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Abstract

This paper introduces a well-balanced second-order finite volume scheme, based on the Q-scheme of Roe, for simulating granular type flows. The proposed method is applied to solve the incompressible Euler equations under Savage–Hutter assumptions. The model is derived in a local coordinate system along a non-erodible bed to take its curvature into account. Moreover, simultaneous appearance of flowing/static regions is simulated by considering a basal friction resistance which keeps the granular flow from moving when the angle of granular flow is less than the angle of repose. The proposed scheme preserves stationary solutions up to second order and deals with different situations of wet/dry transitions by a modified nonlinear wet/dry treatment. Numerical results indicate the improved properties and robustness of the proposed finite volume structure. In addition, the granular flow properties are estimated with a computational error of less than 5%. These errors are consistently less than those obtained by using similar existing finite volume schemes without the proposed modifications, which can result in up to 30% overestimation.

1. Introduction

Natural granular flows like landslides, mudslides, snow avalanches and rockslides are natural hazards that may impose fatalities and significant economical damages. These flows are associated with soil erosion and sedimentation into rivers and valleys [1,18,33], seabed topography change, and soil or surface ground water contamination [64]. Moreover, on the shores of a water body, they may be followed by resulting impulsive waves and their subsequent dam overtopping [6,7,9–11,14,63,82] or run-up to coastal areas [36,80] as a secondary hazard. In order to conduct hazard analysis and protect settled areas, predictions of the flow thickness and velocity of the slide are needed [58,62,72]. To this end, a number of numerical studies have been performed based on different numerical approaches.

Savage and Hutter [70] pioneered the study of rock, snow and ice avalanches based on shallow water equations under hydrostatic assumption, using two finite difference methods, one of Lagrangian and the other of Eulerian. Their theory was verified to be in an excellent agreement with laboratory experiments [39,46,52,70]. Many of the available numerical models apply the Savage–Hutter (SH) type considerations to describe the behavior of granular type flows [30,44,45,58,65,75,81]. This fact also confirms the ability and efficiency of these assumptions in recitation of the granular flow behavior [51]. SH type models are based on the shallow water equations considering a Coulomb friction term as the flow/bottom interaction [70]. The constitutive relation of the granular material is also defined based on the Mohr–Coulomb criteria; i.e. the normal stresses are related to the longitudinal stresses by a factor $K$ (the earth pressure coefficient) [70]. In 1991, the SH formulation was transferred to a local coordinate system for considering the bed curvature effects [71]. Gray et al. [38] extended this model to two dimensions. Wieland et al. [81] used a mixed FVM–FDM (Finite Volume Method–Finite Difference Method) to discretize the two dimensional SH model. The effects of the bed erosion were inserted in this model by Pitman et al. [65] who applied a Godunov type FVM to discretize the model equations. Denlinger and Iverson [31] extended the three dimensional version of a SH type model using Harten, Lax and Van Leer contact (HLLC) finite volume scheme. More studies have been performed on behavior of granular type flows based on different rheologies and governing equations using FDM [2,4,24,49,62,75], FVM [23,32,53,58,61,83], FEM (Finite Element Method) [4,27,28,35], SPH (Smoothed Particle Hydrodynamics) [59], or a combination of these schemes [38].

A comprehensive review of these studies is summarized in Table 1. This table shows the previous numerical models including their governing equations, considered rheology, numerical...
approaches and numerical schemes. Based on this review, FVM and FEM have been more popular than FDM because of using the integral form of conservation laws which is closer to the physics [55,73]. FVM has also the advantage of preserving conservation of mass and momentum in multidimensional physical systems like granular avalanches where rapid transitions between flowing and static states are common [55]. The new approach of SPH, which has been lately used by many researchers, e.g. [5,8,12,13,59], is not efficient in simulating the situations where flow encounters unexpected corners or constrictions [30].

The SH type formulations are applied in the present model to describe the behavior of the granular flow. The present SH type model has two special properties. It takes bed curvature effects and flow dynamic/static regions into account. Based on the previous studies, bottom curvatures have noticeable effects on the behavior of granular type flows [20,30,34,42,67]. Lately, two new SH models have been introduced by Bouchut et al. [20] over a general bottom. The first model considers small variations of the bed curvature and the second one is dealing with general bottom topographies. The present SH type model applied the first hypothesis, i.e. a small variation of the curvature. Accordingly, the model equations are derived in a local coordinate system along with the bed to take its curvature into account. This model differs from original SH model through a new curvature term which is required to obtain the energy inequality and to satisfy the stationary solutions regarding water at rest [20]. Moreover, in the present model, a critical stress is defined to stop the granular layer from moving when its angle is less than the angle of repose [19,34]. This second property is especially important when the flow is supposed to be shallow which results in simultaneous existence of the flowing and static regions [72].

Effective and robust numerical solution of the system of model equations described above is the main focus of this paper. A well-balanced finite volume scheme is proposed which minimize the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nomenclature</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$A$</td>
<td>coefficient matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>bottom level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c$</td>
<td>characteristic wave velocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D$</td>
<td>diagonal matrix of eigenvalues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$df$</td>
<td>generalized Roe flux difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Err$</td>
<td>computational error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>numerical flux matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G$</td>
<td>source term matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_1$</td>
<td>source term matrix concerning bed level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_2$</td>
<td>source term matrix concerning bed curvature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_3$</td>
<td>first $\theta$ related part of the flux term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_4$</td>
<td>second $\theta$ related part of the flux term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g$</td>
<td>gravitational acceleration vector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H$</td>
<td>granular flow depth vertical to the bed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H'$</td>
<td>characteristic depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h$</td>
<td>granular flow depth $(h')/\cos^2\theta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h^*$</td>
<td>predicted values in the first step $[h^*]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h_q$</td>
<td>depth-averaged flow discharge related part of the flux term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h_q^*$</td>
<td>depth-averaged flow discharge related part of the flux term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I$</td>
<td>computational cell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$id$</td>
<td>identity matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$J$</td>
<td>Jacobian of transformation matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K$</td>
<td>earth pressure coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L$</td>
<td>characteristic length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m$</td>
<td>number of computational grids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>number of time steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n_b$</td>
<td>unit normal vector of bottom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n_s$</td>
<td>unit normal vector of flow surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>pressure tensor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{XX}$</td>
<td>normal pressure along $X$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{ZZ}$</td>
<td>normal pressure along $Z$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{XZ}$</td>
<td>longitudinal stress along $X$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{Zx}$</td>
<td>longitudinal stress along $Z$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{xx}$</td>
<td>normal pressure along $x$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{zz}$</td>
<td>normal pressure along $z$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{xz}$</td>
<td>longitudinal stress along $x$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{zx}$</td>
<td>longitudinal stress along $z$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_1$</td>
<td>$\kappa D K^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_2$</td>
<td>projection matrices $1/2x(\epsilon_{1} \pm sgn(D))K^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_3$</td>
<td>matrix characteristic of a Q scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$q$</td>
<td>flow discharge $hu$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$q^*$</td>
<td>predicted flow discharge in the first step</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>$\Delta t/\Delta x$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S$</td>
<td>numerical source term matrix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
appearance of negative flow depth, spurious waves and artificial dispersion, especially in the situations involving shocks, discontinuities, high gradients or wet/dry fronts [55,76]. In simulating the granular type flows, we are dealing with a hyperbolic system of conservation laws with source terms to solve a series of the Riemann problems and determine the local wave structure [55]. The most frequent approximate Riemann solvers are Roe scheme [68] and Harten, Lax and Van Leer (HLL) scheme [40]. A difficulty of HLL type models is modeling the full Riemann solution by only two waves based on approximate speeds of the fastest and slowest waves [79]. The second complexity related to the numerical treatment of the source terms is discretization of the Coulomb friction term; particularly, with considering no movement for granular material in the cells where its angle is less than the angle of repose. It can originate numerical instabilities during the simulation of the shallow granular type flows. Wet/dry fronts appear along numerical domain where the avalanche depth vanishes, due to initial condition or as a consequence of the landslide motion (Fig. 3a) [25]. These fronts may originate negative flow depth, spurious waves and artificial waves [79]. The second complexity related to the numerical treatment of the source terms can be a source of appearance of artificial waves [79]. The second complexity related to the numerical treatment of the source terms is discretization of the Coulomb friction term; particularly, with considering no movement for granular material in the cells where its angle is less than the angle of repose. It can originate numerical instabilities during the simulation [34]. This problem is solved by applying a two-step semi-implicit method proposed by Mangeney-Castelnau et al. [58] and applied by Fernández-Nieto et al. [34].

The second numerical intricacy is appearance of wet/dry fronts during the simulation of the shallow granular type flows. Wet/dry fronts appear along numerical domain where the avalanche depth vanishes, due to initial condition or as a consequence of the landslide motion (Fig. 3a) [25]. These fronts may originate negative values of flow thickness which yields to numerical instabilities [56]. Besides, the numerical scheme may not be able to preserve steady or near steady flows including wet/dry fronts [24,25]. Bermudez and Vázquez-Cendón [16] introduced a concept called conservation property (C-property). A numerical scheme satisfies this condition if it correctly solves the steady state solutions related to water at rest [16]. Hence, a well balanced numerical scheme should satisfy the C-property condition. In the present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. no.</th>
<th>Developer name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rheology</th>
<th>Governing equations</th>
<th>Numerical method</th>
<th>Numerical scheme</th>
<th>Model dim.</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Case study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Savage &amp; Hutter</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Coulomb friction</td>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>FDM</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>1D</td>
<td>Rock, snow and ice avalanches</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Hutter &amp; Greve</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Coulomb friction</td>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>FDM</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2D</td>
<td>Rock, snow and ice avalanches</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Laigle &amp; Coussot</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Herschel-Bulkley</td>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>FVM</td>
<td>Godunov</td>
<td>1D</td>
<td>Granular flow</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Wieland et al.</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Coulomb friction</td>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>M FV-FD</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>2D</td>
<td>Granular avalanche</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Gray et al.</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Coulomb friction</td>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>FDM</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>2D</td>
<td>Granular avalanche</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Bruflau et al.</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Manning's Eq</td>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>FVM</td>
<td>Roe</td>
<td>1D</td>
<td>Debris flows</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Imran et al.</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Herschel-Bulkley/bilinear</td>
<td>PSFA</td>
<td>FDM</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>1D</td>
<td>Muddy debris flows</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Denlinger &amp; Iverson</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Coulomb friction</td>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>FVM</td>
<td>HLLC</td>
<td>3D</td>
<td>Debris flows/rock avalanches</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Frenette et al.</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Drucker-Parger type</td>
<td>NSE</td>
<td>Fem</td>
<td>Galerkin</td>
<td>1D</td>
<td>Granular flow</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aranson et al.</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Bagnold</td>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>FDM</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1D/2D</td>
<td>Partially fluidized granular flows</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Zanutta &amp; Lamberti</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Bingham/Herschel-Bulkley/Visco-plastic</td>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>FVM</td>
<td>WAF</td>
<td>1D</td>
<td>Debris flow</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Pitman et al.</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Coulomb friction</td>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>FVM</td>
<td>Godunov</td>
<td>2D</td>
<td>Granular avalanche/landslides</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Mangeney et al.</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Coulomb friction</td>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>FVM</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>1D</td>
<td>Granular avalanche</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Chen &amp; Lee</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Voellmy</td>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>LFEM</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3D</td>
<td>Landslide</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>McDouggall &amp; Huns</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Bingham/Voellmy/frictional/plastic</td>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>SPF</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3D</td>
<td>Landslide</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Denlinger &amp; Iverson</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Coulomb friction</td>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>FVM</td>
<td>HLLC</td>
<td>3D</td>
<td>Granular avalanche</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Toni &amp; Scotton</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Coulomb friction</td>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>FDM</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>2D</td>
<td>Snow avalanche</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Medina et al.</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Bingham/Herschel-Bulkley/Voellmy</td>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>FVM</td>
<td>Godunov</td>
<td>2D</td>
<td>Debris flows</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Moriguchi et al.</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>NSE</td>
<td>FDM</td>
<td>THINC</td>
<td>2D</td>
<td>Debris flow</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Armanini et al.</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Grain-inertial</td>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>H FV-FE</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2D</td>
<td>Debris flow</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Domnik et al.</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Coulomb-Viscoplastic</td>
<td>NSE</td>
<td>FVM</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>2D</td>
<td>Granular flow</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Chauchat et al.</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>μ(1)</td>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3D</td>
<td>Dense granular flow</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Armanini et al.</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Modified Coulomb</td>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>Galerkin</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Satu. granular flow</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

study, the proposed method of Castro et al. [25] is applied as a new treatment of wet/dry fronts. In this method, at every intercell with wet/dry transition a nonlinear Riemann problem is considered which is easy to solve. The exact solutions of these nonlinear Riemann problems are employed to calculate the numerical fluxes. Although a big variety of wetting and drying algorithms have been proposed before, most of them are not general [15,22,24,77], or linearly extrapolate the flow depth onto dry cells [17,60]. The applied method of Castro et al. [25] has two distinctive advantages: using nonlinear Riemann problem instead of a usual linear one at intercells where a wet/dry transition happens and modifying the numerical scheme at all related situations not only when the bottom emerges at intercell [25]. We have modified this wet/dry algorithm for dealing with the bed curvature term in the present model.

Finally, for the sake of simplicity, the problems are simulated in one dimension. However, the proposed scheme can be extended for more general one dimensional or multi dimensional flows. The only drawback is complication of using the considered wet/dry method for multi dimensional flows. In these situations, the wet/dry fronts can be treated by an approximation of the present wet/dry algorithm proposed by [24].

The core objective of this work is to introduce a robust and effective Roe type finite volume method for granular flow modeling so that improves the shortcomings of previous similar formulations. The key novelty of this work is implementing an effective combination of the state of the art of numerical methods such as: numerical treatment of non-homogeneous source terms, wet/dry fronts, and friction term considering flowing/ static regions.

The resulting method is a well-balanced scheme that minimizes the appearance of negative flow depths and spurious numerical waves or dispersion which are likely to appear during the simulation of landslides where flow moves on a dry bed and may encounter with many natural or man-made obstacles or adverse slopes. The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 provides the governing mathematical equations. In Section 3, we present a well-balanced finite volume scheme based on the Q-scheme of Roe, to discretize the system of model equations. Section 4 is devoted to performing a series of numerical and experimental tests to illustrate the improved properties of the proposed numerical scheme in preserving the stationary solutions, treating wet/dry fronts and estimating the granular flow properties. It is also shown that how upwinding the source term related to the bed curvature helps the numerical stability of the proposed scheme. Finally, the concluding results will be discussed in the last section.

2. Mathematical model equations

The following incompressible Euler equations are considered to derive the system of model equations [76].

\[ \begin{align*}
\nabla \cdot \mathbf{V} &= 0 \\
\rho \frac{D\mathbf{V}}{Dt} + \mathbf{V} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{V} &= -\nabla P + \rho \nabla (g \hat{z} \cdot \hat{X})
\end{align*} \]  

(1)

where \( \mathbf{V} = (u, v) \) is the velocity vector with the horizontal and the vertical components \( u \) and \( v \), \( \rho \) is the constant density of the granular material, \( P = \begin{pmatrix} P_{xx} & P_{xy} \\ P_{xy} & P_{yy} \end{pmatrix} \) is the pressure tensor with \( P_{xx} = P_{yy} \) and \( g = (0, -g) \) is the vector of gravitational acceleration. \( \hat{X} = (\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \) represents Cartesian coordinate. \( \nabla = (\partial_x, \partial_y) \) is the gradient vector. \( t \) is time and \( \partial_t = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \). The model parameters are illustrated in Fig. 1.

Eq. (1) is transferred to a local coordinate system over the non-erodible bed defined by \( z = b(x) \), based on the following transformation matrix [34]:

\[ \begin{align*}
\nabla \cdot \mathbf{V} &= 1 \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & \sin \theta \\ -\sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{pmatrix} \cdot J (\mathbf{V}) \\
J &= 1 - \frac{Z}{Z_0} \sin \theta \cos \theta
\end{align*} \]  

(2)

X and Z are the components of this local coordinate system. X denotes the arc’s length of the bottom and Z is measured perpendicular to the bed (Fig. 1). J is the Jacobian of the change of variables. It should be noticed that for a non-erodible bed, the depth of the sliding mass cannot exceed the local radius of the bed curvature for \( J \neq 0 \) [71]. The incompressible Euler equations in the new coordinate system are [34]

\[ \begin{align*}
\partial_t U + \partial_x (J V) &= 0 \\
\rho \partial_t (J U) + \rho \partial_x (J U^2) + \rho \partial_x (J VU) + \rho \partial_x (g \hat{z} \cdot \hat{X}) &= -\partial_x (P_{xx} - \partial_x (J P_{xx})) + \rho J \partial_x (J V) + P_{xx} \delta h \\
\partial_t (J V) + \partial_x (J (V^2) + \rho \partial_x (J V^2) + \rho J \partial_x (g \hat{z} \cdot \hat{X}) &= -\partial_x (P_{xx} - \partial_x (J P_{xx})) - P_{xx} \delta h
\end{align*} \]  

(3)

where \( U \) and \( V \) are the flow velocity components parallel and perpendicular to the bottom, respectively, \( \theta \) is the local bed slope, \( \delta h = \partial_x (b) \), \( \partial_x = \partial / \partial x \), \( \partial_x = \partial / \partial X \) and \( \hat{X} = (X, Z) \) represents the local coordinate system.

The following kinematic (K.C.) and boundary (B.C.) conditions are considered at the granular flow surface [70]

\[ \begin{align*}
\partial_t H + U \partial_x H - V &= 0 & \text{K.C.} \\
P \cdot n_s &= 0 & \text{B.C.}
\end{align*} \]  

(4)

and at the bottom [70]

\[ \begin{align*}
V &= 0 & \text{K.C.} \\
P \cdot n_b - n_s (n_b \cdot P \cdot n_b) &= -(U_b / |U_b|) (n_b \cdot P \cdot n_b) \tan \delta & \text{B.C.}
\end{align*} \]  

(5)

where \( n_s \) and \( n_b \) are the exterior unit normal vector of the flow surface and the bottom, respectively. \( H \) is the granular flow thickness vertical to the bed. The second equation of Eq. (5) describes the interactions between the granular flow and the non-erodible bottom based on a Coulomb type friction law [70]. In this relation, \( U_b \) is the sliding velocity along the stationary bed and \( \delta \) is the basal friction angle.

In the next step, the system of model Eq. (3) and the boundary conditions (4) and (5) are given in dimensionless form, using two characteristic lengths of \( L \) and \( H \) in the X and Z direction, respectively. The non-dimensional variables \( \tau \) are as follows [34]:

\[ \begin{align*}
(X, Z, t) &= (L X, H Z, \sqrt{L / g} t), \\
(U, V) &= \sqrt{L / g} (U, v V), \\
(P_{xx}, P_{zz}) &= g H (P_{xx}, P_{zz}) \quad P_{xz} = g H \tan \delta \partial_x P_{xx}, \quad H = H / H
\end{align*} \]
\( \theta_0 \) is the angle of repose of the granular material [34]. \( \epsilon = H/L \) is supposed to be a small value due to considering a shallow domain. Based on this change of variables, the non-dimensional system of model Eq. (3) will be [34]

\[
\begin{align*}
\partial_x \tilde{u} + \partial_z (f \tilde{v}) &= 0 \\
\partial_x (\rho \tilde{u}) + \rho \tilde{u} \partial_x (\tilde{u}) + \rho \tilde{u} \partial_z (b + \tilde{Z} \cos \theta + \tilde{P}_{xx}/\rho) \epsilon &= - \tan \theta_0 (\partial_x \tilde{P}_{xx} - \partial_z \tilde{P}_{xz}) \\
\epsilon \left[ \partial_x (\rho \tilde{v}) + \rho \tilde{u} \partial_x (\tilde{v}) + \rho \tilde{v} \partial_z (\tilde{v}) + \partial_z (\tilde{P}_{xz}) \right] &= -\partial_x \tilde{P}_{xz} - \rho \tilde{u}^2 \partial_x \theta \\
\end{align*}
\]  

(6)

The dimensionless form of the exterior unit vector of the granular flow surface is \( n_i = (-\tilde{e}_x, 1, \sqrt{1 + \partial^2 \tilde{H}^2}) \). Therefore, the non-dimensional boundary and kinematic conditions at the flow surface from Eq. (4) are [34]

\[
\begin{align*}
\partial_x \tilde{H} + \tilde{U} \partial_x \tilde{H} - \tilde{V} &= 0 & \text{K.C.} \\
-\tan \theta_0 \tilde{H} \frac{\partial \tilde{P}_{xx}}{\partial x} + \tan \theta_0 \tilde{P}_{xz} &= 0 & \text{B.C.} \\
-\tan \theta_0 \tilde{P}_{xz} + \frac{\partial \tilde{P}_{xx}}{\partial x} &= 0 & \text{B.C.}
\end{align*}
\]  

(7)

and at the bottom from Eq. (5) [34]

\[
\begin{align*}
\tilde{V} &= 0 \\
\tan \theta_0 \tilde{P}_{xz} &= -\left( \frac{\tilde{U}_b}{\tilde{U}_b} \right) \tilde{P}_{xz} & \text{B.C.}
\end{align*}
\]  

(8)

In the following equations tilde (\( \tilde{} \)) is omitted for simplicity. In the present model, the constitutive behavior of the granular material is defined as \( P_{\text{xx}} = K \tilde{H} \tilde{P}_{xx} \), where \( K \) represents the earth pressure coefficient as [70]

\[
K = 2 \left( 1 - \text{sgn}(\partial \tilde{U} / \partial X) \sqrt{1 - (\cos \phi / \cos \beta)^2} \right) / \cos^2 \phi - 1
\]  

(9)

\( \phi \) represents the internal friction angle of the granular material. In this equation, the “active” and “passive” states of the earth pressure coefficient are correspond to the maximum and minimum values of \( K \) which are distinguished by the sign of the longitudinal strain (\( \text{sgn}(\partial \tilde{U} / \partial X) \)) [70].

There are additional improved techniques for distinction between the two states like the gradual transition introduced by Hung [42,59] which improves the numerical model stabilities. In the present study, we have applied two step scheme to satisfy numerical stability of the proposed scheme regarding the Coulomb friction term.

Now, the third relation of Eq. (6) is integrated along the flow depth. As it mentioned in Section 1, \( \delta_0 \) is considered to be \( O(\epsilon) \) [20,34]. Therefore,

\[
P_{zz} = \rho (H - Z) \cos \theta
\]  

(10)

With substituting Eqs. (9) and (10) into the first two relations of Eq. (6), we have

\[
\begin{align*}
\partial_t (\rho \tilde{u}) + \rho \tilde{u} \partial_t (\tilde{u}) + \rho \partial_x (b + \tilde{Z} \cos \theta + \tilde{K}(H - Z) \cos \theta) \epsilon &= - \tan \theta_0 (\partial_x \tilde{P}_{xx} - \partial_z \tilde{P}_{xz}) \\
\end{align*}
\]  

(11)

In the next step, the equations are depth-averaged in perpendicular direction to the bottom. The averaged values of velocity are defined as \( \tilde{U} = \frac{1}{H} \int_0^H \tilde{U}(X, Z) dZ \) and \( \tilde{U}^2 = \frac{1}{H} \int_0^H \tilde{U}^2(X, Z) dZ \) [70].

Now, the constitutive relations, boundary and kinematic conditions are substituted into the system of model Eq. (6) to obtain the depth-averaged system of model equations. \( \delta_0 \) is considered to be \( O(\epsilon) \) [20]; therefore, \( j = 1 - Z \delta_0 \approx 1 \) [34]. The coulomb friction term is also assumed to be order of some \( \gamma \in (0, 1) \); this is \( tan \theta_0 = O(\epsilon^\gamma) \). Based on these considerations, the depth-averaged form of the system of model equations is

\[
\begin{align*}
\partial_t \tilde{H} + \partial_z (\tilde{H} \tilde{U}) &= 0 \\
\partial_t (\tilde{H} \tilde{U}) + \partial_z (\tilde{H} U^2 + \tilde{K}(H^2/2) \cos \theta) &= -\gamma \tilde{d}_h b + \gamma (\tilde{H}/2) \sin \theta_0 \theta \\
\end{align*}
\]  

(12)

Now, the system of model Eq. (12) is rewritten with original variables as the system of model Eq. (13). In this form, the terms of order \( \epsilon^\gamma \) are neglected and the profile of the flow velocity is considered to be constant [34].

\[
\begin{align*}
\partial_t \tilde{H} + \partial_z (\tilde{H} \tilde{U}) &= 0 \\
\partial_t (\tilde{H} \tilde{U}) + \partial_z (\tilde{H} U^2 + \tilde{K}(H^2/2) \cos \theta) &= -\gamma \tilde{d}_h b + \gamma (\tilde{H}/2) \sin \theta_0 \theta \\
\end{align*}
\]  

(13)

As the final step, the system of model Eq. (13) is returned to the global Cartesian coordinate system using the following relations [34].

\[
\partial_t / \partial x = \cos \theta / \partial x, \quad h = H / \cos \theta, \quad \tilde{q} = h \tilde{u}
\]

Consequently, the final system of model equations will be

\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{cases}
\partial_t \tilde{h} + \partial_x (\tilde{q} \cos \theta) &= 0 \\
\partial_t \tilde{q} + \partial_x (h \tilde{u}^2 \cos \theta + gK \cos^2 \theta / 2 \cos^3 \theta) &= -gh \cos \theta \tilde{d}_h b + g \tilde{H} \sin \theta_0 \theta + 3 \cos \theta
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \tilde{3} \) represents the Coulomb friction term which is defined as follows [34]

\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{cases}
\tilde{3} = -gh \cos^2 \theta + h \cos \theta \tilde{u}^2 \tilde{d}_h (\sin \theta) \frac{1}{\tilde{q}} \tan \theta_0 \tilde{3} \geq \sigma_c \\
\tilde{q} = 0 \quad \tilde{3} < \sigma_c
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]  

(15)

where \( \sigma_c \) is the basal critical stress which is defined based on the angle of repose of the sliding mass as \( \sigma_c = gh \cos^2 \theta \tan \theta_0 \) [34]. Eq. (15) shows that when the basal friction term is less than the critical basal stress, \( \tilde{3} < \sigma_c \), the granular mass stops moving, \( u = 0 \). This condition happens when the granular mass angle is smaller than the angle of repose [34].

3. Numerical model formulations

In this section, we propose a modified Q-scheme of Roe to discretize the system of model Eq. (14). Eq. (14) can be re-written in the form of a hyperbolic system with a conservative product, \( F \) and three source terms, \( G_1, G_2, \) and \( T \) corresponding to the bed level, the bed curvature and the basal friction, respectively. It should be noticed that the tilde (~) has been omitted in the following equations.

\[
\begin{align*}
\partial_t \tilde{W} + \partial_x (F(\tilde{W})) &= G_1(x, \tilde{W}) + G_2(x, \tilde{W}) + T
\end{align*}
\]  

(16)

where

\[
\begin{align*}
W &= \begin{bmatrix} h \\ \tilde{q} \end{bmatrix}, \quad F(\tilde{W}) &= \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{q} \cos \theta \\ \frac{\tilde{q}}{\tilde{q}} \cos \theta + gK \tilde{H} \cos^3 \theta \end{bmatrix} \\
G_1 &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -gh \cos \theta \tilde{d}_h b \end{bmatrix}, \quad G_2 &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -g \tilde{H} \cos \theta \tilde{d}_h (\cos^2 \theta) \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
T = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{3} / \cos \theta \end{bmatrix}
\]
As it mentioned in the introduction section, the source terms \( G_1 \) and \( G_2 \) are upwinded in the same way of the flux term, \( F \). For numerical discretization of the Coulomb friction term \( T \), a two-step semi-implicit approach is applied [34,58]. In the first step, the unknowns are calculated without considering the basal friction effects. Then, in the second step, the predicted flow velocity is modified based on Eq. (15) [34]. In this stage, if the granular material angle is less than the angle of repose, the flow velocity becomes zero.

Definition of the flux term, \( F \), shows that it is not only a function of the vector of unknowns, but also a function of the bed slope, \( \theta(x) \).

The system of model Eq. (14) can be expanded as

\[
\begin{align*}
\partial_t h &+ \partial_i(q_i)\cos \theta = -q_i\sin \theta,
\partial_t q_i + \partial_i\left(u_i^2\right)\cos \theta + \partial_i(gkh^2/2)\cos \theta
\end{align*}
\]

(17)

The non-conservative form of the model Eq. (17) is

\[
\partial_t W + A(\theta, W) = G(\theta, W)
\]

(18)

where \( G(\theta, W) = G_1 + G_2 + \partial_t F + T \) and \( \partial_t F = G_3 + G_4 \).

\[
G_3 = -\frac{3gk^2}{4} \frac{h_i}{\cos \theta} \frac{\partial_i \sin \theta}{\cos \theta}, \quad G_4 = \frac{q_i}{\cos \theta}
\]

(19)

The Jacobian matrix of the system of model Eq. (14) as

\[
A(\theta, W) = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & \cos \theta \\
-u^2 \cos \theta + gkh^2 \cos \theta & 2u \cos \theta
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & \frac{1}{2} \\
-u^2 + c^2 & 2u
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(20)

In this matrix \( u = q/h \) is the averaged velocity of the flow. The local eigenvalues, \( \lambda_i \), and the local eigenvectors, \( \kappa_i \), of the coefficient matrix \( A \) can be calculated as

\[
\lambda_i = [u + c] \cos \theta \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa_i = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ u - c \end{bmatrix}
\]

(21)

where \( c = (gkh \cos \theta) \) is a specific wave speed and \( l = 1, 2 \).

The computational domain is subdivided into constant intervals of size \( \Delta x \) as shown in Fig. 2. The ith grid cell is denoted by \( i = [x_{i-1/2}, x_{i+1/2}] \) [55]. For the sake of simplicity, the time step, \( \Delta t \), is also supposed to be constant and \( t_n = n\Delta t \) and \( x_t = (l - 1/2)\Delta x \) is the center of the cell \( i \). \( W_i^n \) denotes the numerical approximation of the average value over the ith cell at time \( t^n \) as [55]

\[
W_i^n \approx \frac{1}{\Delta x} \int_{x_{i-1/2}}^{x_{i+1/2}} W(x, t^n) dx
\]

(22)

3.1. Modified Q-scheme of Roe

The Q-schemes are a family of three point upwind schemes corresponding to numerical fluxes, \( \phi' \), of the form [16]

\[
\phi'(Y_1, Y_2) = \frac{F(Y_1) - F(Y_2)}{2} - \frac{1}{2} (Q(Y_1, Y_2))(Y_1 - Y_2)
\]

(23)

For each Q-scheme, \( Q \) is a matrix characteristic having a continuous dependence on the two state values of \( Y_1 \) and \( Y_2 \). For example, in the Roe scheme which is based on a linearization of the flux, \( Q \) is a diagonalizable matrix which satisfies the property of conservation across discontinuities as follows [76],

\[
F(Y_1) - F(Y_2) = Q(Y_1, Y_2)(Y_1 - Y_2)
\]

(24)

Roe proposed to define \( Q \) as the Jacobian matrix, \( A \), evaluated at some state \( W = W(Y_1, Y_2) \) known as the Roe average of \( Y_1 \) and \( Y_2 \) [76].
and
\[ dh_{i+1/2} = b_{i+1} - b_i, \quad d(\cos \theta)_{i+1/2} = \cos \theta_{i+1} - \cos \theta_i, \quad d(\cos^2 \theta)_{i+1/2} = \cos^2 \theta_{i+1} - \cos^2 \theta_i \]

The numerical source term, \( G_{i+1/2} \), is upwinded by applying the projection-matrix equations [38]
\[
P_{i+1/2}^+ = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \kappa_{i+1/2} \left( Id \pm \text{sgn}(D_{i+1/2}) \right) \right] \kappa_{i+1/2}^{-1}
\]

where \( Id \) is the identity matrix and
\[
\text{sgn}(D_{i+1/2}) = \begin{cases} 
\text{sgn}(\lambda_{i+1/2}) & \text{if } \lambda_{i+1/2} > 0 \\
0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

\( T_{i+1/2} \) is the Coulomb friction term defined as
\[
T_{i+1/2} = \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\lambda_{i+1/2} / \cos \theta_{i+1/2}
\end{array} \right], \text{ where } [34]
\]

\( \lambda_{i+1/2} = \begin{cases} 
\lambda_{i+1/2} + \Delta \lambda_{i+1/2} & \text{if } |q_{i+1/2}| > \frac{\Delta \sigma_{c,i+1}}{\Delta \cos \theta_{i+1/2}} \\
0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

and \[ \lambda_{i+1/2} = -gh_{i+1/2} \cos^2 \theta_{i+1/2} \text{sgn}(\bar{u}_{i+1/2}) \tan \delta \]
\[ \lambda_{i+1/2} = -h_{i+1/2} \sin^2 \theta_{i+1/2} \text{sgn}(\bar{u}_{i+1/2}) \tan \delta \cos \theta_{i+1/2} \]
\[ \lambda_{i+1/2} = gh_{i+1/2} \cos^2 \theta_{i+1/2} \tan \delta \theta_0 \]
\[ \lambda_{i+1/2} = gh_{i+1/2} \cos^2 \theta_{i+1/2} \left( K(b_{i+1} - b_i + h_{i+1} \cos^2 \theta_{i+1} - h_i \cos^2 \theta_i) / \Delta x + \frac{(h_{i+1} + 4)(\cos \theta_{i+1} - \cos \theta_{i})}{\Delta x} \right) \]

In the first step, the Coulomb friction term is only included in the Roe correction part [34] with the projection matrix:
\[
P_{i+1/2}^+ = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \kappa_{i+1/2} \text{sgn}(D_{i+1/2}) \right] \kappa_{i+1/2}^{-1}
\]

The proposed O-scheme of Roe can be re-written in a more general form as
\[
W_i = W_{i+1/2}^0 + r \left( dF_{i+1/2}^+ - dF_{i+1/2}^- \right)
\]

where \( W_i^{n+1/2} \) is supposed to be the vector of unknowns computed at the first step for \[ \frac{1}{2} \left( W_i^{n+1/2} - W_i^n + \frac{1}{2} (dF_{i+1/2}^+ - dF_{i+1/2}^-) \right) \] and
\[
dF_{i+1/2}^+ = dF_{i+1/2} \left( W_i^{n+1/2} - W_i^n \right) \]

is a generalized Roe flux difference computed as
\[
dF_{i+1/2}^+ = \frac{1}{2} \left( \pm \tilde{S}_{i+1/2}^+ + \tilde{S}_{i+1/2}^- \pm \tilde{S}_{i+1/2} \pm P_{i+1/2}^+ dW_{i+1/2}^{n+1/2} + P_{i+1/2}^- dW_{i+1/2}^{n+1/2} \right)
\]

The vector of unknowns, \( W_i = [h_i^+ \ q_i^+] \), is calculated by Eq. (32) without considering the interaction between the granular material and the non-erosible bed which is defined by the Coulomb friction term, \( T \). In the second step, the granular flow heights remain the same, i.e. \( h_i^{n+1} = h_i^+ \), but the predicted values of flow velocity, \( q_i^+ \), will be modified based on the effects of the Coulomb friction to compute the state values corresponding to the next time step, \( W_i^{n+1} = [h_i^{n+1} \ q_i^{n+1}] \).

3.1.2. Second step
In this step, the state values, \( W_i = [h_i^+ \ q_i^+] \), predicted in the first step, are applied to calculate the updated values of flow velocity \( q_i^{n+1} \), based on the following equations [34].

\[
q_{i+1}^{n+1} = \begin{cases} 
(q_i^n + \left( \lambda_{i+1} + \lambda_{i+2} \right) \Delta t / \cos \theta_i, & \text{if } |q_i^n| > \sigma_{c,i} \Delta t / \cos \theta_i \\
0, & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

where [34]
\[
\lambda_{i+1} = -0.5 \left( (c_{i+1}^r)^2 + (c_{i+1}^r)^2 \right) \cos \theta \text{sgn}(q_i^n) \tan \delta
\]
\[
\lambda_{i+1} = -0.5 \left( h_{i+1}^+ + h_{i+1}^- \right) \mu_{i+1}^r \left( \sin \theta_{i+1/2} - \sin \theta_{i-1/2} \right) \text{sgn}(q_i^n) \times \tan \delta \cos \theta_i / \Delta x
\]
\[
\sigma_{c,i} = 0.5 \left( (c_{i+1}^r)^2 + (c_{i+1}^r)^2 \right) \cos \theta \tan \delta \theta_0. \quad c_{i+1}^r
\]
\[
= \sqrt{g(h_i^+ + h_{i-1}^-) / 2 \cos \theta_{i+1/2}}
\]

Now the state values of the next time step, \( W_i^{n+1} = [h_i^{n+1} \ q_i^{n+1}] \), are calculated. Observe that when the Coulomb friction term is less than the critical resistance of the bottom against the flow, \( |\Pi| < \sigma_c \), the granular material stops moving, \( q = 0 \). In fact, the numerical treatment of the Coulomb friction term acts like a predictor-corrector method. In the first step, this term is only considered in the unrecovered part of the scheme. Then, the predicted value of \( q_i^n \) is corrected using Eq. (33) in the second step.

3.2. Numerical scheme properties

More considerations and properties of the proposed numerical scheme are as follows:

3.2.1. Order of accuracy
The scheme introduces a second-order approximation of the system of model Eq. (14) in both space and time, \( W_i^n = W_i^n + O(\Delta t^2, \Delta x^2) \). To achieve the second order of accuracy in time, the intermediate values of fluxes at \( F_{i+1/2}^{n+1/2}, F_{i-1/2}^{n+1/2} \) are calculated based on the numerical approach introduced by Lax and Wendroff in 1960 [54].

3.2.2. CFL condition
Regarding the stability requirements, the following CFL (Courant–Friedrichs–Lewy) condition is applied in the present model [29]
\[
\max \| ||W_{i+1/2}||^\infty, 1 \leq l \leq 2, 0 \leq i \leq M \Delta t / \Delta x \leq \gamma
\]
where \( \gamma < 1 \) is a constant, \( \Delta x_{i+1/2} \) is the eigenvalues of the Jacobean matrix \( A \) and \( m \) is the number of computational cells.

3.2.3. Critical flow fix
In Roe-type schemes, the fluxes may not be computed correctly when the flow is critical [21] or more generally when one of the eigenvalues of the Jacobean matrix \( A \) goes to zero [26]. As it is well-known, the Froude number of a critical flow, \( Fr = u / \sqrt{g} \), is equal to one [55]. It means that one of the eigenvalues, \( \lambda_1 = (u - c) \cos \theta \), of the Jacobean matrix \( A \) vanishes in the intercells where the flow is critical. When any of the eigenvalues of the Jacobean matrix \( A \) are zero, the numerical viscosity of the scheme disappears which may cause inappropriate numerical behavior in these situations [26]. The most applied correction for these situations is the Harten regularization [41]. He proposed to increase the near zero eigenvalues based on the following equation by choosing a small parameter \( \epsilon' \) [41].

\[
|\lambda|^* = |\lambda| + 0.5 \left( 1 + \text{sgn}(\epsilon' - |\lambda|) \left( \frac{x^2 + \epsilon'^2}{2 \epsilon'} - |\lambda| \right) \right)
\]
In this method $\psi$ should be selected arbitrary. In the present model, a better numerical solution is applied which increases the near zero eigenvalues in critical cells based on the right, $\lambda^+$, and the left, $\lambda^-$, eigenvalues of the critical cell [78] as

$$|\lambda| = \frac{\sqrt{\lambda^2 + \Delta \lambda}}{4} \quad \text{When} \quad -\Delta \lambda/2 < \lambda < \Delta \lambda/2$$

where $\Delta \lambda = 4(\lambda^+ - \lambda^-)$ [78]. Then, the flux terms are computed based on these modified eigenvalues $|\lambda|$.

3.2.4. Wet/dry treatment

As it mentioned before, the proposed method of Castro et al. [25] is employed for numerical treatment of wet/dry fronts, in the present model. In this approach, a simple nonlinear Riemann problem will be considered at intercells where wet/dry transitions happen. The exact solutions of this problem are applied to calculate the numerical fluxes at the related intercell [25].

In Roe type schemes, with Roe linearization of the Jacobian matrix a linear Riemann problem is considered in each intercell, $x_{i+1/2}$, as follows [76]:

$$\begin{align*}
\partial_t W + A \partial_x W &= 0 \\
W(x, t^n) &= W_i^n \\
W(x, t^{n+1}) &= W_{i+1}^n
\end{align*}$$

When a wet/dry front is detected in the intercell $x_{i+1/2}$, i.e. $h_i > 0$ and $h_{i+1} = 0$, the linear Riemann problem (37) is replaced by a nonlinear one [25]:

$$\begin{align*}
\partial_t W + \partial_x f(W) &= 0 \\
W(x, t^n) &= W_i^n \\
W(x, t^{n+1}) &= W_{i+1}^n
\end{align*}$$

The choice of these nonlinear problems relies on the bed level, $b(x)$, at the both sides of the wet/dry front [25]. As it can be observed in Fig. 3, $W^+$ and $W^-$ are considered to be the exact solutions at the right and the left sides of the intercell $x_{i+1/2}$ where a wet/dry transition is happening. A summary of the exact solutions corresponding to these nonlinear problems at different situations are as follows [25].

(a) The bottom is flat; i.e. $b_i = b_{i+1}$ [25]

$$W^+ = W^- = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{if} \quad u_i < -2c_i$$

(b) The flow is moving down a slope; i.e. $b_i > b_{i+1}$ [25]

$$W^+ = W^- = \begin{bmatrix} (u_i + 2c_i)^2 / 9g \\ (u_i + 2c_i)^3 / 27g \end{bmatrix} - 2c_i \leqslant u_i \leqslant c_i$$

$$W^+ = \begin{bmatrix} h^+ \\ q_i \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{if} \quad -2c_i \leqslant u_i \leqslant c_i$$

where $h^+$ is the least positive root of the following polynomial [42]. In this case, the flow is critical at the left edge of the intercell and subcritical at the right edge [25].

$$P_i(h^+) = h^3 + (b_i - b_i - Q_i^2 / (2gh_i^2) - h_0) h_i^2 + q_i^2 / (2g)$$

$$W^+ = W_i \quad \text{and} \quad W^- = \begin{bmatrix} h^- \\ q_i \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{if} \quad u_i \geqslant c_i$$

(c) The granular flow is moving up a slope; i.e. $b_i < b_{i+1}$ [25]

$$W^+ = \begin{bmatrix} h^+ \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$W^- = \begin{bmatrix} h^- \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

where $h^+$ is the least positive root of the following polynomial [25]:

$$P_i(h^+) = h^3 - h_i h^2 - h_i^2 h^3 + h^3 - 2q_i^2 h / (gh_i)$$

In this case, the granular flow is not able to move forward, because either the slope acts as an obstacle for the flow if [25]

$$\begin{align*}
u_i &< 0 \\
b_{i+1} &> h_i + b_i
\end{align*}$$

or the wet cell has no enough mechanical energy if [25]

$$\begin{align*}
u_i &> 0 \\
b_{i+1} - b_i &> h_i + q_i^2 / (2gh_i^2) - 3q_i^2 / (2g)$$

$$W^+ = W_i \quad \text{and} \quad W^- = \begin{bmatrix} h^- \\ q_i \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{if} \quad u_i > 0$$

where $h^-$ is the least positive root of the following polynomial [25]:

$$P_i(h^-) = h^3 + (b_i - b_i - Q_i^2 / (2gh_i^2) - h_i) h_i^2 + q_i^2 / (2g)$$

In this case, the flow is supercritical in both sides of the intercell [25].

$$P_i(h^-) = h^3 + (b_{i+1} - b_i - Q_i^2 / (2gh_i^2) - h_0) h_i^2 + q_i^2 / (2g)$$

$$W^+ = W_i \quad \text{and} \quad W^- = \begin{bmatrix} h^- \\ q_i \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{if} \quad u_i \leqslant -2c_i$$

where $h^-$ is the least positive root of the following polynomial [25]:

$$P_i(h^-) = h^3 + (b_i - b_i - Q_i^2 / (2gh_i^2) - h_i) h_i^2 + q_i^2 / (2g)$$

In this case, the flow is supercritical in both sides of the intercell [25].

$$P_i(h^-) = h^3 + (b_i - b_i - Q_i^2 / (2gh_i^2) - h_i) h_i^2 + q_i^2 / (2g)$$

In the last case, the granular flow has energy enough to go up the slope. The nonlinear Riemann problem in this condition is not easy to solve. Therefore, the scheme is applied without any modifications [25].

It should be noted that in all the mentioned cases corresponding to wet/dry transitions, the bed level at the left and the right edges of the intercell, where a wet/dry transition happens, are supposed to be the same as the bed level at the left and the right mesh points, respectively (Fig. 3) [25]. In fact, it is supposed that there is a step in the related intercell. In Fig. 3, a wet/dry front is considered in intercell $x_{i+1/2}$, i.e. ith cell is a wet cell ($h_i = 0$) and (i + 1)th cell is a dry one ($h_{i+1} = 0$). Since $b_i < b_{i+1}$, the case (c) of the wet/dry treatment should be considered. Hence, the exact solutions of the nonlinear Riemann problems, $W^+$, can be calculated by Eqs. (45)–(51).

In the present model, there is another source term related to the bed curvature, $S_b$, which also affects the wet/dry transitions. We propose to assume no curvature at the both sides of the related intercell for calculating the numerical fluxes, $df^+_{i+1/2}$. As it is shown in Fig. 3, a flat bed can be presumed in the both sides of the intercell containing a wet/dry transition. The present numerical results demonstrate that with this modification, the proposed numerical scheme becomes a complete well-balanced scheme. It satisfies all...
the stationary solutions regarding water at rest with or without wet/dry transitions. It is also able to deal with all different cases of wet/dry transitions.

3.2.5. Stationary solutions

Considering no movement for the granular mass means \( u(x) = 0 \). In this condition, the system of model Eq. (17) results in

\[
\rho_i \left( \frac{gK h_i^2}{2} \cos^3 \theta - \frac{3}{4} gK h_i \cos \theta \partial \omega_i (\cos^2 \theta) - gh \cos \partial d_i b \right.
- \left. \frac{g h_i^2}{4} \cos \theta \partial \omega_i (\cos^2 \theta) + \frac{3}{\cos \theta} \right) = 0
\]

where \( 3 < \sigma_c = gh \cos^2 \theta \tan \delta_0 \). Which leads to the following inequality.

\[
|K \cos^2 \omega_i h + \frac{3K + 1}{4} h \partial \omega_i (\cos^2 \theta) + d_i b | \leq \tan \delta_0
\]

which is a first order differential equation and can be easily solved for each arbitrary boundary condition. This relation demonstrates dependence of stationary flow surface profile on the values of \( K \) and the bed curvature. It confirms that the flow surface slope should be smaller than \( \tan \delta_0 \) [34]. When \( K = 1 \), the surface profile is independent of the bed curvature:

\[
|\partial \omega_i (b + h \cos^2 \theta)| \leq \tan \delta_0
\]

When the fluid is water, i.e. \( \delta = \phi = 0 \), the stationary solution verifies,

\[
\begin{cases}
    u(x) = 0 \\
    b(x) + h(x) = \text{cst}
\end{cases}
\]

where \( h'(x) = H(x) \), \( \cos \theta(x) = h(x) \cos^2 \theta(x) \). For a granular material, since the inequality (53) is satisfied, there will be no movement in the granular material and the flow surface will be preserved. Otherwise, the granular profile will transfer to a new stable state depending on the values of the bed curvature, the internal and the basal friction angles so that its angle becomes less than the angle of repose all over the non-erodible bottom.

For better understanding of the performance of the present model using the proposed scheme, its flowchart has been illustrated in Fig. 4. As it can be seen in this flowchart, the distinctive modifications made to the general Q-scheme of Roe [38] in the present model are:

- Applying the nonlinear wet/dry algorithm of Castro et al. [25] modified for dealing with the bed curvature.
- Altering the critical flow simulation by the proposed method of Van Leer et al. [78].
- Employing a two-step semi-implicit discretization for the source term \( T \) including the Coulomb friction effects and considering the simultaneous flowing/static regions of the granular flow by a critical basal resistance term, based on the proposed method of Fernández-Nieto et al. [34].

4. Numerical tests

In this section, a series of experimental results and numerical tests are simulated using the present model to verify the improved properties of the proposed scheme. The ability of the model in preserving the stationary solutions, dealing with different situations of wet/dry transitions, critical flows and adverse slopes is been examined in the following numerical simulations. The estimated values of granular flow thicknesses, velocities, maximum run up and final deposition profile is also compared with their experimental measurements. It should be mentioned that in all the following simulated cases, the runtime is less than 2 min with a 2.2 GHz Intel Core 2 CPU.

4.1. Stationary solutions

To confirm the ability of the proposed scheme in preserving the steady state corresponding to water at rest, i.e. \( u = 0 \) and \( b + h \cos^2 \theta = \text{cst} \), a simple numerical test is performed as follows. An arc-shaped slope (1 m radius) is considered in order to have variable values of both the bed slope and the bed curvature. Consequently, all the source terms are involved in simulation. The bottom topography and the initial conditions are defined as (Fig. 5a)

\[
b(x) = \sqrt{1 - (x - 1)^2} - 1, \quad h(x) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
0 & b(x) \geq 0.235 \\
0.235 - b(x) & b(x) < 0.235
\end{array} \right.
\]

(56)

The model parameters are chosen as \( \Delta x = 0.01 \) and \( r = dt/dx = 0.1 \). At first, we suppose no internal and basal friction angles \( \phi = \delta = 0 \). It means that we have a layer of water at rest. It helps to make sure that the scheme is a complete well-balanced scheme. The numerical results are illustrated in Fig. 5. As it can be observed in Fig. 5b, considering no wet/dry treatment leads to numerical instability due to appearance of negative heights at the place of wet/dry transition. On the other hand, with applying the proposed wet/dry treatment of Castro et al. [25], no negative height emerges to make the numerical results unstable. Nevertheless, the steady state solution is not still satisfied completely. As it mentioned in Section 3.2, in the present model, there is a new source term regarding the bed curvature.
which should be also treated properly when a wet/dry transition happens. The artificial numerical wave caused by this term in the wet/dry front is exemplified in Fig. 5c. In accordance with Fig. 3, when a wet/dry transition occurs, for example at intercell \( x_{i=1/2} \), it is proposed to consider no bed curvature for calculating the numerical fluxes \( df_{i=1/2} \) at the left and the right sides of the intercell, in the present model. With this modification the proposed numerical scheme becomes totally well-balanced.

For a granular mass with the same initial condition, since the inequality (53) is satisfied there will be no movement in the granular material and the scheme preserves the flow surface profile as it is shown in Fig. 5a. The constant value of 30° is considered as the basal friction angle, \( \phi \). With the same conditions as Eq. (56) and the same model parameters, the new stable states of granular mass with different values of \( K \) are shown in Fig. 6. For \( K < 1.5 \) in combination with the considered bottom curvature, the inequality (53) will be satisfied which preserves the flow surface without any changes. As it can be observed in Fig. 6, the final stationary profiles of the granular mass are beneath its initial stationary profile.

4.2. The effects of the bed curvature and upwinding the source terms

Vázquez-Cendón [79] confirms the importance of upwinding the source terms containing the bed friction, \( T \), and the bed level change, \( S_1 \). In this section, some of the experiments of Hutter et al. [47,48] are simulated with the present model to verify the importance of upwinding the source term \( S_2 \) including the effects of the bed curvature. These experiments included the release of a granular mass down a 40–60° straight slope, passing through a curved transition (246 mm radius) and depositing on a horizontal surface. Hutter et al. [47] considered two types of granular material: plastic particles with bulk density of 450 kg/m³ representing snow avalanches and glass beads with density of 1730 kg/m³ representing sand. The present model successfully estimated the flow thicknesses and velocities for both type of material. The computational errors of less than 4% for both flow height distribution (Eq. (57)) and flow velocities confirm the ability of the present model in estimating the properties of different types of granular flows.

The numerical results are compared with corresponding experimental data in Figs. 7 and 8 for experiment no. 113. In this experiment, the plastic particles are released on the 60° slope. The internal and basal friction angles are 29° and 23°, respectively and the model parameters are \( \Delta x = 1.0 \) and \( r = 0.01 \). Fig. 7 shows the predicted depth flow profiles at different times from the beginning to deposition of the granular flow. The results demonstrate good agreement between the numerical and the experimental data with the computational error less than 5% for flow thickness distribution (Fig. 7a). As it mentioned in Section 2, the equations are transferred to a local coordinate system along the bed to consider the bed curvature effects on the sliding mass deformations. To illustrate the importance of the centripetal acceleration of the grains movement due to the bed curvature, the numerical results of the present model are compared with and without considering the bed curvature effects in Fig. 7a and b. The results indicate the strong effects of the interactions between the flow and the curved part on the granular flow properties. For a better visual comparison, the flow profiles and their corresponding velocities passing through the curved transition are illustrated in Fig. 7c and d, respectively. The curved part of the flume is located in the spatial interval of \( x \in [80105] \). As it can be observed in Fig. 7c and d, the centrifugal forces acting on the flow through this part act like a local obstacle, slowing the flow, rising up the flow thickness and decreasing its energy. Both profiles (with and without considering the bed curvature) have the same velocity of about 42.8 m/s close to the curved part (Fig. 7d). With neglecting the bed curvature effects, avalanche passes through the curved part with an increased velocity of about 45 m/s to the horizontal part which leads to an up to 35% overestimated velocity on the horizontal part. Consequently, the granular mass deposits farther than the correct position on the flat surface (Fig. 7b). On the other hand, with considering the bed curvature effects, the granular mass flow is decelerated until it reaches to the velocity of about 29.8 m/s at the end of the curved part (Fig. 7d). The effects of this deceleration can be observed in Fig. 7c as increasing in the flow thickness compared with the flow thickness without curvature effects. This fact verifies that the curved part is acting like a local obstruction.

To compare the effects of centered discretization of the source terms with upwind discretization, the landslide deposit predicted based on upwinded source terms \( S_1 \) and \( S_2 \), centered source terms \( S_1 \) and \( S_2 \), and upwinded \( S_1 \) and centered \( S_2 \) are illustrated in Fig. 8. As it can be observed in this figure, with centered discretization of each source term, \( S_1 \) or \( S_2 \), or both the length of the avalanche deposition will be overestimated while its depth is simultaneously...
underestimated (Table 2). These results can be a sign of artificial numerical dispersion which can be avoided by upwinding the source terms. Accordingly, like the other kinds of source terms, upwinding the source term \( S_2 \) related to the bed curvature decreases the artificial numerical dispersion and makes the stable region of the scheme bigger.

The numerical results of Hungr [43], who applied an integrated model based on a lagrangian numerical solution with the SH assumptions for the same problem, is also compared with the present model in Fig. 8. As it can be observed in this figure and Table 2, the present model estimates the maximum height, length and depth profile of the final deposition closer to the experimental data than the numerical results of Hungr [43]. The computational error of deposition profile in the last column of Table 2 is computed as

\[
Err = \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m} (h_{\exp i} - h_{\num i})}{h_{\exp i}} \right) / (m + 1)
\]

where \( h_{\exp} \) are the measured values and \( h_{\num} \) are the computed values of deposition depths, and \( m \) is the number of computational grids.

As it can be observed in Fig. 7a, the solutions are free of numerical oscillations before the sliding mass starts to shape the final deposition. On the other hand, when the granular flow is slowing down to stop, the numerical results reveal some fluctuations on the avalanche surface (Figs. 6 and 8). These oscillations may be caused by the effects of critical stress which is trying to stop the granular flow when its angle is less than the angle of repose. Accordingly, the granular profile starts to change to a stable geometry which takes more time than the final deposition.

Finally, temporal positions of the flow leading edge are compared with the experimental measurements in Fig. 9. The computed values of the flow front position are in a good agreement with the experimental data with computational error less than 4%. As it mentioned before, when the effects of the bed curvature are neglected the flow velocity is overestimated by more than 35%.

It should be noticed that in all simulated experiments of Hutter et al. [47], the avalanche tail moves very slowly in comparison with the experimental measurements. It is probably due to considering a constant friction angle at the bottom, \( \delta \), while it dynamically reduces as the avalanche accelerates [1,38]. At high flow rates, the granular temperature may increase near the bottom boundary which leads to granular mass fluidization and consequent reduction of \( \delta \). On the other word, the front of a fully developed avalanche may acts like a granular solid, while its tail acts more like a fluid [50]. Moreover, Hungr [43] explained another...
shortcoming of SH model, i.e. considering negligible depth gradients due to shallow flow assumption of parallel flow lines, which is a further effective factor in slowing down the trailing flow. The curved flow lines caused by a significant depth gradient create a pressure component nonparallel to the bed. This pressure component originates additional shear stresses close to the bottom which are not considered in classic SH model. He proposed a modified definition for the resisting shear stress at the flow bottom with reducing the basal friction angle by a certain fraction of this additional stress [43]. Underestimated velocities of ensuing flow affect the maximum travel distance (1.25% underestimated) and
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**Fig. 7.** Predicted flow profiles (a) including the bed curvature effects (0.1 s intervals) and (b) without the bed curvature effects (0.05 s intervals), for the experimental data of Hutter et al. [47] with the present model; (c) predicted depth flow profiles and (d) their corresponding flow velocities through the curved part of the flume. The flow depth is exaggerated 5 times.
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**Fig. 8.** Comparison between the predicted avalanche depositions with different discretization (upwind or centered) of the source terms and the numerical results of Hungr [33] for the experimental data of Hutter et al. [47].
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**Fig. 9.** Comparison between the present numerical results and the experimental data of Hutter et al. [47] for flow front position against time. The numerical results are based on considering: upwinded $S_1$ and centered $S_2$, centered $S_1$ and $S_2$, upwinded $S_1$ and centered $S_2$, and no bed curvature effects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numerical considerations</th>
<th>Maximum height</th>
<th>Deposition length</th>
<th>Depth profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upwinded $S_1$ and $S_2$</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered $S_1$ and $S_2$</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>24.85</td>
<td>9.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upwinded $S_1$ and centered $S_2$</td>
<td>18.34</td>
<td>26.28</td>
<td>9.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungr [33]</td>
<td>15.59</td>
<td>15.83</td>
<td>7.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The curved flow lines caused by a significant depth gradient create a pressure component nonparallel to the bed. This pressure component originates additional shear stresses close to the bottom which are not considered in classic SH model. He proposed a modified definition for the resisting shear stress at the flow bottom with reducing the basal friction angle by a certain fraction of this additional stress [43]. Underestimated velocities of ensuing flow affect the maximum travel distance (1.25% underestimated) and
especially the final deposition length (7.72% overestimated) of the slide. Proper estimation of trailing flow behavior is important to predict the topographic changes of the bottom after landslide. Nevertheless, the primary purpose of natural granular flow modeling is to estimate their maximum possible travel distance and the prediction of flow tail is of less practical importance. This fact makes the present model an applicable means for analyzing the real hazards.

4.3. Adverse slope

Predicting the behavior of granular flow against protective structures such as barriers is an important aspect of risk assessment [57,62,66]. It is also applicable for testing the wet/dry treatment method when the flow is going up against a slope. The ability of the proposed numerical framework in estimating the maximum runup against an obstacle is verified by simulating one of the experiments performed by Mancarella and Hungr [57]. In these experiments, a reservoir of dry sand with the bulk density of 1630 kg/m$^3$ is released down a 29° slope, passing through a curved transition with the radius of 0.1 m and running into an adverse 33° slope [57]. The internal and basal friction angles are measured as 30.9° and 21.7°, respectively [57].

The final profile of the granular flow and the flow front velocities are shown in Fig. 10, with and without considering numerical treatment for wet/dry transitions. The numerical results are in a good agreement with corresponding experimental data with computational error less than 4% for the flow thicknesses. As it can be observed in Fig. 10b, the granular flow reaches to the maximum distance of 1.86 m on the reversed slope at time 1.35 s which is sufficiently close to the experimental measurements of about 1.83 m at time 1.2 s with relative error of about 1.64%. Without considering any wet/dry treatment, the maximum runup and the flow velocity are overestimated by more than 5% and 20%, respectively.

4.4. Critical flow

A simple dam break problem is simulated with the present model to show the effects of applying the critical flow fix (CFF) method. A 0.2 m high, 0.4 m long reservoir of sand is suddenly released down a dry bed [43]. The granular material has the bulk density of 1630 kg/m$^3$ with the inertial friction angle of $\phi = 31.9^\circ$ and the basal friction angle of $\delta = 21.7^\circ$ [43].

Comparison between the numerical and the experimental data can be observed in Fig. 11. The granular flow is critical around the gate, $x = 0.4$ m in Fig. 11a, where the Froude number is one (Fig. 11b). In this area without using the CFF method, the scheme is not able to show the flow profile correctly due to vanishing one of the eigenvalues of the Jacobean matrix $A$. With increasing the near zero eigenvalue by applying the CFF correction, the numerical results become correct and smooth enough. Fig. 11c and d shows the final profile of granular material and its equivalent Froude numbers, respectively. When the flow becomes subcritical, $Fr < 1$, all over the computational domain (Fig. 11d), the scheme works properly even without CFF correction. Anyway, the effects of incorrect fluxes at critical regions make the numerical results far away from the experimental results (Fig. 11c).
Fig. 11. Comparison between the numerical results of the proposed scheme (a) and (b) with and (c) and (d) without critical flow fix (CFF) and the experimental data of Hungr [43].

Fig. 12. (a) The absolute error values ($L_1$-norm) and (b) the log–log graph of $L_1$-norm plotted against different values of $\Delta x$ and $\Delta t$. 
4.5. Order of accuracy

The following numerical test is performed by the present model to illustrate the decreasing trend of the scheme error against different time steps, $\Delta t$, and mesh sizes, $\Delta x$. As it can be observed in the right side of Fig. 12b, a wedge-shaped granular mass with the same length and height of 0.1 m is released down a 40° slope passing through a curved transition (0.6 m radius) to a horizontal plane. The inclined, curved and straight parts of the considered topography are 1.175 m, 0.314 m and 0.8 m long, respectively. The internal and the basal friction angles are supposed to be 30° and 23°, chosen as common values of friction angles for dry sand, respectively [47,74]. The values of flow thickness corresponding to the final granular mass profile (avalanche deposit) are applied to calculate the numerical errors. The sum of absolute difference ($L_1$-norm) of the flow thicknesses is calculated for different values of time steps, $\Delta t$, or mesh sizes, $\Delta x$, as [55]

$$L_1 = ||h_1 - h_2||_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{m}|h_{1,i} - h_{2,i}|$$

(58)

where $h_1$ is the predicted flow thickness and $m$ is the number of computational mesh points. $h_2$ is equal to the exact values of flow depth which in case are supposed to be the predicted values for $\Delta x = 0.003$ and $\Delta t = 0.001$ to compare the $L_1$-norm based on different values of $\Delta x$ and for $\Delta x = 0.01$ and $\Delta t = 0.0004$ to compare the $L_1$-norm based on different values of $\Delta t$.

The computed errors against both time step and cell size are plotted in Fig. 12. As it can be observed in Fig. 12a, the absolute error ($L_1$-norm) of the present scheme has an approximate second order descending trend against decreasing both $\Delta x$ and $\Delta t$. In Fig. 12b, the absolute errors are plotted against different length steps and time steps in a log–log graph. According to this figure, the slopes of the error curves are about 1.91 against $\Delta x$ and 1.7 against $\Delta t$. The difference of these slopes with the expected value of 2 represents the existence of other sources of error. With considering a constant $\Delta x$ or $\Delta t$ and changing the other one, we have different values of $r = \Delta t/\Delta x$ which has noticeable effects on numerical results regarding avalanche properties and its deposit profile. Therefore, it may change the consequent computational errors. Besides, in the present model the granular mass has stop points where its angle is less than the angle of repose. These stop points also change the granular mass properties. They may happen everywhere along the flow path depending on various factors such as avalanche depth and velocity, internal and basal friction angle, model parameters ($\Delta x$, $\Delta t$ and $r$) and bottom topography. Finally, it should be remembered that error curves are plotted in log scale so a modest difference on the error values can correspond to a very large difference in magnitude.

5. Conclusions

In this work, we introduced a numerical solution of granular type flows based on shallow SH type model using a well-balanced Roe type finite volume scheme. The model is derived in a local coordinate system along the non-erodible bottom to consider its curvature effects. The proposed scheme is based on the Q-scheme of Roe, and upwinding the source terms related to the bottom level and the bed curvature. Numerical results confirm the strong effects of the bed curvature on the granular flow characteristics and the importance of upwinding the source term corresponding to the bed curvature like the other source term. Centered discretization of this source term can originate numerical spurious waves and artificial dispersion. The numerical method constructed in this way completely satisfies the C-property.

The Coulomb friction term is discretized using a two-step semi-implicit approach. This approach prepares the proposed scheme to simulate the static regions caused by frictional resistance of the non-erodible bed maintaining stability. These static areas may appear when the flow is supposed to be shallow. In the present model, the basal friction angle is supposed to be constant which is unrealistic. To have a better estimate of flow velocities especially at the flow trail, a time-dependent relation can be considered for the basal friction angle based on grain temperature and grain-size segregation.

Different situations of wet/dry transitions are numerically treated in the present model. In this model both the bed level and the bed curvature are considered into the equations. Accordingly, it is proposed to neglect the bed curvature at the left and the right sides of the related intercell to calculate the numerical fluxes. This idea is verified by the numerical results. This modified wet/dry algorithm helps the proposed scheme to avoid appearance of negative flow thickness and overestimated flow velocities. Moreover, the scheme is able to satisfy stationary solutions including wet/dry fronts.

Our numerical results demonstrate the efficiency of the proposed numerical framework in reducing non-physical results like negative flow heights, spurious numerical waves and artificial numerical dispersion which are the main concerns in numerical modeling of fluid flows. Comparison with the available experimental measurements shows that the present model applying this modified scheme estimates the granular flow thickness, velocity and maximum run-up with a relative error of less than 5%. These results confirm the ability of the proposed method for natural landslide hazards analysis. Although we have limited our investigation to the case of one dimensional mathematical model in this study, our methodology is applicable to multi-dimensional models.

In particular, the procedure can be extended for multi-layer cases as well.
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