A Multilayer Shallow Water Approach for Polydisperse Sedimentation with Sediment Compressibility and Mixture Viscosity

Raimund Bürger¹ · Enrique D. Fernández-Nieto² · Víctor Osóres¹

Abstract

A three-dimensional multilayer shallow water approach to study polydisperse sedimentation and sediment transport in a viscous fluid is presented. The fluid is assumed to be loaded with finely dispersed solid particles that belong to a finite number of species that differ in density and size. The model formulation allows one to recover the global mass and linear momentum balance laws of the mixture. The model incorporates compressibility of the sediment and viscosity of the mixture through a viscous stress tensor. As a consequence of a dimensional analysis applied to the global mass conservation and linear momentum balance equations, the horizontal components of the compression term and the horizontal terms of the viscous stress tensor may be neglected. This results in a final model that is vertically consistent with the classical one-dimensional vertical model. Numerical simulations illustrate the coupled solids volume fraction and flow fields in various scenarios and the effect of the compressibility and viscosity terms. Various bottom topographies give rise to recirculation of the fluid and high solids volume fractions on the bottom.

Keywords Multilayer shallow water model · Polydisperse sedimentation · Nonconservative products · Path-conservative method · Sediment compressibility · Mixture viscosity · Recirculation

Mathematics Subject Classification 65N06 · 76T20

✉ Víctor Osóres
victorosores@udec.cl

Raimund Bürger
rburger@ing-mat.udec.cl

Enrique D. Fernández-Nieto
edofer@us.es

¹ CI2MA and Departamento de Ingeniería Matemática, Facultad de Ciencias Físicas y Matemáticas, Universidad de Concepción, Casilla 160-C, Concepción, Chile

² Departamento de Matemática Aplicada I, ETS Arquitectura, Universidad de Sevilla, Avda. Reina Mercedes No. 2, 41012 Sevilla, Spain

1 Introduction

1.1 Scope

Mathematical models for the sedimentation of small particles suspended in a viscous fluid combined with the flow of the solid–fluid mixture are important to describe geophysical processes such as settling and sediment transport in rivers and estuaries as well as industrial applications in mineral processing, wastewater treatment, and other fields [3,5,16,23,26]. It is frequently assumed that the volume fractions (concentrations) of the solid species are constant in each horizontal cross section, wall effects are neglected, and all field variables are assumed to depend on the vertical coordinate and time only. These assumptions lead to a one-dimensional vertical model that is aligned with the gravity body force [9,13,14], which is adequate for models of unit operations in industrial applications. In this work we are interested in modeling polydisperse sedimentation processes that not only depend on the vertical direction (in which the species segregate), but that are subject to significant bulk flow in two horizontal directions.

In [10] we introduced a multilayer shallow water model for polydisperse sedimentation without viscous stress tensor and sediment compressibility. The goal is here to introduce these terms and to solve the resulting model numerically. In [11,24] the authors included terms accounting for sediment compressibility to one-dimensional sedimentation models. A theory of polydisperse sedimentation with compressibility terms was developed in [4] for a three-dimensional setting, but numerical results were presented for one space dimension only. Efficient implicit–explicit (IMEX) numerical techniques to solve the one-dimensional sedimentation model with compressibility terms and related strongly degenerate parabolic–hyperbolic equations are presented in [6,7,12].

Multilayer models are designed to avoid solving a fully three-dimensional model (such as the three-dimensional Navier–Stokes equations for an incompressible fluid) and are based on the so-called shallow water or Saint-Venant approach, that is, a vertically integrated version of the underlying model [1,2,27]. The multilayer approach consists in subdividing the computational domain into M layers in the vertical direction, which leads to a system of Saint-Venant equations. Under typical assumptions the unknowns are horizontal velocities by layer, the total height of the fluid column, and the solids concentrations for each species in each layer and in some cases as in [10] the total mass of the mixture. The vertical velocity of the mixture in each layer can be calculated by post-processing data, and we do not need to solve a partial differential equation (PDE) to obtain this quantity.

It is the purpose of this paper to develop a multilayer shallow water model for three-dimensional polydisperse sedimentation process with the property that is possible to recover the mass and linear momentum balance laws of the mixture, which means that the mixture description is consistent with a single-phase flow model. Furthermore, and in contrast to previous efforts [10,17], sediment compressibility and viscosity of the mixture are taken into account. As in [10] we use a mass-average velocity and definition for total density of the mixture such that is possible to recover global mass and linear momentum balance of the mixture. The novelty of the present work, besides the introduction of the compressibility and mixture viscosity terms and their numerical treatment, is the use of a rotational invariance property of the equations to design the numerical method.

1.2 Outline of the Paper

The paper is organized as follows. In Sect. 2 we introduce the PDEs governing polydisperse sedimentation coupled with the multilayer shallow water approach, introducing the continuity and the linear momentum balances equations for the solids, fluid phases and for the mixture in Sect. 2.1. In Sect. 2.2 we define the solid-fluid relative velocity for each solid phase. These velocities incorporate the effective solid stress and the modified form of the Masliyah–Lockett–Bassoon (MLB; [21,22]) model introduced in [10]. The effective solid stress is only active during consolidation, that is wherever the local total solids volume fraction ϕ exceeds a critical concentration or gel point ϕ_c . The final form of the multilayer approach with sediment compressibility and mixture viscosity is summarized in Sect. 2.3. A dimensional analysis is applied to mass and linear momentum balance equations in Sect. 3 in order to attain a simplified system of governing PDEs. The notation used in [10], and which is also employed here, for layers, interfaces, and boundaries of the multilayer approach is summarized in Sects. 4.1 and 4.2. The notion of a weak solution to the governing multilayer PDEs, based on appropriate jump conditions across the each interface between adjacent layers, is introduced in Sect. 4.3. Mass and linear momentum jump conditions across the interlayer interfaces and the approximation of viscous stress tensors at the interfaces are computed in Sect. 4.4. To finish this section, in Sect. 4.5 we explain how vertical velocities of the mixture in each layer are recovered by post-processing of data. The multilayer model that will eventually be solved is derived in Sect. 5. To this end we introduce in Sect. 5.1 the assumption of a hydrostatic pressure. Then we recall that the multilayer approach arises from a variational formulation of the balance equations, and notice that the multilayer model is a particular weak solution of these variational identities. The corresponding weak formulation is introduced in Sect. 5.2. Then, in Sect. 5.3 we use the dimensional analysis done in Sect. 3 to compute the final form of the multilayer model (returning to the original variables). Finally, the model is closed in Sect. 5.4 by establishing that the thickness of each layer is a fixed fraction of the total height of the fluid, and the final form of the equations that will actually be solved is developed. In Sect. 6 we formulate a 2D numerical scheme to solve this model by using the rotational invariance property of the system to solve and simulate polydisperse sedimentation process over different scenarios. Finally in Sect. 7 we present four numerical examples. First, in Sect. 7.1 we simulate a bidisperse sedimentation process in two horizontal space dimensions over a domain with a bump (Test 1), where the compressibility of the sediment and viscosity mixture terms are deactivated. This simulation is the three-dimensional version of [10, Test 3]. In Sect. 7.2 (Test 2) we simulate a cylindrical dam-break bidisperse sedimentation process over a paraboloidal bottom and we compare the behavior of the mixture where the sediment compressibility and mixture viscosity terms are activated and deactivated respectively. In Sect. 7.3 (Test 3) we simulate a bidisperse sedimentation over a real bathymetry. The compression and mixture viscosity terms are activated, and we compare the behavior of the mixture for various values of the critical concentration ϕ_c . Finally, in Sect. 7.4 (Test 4) we simulate the same mixture before but we employ various values of σ_0 keeping $\phi_c = 0.1$ constant. Some conclusions are collected in Sect. 8.

2 Governing Equations

2.1 Continuity Equations and Linear Momentum Balances

Let us consider $N \in \mathbb{N}$ species of spherical solid particles dispersed in a viscous fluid. For each solid species j , $j = 1, \dots, N$, we denote by ϕ_j , ρ_j , and d_j its volumetric concentration, density, and particle diameter, respectively. Furthermore, we denote by $\mathbf{v}_j = (u_j, v_j, w_j)^T \in \mathbb{R}^3$ its phase velocity with the horizontal component $(u_j, v_j) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and vertical component $w_j \in \mathbb{R}$. The same notation is used for the fluid indexed by $j = 0$. The model is based on the continuity and linear momentum balance equations for the N solid species and the fluid. As in [10], the continuity and linear momentum equations are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t(\rho_j \phi_j) + \nabla \cdot (\rho_j \phi_j \mathbf{v}_j) &= 0, \\ \partial_t(\rho_j \phi_j \mathbf{v}_j) + \nabla \cdot (\rho_j \phi_j \mathbf{v}_j \otimes \mathbf{v}_j) &= \nabla \cdot \mathbf{T}_j + \rho_j \phi_j \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{m}_j^f + \mathbf{m}_j^s, \quad j = 0, \dots, N, \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

where $\mathbf{T}_j$ denotes the stress tensor of particle species j , $j = 1, \dots, N$, $\mathbf{T}_0$ that of the fluid, $\mathbf{b}$ is the body force, $\mathbf{m}_j^f$ and $\mathbf{m}_{ji}^s$ are the interaction forces per unit volume between solid species j and the fluid and between the solid species j and i , respectively, and $\mathbf{m}_j^s = \mathbf{m}_{j1}^s + \dots + \mathbf{m}_{jN}^s$ is the particle–particle interaction terms of species j . For the fluid we obtain $\mathbf{m}_0^f = -\mathbf{m}_1^f - \dots - \mathbf{m}_N^f$ and $\mathbf{m}_0^s = 0$. For very low Reynolds numbers there is considerable experimental and theoretical justification [4] for neglecting the quantities $\mathbf{m}_{ji}^s$. Let $\Phi := (\phi_0, \dots, \phi_N)^T$. We define the density $\rho = \rho(\Phi)$ of the mixture and its mass-average velocity $\mathbf{v}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &:= \rho(\Phi) := \rho_0 \phi_0 + \rho_1 \phi_1 + \dots + \rho_N \phi_N, \\ \mathbf{v} &:= (u, v, w)^T := \frac{1}{\rho} \sum_{m=0}^N \rho_m \phi_m \mathbf{v}_m = \frac{1}{\rho} \left[\left(\rho - \sum_{j=1}^N \rho_j \phi_j \right) \mathbf{v}_0 + \sum_{k=1}^N \rho_k \phi_k \mathbf{v}_k \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

The importance of utilizing the mass average velocity $\mathbf{v}$ is that the resulting formulation allows us to recover the global mass and linear momentum balance laws for the mixture. In fact, summing from $j = 0$ to $j = N$ the continuity and linear momentum balance equations (2.1) yields

$$\partial_t \rho + \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{v}) = 0, \quad \partial_t (\rho \mathbf{v}) + \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{v} \otimes \mathbf{v}) = \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\Sigma} + \rho \mathbf{b}, \quad (2.3)$$

where ρ and $\mathbf{v}$ are given by (2.2), and setting $\mathbf{T} := \mathbf{T}_0 + \mathbf{T}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{T}_N$ and defining the diffusion velocities $\mathbf{u}_j^d := \mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{v}$, the stress tensor of the mixture

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma} := \mathbf{T} - \sum_{j=0}^N \rho_j \phi_j \mathbf{u}_j^d \otimes \mathbf{u}_j^d$$

is obtained. The stress tensor of each solid phase can be written as $\mathbf{T}_j = -p_j \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{T}_j^E$, where $p_j = (\phi_j / \phi)(\phi p + \sigma_e(\phi))$ is the pressure of phase j for $j = 1, \dots, N$. For the stress tensor of the fluid we get $p_0 = (1 - \phi)p$. The total concentration of particles is $\phi = \phi_1 + \dots + \phi_N$ and $\mathbf{T}_0^E$ and $\mathbf{T}_j^E$ are viscous stress tensors of the fluid and solid phases, respectively. The effective solid stress $\sigma_e(\phi)$ is given by a material-specific constitutive function. For example, $\sigma_e(\phi)$ can be defined by

$$\sigma_e(\phi) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } \phi \leq \phi_c, \\ \sigma_0 ((\phi / \phi_c)^k - 1) & \text{for } \phi > \phi_c \end{cases} \quad (2.4)$$

with parameters $\sigma_0 > 0$ and $k \geq 1$, and where ϕ_c denotes the so-called critical concentration. Values for real materials for these parameters can be found in the literature. Note that (2.4) implies that

$$\sigma'_e(\phi) := \frac{d\sigma_e(\phi)}{d\phi} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } \phi \leq \phi_c, \\ (\sigma_0/\phi_c^k)k\phi^{k-1} & \text{for } \phi > \phi_c. \end{cases}$$

The solid–fluid interaction force per unit volume is given by $\mathbf{m}_j^f = \alpha_j(\Phi)\mathbf{u}_j + p\nabla\phi_j$, where α_j is the resistance coefficient for the transfer of momentum between the fluid and solid phase species j [4]. Finally here we assume that gravity is the only body force, i.e., $\mathbf{b} = g\mathbf{k}$, where $\mathbf{k}$ is the downward-pointing unit vector.

Defining the slip velocities $\mathbf{u}_j := \mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{v}_0$ (including $\mathbf{u}_0 = \mathbf{0}$) and $\lambda_j := \rho_j\phi_j/\rho$ for $j = 1, \dots, N$, we can derive for each solid species

$$\rho_j\phi_j\mathbf{v}_j = \rho_j\phi_j(\mathbf{u}_j + \mathbf{v} - (\lambda_1\mathbf{u}_1 + \dots + \lambda_N\mathbf{u}_N)), \quad j = 0, \dots, N; \quad (2.5)$$

hence as in [10] the mass and linear momentum equations for all phases are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t(\rho_j\phi_j) + \nabla \cdot (\rho_j\phi_j(\mathbf{u}_j + \mathbf{v} - (\lambda_1\mathbf{u}_1 + \dots + \lambda_N\mathbf{u}_N))) &= 0, \quad j = 0, \dots, N, \\ \rho_j\phi_j D_t \mathbf{v}_j &= \nabla \cdot \mathbf{T}_j^E - \phi_j \nabla p - \rho_j\phi_j g\mathbf{k} + \alpha_j\mathbf{u}_j - \nabla \left(\frac{\phi_j}{\phi} \sigma_e(\phi) \right), \quad j = 1, \dots, N, \\ \rho_0(1 - \phi) D_t \mathbf{v}_0 &= -(1 - \phi) \nabla p + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{T}_0^E + \rho_0(1 - \phi) g\mathbf{k} - (\alpha_1\mathbf{u}_1 + \dots + \alpha_N\mathbf{u}_N), \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

where we have used the standard notation $D_t \mathbf{v} = \partial_t \mathbf{v} + (\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{v}$. The systems (2.1) and (2.6) are equivalent and therefore both allow us to recover (2.3).

2.2 Explicit Formula for the Slip Velocities $\mathbf{u}_j$

The system (2.6) is closed by an explicit expression for the slip velocities $\mathbf{u}_j$. In [4] the explicit formula

$$\mathbf{u}_j = g \frac{\phi_j}{\alpha_j(\Phi)} \left((\bar{\rho}_j - \bar{\rho}^T \Phi) \mathbf{k} + \frac{\sigma_e(\phi)}{g\phi_j} \nabla \left(\frac{\phi_j}{\phi} \right) + \frac{1 - \phi}{g\phi} \nabla \sigma_e(\phi) \right), \quad j = 1, \dots, N \quad (2.7)$$

for these relative velocities was derived, where $\bar{\rho}_j := \rho_j - \rho_0$ for $j = 1, \dots, N$ are reduced densities and $\bar{\rho} := (\bar{\rho}_1, \dots, \bar{\rho}_N)^T$. In [10] we only considered the case $\sigma_e \equiv 0$, that is, sediment compressibility was not taken into account. Thus, the slip velocities used in [10] are the simplest possible, namely

$$\mathbf{u}_j = g \frac{\phi_j}{\alpha_j(\Phi)} (\bar{\rho}_j - \bar{\rho}^T \Phi) \mathbf{k}, \quad j = 1, \dots, N.$$

Following [4, 10, 21, 22] we choose $\phi_j/\alpha_j(\Phi) = -d_j^2 V(\phi)/18\mu_0$, where μ_0 is the viscosity of the pure fluid, and $V(\phi)$ is a hindrance factor that is assumed to satisfy $V(\phi) > 0$ and $V'(\phi) < 0$ for $0 < \phi < \phi_{\max}$. This factor can be chosen as the Richardson–Zaki [25] function

$$V(\phi) = (1 - \phi/\phi_{\max})^{n_{\text{RZ}}-2}, \quad n_{\text{RZ}} > 2. \quad (2.8)$$

Setting $\mu := -gd_1^2/(18\mu_0)$ and $\delta_j := d_j^2/d_1^2$, $j = 1, \dots, N$, we obtain the final form of the slip velocities

$$\mathbf{u}_j = \mu\delta_j V(\phi) \left((\bar{\rho}_j - \bar{\rho}^T \Phi) \mathbf{k} + \frac{\sigma_e(\phi)}{g\phi_j} \nabla \left(\frac{\phi_j}{\phi} \right) + \frac{1-\phi}{g\phi} \nabla \sigma_e(\phi) \right), \quad j = 1, \dots, N. \quad (2.9)$$

Inserting (2.9) into (2.5) and denoting $\Phi := (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_N)^T$, $\delta := (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_N)^T$, and $\lambda := (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N)^T$ we get for each solid species $\rho_j \phi_j \mathbf{v}_j = \rho_j f_j^M(\Phi) \mathbf{k} + \rho_j \phi_j \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{a}_j(\Phi, \nabla \Phi)$, where we define for $j = 1, \dots, N$

$$\begin{aligned} f_j^M(\Phi) &:= \phi_j v_j^{\text{MLB}} = \phi_j \mu V(\phi) \left(\delta_j (\bar{\rho}_j - \bar{\rho}^T \Phi) - \sum_{k=1}^N \lambda_k \delta_k (\bar{\rho}_k - \bar{\rho}^T \Phi) \right), \\ \mathbf{a}_j(\Phi, \nabla \Phi) &:= -\frac{\mu}{g} \rho_j V(\phi) \left\{ \frac{(1-\phi)\phi_j}{\phi} (\delta_j - \delta^T \lambda) \nabla \sigma_e(\phi) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sigma_e(\phi) \left[\delta_j \nabla \left(\frac{\phi_j}{\phi} \right) - \phi_j \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\lambda_i \delta_i}{\phi_i} \nabla \left(\frac{\phi_i}{\phi} \right) \right] \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Consistently with the global mass conservation (2.1), we define $f_0^M := (\rho_1 f_1^M + \dots + \rho_N f_N^M)/\rho_0$ and $\mathbf{a}_0 := -(\mathbf{a}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{a}_N)$.

Note that the velocity of each phase is much more complicated than in the framework of [10]. This new approach poses extreme difficulties for the attempt to solve (2.1). Without going into detail, we do no longer have the property that the horizontal velocity of each species equals that of the mixture. This difficulty will be handled in Sect. 3.

Remark 1 If $\phi \leq \phi_c$, then the horizontal velocity of each species equals that of the mixture and only the vertical velocity of each species differs from that of the mixture, as can be inferred from

$$\rho_j \phi_j w_j = \rho_j \phi_j w + \rho_j f_j^M(\Phi).$$

2.3 Final Form of the Model Equations

The final model is given by the mass and linear momentum balance equations for each species plus the fluid after substituting (2.7) into (2.6). It can be written as

$$\partial_t(\rho_j \phi_j) + \nabla \cdot (\rho_j \phi_j \mathbf{v} + \rho_j f_j^M(\Phi) \mathbf{k}) = \nabla \cdot \mathbf{a}_j(\Phi, \nabla \Phi), \quad j = 0, \dots, N, \quad (2.10)$$

$$\rho_j \phi_j \mathbf{D}_t \mathbf{v}_j = \nabla \cdot \mathbf{T}_j^E - \phi_j \nabla p - \phi_j \rho g \mathbf{k} - \phi_j \nabla \sigma_e(\phi), \quad j = 0, \dots, N. \quad (2.11)$$

Summing up from $j = 0$ to $j = N$ the linear momentum balance equations (2.6) yields

$$\partial_t \left(\sum_{j=0}^N \rho_j \phi_j \mathbf{v}_j \right) + \nabla \cdot \left(\sum_{j=0}^N \rho_j \phi_j \mathbf{v}_j \otimes \mathbf{v}_j \right) = \nabla \cdot \mathbf{T} - \rho g \mathbf{k}, \quad (2.12)$$

where $\mathbf{T} = \sum_{j=0}^N \mathbf{T}_j = -(p + \sigma_e(\phi)) \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{T}^E$, where p is pressure and the extra stress tensor $\mathbf{T}^E$ is given by

$$\mathbf{T}^E = \frac{\eta}{2} \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{v}) + \lambda (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}) \mathbf{I},$$

where $\eta, \lambda \geq 0$ are viscosity terms. The strain rate tensor $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{v})$ is given by $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{v}) = \nabla \mathbf{v} + (\nabla \mathbf{v})^T$.

3 Dimensional Analysis

By a dimensional analysis we now show that only terms in the vertical direction of the extra stress tensor are important. Other terms will be discarded under the assumption of a shallow domain, that is, the characteristic height (H) will be assumed much smaller than the characteristic length (L) such that $\varepsilon := H/L$ is small.

We define the following dimensionless (starred) variables: $(x, y, z) = (Lx^*, Ly^*, Hz^*)$ for spatial position and $t = (L/U)t^*$ for characteristic time. The relation between the spatial gradient ∇ and the dimensionless gradient ∇^* is defined by $\nabla = (1/L)\mathbf{I}_\varepsilon \nabla^*$, where $\mathbf{I}_\varepsilon := \text{diag}(1, 1, 1/\varepsilon)$. The dimensionless time derivative is defined via $\partial/\partial t = (U/L)\partial/\partial t^*$. We use in some cases the following definitions for the velocity vector to simplify notation: $\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon := (u^*, v^*, \varepsilon w^*)$, $\mathbf{v}_{\varepsilon,j} := (u_j^*, v_j^*, \varepsilon w_j^*)$, $\mathbf{v}^* := (u^*, v^*, w^*)$, and $\mathbf{v}_j^* := (u_j^*, v_j^*, w_j^*)$.

Then for height, densities, pressure, and viscosities we have $h = Hh^*$, $\rho_j = \rho_0 \rho_j^*$, $P = \rho_0 U^2 P^*$, $\sigma_\varepsilon = \rho_0 U^2 \sigma_\varepsilon^*$, $\eta = \rho_0 U H \eta^*$, $\lambda = \rho_0 U H \lambda^*$, $\mu_0 = \rho_0 U H \mu_0^*$, $d_1 = H d_1^*$, and $\mu/g = H d_1^*/18\rho_0 U \mu_0^*$. Here ρ_0 is a characteristic density that in this case represents density of the pure fluid. In light of $\mathbf{v}_j = (u_j, v_j, w_j) = U \mathbf{v}_{\varepsilon,j}$, the mass average velocity $\mathbf{v}$ of the mixture satisfies

$$\mathbf{v} = \sum_{j=0}^N \frac{\rho_j \phi_j}{\rho} (u_j, v_j, w_j) = U \sum_{j=0}^N \frac{\rho_j^* \phi_j}{\rho^*} (u_j^*, v_j^*, \varepsilon w_j^*) = U \sum_{j=0}^N \frac{\rho_j^* \phi_j}{\rho^*} \mathbf{v}_{\varepsilon,j} = U \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon.$$

Furthermore, the equalities $\rho_j \phi_j \mathbf{v}_j = \rho_0 U \rho_j^* \phi_j \mathbf{v}_{\varepsilon,j}$ and

$$\rho_j f_j^M(\Phi) \mathbf{k} + \rho_j \phi_j \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{a}_j(\Phi, \nabla \Phi) = \rho_0 U (\rho_j^* (f_j^M(\Phi))^* \mathbf{k} + \rho_j^* \phi_j \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon - \varepsilon \mathbf{I}_\varepsilon \mathbf{a}_j^*(\Phi, \nabla \Phi))$$

imply that

$$\rho_0 U \rho_j^* \phi_j \mathbf{v}_{\varepsilon,j} = \rho_0 U (\rho_j^* (f_j^M(\Phi))^* \mathbf{k} + \rho_j^* \phi_j \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon - \varepsilon \mathbf{I}_\varepsilon \mathbf{a}_j^*(\Phi, \nabla \Phi)). \quad (3.1)$$

In light of the previous equalities, the mass balance of each solid species (2.10) can be written as

$$\frac{\rho_0 U}{L} \partial_{t^*} (\rho_j^* \phi_j) + \frac{\rho_0 U}{L} \nabla^* \cdot (\mathbf{I}_\varepsilon (\rho_j^* \phi_j \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon + \rho_j^* (f_j^M(\Phi))^* \mathbf{k})) = \frac{\rho_0 U}{L} \nabla^* \cdot (\varepsilon \mathbf{I}_\varepsilon^2 \mathbf{a}_j^*). \quad (3.2)$$

We then obtain the dimensionless PDE for the mass balance of each species

$$\partial_{t^*} (\rho_j^* \phi_j) + \nabla^* \cdot \left(\rho_j^* \phi_j \mathbf{v}^* + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \rho_j^* (f_j^M(\Phi))^* \mathbf{k} \right) = \tilde{\nabla} \cdot (\varepsilon \mathbf{I}_\varepsilon^2 \mathbf{a}_j^*), \quad (3.3)$$

or equivalently, applying the matrix $\mathbf{I}_\varepsilon$ to equality (3.1),

$$\partial_{t^*} (\rho_j^* \phi_j) + \nabla^* \cdot (\rho_j^* \phi_j \mathbf{v}_j^*) = 0. \quad (3.4)$$

Furthermore, we define the dimensionless horizontal component of the strain rate

$$\mathbf{D}_{\varepsilon,h}(\mathbf{v}^*) := \nabla_{\mathbf{x}^*}^* \mathbf{v}_h^* + (\nabla_{\mathbf{x}^*}^* \mathbf{v}_h^*)^\top,$$

notice that $\rho_j \phi_j \mathbf{v}_j \otimes \mathbf{v}_j = \rho_0 U^2 \rho_j^* \phi_j \mathbf{v}_{\varepsilon,j} \otimes \mathbf{v}_{\varepsilon,j}$, and rewrite the total pressure $p_{\text{tot}} := p + \sigma_\varepsilon(\phi)$ as $p_{\text{tot}} = \rho_0 U^2 (p^* + (\sigma_\varepsilon(\phi))^*) =: \rho_0 U^2 p_{\text{tot}}^*$ and $\rho g \mathbf{k} = \rho_0 U^2 \rho^* / (\varepsilon \text{Fr}^2 L) \mathbf{k}$, where

the Froude number is given by $\text{Fr} = \sqrt{gH}$, so we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\rho_0 U^2}{L} \partial_t^* \left(\sum_{j=0}^N \rho_j^* \phi_j \mathbf{v}_{\varepsilon,j} \right) + \frac{\rho_0 U^2}{L} \nabla^* \cdot \left(\sum_{j=0}^N \rho_j^* \phi_j \mathbf{v}_{\varepsilon,j} \otimes (\mathbf{I}_\varepsilon \mathbf{v}_{\varepsilon,j}) \right) \\ &= \frac{\rho_0 U^2}{L} \nabla^* \cdot (p_{\text{tot}}^* \mathbf{I} + (\mathbf{T}_\varepsilon^{\text{E}})^*(\mathbf{v}^*)) \mathbf{I}_\varepsilon - \frac{\rho_0 U^2 \rho^*}{L \text{Fr}^2 \varepsilon} \mathbf{k}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

where $(\mathbf{T}_\varepsilon^{\text{E}})^*$ is a dimensionless viscous stress tensor. Finally, setting $\tilde{\mathbf{I}} := \varepsilon \mathbf{I}_\varepsilon$, we may rewrite the dimensionless linear momentum balance equation (3.5) as

$$\partial_t^* \left(\sum_{j=0}^N \rho_j^* \phi_j \mathbf{v}_{\varepsilon,j} \right) + \nabla^* \cdot \left(\sum_{j=0}^N \rho_j^* \phi_j \mathbf{v}_{\varepsilon,j} \otimes \mathbf{v}_j \right) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \nabla^* \cdot (\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \tilde{\mathbf{I}}) - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \frac{\rho^*}{\text{Fr}^2} \mathbf{k}, \quad (3.6)$$

where the dimensionless stress tensor is $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} := p_{\text{tot}}^* \mathbf{I} + (\mathbf{T}_\varepsilon^{\text{E}})^*(\mathbf{v}^*)$ with the dimensionless viscous stress tensor

$$(\mathbf{T}_\varepsilon^{\text{E}})^*(\mathbf{v}^*) = \frac{\eta^*}{2} \mathbf{D}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{v}^*) + 2\varepsilon \lambda^* (\nabla^* \cdot \mathbf{v}^*) \mathbf{I},$$

where

$$\mathbf{D}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{v}^*) := \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon \mathbf{D}_{\varepsilon,h}(\mathbf{v}^*) & \partial_{z^*} \mathbf{v}_h^* + \varepsilon^2 (\nabla_x^* w^*)^T \\ (\partial_{z^*} \mathbf{v}_h^*)^T + \varepsilon^2 \nabla_x^* w^* & 2\varepsilon \partial_{z^*} w^* \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.7)$$

Note that (3.2) and (3.5) allow us to easily change to the original variables. To finish this section, from hereon the star symbol will be omitted to simplify notation. Thus, the final model in dimensionless variables is given by the dimensionless mass balance equations (3.4) of each solid species and by the dimensionless momentum balance equation of the mixture (3.6)

$$\partial_t(\rho_j \phi_j) + \nabla \cdot (\rho_j \phi_j \mathbf{v}_j) = 0, \quad j = 0, \dots, N, \quad (3.8)$$

where

$$\rho_j \phi_j \mathbf{v}_j = \rho_j \phi_j \mathbf{v} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \rho_j f_j^M(\Phi) \mathbf{k} - \varepsilon \mathbf{I}_\varepsilon^2 \mathbf{a}_j \quad (3.9)$$

and the dimensionless momentum balance equation of the mixture is given by

$$\partial_t \left(\sum_{j=0}^N \rho_j \phi_j \mathbf{v}_{\varepsilon,j} \right) + \nabla \cdot \left(\sum_{j=0}^N \rho_j \phi_j \mathbf{v}_{\varepsilon,j} \otimes \mathbf{v}_j \right) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \nabla \cdot (\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \tilde{\mathbf{I}}) - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \frac{\rho}{\text{Fr}^2} \mathbf{k}. \quad (3.10)$$

4 A Multilayer Approach

4.1 Layers, Interfaces, and Boundaries

For a given final time $T > 0$ and each time $t \in [0, T]$ we denote by $\Omega_F(t)$ the fluid domain and by $I_F(t)$ its projection onto the horizontal plane. To introduce a multilayer system, we divide $\Omega_F(t)$ along the vertical direction into $M \in \mathbb{N}$ layers of thickness $h_\alpha(\mathbf{x}, t)$ (see Fig. 1) with $M + 1$ interfaces

$$\Gamma_{\alpha+1/2}(t) = \{(\mathbf{x}, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : z = z_{\alpha+1/2}(\mathbf{x}, t), \mathbf{x} \in I_F(t)\}, \quad \alpha = 0, 1, \dots, M$$

Fig. 1 Sketch of the multilayer approach

We assume that the interfaces $\Gamma_{\alpha+1/2}(t)$ are smooth, concretely at least of class C^1 in time and space. We denote by $z_B = z_{1/2}$ and $z_S = z_{M+1/2}$ the bottom and the free surface interfaces $\Gamma_B(t)$ and $\Gamma_S(t)$, respectively. The thickness of layer α at horizontal position $\mathbf{x}$ at time t is

$$h_\alpha = h_\alpha(\mathbf{x}, t) = z_{\alpha+1/2}(\mathbf{x}, t) - z_{\alpha-1/2}(\mathbf{x}, t), \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, M,$$

such that $z_{\alpha+1/2} = z_B + h_1 + \dots + h_\alpha$ for $\alpha = 1, \dots, M$. Then the height of the fluid is $h := z_S - z_B = h_1 + \dots + h_M$.

The boundary $\partial\Omega_F(t)$ of $\Omega_F(t)$ can be represented as $\partial\Omega_F(t) = \Gamma_B(t) \cup \Gamma_S(t) \cup \Theta(t)$, where $\Theta(t)$ is the inflow/outflow boundary which we assume here to be vertical. The fluid domain is split as $\overline{\Omega_F(t)} = \cup_{\alpha=1}^M \overline{\Omega_\alpha(t)}$, where we define the layers and their boundaries as

$$\Omega_\alpha(t) := \{(\mathbf{x}, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \mathbf{x} \in I_F(t) \text{ and } z_{\alpha-1/2} < z < z_{\alpha+1/2}\},$$

such that $\partial\Omega_\alpha(t) := \Gamma_{\alpha-1/2}(t) \cup \Gamma_{\alpha+1/2}(t) \cup \Theta_\alpha(t)$, where

$$\Theta_\alpha(t) := \{(\mathbf{x}, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \mathbf{x} \in \partial I_F(t) \text{ and } z_{\alpha-1/2} < z < z_{\alpha+1/2}\}.$$

Hence the inflow/outflow boundary is split as $\overline{\Theta(t)} = \cup_{\alpha=1}^M \overline{\Theta_\alpha(t)}$.

4.2 Notation

Based in part on the definition of layers above, we introduce the following notation:

- (i) For two tensors $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{b}$ of sizes (n, m) and (n, p) respectively, we denote by $(\mathbf{a}; \mathbf{b})$ the tensor of size $(n, m + p)$ which is the concatenation of $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{b}$ in this order.
- (ii) For $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_{d-1})$ and the differential operator $\nabla = (\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_{d-1}}, \partial_z)$, we define

$$\bar{\nabla} := (\partial_t; \nabla) = (\partial_t, \partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_{d-1}}, \partial_z), \quad \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} := (\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_{d-1}}).$$

- (iii) For $\alpha = 0, 1, \dots, M$ and for a function f , we set

$$f_{\alpha+1/2}^- := (f|_{\Omega_\alpha(t)})|_{\Gamma_{\alpha+1/2}(t)}, \quad f_{\alpha+1/2}^+ := (f|_{\Omega_{\alpha+1}(t)})|_{\Gamma_{\alpha+1/2}(t)}.$$

If f is continuous across $\Gamma_{\alpha+1/2}(t)$, we simply set $f_{\alpha+1/2} := f|_{\Gamma_{\alpha+1/2}(t)}$. We shall also use the notation

$$\tilde{f}_{\alpha+1/2} := \frac{1}{2}(f_{\alpha+1/2}^+ + f_{\alpha+1/2}^-).$$

- (iv) We denote by $\eta_{\alpha+1/2}$ the spatial unit normal vector to the interface $\Gamma_{\alpha}(t)$ outward to the layer $\Omega_{\alpha}(t)$ for a given time t , that is

$$\eta_{\alpha+1/2} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} z_{\alpha+1/2}|^2}} (\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} z_{\alpha+1/2}, -1)^T, \quad \alpha = 0, \dots, M.$$

Furthermore, $\eta_{\alpha+1/2,t}$ denotes the (space–time) unit normal vector $\Gamma_{\alpha}(t)$ pointing to $\Omega_{\alpha}(t)$, i.e.,

$$\eta_{\alpha+1/2,t} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} z_{\alpha+1/2}|^2 + (\partial_t z_{\alpha+1/2})^2}} (\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} z_{\alpha+1/2}, -1, \partial_t z_{\alpha+1/2})^T, \\ \alpha = 0, \dots, M.$$

- (v) Let $\alpha \in \{1, \dots, M-1\}$, and assume that y is a scalar, vectorial, or tensorial quantity defined in $\Omega_{\alpha}(t)$ and $\Omega_{\alpha+1}(t)$, such that the one-sided limits of y on either side of $\Gamma_{\alpha+1/2}(t)$, that is

$$y_{\alpha+1/2,t}^+ := \lim_{\substack{z \rightarrow z_{\alpha+1/2} \\ z > z_{\alpha+1/2}}} y(\mathbf{x}, z, t), \quad y_{\alpha+1/2,t}^- := \lim_{\substack{z \rightarrow z_{\alpha+1/2} \\ z < z_{\alpha+1/2}}} y(\mathbf{x}, z, t),$$

are well defined. Then we denote by $\llbracket y \rrbracket_{\alpha+1/2,t}$ the jump of y across $\Gamma_{\alpha+1/2}(t)$, that is,

$$\llbracket y \rrbracket_{\alpha+1/2,t} := y_{\alpha+1/2,t}^+ - y_{\alpha+1/2,t}^-.$$

If y does not depend on z within each of the layers $\Omega_{\alpha}(t)$ and $\Omega_{\alpha+1}(t)$, then this implies

$$\llbracket y \rrbracket_{\alpha+1/2,t} = (y|_{\Omega_{\alpha+1}(t)} - y|_{\Omega_{\alpha}(t)})|_{\Gamma_{\alpha+1/2}(t)}. \quad (4.1)$$

Remark 2 If we add the time variable as one more dimension, then the corresponding domain Ω_T is given by $\Omega_T = \{(\mathbf{x}, z, t) : (\mathbf{x}, z) \in \Omega_F(t), t \in (0, T)\}$ with $\partial\Omega_T = \Lambda_T \cup \Lambda_1 \cup \Lambda_2$, where $\Lambda_T = \{(\mathbf{x}, z, t) : (\mathbf{x}, z) \in \partial\Omega_F(t), t \in (0, T)\}$, $\Lambda_1 = \{0\} \times \Omega_F(0)$, and $\Lambda_2 = \{T\} \times \Omega_F(T)$. Since we integrate over $\Omega_F(t)$, we retain here the boundary Λ_T for the computations even if it means cancelling the tests functions over the boundaries Λ_1 and Λ_2 .

4.3 Weak Solution with Discontinuities

Let us recall the conditions to be satisfied by a piecewise smooth weak solution $(v_0, \dots, v_N, \phi_0, \dots, \phi_N, p_{\text{tot}})$ of (3.8)–(3.10), where v_j is defined by (3.9).

Definition 1 Assume that the velocities $v_0, \dots, v_N$, the pressure p_{tot} and the volume fractions $\phi_0, \dots, \phi_N$ are smooth in each $\Omega_{\alpha}(t)$, but possibly discontinuous across the predetermined hypersurfaces $\Gamma_{\alpha+1/2}(t)$ for $\alpha = 1, \dots, M-1$. Then

$$\mathbf{y} := (v_0, \dots, v_N, \phi_0, \dots, \phi_N, p_{\text{tot}}) : \Omega_T \ni (\mathbf{x}, z, t) \mapsto \mathbf{y}(\mathbf{x}, z, t) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}$$

is a *weak solution* of (3.8)–(3.10) if the following conditions hold:

- (i) The function $\mathbf{y}$ is a standard weak solution of (3.8)–(3.10) in each layer $\Omega_{\alpha}(t)$, $\alpha = 1, \dots, M$.

- (ii) For each $\alpha = 1, \dots, M-1$ and $t \in (0, T]$, the following normal flux jump conditions across the interface $\Gamma_{\alpha+1/2}(t)$ are satisfied: for the conservation of mass equations,

$$\left[(\rho_j \phi_j; \rho_j \phi_j \mathbf{v}_j) \right]_{\alpha+1/2,t} \cdot \boldsymbol{\eta}_{\alpha+1/2,t} = 0 \quad \text{for all } j = 1, \dots, N, \quad (4.2)$$

and for the momentum conservation law corresponding to Eq. (3.10),

$$\left[\left(\sum_{j=0}^N \rho_j \phi_j \mathbf{v}_{\varepsilon,j}; \sum_{j=0}^N \rho_j \phi_j \mathbf{v}_{\varepsilon,j} \otimes \mathbf{v}_j - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \tilde{\mathbf{I}} \right) \right]_{\alpha+1/2,t} \cdot \boldsymbol{\eta}_{\alpha+1/2,t} = 0, \quad (4.3)$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = -p_{\text{tot}} \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{T}_{\varepsilon}^{\text{E}} \quad (4.4)$$

is the stress tensor of the mixture and $\mathbf{v}_{\varepsilon,j} = \mathbf{I}_{\varepsilon}^{-1} \mathbf{v}_j$.

There are some different ways to introduce a multilayer model. In [17] for example, the authors integrate the mass and linear momentum equations inside the each layer to define the multilayer model, while in [10] the multilayer approach is deduced as a particular weak solution of a variational formulation. In our case, we extend the results obtained in [10] to get the multilayer model (see Sect. 5). For $\alpha = 1, \dots, M$ and $j = 0, \dots, N$ we set $\mathbf{v}_j|_{\Omega_{\alpha}(t)} := \mathbf{v}_{j,\alpha} := (\mathbf{u}_{j,\alpha}, w_{j,\alpha})^{\text{T}}$ where $\mathbf{u}_{j,\alpha}$ and $w_{j,\alpha}$ are horizontal and vertical velocities respectively, and $\phi_{j,\alpha} := \phi_j|_{\Omega_{\alpha}(t)}$ is the volumetric concentration of species j in layer α . For $\alpha = 1, \dots, M$, $p_{\text{tot},\alpha} := p_{\text{tot}}|_{\Omega_{\alpha}(t)}$ is the pressure and

$$\mathbf{v}_{\alpha} = \frac{1}{\rho_{\alpha}} \sum_{j=0}^N \rho_j \phi_{j,\alpha} \mathbf{v}_{j,\alpha} = (\mathbf{u}_{\alpha}, w_{\alpha})$$

is the mixture velocity of each layer. In both cases we need to assume that the layer thicknesses are small enough to neglect the dependence of the horizontal velocities and the concentration of each species on the vertical coordinate within each layer. This means that

$$\partial_z \mathbf{u}_{j,\alpha} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_z \phi_{j,\alpha} = 0 \quad \text{for all } \alpha = 1, \dots, M \text{ and } j = 0, \dots, N. \quad (4.5)$$

Under this assumption the vertical velocity and the (hydrostatic) pressure are piecewise linear in z , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_z w_{j,\alpha} &= d_{j,\alpha}(\mathbf{x}, t) \quad \text{for all } \alpha = 1, \dots, M \text{ and } j = 0, \dots, N, \\ \partial_z p_{\text{tot},\alpha}(\mathbf{x}, t) &= g_{\alpha}(\mathbf{x}, t) \quad \text{for all } \alpha = 1, \dots, M \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

for some smooth functions $d_{j,\alpha}(t, \mathbf{x})$, and $g_{\alpha}(t, \mathbf{x})$. In the following section we will also use the notation

$$\Phi_{\alpha} := (\phi_{0,\alpha}, \phi_{1,\alpha}, \dots, \phi_{N,\alpha})^{\text{T}} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\rho}_{\alpha} := \rho_0 \phi_{0,\alpha} + \rho_1 \phi_{1,\alpha} + \dots + \rho_N \phi_{N,\alpha}.$$

4.4 Mass and Momentum Conservation Jump Conditions

In what follows we analyze the jump conditions (4.2) and (4.3), where (4.5) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u}_{j,\alpha-1/2}^+(\mathbf{x}) &= \mathbf{u}_{j,\alpha+1/2}^-(\mathbf{x}, t) = \mathbf{u}_{j,\alpha}(\mathbf{x}, t) \quad \text{and} \\ \phi_{j,\alpha-1/2}^+(\mathbf{x}, t) &= \phi_{j,\alpha+1/2}^-(\mathbf{x}, t) = \phi_{j,\alpha}(\mathbf{x}, t). \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

We define the lateral limits of the normal mass flux for species j at the interface $\Gamma_{\alpha+1/2}(t)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} G_{j,\alpha+1/2}^+ &:= \rho_j \phi_{j,\alpha+1} (\partial_t z_{\alpha+1/2} + \mathbf{u}_{j,\alpha+1/2}^+ \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} z_{\alpha+1/2} - w_{j,\alpha+1/2}^+), \\ G_{j,\alpha+1/2}^- &:= \rho_j \phi_{j,\alpha} (\partial_t z_{\alpha+1/2} + \mathbf{u}_{j,\alpha+1/2}^- \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} z_{\alpha+1/2} - w_{j,\alpha+1/2}^-), \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, N. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

The mass conservation jump conditions (4.2) are then satisfied provided that

$$G_{j,\alpha+1/2} := G_{j,\alpha+1/2}^- = G_{j,\alpha+1/2}^+, \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, N, \quad (4.9)$$

where $G_{j,\alpha+1/2}$ represents the normal mass flux for species j across $\Gamma_{\alpha+1/2}(t)$. Taking into account (4.7), we obtain the following structure of the horizontal and vertical velocities:

$$\mathbf{u}_{j,\alpha+1/2}^+ = \mathbf{u}_{\alpha+1} - \varepsilon \mathbf{a}_{h,j,\alpha+1/2}^+ / (\rho_j \phi_{j,\alpha+1}), \quad \mathbf{u}_{j,\alpha+1/2}^- = \mathbf{u}_{\alpha} - \varepsilon \mathbf{a}_{h,j,\alpha+1/2}^- / (\rho_j \phi_{j,\alpha}), \quad (4.10)$$

$$w_{j,\alpha+1/2}^{\pm} = w_{\alpha+1/2}^{\pm} + (\rho_j f_{j,\alpha+1/2}^{\pm} - a_{3,j,\alpha+1/2}^{\pm}) / (\varepsilon \rho_j \phi_{j,\alpha+1/2}^{\pm}), \quad (4.11)$$

where $f_{j,\alpha+1/2}^{\pm}$ and $\varepsilon \mathbf{I}_{\varepsilon}^2 \mathbf{a}_{j,\alpha+1/2}^{\pm}$ must satisfy the respective conditions

$$\sum_{j=0}^N \rho_j f_{j,\alpha+1/2}^{\pm} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=0}^N \varepsilon \mathbf{I}_{\varepsilon}^2 \mathbf{a}_{j,\alpha+1/2}^{\pm} = \mathbf{0}.$$

We can then compute the total normal mass flux across $\Gamma_{\alpha+1/2}(t)$ as $G_{\alpha+1/2} := \sum_{j=0}^N G_{j,\alpha+1/2}$, and by (4.8) and (4.9) we get the jump condition

$$G_{\alpha+1/2} = G_{\alpha+1/2}^- = G_{\alpha+1/2}^+ \quad (4.12)$$

for the first equation from (2.3), where

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\alpha+1/2}^+ &:= \bar{\rho}_{\alpha+1} (\partial_t z_{\alpha+1/2} + \mathbf{u}_{\alpha+1} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} z_{\alpha+1/2} - w_{\alpha+1/2}^+), \\ G_{\alpha+1/2}^- &:= \bar{\rho}_{\alpha} (\partial_t z_{\alpha+1/2} + \mathbf{u}_{\alpha} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} z_{\alpha+1/2} - w_{\alpha+1/2}^-). \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

Then, after substituting the limits of the horizontal and vertical velocities (4.10) and (4.11) into (4.8) and using the definition of limits of total normal mass flux (4.13) and the jump condition (4.12), we get

$$\begin{aligned} G_{j,\alpha+1/2}^+ &= \frac{\rho_j \phi_{j,\alpha+1}}{\bar{\rho}_{\alpha+1}} G_{\alpha+1/2} - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \rho_j f_{j,\alpha+1/2}^+ - \varepsilon \mathbf{I}_{\varepsilon}^2 \mathbf{a}_{j,\alpha+1/2}^+ \cdot \boldsymbol{\eta}_{\alpha+1/2} \sqrt{1 + |\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} z_{\alpha+1/2}|^2}, \\ G_{j,\alpha+1/2}^- &= \frac{\rho_j \phi_{j,\alpha}}{\bar{\rho}_{\alpha}} G_{\alpha+1/2} - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \rho_j f_{j,\alpha+1/2}^- - \varepsilon \mathbf{I}_{\varepsilon}^2 \mathbf{a}_{j,\alpha+1/2}^- \cdot \boldsymbol{\eta}_{\alpha+1/2} \sqrt{1 + |\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} z_{\alpha+1/2}|^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

The relationship between normal mass flux of species j and the total normal mass flux across $\Gamma_{\alpha+1/2}(t)$ is computed using the j th mass jump condition (4.9) and summing for each $j = 0, \dots, N$ the equations from (4.14). This yields

$$G_{j,\alpha+1/2} = \tilde{\phi}_{j,\alpha+1/2} G_{\alpha+1/2} - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \rho_j \tilde{f}_{j,\alpha+1/2} - \varepsilon \mathbf{I}_{\varepsilon}^2 \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_{j,\alpha+1/2} \cdot \boldsymbol{\eta}_{\alpha+1/2} \sqrt{1 + |\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} z_{\alpha+1/2}|^2}, \quad (4.15)$$

where for each $j = 0, \dots, N$ the averages $\tilde{\phi}_{j,\alpha+1/2}$, $\tilde{f}_{j,\alpha+1/2}$ and $\tilde{a}_{j,\alpha+1/2}$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\phi}_{j,\alpha+1/2} &:= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\rho_j \phi_{j,\alpha+1}}{\bar{\rho}_{\alpha+1}} + \frac{\rho_j \phi_{j,\alpha}}{\bar{\rho}_\alpha} \right), \quad \tilde{f}_{j,\alpha+1/2} := \frac{1}{2} (f_{j,\alpha+1/2}^+ + f_{j,\alpha+1/2}^-), \\ \tilde{a}_{j,\alpha+1/2} &:= \frac{1}{2} (a_{j,\alpha+1/2}^+ + a_{j,\alpha+1/2}^-).\end{aligned}\tag{4.16}$$

On the other hand, setting $\mathbf{M} = \varepsilon \tilde{\mathbf{I}}^{-1}$ and writing the jump condition of species j as

$$\begin{aligned}& \left[(\rho_j \phi_j \mathbf{v}_{\varepsilon,j}; \rho_j \phi_j \mathbf{v}_{\varepsilon,j} \otimes \mathbf{v}_j) \right]_{t,\alpha+1/2} \cdot (\partial_t z_{\alpha+1/2}, \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} z_{\alpha+1/2}, -1)^T \\ &= G_{j,\alpha+1/2} \mathbf{M} \llbracket \mathbf{v}_j \rrbracket_{t,\alpha+1/2}, \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, N,\end{aligned}$$

where $\llbracket (\dots; \dots) \rrbracket$ is a matricial 3×4 jump, we may rewrite the momentum jump condition (4.3) as

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \llbracket \Sigma \tilde{\mathbf{I}} \rrbracket_{t,\alpha+1/2} \cdot \boldsymbol{\eta}_{\alpha+1/2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} z_{\alpha+1/2}|^2}} \sum_{j=0}^N G_{j,\alpha+1/2} \mathbf{M} \llbracket \mathbf{v}_j \rrbracket_{t,\alpha+1/2}.\tag{4.17}$$

Now, from the left-hand side of (4.17) it is clear that we need to define an approximation of the stress tensor at each interface $\Gamma_{\alpha+1/2}$. Then, for $\alpha = 1, \dots, M-1$, the stress tensor from (4.4) is decomposed as

$$\Sigma_{\alpha+1/2}^{\pm} = -p_{\text{tot},\alpha+1/2} \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{T}_{\varepsilon,\alpha+1/2}^{\text{E},\pm},\tag{4.18}$$

where $p_{\text{tot},\alpha+1/2}$ is the pressure and $\mathbf{T}_{\varepsilon,\alpha+1/2}^{\text{E},\pm}$ are the limit approximations of the viscous stress tensor $\mathbf{T}_{\varepsilon}^{\text{E}}$ at $\Gamma_{\alpha+1/2}$. From (4.17) we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}& \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (\mathbf{T}_{\varepsilon,\alpha+1/2}^{\text{E},+} - \mathbf{T}_{\varepsilon,\alpha+1/2}^{\text{E},-}) \tilde{\mathbf{I}} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{\alpha+1/2} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} z_{\alpha+1/2}|^2}} \sum_{j=0}^N G_{j,\alpha+1/2} \mathbf{M} \llbracket \mathbf{v}_j \rrbracket_{t,\alpha+1/2},\end{aligned}\tag{4.19}$$

where $\mathbf{T}_{\varepsilon,\alpha+1/2}^{\text{E},\pm}$ must be defined such that

$$\tilde{\mathbf{T}}_{\alpha+1/2}^{\text{E}} := \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{T}_{\varepsilon,\alpha+1/2}^{\text{E},+} + \mathbf{T}_{\varepsilon,\alpha+1/2}^{\text{E},-}),$$

in order to satisfy the momentum jump condition (4.3). Here, $\tilde{\mathbf{T}}_{\alpha+1/2}^{\text{E}}$ is an approximation of the viscous stress tensor $\mathbf{T}_{\varepsilon}^{\text{E}}|_{\Gamma_{\alpha+1/2}}$. Then, as in [10] we define

$$\tilde{\mathbf{T}}_{\alpha+1/2}^{\text{E}} = \frac{\eta}{2} \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_{\varepsilon,\alpha+1/2} + 2\varepsilon\lambda(\tilde{\nabla} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{v}})_{\alpha+1/2} \mathbf{I}\tag{4.20}$$

with

$$\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_{\varepsilon,\alpha+1/2} := \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon \mathbf{D}_{\varepsilon,h}(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{h,\alpha+1/2}) & \varepsilon^2 (\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{\alpha+1/2})^T + \mathbf{Q}_{h,\alpha+1/2} \\ \varepsilon^2 \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{\alpha+1/2} + (\mathbf{Q}_{h,\alpha+1/2})^T & 2\varepsilon \mathbf{Q}_{v,\alpha+1/2} \end{bmatrix},\tag{4.21}$$

and

$$(\tilde{\nabla} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{v}})_{\alpha+1/2} = \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{h,\alpha+1/2} + \mathbf{Q}_{v,\alpha+1/2},\tag{4.22}$$

where $\mathcal{Q}_{\alpha+1/2} = \mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{v})|_{\Gamma_{\alpha+1/2}}$ and $\mathcal{Q} = (\mathcal{Q}_h, \mathcal{Q}_v)^T$ satisfies the equation $\mathcal{Q} - \partial_z \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}$. To approximate $\mathcal{Q}$, the solution of this equation, we approximate $\mathbf{v}$ by a linear interpolation in z , denoted by $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}$, such that

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}|_{z=\frac{1}{2}(z_{\alpha-1/2}+z_{\alpha+1/2})} = \mathbf{v}_\alpha.$$

Finally, introducing $\tilde{\mathbf{T}}_{\alpha+1/2}^E$ in the equality (4.19) we get

$$\mathbf{T}_{\varepsilon, \alpha+1/2}^{E, \pm} \tilde{\mathbf{I}} \eta_{\alpha+1/2} = \tilde{\mathbf{T}}_{\alpha+1/2}^E \tilde{\mathbf{I}} \eta_{\alpha+1/2} \pm \frac{1}{2} \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} z_{\alpha+1/2}|^2}} \sum_{j=0}^N G_{j, \alpha+1/2} \mathbf{M}[\mathbf{v}_j]_{t, \alpha+1/2}, \quad (4.23)$$

which satisfies the jump condition (4.17).

4.5 Vertical Velocity of the Mixture

It is well known that in the multilayer approach under hydrostatic pressure the vertical velocity disappears from the third equation of the momentum equations so we need to recover this velocity by post-processing data. In [10] we compute vertical velocities of each species and vertical velocity of the mixture, but the former are only computed to get the vertical velocity of the mixture. In other words, it is not possible to use the vertical velocities of each species to determine the velocity of the each species, since these velocities are not well defined for all $t \in [0, T]$. On the other hand, these particular velocities are important and they allow us to compute the vertical velocity of the mixture for all $t \in [0, T]$. To compute the vertical velocities of each species we set $\alpha \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ and integrate vertically the mass balance equations (3.8) over a layer α , this is over $(z_{\alpha-1/2}, z)$ for $z \in (z_{\alpha-1/2}, z_{\alpha+1/2})$ and then we use the assumption (4.5) to get

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_t (\rho_j \phi_{j, \alpha})(z - z_{\alpha-1/2}) + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot (\rho_j \phi_{j, \alpha} \mathbf{u}_{j, \alpha})(z - z_{\alpha-1/2}) \\ & + \rho_j \phi_{j, \alpha} (w_{j, \alpha}(\mathbf{x}, z, t) - w_{j, \alpha-1/2}^+) = 0 \quad \text{for } j = 0, \dots, N, \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

where it is clear from (4.24) that it is not possible to recover the vertical velocity of species j when $\phi_{j, \alpha} = 0$. On the other hand, if we sum all equations in (4.24) from $j = 0$ to $j = N$ we get the following expression for the vertical velocity of the mixture:

$$w_\alpha(\mathbf{x}, z, t) = w_{\alpha-1/2}^+ - \frac{1}{\bar{\rho}_\alpha} (\partial_t \bar{\rho}_\alpha + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot (\bar{\rho}_\alpha \mathbf{u}_\alpha))(z - z_{\alpha-1/2}), \quad (4.25)$$

where $w_{\alpha-1/2}^+$ is defined by using the mass jump condition (4.12), so this vertical velocity is given by

$$w_{\alpha-1/2}^+ = \frac{1}{\bar{\rho}_\alpha} ((\bar{\rho}_\alpha - \bar{\rho}_{\alpha-1}) \partial_t z_{\alpha-1/2} + (\bar{\rho}_\alpha \mathbf{u}_\alpha - \bar{\rho}_{\alpha-1} \mathbf{u}_{\alpha-1}) \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} z_{\alpha-1/2} + \bar{\rho}_{\alpha-1} w_{\alpha-1/2}^-),$$

and the corresponding limit of the vertical velocity $w_{\alpha-1/2}^-$ at the interface $\Gamma_{\alpha-1/2}(t)$ is computed using the linear profile (4.25) in layer $\alpha - 1$ evaluated at $z_{\alpha-1/2}$:

$$w_{\alpha-1/2}^- = w_{\alpha-3/2}^+ - \frac{h_{\alpha-1}}{\bar{\rho}_{\alpha-1}} (\partial_t (\bar{\rho}_{\alpha-1}) + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot (\bar{\rho}_{\alpha-1} \mathbf{u}_{\alpha-1})).$$

Finally, the vertical velocities of the mixture in each layer are computed recursively as follows. First, the vertical velocity $w_{1/2}^+$ is computed using mass transference condition (4.13) at the

bottom by

$$w_{1/2}^+ = \partial_t z_B + \mathbf{u}_1 \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} z_B - \frac{G_{1/2}}{\rho_1}. \quad (4.26)$$

Then, for $\alpha = 1, \dots, M$ and $z \in (z_{\alpha-1/2}, z_{\alpha+1/2})$ we obtain the vertical velocities of the mixture in each layer successively as

$$\begin{aligned} w_{\alpha}(\mathbf{x}, z, t) &= w_{\alpha-1/2}^+ - \frac{1}{\bar{\rho}_{\alpha}} (\partial_t \bar{\rho}_{\alpha} + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot (\bar{\rho}_{\alpha} \mathbf{u}_{\alpha})) (z - z_{\alpha-1/2}), \\ w_{\alpha+1/2}^- &= w_{\alpha-1/2}^+ - \frac{h_{\alpha}}{\bar{\rho}_{\alpha}} (\partial_t \bar{\rho}_{\alpha} + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot (\bar{\rho}_{\alpha} \mathbf{u}_{\alpha})), \\ w_{\alpha+1/2}^+ &= \frac{1}{\bar{\rho}_{\alpha+1}} ((\bar{\rho}_{\alpha+1} - \bar{\rho}_{\alpha}) \partial_t z_{\alpha+1/2} + (\bar{\rho}_{\alpha+1} \mathbf{u}_{\alpha+1} \\ &\quad - \bar{\rho}_{\alpha} \mathbf{u}_{\alpha}) \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} z_{\alpha+1/2} + \bar{\rho}_{\alpha} w_{\alpha+1/2}^-). \end{aligned} \quad (4.27)$$

5 Multilayer Approach

Following [10,18], we now derive the multilayer model using the final form of the dimensionless model (3.8)–(3.10). We first need to introduce the multilayer version of the hydrostatic pressure.

5.1 Multilayer Version of Hydrostatic Pressure

Using the last equality of the linear momentum equation of the mixture (3.10) we get

$$\partial_z p_{\text{tot}} = -\frac{\rho}{\text{Fr}^2} + \varepsilon \left(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \left(\frac{\eta}{2} \partial_z \mathbf{v}_h \right) + \partial_z (\eta \partial_z w) + \partial_z (2\lambda \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}) \right) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2).$$

To recover the hydrostatic framework (assumption (4.6)) we neglect in this equation terms of order $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ (and smaller, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$), which yields $\partial_z p_{\text{tot}} = -\rho/\text{Fr}^2$. Then the multilayer version of the pressure is given by

$$p_{\text{tot},\alpha} = p_{\alpha+1/2} + \bar{\rho}_{\alpha} \frac{z_{\alpha+1/2} - z}{\text{Fr}^2}, \quad p_{\alpha+1/2} = p_S + \sum_{\beta=\alpha+1}^M \frac{\bar{\rho}_{\beta} h_{\beta}}{\text{Fr}^2}, \quad (5.1)$$

where the component $p_{\alpha+1/2}$ is the pressure at interface $\Gamma_{\alpha+1/2}(t)$, p_S denotes the pressure at the free surface, and Fr is the Froude number. This assumption ensures that the pressure is not an unknown of the problem.

5.2 Weak Formulation

The multilayer approach arises from a variational formulation of the system (3.8)–(3.10). We notice that the multilayer model is a particular weak solution of these variational identities. The weak formulation in $\Omega_{\alpha}(t)$ for $\alpha = 1, \dots, N$ is as follows (cf. [10]). Assume that $\mathbf{v}_{j,\alpha} \in L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega_{\alpha}(t))^3)$, $\partial_t \mathbf{v}_{j,\alpha} \in L^2(0, T; L^2(\Omega_{\alpha}(t))^3)$, $\phi_{j,\alpha} \in L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega_{\alpha}(t)))$, $\partial_t \phi_{j,\alpha} \in L^2(0, T; L^2(\Omega_{\alpha}(t)))$ and $p_{\text{tot},\alpha} \in L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega_{\alpha}(t)))$. Then a weak solution $(\mathbf{v}_{j,\alpha}, \phi_{j,\alpha}, p_{\text{tot},\alpha})$ in $\Omega_{\alpha}(t)$ should satisfy for all $\varphi \in L^2(\Omega_{\alpha}(t))$ and for all $\boldsymbol{\vartheta} \in H^1(\Omega_{\alpha}(t))^3$

with $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}|_{\partial I_F} = 0$ the identities

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega_\alpha(t)} (\partial_t (\rho_j \phi_{j,\alpha}) + \nabla \cdot (\rho_j \phi_{j,\alpha} \mathbf{v}_{j,\alpha})) \varphi \, d\Omega = 0, \\
& \int_{\Omega_\alpha(t)} \left(\sum_{j=0}^N \rho_j \partial_t (\phi_{j,\alpha} \mathbf{v}_{\varepsilon,j,\alpha}) \right) \cdot \boldsymbol{\vartheta} \, d\Omega + \int_{\Omega_\alpha(t)} \left(\sum_{j=0}^N \rho_j \nabla \cdot (\phi_{j,\alpha} \mathbf{v}_{\varepsilon,j,\alpha} \otimes \mathbf{v}_{j,\alpha}) \right) \cdot \boldsymbol{\vartheta} \, d\Omega \\
& + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega_\alpha(t)} (\mathbf{T}_{\varepsilon,\alpha}^E \tilde{\mathbf{I}}) : \nabla \boldsymbol{\vartheta} \, d\Omega - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega_\alpha(t)} (p_{\text{tot},\alpha} \tilde{\mathbf{I}}) : \nabla \boldsymbol{\vartheta} \, d\Omega \\
& + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Gamma_{\alpha+1/2}(t)} (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\alpha+1/2}^- \tilde{\mathbf{I}}) \boldsymbol{\eta}_{\alpha+1/2} \cdot \boldsymbol{\vartheta} \, d\Gamma - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Gamma_{\alpha-1/2}(t)} (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\alpha-1/2}^+ \tilde{\mathbf{I}}) \boldsymbol{\eta}_{\alpha-1/2} \cdot \boldsymbol{\vartheta} \, d\Gamma \\
& = -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega_\alpha(t)} \frac{g}{\text{Fr}^2} \bar{\rho}_\alpha \mathbf{k} \cdot \boldsymbol{\vartheta} \, d\Omega
\end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

for particular test functions φ and $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}$ that satisfy $\partial_z \varphi = 0$ and

$$\boldsymbol{\vartheta}(\mathbf{x}, z, t) = (\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_h(\mathbf{x}, t), (z - z_B) \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x}, t))^T, \tag{5.3}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_h$ and $\mathcal{V}$ are smooth functions that do not depend on z . We use the structure given by (4.5), (4.6) and apply straightforward calculations analogous to those of [10, Appendix C] (details are omitted here) to arrive at the following multilayer version of (3.8)–(3.10):

For $\alpha = 0, \dots, M$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \partial_t (\rho_j \phi_{j,\alpha} h_\alpha) + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot (\rho_j \phi_{j,\alpha} h_\alpha \mathbf{u}_{j,\alpha}) = G_{j,\alpha+1/2} - G_{j,\alpha-1/2}, \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, N, \\
& \sum_{j=0}^N (\rho_j h_\alpha \partial_t (\phi_{j,\alpha} \mathbf{u}_{j,\alpha}) + \rho_j h_\alpha \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot (\phi_{j,\alpha} \mathbf{u}_{j,\alpha} \otimes \mathbf{u}_{j,\alpha}) \\
& + \rho_j \phi_{j,\alpha} (w_{j,\alpha+1/2}^- - w_{j,\alpha-1/2}^+) \mathbf{u}_{j,\alpha}) \\
& + \int_{z_{\alpha-1/2}}^{z_{\alpha+1/2}} \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} p_{\text{tot},\alpha} \, dz - \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot (h_\alpha \mathbf{T}_{h,\alpha}^E) + \tilde{\mathbf{T}}_{h,\alpha+1/2}^E (\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} z_{\alpha+1/2})^T - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \tilde{\mathbf{T}}_{xz,\alpha+1/2}^E \\
& - \tilde{\mathbf{T}}_{h,\alpha-1/2}^E (\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} z_{\alpha-1/2})^T + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \tilde{\mathbf{T}}_{xz,\alpha-1/2}^E \\
& = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=0}^N G_{j,\alpha+1/2} (\mathbf{u}_{j,\alpha+1} - \mathbf{u}_{j,\alpha}) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=0}^N G_{j,\alpha-1/2} (\mathbf{u}_{j,\alpha} - \mathbf{u}_{j,\alpha-1}),
\end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

where the mass transfer terms $G_{j,\alpha+1/2}$ are given by (4.15), the horizontal and vertical velocities $\mathbf{u}_{j,\alpha}$ and $w_{\alpha+1/2}^\pm$ are given by (4.10) and (4.11), respectively, where we keep in mind the equalities (4.7), and the viscous stress terms are given by (4.20)–(4.22). The integral term in (5.4) is given by

$$\int_{z_{\alpha-1/2}}^{z_{\alpha+1/2}} \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} p_{\text{tot},\alpha} \, dz = h_\alpha \left(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \bar{p}_\alpha + \frac{\rho_\alpha}{\text{Fr}^2} \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \bar{z}_\alpha \right),$$

where $\bar{p}_\alpha$ and $\bar{z}_\alpha$ are defined as

$$\bar{p}_\alpha := p_S + \sum_{\beta=\alpha+1}^M \frac{\rho_\beta h_\beta}{\text{Fr}^2} + \rho_\alpha \frac{h_\alpha}{2\text{Fr}^2}, \quad \bar{z}_\alpha := z_B + \sum_{\beta=1}^{\alpha-1} h_\beta + \frac{h_\alpha}{2}. \quad (5.5)$$

To this point all equations were given in dimensionless variables. In Sect. 5.3 and from here so on we will return to the original variables.

5.3 Multilayer Model in Original Variables

To obtain the final form of the model, first we multiply the mass and linear momentum balance equations (5.4) by $\varepsilon := H/L$, and discard all $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)$ terms. Finally we use (3.3) and (3.5) to return to the original variables. Multiplying (4.10) and (4.11) by ε and neglecting small terms, we obtain $\mathbf{u}_{j,\alpha} = \mathbf{u}_\alpha$. Analogously for (4.15) we get

$$G_{j,\alpha+1/2} = \tilde{\phi}_{j,\alpha+1/2} G_{\alpha+1/2} - \rho_j \tilde{f}_{j,\alpha+1/2} + \tilde{a}_{3,j,\alpha+1/2}. \quad (5.6)$$

For the viscous stress tensor from (3.7) we have

$$\mathbf{T}_\varepsilon^E(\mathbf{v}) \tilde{\mathbf{I}} = \frac{\eta}{2} \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{D}_{\varepsilon,h}(\mathbf{v}) & \partial_z \mathbf{v}_h + \varepsilon^2 (\nabla_x w)^T \\ \varepsilon ((\partial_z \mathbf{v}_h)^T + \varepsilon^2 \nabla_x w) & 2\varepsilon \partial_z w \end{bmatrix} + 2\lambda (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}) \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \varepsilon^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \varepsilon \end{bmatrix},$$

along with an analogous expression for the approximation of the viscous stress tensor at each interface $\tilde{\mathbf{T}}_{\alpha+1/2}^E(\mathbf{v})$. So the multilayer approach in original variables is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{For } \alpha = 1, \dots, M : \\ & \partial_t (\rho_j \phi_{j,\alpha} h_\alpha) + \nabla_x \cdot (\rho_j \phi_{j,\alpha} h_\alpha \mathbf{u}_\alpha) \\ & = \tilde{\phi}_{j,\alpha+1/2} G_{\alpha+1/2} - \tilde{\phi}_{j,\alpha-1/2} G_{\alpha-1/2} \\ & \quad - \rho_j (\tilde{f}_{j,\alpha+1/2} - \tilde{f}_{j,\alpha-1/2}) + \tilde{a}_{j,3,\alpha+1/2} - \tilde{a}_{j,3,\alpha-1/2}, \quad j = 0, \dots, N, \\ & h_\alpha \partial_t (\bar{\rho}_\alpha \mathbf{u}_\alpha) + h_\alpha \nabla_x \cdot (\bar{\rho}_\alpha \mathbf{u}_\alpha \otimes \mathbf{u}_\alpha) + \sum_{j=0}^N \rho_j \phi_{j,\alpha} (w_{j,\alpha+1/2}^- - w_{j,\alpha-1/2}^+) \mathbf{u}_\alpha \\ & \quad + h_\alpha (\nabla_x \bar{p}_\alpha + g \rho_\alpha \nabla_x \bar{z}_\alpha) \\ & = \frac{1}{2} G_{\alpha+1/2} (\mathbf{u}_{\alpha+1} - \mathbf{u}_\alpha) + \frac{1}{2} G_{\alpha-1/2} (\mathbf{u}_\alpha - \mathbf{u}_{\alpha-1}) + \mathbf{K}_{\alpha+1/2} - \mathbf{K}_{\alpha-1/2}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

where the mass transfer terms $G_{\alpha+1/2}$ through each interface $\Gamma_{\alpha+1/2}$ for $\alpha = 0, \dots, M$ are given by (4.12) and (4.13), and $\tilde{\phi}_{j,\alpha+1/2}$, $\tilde{f}_{j,\alpha+1/2}$, and $\tilde{a}_{j,3,\alpha+1/2}$ are given by (4.16). The terms $\mathbf{K}_{\alpha+1/2}$ are the viscous stress tensors that remain after discarding small terms. These terms are given by

$$\mathbf{K}_{\alpha+1/2} = \frac{\eta}{2} \mathbf{Q}_{h,\alpha+1/2}, \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, M. \quad (5.8)$$

The total mass equation of the mixture at layer α can be recovered summing from $j = 0$ to $j = N$ the first equations of (5.7). This yields

$$\partial_t (\bar{\rho}_\alpha h_\alpha) + \nabla_x \cdot (\bar{\rho}_\alpha h_\alpha \mathbf{u}_\alpha) = G_{\alpha+1/2} - G_{\alpha-1/2}, \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, M. \quad (5.9)$$

The third term of the linear momentum balance in (5.7) can be written as follows, where we use (4.25) evaluated at $z_{\alpha+1/2}$:

$$\bar{\rho}_\alpha(w_{\alpha+1/2}^- - w_{\alpha-1/2}^+) = -h_\alpha(\partial_t \bar{\rho}_\alpha + \nabla_x \cdot (\bar{\rho}_\alpha \mathbf{u}_\alpha)), \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, M. \quad (5.10)$$

Finally, multiplying (5.10) by $\mathbf{u}_\alpha$ and introducing the result into the momentum equation of (5.7) and using (5.9) multiplied by $\mathbf{u}_\alpha$, we get the final form of the multilayer model

For $\alpha = 1, \dots, M$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_t(\rho_j \phi_{j,\alpha} h_\alpha) + \nabla_x \cdot (\rho_j \phi_{j,\alpha} h_\alpha \mathbf{u}_\alpha) \\ &= \tilde{\phi}_{j,\alpha+1/2} G_{\alpha+1/2} - \tilde{\phi}_{j,\alpha-1/2} G_{\alpha-1/2} \\ & \quad - \rho_j(\tilde{f}_{j,\alpha+1/2} - \tilde{f}_{j,\alpha-1/2}) + \tilde{a}_{j,3,\alpha+1/2} - \tilde{a}_{j,3,\alpha-1/2}, \quad j = 0, \dots, N, \\ & \partial_t(h_\alpha \bar{\rho}_\alpha \mathbf{u}_\alpha) + \nabla_x \cdot (h_\alpha \bar{\rho}_\alpha \mathbf{u}_\alpha \otimes \mathbf{u}_\alpha) + h_\alpha(\nabla_x \bar{p}_\alpha + g \bar{\rho}_\alpha \nabla_x \bar{z}_\alpha) \\ &= \frac{G_{\alpha+1/2}}{2}(\mathbf{u}_{\alpha+1} + \mathbf{u}_\alpha) - \frac{G_{\alpha-1/2}}{2}(\mathbf{u}_\alpha + \mathbf{u}_{\alpha-1}) + \mathbf{K}_{\alpha+1/2} - \mathbf{K}_{\alpha-1/2}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

where $\tilde{\phi}_{j,\alpha+1/2}$, $\tilde{f}_{j,\alpha+1/2}$, and $\tilde{a}_{j,3,\alpha+1/2}$ are given by (4.16), the mass transfer terms $G_{\alpha+1/2}$ for $\alpha = 1, \dots, M$ are given by (4.12) and (4.13), $\bar{p}_\alpha$, $\bar{z}_\alpha$ are given by (5.5) (but in original variables), and $\mathbf{K}_{\alpha+1/2}$ is specified by (5.8).

5.4 Closure of the Model

We close the system by assuming that the thickness of each layer h_α is a fixed fraction of the total height h , i.e., $h_\alpha = l_\alpha h$ for $\alpha = 1, \dots, M$, where $l_1, \dots, l_M$ are positive constants such as $l_1 + \dots + l_M = 1$. Furthermore, defining $m_\alpha := \bar{\rho}_\alpha h$, $\mathbf{q}_\alpha := \bar{\rho}_\alpha h \mathbf{u}_\alpha$, and $r_{j,\alpha} := \rho_j \phi_{j,\alpha} h$ for $\alpha = 1, \dots, M$ and $j = 0, \dots, N$, we can write the system (5.11) as follows:

$$\partial_t m_\alpha + \nabla_x \cdot \mathbf{q}_\alpha = \frac{1}{l_\alpha}(G_{\alpha+1/2} - G_{\alpha-1/2}), \quad (5.12a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_t r_{j,\alpha} + \nabla_x \cdot \left(\frac{r_{j,\alpha} \mathbf{q}_\alpha}{m_\alpha} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{l_\alpha}(\tilde{\phi}_{j,\alpha+1/2} G_{\alpha+1/2} - \tilde{\phi}_{j,\alpha-1/2} G_{\alpha-1/2}) - \frac{\rho_j}{l_\alpha}(\tilde{f}_{j,\alpha+1/2} - \tilde{f}_{j,\alpha-1/2}) \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{l_\alpha}(\tilde{a}_{j,3,\alpha+1/2} - \tilde{a}_{j,3,\alpha-1/2}), \quad j = 1, \dots, N, \end{aligned} \quad (5.12b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_t \mathbf{q}_\alpha + \nabla_x \cdot \left(\frac{\mathbf{q}_\alpha \otimes \mathbf{q}_\alpha}{m_\alpha} \right) + h(\nabla_x \bar{p}_\alpha + g \bar{\rho}_\alpha \nabla_x \bar{z}_\alpha) \\ &= \frac{1}{l_\alpha}(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\alpha+1/2} G_{\alpha+1/2} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\alpha-1/2} G_{\alpha-1/2}) + \frac{1}{l_\alpha}(\mathbf{K}_{\alpha+1/2} - \mathbf{K}_{\alpha-1/2}), \end{aligned} \quad (5.12c)$$

where $\bar{p}_\alpha$, $\bar{z}_\alpha$, and the average $\tilde{\phi}_{j,\alpha+1/2}$ defined by (4.16) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{p}_\alpha &= p_S + g \sum_{\beta=\alpha+1}^M l_\beta m_\beta + \frac{g}{2} l_\alpha m_\alpha, \quad \bar{z}_\alpha = z_B + h \sum_{\beta=1}^{\alpha-1} l_\beta + \frac{l_\alpha}{2} h, \\ \tilde{\phi}_{j,\alpha+1/2} &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{r_{j,\alpha+1}}{m_{\alpha+1}} + \frac{r_{j,\alpha}}{m_\alpha} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (5.13)$$

respectively, and for $\alpha = 1, \dots, M$ the average $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\alpha+1/2}$ by

$$\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\alpha+1/2} := \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\mathbf{q}_{\alpha+1}}{m_{\alpha+1}} + \frac{\mathbf{q}_{\alpha}}{m_{\alpha}} \right).$$

Summing from $j = 0$ to $j = M$ the equations (5.12a) we get one equation for the total mass of the mixture, namely

$$\partial_t \bar{m} + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \left(\sum_{\beta=1}^M l_{\beta} \mathbf{q}_{\beta} \right) = G_{M+1/2} - G_{1/2}, \quad (5.14)$$

where $\bar{m} := \sum_{\beta=1}^M l_{\beta} m_{\beta}$ and $G_{M+1/2}$ and $G_{1/2}$ represent the mass transfer on the bottom and at the free surface, respectively.

Finally, we need to derive an explicit formula for the total interlayer mass fluxes. To this end, we consider for a fixed layer α the sums of the equations (5.12a) from layer 1 to layer α and from layer $\alpha + 1$ to layer M , obtaining the respective equations

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\beta=1}^{\alpha} l_{\beta} (\partial_t m_{\beta} + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \mathbf{q}_{\beta}) &= G_{\alpha+1/2} - G_{1/2} \quad \text{and} \\ \sum_{\gamma=\alpha+1}^M l_{\gamma} (\partial_t m_{\gamma} + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \mathbf{q}_{\gamma}) &= G_{M+1/2} - G_{\alpha+1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.15)$$

Now, defining $L_{\alpha} := l_1 + \dots + l_{\alpha}$ and using that $m_{\alpha} = \bar{\rho}_{\alpha} h$ can be written as

$$m_{\alpha} = \sum_{j=0}^N r_{j,\alpha} = \rho_0 h + \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\rho_j - \rho_0}{\rho_j} r_{j,\alpha}, \quad (5.16)$$

we deduce from (5.15) the identities

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\alpha} \partial_t (\rho_0 h) + \sum_{\beta=1}^{\alpha} \sum_{j=1}^N l_{\beta} \partial_t r_{j,\beta} \frac{\rho_j - \rho_0}{\rho_j} + \sum_{\beta=1}^{\alpha} l_{\beta} \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \mathbf{q}_{\beta} &= G_{\alpha+1/2} - G_{1/2}, \\ (1 - L_{\alpha}) \partial_t (\rho_0 h) + \sum_{\gamma=\alpha+1}^M \sum_{j=1}^N l_{\gamma} \partial_t r_{j,\gamma} \frac{\rho_j - \rho_0}{\rho_j} + \sum_{\gamma=\alpha+1}^M l_{\gamma} \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \mathbf{q}_{\gamma} &= G_{M+1/2} - G_{\alpha+1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.17)$$

Subtracting (5.17) multiplied by $(1 - L_{\alpha})$ from (5.18) multiplied by L_{α} we obtain an equation that does not depend on $\partial_t h$. Secondly, we use (5.12b) to substitute the time derivatives $\partial_t r_{j,\beta}$. Then, using the notation

$$\mathbf{R}_{\beta} := \mathbf{q}_{\beta} - \sum_{j=1}^N r_{j,\beta} \frac{\mathbf{q}_{\beta}}{m_{\beta}} \frac{\rho_j - \rho_0}{\rho_j}, \quad \bar{\mathbf{R}} := \sum_{\beta=1}^M l_{\beta} \mathbf{R}_{\beta},$$

we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
& G_{\alpha+1/2} \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\rho_j - \rho_0}{\rho_j} \tilde{\phi}_{j,\alpha+1/2} \right) - (1 - L_\alpha) G_{1/2} \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\rho_j - \rho_0}{\rho_j} \tilde{\phi}_{j,1/2} \right) \\
& - L_\alpha G_{M+1/2} \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\rho_j - \rho_0}{\rho_j} \tilde{\phi}_{j,M+1/2} \right) \\
& = \sum_{\beta=1}^{\alpha} l_{\beta} \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot (\mathbf{R}_{\alpha} - \bar{\mathbf{R}}) - \sum_{j=1}^N (\rho_j - \rho_0) \left(\tilde{f}_{j,\alpha+1/2} - \frac{\tilde{a}_{j,3,\alpha+1/2}}{\rho_j} \right) \\
& + \sum_{j=1}^N (\rho_j - \rho_0) \left((1 - L_\alpha) \left(\tilde{f}_{j,1/2} - \frac{\tilde{a}_{j,3,1/2}}{\rho_j} \right) + L_\alpha \left(\tilde{f}_{j,M+1/2} - \frac{\tilde{a}_{j,3,M+1/2}}{\rho_j} \right) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Taking into account the definition of $\tilde{\phi}_{j,\alpha+1/2}$ (5.13), we obtain

$$1 - \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\rho_j - \rho_0}{\rho_j} \tilde{\phi}_{j,\alpha+1/2} = \frac{\rho_0}{\tilde{\rho}_{\alpha+1/2}}, \quad \text{where} \quad \tilde{\rho}_{\alpha+1/2} := \frac{2}{\frac{1}{\bar{\rho}_{\alpha}} + \frac{1}{\bar{\rho}_{\alpha+1}}}.$$

Finally, we deduce

$$G_{\alpha+1/2} = \frac{\tilde{\rho}_{\alpha+1/2}}{\rho_0} \sum_{\beta=1}^{\alpha} l_{\beta} \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot (\mathbf{R}_{\beta} - \bar{\mathbf{R}}) + \tilde{G}_{\alpha+1/2}, \quad (5.19)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{G}_{\alpha+1/2} &:= \frac{\tilde{\rho}_{\alpha+1/2}}{\rho_0} \left(- \sum_{j=1}^N (\rho_j - \rho_0) \left(\tilde{f}_{j,\alpha+1/2} - \frac{\tilde{a}_{j,3,\alpha+1/2}}{\rho_j} \right) + (1 - L_\alpha) C_{1/2} + L_\alpha C_{M+1/2} \right), \\
C_{l+1/2} &:= G_{l+1/2} \frac{\rho_0}{\bar{\rho}_{l+1/2}} + \sum_{j=1}^N (\rho_j - \rho_0) \left(\tilde{f}_{j,l+1/2} - \frac{\tilde{a}_{j,3,l+1/2}}{\rho_j} \right) \quad \text{for } l = 0 \text{ and } l = M.
\end{aligned}$$

The system of partial differential equations (5.12) preserves the water at rest with uniform density stationary solution.

Proposition 1 *Let assume that $\phi_{j,\alpha} = 0$ or $\phi_{j,\alpha} = \bar{\phi} \geq \phi_{\max}$, being $\bar{\phi}$ a constant value, for $j = 1, \dots, N$ and $\alpha = 1, \dots, M$. If m_{α} , $r_{j,\alpha}$ defined by these concentrations are smooth functions, we set $\mathbf{q}_{\alpha} = 0$ and p_s constant, then a stationary solution of (5.12) satisfies*

$$h + z_B = \text{const.}$$

Proof Under the assumption $\phi_{j,\alpha} = 0$ or $\phi_{j,\alpha} = \bar{\phi} \geq \phi_{\max}$ we obtain that $f_j^M(\Phi) = \phi_j v_j^{\text{MLB}} = 0$, what implies that there is not a vertical mass transfer of particles. Moreover, as $\mathbf{q}_{\alpha} = 0$, by definition (5.19) we obtain $G_{\alpha+1/2} = 0$. Then the system (5.12) is reduced to

$$h \left(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \left(p_s + \frac{g}{2} l_{\alpha} m_{\alpha} + g \sum_{\beta=\alpha+1}^M l_{\beta} m_{\beta} \right) + g \bar{\rho}_{\alpha} \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \left(z_B + h \sum_{\beta=1}^{\alpha-1} l_{\beta} + \frac{l_{\alpha}}{2} h \right) \right) = 0. \quad (5.20)$$

Using in (5.20) the fact that $\rho_\alpha = \rho_0 + \sum_{j=1}^N (\rho_j - \rho_0) \phi_{j,\alpha} = \rho_0 + \phi \sum_{j=1}^N (\rho_j - \rho_0)$ is constant, and that p_s is constant, we get

$$h \left(\nabla_x \left(\frac{1}{2} l_\alpha + \sum_{\beta=\alpha+1}^M l_\beta \right) + \nabla_x \left(z_B + h \sum_{\beta=1}^{\alpha-1} l_\beta + \frac{l_\alpha}{2} h \right) \right) = 0. \quad (5.21)$$

Expanding the left-hand side of (5.21) we get

$$g \sum_{\beta=\alpha+1}^M l_\beta \nabla_x h + \frac{g}{2} l_\alpha \nabla_x h + g \nabla_x z_B + g \sum_{\beta=1}^{\alpha-1} l_\beta \nabla_x h + \frac{g}{2} l_\alpha \nabla_x h = 0. \quad (5.22)$$

Finally, from (5.22) we deduce that

$$\nabla_x \left(h \left(l_\alpha + \sum_{\beta=\alpha+1}^M l_\beta + \sum_{\beta=1}^{\alpha-1} l_\beta \right) + z_B \right) = 0,$$

or equivalently, $h + z_B = \text{const.}$ $\square$

6 Numerical Scheme

We now devise a numerical method to discretize the final system, defined by Eqs. (5.12b), (5.12c), and (5.14) with the explicit definition of mass transfer (5.19). For the numerical scheme, we have used a three-step procedure. In Step 1 we design a numerical scheme in which we leave out the viscous terms. Then, in Step 2, we update the velocity field adding all viscous terms employing an implicit discretization of the terms $\mathbf{K}_{\alpha+1/2} - \mathbf{K}_{\alpha-1/2}$, and in Step 3 we post-process data to recover the vertical velocity of the mixture. Thus, if we define $\mathbf{W}_\alpha := (m_\alpha, \mathbf{q}_\alpha, r_{1,\alpha}, \dots, r_{N,\alpha})^T$, then the vector of unknowns of the system defined by (5.12b), (5.12c), and (5.14) is

$$\mathbf{W} = \mathcal{C} \hat{\mathbf{W}}, \quad (6.1)$$

where the matrix $\mathcal{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{(M(N+2)+1) \times M(N+3)}$ is defined as follows. We define $\mathbf{e}_{i,N}$ to be the i -th N -dimensional unit vector ($i = 1, \dots, N$) for general N , $\mathbf{I}_d$ to be the $d \times d$ identity matrix, $\mathbf{0}_d$ to be the zero vector of size d , and $\mathbf{0}$ (without index) to be a zero matrix of unspecified size. Then we define the $(N+2) \times (N+3)$ block $\mathbf{C} := [\mathbf{0}_{N+2} \ \mathbf{I}_{N+2}]$, the matrix

$$\mathcal{C} = \begin{bmatrix} l_1 \mathbf{e}_{1,N+3}^T & l_2 \mathbf{e}_{1,N+3}^T & \cdots & l_M \mathbf{e}_{1,N+3}^T \\ \mathbf{C} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{C} & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{C} \end{bmatrix},$$

and the $M(N+3)$ vector $\hat{\mathbf{W}} = (\mathbf{W}_\alpha)_{1 \leq \alpha \leq M}$, where $\mathbf{W}_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{N+3}$.

Note that relation (6.1) allows us to connect the full system (5.12) with the compact one defined by (5.12b), (5.12c) and (5.14). The compact system can be written as

$$\mathcal{C}(\partial_t \hat{\mathbf{W}} + \nabla_x \cdot \mathbf{F}(\hat{\mathbf{W}}) + \mathcal{P}(\hat{\mathbf{W}})) = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G}^+(\hat{\mathbf{W}}) - \mathcal{G}^-(\hat{\mathbf{W}})), \quad (6.2)$$

where analogously to $\hat{W}$, each of the terms that define this system can be written by layers. That is, we define the vectors $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{P}_\alpha)_{1 \leq \alpha \leq M}$ and $\mathcal{G}^\pm = (\mathcal{G}_\alpha^\pm)_{1 \leq \alpha \leq M}$, where $\mathcal{P}_\alpha, \mathcal{G}_\alpha^\pm \in \mathbb{R}^{N+3}$ and

$$\mathcal{G}_\alpha^\pm = \frac{1}{l_\alpha} (U_{\alpha \pm 1/2} G_{\alpha \pm 1/2} + \mathcal{G}_{f-a, \alpha}^\pm),$$

where we define

$$\mathcal{P}_\alpha := \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ g m_\alpha \nabla_x (z_B + h) + g h^2 \left(\frac{l_\alpha}{2} + \sum_{\beta=\alpha+1}^M l_\beta \right) \nabla_x \bar{\rho}_\alpha + g h \nabla_x \left(h \sum_{\beta=\alpha+1}^M l_\beta (\bar{\rho}_\beta - \bar{\rho}_\alpha) \right) \\ \mathbf{0}_N \end{pmatrix},$$

$$U_{\alpha \pm 1/2}(\hat{W}) := \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \tilde{u}_{\alpha \pm 1/2} \\ \tilde{\phi}_{1, \alpha \pm 1/2} \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{\phi}_{N, \alpha \pm 1/2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{G}_{f-a, \alpha}^\pm := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_3 \\ -\rho_1 \tilde{f}_{1, \alpha \pm 1/2} + \tilde{a}_{1, 3, \alpha \pm 1/2} \\ \vdots \\ -\rho_N \tilde{f}_{j, \alpha \pm 1/2} + \tilde{a}_{N, 3, \alpha \pm 1/2} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (6.3)$$

On the other hand, $F \in \mathbb{R}^{M(N+3) \times 2}$ is a matrix that can be partitioned as

$$F = \begin{bmatrix} F_1 \\ F_2 \\ \vdots \\ F_M \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{where } F_\alpha = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{q}_\alpha^T \\ (1/m_\alpha) \mathbf{q}_\alpha \otimes \mathbf{q}_\alpha \\ (r_{1, \alpha}/m_\alpha) \mathbf{q}_\alpha^T \\ \vdots \\ (r_{N, \alpha}/m_\alpha) \mathbf{q}_\alpha^T \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(N+3) \times 2}, \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, M.$$

Then, to propose a discretization of (6.2) in two horizontal space dimensions, we first study the properties of the system corresponding to one layer, that is, we fix $\alpha \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ and consider

$$\partial_t W_\alpha + \nabla_x \cdot F_\alpha(W_\alpha) + \mathcal{P}_\alpha(\hat{W}) = \mathcal{G}_\alpha^+(\hat{W}) - \mathcal{G}_\alpha^-(\hat{W}). \quad (6.4)$$

For a vector $\eta = (\eta_1, \eta_2)^T \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with $\|\eta\|_2 = 1$ we define the matrices

$$T_\eta := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \mathbf{0}_N^T \\ 0 & \eta_1 & \eta_2 & \mathbf{0}_N^T \\ 0 & -\eta_2 & \eta_1 & \mathbf{0}_N^T \\ \mathbf{0}_N & \mathbf{0}_N & \mathbf{0}_N & I_N \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(N+3) \times (N+3)}, \quad \hat{T}_\eta := I_M \otimes T_\eta \in \mathbb{R}^{M(N+3) \times M(N+3)}.$$

For $\eta^\perp = (-\eta_2, \eta_1)^T$ and $f: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ we have $\nabla_x \cdot f = \partial_\eta(f \cdot \eta) + \partial_{\eta^\perp}(f \cdot \eta^\perp)$. Moreover, the quantities $U_{\alpha \pm 1/2}(\hat{W})$ defined in (6.3) satisfy $T_\eta U_{\alpha \pm 1/2}(\hat{W}) = U_{\alpha \pm 1/2}(\hat{T}_\eta \hat{W})$, and $\mathcal{P}_\alpha$ and $\mathcal{G}_\alpha^\pm(\hat{W})$ satisfy

$$T_\eta \mathcal{P}_\alpha(\hat{W}) = \mathcal{P}_{\eta, \alpha}(\hat{W}) + \mathcal{P}_{\eta^\perp, \alpha}(\hat{W}) \quad (6.5)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}_{\eta,\alpha} &= \left(gm_\alpha \partial_\eta (z_B + h) + gh^2 \left(\frac{l_\alpha}{2} + \sum_{\beta=\alpha+1}^M l_\beta \right) \partial_\eta \bar{\rho}_\alpha \right. \\
&\quad \left. + gh \partial_\eta \left(h \sum_{\beta=\alpha+1}^M l_\beta (\bar{\rho}_\beta - \bar{\rho}_\alpha) \right) \right) \mathbf{e}_{2,N+3}, \\
\mathcal{P}_{\eta^\perp,\alpha} &= \left(gm_\alpha \partial_{\eta^\perp} (z_B + h) + gh^2 \left(\frac{l_\alpha}{2} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \sum_{\beta=\alpha+1}^M l_\beta \right) \partial_{\eta^\perp} \bar{\rho}_\alpha + gh \partial_{\eta^\perp} \left(h \sum_{\beta=\alpha+1}^M l_\beta (\bar{\rho}_\beta - \bar{\rho}_\alpha) \right) \right) \mathbf{e}_{3,N+3},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
T_\eta \mathcal{G}_\alpha^\pm(\hat{\mathbf{W}}) &= U_{\alpha \pm 1/2}(\hat{T}_\eta \hat{\mathbf{W}}) G_{\eta,\alpha \pm 1/2} + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{G}_{f-a,\alpha}^\pm(\hat{T}_\eta \hat{\mathbf{W}}) \partial_\eta ((x - \bar{x})^\top \eta) \\
&\quad + U_{\alpha \pm 1/2}(\hat{T}_\eta \hat{\mathbf{W}}) G_{\eta^\perp,\alpha \pm 1/2} + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{G}_{f-a,\alpha}^\pm(\hat{T}_\eta \hat{\mathbf{W}}) \partial_{\eta^\perp} ((x - \bar{x})^\top \eta^\perp) \quad (6.6) \\
&=: \mathcal{G}_{\eta,\alpha}^\pm(\hat{\mathbf{W}}) + \mathcal{G}_{\eta^\perp,\alpha}^\pm(\hat{\mathbf{W}}),
\end{aligned}$$

where $T_\eta \mathcal{G}_{f-a,\alpha}^\pm(\hat{\mathbf{W}}) = \mathcal{G}_{f-a,\alpha}^\pm(\hat{T}_\eta \hat{\mathbf{W}})$ and we have used that $G_{\alpha+1/2} = G_{\eta,\alpha+1/2} + G_{\eta^\perp,\alpha+1/2}$ with

$$\begin{aligned}
G_{\eta,\alpha+1/2} &= \frac{\tilde{\rho}_{\alpha+1/2}}{\rho_0} \sum_{\beta=1}^{\alpha} l_\beta (\partial_\eta (\mathbf{R}_\alpha - \bar{\mathbf{R}}))^\top \eta + \frac{\tilde{G}_{\alpha+1/2}}{2} \partial_\eta ((x - \bar{x})^\top \eta), \\
G_{\eta^\perp,\alpha+1/2} &= \frac{\tilde{\rho}_{\alpha+1/2}}{\rho_0} \sum_{\beta=1}^{\alpha} l_\beta (\partial_{\eta^\perp} (\mathbf{R}_\alpha - \bar{\mathbf{R}}))^\top \eta^\perp + \frac{\tilde{G}_{\alpha+1/2}}{2} \partial_{\eta^\perp} ((x - \bar{x})^\top \eta^\perp).
\end{aligned}$$

The system (6.4) can now be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t W_\alpha + \partial_\eta (F_\alpha(W_\alpha) \eta) + \partial_{\eta^\perp} (F_\alpha(W_\alpha) \eta^\perp) + T_\eta^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{\eta,\alpha}(\hat{\mathbf{W}}) + T_\eta^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{\eta^\perp,\alpha}(\hat{\mathbf{W}}) \\
= T_\eta^{-1} \mathcal{G}_{\eta,\alpha}^+(\hat{\mathbf{W}}) + T_\eta^{-1} \mathcal{G}_{\eta^\perp,\alpha}^+(\hat{\mathbf{W}}) - T_\eta^{-1} \mathcal{G}_{\eta,\alpha}^-(\hat{\mathbf{W}}) - T_\eta^{-1} \mathcal{G}_{\eta^\perp,\alpha}^-(\hat{\mathbf{W}}).
\end{aligned}$$

Multiplying this system by T_η and using that $F_\alpha(W_\alpha) \eta = T_\eta^{-1} [F_\alpha]_1 (T_\eta W_\alpha)$, where $[F_\alpha]_1 = F_\alpha \mathbf{e}_{1,2}$ is the first column of $[F_\alpha]$, we obtain the rotated system

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t (T_\eta W_\alpha) + \partial_\eta [F_\alpha]_1 (T_\eta W_\alpha) + \mathcal{P}_{\eta,\alpha}(\hat{T}_\eta \hat{\mathbf{W}}) \\
= \mathcal{G}_{\eta,\alpha}^+(\hat{\mathbf{W}}) - \mathcal{G}_{\eta,\alpha}^-(\hat{\mathbf{W}}) + S_{\eta^\perp}, \quad (6.7)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{\eta^\perp} &= T_\eta \left(-\partial_{\eta^\perp} (F_\alpha(W_\alpha) \eta^\perp) - T_\eta^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{\eta^\perp,\alpha}(\hat{\mathbf{W}}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + T_\eta^{-1} \left(U_{\alpha+1/2}(\hat{T}_\eta \hat{\mathbf{W}}) G_{\eta^\perp,\alpha+1/2} + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{G}_{f-a,\alpha}^+(\hat{T}_\eta \hat{\mathbf{W}}) \partial_{\eta^\perp} ((x - \bar{x})^\top \eta^\perp) \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - T_\eta^{-1} \left(U_{\alpha-1/2}(\hat{T}_\eta \hat{\mathbf{W}}) G_{\eta^\perp,\alpha-1/2} - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{G}_{f-a,\alpha}^-(\hat{T}_\eta \hat{\mathbf{W}}) \partial_{\eta^\perp} ((x - \bar{x})^\top \eta^\perp) \right) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Step 1

The numerical scheme is designed by defining a numerical approximation of the rotated system (6.7) at each edge of the control volumes grid, by neglecting tangential variations in each edge of the control volume, that is, neglecting the term $S_{\eta^\perp}$, where η is the normal vector at each edge. Let us denote by $\{V_i\}_{i=1}^{N_c}$ control volumes that define a partition of the domain, by $E_{i,j}$ the interface between two adjacent control volume V_i and V_j , being $\eta_{i,j}$ the unitary normal vector from V_i to V_j . For each control volume V_i we define the set of neighboring control volumes by K_i and by $|V_i|$ and $|E_{i,j}|$ the area and the length of each edge $E_{i,j}$ respectively. The center of mass of the control volume V_i will be denoted by $\mathbf{x}_i$ and the center of the edge $E_{i,j}$ by $\mathbf{x}_{i,j}$. For the numerical simulation, we will use the following CFL condition to determine Δt in each iteration:

$$\max \left\{ \frac{|\lambda_{i,j}|}{d_{i,j}}, i = 1, \dots, \mathcal{V}, j \in K_i \right\} \Delta t \leq \text{CFL},$$

where $\lambda_{i,j}$ are bounds of the eigenvalues of the viscosity matrix, $d_{i,j} = \|\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i\|_2$, the distance between centers of the volume i and j and $\mathcal{V}$ the number of cells. We have fixed the Courant number by $\text{CFL} = 0.5$.

The design of the numerical method is done by taking into account that the original system (6.2), multiplied by $\hat{T}_{\eta_{i,j}}$, is rewritten as (6.7). Then we denote by $\mathbf{W}_i^n$ the average values of the unknowns over the control volume V_i at time t^n . We propose the following 2D finite volume method to approximate the system (6.2):

$$\mathbf{W}_i^{n+1} = \mathbf{W}_i^n - \frac{\Delta t}{|V_i|} \sum_{j \in K_i} |E_{i,j}| \mathbf{c} \hat{T}_{\eta_{i,j}}^{-1} (\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{i,j} + \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{i,j} - \hat{\mathcal{G}}_{i,j}^+ + \hat{\mathcal{G}}_{i,j}^-),$$

where

$$\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{i,j} = (\mathcal{F}_{i,j,\alpha})_{1 \leq \alpha \leq M}, \quad \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{i,j} = (\mathcal{P}_{i,j,\alpha})_{1 \leq \alpha \leq M}, \quad \hat{\mathcal{G}}_{i,j}^\pm = (\mathcal{G}_{i,j,\alpha}^\pm)_{1 \leq \alpha \leq M}.$$

We define $\mathcal{F}_{i,j,\alpha}$ for $\alpha = 1, \dots, M$ by an HLL-PVM-1U method [15] (which approximates the viscosity matrix as a first-order polynomial) to define the first and second component. This approach relies on left and right bounds of the eigenvalues, S_L and S_R , of the transport matrix of the full system. That implies to consider an HLL method of the full system and not a local independent method for each layer. For the other components we use that $\mathcal{F}_{i,j,\alpha}$ is an approximation $[\mathbf{F}_\alpha]_1(T_\eta \mathbf{W}_\alpha)$ on edge $E_{i,j}$. Then, from the third component the flux components correspond to passive transport equations. Then we define for $k = 1, 2$

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathcal{F}_{i,j,\alpha}]_k &= \left[\frac{1}{2} ([\mathbf{F}_\alpha]_1(T_{\eta_{i,j}} \mathbf{W}_{i,\alpha}) + [\mathbf{F}_\alpha]_1(T_{\eta_{i,j}} \mathbf{W}_{j,\alpha})) \right. \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} (a_{0,i,j}(T_{\eta_{i,j}}(\mathbf{W}_{j,\alpha} - \mathbf{W}_{i,\alpha}) + \mathbf{b}_{i,j,\alpha})) \\ &\quad \left. + a_{1,i,j}([\mathbf{F}_\alpha]_1(T_{\eta_{i,j}} \mathbf{W}_{j,\alpha}) - [\mathbf{F}_\alpha]_1(T_{\eta_{i,j}} \mathbf{W}_{i,\alpha}) + \mathcal{P}_{i,j,\alpha}) \right) \Big]_k \end{aligned}$$

and for $k = 3, \dots, N + 3$

$$[\mathcal{F}_{i,j,\alpha}]_k = [\mathcal{F}_{i,j,\alpha}]_1 \left(\frac{[T_{\eta_{i,j}} \mathbf{W}_{i,\alpha}]_k}{[T_{\eta_{i,j}} \mathbf{W}_{i,\alpha}]_1} \frac{1 + \text{sgn}([\mathcal{F}_{i,j,\alpha}]_1)}{2} + \frac{[T_{\eta_{i,j}} \mathbf{W}_{j,\alpha}]_k}{[T_{\eta_{i,j}} \mathbf{W}_{j,\alpha}]_1} \frac{1 - \text{sgn}([\mathcal{F}_{i,j,\alpha}]_1)}{2} \right).$$

The HLL-PVM-1U method is defined by the coefficients

$$a_{0,i,j} = \frac{S_{R,i,j}^n |S_{L,i,j}^n| - S_{L,i,j}^n |S_{R,i,j}^n|}{S_{R,i,j}^n - S_{L,i,j}^n}, \quad a_{1,i,j} = \frac{|S_{R,i,j}^n| - |S_{L,i,j}^n|}{S_{R,i,j}^n - S_{L,i,j}^n}.$$

The characteristic velocities $S_{L,i,j}^n$ and $S_{R,i,j}^n$ are global approximations of the minimum and maximum wave speed of the rotated system (6.7) obtained by neglecting the tangential terms, that is, by setting $S_{\eta_{i,j}}^\perp = 0$. In this case we obtain a 1D system evaluated at $T_{\eta_{i,j}} \hat{\mathbf{W}}$ with an extra passive scalar corresponding to the tangential velocity. This extra field does not modify the maximum and minimum wave speeds of the 1D system. Then, taking into account the bound of the eigenvalues deduced in [10] for the 1D system we define $S_{L,i,j}$ and $S_{R,i,j}$ as follows:

$$S_{L,i,j} := \bar{u}_{i,j}^n - \Psi_{i,j}^n, \quad S_{R,i,j} := \bar{u}_{i,j}^n + \Psi_{i,j}^n, \quad (6.8)$$

where

$$\bar{u}_{i,j}^n := \frac{1}{M} \sum_{\beta=1}^M \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{u}_{\beta,i}^n + \mathbf{u}_{\beta,j}^n)^T \boldsymbol{\eta}_{i,j}, \quad (6.9)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{i,j}^n &:= \frac{2M-1}{\sqrt{2M(2M-1)}} \left(2 \sum_{\beta=1}^M (\bar{u}_{i,j}^n - u_{\beta,i,j}^n)^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{g(h_i^n + h_j^n)}{2\rho_0} \left(\rho_0 + \frac{1}{M} \sum_{\beta=1}^M (2\beta-1) \frac{\bar{\rho}_{\beta,i}^n + \bar{\rho}_{\beta,j}^n}{2} \right) \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.10)$$

We define $\mathcal{P}_{i,j,\alpha}$ to be zero for all components except for the second one. Specifically, we set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_{i,j,\alpha} &= \left(g \frac{m_{i,\alpha}^n + m_{j,\alpha}^n}{2} (z_{B,j} + h_j^n - z_{B,i} - h_i^n) + g \frac{(h_i^n)^2 + (h_j^n)^2}{2} \left(\frac{l_\alpha}{2} + \sum_{\beta=\alpha+1}^M l_\beta \right) \right. \\ &\quad \times (\bar{\rho}_{j,\alpha}^n - \bar{\rho}_{j,\alpha}^n) \\ &\quad \left. + g \frac{h_i^n + h_j^n}{2} \sum_{\beta=\alpha+1}^M l_\beta (m_{j,\beta}^n - m_{j,\alpha}^n + m_{i,\beta}^n - m_{i,\alpha}^n) \right) \mathbf{e}_{2,N+3}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.11)$$

$$\mathcal{G}_{i,j,\alpha}^\pm = U_{i,j,\alpha \pm 1/2} G_{i,j,\alpha \pm 1/2} + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{G}_{i,f-\alpha,\alpha}^\pm (\mathbf{x}_{i,j} - \mathbf{x}_i)^T \boldsymbol{\eta}_{i,j}, \quad (6.12)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 U_{i,j,\alpha\pm 1/2} &= \frac{1}{4} \left(U(T_{\eta_{i,j}} \mathbf{W}_{i,\alpha}) + U(T_{\eta_{i,j}} \mathbf{W}_{j,\alpha}) + U(T_{\eta_{i,j}} \mathbf{W}_{i,\alpha+1}) + U(T_{\eta_{i,j}} \mathbf{W}_{j,\alpha+1}) \right), \\
 G_{i,j,\alpha+1/2} &= \frac{\tilde{\rho}_{i,j,\alpha+1/2}}{\rho_0} \sum_{\beta=1}^{\alpha} l_{\beta} \left((\mathbf{R}_{j,\alpha} - \bar{\mathbf{R}}_j) - (\mathbf{R}_{i,\alpha} - \bar{\mathbf{R}}_i) \right) \\
 &\quad + \frac{G_{i,f-a,\alpha+1/2}}{2} (\mathbf{x}_{i,j} - \mathbf{x}_i)^T \boldsymbol{\eta}_{i,j}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{6.13}$$

By $\mathcal{G}_{i,f-a,\alpha}^{\pm}$ and $G_{i,f-a,\alpha+1/2}$ we denote any second-order approximation of $\mathcal{G}_{f-a,\alpha}^{\pm}$ and $\tilde{G}_{\alpha+1/2}$ at $\mathbf{x}_i$, respectively. Finally, in order to obtain a well-balanced finite volume solver, which preserves exactly the stationary solution deduced in Proposition 1, we utilize the following definition of $\mathbf{b}_{i,j,\alpha}$,

$$\mathbf{b}_{i,j,\alpha} = \left(\frac{\bar{\rho}_{i,\alpha}^n + \bar{\rho}_{j,\alpha}^n}{2} (z_{B,j} - z_{B,i}) \right) \mathbf{e}_{1,N+3}.$$

Step 2

For each cell $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{V}\}$, from the end of Sect. 4.4 we have that

$$\mathcal{Q}_{i,\alpha+1/2} - \partial_z \mathbf{v}_{i,\alpha+1/2} = 0.$$

Thus, we may approximate the viscous terms as

$$\mathbf{K}_{i,\alpha+1/2} = \frac{\eta_{i,\alpha+1/2}}{2} (\mathbf{u}_{i,\alpha+1} - \mathbf{u}_{i,\alpha}),$$

which allows us to update the horizontal velocities by solving the tri-diagonal linear system

$$\begin{bmatrix} a_{i,1}^n & b_{i,1}^n & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ b_{i,1}^n & a_{i,2}^n & b_{i,2}^n & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & b_{i,2}^n & a_{i,3}^n & \ddots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & b_{i,M-1}^n \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & b_{i,M-1}^n & a_{i,M}^n \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{u}_{i,1}^{n+1} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{u}_{i,\alpha}^{n+1} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{u}_{i,M}^{n+1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} m_{i,1}^n \mathbf{u}_{i,1}^n \\ \vdots \\ m_{i,\alpha}^n \mathbf{u}_{i,\alpha}^n \\ \vdots \\ m_{i,M}^n \mathbf{u}_{i,M}^n \end{pmatrix},$$

where $a_{i,\alpha}^n$ and $b_{i,\alpha}^n$ are given by

$$a_{i,\alpha}^n = m_{i,\alpha}^n + \frac{\Delta t}{2l_{\alpha}^2} \left(\eta(\phi_{i,\alpha+1/2}^n) + \eta(\phi_{i,\alpha-1/2}^n) \right), \quad b_{i,\alpha}^n = -\frac{\Delta t}{2l_{\alpha}^2} \eta(\phi_{i,\alpha+1/2}^n).$$

Step 3

We recover from the cells W_i^n the primitive variables $h_{i,\alpha}^n$, $\bar{\rho}_{i,\alpha}^n$ and $\mathbf{u}_{i,\alpha}^n$ for each cell i to compute the vertical component of the velocity field. To this we use the discrete version of the procedure (4.26)–(4.27) replacing all derivatives by discrete derivatives. We will use the

discrete operators

$$\begin{aligned}\Upsilon(\mathbf{u}_{i,\alpha}^n) &:= \frac{1}{2|V_i|} \sum_{j \in K_i} |E_{i,j}| (\mathbf{u}_{j,\alpha}^n - \mathbf{u}_{i,\alpha}^n) \cdot \boldsymbol{\eta}_{i,j}, \\ \vec{\Upsilon}(\bar{\rho}_{i,\alpha}^n) &:= \frac{1}{2|V_i|} \sum_{j \in K_i} |E_{i,j}| (\bar{\rho}_{j,\alpha}^n - \bar{\rho}_{i,\alpha}^n) \boldsymbol{\eta}_{i,j}.\end{aligned}$$

Then, for a Cartesian grid and for each time iteration we use the following algorithm:

DO $i = 1, \dots, \mathcal{V}$:

$$w_{i,1/2}^{+n} = \mathbf{u}_{i,1}^n \cdot \vec{\Upsilon}(z_{i,B}^n)$$

DO $\alpha = 1, \dots, M$:

$$\begin{aligned}w_{i,\alpha}^n &= w_{i,\alpha-1/2}^{+n} - \frac{1}{\bar{\rho}_{i,\alpha}^n} \left(\frac{\bar{\rho}_{i,\alpha}^n - \bar{\rho}_{i,\alpha}^{n-1}}{\Delta t} + \vec{\Upsilon}(\bar{\rho}_{i,\alpha}^n) \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i,\alpha}^n + \bar{\rho}_{i,\alpha}^n \Upsilon(\mathbf{u}_{i,\alpha}^n) \right) \\ &\quad (z - z_{i,\alpha-1/2}^n), \\ w_{i,\alpha+1/2}^{-n} &= w_{i,\alpha-1/2}^{+n} - \frac{h_{i,\alpha}^n}{\bar{\rho}_{i,\alpha}^n} \left(\frac{\bar{\rho}_{i,\alpha}^n - \bar{\rho}_{i,\alpha}^{n-1}}{\Delta t} + \vec{\Upsilon}(\bar{\rho}_{i,\alpha}^n) \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i,\alpha}^n + \bar{\rho}_{i,\alpha}^n \Upsilon(\mathbf{u}_{i,\alpha}^n) \right), \\ w_{i,\alpha+1/2}^{+n} &= \frac{1}{\bar{\rho}_{i,\alpha+1}^n} \left((\bar{\rho}_{i,\alpha+1}^n - \bar{\rho}_{i,\alpha}^n) \frac{z_{i,\alpha+1/2}^n - z_{i,\alpha+1/2}^{n-1}}{\Delta t} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (\bar{\rho}_{i,\alpha+1}^n \mathbf{u}_{i,\alpha+1}^n - \bar{\rho}_{i,\alpha}^n \mathbf{u}_{i,\alpha}^n) \cdot \vec{\Upsilon}(z_{i,\alpha+1/2}^n) + \bar{\rho}_{i,\alpha}^n w_{i,\alpha+1/2}^{-n} \right)\end{aligned}$$

END DO

END DO

7 Numerical Tests

In the following numerical simulations we use the global acceleration of gravity constant $g = 9.8 \text{ m/s}^2$, the (nominal) maximal total solids volume fraction $\phi_{\max} = 0.68$, and employ the Richardson–Zaki hindered settling factor (2.8) with $n_{\text{RZ}} = 4.7$. The viscosity and density of the pure fluid are $\mu_0 = 0.02416 \text{ Pa s}$ and $\rho_0 = 1208 \text{ kg/m}^3$, respectively, $\eta = \eta(\phi)$ is the concentration-dependent viscosity defined by $\eta(\phi) := \mu_0(1.0 - \phi/0.95)^{-\beta}$, $\beta = 2.5$. Other parameters in (2.4) are set $\sigma_0 = 0.22 \text{ Pa}$, $\alpha = 5$ and the gel point $\phi_c = 0.1$. In all tests the particles are assumed to have the same density $\rho_1 = \dots = \rho_N = 2790 \text{ kg/m}^3$.

7.1 Test 1: Bidisperse Sedimentation in a Domain with a Bump

In Test 1 we are interested in studying the behavior of a mixture with $N = 2$ different solid species dispersed in a viscous fluid with a viscosity μ_0 . In this first test we consider $\mathbf{T}^E = \sigma_e = 0$ (without viscous stress tensor and without compression). The solid particle diameters are $d_1 = 4.96 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m}$ and $d_2 = 3.25 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m}$ respectively. The discretization of the domain is given by 100×100 cells and $M = 10$ layers in the horizontal and vertical directions, respectively. The bottom elevation is given by

$$z_B(x, y) = \exp(-40((x - 0.5)^2 + (y - 0.5)^2)) \text{ m} \quad \text{for } (x, y) \in [0, 1 \text{ m}]^2. \quad (7.1)$$

The initial condition for the concentrations and the horizontal velocities are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_{1,\alpha}(0, x, y) &= 0.05, \quad \phi_{2,\alpha}(0, x, y) = 0.025, \quad u_\alpha(0, x, y) = 0 \\ &\text{for } \alpha = 1, \dots, M, \text{ and } (x, y) \in [0, 1 \text{ m}]^2.\end{aligned}$$

Fig. 2 Test 1: Concentration of species 1 (ϕ_1) by color in a domain with a bump

Fig. 3 Test 1: Concentration of species 2 (ϕ_2) by color in a domain with a bump

Fig. 4 Test 1: Total concentration of solid particles, $\phi_T = \phi_1 + \phi_2$ by color in a domain with a bump

Fig. 5 Test 1: Velocity field of the mixture over magnitude of the velocity

Fig. 6 Test 2: Concentration of species 1 (ϕ_1) by color in a 3D domain with compression and viscous stress tensor deactivated (left) versus concentration of species 1 with stress tensor and compression terms activated (right)

The initial height is $h(0, x, y) = 0.3 \text{ m} - z_B(x, y)$. Furthermore, as boundary condition we impose a closed basin.

In Figs. 2, 3 and 4 we present the numerical results of the concentrations each species, ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 , and the total concentration, respectively. This simulation is a three-dimensional version of [10, Test 2]. In Fig. 2 high concentrations of species 1 can be observed since the bigger particles are deposited rapidly over the bottom around the bump. In Fig. 3 we see how some fine particles remain in suspension close to the wall. At larger simulated times the smaller particles begin to settle and occupy zones where the concentration of species 1 is small, as can be seen in Figs. 2f and 3f at time $t = 50 \text{ s}$. The joint behavior of all particles dispersed in the fluid is displayed in Fig. 4. Here the global sedimentation process can be seen and we observe that the particles are deposited on the bottom around the bump but some fine particles (species 2) are kept in suspension at short times.

The velocity field of the mixture and its magnitude are presented in Fig. 5 at different times. The movement of the mixture is a natural consequence of the movement of the particles. Some important recirculations can be seen around the bump. At larger times the velocity decreases and the particles settle more easily.

7.2 Test 2: Cylindrical Dam Break

In this second numerical simulation we compare the behavior of the bidisperse sedimentation process with compression and mixture viscosity with the same mixture without compression

Fig. 7 Test 2: Concentration of species 2 (ϕ_2) by color in a 3D domain with compression and viscous stress tensor deactivated (left) versus concentration of species 2 with stress tensor and compression terms activated (right)

and mixture viscosity in a paraboloid domain. To this end, we simulate a dam break problem over a paraboloid bottom given by

$$z_B(x, y) = \begin{cases} 0.71((x - 0.5)^2 + (y - 0.5)^2) & \text{for } (x - 0.5)^2 + (y - 0.5)^2 \leq 0.21, \\ 0.15 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (x, y) \in [0, 1] \times [0, 1].$$

The diameters of the solid particles are as in Test 1. Here we use a rectangular grid of 100×100 cells in the horizontal directions and $M = 10$ layers in the vertical direction. For all $\alpha = 1, \dots, M$ the initial condition is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{1,\alpha}(0, \mathbf{x}) &= \begin{cases} 0.05 & \text{for } (x - 0.2)^2 + (y - 0.5)^2 \leq 0.1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \mathbf{u}_\alpha(0, \mathbf{x}) = 0, \\ \phi_{2,\alpha}(0, \mathbf{x}) &= \begin{cases} 0.025 & \text{for } (x - 0.2)^2 + (y - 0.5)^2 \leq 0.1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (7.2)$$

and for the height $h(0, x, y) = 0.3 - z_B(x, y)$. Figs. 6, 7, 8 and 9 show the comparison between a simulation without (Case 1, left) and with (Case 2, right) for bigger particles ϕ_1 (species 1), fine particles ϕ_2 (species 2), for the total concentration ϕ and for the velocity field of the mixture. In both cases the larger particles settle faster than the small ones. Furthermore the small particles move to zones of the domain where the concentration of the larger particles is small (Figs. 6a, c, e and 7b, d, f, respectively). As we can see in Case 1 (left) in Figs. 6, 7 and 8 (plots (a), (c) and (e) in each case), the movement of the solid particles in the mixture

Fig. 8 Test 2: Total concentration of solid particles $\phi_T = \phi_1 + \phi_2$ by color in a 3D domain with compression and viscous stress tensor deactivated (left) versus total concentration of solid particles with stress tensor and compression terms activated (right)

Fig. 9 Test 2: Velocity field of mixture over her magnitude by color. Comparison between a a mixture with compression and viscous stress tensor deactivated (left) versus a mixture with stress tensor and compression terms activated (right)

Fig. 10 Test 4: Concentration of species 1 (ϕ_1) by color with gel point $\phi_c = 0.08$ (left) versus concentration of species 1 with gel point $\phi_c = 0.15$ (right)

oscillates for short times and from $t = 50$ s the solid particles almost stop and from this time on the velocity field begins to be nearly symmetrical (see Fig. 9a, c, e). In Case 1 the solid particles move freely in the mixture. Instead, if we activate the compression and mixture viscosity terms (viscous stress) we can see from Figs. 6, 7 and 8 (plots (b), (d) and (f) in each case) how the movement of each solid species is slower than in Case 1, since for $\phi > \phi_c$ the sediment starts to compress and on the other hand the viscosity of the mixture increases when concentration. As a result the movement of the solid particles begins to be denser than in the first case. In this Case 2 (right) the solid particles do not move oscillatorily as we can see in Figs. 6, 7 and 8 (plots (b), (d) and (f) in each case). Finally, we comment that the velocity field is still not symmetrical at time $t = 50$ s (see Fig. 9b, d, f). The mixture of Case 2 (right) moves with more difficulties than the mixture of Case 1.

7.3 Test 3: Bidisperse Sedimentation Process in Real Bathymetry for Different Gel Points

In the following numerical simulation we examine the behavior of the mixture when the gel point ϕ_c is varied. To this we simulate a bidisperse sedimentation process in a real configuration with compression and viscosity mixture terms activated. The bathymetry for

(a) Concentration by layers $\phi_{T,\alpha}$, $\phi_c = 0.08$, $t = 20$ s

(b) Concentration by layers $\phi_{T,\alpha}$, $\phi_c = 0.15$, $t = 20$ s

(c) Concentration by layers $\phi_{T,\alpha}$, $\phi_c = 0.08$, $t = 40$ s

(d) Concentration by layers $\phi_{T,\alpha}$, $\phi_c = 0.15$, $t = 40$ s

(e) Concentration by layers $\phi_{T,\alpha}$, $\phi_c = 0.08$, $t = 50$ s

(f) Concentration by layers $\phi_{T,\alpha}$, $\phi_c = 0.15$, $t = 50$ s

Fig. 11 Test 4: Total concentration of solid species ϕ_T with gel point $\phi_c = 0.08$ (left) versus total concentration of solid species with gel point $\phi_c = 0.15$ (right)

(a) Velocity field $\vec{u}$, $t = 5$ s

(b) Velocity field $\vec{u}$, $t = 20$ s

(c) Velocity field $\vec{u}$, $t = 30$ s

(d) Velocity field $\vec{u}$, $t = 50$ s

Fig. 12 Test 4: Velocity field of the mixture with gel point $\phi_c = 0.15$

this numerical simulation is given by

$$z_B(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1.1 & \text{for } 0 \leq x < 0.4, 0 \leq y \leq 4, \\ 1.1 & \text{for } 0.4 \leq x \leq 5.8 - a, 0 \leq y < a, \\ -\frac{1.1(y - a)}{1.875 - a} + 1.1 & \text{for } 0.4 \leq x \leq 5.8 - a, a \leq y < \mathcal{L}_1, \\ -\frac{1.1}{5.3}(x - 0.4) + 1.1 & \text{for } 0.4 \leq x \leq 5.8 - a, \mathcal{L}_1 \leq y \leq \mathcal{L}_2, \\ -\frac{1.1(y - (4 - a))}{(2.125 - (4 - a))} + 1.1 & \text{for } 0.4 \leq x \leq 5.8 - a, \mathcal{L}_2 < y \leq 4 - a, \\ 1.1 & \text{for } 0.4 \leq x \leq 5.8 - a, 4 - a < y \leq 4, \\ z_B(5.8 - a, y) & \text{for } 5.8 - a < x \leq 5.8, 0 \leq y \leq 4, \end{cases} \quad (7.3)$$

where the lines are given by

$$\mathcal{L}_1 : y = \frac{1.875 - a}{5.3}(x - 0.4) + a, \quad \mathcal{L}_2 : y = \frac{2.125 - (4 - a)}{5.3}(x - 0.4) + 4 - a,$$

along with the parameter $a = 0.116$. The initial condition is the same as in Test 1, namely

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{1,\alpha}(0, x, y) &= 0.05, \quad \phi_{2,\alpha}(0, x, y) = 0.025, \quad u_\alpha(0, x, y) = 0 \\ \text{for } \alpha &= 1, \dots, M \text{ and } (x, y) \in [0, 5.8] \times [0, 4]. \end{aligned}$$

For the height $h(0, x, y) = 1.7 - z_B(x, y)$ m. In this numerical simulation we only analyze the total concentration of the mixture (Fig. 11) and the concentration of the bigger particles in the mixture (Fig. 10) since it is difficult to see differences in the behavior of the small particles dispersed in the mixture. In Figs. 10 and 11 we can see the behavior of each species for different gel points, $\phi_c = 0.08$ (left) and $\phi_c = 0.15$ (right). Note that for small times when the compression is deactivated (before $\phi_c = 0.08$) there is no difference in the concentrations. We show solutions only at those times where in some regions of the spatial domain the total concentration exceeds $\phi_c = 0.08$. In this figure we can see that when the gel point is small, the particles begin to compress before they settle, and the movement of these particles is slow and they move with difficulties in the horizontal direction. This means that when we activate the gel point $\phi_c = 0.08$ the particles essentially settle and with difficulties move horizontally. They begin to compress anticipatedly (see Figs. 10 (left), 11). On the other hand, when we active the gel point later $\phi_c = 0.15$, first the particles settle faster than in the case before (see Fig. 10b, d, e), and after the particles have settled they begin to compress and the movement of the particles begins to be more slow. We need to be careful with this comparison because if we see the equalities (2.4) keeping constant σ_0 we can observe two effects when ϕ_c increases, first the compression starts later and the capacity of compression is smaller than when the ϕ_c is small. Finally, Fig. 12 shows the velocity field of the mixture only for gel point $\phi_c = 0.15$ at some times, here we can see several recirculations at least one for each slope on the bottom.

7.4 Test 4: Bidisperse Sedimentation Process in Real Bathymetry with Different σ_0

The last numerical simulation shows a bidisperse sedimentation of the same mixture before (same diameters, densities, species), and initial and boundary conditions are as in Test 3. The

Fig. 13 Test 4: Concentration of species 1 (ϕ_1) by color with $\sigma_0 = 0.22$ (left) versus $\sigma_0 = 0.88$ (right) with a fixed gel point $\phi_c = 0.1$

bottom is given by Sect. 7.3. Here we keep constant the gel point $\phi_c = 0.1$ and study the behavior of the mixture when the parameter σ_0 in (2.4) is varied. This term represent the force or capacity of compression, it is clear from (2.4) that when σ_0 is increased, σ_c increases as well (keeping constant the gel point). When the compression term is deactivated all species settle faster that when the compression term is activated and they move to the deepest zone. On the other hand, as we can see in Figs. 13 and 14 with $\sigma_0 = 0.22$ (left) and $\sigma_0 = 0.88$ (right) if we active the compression term the particles begin to move with more difficulty to the deepest zone. In Figs. 13 and 14b, d, f for $\sigma_0 = 0.88$ we can see that the maximum of the concentration is smaller than of the maximum concentration for $\sigma_0 = 0.22$.

8 Conclusions

We have formulated a three-dimensional mathematical model to simulate polydisperse sedimentation that includes the compressibility of the sediment and the viscosity of the mixture. This model can be used for simulations in industrial applications (clarification tanks, wastewater treatment) and geophysical flows such as sediment transport and polydisperse sedimentation in rivers. The model is vertically consistent with the classical 1D vertical model but with the property that solid particles are transported in all directions. Naturally, under the assumption of shallow water, the compression term is essentially vertical. If we do not impose this assumption, the system (2.10)–(2.12) is much more complicated to solve since the compression term would be activated in all direction. This mathematical model

(a) Concentration by layers $\phi_{T,\alpha}$, $\sigma_0 = 0.22$, $t = 20$ s

(b) Concentration by layers $\phi_{T,\alpha}$, $\sigma_0 = 0.88$, $t = 20$ s

(c) Concentration by layers $\phi_{T,\alpha}$, $\sigma_0 = 0.22$, $t = 40$ s

(d) Concentration by layers $\phi_{T,\alpha}$, $\sigma_0 = 0.88$, $t = 40$ s

(e) Concentration by layers $\phi_{T,\alpha}$, $\sigma_0 = 0.22$, $t = 50$ s

(f) Concentration by layers $\phi_{T,\alpha}$, $\sigma_0 = 0.88$, $t = 50$ s

Fig. 14 Test 4: Total concentration of solid species $\phi_T = \phi_1 + \phi_2$ by color with $\sigma_0 = 0.22$ (left) versus $\sigma_0 = 0.88$ (right) with a fixed gel point $\phi_c = 0.1$

allows one to know the concentration of each solid particle species dispersed in the fluid. For instance we get important information on areas where the concentration of the solid particles is below a tolerance index, in other words this model allows one to define zones where clean water can be extracted. In this work the bottom or topography only varies with the space variable $z_B(x, y)$, but other important geophysical phenomena could also be modeled when the bottom vary respect to time t . Some future work is to design a mathematical model suitable to simulate erosion process, which means that the bottom can vary respect in time, and to describe sedimentation in an inclined channel.

While the model and its applications are of obvious practical interest, there are still some open mathematical questions. For example, hyperbolicity of the model is very hard to prove in the general case when the viscous term is neglected. However, the multilayer shallow water equations (i.e., the present model without dispersed particulate matter) is hyperbolic at least for $M = 2$, as can be inferred from [1]. The purely vertical polydisperse model including compression terms is also hyperbolic as long as $\phi \leq \phi_c$, as is explained in [4]. Obviously, this do not imply that our model is always hyperbolic, but a general result is currently unavailable. With respect to related issue of wave speeds we comment that the PVM method used only requires approximations of the minimum and maximum eigenvalues that are given by (6.8)–(6.10).

Furthermore, we comment that if we do not consider concentrations of the different species dispersed in the fluid, the model is reduced to a model obtained in [18], which has an associated energy equation. We can also prove that in the case of constant concentration the model has an associated dissipative energy equation. Nevertheless we cannot prove a general result for

Fig. 15 Comparison of numerical simulation (solid line) with experimental results by Gladstone et al. [19]. Densities of solids species $\rho_1 = \rho_2 = 3217 \text{ kg/m}^3$ and for the fluid $\rho_0 = 1000 \text{ kg/m}^3$. Diameters $d_1 = 6.90 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m}$ and $d_2 = 2.50 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m}$

the full model. Let us remark that even for two-phase depth-averaged models this is a difficult task, see for example [8].

The numerical scheme conserves mass exactly. On the other hand, we note that by the first definition in (2.2), the density ρ inherits properties from ϕ_j , $j = 1, \dots, N$. We cannot prove exact positivity preservation of the concentrations, although in practice we have not found any problem, because this difficulty is very similar to a classical transport equation of a passive scalar with some vertical transfer of particles. Then horizontal transport ensures positivity. Moreover, if a vertical source produces some non-positive value it is sufficient to update the unknowns by re-calculating them with a smaller time step. Since the numerical scheme is coded in terms of the fluxes this is not at all computationally costly.

Finally, a broad comparison of the model predictions with laboratory data is still missing. However, we have analyzed the numerical solution of our model with experimental data obtained by Gladstone et al. [19]. The parameters used in [19] are the densities of solids $\rho_1 = \rho_2 = 3217 \text{ kg/m}^3$ and of the fluid $\rho_0 = 1000 \text{ kg/m}^3$ along with the solid particle diameters $d_1 = 6.90 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m}$ and $d_2 = 2.50 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m}$. With these parameters we have simulated a sediment dam break problem and compared the results with the experimental data provided in [19], see Fig. 15. Specifically, we show a comparison with experimental data of the evolution of the front position with the test described in [19]. We can observe that for smaller times the evolution of the front is correctly described. Nevertheless, for bigger times the front position changes depending on the concentration of coarse (C) and fine (F) particles that is not well described in this case by our model. This behavior is possibly due to additional bottom effects that have not been considered here. For example, Harris et al. [20] propose a shallow-water-type model with an extra boundary condition near the bottom that can be seen as an approach to model only the layer of particles with velocity. Another form to see that is that near the bottom the model of [20] implies that particles are immobile. It seems to us that more detailed studies must be performed to understand correctly all the physical phenomena in this test.

Acknowledgements RB is supported by Fondecyt Project 1170473; CRHIAM, Project ANID/FONDAP/15130015; and CONICYT/PIA/Concurso Apoyo a Centros Científicos y Tecnológicos de Excelencia con Financiamiento Basal AFB170001. EDFN is supported by the Spanish Government and FEDER through the Research project MTM 2015-70490-C2-2-R. VO is supported by CONICYT scholarship.

References

1. Audusse, E., Bristeau, M., Perthame, B., Sainte-Marie, J.: A multilayer Saint-Venant system with mass exchanges for shallow water flows: Derivation and numerical validation. *ESAIM: Math. Model. Numer. Anal.* **45**(1), 169–200 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1051/m2an/2010036>
2. Audusse, E.: A multilayer Saint-Venant model: derivation and numerical validation. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B* **5**(2), 189–214 (2005). <https://doi.org/10.3934/dcdsb.2005.5.189>
3. Austin, L.G., Lee, C.H., Concha, F.: Hindered settling and classification partition curves. *Miner. Metall. Process.* **9**(4), 161–168 (1992)
4. Berres, S., Bürger, R., Karlsen, K.H., Tory, E.M.: Strongly degenerate parabolic–hyperbolic systems modeling polydisperse sedimentation with compression. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **64**(1), 41–80 (2003). <https://doi.org/10.1137/S0036139902408163>
5. Bonnetaze, R.T., Huppert, H.E., Lister, J.R.: Patterns of sedimentation from polydispersed turbidity currents. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A* **452**, 2247–2261 (1996)
6. Boscarino, S., Bürger, R., Mulet, P., Russo, G., Villada, L.M.: On linearly implicit IMEX Runge–Kutta methods for degenerate convection–diffusion problems modeling polydisperse sedimentation. *Bull. Braz. Math. Soc. (N. S.)* **47**(1), 171–185 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00574-016-0130-5>
7. Boscarino, S., Bürger, R., Mulet, P., Russo, G., Villada, L.M.: Linearly implicit IMEX Runge–Kutta methods for a class of degenerate convection–diffusion problems. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* **37**(2), B305–B331 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1137/140967544>
8. Bouchut, F., Fernández-Nieto, E., Mangeney, A., Narbona-Reina, G.: A two-phase shallow debris flow model with energy balance. *ESAIM: Math. Model. Numer. Anal.* **49**(1), 101–140 (2015)
9. Bürger, R., Evje, S., Karlsen, K.H., Lie, K.A.: Numerical methods for the simulation of the settling of flocculated suspensions. *Chem. Eng. J.* **80**(1), 91–104 (2000). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1383-5866\(00\)00080-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1383-5866(00)00080-0)
10. Bürger, R., Fernández-Nieto, E.D., Osóres, V.: A dynamic multilayer shallow water model for polydisperse sedimentation. *ESAIM: Math. Model. Numer. Anal.* **53**(5), 1391–1432 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1051/m2an/2019032>
11. Bürger, R., Wendland, W.L., Concha, F.: Model equations for gravitational sedimentation–consolidation processes. *ZAMM Z. Angew. Math. Mech.* **80**, 79–92 (2000)
12. Bürger, R., Mulet, P., Villada, L.M.: Regularized nonlinear solvers for IMEX methods applied to diffusively corrected multispecies kinematic flow models. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* **35**(3), B751–B777 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1137/120888533>
13. Bürger, R., Diehl, S., Farås, S., Nopens, I., Torfs, E.: A consistent modelling methodology for secondary settling tanks: a reliable numerical method. *Water Sci. Technol.* **68**, 192–208 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.2166/wst.2013.239>
14. Bürger, R., Diehl, S., Martí, M.C., Mulet, P., Nopens, I., Torfs, E., Vanrolleghem, P.A.: Numerical solution of a multi-class model for batch settling in water resource recovery facilities. *Appl. Math. Model.* **49**, 415–436 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apm.2017.05.014>
15. Castro Díaz, M.J., Fernández-Nieto, E.: A class of computationally fast first order finite volume solvers: PVM methods. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* **34**(4), A2173–A2196 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1137/100795280>
16. Diehl, S.: Shock-wave behaviour of sedimentation in wastewater treatment: a rich problem. In: Åström, K., Persson, L.E., Silvestrov, S.D. (eds.) *Analysis for Science, Engineering and Beyond*, pp. 175–214. Springer, Berlin (2012)
17. Fernández-Nieto, E.D., Koné, E.H., Morales de Luna, T., Bürger, R.: A multilayer shallow water system for polydisperse sedimentation. *J. Comput. Phys.* **238**, 281–314 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2012.12.008>
18. Fernández-Nieto, E.D., Koné, E.H., Chacón Rebollo, T.: A multilayer method for the hydrostatic Navier–Stokes equations: a particular weak solution. *J. Sci. Comput.* **60**(2), 408–437 (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10915-013-9802-0>
19. Gladstone, C., Philips, J., Sparks, R.: Experiments on bidisperse, constant–volume gravity currents: propagation and sediment deposition. *Sedimentology* **45**, 833–843 (1998)

20. Harris, T.C., Hogg, A.J., Huppert, H.E.: Polydisperse particle-driven gravity currents. *J. Fluid Mech.* **472**, 333–371 (2002)
21. Lockett, M.J., Bassoon, K.S.: Sedimentation of binary particle mixtures. *Powder Technol.* **24**, 1–7 (1979)
22. Masliyah, J.H.: Hindered settling in a multiple-species particle system. *Chem. Eng. Sci.* **34**, 1166–1168 (1979)
23. Meiburg, E., Kneller, B.: Turbidity currents and their deposits. *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.* **42**(1), 135–156 (2010). <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-fluid-121108-145618>
24. Pérez, M., Font, R., Pastor, C.: A mathematical model to simulate batch sedimentation with compression behavior. *Comput. Chem. Eng.* **22**(11), 1531–1541 (1998). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0098-1354\(98\)00246-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0098-1354(98)00246-4)
25. Richardson, J.F., Zaki, W.N.: Sedimentation and fluidisation: Part I. *Trans. Inst. Chem. Eng. (Lond.)* **32**, 34–53 (1954)
26. Rushton, A., Ward, A.S., Holdich, R.G.: *Solid–Liquid Filtration and Sedimentation Technology*, 2nd edn. Wiley-VCH, Weinheim (2000)
27. Sainte-Marie, J.: Vertically averaged models for the free surface non-hydrostatic Euler system: derivation and kinetic interpretation. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* **21**(3), 459–490 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218202511005118>