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Recently, experiments haye been made with a new numerical scheme for integrating the primitiye equations. The new method may be expressed Ey reference to the wave equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial t}=i \otimes \bar{\omega} \zeta \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

by writing

$$
\begin{align*}
& \zeta_{*}^{\mathrm{n}+1}=\zeta^{\mathrm{n}-1}+2 \Delta t 1 \omega \zeta_{*}^{\mathrm{n}}  \tag{2a}\\
& \zeta^{\mathrm{n}}=\alpha \zeta_{*}^{\mathrm{n}}+.5(1-\alpha)\left(\zeta^{\mathrm{n}-1}+\zeta_{*}^{\mathrm{n}+1}\right) \tag{2b}
\end{align*}
$$

in which the index, $n$, fixes the time level and $\alpha$ is a fraction less than unity.

When $\alpha$ is set to unity, the scheme is the well-known "leapfrog", method. When $\alpha$ is set to zero, the method reduces to one studied by Kurihara [1] and called by him the "leapfrog-backward" method. To show this last point, (2b) may be rewritten as $(\alpha=0)$

$$
\zeta^{\mathrm{n}+1}=.5\left(\zeta^{\mathrm{n}}+\zeta^{\mathrm{n}}+2 \Delta t i \omega \zeta_{\dot{*}}^{\mathrm{n}+1}\right)
$$

or

$$
\begin{equation*}
\zeta^{\mathrm{n}+1}=\zeta^{\mathrm{n}}+\Delta t i \omega \zeta^{\mathrm{n}+} \tag{2c}
\end{equation*}
$$

If one defines $b=\omega \Delta t$, following Kurihara, the stability criterion for the leapfrog scheme is

$$
b \leq 1
$$

and for the leapfrog-backward scheme is

$$
b \leq .8
$$

Two other schemes have been used in numerical integrations of the primitive equations and analyzed by Kurihara. These are the Eulerbackward scheme

$$
\begin{align*}
& \zeta^{\mathrm{n}+1}=\zeta^{\mathrm{n}}+\Delta t i \omega \zeta^{\mathrm{n}}  \tag{3a}\\
& \zeta^{\mathrm{n}+1}=\zeta^{\mathrm{n}}+\Delta t i \omega \zeta^{\mathrm{n}+1} \tag{3b}
\end{align*}
$$

for which the stability criterion is

$$
\mathrm{b}<1
$$

and the "leapfrog-trapezoidal" method

$$
\begin{align*}
& \zeta_{*}^{\mathrm{n}+1}=\zeta^{\mathrm{n}-1}+2 \Delta t i \omega \zeta^{\mathrm{n}}  \tag{4a}\\
& \zeta^{\mathrm{n}+1}=\zeta^{\mathrm{n}}+.5 \Delta t\left(i \omega \zeta^{\mathrm{n}}+i \omega \zeta^{\mathrm{n}+1}\right) \tag{4b}
\end{align*}
$$

One may show that the general scheme (2) provides a solution, $\zeta_{\alpha}^{\mathrm{n}}$, of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\zeta_{\alpha}^{\mathrm{n}}=(1-\alpha) \zeta_{L \cdot B}^{\mathrm{n}}+\alpha \zeta_{L}^{\mathrm{n}} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\zeta_{L . B .}^{n}$ is the result of integration with the leapfrog-backward method, $L \cdot B$ and $\zeta_{\mathrm{L}}^{\mathrm{n}}$ is the result of integration with the leapfrog method.

Now, interest has been expressed in the results to be expected with the method (2) for a variety of values of $\alpha$. It should be noted that (5) does not necessarily imply stability of the new method whenever the criteria for the leapfrog-backward and leapfrog methods are satisfied separately. Therefore, we made calculations to solve the initial value problem,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial t}=i \omega \zeta  \tag{6}\\
& \zeta \text { at } t=0 \quad \text { is } \quad \hat{\zeta}=1+0 i \tag{7}
\end{align*}
$$

with each of the methods discussed above. The starting procedure for use with method (2) was

$$
\begin{align*}
& \zeta^{1}=\hat{\zeta}+i \omega \Delta t \hat{\zeta}  \tag{8a}\\
& \zeta^{0}=\alpha \hat{\zeta}+5(1-\alpha)\left(\hat{\zeta}+\zeta_{*}^{1}\right) \tag{8b}
\end{align*}
$$

We defined

$$
\mathrm{R}=\frac{2 \pi}{\omega \Delta \mathrm{t}}
$$

which implies that the period of the wave is $R$ intervals of time measured in $\Delta t$-units. The amplitude of the solution after 15 steps is tabulated below for various values of $R$ and $\alpha$ :

| $\alpha R$ | 6 | 8 | 10 | 12 | 14 | 16 | 18 | 20 | 50 | 100 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1. | $>100$. | 1.22 | 1.16 | 1.03 | 1.07 | 1.08 | 1.02 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| .999 | $>100$. | 1.21 | 1.15 | 1.03 | 1.07 | 1.08 | 1.02 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| .990 | $>100$ | 1.15 | 1.12 | 1.03 | 1.06 | 1.07 | 1.02 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| .900 | $>100$ | .97 | .94 | .99 | .97 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| .75 | $>100$. | .56 | .71 | .79 | .84 | .88 | .90 | .92 | .99 | 1.00 |
| .50 | $>100$ | 2.71 | .32 | .49 | .61 | .69 | .75 | .79 | .97 | .99 |
| .25 | $>100$. | 41.00 | .11 | .21 | .36 | .48 | .57 | .64 | .94 | .99 |
| 0.0 | $>100$. | $>100$. | 4.42 | .11 | .12 | .25 | .36 | .45 | .89 | .97 |
| -.25 | $>100$ | $>100$. | 35.44 | 2.74 | .34 | .06 | .12 | .22 | .83 | .96 |
| E.B. | 2.13 | .13 | .13 | .19 | .27 | .35 | .43 | .50 | .89 | .97 |
| L.T. | .23 | .56 | .75 | .86 | .91 | .94 | .96 | .97 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

It will be noted that the leapfrog method yields amplitudes greater than unity even for $R>2 \pi$, the computational stability criterion corresponding to $b \leq 1$. This error is associated with the amplification produced by the "forward," starting scheme. It will be noted that that error is greatly reduced by using $\alpha=190$. The empirical result for $\alpha=0$, suggests that the instability with $R=8,10$ (should be stable by Kurihara's result when $b<.8, R \simeq 8$ ) is also related to the "forward" start utilized with that method (see eqs. 8) and the greater weight attached to the amplified value of $\zeta_{\%}^{1}$.

Since both the leapfrog-trapezoidal and Euler-backward methods require the computation of two tendencies to advance the calculation, the scheme with $\alpha=.9$ or 775 seems to have considerable merit from an efficiency viewpoint.
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