rate at which this heat flows in either phase. Along the interface, the Stefan condition states that

$$\mathbf{v} = \text{St} [\nabla T]_L^S \cdot \mathbf{n}, \quad \mathbf{x} \in \Gamma, \quad (6)$$

where \mathbf{v} is the interface velocity, \mathbf{n} is the outward normal unit vector at the interface and $[\nabla T]_L^S = \partial T_S / \partial \mathbf{n} - \partial T_L / \partial \mathbf{n}$ is the jump in normal components of the temperature gradients from the solid phase to the liquid phase. The Stefan number St is defined as the ratio between available heat in the system and the latent heat

$$\text{St} = \frac{k \Delta T}{L_H}, \quad (7)$$

where L_H is the latent heat. The moving interface is captured using the level set method. A level set function ϕ [45] is defined on the computational domain Ω to map the locus of one of its iso-levels ($\{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega \mid \phi(\mathbf{x}, t) = \phi_0\}$) to an interface $\Gamma(t)$ that separates two non-overlapping domains, $\Omega_S(t)$ and $\Omega_L(t)$, each occupied by a different phase. The value ϕ is defined as the signed distance to the interface,

$$\phi(\mathbf{x}, t) = \begin{cases} -d(\mathbf{x}, \Gamma(t)), & \mathbf{x} \in \Omega_S(t) \\ 0, & \mathbf{x} \in \Gamma(t) \\ d(\mathbf{x}, \Gamma(t)), & \mathbf{x} \in \Omega_L(t) \end{cases}, \quad (8)$$

where $d(\mathbf{x}, \Gamma(t))$ denotes the minimal distance between the point \mathbf{x} and the interface $\Gamma(t)$,

$$d(\mathbf{x}, \Gamma(t)) = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{y} \in \Gamma(t)} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|, \quad (9)$$

with $\|\cdot\|$ denoting the Euclidean distance. The main advantage of the level set method is that its evolution is governed by a simple advection equation

$$\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \phi = 0. \quad (10)$$

provided that the velocity field can be smoothly extended from $\Gamma(t)$. This evolution equation however does not preserve the signed distance property, which can be restored by periodically employing a reinitialization procedure. For further details on the numerical implementation of the level set coupled to a cut cell method, we refer the reader to [16–18].

The forward problem, setting $\text{St} = 1$, can be recast in the level set framework as follows.

Find a function $T : \Omega \times [0, t_f] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a function $\phi : \Omega \times [0, t_f] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \frac{\partial T_S}{\partial t} = \nabla^2 T_S & \text{in } \Omega_S(t) \text{ (FP.a)} \\ \text{Pr}^{-1} \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} \right) = -\nabla p + \text{Ra } T_L \mathbf{e}_y + \nabla^2 \mathbf{u} & \text{in } \Omega_L(t) \text{ (FP.b)} \\ \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0 & \text{in } \Omega_L(t) \text{ (FP.c)} \\ \frac{\partial T_L}{\partial t} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla T_L = \nabla^2 T_L & \text{in } \Omega_L(t) \text{ (FP.d)} \\ \frac{\partial T_L}{\partial t} = \nabla^2 T_L & \text{in } \Omega_L(t) \text{ (FP.e)} \\ T(x, 0) = T_0(x) & \text{in } \Omega \text{ (FP.f)} \\ T_S = w(x) & \text{on } \partial\Omega_S \text{ (FP.g)} \\ T_L = T_b & \text{on } \partial\Omega_L \text{ (FP.h)} \\ T(x, t) = T_M & \text{on } \Gamma(t) \text{ (FP.i)} \\ \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} = -[\nabla T_i]_L^S \cdot \nabla \phi & \text{on } \Gamma(t) \text{ (FP.j)} \\ \phi(x, 0) = \phi_0(x) & \text{in } \Omega \text{ (FP.k)} \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{FP})$$

The global Rayleigh number in Eq. (3) will control the onset of the Rayleigh-Bénard instability. The effective Rayleigh number is defined as

$$\text{Ra}_e = \text{Ra} (1 - T_M) \bar{h}^3, \quad (11)$$

where \bar{h} is the average fluid height

$$\bar{h}(t) = \frac{1}{b} \int_0^b h(x, t) dx. \quad (12)$$

When the effective Rayleigh number reaches the critical value $\text{Ra}_c = 1707.76$, the initial diffusion-driven motion is transformed into a convection-driven one. We consider a domain with aspect ratio $b = 4$, a fixed temperature $w = -0.3$ at the top boundary and vary the global Rayleigh number. Figure 2a shows the average height as function of time for the different cases. In the $\text{Ra} = 10^4$ case, the critical Rayleigh number is not reached and the motion of the fluid layer is not affected, thus remaining a diffusion-driven one, similarly to the planar motion. In the rest of the cases, the effective Rayleigh number Ra_e (Fig. 2b) crosses the threshold indicating the onset of

the instability, characterized by a sharp increase in interface speed. Figure 5 shows a time series of the temperature field and interface position for the $Ra = 10^5$ case. When the critical Rayleigh number is reached, the first bifurcation appears, creating the convection cells. The size of the convection cells will then vary with the secondary bifurcations mechanism. When the averaged height \bar{h} matches the characteristic wavelength of the convection rolls, the convection cells have sufficient time to merge and then stabilize. We also note that the interface is deformed according to the shape of the cells.




Fig. 2: Average height and effective Rayleigh number as a function of time for $Ra = 10^5, 8 \times 10^4, 4 \times 10^4, 10^4$.




Fig. 3: Times series of the temperature field and interface position for the $Ra = 10^5$ case. The color map is the temperature field in both phases and the interface corresponding to the 0-levelset is denoted in red.

3 Adjoint problem

We now aim at solving a minimization problem by using the adjoint of (FP). We assume that the desired temperature field T^d and the desired position of the interface ϕ^d are known a priori. The control variable w is then iteratively calculated through

an optimization procedure to reach these desired quantities and will drive our cost functional towards its minimum. The following tracking-type cost functional provides a mathematical description of the control goals stated above

$$\mathcal{J}(T, \phi, w) = \frac{\beta_1}{2} \int_{\Omega} |T^f - T^d|^2 dx + \frac{\beta_2}{2} \int_{\Gamma^f} |\phi^f - \phi^d|^2 ds + \frac{\beta_3}{2} \int_0^{t_f} \int_{\partial\Omega_S} |w|^2 ds dt \quad (13)$$

with constants β_1 to β_3 acting as weights, T^f and ϕ^f the final temperature field and level set function of (FP) and Γ^f the final position of the interface (0-level set of ϕ^f). The first term monitors the final temperature distribution and is mostly used as an initializer for the adjoint temperature field for the adjoint problem. The second term controls the relative position of the level set function with respect to the desired one. Taking advantage of the signed distance function property of both ϕ^d and ϕ^f , the discrete form is simply the square of the difference between both functions computed in the points belonging to the final interface Γ^f . Finally, the last term penalizes the control cost and leads to the gradient equation in the adjoint problem.

We assume that each choice of the control variable w leads to unique states $T(w)$ and $\phi(w)$. Therefore, the minimization problem (MP) reads

$$\begin{aligned} \min_w \mathcal{J}(T(w), \phi(w), w) \\ \text{subject to (FP).} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{MP})$$

We will now proceed with the derivation of the corresponding continuous adjoint problem. The main novelty behind our derivation is that the velocity field \mathbf{u} , known at each time step, can be considered as a check-pointing variable, therefore discarding the adjoint of the of the Navier-Stokes equations. Indeed, as phase-change is the main driver of this phenomena, one can neglect the velocity in the adjoint. The minimization procedure will serve as a validation of this hypothesis.

Let Θ be the adjoint temperature and ψ the adjoint level set function. In order to compute the gradient of $\mathcal{J}(w)$, we introduce the following Lagrange functional \mathcal{L} (dx , dt and ds are omitted for brevity)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(T, \phi, w, \Theta, \Theta_S^D, \Theta_L^D, \Theta^I, \psi) &= \mathcal{J}(T, \phi, w) \\ &- \int_0^{t_f} \int_{\Omega_S} \left(\frac{\partial T_S}{\partial t} - \nabla^2 T_S \right) \Theta_S - \int_0^{t_f} \int_{\Omega_L} \left(\frac{\partial T_L}{\partial t} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla T_L - \nabla^2 T_L \right) \Theta_L \\ &- \int_0^{t_f} \int_{\partial\Omega_S} (T - w) \Theta_S^D - \int_0^{t_f} \int_{\partial\Omega_L} (T - T_b) \Theta_L^D - \int_0^{t_f} \int_{\Gamma} (T - T_M) \Theta^I \\ &- \int_0^{t_f} \int_{\Gamma} \left(\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} + [\nabla T_i]_L^S \cdot \nabla \phi \right) \psi. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Similarly to the temperature field, $\Theta_{S,L}: (x, t) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ denotes the adjoint temperature field in either phase. The Lagrange multipliers $\Theta_{S,L}^D$ and Θ^I are used for the boundary conditions on the domain and the interface respectively.

The adjoint system is obtained by setting to zero the derivatives of the Lagrange functional with respect to T and ϕ : $\mathcal{L}_T(\cdot) = \mathcal{L}_\phi(\cdot) = 0$. Setting the initial conditions to

$$\begin{aligned} T(x, 0) &= T_0(x), \\ \phi(x, 0) &= \phi_0(x), \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

leads to $\delta T(x, 0) = \delta\phi(x, 0) = 0$ when calculating the derivatives in the direction δT and $\delta\phi$.

We start by deriving the adjoint temperature equations by setting $\mathcal{L}_T(\cdot) = 0$. The terms in the Lagrangian that do not depend on the temperature vanish and we move the spatial and temporal derivatives towards the adjoint state Θ . By applying integration by parts, once with respect to time and twice with respect to space, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_T \delta T &= \int_0^{t_f} \int_{\Omega_S} \left(\frac{\partial \Theta_S}{\partial t} + \nabla^2 \Theta_S \right) \delta T + \int_0^{t_f} \int_{\Omega_L} \left(\frac{\partial \Theta_L}{\partial t} - \mathbf{u} \nabla \Theta_L + \nabla^2 \Theta_L \right) \delta T \\ &- \int_{\Omega_S} \left(\Theta_S^f - \beta_1 (T^f - T^d) \right) \delta T^f - \int_{\Omega_L} \left(\Theta_L^f - \beta_1 (T^f - T^d) \right) \delta T^f \\ &+ \int_0^{t_f} \int_{\partial \Omega_S} \left(-\frac{\partial \Theta_S}{\partial n} \delta T + \frac{\partial \delta T}{\partial n} (\Theta_S - \Theta_S^D) \right) + \int_0^{t_f} \int_{\partial \Omega_L} \left(-\frac{\partial \Theta_L}{\partial n} \delta T + \frac{\partial \delta T}{\partial n} (\Theta_L - \Theta_L^D) \right) \\ &+ \int_0^{t_f} \int_{\Gamma} \left(\Theta_S \vec{v}_S \cdot \mathbf{n} - \Theta_L \vec{v}_L \cdot \mathbf{n} - \frac{\partial \Theta_S}{\partial n} + \frac{\partial \Theta_S}{\partial n} - \Theta^I \right) \delta T \\ &+ \int_0^{t_f} \int_{\Gamma} (\Theta - \psi |\nabla \phi|) [\nabla \delta T]_L^S \cdot \mathbf{n} \quad \forall \delta T = 0. \end{aligned}$$

with \vec{v}_S and \vec{v}_L the velocities of the control volumes Ω_S and Ω_L respectively, only non-zero on Γ . The second to last term, corresponds to the normal jump in adjoint temperature, which gives $\Theta^I = -[\nabla \Theta]_L^S \cdot \mathbf{n}$ as $\Theta_S = \Theta_L$ on Γ . By altering the directions of variations and eliminating certain terms, we obtain the adjoint temperature problem

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} -\frac{\partial \Theta_S}{\partial t} = \nabla^2 \Theta_S & \text{in } \Omega_S(t) \\ -\frac{\partial \Theta_L}{\partial t} - \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \Theta_L = \nabla^2 \Theta_L & \text{in } \Omega_L(t) \\ \Theta(x, t_f) = \beta_1(T^f - T^d) & \text{in } \Omega \\ \frac{\partial \Theta_S}{\partial n} = 0 & \text{on } \partial \Omega_S \\ \frac{\partial \Theta_L}{\partial n} = 0 & \text{on } \partial \Omega_L \\ \Theta(x, t) = \psi |\nabla \phi| & \text{on } \Gamma(t) \\ \Theta^I = -[\nabla \Theta]_L^S \cdot n & \text{on } \Gamma(t) \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{AT})$$

The first two equations of the adjoint temperature problem (AT) are the heat and convection-diffusion equations in reverse time. The third equation is the initial condition for the adjoint temperature field, that depends on the desired temperature distribution T^d . The fourth and fifth equations are the homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions for the adjoint field mapped from the Dirichlet boundary conditions of the forward problem. The second to last equation is the Dirichlet boundary condition at the interface that now depends on the value of the adjoint level set function ψ . We can note that the adjoint level set function will not behave as a signed distance function but as an auxiliary variable that acts on the temperature field through the boundary condition at the interface Γ . Finally, the last equation states that the multiplier Θ^I , defined on Γ , must be equal to the jump in normal gradient of Θ .

Turning now to the adjoint level set problem; due to the geometric non-linearity induced by ϕ on the domains of integration a careful treatment of each term is required as described in [43]. Denoting $D[[H(\phi); \delta\phi]]$ the variation of $H(\cdot)$ in the direction $\delta\phi$, the adjoint level set equations are derived by setting $\mathcal{L}_\phi(\cdot) = 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_\phi \delta\phi &= D[[\mathcal{J}(T, \phi, w); \delta\phi]] \\ &+ D \left[\int_0^{t_f} \int_{\Omega_S} \left(\frac{\partial T_S}{\partial t} - \nabla^2 T_S \right) \Theta_S; \delta\phi \right] + D \left[\int_0^{t_f} \int_{\Omega_L} \left(\frac{\partial T_L}{\partial t} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla T_L - \nabla^2 T_L \right) \Theta_L; \delta\phi \right] \\ &- D \left[\int_0^{t_f} \int_{\partial \Omega} (T_S - w) \Theta_S^D; \delta\phi \right] - D \left[\int_0^{t_f} \int_{\partial \Omega} (T_L - T_b) \Theta_L^D; \delta\phi \right] \\ &- D \left[\int_0^{t_f} \int_{\Gamma} (T - T_M) \Theta^I; \delta\phi \right] - D \left[\int_0^{t_f} \int_{\Gamma} \left(\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} + [\nabla T_i]_L^S \cdot \nabla \phi \right) \psi; \delta\phi \right]. \end{aligned}$$

For details on the derivation and simplifications of $\mathcal{L}_\phi(\cdot) = 0$, we refer the reader to [16].

Finally, the last term to complete the adjoint Stefan problem is the gradient equation. By setting $\mathcal{L}_w \delta w = 0$ in Equation 14, we have

$$\mathcal{L}_w \delta w = \left[\left[\frac{\beta_3}{2} \int_0^{t_f} \int_{\partial\Omega_S} |w|^2; \delta w \right] - \left[\int_0^{t_f} \int_{\partial\Omega_S} (T_S - w) \Theta_S^D; \delta w \right] \right].$$

Using the previously defined multiplier Θ_S^D that is identically equal to Θ_S on $\partial\Omega_S$ we obtain the gradient equation $0 = \beta_3 w + \Theta$ on $\partial\Omega_S$. Putting it all together, we can now formulate the adjoint problem as follows

Find a function $\Theta : \Omega \times [t_f, 0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a function $\psi : \Omega \times [t_f, 0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} -\frac{\partial \Theta_S}{\partial t} = \nabla^2 \Theta_S & \text{in } \Omega_S(t) \text{ (AP.a)} \\ -\frac{\partial \Theta_L}{\partial t} - \mathbf{u} \nabla \Theta_L = \nabla^2 \Theta_L & \text{in } \Omega_L(t) \text{ (AP.b)} \\ \Theta(x, t_f) = \beta_1 (T(t_f) - T_{t_f}) & \text{in } \Omega \text{ (AP.c)} \\ \frac{\partial \Theta_S}{\partial n} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega_S \text{ (AP.d)} \\ \frac{\partial \Theta_L}{\partial n} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega_L \text{ (AP.e)} \\ \Theta(x, t) = \psi |\nabla \phi| & \text{on } \Gamma(t) \text{ (AP.f)} \\ \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} + \text{div}(\psi \vec{v}_S) = \frac{1}{|\nabla \phi|} \frac{\partial T}{\partial n} [\nabla \Theta_i]_L^S \cdot n & \text{on } \Gamma(t) \text{ (AP.g)} \\ \psi(x, t_f) = -\frac{\beta_2}{2} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial n} |\phi_{t_f}|^2 + \kappa |\phi_{t_f}|^2 \right) & \text{in } \Omega \text{ (AP.h)} \\ 0 = \beta_4 w + \Theta & \text{on } \partial\Omega \text{ (AP.i)} \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{AP})$$

We again emphasize on the fact that, here, the velocity field \mathbf{u} is considered as a known variable, eliminating the need to derive the adjoint of the Navier-Stokes equations in the fluid phase and leading to an incomplete adjoint formulation.

4 Optimization results

In the family of the adjoint-based methods, the gradient-based ones are the methods of choice to prove that the optimal control approach is reasonable due to their straight forward implementation. We choose to solve the minimization problem (MP) by using the limited memory BFGS (L-BFGS) method, a quasi-Newton method originally described in [46]. The main characteristic of this method is that it determines

the descent direction by preconditioning the gradient with an approximation of the Hessian matrix. This information is obtained using past approximations – the number of approximations is determined by the memory length parameter which is set to $m = 10$ – as well as the gradient. As an initial guess for the initial Hessian, we use the scaled identity matrix as described in [47]. Algorithm 1 summarizes the L-BFGS method used in our numerical example. The algorithm is stopped at a given iteration n if one of the following criteria is fulfilled

- The relative difference in control variable $\left| \frac{w^{n-1} - w^n}{w^n} \right| < 10^{-8}$.
- The relative difference in cost functional $\left| \frac{\mathcal{J}^{n-1} - \mathcal{J}^n}{\mathcal{J}^n} \right| < 10^{-8}$. This criterion can be relaxed to allow temporary increase of the cost functional, for example to ‘escape’ a local minimum.
- The norm of the gradient $|\nabla \mathcal{J}^n| < 10^{-6}$.

To test our gradient-based minimization procedure, we now consider the numerical setup defined in 1. The goal of this optimization procedure is to actuate on the top boundary condition to diminish the fluid layer growth, therefore reducing the onset of the instability. The actuator w is parametrized with the following basis

$$w = -|a_1| - |a_2|(1 - \tanh(2x)^2), \quad (16)$$

where x corresponds to the bounds of the domain and a_1 and a_2 to the basis coefficients. Through the optimization process, the amplitude of each coefficient is determined using the gradient equation (AP).i. By opting for a parameterized distribution we ensure the smoothness of the actuation function. Indeed, due to the high sensitivity of the cost functional with respect to the basis considered – too many parameters will create multiple local minima – the number of parameters are kept at a low enough value to ensure the convexity of the problem while allowing spatial variation of the actuation function.

The global Rayleigh number is set to $\text{Ra} = 10^5$ and an initial guess $w = 0$. The coefficients in the cost functional (13) are set to $\beta_1 = 1$, $\beta_2 = 1$ and $\beta_3 = 10^{-3}$. The desired solution is computed beforehand with coefficients $a_1 = 0.3$ and $a_2 = 2$. Figure 5 shows the interface position and temperature field at different iterations of the optimization procedure. The initial guess with $w = 0$ allows the interface to grow unperturbed, creating self-similar convection cells that affect the interface shape. The localized heat flux at the top boundary will create a heat gradient at the center of the domain leading to a destabilization of the interface and the appearance of the convection-driven regime before the unperturbed case (Fig. 4).

As the optimization procedure advances, we observe that the final interface position converges to the desired one, with a localized heat flux that prevents the melting interface growth at the center of the domain. In Figure 6 we show the evolution of the normalized cost functional $\mathcal{J}/\mathcal{J}_0$ as a function of the iterations. The procedure stops

Algorithm 1: Optimization procedure using the L-BFGS method

input : $w^0, m = 10$
output: w, T, ϕ, Θ, ψ
 $k \leftarrow 0, l \leftarrow 0$
while *not converged* **do**
 Solve the forward Stefan problem (FP) for T^k and ϕ^k

 Solve the adjoint Stefan problem (AP) for Θ^k and ψ^k


 Compute the gradient:

$$\nabla \mathcal{J}^k = \beta_3 w^k + \Theta^k$$


 if $k \geq 1$ **then**
 $s^{k-1} = \sigma^{k-1} d^{k-1} \quad g^{k-1} = \nabla \mathcal{J}^k - \nabla \mathcal{J}^{k-1}$
 if $(s^{k-1})^T g^{k-1} \leq 0$ **then**
 $l \leftarrow 0$
 else if $(s^{k-1})^T g^{k-1} > 0$ **then**
 $l \rightarrow l + 1$
 if $l > m$ **then**
 Remove $\{s^{l-m}, g^{l-m}\}$
 end
 Add $\{s^{l-m}, s^{l-m}\}$
 end
 end

 Choose an initial approximation to the inverse of the Hessian H_0^k
 Construct the direction $d^k = -H^k \nabla \mathcal{J}^k$
 Determine σ^k using a Line Search algorithm with backtracking where
 $\sigma^k = \operatorname{argmin} \mathcal{J}(w^k + \sigma^k d^k)$
 Update $w^{k+1} = w^k + \sigma^k d^k$
 $k \rightarrow k + 1$
end

at iteration 15, with a relative value three orders of magnitude lower, as the norm of the gradient goes below the prescribed threshold.




(a) Average height




(b) Effective Rayleigh number


Fig. 4: Average height and effective Rayleigh number as a function of time for the desired solution and initial guess.




(a) Iteration 0



(b) Iteration 1



(c) Iteration 2



(d) Iteration 15

Fig. 5: Iterations 0, 1, 2 and 15 of the optimization procedure. The red curve represents the desired shape and the black one the final position of the interface at a given iteration. The color map corresponds to the final temperature field of the (FP).




Fig. 6: Normalized cost functional as a function of the iterations of the L-BFGS optimization procedure.

5 Conclusion

This paper demonstrates the feasibility of extending the optimization of Stefan problems to scenarios where the flow in the fluid phase is significant and cannot be ignored. By treating the velocity field as a checkpoint variable, we were able to derive an incomplete continuous adjoint formulation for the two-phase problem. Our results indicate that the adjoint-based gradient descent method effectively controls the shape of melting fronts in this highly nonlinear system. This approach shows great potential for applications in more complex and dynamic melting processes. Looking forward, future work could explore more advanced actuator models, especially in non-periodic domains, to further enhance the optimization framework and broaden its applicability.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no competing interests.

Replication of results

The results obtained with an in-house Julia code `Flower.jl` are available from the corresponding authors upon request.

References

- [1] Šarler, B.: Stefan's work on solid-liquid phase changes. *Engineering Analysis with Boundary Elements* **16**(2), 83–92 (1995) [https://doi.org/10.1016/0955-7997\(95\)00047-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0955-7997(95)00047-X)
- [2] Osher, S., Sethian, J.A.: Fronts propagating with curvature-dependent speed: Algorithms based on Hamilton-Jacobi formulations. *J Comput. Phys.* **79**(1), 12–49 (1988) [https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9991\(88\)90002-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9991(88)90002-2)
- [3] Juric, D., Tryggvason, G.: A front-tracking method for dendritic solidification. *J Comput. Phys.* **123**, 127–148 (1996)
- [4] Segal, G., Vuik, C., Vermolen, F.: A conserving discretization for the free boundary in a two-dimensional stefan problem. *J Comput. Phys.* **141**, 1–21 (1998)
- [5] Hassan, A., Sayadi, T., Le Chenadec, V., Pitsch, H., Attili, A.: Adjoint-based sensitivity analysis of steady char burn out. *Com. Theo. Modeling* **25**(1), 96–120 (2021) <https://doi.org/10.1080/13647830.2020.1838614>
- [6] Javierre, E., Vuik, C., Vermolen, F.J., Zwaag, S.: A comparison of numerical models for one-dimensional Stefan problems. *J Comp. Applied Mathematics* **192**(2), 445–459 (2006) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cam.2005.04.062>
- [7] Rose, M.E.: An enthalpy scheme for stefan problems in several dimensions. *App. Numerical Math.* **12**, 229 (193)

- [8] Brattkus, K., Meiron, D.I.: Numerical simulations of unsteady crystal growth. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **52**, 1303 (1992)
- [9] Langer, J.S.: Instabilities and pattern formation in crystal growth. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **52**(1), 1–28 (1980) <https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.52.1>
- [10] Mullins, W.W., Sekerka, R.F.: Stability of a planar interface during solidification of a dilute binary alloy. *Journal of Applied Physics* **35**(2), 444–451 (1964) <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1713333> . Publisher: American Institute of Physics
- [11] Woods, A.W.: Melting and dissolving. *J. Fluid Mech.* **239**, 429 (1992) <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022112092004476>
- [12] Limare, A., Popinet, S., Josserand, C., Xue, Z., Ghigo, A.: A hybrid level-set / embedded boundary method applied to solidification-melt problems. *arXiv* (2022) [arXiv:2202.08300](https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.08300) [math.NA]
- [13] Gibou, F., Fedkiw, R., Caffisch, R., Osher, S.: A Level Set Approach for the Numerical Simulation of Dendritic Growth. *Journal of Scientific Computing* **19**(1), 183–199 (2003) <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1025399807998>
- [14] Chen, H., Min, C., Gibou, F.: A numerical scheme for the Stefan problem on adaptive Cartesian grids with supralinear convergence rate. *Journal of Computational Physics* **228**(16), 5803–5818 (2009) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2009.04.044>
- [15] Bayat, E., Egan, R., Bochkov, D., Sauret, A., Gibou, F.: A sharp numerical method for the simulation of Stefan problems with convective effects. *Journal of Computational Physics* **471**, 111627 (2022) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2022.111627>
- [16] Fullana, T.: Simulation and optimization of complex phenomena in multi-phase flows. phdthesis, Sorbonne Université (December 2022). <https://theses.hal.science/tel-04053531>
- [17] Fullana, T., Le Chenadec, V., Sayadi, T.: Adjoint-based optimization of two-dimensional Stefan problems. *Journal of Computational Physics* **475**, 111875 (2023) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2022.111875>
- [18] Quirós Rodríguez, A., Fullana, T., Sayadi, T., Le Chenadec, V.: A level-set based cut cell method for interfacial flows. Part 2: Free-surface flows and dynamic contact angle treatment. *Acta Mechanica* (2024)
- [19] Bodenschatz, E., Pesch, W., Ahlers, G.: Recent Developments in Rayleigh-Bénard Convection. *Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics* **32**(Volume 32, 2000), 709–778 (2000) <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.fluid.32.1.709> . Publisher: Annual Reviews Type: Journal Article

- [20] Yang, R., Howland, C.J., Liu, H.-R., Verzicco, R., Lohse, D.: Morphology evolution of a melting solid layer above its melt heated from below. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **956**, 23 (2023) <https://doi.org/10.1017/jfm.2023.15>
- [21] Perissutti, D., Marchioli, C., Soldati, A.: Morphodynamics of melting ice over turbulent warm water streams (2024). <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.12116>
- [22] Marsden, A.L., Feinstein, J.A., Taylor, C.A.: A computational framework for derivative-free optimization of cardiovascular geometries. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* **197**(21-24), 1890–1905 (2008)
- [23] Pierret, S., Coelho, R.F., Kato, H.: Multidisciplinary and multiple operating points shape optimization of three-dimensional compressor blades. *Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimization* **33**(1), 61–70 (2007)
- [24] Giles, M.B., Pierce, N.A.: An Introduction to the Adjoint Approach to Design. *Flow Turb. Combust.* **65**(3), 393–415 (2000)
- [25] Pironneau, O.: On optimum design in fluid mechanics. *J Fluid Mech.* **64**(1), 97–110 (1974)
- [26] Jameson, A.: Aerodynamic design via control theory. *J Scientific Computing* **3**(3), 233–260 (1988)
- [27] Jameson, A., Martinelli, L., Pierce, N.A.: Optimum Aerodynamic Design Using the Navier-Stokes Equations. *Theor. Comp. Fluid Dyn.* **10**(1), 213–237 (1998)
- [28] Juniper, M.: Triggering in the horizontal Rijke tube: non-normality, transient growth and bypass transition. *J. Fluid Mech.* **667**, 272–308 (2010)
- [29] Lemke, M., Reiss, J., Sesterhenn, J.: Adjoint-based analysis of thermoacoustic coupling. *ICNAAM*, 2163–2166 (2013)
- [30] Schmidt, S., Ilic, C., Schulz, V., Gauger, N.R.: Three-dimensional large-scale aerodynamic shape optimization based on shape calculus. *AIAA J* **51**(11), 2615–2627 (2013)
- [31] Rabin, S., Caulfield, C., Kerswell, R.: Designing a more nonlinearly stable laminar flow via boundary manipulation. *J Fluid Mech.* **738**, 1–112 (2014)
- [32] Foures, D., Caulfield, C., Schmid, P.: Optimal mixing in two-dimensional plane Poiseuille flow at finite Péclet number. *J Fluid Mech.* **748**, 241–277 (2014)
- [33] Duraisamy, K., Alonso, J.: Adjoint-based techniques for uncertainty quantification in turbulent flows with combustion. *42nd AIAA Fluid Dynamics Conference and Exhibit*, 25–28 (2012)
- [34] Fikl, A., Le Chenadec, V., Sayadi, T.: Control and optimization of interfacial

- flows using adjoint-based techniques. *Fluids* **5**(3) (2020) <https://doi.org/10.3390/fluids5030156>
- [35] Ou, K., Jameson, A.: Unsteady adjoint method for the optimal control of advection and burger’s equations using high-order spectral difference method. *American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics*, 1–18 (2011) <https://doi.org/10.2514/6.2011-24>
- [36] Braman, K., Oliver, T.A., Raman, V.: Adjoint-based sensitivity analysis of flames. *Comb. Theo. Modelling* **19**(1), 29–56 (2015)
- [37] Lemke, M., Cai, L., Reiss, J., Pitsch, H., Sesterhehn, J.: Adjoint-based sensitivity analysis of quantities of interest of complex combustion models. *Comb. Theo. Modelling* **23**(1), 180–196 (2019)
- [38] Hoffmann, K.H., Sprekels, J.: Real-time control of the free boundary in a two-phase stefan problem. *Numerical Functional Analysis and Optimization* **5**(1), 47–76 (1982)
- [39] Knabner, P.: Control of stefan problems by means of linear-quadratic defect minimization. *Numerische Mathematik* **46**(3), 429–442 (1985)
- [40] Kang, S., Zabaras, N.: Control of the freezing interface motion in two-dimensional solidification processes using the adjoint method. *International J Numerical Methods in Engineering* **38**, 63–80 (1995)
- [41] Yang, Z.: The adjoint method for the inverse design of solidification processes with convection. PhD thesis, Cornell University (1997)
- [42] Hinze, M., Ziegenbalg, S.: Optimal control of the free boundary in a two-phase stefan problem. *J Comput. Phys.* **223**(2), 657–684 (2007)
- [43] Bernauer, M.K., Herzog, R.: Optimal Control of the Classical Two-Phase Stefan Problem in Level Set Formulation. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* **33**(1), 342–363 (2011) <https://doi.org/10.1137/100783327>
- [44] Favier, B., Purseed, J., Duchemin, L.: Rayleigh–Bénard convection with a melting boundary. *J. Fluid Mech.* **858**, 437–473 (2019) <https://doi.org/10.1017/jfm.2018.773>
- [45] Sethian, J.A.: *Level Set Methods and Fast Marching*. Cambridge Monographs on Applied and Computational Mathematics, vol. 1. Cambridge University Press, University of California, Berkeley (1999)
- [46] Liu, D.C., Nocedal, J.: On the limited memory method for large scale optimization. *Mathematical Programming* **3**(45), 503–528 (1989)
- [47] Wright, S.J., Nocedal, J.: *Numerical Optimization*. Springer, ??? (2006)