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Abstract:  
This paper is concerned with the numerical solutions of the vorticity transport equation (VTE) in two-dimensional space with homogenous Dirichlet boundary conditions. Namely, for this problem, the Crank-Nicolson finite difference equation is derived. In addition, the consistency and stability of the Crank-Nicolson method are studied. Moreover, a numerical experiment is considered to study the convergence of the Crank-Nicolson scheme and to visualize the discrete graphs for the vorticity and stream functions. The analytical result shows that the proposed scheme is consistent, whereas the numerical results show that the solutions are stable with small space-steps and at any time levels.
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Introduction:  
This work is concerned with the two-dimensional vorticity-transport equation (VTE), which is a nonlinear time-dependent partial differential equation:

\begin{equation}
\frac{\partial \omega}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{\rho} \left( \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial x} \right)^2 + \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial y} \left( \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x} \right) + \left( \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial y} \right)^2 \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial y}, \quad (1)
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\omega = -\left( \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial y} \right), \quad (2)
\end{equation}

for \((x, y) \in D, t > 0\),

with the following initial and boundary conditions:

\begin{equation}
\omega(x, y, 0) = \omega_0(x, y), \quad \psi(x, y, 0) = \psi_0(x, y), \quad (3)
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
(x, y) \in \partial D, t > 0, \quad (4)
\end{equation}

where \(\omega\) refers to the vorticity function, and \(\psi\) refers to the stream function, and \(R > 0\) is the Reynolds number; \(D = \{(x, y); a < x < b; a < y < b\}\); and \(\partial D = \{(a, y), (b, y), (x, a), (x, b)\}\); and \(\omega_0, \psi_0\) are smooth nonnegative functions satisfying equation (2).

Due to the various applications of time-dependent partial differential equations in various fields of science, since last century, many authors have been interested in studying the analytical and numerical solutions of such types of problems including linear equations, nonlinear equations, partial integro-differential equations, and time-space fractional-order partial differential equations, see for instance 1-5. In fluid dynamics, the numerical solutions of various Mathematical models, including problem (1)-(2), have been studied by some authors, see for instance 6-7.

It is known that problem (1)-(2) is used to study the unsteady flow problem in two-dimensional space. In other words, it can be used for solving the two-dimensional viscous incompressible flow. In addition, the two-dimensional vorticity transport equation can be used in some applications, such as analysis of laminar to turbulent flow transition, studies on free and mixed convection and the modeling of turbulent flows. For more details about the importance, derivation and the applications of this problem, see 8-9.

In fact, this problem cannot be solved analytically due to the nonlinear terms that appear in equation (1). So that since the last decades, problem (1)-(2), with different initial-boundary conditions, has been solved numerically by some authors using several methods, such as the Petrov-Galerkin finite element method 10, finite difference schemes, see for instance 11-16, and the boundary-domain integral method 17. Because of the poor stability properties of explicit finite difference methods, the implicit methods are more
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recommended to compute the numerical solutions of initial-boundary value problems in two or more dimensions-space. The Crank-Nicolson method is one of the most recommended implicit methods for solving many types of second order linear problems with constant coefficients due to its high order of convergence and unconditional stability. However, it is not always guaranteed that Crank-Nicolson method is stable and applicable for other types of problems such as nonlinear problems, problems with variable coefficients and problems with nonlinear boundary conditions. In this work, the Crank-Nicolson finite difference scheme is used to solve problem (1)-(4). Moreover, it is shown that the proposed scheme is consistent and stable.

This paper is divided into seven sections. In the second section, the discrete formulas of equations (1) and (2), using Crank-Nicolson scheme, are derived. In the third section, the matrix forms of the Crank-Nicolson finite difference equations are presented. The consistency of the discrete difference equations is studied in the fourth section. In the fifth section, the stability condition for the matrices form is discussed. In the sixth section, the Crank-Nicolson discrete scheme is used to compute the numerical solutions of problem (1)-(4) with a certain initial function and a fixed value to the Reynolds number. Moreover, the numerical simulations for the vorticity and stream functions are shown in two-dimensional spaces and at different time levels. Finally, some conclusions and future works are stated in the seventh section.

The Discrete Problem

For convenient computations, let \( h \) refers to the space-step in \( x \) and \( y \) directions. In addition, let \( k \) refers to the time-step, such that:

\[
x_0 = a, \quad x_i = x_0 + ih, \quad x_m = b,
\]

\[
y_0 = a, \quad y_i = y_0 + jh, \quad y_m = b,
\]

for \( h = (b - a)/m; \ i, j = 1,2,3,... \ m - 1, \) and \( t_n = nk \) for \( k > 0; \ n = 0,1,2, \ldots \)

Consider that \( \omega_{i,j}^n \) and \( \psi_{i,j}^n \) are the approximate values to \( \omega(x_i,y_j,t_n) \) and \( \psi(x_i,y_j,t_n) \), respectively.

In addition, the discrete-space \( D_{i,j}^n \) is defined as follows:

\[
D_{i,j}^n = \{ (x_i,y_j,t_n); i,j = 0,1,2 \ldots m; n \geq 0 \}
\]

Taking Taylor expansion to \( \omega(x,y,(n + 1)k) \) about \( \omega(x,y,nk) \), it follows:

\[
\omega(x,y,(n + 1)k) = \left( 1 + k \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \frac{k^2}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} + \ldots \right) \omega(x,y,nk).
\]

This implies that

\[
\omega(x,y,(n + 1)k) = \exp(k \frac{\partial}{\partial t}) \omega(x,y,nk)
\]

(5)

The last equation can be rewritten as follows:

\[
\exp(-k \frac{\partial}{\partial t}) \omega(x,y,(n + 1)k) = \exp(k \frac{\partial}{\partial t}) \omega(x,y,nk)
\]

By equation (1), the last equation becomes:

\[
\exp\left( -\frac{k}{2} (\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2}) \right) \omega(x,y,(n + 1)k) = \exp\left( k \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right) \omega(x,y,nk)
\]

Next, the partial derivatives \( \omega_x, \omega_y \), and \( \psi_x \) and \( \psi_y \) are approximated by the first-order central finite difference operators, \( \delta_x \) and \( \delta_y \), and the partial derivatives, \( \omega_{xx}, \omega_{yy} \) are approximated by the second-order central finite difference operators, \( \delta^2_x \) and \( \delta^2_y \), respectively, and \( \omega, \psi \), are replaced by \( \omega_{i,j}^n \) and \( \psi_{i,j}^n \), respectively, then the above equation becomes:

\[
\exp\left( -\frac{k}{2} \left( \delta^2_x + \delta^2_y \right) \right) \omega_{i,j}^{n+1} = \exp\left( \frac{k}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right) \omega_{i,j}^n
\]

For simplicity, the last equation can be rewritten as follows:

\[
\exp\left( \frac{r}{2R} \left( \delta^2_x + \delta^2_y \right) \right) = \exp\left( \frac{r}{8} \delta_y \psi_{i,j}^n \right) \delta_x
\]

(6)
Next, the spatial derivatives in equation (2) are approximated by the central finite difference operator of second order as follows:

\[
\omega^n_{i,j} = \left( \frac{\delta_x^2 \psi^n_{i,j} + \delta_y^2 \psi^n_{i,j}}{h^2} \right)
\]

For simplicity, equations (6) and (7) can be rewritten as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
(1 + \frac{2r}{R}) \omega^n_{i,j} + \frac{r}{2R} [ (\omega^n_{i+1,j} + \omega^n_{i-1,j} + \omega^n_{i,j+1} + \omega^n_{i,j-1}) \\
+ \left( \frac{8}{r} \psi^n_{i+1,j} - \psi^n_{i,j} \right) - \left( \frac{8}{r} \psi^n_{i,j-1} - \psi^n_{i,j} \right) ] \\
= \left( 1 - \frac{2r}{R} \right) \omega^n_{i,j} + \frac{r}{2R} (\omega^n_{i,j+1} + \omega^n_{i,j-1} + \omega^n_{i+1,j} + \omega^n_{i-1,j}) \\
+ \left( \frac{8}{r} \psi^n_{i,j+1} - \psi^n_{i,j} \right) + \left( \frac{8}{r} \psi^n_{i,j-1} - \psi^n_{i,j} \right)
\end{align*}
\]

and

\[-h^2 \omega^n_{i,j} = \psi^n_{i-1,j} + \psi^n_{i+1,j} + \psi^n_{i,j+1} + \psi^n_{i,j-1} - \psi^n_{i,j},
\]

\[i,j = 1,2,3,...,m-1; \quad n = 0,1,2,...
\]

Finally, in the discrete space, \(D^n_{i,j}\), the initial-boundary conditions (3) and (4) become:

\[
\begin{align*}
\omega^n_{0,j} &= \omega_0(x_i,y_j), \\
\psi^n_{0,j} &= \psi_0(x_i,y_j),
\end{align*}
\]

\[i,j = 0,1,2,...,m
\]

\[
\omega^n_{i,j} = \omega^n_{i,0} = \omega^n_{i,m} = 0, \quad n = 0,1,2,...
\]

\[
\psi^n_{i,j} = \psi^n_{i,0} = \psi^n_{i,m} = 0.
\]

The Matrix Form

The difference equations (6) and (7) of Crank-Nicolson method can be presented in matrix form as follows:

\[
(I + \frac{r}{2R} M_1 + \frac{r}{8} M_2 A - \frac{r}{8} M_2 B) \omega^{n+1} = \\
(I + \frac{r}{2R} M_1 - \frac{r}{8} M_2 A + \frac{r}{8} M_2 B) \omega^n,
\]

\[-h^2 \omega^n = \psi^n,
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\psi^n &= \psi^n_{i-1,j} + \psi^n_{i+1,j} + \psi^n_{i,j+1} + \psi^n_{i,j-1} - \psi^n_{i,j},
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
M_1 &= \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 \\
\vdots & \ddots & \ddots \\
0 & \cdots & 1
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\
0 & \cdots & 1
\end{bmatrix}
\end{align*}
\]

where

\[
B = \begin{bmatrix}
B_1 & 0 \\
0 & B_2
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
B_1 = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 1 \\
1 & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
C = \begin{bmatrix}
C_1 & I_1 & 0 \\
I_1 & C_1 & 0 \\
0 & I_1 & C_1
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
C_1 = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 1 & -4 & 0 \\
1 & -4 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & -4 & 1
\end{bmatrix}
\]

and \(I_1, I_2\) are the identity matrices of order \((m-1)^2\), \((m-1)\), respectively.

Remark 1 At each advance time level \((n+1)\), to find the numerical solution of problem (1)-(4) using Crank-Nicolson discrete scheme (6) and (7), the following procedure is applied:

- Solve the linear system (12), to compute the vector \(\psi^n\).
- By (13), find the vectors \(V^n_0, V^n_2\).
- Substitute \(V^n_0, V^n_2\) in (11) and solve the resulting linear system (11), to obtain the solution \(\omega^{n+1}\).

Consistency of the Discrete Problem

In this section, the local truncation errors (consistency errors) of the Crank-Nicolson discrete difference equations are estimated. In addition, the orders of accuracy are shown.

Theorem 1 Let \(T^n_{i,j}\) and \(\tilde{T}^n_{i,j}\) be the local-truncation errors, at a mesh point \((x_i, y_j, t_n)\), of the discrete equations (6) and (7), respectively. There are positive constants \(C_1, C_2, C_3\), such that:

\[
|T^n_{i,j}| \leq C_1 k^2 + C_2 h^2, \quad |\tilde{T}^n_{i,j}| \leq C_3 h^2.
\]

Proof: Set \(\omega^n_{i,j} = \omega(x_i, y_j, t_n)\), \(\psi^n_{i,j} = \psi(x_i, y_j, t_n)\).

By the Crank-Nicolson difference equation (6), it follows that

\[
\begin{align*}
T^n_{i,j} &= \left( 1 - \frac{r}{2R} (\delta^2_x + \delta^2_y) + \frac{r}{8} (\delta_x \psi^n_{i,j}) (\delta_x) - \frac{r}{8} (\delta_y \psi^n_{i,j}) (\delta_y) \right) \omega^{n+1} \\
&+ \frac{r}{2R} (\delta^2_x + \delta^2_y) + \frac{r}{8} (\delta_x \psi^n_{i,j}) (\delta_x) + \frac{r}{8} (\delta_y \psi^n_{i,j}) (\delta_y) \omega^n_{i,j}
\end{align*}
\]

Since \(\omega^n_{i,j} = \exp(k \frac{\partial}{\partial t}) \omega_{i,j}\)
By truncating after the second term, it yields that
\[
\omega_{i,j}^{n+1} = \left(1 + k \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + k^2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2}\right)\omega_{i,j}^n
\]

Thus
\[
T_{i,j}^n = (\omega_{i,j}^{n+1} - \omega_{i,j}^n) + \left[-\frac{r}{2R} (\delta_x^2 \omega_{i,j}^n + \delta_y^2 \omega_{i,j}^n) + \frac{r}{8} (\delta_y \psi_{i,j}^n)(\delta_x \omega_{i,j}^n) - \frac{r}{8} (\delta_x \psi_{i,j}^n)(\delta_y \omega_{i,j}^n)\right] 2 + k \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + k^2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2}
\]

Truncating the Taylor expansion in the above equation yields that
\[
T_{i,j}^n = k \left(\frac{\partial \omega}{\partial t}\right)_{i,j}^{n+1} + k \frac{\partial^2 \omega}{\partial x^2} + O(k^2)\]

By equation (1), it yields that
\[
\left[\frac{\partial^2 \omega}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \omega}{\partial y^2}\right]_{i,j}^{n+1} + O(h^2) = \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial x}\left|_{i,j}^{n}\right.
\]

Thus
\[
T_{i,j}^n = O(k^2) + O(kh^2),
\]
or
\[
T_{i,j}^n = O(k^2 + kh^2)
\]

By assuming that, in the domain \(D_{i,j}^n\), all partial derivatives of \(\omega, \psi\) are bounded, there are positive constants \(C_1, C_2 \in R\) such that
\[
|T_{i,j}^n| \leq C_1 k^2 + C_2 k h^2
\]

For the difference equation (7), the local truncation error at the mesh point \((x_i, y_j, t_n)\), takes the form:
\[
\hat{T}_{i,j}^n = \omega_{i,j}^{n+1} + \frac{\delta^2 \omega (\psi_{i,j}^n)}{h^2} + \frac{\delta^2 \psi (\omega_{i,j}^n)}{h^2}
\]

Truncating the Taylor expansion in the above equation yields that
\[
\hat{T}_{i,j}^n = \omega_{i,j}^{n+1} + \frac{\delta^2 \psi (\omega_{i,j}^n)}{h^2} + \frac{\delta^2 \psi (\omega_{i,j}^n)}{h^2}
\]

By equation (2), it yields that
\[
\omega_{i,j}^{n+1} + \frac{\delta^2 \psi (\omega_{i,j}^n)}{h^2} + \frac{\delta^2 \psi (\omega_{i,j}^n)}{h^2} = 0
\]

So, \(T_{i,j}^n = O(h^2)\), this implies that there is \(C_3 > 0\) such that
\[
|T_{i,j}^n| \leq C_3 h^2
\]

**Definition 1** A difference equation of a parabolic equation is called consistent, if the following condition is satisfied:
\[
\frac{\text{LTE}}{k} \to 0, \quad \text{as} \quad h, k \to 0
\]

Based on Definition 1 and Theorem 1, the following theorem can be proved.

**Theorem 2** The difference equation of Crank-Nicolson scheme (6) and (7) is consistent.

**Stability of the Discrete Problem**

In this section, the stability for the matrix form (11) and (12) are discussed.

The matrix form Crank-Nicolson scheme (11) and (12) can be rewritten as follows:
\[
\omega_{i,j}^{n+1} = H_n \omega_{i,j}^n, \quad \forall n, \quad (16)
\]

where
\[
H_n = \left(I - \frac{r}{2R} C + \frac{r}{8} V_2^n A - \frac{r}{8} V_1^n B\right)^{-1}\left(I + \frac{r}{2R} C - \frac{r}{8} V_2^n A + \frac{r}{8} V_1^n B\right)
\]

**Theorem 3** Based on a constant time-step, the necessary and sufficient condition for stability of the matrix form (16) of the Crank-Nicolson scheme is
\[
\|H_n\| \leq 1, \quad \text{for all} n. \quad (17)
\]

where \(\|H_n\|_2 = \max_s |\lambda_s|\),

\(\lambda_s(s = 1, 2, \ldots, (m - 1)^2)\) are the eigenvalues of \(H_n\).

Proof: This theorem can be proved easily following the same technique used in \(1^8\).

**Numerical Experiment**

The Crank-Nicolson difference equations (6) and (7) are used in this section to find the numerical solution of problem (1)-(4), with \(R = 1\), and the following initial function:
\[
\omega_0(x, y) = (1 - x^2)(1 - y^2), \quad \text{for} \quad -1 \leq x \leq 1, \quad -1 \leq y \leq 1 \quad (19)
\]

Moreover, in order to study the numerical convergence, different space-steps \((h = 0.4, 0.2, 0.1)\) and a small fixed time-step \(k = 0.002\) are considered in the computations.

Based on the type of the initial function (19), the solution of problem (1)-(4) with (19) is symmetric and positive. Therefore, it is sufficient to find only the first \(M\) components of the numerical solution vectors, \(\omega^n, \psi^n\), at each time level.

\[
M = \begin{cases} \frac{(m-1)^2}{2} & \text{if } m \text{ is even} \\ \frac{(m-1)^2+1}{2} & \text{if } m \text{ is odd} \end{cases}
\]

In addition, for each of \(h = 0.4, h = 0.2\), and at the time level \(n\), the errors bounds will be computed that show, at some fixed meshes-points, the differences between the numerical solutions \((\omega_h^n, \psi_h^n)\) and \((\omega_{h/2}^n, \psi_{h/2}^n)\) with respect to \(h\) and \(h/2\), respectively, as follows:
\[ E_h^N(\omega) = \frac{\sum_{(x,y) \in \Omega} |\omega_h^N(x,y) - \omega_h^{N-1}(x,y)|}{N=8} \]
\[ E_h^N(\psi) = \frac{\sum_{(x,y) \in \Omega} |\psi_h^N(x,y) - \psi_h^{N-1}(x,y)|}{N=8} \]
where \( \pi = \{(x,y), s.t. x = -1 + ih; y = -1 + jh; i = 1,2,3,4; j = 1,2; h = 0.4\}. \]

Results and Discussions:

Numerical:

The numerical results are presented in the next tables, where Matlab software is used in the computational processes. In Tables 1, 2 and 3, the numerical results are shown, for \( h = 0.4,0.2,0.1 \), at the time-levels 100, 200 and 400, respectively. In Table 4, the formula (20) is used to compute the errors bounds of numerical solutions, for \( h = 0.4,0.2,0.1 \), at time-levels: \( n = 100, 200, 400 \). In Table 5, the numerical values of the norm \( ||H_n||_2 \), defined in (18), are shown, for \( h = 0.4,0.2,0.1 \), at time-levels: \( n = 100, 200 \) and 400.

From Tables 1-3, it is observed that the numerical values for vorticity and stream are decreasing as time level increases. In addition, Table 4 shows that at a fixed time level, the corresponding error bounds decrease, as the space grids are refined. This indicates that the numerical solution is convergent. On the other hand, at any fixed space-step, the corresponding errors decrease as time increases. Moreover, Table 5 shows that the numerical results are stable (condition (17) is satisfied) with any space-step and time level.

| Table 1. Numerical solutions \((\omega, \psi)\), \( n = 100 \) \((t = 0.2)\) |
|-----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| \((x,y)\)       | \(\omega\) | \(\psi\) | \(\omega\) | \(\psi\) | \(\omega\) | \(\psi\) |
| \((-0.6,-0.6)\) | 0.1364 | 0.0279 | 0.1373 | 0.0282 | 0.1413 | 0.0297 |
| \((-0.2,-0.6)\) | 0.2209 | 0.0451 | 0.2223 | 0.0457 | 0.2282 | 0.0480 |
| \((0.2,-0.6)\)  | 0.2220 | 0.0451 | 0.2215 | 0.0456 | 0.2271 | 0.0479 |
| \((0.6,-0.6)\)  | 0.1349 | 0.0278 | 0.1360 | 0.0282 | 0.1396 | 0.0296 |
| \((-0.6,-0.2)\) | 0.2191 | 0.0450 | 0.2204 | 0.0456 | 0.2262 | 0.0479 |
| \((-0.2,-0.2)\) | 0.3561 | 0.0729 | 0.3583 | 0.0739 | 0.3667 | 0.0775 |
| \((0.2,-0.2)\)  | 0.3556 | 0.0729 | 0.3578 | 0.0738 | 0.3660 | 0.0775 |
| \((0.6,-0.2)\)  | 0.2182 | 0.0450 | 0.2198 | 0.0456 | 0.2252 | 0.0478 |

| Table 2. Numerical solutions \((\omega, \psi)\), \( n = 200 \) \((t = 0.4)\) |
|-----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| \((x,y)\)       | \(\omega\) | \(\psi\) | \(\omega\) | \(\psi\) | \(\omega\) | \(\psi\) |
| \((-0.6,-0.6)\) | 0.0505 | 0.0104 | 0.0512 | 0.0106 | 0.0538 | 0.0114 |
| \((-0.2,-0.6)\) | 0.0819 | 0.0168 | 0.0829 | 0.0171 | 0.0871 | 0.0184 |
| \((0.2,-0.6)\)  | 0.0817 | 0.0168 | 0.0828 | 0.0171 | 0.0869 | 0.0184 |
| \((0.6,-0.6)\)  | 0.0503 | 0.0103 | 0.0510 | 0.0105 | 0.0535 | 0.0113 |
| \((-0.6,-0.2)\) | 0.0816 | 0.0168 | 0.0826 | 0.0171 | 0.0867 | 0.0184 |
| \((-0.2,-0.2)\) | 0.1323 | 0.0271 | 0.1340 | 0.0276 | 0.1407 | 0.0297 |
| \((0.2,-0.2)\)  | 0.1322 | 0.0271 | 0.1339 | 0.0276 | 0.1406 | 0.0297 |
| \((0.6,-0.2)\)  | 0.0814 | 0.0167 | 0.0825 | 0.0171 | 0.0866 | 0.0184 |

| Table 3. Numerical solutions \((\omega, \psi)\), \( n = 400 \) \((t = 0.8)\) |
|-----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| \((x,y)\)       | \(\omega\) | \(\psi\) | \(\omega\) | \(\psi\) | \(\omega\) | \(\psi\) |
| \((-0.6,-0.6)\) | 0.0070 | 0.0014 | 0.0072 | 0.0015 | 0.0079 | 0.0017 |
| \((-0.2,-0.6)\) | 0.0114 | 0.0023 | 0.0117 | 0.0024 | 0.0128 | 0.0027 |
| \((0.2,-0.6)\)  | 0.0114 | 0.0023 | 0.0117 | 0.0024 | 0.0128 | 0.0027 |
| \((0.6,-0.6)\)  | 0.0070 | 0.0014 | 0.0072 | 0.0015 | 0.0079 | 0.0017 |
| \((-0.6,-0.2)\) | 0.0114 | 0.0023 | 0.0117 | 0.0024 | 0.0128 | 0.0027 |
| \((-0.2,-0.2)\) | 0.0184 | 0.0038 | 0.0189 | 0.0039 | 0.0208 | 0.0044 |
| \((0.2,-0.2)\)  | 0.0184 | 0.0038 | 0.0189 | 0.0039 | 0.0208 | 0.0044 |
| \((0.6,-0.2)\)  | 0.0114 | 0.0023 | 0.0116 | 0.0024 | 0.0128 | 0.0027 |
Table 4. Errors bounds: $E_n^h(\psi)$, $E_n^h(\omega)$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>h</th>
<th>$E_n^h(\psi)$</th>
<th>$E_n^h(\omega)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0024</td>
<td>0.0059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>6.1250e-04</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0014</td>
<td>0.0044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.7500e-04</td>
<td>0.0011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.2500e-04</td>
<td>0.0012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.0000e-04</td>
<td>3.1250e-04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. $\|H_n\|_2 = \max_s |\lambda_s|$ 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>h</th>
<th>$|H_n|_2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.990436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.990190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.990128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.990473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.990233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.990172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.990492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.990255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.990195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numerical Simulations

The discrete graphs of vorticity and stream functions (for $h = 0.1$) at time levels $n = 0, 200$ and $400$ are presented in Figures 1, 2 and 3, respectively. Clearly, by Figs. 1-3, it is observed that the discrete graphs for vorticity and stream are decreasing as time increases and that supports the numerical results.

Figure 1. Numerical solutions at $t = 0$

Figure 2. Numerical solutions at $t = 0.4$

Figure 3. Numerical solutions at $t = 1$
Figure 3. Numerical solutions at $t = 0.8$

Conclusions:
This paper is concerned with the numerical solutions of the vorticity transport equation with homogenous Dirichlet boundary conditions using Crank-Nicolson finite difference scheme. From this work, the following conclusions are pointed out:

1- Crank-Nicolson finite difference scheme is consistent. Moreover, the order of the local truncation error has the form: $O(k^2 + kh^2)$.

2- At a fixed time level, the corresponding error bounds decrease, as the space grids are refined. This indicates that the numerical solution is convergent.

3- At any fixed space-step, the corresponding errors decrease as time increases.

4- Table 5 shows that the numerical results are stable with any space-step and time level.

5- Tables (1- 3) and Figures (1- 3) show that the numerical values for vorticity and stream are decreasing as time level increases.

For future work, the following directions may be considered:

1. Other finite difference schemes can be proposed to find the numerical solution of problem (1)-(4), such as implicit Euler scheme.

2. One could solve problem (1)-(4), with a certain initial function using different consistent finite difference schemes including the present one in order to make a numerical comparison between the results regarding stability and error bounds.

3. With a very large Reynolds number, the nonlinear terms in equation (1) are dominated, so that may affect the stability properties of the proposed scheme. Therefore, in this case, other numerical methods should be adapted to solve the problem.
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الحلول العددية لمعادلة نقل الحركة الدورانية ثنائية الأبعاد باستخدام طريقة كرانك-نيكلسون

معن عبد الكاظم رشيد 1
عماد ناجي كاظم 2

1 قسم الرياضيات، كلية التربية الأساسية، الجامعة المستنصرية، بغداد، العراق
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الخلاصة:
يهدف هذا البحث إلى حل معادلة نقل الحركة الدورانية (VTE) ثنائية الأبعاد مع شروط ديريشل الحدودية المتجانسة. وبالتحديد، نشتق معادلة الفروقات المنتهية (Crank-Nicolson) لهذه المسألة. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، نناقش اتساق ومستقرة طريقة. علاوة على ذلك، يتم التطرق إلى تجربة عددية لدراسة تقارب طريقة (Crank-Nicolson) وتصور الرسوم البيانية المتعلقة لكلا من دوال الحركة الدورانية والتدفق. تظهر النتيجة النظرية أن الطريقة المثيرة متسقة، في حين أن النتائج العددية تظهر أن الحلول مستقرة عند خطوات مساحة صغيرة وفي أي مساحات زمنية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الفروقات المنتهية، عدد رينولد، دالة التدفق، خطأ القطع، دالة الحركة الدوارية.