XXI Congreso de Ecuaciones Diferenciales y Aplicaciones
XI Congreso de Matemática Aplicada
Ciudad Real, 21-25 septiembre 2009
(pp. 1–7)

Geometric form of volcanoes with a limited based

A. Arjona[1], J.I. Díaz[2], J. Fernández [1],

[1] *Instituto de Astronomía y Geodesia, CSIC-UCM, Plaza de Ciencias, 3. Madrid. E-mails:* alicia_arjona@mat.ucm.es, jose_fernandez@mat.ucm.es.
[2] *Dpto. de Matemática Aplicada, Univ. Complutense de Madrid. Plaza de Ciencias, 3. Madrid. E-mail:* ji_diaz@mat.ucm.es.

Key words: geometric of volcanoes, limited base, degenerate parabolic equation, bounded free boundary

Abstract

Many volcanic constructs have geometric different shapes depending on different phenomena as parasitic cones, erosion or coral growth. In Lacey, Ockendon and Turcotte [11] the authors proposed a nonlinear model proving that the shape of volcanoes is determined by the hydraulic resistance to the flow of magma, from a line source, through the porous edifice. This model was later extended in Angevine, Turcotte and Ockendon [2] to include the shape of aseismic, submarine ridges. In this communication we propose a modification of the above mentioned models in order to simulate the more realistic case of volcanoes with a limited base.

We start by proving that the free boundary (the volcano base) associated to the models described in the above mentioned references is not bounded as $t \to +\infty$ (even if it is assumed that the flux generated by the magma supply $Q_0(t)$ in the line source is a bounded function). As said before, this unrealistic fact (specially in the case of volcanoes located in islands) is the main reason to propose a modification of the involved nonlinear equations in order to obtain a new model giving rise to a bounded free boundary (even if $t \to +\infty$). By using some suitable variations of the modelling arguments of Angevine, Turcotte and Ockendon [2] and Lacey, Ockendon and Turcotte [11] we propose the new model,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{lll} \frac{\partial H}{\partial t} & = K\frac{\partial^2 H^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\mu x}{|x|}\frac{\partial H^\lambda}{\partial x}, & x \in \mathbb{R} - \{0\}, t > 0 \\ -K\frac{\partial H^2}{\partial x}(0,t) & = Q_0(t), & t > 0, \\ H(0,x) & = H_0(x), & x \in \mathbb{R} - \{0\}. \end{array} \right. \quad (1)$$

Here we assume known the constants K, $\mu, \lambda > 0$ (which depend on the constitutive porous material) and that $Q_0(t) \geq 0$, $H_0(x) \geq 0$ and H_0 has compact support in $\mathbb{R} - \{0\}$. The models proposed in Angevine, Turcotte and Ockendon [2] and Lacey,

Ockendon and Turcotte [11] correspond to the case of $\mu = 0$. We prove that when $\lambda \in (0, 2)$ and $Q_0(t)$ is a bounded function (as it corresponds to the more important examples) then, if we denote by $\xi_{\pm}(t)$ the free boundary (formed by two curves) given by support of $H(t;\cdot)$, i.e. supp $H(t;\cdot) = [\xi_-(t), 0] \cup [0, \xi_+(t)]$, necessarily $|\xi_{\pm}(t)| < \xi_\infty$ for any $t > 0$, for some $\xi_\infty < +\infty$. This conclusion leads to a better comparison between the bathymetric and theoretical profiles of many volcanoes.

1 Introduction

Let the governing equations for two-dimensional flow of uniform incompressible fluid through a rigid, isotropic porous medium were used in [2] to derive the geometrical form of aseismic volcanoes. They started from the basic equations

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial x} + \dfrac{\partial w}{\partial z} = 0, \\ u = -\dfrac{k}{\mu\phi}\dfrac{\partial p}{\partial x}, \\ w = -\dfrac{k}{\mu\phi}\left(\dfrac{\partial p}{\partial z} + \rho_m g\right), \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

where u and w are the velocities in the x and z directions of the flow, k is permeability, μ is dynamic viscosity, ϕ is porosity, p is pressure, ρ_m is magma density, and g is the gravitational acceleration. These equations are combined to get

$$\frac{\partial^2 p}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 p}{\partial z^2} = 0. \tag{3}$$

The boundary conditions considered in [2] let the following:

$$\begin{cases} z = h, & p = \rho_m g(d-h), & \text{pressure due to the overlying seawater,} \\ z = h, & w = \dfrac{\partial h}{\partial t} + u\dfrac{\partial h}{\partial x}, & \text{kinematic constraint on the upper surface,} \\ z = 0, & \dfrac{\partial p}{\partial z} = -\rho_m g, & \text{on the base of the ridges,} \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

where d is the depth of the ocean floor and $z = h(x,t)$. We also recall that the magma supply requires the additional condition

$$uh \to \frac{Q_0}{2\phi} \text{ as } x \to 0. \tag{5}$$

By introducing the small aspect ratio, a rescale is introduced originating the new terms; $Z = z/\epsilon, H = h/\epsilon, D = d/\epsilon$ and $T = t\epsilon$, with $\epsilon << 1$. Equations (3) and (4) become:

$$\begin{cases} & \epsilon^2\dfrac{\partial^2 p}{\partial x^2} + \dfrac{\partial^2 p}{\partial Z^2} = 0, \\ Z = H, & p = \epsilon\rho_m g(D-H), \\ Z = H, & w = \epsilon^2\dfrac{\partial H}{\partial T} + \epsilon u\dfrac{\partial H}{\partial x}, \\ Z = 0, & \dfrac{\partial p}{\partial Z} = -\epsilon\rho_m g, \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

Finally, after rescaling (2) and by using an expansion in the form

$$p = \epsilon p_0 + \epsilon^3 p_1 + ...$$

it was proved in [2] that the velocities at $Z = H$ must be given by

$$\begin{cases} u = -\epsilon \dfrac{k(\rho_m - \rho_w)g}{\mu\phi} \dfrac{\partial H}{\partial x}, \\ w = \epsilon^2 \dfrac{k(\rho_m - \rho_w)g}{\mu\phi} H \dfrac{\partial^2 H}{\partial x^2}. \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

Substituting these velocities into third equation of (6) they arrive to the degenerate quasi-linear equation of Boussinesq type

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial T} = \frac{k(\rho_m - \rho_w)g}{\mu\phi} \left(H \frac{\partial H}{\partial x} \right)_x. \tag{8}$$

The solution of this equation, satisfying the associated boundary conditions to (4) and (5) were studied in [2] by using their self-similar structure. Here we shall see (Theorem 1) that if we call as $\xi(t)$ to the free boundary given by support of $H(t,\cdot) = [-\xi(t), 0) \cup (0, \xi(t)]$, for any $t > 0$, then necessarily $\xi(t) \longrightarrow +\infty$ as $t \longrightarrow +\infty$, which does not seems to be very realistic. So, if we assume symmetry conditions on the initial data $H_0(x)$, to improve the model, avowing such conclusion, we consider the system

$$P(\mu, Q_0) \equiv \begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial H}{\partial T} = K \dfrac{\partial^2 H^2}{\partial x^2} + \mu \dfrac{\partial H^\lambda}{\partial x} & x \in (0, +\infty), t > 0, \\ -KH \dfrac{\partial H}{\partial x}(0, t) = Q_0(t) & t > 0, \\ H(0, x) = H_0(x) & x \in (0, +\infty). \end{cases}$$

Notice that $P(0, Q_0)$ corresponds to the Boussinesq type equation (8). Here we assume a renormalization of the constants $K, \mu > 0$ and that $H_0(x) \geq 0$ has a compact support. We point out that a more general framework is possible (we can detail it in a subsequent draft of the paper which would contain as well the exact definition of weak solution, and other details). The main result for the new model is given in Theorem 2 and shows that if

$$0 < \lambda < 2,$$

and

$$0 \leq Q_0(t) \leq Q_{0,\infty} \text{ for any } t > 0.$$

then the support of $H(t,\cdot) = [-\xi(t), 0) \cup (0, \xi(t)]$, for any $t > 0$, but it has a limited penetration in the sense that

$$|\xi(t)| \leq \xi_\infty \text{ for any } t \geq 0,$$

for some finite $\xi_\infty < \infty$ depending on $\lambda, K, \mu, Q_{0,\infty}$ and $H_0(x)$. We mention that without the symmetry assumption on $H_0(x)$ we must work on the spatial domain $\mathbb{R} - \{0\}$ and by replacing the nonlinear pde by

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial T} = K \frac{\partial^2 H^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\mu x}{|x|} \frac{\partial H^\lambda}{\partial x}.$$

The new modelling argument consists in introducing the new velocities:

$$\begin{aligned} u &= \epsilon \frac{k(\rho_m - \rho_w)g}{\mu\phi}\frac{\partial H}{\partial x} - \nu(\epsilon)(\frac{\rho_m - \rho_w}{\mu\phi})g\lambda H^{\lambda-1}, \\ w &= \epsilon^2 \frac{k(\rho_m - \rho_w)g}{\mu\phi} H \frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial x^2}, \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

for some $0 < \lambda < 2$ (the justification of this new exponent λ may come from some other terms in the asymptotic expansion or from other form of the boundary conditions). Notice also that if $\lambda \in (1,2)$ the new term is small for $H \in (0, H_0)$, if $\lambda \in (0,1)$ the new term is very big if $H \in (0, H_0)$ and, which is more useful, when $\lambda = 1$ the new term is a constant. We also point out that

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon^2 \frac{\partial H}{\partial t} = w - \epsilon u \frac{\partial H}{\partial x} &= \epsilon^2 \frac{k(\rho_m - \rho_w)g}{\mu\phi} H \frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial x^2} + \epsilon^2 \frac{k(\rho_m - \rho_w)g}{\mu\phi}\left(\frac{\partial H}{\partial x}\right)^2 \\ &\quad + \nu(\epsilon)\epsilon(\frac{\rho_m - \rho_w}{\mu\phi})g\frac{H^{\lambda-1}}{\lambda}\frac{\partial H}{\partial x}. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

So,

$$\epsilon^2 \frac{\partial H}{\partial t} = \epsilon^2 \frac{k(\rho_m - \rho_w)g}{\mu\phi}\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\left(H\frac{\partial H}{\partial x}\right) + \nu(\epsilon)\epsilon\left(\frac{\rho_m - \rho_w}{\mu\phi}\right)g\frac{\partial}{\partial x}(H^\lambda), \tag{11}$$

and then, we must assume that $\nu(\epsilon) = \epsilon$.

2 Unlimited volcanoes base according the previous model ($\mu = 0$).

We are going to prove that the free boundary is not bounded as $t \longrightarrow +\infty$, for this we are going to prove next theorem.

Theorem 1 *Let $\zeta(t)$ the free boundary of the problem $P(0, Q_0)$, then $\zeta(t) \longrightarrow +\infty$ if $t \longrightarrow +\infty$.*

We shall built the proof in two different steps. In a first one, we shall prove that if $U(t,x)$ and $H(t,x)$ are solutions of the respective problems $P(0,Q_0)$ and $P(0,0)$ with the same initial data then, we have $U \le H$.

In a second step, we shall prove that if $\zeta(t)$ and $\xi(t)$ are the free boundaries of the problems $P(0,Q_0)$ and $P(0,0)$, with the same initial data, then $\zeta(t) \longrightarrow +\infty$ as $t \longrightarrow +\infty$. This will conclude the proof since, the first step proves that $0 < \zeta(t) \le \xi(t)$, and thus, necessarily, $\xi(t) \longrightarrow +\infty$ if $t \longrightarrow +\infty$.

The first step is a special conclusion of a more general statement:

Proposition 1 *Let H_1 and H_2 be the solutions of $P(\mu, Q_0)$ corresponding to $\mu \ge 0$, $Q_{1,0}$, $Q_{2,0}$ and $H_{1,0}$, $H_{2,0}$ respectively. Then, for any $t > 0$ we have*

$$\int_\Omega (H_1(t,x) - H_2(t,x))_+ dx \le \int_\Omega (H_{1,0}(x) - H_{2,0}(x))_+ dx + \int_0^t (Q_{1,0}(\tau) - Q_{2,0}(\tau))_+ d\tau \tag{12}$$

where, we used the notation, $a_+(x) = max(0, a(x))$, for any general function defined on Ω.

Notice that as a direct consequence of the Proposition 1, and of the fact that $a_+(x) = 0$ implies that $a(x) \leq 0$, we have

Corollary 1 *Let H_1 and H_2 be the solutions of $P(\mu, Q_0)$ corresponding to $\mu \geq 0$, $Q_{1,0}$, $Q_{2,0}$ and $H_{1,0}$, $H_{2,0}$ respectively such that $Q_{1,0}(t) \leq Q_{2,0}(t)$ for any $t > 0$ and $H_{1,0}(x) \leq H_{2,0}(x)$ for $x \in \Omega$. Then $H_1(t,x) \leq H_2(t,x)$ for any $t > 0$ and for $x \in \Omega$.*

We also get from Proposition 1 a quantitative expression of the continuous dependence of solution H of $P(\mu, Q_0)$ with respect to the data Q_0 and H_0.

Corollary 2 *Let H_1 and H_2 be the solutions of $P(\mu, Q_0)$ corresponding to $\mu \geq 0$, $Q_{1,0}$, $Q_{2,0}$ and $H_{1,0}$, $H_{2,0}$ respectively. Then for any $t > 0$*

$$\int_\Omega |H_1(t,x) - H_2(t,x)|\,dx \leq \int_\Omega |H_{1,0}(x) - H_{2,0}(x)|\,dx + \int_0^t |(Q_{1,0}(\tau) - Q_{2,0}(\tau))|\,d\tau.$$

Proof of Corollary 2. It is enough to observe that, for any general function $a(x)$ defined on Ω we have that $|a(x)| = a_+(x) + a_-(x)$ and that, if for fixed $t > 0$ we define $a(x) = H_1(t,x) - H_2(t,x)$ then $a_-(x) = -\min(0, a(x)) = (H_2(t,x) - H_1(t,x))_+$. Since, the order of H_1 and H_2, taken in Proposition 1, is arbitrary, by reversing the roles of H_1 and H_2, we get that

$$\int_\Omega (H_1(t,x) - H_2(t,x))_- dx \leq \int_\Omega (H_{1,0}(x) - H_{2,0}(x))_- dx + \int_0^t (Q_{1,0}(\tau) - Q_{2,0}(\tau))_- d\tau, \quad (13)$$

which concludes the proof.
Proof of the Proposition 1. The main idea is to multiply the difference of the two equations by a regular approximation $p_n(r)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, of the Heaviside type function

$$sign_{+,0}(r) = 0 \text{ if } r \leq 0 \text{ and } sign_{+,0}(r) = 1 \text{ if } r > 0,$$

taking as $r = (H_1^2(t,x) - H_2^2(t,x))$. For instance, we can take p_n

$$p_n(r) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } r \leq -\frac{1}{n}, \\ nr & \text{if } r \in [-\frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}], \\ 1 & \text{if } r > \frac{1}{n}. \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

Then,

$$\int_\Omega (\frac{\partial H_1(t,x)}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial H_2(t,x)}{\partial t}) p_n(H_1^2(t,x) - H_2^2(t,x))dx = K \int_\Omega \frac{\partial}{\partial x}((\frac{\partial}{\partial x} H_1^2(t,x) - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} H_2^2(t,x)) p_n(H_1^2(t,x) - H_2^2(t,x))dx + \mu \int_\Omega \frac{\partial}{\partial x}(H_1^\lambda(t,x) - H_2^\lambda(t,x)) p_n(H_1^2(t,x) - H_2^2(t,x))dx.$$

By the definition of weak solution (i.e., by integrating by parts) we get

$$\int_\Omega (\frac{\partial H_1(t,x)}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial H_2(t,x)}{\partial t}) p_n(H_1^2(t,x) - H_2^2(t,x))dx + K \int_\Omega (\frac{\partial}{\partial x} H_1^2(t,x) - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} H_2^2(t,x))^2 p_n'(H_1^2(t,x) - H_2^2(t,x))dx = \mu \int_\Omega \frac{\partial}{\partial x}(H_1^\lambda(t,x) - H_2^\lambda(t,x)) p_n(H_1^2(t,x) - H_2^2(t,x))dx + K(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} H_1^2(t,0) - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} H_2^2(t,0)) p_n(H_1^2(t,0) - H_2^2(t,0)),$$

where we used the facts that support of $H_1^2(t,.) - H_2^2(t,.)$ is a compact set for any $t \geq 0$. Then, since $0 \leq p_n(r) \leq 1$ for any r, and passing to the limit, as $n \to +\infty$ we have that

$$sign_{+,0}(H_1^2(t,x) - H_2^2(t,x)) = sign_{+,0}(H_1(t,x) - H_2(t,x)) = sign_{+,0}(H_1^\lambda(t,x) - H_2^\lambda(t,x)).$$

Finally, it is enough to remember that

$$\frac{\partial H(t,x)}{\partial t} sign_{+,0}(H(t,x)) = \frac{\partial [H(t,x)]_+}{\partial t} \text{ and } \frac{\partial H(t,x)}{\partial x} sign_{+,0}(H(t,x)) = \frac{\partial [H(t,x)]_+}{\partial x}$$

for any general function $H(t,x)$ and so the result follows by interating in t and using that support of $H_1^\lambda(t,.) - H_2^\lambda(t,.)$ is a compact set for any $t \geq 0$ and that $[H_1^\lambda(t,0) - H_2^\lambda(t,0)]_+ \geq 0$.

3 Limited volcanoes base for $\mu > 0$.

Concerning the theory of existence and uniqueness of weak solutions we send the reader to the works [1], [10], [6], [9], [8], [4] and their references.

Theorem 2 *Assume $H_0(x)$ bounded and with compact support,*

$$0 < \lambda < 2,$$

and let

$$0 \leq Q_0(t) \leq Q_{0,\infty}, \text{ for any } t > 0 \tag{15}$$

for a suitable $Q_{0,\infty}$. Then the support $H(t,\cdot) = [-\xi(t), 0) \cup (0, \xi(t)]$, for any $t > 0$,

$$|\xi(t)| \leq \xi_\infty \text{ for any } t \geq 0,$$

for some finite $\xi_\infty < \infty$ depending on $\lambda, K, \mu, Q_{0,\infty}$ and $H_0(x)$.

Proof. Thanks to Corollary 1 it is enough to construct a supersolution $H_2(t,x)$ with a bounded support for any $t \geq 0$. In fact, we can construct such a function as $H_2(t,x) = U(x)$ solution of the ordinary differential equation

$$\begin{cases} K(U^2)_x + C_1 U^\lambda = 0 & x \in (0, +\infty), \\ U(0) = C_2. \end{cases}$$

Using that $\lambda < 2$ the support of U is compact and since $H(t,x)$ is bounded we can choose $C_1, C_2 > 0$ suitably as to have

$$Q_{1,0}(t) \leq C_1 C_2^\lambda \text{ for any } t > 0 \text{ and } H_{1,0}(x) \leq U(x) \text{ for } x \in \Omega,$$

and the proof is complete.

Remark. Other supersolutions leading to other qualitative properties of the free boundary can be found in the works [10], [6], [7], [8], [5] and [3].

Acknowledgments

The work of the first two authors was supported by the research project MTM2008-06208 of the Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación, Spain, and the one by the second author by the projects MTM2008-06208 of the Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación, Spain and CCG07-UCM/ESP-2787 of the DGUIC of the CAM and the UCM.

References

[1] Alt, H. W. and Luckhaus, S., *Quasilinear elliptic-parabolic differential equations*, Math. Z., 183, pp. 311–341, 1983.

[2] Angevine, C.L., Turcotte, D.L., Ockendon, J.R., *Geometrical form of aseismic ridges, volcanoes and seamounts*, Journal of Geophysical Resarch, 89, 11, 287-292, 1984.

[3] Antontsev, S., Díaz, J. I., Shmarev, S., *Energy methods for free boundary problems. Applications to nonlinear PDEs and Fluid Mechanics*, Series Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and Their Applications, No. 48, Birkäuser, Boston, 2002.

[4] Ph. Benilan, J. I. Díaz, *Pointwise gradient estimates of solutions of onedimensional nonlinear parabolic problems*, J. Evolution Equations, 3, 557-602, 2004.

[5] Díaz, J. I., *Qualitative Study of Nonlinear Parabolic Equations: an Introduction*, Extracta Mathematicae, 16, núm.2, 303-341, 2001.

[6] Díaz, J. I., Kersner,R. , *On a nonlinear degenerate parabolic equation in filtration or evaporation through a porous medium.* Journal of Differential Equations, Vol 69, No 3, 368- 403, 1987.

[7] Díaz, J.I., Kersner, R., *On the behaviour and cases of nonexistence of the free boundary in a semibounded porous medium*, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Application, Vol 132, No 1, 281 289, 1988.

[8] Díaz, J. I. and Shmarev, S. I., *On the behaviour of the interface in nonlinear processes with convection dominating diffusion via Lagrangian coordinates.* Advances in Mathematical Sciences and Applications, Vol 1, No1, 19 45, 1992.

[9] Gilding, B. H. *Improved theory for a nonlinear degenerate parabolic equation.* Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa - Classe di Scienze, Sér. 4, 16 no. 2, p. 165-224, 1989.

[10] Kalashnikov, A.S., *Some problems of qualitative theory of nonlinear degenerate second-order parabolic equations*, Uspekhi Mat. Nauk., 42, 135-176, 1987.

[11] Lacey, A., Ockendon, J.R., Turcotte, D.L., *On the geometrical form of volcanoes*, Earth Planet.Sci.Lett., 54, 139-143, 1981.