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\textbf{A B S T R A C T}

We propose new collocation methods for phase-field models. Our algorithms are based on isogeometric analysis, a new technology that makes use of functions from computational geometry, such as, for example, Non-Uniform Rational B-Splines (NURBS). NURBS exhibit excellent approximability and controllable global smoothness, and can represent exactly most geometries encapsulated in Computer Aided Design (CAD) models. These attributes permitted us to derive accurate, efficient, and geometrically flexible collocation methods for phase-field models. The performance of our method is demonstrated by several numerical examples of phase separation modeled by the Cahn–Hilliard equation. We feel that our method successfully combines the geometrical flexibility of finite elements with the accuracy and simplicity of pseudo-spectral collocation methods, and is a viable alternative to classical collocation methods.

\© 2013 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

The Cahn–Hilliard equation is a central model in nonlinear interface dynamics\textsuperscript{5} and pattern formation\textsuperscript{66}. It was derived about fifty years ago as a model for phase separation of immiscible fluids\textsuperscript{23,24}. Since then, it has been applied to a variety of physical problems, including planet formation\textsuperscript{73}, microstructure evolution of binary mixtures\textsuperscript{2,3,26} and phase separation of polymer blends\textsuperscript{27}. The Cahn–Hilliard equation is also one of the simplest equations that can model stable co-existence of two phases and, as such, is the basis for various multiphase flow theories\textsuperscript{31,32,60,63}. Even more important is the fact that the ideas behind the Cahn–Hilliard equation have given rise to a new class of mathematical models termed phase-field models\textsuperscript{40}. These models treat the interfaces as diffuse, track their dynamical evolution, and encode the interfacial physics at once. Phase-field models have had a significant impact on condensed matter physics\textsuperscript{37,38}, fluid mechanics\textsuperscript{16,45,46}, and solid mechanics\textsuperscript{20,64,65}. Since the numerical challenges faced when dealing with phase-field equations are common to many different models, we feel that studying efficient and accurate algorithms for the Cahn–Hilliard equation is a significant goal in computational physics.

The Cahn–Hilliard model is a nonlinear partial differential equation that involves fourth-order derivatives in space. Typical solutions to the equation include thin layers that evolve dynamically through the computational domain. The length scale of these layers is given by a small parameter that multiplies the fourth-order derivative, making the problem singularly perturbed. All these features make the numerical approximation of the Cahn–Hilliard equation a significant challenge. Although, new finite element methods are being proposed to solve the Cahn–Hilliard equation\textsuperscript{44,71,75}, collocation methods continue to be the standard methodology for computational phase field modeling. The two most representative examples of
collocation methods for phase field models are the finite difference method [12,25,52,70] and spectral methods [12,33,54,69,72].

Most work on collocation methods for the Cahn–Hilliard equation has been focused on the development of algorithms to study the structure of the spatial patterns and free-energy evolution in extended systems, like in the spirit of the problem of isotropic turbulence decay in fluid mechanics. It is, however, becoming clear that technological applications will demand accurate and robust algorithms that can handle complicated geometries and boundary conditions (a significant example has been recently presented in [4]). This paper constitutes a first step in this direction. We propose a new collocation method for the Cahn–Hilliard equation that is fast, accurate, robust, geometrically flexible, and can handle a variety of different boundary conditions.

Our collocation scheme is based on IsoGeometric Analysis (IGA) [28,57]. IGA is a computational technology that uses functions from computational geometry to represent both the solution and the domain of a boundary-value problem. The most frequently utilized functions are Non-Uniform Rational B-Splines (NURBS) [29,57] and T-Splines [13] which are widely used in computational geometry and design. The first applications of IGA were within the framework of finite element discretizations in which NURBS replaced the standard piece-wise polynomials, giving rise to new and more accurate discretizations on a per-degree-of-freedom basis [10,14,15,21,22,30,35,39,50,58,59,61,62,67]. In fact, IGA is a generalization of finite elements because NURBS are a superset of piece-wise polynomials. However, IGA offers new possibilities not available in classical finite elements [56], such as, for example, the straightforward generation of basis functions of arbitrarily high global smoothness. Within the context of geometrically flexible methods, this seems to be a unique attribute of IGA with profound implications on the accuracy of the discretization [1,17,29,42]. Additionally, the possibility of generating arbitrarily smooth basis functions on complicated domains opens the door to geometrically flexible collocation methods [8], which have already successfully applied in the fields of elastostatics and explicit elastodynamics [9], as well as for the development of innovative structural elements [11,18]. A detailed study on the advantages of isogeometric collocation over Galerkin approaches is provided by [68]. In that paper, the authors show the superior behavior, in terms of accuracy-to-computational-time ratio, attained by collocation with respect to Galerkin, in particular for higher order approximations. Although this study was performed for second-order partial-differential equations, we expect that similar advantages can be achieved also for higher-order equations, like those emanating from the phase-field theory. Moreover, in the same paper, the authors introduce and analyze adaptive isogeometric collocation methods based on local hierarchical refinement of NURBS.

Here we use these ideas to derive new collocation methods for phase-field models. The numerical examples in this paper show that our algorithms are very efficient, and seem to be a successful combination of the geometrical flexibility of classical finite element methods and the accuracy, efficiency, and simplicity of pseudo-spectral collocation methods.

The outline of this paper is as follows: We introduce the Cahn–Hilliard equation in Section 2. Our numerical formulation is presented in Section 3. Section 4 illustrates, with several numerical examples, the efficiency, accuracy, and geometrical flexibility of our algorithm. We draw conclusion in Section 5.

2. The Cahn–Hilliard equation

We present the Cahn–Hilliard equation in the context of isotropic and isothermal phase separation of immiscible fluids. Within this simplified setting, the thermodynamic state of the mixture is defined by an order parameter $u$ of the mass fraction. The assumption of an isothermal system indicates that the relevant thermodynamic potential is a free energy, which in the context of two-phase immiscible mixtures is called Ginzburg–Landau free energy.

2.1. Ginzburg–Landau free energy

Let $V$ be an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$, where $d$ is the spatial dimension. The Ginzburg–Landau free energy is defined as the functional $G: H^1(V) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ which takes the form

$$G[u] = \int_V \left( F(u) + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} |\nabla u|^2 \right) dV$$

(1)

where $H^1$ is the Sobolev space of square integrable functions with square integrable first derivatives. Following the interpretation of Cahn and Hilliard [23,24], $F$ is the free energy of a homogeneous system and the gradient term accounts for the interfacial free energy. Among the various possibilities for the homogeneous free energy $F$, we take the simple form

$$F(u) = \frac{\alpha}{4} \left( u^2 - \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \right)^2$$

(2)

This function is non-convex and presents a double well structure with two local minima located at $u = -\sqrt{\beta/\alpha}$ and $u = +\sqrt{\beta/\alpha}$, which are called the binodal points.

---

1 A detailed study along these lines would be surely interesting, but it is beyond the scope of this paper and will be the subject of future research.
The Cahn–Hilliard equation is a statement of mass conservation
\[
\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot j = 0
\]  
(3)

where the mass flux \( j \) is chosen such that the Ginzburg–Landau free energy decreases with time. This can be achieved taking
\[
j = -\nabla \left( \frac{\delta G}{\delta u} \right)
\]  
(4)

where \( \delta G/\delta u \) represents the variational derivative of \( G \) with respect to variations of \( u \) that vanish on \( \partial V \). Using Eqs. (3) and (4) we obtain the Cahn–Hilliard equation
\[
\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = \Delta \left( f(u) - \varepsilon^2 \Delta u \right)
\]  
(5)

where
\[
f(u) = F'(u) = \alpha u^3 - \beta u
\]  
(6)

is the chemical potential of a uniform solution. For an alternative derivation based on a microforce balance, the reader is referred to [53].

Since the dynamics of the Cahn–Hilliard equation is driven by the minimization of the Ginzburg–Landau free energy, the solution will approach the binodal points, defining a spatial structure with patches of each of the phases that dynamically coarsen over time. The patches of pure phases are separated by thin layers with thickness \( \nu \). A typical argument to find how \( \nu \) scales with the physical parameters of the model is to obtain a one-dimensional, stationary solution to the Cahn–Hilliard equation on an infinite domain. That solution should represent a fully separated flow. This can be achieved by solving the ordinary differential equation \( \alpha u_t^3 - \beta u_t - \varepsilon^2 u_t = 0 \) in \( x \in (-\infty, +\infty) \) subject to boundary conditions \( u_t(\pm\infty) = \pm \sqrt{\beta/\alpha} \).

The solution of the last equation is \( u_t(x) = \sqrt{\beta/\alpha} \tanh(\sqrt{\beta/2}x/\varepsilon) \) which, for fixed \( \beta \), indicates that \( \nu \sim \varepsilon \). Based on this result, we proposed in [44] an argument to select the mesh characteristic length of a numerical scheme in terms of \( \varepsilon \).

### 2.2. Initial/boundary-value problem

Let us assume that the spatial domain \( V \) has a smooth boundary \( \partial V \) that can be decomposed into two complementary parts as \( \partial V = \partial V_D \cup \partial V_N \). We state the following initial/boundary-value problem over the spatial domain \( V \) and the time interval \((0, T)\): given \( u_0 : V \mapsto \mathbb{R} \) and \( u_D : \partial V_D \mapsto \mathbb{R} \), find \( u : V \times [0, T] \mapsto \mathbb{R} \) such that

\[
\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = \Delta \left( f(u) - \varepsilon^2 \Delta u \right) \quad \text{in} \ V \times (0, T)
\]  
(7)

\[
u(0, t) \quad \text{on } \partial V_D \times [0, T)
\]  
(8)

\[
\nabla \left( f(u) - \varepsilon^2 \Delta u \right) \cdot n = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial V_N \times [0, T]
\]  
(9)

\[
\nabla u \cdot n = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial V \times [0, T]
\]  
(10)

\[
u(x, 0) = u_0(x) \quad \text{in } V
\]  
(11)

### 3. Numerical formulation

Here we present our fully discrete algorithm for the Cahn–Hilliard equation. We start by defining a time-discrete version of the equation, which is eventually discretized in space using our isogeometric collocation methods.

#### 3.1. Time discretization

We utilize the linearly stabilized Eyre’s method [41] to perform time integration. Thus, the non-convex homogeneous free energy \( F \) is split into two convex functions \( F_c \) and \( F_e \), as follows,
\[
F(u) = F_c(u) - F_e(u)
\]  
(12)

We call \( F_c \) and \( F_e \) the contractive and expansive parts because they reduce and increase, respectively, the \( L^2 \) energy into the system. This splitting is always possible, but it is not unique. Among the various possibilities, we take
\[
F_c(u) = \beta u^2, \quad F_e(u) = -\frac{\alpha}{4} u^4 + \frac{3 \beta}{2} u^2 + \frac{\alpha \beta^2}{4 \alpha^2}
\]  
(13)
which satisfies the necessary requirements, namely, the functions $F_c$ and $F_e$ are both convex in the physically relevant domain and they verify equation (12). The chemical potentials associated to this splitting are given by,

$$f_c(u) = 2\beta u, \quad f_e(u) = -\alpha u^3 + 3\beta u \quad (14)$$

In what follows, we present our time-stepping scheme. Let us divide the time interval of interest $[0, T]$ into $N$ subintervals $(t_n, t_{n+1})$; $n = 0, \ldots, N - 1$, where $t_0 = 0$ and $t_N = T$. We use the notation $\delta_n = t_{n+1} - t_n$. We call $u_n$ the time discrete approximation to $u(t_n)$, where we have omitted the dependence on the spatial coordinate for simplicity. We propose the following time integration algorithm: Given $u_n$, find $u_{n+1}$ such that

$$\frac{u_{n+1} - u_n}{\delta_n} = \Delta \left( f_c(u_{n+1}) - f_e(u_n) - \varepsilon^2 \Delta u_{n+1} \right) \quad (15)$$

Eq. (15) may be rewritten as

$$u_{n+1} - 2\beta \delta_n \Delta u_{n+1} + \varepsilon^2 \delta_n \Delta^2 u_{n+1} = u_n + 6\alpha \delta_n u_n |\nabla u_n|^2 + 3\delta_n (\alpha u_n^2 - \beta) \Delta u_n \quad (16)$$

We note that the algorithm (16) is linearly implicit and, thus, the updates can be computed every time step by solving a linear problem. Although the unconditional stability of this method is out of the scope of this paper, we note that this method has been shown to be unconditionally stable when combined with certain spatial discretizations (for a detailed discussion on unconditionally stable schemes for the Cahn–Hilliard equation, the reader is referred to [47] or [36, 43, 48, 49, 51, 54, 55]). In our case, we expect the algorithm to at least permit taking time steps significantly larger than those employed by explicit methods.

3.2. Space discretization

Our space discretization makes use of the finite-dimensional spaces generated by Non-Uniform Rational B-Splines (NURBS), which, in turn, originate from B-Splines. Thus, we start our presentation showing how to generate a B-Spline basis.

3.2.1. One-dimensional B-Splines

A one-dimensional B-Spline basis is a set of $n$ piecewise polynomial functions of degree $p$ denoted by $\{B_{i,p}\}_{i=1,\ldots,n}$. These functions are generated from a knot vector, which is a set of non-decreasing coordinates (in parametric space) called knots. Let us introduce the following knot vector

$$K_\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \ldots, \xi_{n+p+1}) \quad (17)$$

Without loss of generality, it may be assumed that $\xi_1 = 0$ and $\xi_{n+p+1} = 1$, and the basis functions are defined on the interval $[0, 1]$. Moreover, we assume that the knot vector is open, that is, $\xi_1 = \cdots = \xi_{p+1}$ and $\xi_{n+1} = \cdots = \xi_{n+p+1}$. Given $p$ and $K_\xi$, we define the zeroth degree B-Spline functions $\{B_{i,0}\}_{i=1,\ldots,n}$ as

$$B_{i,0}(\xi) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \xi_i \leq \xi < \xi_{i+1} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

The $p$-th degree B-Splines basis functions are defined recursively using the relation

$$B_{i,q}(\xi) = \frac{\xi - \xi_i}{\xi_{i+p} - \xi_i} B_{i,q-1}(\xi) + \frac{\xi_{i+p+1} - \xi}{\xi_{i+p+1} - \xi_{i+1}} B_{i+1,q-1}(\xi); \quad i = 1, \ldots, n; \quad q = 1, \ldots, p \quad (19)$$

The functions $\{B_{i,p}\}_{i=1,\ldots,n}$ are $C^\infty$ everywhere except at the knots. At a non-repeated knot, the functions have $p - 1$ continuous derivatives. If a knot has multiplicity $k$, the number of continuous derivatives at that point is $p - k$.

3.2.2. Two-dimensional B-Splines

Given two polynomial degrees $p^{(i)}$, $i = 1, 2$ and two knot vectors $K_{\gamma}, \gamma = (\xi^{(1)}, \xi^{(2)})$ of lengths $n^{(i)} + p^{(i)} + 1$, respectively, two-dimensional B-Spline functions are defined by taking tensor products of their one-dimensional counterparts

$$B_{i^{(1)},i^{(2)}}(\xi^{(1)}, \xi^{(2)}) = \bigotimes_{\gamma^{(1)}} B_{i^{(1)},p^{(1)}}(\xi^{(1)}) \quad (20)$$

We will denote by $\mathcal{S}$ the parametric space, which may be assumed to be $\mathcal{S} = [0, 1]^2$. Using the functions (20) we can generate a volumetric object $V = F_G(\xi)$ by way of the geometrical map $F_G$ such that

$$F_G(\xi) = \sum_{i\in I} C_i B_i(\xi) \quad \forall \xi \in \mathcal{S} \quad (21)$$

where $C_i \in \mathbb{R}^2$ are the control points and

$$I = \{ i = (i^{(1)}, i^{(2)}) \in \mathbb{N}^2, \; i^{(k)} = 1, \ldots, n^{(k)} + p^{(k)} + 1 \} \quad (22)$$
3.2.3. Non-Uniform Rational B-Splines (NURBS)

NURBS geometrical objects in $\mathbb{R}^d$ are projective transformations of B-Spline geometrical entities in $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$. Let $\mathbf{C}_i \in \mathbb{R}^2$ be a set of control points in two-dimensional space and $w_i$ a set of positive real numbers called weights such that $(\mathbf{C}_i, w_i) \in \mathbb{R}^3$. We define the following B-Spline geometrical object in $\mathbb{R}^3$ as,

$$\hat{V} = \hat{F}(\Xi)$$

where

$$\hat{F}(\xi) = \sum_{i \in I} (\mathbf{C}_i, w_i) B_i(\xi), \quad \xi \in \Xi$$

Let $\hat{C}_i \in \mathbb{R}^2$ be a set of control points in two-dimensional space and $\omega_i$ a set of positive real numbers called weights such that $(\hat{C}_i, \omega_i) \in \mathbb{R}^3$. We define the following B-Spline geometrical object in $\mathbb{R}^3$ as,

$$\hat{V} = \hat{F}(\Xi)$$

where the geometrical mapping $F$ is defined as,

$$F(\xi) = \sum_{i \in I} \hat{C}_i \omega_i B_i(\xi), \quad \xi \in \Xi$$

Denoting,

$$\hat{C}_i = \hat{C}_i \omega_i, \quad W(\xi) = \sum_{i \in I} \omega_i B_i(\xi), \quad R_i(\xi) = \frac{\omega_i B_i(\xi)}{W(\xi)}$$

denote that

$$F(\xi) = \sum_{i \in I} \hat{C}_i R_i(\xi), \quad \xi \in \Xi$$

We will call $R_i, i \in I$, NURBS basis functions in parametric space.

3.2.4. Discrete space

NURBS basis functions in physical space are defined as the push forward of the functions $R_i, i \in I$. The discrete space that we will use for our numerical method is the space spanned by those functions, namely

$$V^h = \text{span}\{ R_i \circ F^{-1}, i \in I \}$$

where the superscript $h$ denotes the mesh-size and also indicates that $V^h$ is a finite-dimensional discrete space. Approximation properties of $V^h$ depend on the mesh-size: we refer to [19] for the mathematical details.

3.2.5. Collocation strategy

In order to motivate our collocation scheme for the spatial discretization, we first discuss the one-dimensional fourth-order toy problem

$$\frac{\partial^4}{\partial \xi^4} \phi(\xi) = g(\xi), \quad \forall \xi \in (0, 1)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \phi(0) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \phi(1) = 0$$

$$\frac{\partial^3}{\partial \xi^3} \phi(0) = \frac{\partial^3}{\partial \xi^3} \phi(1) = 0$$

where $g$ is a continuous function on $(0, 1)$ and $\phi$ is the unknown. Assume that we look for an approximate solution $\phi^h \in \text{span}\{B_{i,p}\}_{i=1, \ldots, n}$, that is, a degree $p$, dimension $n$, spline on a given knot vector. It is understood that the spline regularity is at least $C^4$ and therefore the degree is $p > 4$. Because of the boundary conditions (31)–(32) that account for 4 independent equations, we have to derive $n - 4$ equations from (30). In the collocation setting, we need to introduce collocation points, denoted by $\hat{\xi}_j$, for $j = 3, \ldots, n - 2$, and set

$$\frac{\partial^4}{\partial \xi^4} \phi^h(\hat{\xi}_j) = g(\hat{\xi}_j), \quad \forall j = 3, \ldots, n - 2$$

Notice that (33) are indeed $n - 4$ equations, and with the two boundary conditions at 0 (which can be associated to $j = 1, 2$) and at 1 (which can be associated to $j = n - 1, n$) we have a square linear system. Notice also that (33) is an interpolation
problem on fourth-order derivative of splines, that is, for splines of degree \( p - 4 \) on the same knot vector. A natural choice is then to select suitable interpolation points for the space \( \text{span}\{B_{i,p-4}\}_{i=3,...,n-2} \) as \( \hat{r}_j \). One possibility is then to select Greville sites \([34]\) for degree \( p - 4 \) splines, that is,

\[
\hat{r}_j = \frac{1}{p - 4} \sum_{i=j+3}^{j+p-2} \xi_i \tag{34}
\]

Observe that, from the open knot vector property, the first and last collocation points above are the interval endpoints, that is \( \hat{r}_3 = 0 \) and \( \hat{r}_{n-2} = 1 \).

If the differential operator included lower-order terms (e.g., second-order derivatives or zero-order terms as in Eq. (16)), then (34) would still be a valid choice. Indeed, following e.g. the argument of [8], one can prove the convergence of such a scheme under suitable assumptions.

For the time-discrete Cahn–Hilliard equation in two dimensions, the problem to be addressed is (16). Assuming that the right-hand side of Eq. (16) is known, we look for a discrete solution such that

\[
\begin{align*}
\nabla u \cdot n &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial \Omega, \\
\nabla (\Delta u) \cdot n &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial \Omega,
\end{align*}
\tag{35-37}
\]

Then, we set the collocation points on the parametric domain as the tensor product of (34), that is

\[
\hat{r}_v^C = \left( \frac{1}{p^{(1)} - 4} \sum_{i=j^{(1)}+3}^{j^{(1)}+p^{(1)}-2} \xi_i^{(1)}, \frac{1}{p^{(2)} - 4} \sum_{i=j^{(2)}+3}^{j^{(2)}+p^{(2)}-2} \xi_i^{(2)} \right), \quad v \equiv (j^{(1)}, j^{(2)}) \in T^C
\tag{39}
\]

where the index set is

\[
T^C = \{3, \ldots, n^{(1)} - 2\} \times \{3, \ldots, n^{(2)} - 2\}
\]

The collocation points (39) for a particular example can be observed in Fig. 1. If the computational domain is a mapped geometry \( V \), the collocation points on \( V \) are the push-forward of (39)

\[
\hat{r}_v^C = F(\hat{r}_v^C)
\tag{40}
\]

where \( F \) is the NURBS mapping defined in Eq. (26). Finally, we collocate equation (35) as

\[
u^h(\hat{r}_v^C) - a \Delta u^h(\hat{r}_v^C) + b \Delta^2 u^h(\hat{r}_v^C) = r(\hat{r}_v), \quad \forall v \in T^C
\tag{41}
\]

Boundary conditions as (36) and (37), or of more general kind, can be imposed by interpolation. For this purpose, we introduce on the boundary of the parametric domain \([0, 1]^2\) the Greville sites for degree \( p \) splines, that is

\[
\{ \hat{r}_v^{BC} : v \in T^{BC} \} = \left\{ \left( \frac{1}{p^{(1)}} \sum_{i=j^{(1)}+1}^{j^{(1)}+p^{(1)}-1} \xi_i^{(1)}, 0 \right), \quad j^{(1)} \in \{1, \ldots, n^{(1)}\} \right\} \cup \left\{ \left( \frac{1}{p^{(1)}} \sum_{i=j^{(1)}+1}^{j^{(1)}+p^{(1)}-1} \xi_i^{(1)}, 1 \right), \quad j^{(1)} \in \{1, \ldots, n^{(1)}\} \right\} \cup \left\{ \left( 0, \frac{1}{p^{(2)}} \sum_{i=j^{(2)}+1}^{j^{(2)}+p^{(2)}-1} \xi_i^{(2)} \right), \quad j^{(2)} \in \{2, \ldots, n^{(2)} - 1\} \right\} \cup \left\{ \left( 1, \frac{1}{p^{(2)}} \sum_{i=j^{(2)}+1}^{j^{(2)}+p^{(2)}-1} \xi_i^{(2)} \right), \quad j^{(2)} \in \{2, \ldots, n^{(2)} - 1\} \right\}
\tag{42}
\]
where the first two line sets refer to the $2n^{(1)}$ points on the two horizontal edges of $[0, 1]^2$, and include the four corners, while the third and fourth line sets refer to the $2n^{(2)} - 4$ points on the two vertical edges of $[0, 1]^2$, this time excluding corners (see Fig. 1). The index set $\mathcal{I}^{BC}$ is suitably defined to account for all points in (42). Again the interpolation points on $\partial V$ are the push-forward of (42)

$$\tau_v^{BC} = \mathbf{F}(\tau_v^{BC})$$

and then we interpolate the boundary conditions (36) and (37) at the $\tau_v^{BC}$,

$$\nabla u^h(\tau_v^{BC}) \cdot n = 0, \quad \forall \nu \in \mathcal{I}^{BC}$$

$$\nabla (\Delta u^h) (\tau_v^{BC}) \cdot n = 0, \quad \forall \nu \in \mathcal{I}^{BC}$$

(44) (45)

At the four corners of $V$, the normal vector $n$ that appears in (44)–(45) is understood in an averaged sense. We note now that (41) and (44)–(45) give a total of

$$#\mathcal{I}^C + #\mathcal{I}^{BC} + #\mathcal{I}^{BC} = (n^{(1)} - 4)(n^{(2)} - 4) + 4n^{(1)} + 4n^{(2)} - 8 = n^{(1)}n^{(2)} + 8$$

linear equations. Comparing to (38), it is understood that we need to reduce the number of equations. We propose the following strategy; at each corner, we average the three equations (45) that are associated to the corner point and the two adjacent points (see Fig. 1). This idea seems adequate to deal with all kind of possible boundary conditions, and even though at this stage a proof of convergence is not available, our numerical examples demonstrate the viability of the approach.

To summarize, our fully discrete algorithm is as follows: Given $u^h$, find $u^h_{n+1} \in \mathcal{V}^h$ such that

$$u^h_{n+1}(\tau_v^C) - 2\beta \delta_n \Delta u^h_{n+1}(\tau_v^C) + \epsilon^2 \delta_n \Delta^2 u^h_{n+1}(\tau_v^C)$$

$$= u^h_n(\tau_v^C) + 6\alpha \delta_n u^h_n(\tau_v^C) |\nabla u^h_n(\tau_v^C)|^2 + 3\alpha (\alpha u^h_n(\tau_v^C)^2 - \beta) \Delta u^h_n(\tau_v^C), \quad \forall \nu \in \mathcal{I}^C$$

$$\nabla (u^h_{n+1}(\tau_v^{BC})) \cdot n = 0, \quad \forall \nu \in \mathcal{I}^{BC}$$

$$\nabla (\Delta u^h_{n+1}(\tau_v^{BC})) \cdot n = 0, \quad \forall \nu \in \mathcal{I}^{BC} \text{ with averaging at corners}$$

(46)

An example of selection of collocation and interpolation points is shown in Fig. 1.

4. Numerical examples

Here we present a set of numerical examples that show the accuracy, efficiency, robustness, and geometrical flexibility of our approach. For all the numerical examples we will take $\alpha = \beta = 1$ in Eq. (2), which leads to the stable homogeneous solutions $u = \pm 1$. We will use $p = 5$ in all the numerical examples.
4.1. Accuracy test

Exact solutions to the Cahn–Hilliard equation are not available in several spatial dimensions. For this reason, we will take an adequate initial condition and solve the initial–boundary value problem (7)–(11) in two dimensions using a sufficiently small time step. We will compute the solution using different-size spatial discretizations and observe how the solution converges as we refine the spatial discretization. Following [76], we will take an initial condition for which we can anticipate the behavior of the solution at early times. For this purpose, we linearize the Cahn–Hilliard equation with respect to a given concentration \( \bar{u} \) within the miscibility gap, and derive the partial differential equation

\[
\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = f'(\bar{u}) \Delta u - \varepsilon^2 \Delta^2 u
\]  
(47)

which approximately describes the early-time dynamics of the Cahn–Hilliard equation [6]. Now, we perform a linear stability analysis of Eq. (47) using small perturbations of the concentration \( \bar{u} \). In particular, we take

\[
u_0 = \bar{u} + \eta \cos(2\pi x/\lambda)e^{i\omega t}; \quad \eta \ll \bar{u}
\]  
(48)

Substituting (48) in (47), we obtain an expression for the growth factor \( \omega \), namely,

\[
\omega = -\left(\frac{2\pi}{\lambda}\right)^2 \left[f'(\bar{u}) + \varepsilon^2 \left(\frac{2\pi}{\lambda}\right)^2\right]
\]  
(49)

The growth of perturbations requires \( \omega > 0 \), which for the remaining parameters being fixed, is achieved for

\[
\lambda > \lambda_{\text{min}} = \frac{2\pi \varepsilon}{\sqrt{-f'(\bar{u})}}
\]  
(50)

Note that Eq. (50) is well defined because \( \bar{u} \) is in the miscibility gap, and, thus \( f'(\bar{u}) < 0 \). The fastest-growing mode can be obtained by maximizing \( \omega \) with respect to \( \lambda \). This mode is termed critical mode and is given by a wavelength \( \lambda_{\text{cr}} \) such that

\[
\lambda_{\text{cr}} = \sqrt{2}\lambda_{\text{min}}
\]  
(51)

Substituting (51) in Eq. (49), we get the largest growth factor

\[
\omega_{\text{cr}} = \frac{f'(\bar{u})}{4\varepsilon^2}
\]  
(52)

For the above stated reasons, we will take as initial condition for our initial–boundary value problem the function

\[
u_0(x, y) = \bar{u} + \eta \cos(2\pi x) \cos(2\pi y)
\]  
(53)

where \( \bar{u} = 0 \) and \( \eta = 0.1 \). Now, we will select the parameters of the Cahn–Hilliard equation so as to make the perturbations in (53) the most unstable mode. Using Eqs. (50) and (51), we conclude that this amounts to take the computational domain \( \Omega = [0, 1]^2 \) and \( \varepsilon = 1/(4\sqrt{2}\pi) \). Taking this initial condition we expect the perturbation to grow, without creating new wavelengths, at least until the equilibrium concentrations \( (u = \pm 1) \) are reached. The linear analysis predicts that this will happen at a time \( t_s \) such that the amplification factor \( e^{\omega_{\text{cr}}t_s} \) takes the value 10. This yields a linear time scale of the order \( t_s \approx 3 \cdot 10^{-2} \). After that time, the solution might bifurcate into a coarser arrangement. We have actually verified numerically that the solution achieves the equilibrium concentrations approximately at time \( t \approx 5 \cdot 10^{-2} \). After that, the solution remains practically time independent until time \( t_b \approx 0.2 \) when it bifurcates and undergoes the typical coarsening process.

Following [76] the numerical solutions coming from different refinements will be compared at \( t = 0.08 \). We will use discretizations arising from uniform meshes composed of \( 16^2, 32^2, 64^2, \) and \( 128^2 \) control points. The time step is \( \delta = 10^{-4} \). To use exactly the same initial condition for all the refinements we proceed as follows: we project the function (53) onto the coarsest discretization, and then use standard knot insertion algorithms to produce identical functions on finer discretizations. This can be achieved because knot insertion generates nested discretizations in which richer spaces are supersets of coarser discretizations.

Fig. 2(a) shows the initial condition, while Fig. 2(b) presents the numerical solution on the \( 128^2 \) discretization (note that the color scale is different). The numerical solutions on the coarser meshes are almost indistinguishable from that on the \( 128^2 \) mesh. To make the differences apparent, we take horizontal cutlines of the solution at \( y = 0.5 \) and plot them in Fig. 3. The plot shows that the solutions on different discretizations are superposed at the natural scale of the plot. Only when we zoom in (see the inset) are we able to observe differences. In the inset, it is observed that the numerical approximation
Fig. 2. Accuracy test. The initial condition, shown in panel (a), represents the most unstable mode for the Cahn–Hilliard equation in the linear regime. When we advance the solution in time, the perturbations with respect to the homogeneous state \( u = 0 \) grow leading to the solution in panel (b) at time \( t = 0.08 \) (note that the color scale is different). We computed the solution on meshes composed of 16\(^2\), 32\(^2\), 64\(^2\), and 128\(^2\) control points, and they were almost indistinguishable at the scale of the plot (here we show the solution on the finest mesh).

Fig. 3. Accuracy test. Comparison of the numerical solutions computed on uniform meshes composed of 16\(^2\), 32\(^2\), 64\(^2\), and 128\(^2\) control points. We took horizontal cutlines (at \( y = 0.5 \)) of the solution to the problem shown in Fig. 2(b). The inset shows an amplified view of the interval \( x \in [0.4, 0.6] \).

converges to a function, which we assume to be the exact solution. As we refine the mesh, the approximations get closer to the solution on the 128\(^2\) discretization.

4.2. Phase separation on a square domain

A homogeneous mixture of two fluids is unstable under thermal fluctuations within the so-called miscibility gap. This phenomenon is reproduced by the Cahn–Hilliard equation. A standard linear stability analysis of the Cahn–Hilliard equation reveals that homogeneous states that fall into the so-called spinodal region are unstable solutions that bifurcate into lower-free-energy states in which both phases are fully separated.

This section presents several numerical examples showing the two main separation mechanisms, namely, spinodal decomposition and nucleation.\(^2\) The relevant mechanism in the Cahn–Hilliard equation will be defined by the initial condition. We take \( u_0(x) = \bar{u} + r \), where \( \bar{u} \) is a constant and \( r \) is random number uniformly distributed on \([-0.005, 0.005]\). For \( \bar{u} = 0 \),

\(^2\) In condensed matter physics literature, the word nucleation refers to the traversing of a free-energy barrier to form a new phase.
Fig. 4. Phase separation on a square domain. The governing separation mechanism is spinodal decomposition. The mixture separates from a randomly perturbed homogeneous state ($u = 0$) giving rise to a striped pattern of complicated topology that coarsens over time. The mesh is composed of $512^2$ control points. The parameters are $\varepsilon^2 = \delta = 10^{-5}$.

spinodal decomposition will be the governing separation mechanism, while for $\bar{u} \neq 0$ but within the miscibility gap, nucleation will take place. For these simulations we employ a uniform mesh composed of $512^2$ control points and a constant time step $\delta = 10^{-5}$.

In the first calculation we take $u = 0$, and let the solution evolve. The time history of the phase variable $u$ may be observed in Fig. 4. The different snapshots show the typical spinodal decomposition spatial structure. The mixture separates forming a complicated striped pattern that coarsens over time. As shown in [44], if we let the simulation evolve, the stationary solution would be a fully separated flow with two rectangular patches.

In Fig. 5, we show the solution for $\bar{u} = 0.4$. The rest of the parameters remain the same as in the last calculation. We observe in Fig. 5 that now the separation mechanism is nucleation. Isolated nuclei come up from the mixture. Again, the spatial microstructure of the mixture coarsens over time. We observe that large bubbles grow at the expense of small bubbles in consistency with the phenomenon of Ostwald ripening.

Finally, we present another example that mixes both separation mechanisms. In this case, we do not take $\bar{u}$ as a constant, but we vary it linearly with the horizontal spatial coordinate from $-1$ to $1$. This setting gives rise to three different morphologies as shown in Fig. 6. On the left-hand side of the domain, the red phase nucleates into the blue one. The exact opposite occurs on the right-hand side. In the middle, where $\bar{u} \approx 0$, we observe again the striped pattern typical
Fig. 5. Phase separation on a square domain. The governing separation mechanism is nucleation. The mixture separates from a randomly perturbed homogeneous state \((u = 0.4)\) giving rise to a spatial structure composed of isolated circular patches whose size increases with time. The mesh is composed of 512² control points. The parameters are \(\varepsilon² = \delta = 10^{-5}\).

From spinodal decomposition. We also notice two vertical fronts that move symmetrically to the vertical boundaries of the domain \((x = 0 \text{ and } x = 1)\). The reason for this is that close to those boundaries, the initial condition approaches the pure phases which are stable solutions of the Cahn–Hilliard equation. Thus, phase separation on those parts of the domain is very slow or even inexistent. Fig. 7 shows the time evolution of the free-energy functional \(G\) for the spinodal decomposition (Fig. 7(a)), the nucleation example (Fig. 7(b)), and the mixed decomposition (Fig. 7(c)). We observe that the free energy is decreasing at all times, which is consistent with the behavior of the exact solution.

4.3. Rupture of thin liquid columns during phase separation

In this example we use the Cahn–Hilliard equation to simulate the rupture of thin liquid columns during phase separation. The computational mesh is composed of 512² control points and the time step is \(\delta = 10^{-5}\). We embed into a fully separated phase \((u = -1)\) three columns of a mixture with a concentration in the miscibility gap, as shown in Fig. 8(a). The thickness of the liquid columns is 0.05 with sinusoidal perturbations. The three columns are composed of mixtures with different concentrations, leading to different rupture topologies as shown in the snapshots of Fig. 8. The liquid column on the left is defined by the concentration \(-0.26\), the one in the middle by \(-0.32\), and that on the right by \(-0.38\).
is shown in the simulation that the closer to the spinodal decomposition regime the column concentration is, the more elongated the drops are (left column). As we approach the nucleation regime (right column), the drops become isolated circular spots as one would expect. Finally, we note that Fig. 9 shows that the free energy of the discrete solution is time decreasing.

4.4. Phase separation on mapped domains

Here we show the geometrical flexibility of our method by solving the Cahn–Hilliard equation on mapped geometries. We will illustrate the methodology using a quarter of an annulus and a circle, but more general geometries can be utilized. The NURBS geometrical mapping that transforms the parametric space (a square) into a quarter of an annulus can be found, for example, in [28]. The mapping that transforms the parametric domain into a circle can be found in [74]. We wish to emphasize that, due to the use of NURBS, the geometrical representation of the computational domain is exact. To apply our collocation method on the mapped geometry, the partial derivatives of the discrete solution in the physical space are obtained simply using the chain rule.
Fig. 7. Phase separation on a square domain. Time evolution of the free energy functional $G$ of the discrete solution. We observe that $G$ is monotonically decreasing, indicating that the discrete solution respects the underlying physics of the problem. Panel (a) corresponds to the spinodal decomposition. The parameters are $\varepsilon^2 = \delta = 10^{-5}$ and $\Pi = 0$. Panel (b) corresponds to nucleation. The parameters are $\varepsilon^2 = \delta = 10^{-5}$ and $\Pi = 0.4$. Panel (c) corresponds to the mixed separation mechanism in which spinodal decomposition and nucleation take place simultaneously. The parameters are $\varepsilon^2 = \delta = 10^{-5}$ and $\Pi = 2(x - 0.5)$.

4.4.1. Phase separation on a quarter of an annulus

In this example, we take an annulus with internal radius $r_i = 1$ and external radius $r_e = 4$. The mesh is composed of $256^2$ control points and the time step is $\delta = 10^{-4}$. The interface length scale is given by $\varepsilon^2 = 10^{-3}$. We solve a nucleation example taking as initial condition a random perturbation of the homogeneous state $\Pi = 0.4$. Fig. 10 shows snapshots of the time history of the numerical solution. We observe again the typical spatial pattern of nucleation in which bigger bubbles grow at the expense of smaller bubbles, leading to microstructure coarsening over time.

4.4.2. Phase separation on a circle

In this final example, we consider a circle of radius $r = 4$. We remark that the adopted mapping [74] gives rise to four singular points lying on the boundary of the domain. Such points naturally lack the minimum regularity required for the imposition of Neumann boundary conditions. This kind of problems can be simply solved for instance by resorting to multi-patch geometries comprised of regular patches. Multi-patch conditions for isogeometric collocation have been discussed and successfully applied in the framework of elasticity [9], but it is out of the scope of the present paper to extend them to the case under investigation.

However, we decided to consider this problem to have the opportunity to illustrate the flexibility of our method with respect to boundary conditions, showing how to impose in a simple and straightforward way Dirichlet conditions (which
Fig. 8. Rupture of thin liquid columns during phase separation. The images show how different mixture concentration in the liquid columns lead to different rupture patterns. The mesh is composed on $512^2$ control points. The parameters are $\varepsilon^2 = \delta = 10^{-5}$. As initial condition we will take a random perturbation of the homogeneous state $\bar{u} = 0$. Then, to make the boundary conditions compatible with the initial conditions, we take $u_D = 0$ in (8). As a consequence, we have to impose (8) and (10) on the boundary. These boundary conditions can be imposed strongly in the spline space $V_h$ by removing the basis functions that are not zero or have not zero derivatives at the boundary (as shown in [7] in the context of the solution of different fourth order PDEs by means of standard Galerkin-based isogeometric analysis). The computational mesh is composed of $256^2$ control points, and the time step is $\delta = 10^{-4}$. The interface length scale is given by $\varepsilon^2 = 10^{-3}$. The time history of the phase variable is shown in Fig. 11 which shows the coarsening dynamics of the mixture subjected to Dirichlet boundary conditions. Fig. 12 shows the time evolution of the free energy for the numerical examples on mapped geometries. We note that the free energy is time decreasing in both cases, although for the example on a circle that does not have to be necessarily the case, because that property no longer holds for the exact solution when Dirichlet boundary conditions are imposed.

---

Footnote 3: We remark that the strategy described in Section 3.2.5 can be successfully used also to impose Dirichlet boundary conditions. However, since the strategy proposed here is a simple and straightforward alternative which is also able to deal with Dirichlet conditions on a boundary with singular points, we believe that it is worthwhile to show an example where it is used.
Fig. 9. Phase separation on a square domain. We plot the time evolution of the free energy functional $G$, which is monotonically decreasing. This behavior is consistent with that of the exact solution. The parameters are $\varepsilon^2 = 10^{-5}$.

Fig. 10. Nucleation on a quarter of an annulus. The exterior radius is $r_e = 4$, while the interior is $r_i = 1$. The mixture separates from a randomly perturbed homogeneous state $\bar{u} = 0.4$. The mesh is composed of $256^2$ control points. The parameters are $\varepsilon^2 = 10^{-3}$ and $\delta = 10^{-4}$.
Fig. 11. Spinodal decomposition on a circle of radius $r = 4$. We use homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions and let the mixture separate from a randomly perturbed uniform solution $\bar{u} = 0$. The computational mesh is composed of $256^2$ control points and the time step is $\delta = 10^{-4}$. The interface length scale is given by $\varepsilon^2 = 10^{-3}$.

5. Conclusions

We have presented isogeometric collocation methods for phase-field models. We have illustrated the ideas behind our method by discretizing the Cahn–Hilliard equation, which is one of the most widely utilized phase-field models. We have presented several numerical examples involving the phase separation of two-phase immiscible systems. The numerical examples show the accuracy, efficiency, and geometrical flexibility of our method, which we believe successfully combines geometrical flexibility with simplicity and efficiency.
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