# CONVERGENCE OF THE GENERALIZED VOLUME AVERAGING METHOD ON A CONVECTION-DIFFUSION PROBLEM: A SPECTRAL PERSPECTIVE[*]

C. PIERRE[†], F. PLOURABOUÉ[‡], AND M. QUINTARD[‡]

**Abstract.** This paper proposes a thorough investigation of the convergence of the volume averaging method described by Whitaker [*The Method of Volume Averaging*, Kluwer Academic, Norwell, MA, 1999] as applied to convection-diffusion problems inside a cylinder. A spectral description of volume averaging brings to the fore new perspectives about the mathematical analysis of those approximations. This spectral point of view is complementary with the Lyapunov–Schmidt reduction technique and provides a precise framework for investigating convergence. It is shown for convection-diffusion inside a cylinder that the spectral convergence of the volume averaged description depends on the chosen averaging operator, as well as on the boundary conditions. A remarkable result states that only part of the eigenmodes among the infinite discrete spectrum of the full solution can be captured by averaging methods. This leads to a general convergence theorem (which was already examined with the use of the center manifold theorem [G. N. Mercer and A. J. Roberts, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 50 (1990), pp. 1547–1565] and investigated with Lyapunov–Schmidt reduction techniques [S. Chakraborty and V. Balakotaiah, *Chem. Engrg. Sci.*, 57 (2002), pp. 2545–2564] in similar contexts). Moreover, a necessary and sufficient condition for an eigenvalue to be captured is given. We then investigate specific averaging operators, the convergence of which is found to be exponential.

**Key words.** volume averaging, homogenization, convection, diffusion, Sturm–Liouville, spectral theory, Picard's successive approximation method, spectral methods

**AMS subject classifications.** 74Q, 76M50, 76M22, 78M40, 35B30

**DOI.** 10.1137/040610015

**1. Introduction.** Volume averaging techniques are widely used to model transport problems for which decoupled or separated scales can be identified. The first part of this introduction deals with the potential interest of volume averaging for convection-diffusion problems in different applications. In the second part we discuss the interest and the specificity of volume averaging as compared to other homogenization methods. This general discussion is developed in the paper in a specific case suitable for mathematical treatment: the problem of convection-diffusion in a circular tube.

Convection-diffusion inside a tube would seem to be a simple mathematical problem. It turns out that it is a nontrivial problem, well known in the history of applied mathematics. Starting from Graetz [17] and Lévêque [20] in the stationary case, it has more lately interested Taylor [38] and Aris [1] in the context of its transient nonstationary asymptotic behavior. These seminal works have inspired many others, some of which are discussed in the second part of the introduction when discussing the methodological point of view.

Many research areas such as chemical engineering, biomechanics, and porous media are interested by variants of such a simple generic convection-diffusion problem. For example, when the considered problem involves many tubes inside which con-

---

[†]Université de Nantes Laboratoire de mathématiques Jean Leray, UMR CNRS 6629, 44035 Nantesceder, France (Pierre.Charles@math.univ-nantes.fr).

[‡]IMFT UMR CNRS-INPT/UPS, 5502 Av. du Professeur Camille Soula, 31400 Toulouse, France (plourab@imft.fr, quintard@imft.fr).

vection occurs (such as heat exchangers or microvascular beds), transport equations have been sought in terms of cross-section averaged fields [7, 19, 26, 27, 41]. Recently, the design and optimization of microheater exchangers has stimulated the search for averaged equations governing averaged temperature either at the tube scale or at the scale of the whole exchanger [26, 41]. In the context of heat exchange in biological tissues, averaged descriptions have remained very useful models [28] since the pioneering Pennes model [2, 3, 30]. These investigations suggest that averaged temperature associated with "compartmental" domains such as tissues and blood flow in vessels are interesting quantities to consider in order to model heat exchanges inside bodies. In these cases it is crucial to understand how the microscale flow may be approximated by averaged models because, even if possible, a detailed description of the full stationary problem at the local scale of each tube is not of great interest. In the context of these applications, averaged models have proved to be useful and interesting for applied concerns. Nevertheless, even if the description of averaged quantities is useful in practice for obvious operational reasons, there are still numerous questions concerning the validity and the quality of the approximation given by these ad hoc models. As a matter of fact, even if the model predictions could be *in retrospect* tested numerically, it is always interesting to better understand what their mathematical foundations are. This allows one to better understand their limits and their possible extensions. In this paper, we investigate the model of stationary convection-diffusion inside a tube. This study shows that, in this particular context, an averaged description can capture only large scale features of the exact solution, the convergence of which can be made as precise as necessary.

From a methodological point of view, spatial averaging is at first used as an operational definition of macroscale quantities. From this, macroscale equations may be derived, and the reader is referred to the paper [13] for a review of the different perspectives and points of view. For example, macroscale equations are introduced by many authors from extensive use of irreversible thermodynamics [18] (this approach is also often called mixture theory). In this paper, we are interested in methods that provide a direct, deterministic link, through some *mapping variables*, between the microscale and the macroscale fields. Such a method has been applied to determine macroscale transport equations for porous media applications, as illustrated in [39], while concomitantly a very similar approach has been proposed by Brenner [9]. Many characteristics and assumptions of the cited methods are close to other macroscopization methods, such as homogenization theory [6, 36]. Indeed, the general agreement between both methods has been described for diffusion problems in [8]. The major features may be summarized in the following terms:

- The macroscopic characteristic scales are supposed to be decoupled from the microscopic ones, each level having its own variable description.
- The initial boundary value problem (IBVP) that determines the microscale fields is solved in an approximated manner in terms of the macroscale variables and some mapping variables. The approximation is materialized by microscale problems or *closure problems* that completely define these mapping variables.
- Having solved these microscale problems, the macroscopic mathematical description is essentially dependent on the estimation of macroscopic coefficients or *effective* coefficients that are explicitly given in terms of averages of the mapping variables.

One feature of the considered volume averaging method is, therefore, that some additional hypotheses are needed in order to simplify the original problem and relate the microscale fields to the macroscale ones. These additional relations, which we called "closure relations," are problem dependent and must be consistent with the assumption made of separated scales. This feature is common to almost all homogenization methods. For example, asymptotic methods are based on regular asymptotic expansions for inner (microscale) and outer (macroscale) variables to be specified, the scaling of which has to be carefully evaluated by order of magnitude analysis of the relevant parameters [23]. Another method involving scales is the time-scale separation between master and slave modes based on center manifold description [33]. This method has been used to provide a general and rigorous treatment of Taylor dispersion [4, 5, 10, 21, 24, 31, 34, 40]. This method shares many features with the one examined in this paper, besides a more general background and different objectives. One important starting point for this method is to use steady state solutions as decomposed into a discrete and infinite set of eigenfunctions. Examining a linear problem, the temporal solution are then linearly decomposed into those stationary eigenmodes, i.e., each stationary eigenmode is associated with a nonstationary one. Among those, the one associated with the trivial zero eigenvalue is called the master mode because it is associated with slow temporal relaxations of interest for long-time asymptotic behavior. The other temporal modes fulfill fast temporal relaxations whose influence on the master mode can be recast into the master equation parameters. The coupling between slave and master modes is obtained from a linear decomposition strictly similar to the above-mentioned "closure relations." These closure relations are derived from a Lyapunov–Schmidt reduction [4, 5] associated with a small parameter which is the product between the Péclet number and the aspect ratio of the considered tube.

The general philosophy of this master/slave time separation method is then much similar to the one applied in this paper on the spatial level. In the case of volume averaged methods, far-field spatial asymptotic behavior (sometimes called "fully developed" spatial variations) is interesting in that it describes the evolution of a simple one-dimensional macroscopic field, without requiring of a precise description of supplementary spatial variations. There is nevertheless one major technical difference with the goal pursued in this paper. In the case of the master/slave time separation method, the invariant manifold theorem gives a nice framework for the validity of such slow/fast mode decomposition close to any trivial zero eigenvalue [24] (because the time scales separation is governed by the ratio of the fast to slow mode eigenvalues). This framework can be easily transposed for spatially decaying modes close to a trivial zero eigenvalue [4]. Those zero eigenvalue macroscopic modes might be interesting, especially when the problem has Neumann boundary conditions. In this case, direct Lyapunov–Schmidt reduction techniques have been used to assess the convergence of averaging models, for example, when chemical reaction occurs within the fluid [11]. In section 5.1.1 we will compare our results with those obtained in [11] that are rediscussed in the third section of [5]. Those zero eigenvalue macroscopic modes are nevertheless less interesting in transfer problems. In that case they are associated with a spatially uniform eigenmode whose contribution to the transfer between the tube wall and the fluid is zero. Other nontrivial spatially decaying eigenmodes should then be sought. This is especially true when boundary conditions are not of Neumann type, so that there is no trivial zero eigenmode. But, in this case, the invariant manifold theorem hardly guarantees the validity and accuracy of a slow/fast scale decoupling. One of the purposes of this paper is to re-

examine the conditions for which a macro/micro decoupling is a sensible approach in the case of a simple convection-diffusion problem with general boundary conditions. In this sense, the presented analysis extends previous works [5, 11] which have used Lyapunov–Schmidt reduction techniques close to a 0 eigenmode. Our analysis considers the approximation of nonzero eigenmodes with non-self-adjoint operators. While restricted to a given convection-diffusion problem, this paper examines the precise conditions for which a part of the exact solution can be captured by an averaged model. One important conclusion, for applications purposes, that is drawn from the proposed analysis is that, depending on the chosen averaging method (more precisely depending on the applied weighting function), the nontrivial, interesting eigenmodes cannot always be captured. It is, therefore, of great interest to know better what causes averaging for convection-diffusion problems to work and why.

Moreover, there is an additional interest in our analysis for those willing to use averaged models. Macroscale equations, as generally introduced in the literature [39], come from first order terms. The "quality" of the first order approximation is often checked through some comparison with direct simulations, or analytical solutions of the microscale equations, or by developing estimates for the higher order terms. It is often difficult to have a precise quantitative determination of those terms, and the first approach, if available, can offer valuable information. In a preliminary study of the tube problem, it was found that the approximation proposed by [32] would provide a reasonable estimate of the exchange term for the established regime in the case of diffusion/advection in a tube with constant temperature or concentration at the surface [16]. The objective of this paper is to exhibit a higher order analysis of the problem from which convergence proofs can be obtained so that a posteriori conditions are found for the definition of the macroscopic scale.

The paper is organized as follows. The second section reviews a convection-diffusion problem in the stationary case and describes its known solutions. A short review of the results obtained with the volume averaging method is also presented in this section to further document the general context of the study. The third section presents a generalization of the volume averaging method previously used to describe temporal variations [4, 5]. This leads to a precise formulation of the mathematical convergence to any eigenmode. The fourth section presents the convergence proof in a two-step procedure. Some numerical results associated with the the convergence of different averaging operators are presented at the end of this section.

## 2. General background.

**2.1. Convection-diffusion problem.** The material exposed in this section closely follows classical steps that may be found in textbooks; see, for instance, [14]. We first present the dimensionless formulation associated with convection-diffusion of a passive scalar inside a cylinder with radial coordinate $r$ made dimensionless by the tube radius $R$. This passive scalar could be associated, for instance, with some heat or mass transfer problem, and we will refer to it as $T(r, \phi, z)$. Classically, the ratio of convection to diffusion characteristic times is associated with a dimensionless Péclet number $\mathrm{Pe} = \langle v \rangle R / D_m$, where $D_m$ is the diffusion coefficient of the passive tracer in the liquid and $\langle v \rangle$ is the spatially averaged velocity field. The physical problem giving the convection velocity is supposed to be independent of the passive scalar, so that a translation-invariant fully developed flow $v(r)$ settles in the longitudinal direction $z$ along the cylinder principal axis. Making dimensionless the longitudinal

direction $z$ by the tube radius $R$, the stationary governing equation expressing heat- or mass-conservation of the passive scalar $T(r, z)$ reads

$$(2.1) \qquad \Delta T = Pev(r)\partial_z T \quad \text{with} \quad v(r) \geq 0 \quad \text{analytical in } 0,$$

where $\Delta$ stands for the Laplace operator, which will be appropriately expressed in cylindrical coordinates. As discussed later, we will be mainly interested in the situation where $Pe \gg 1$. Nevertheless, it is important to note that other definitions of the dimensionless variable in the $z$ direction could be adopted. As a matter of fact, the typical longitudinal variations are linearly increasing with the Péclet number when $Pe \gg 1$, and, furthermore, the longitudinal dimensions of the tube could be much larger than its radius. Hence, many authors [4, 5] prefer to introduce an additional parameter $pe = PeR/L$, where $L$ is some longitudinal characteristic length associated with the axial variations. In this context, many studies such as the classical ones [1, 38] have been interested in the limit of $pe \ll 1$, while $Pe \gg 1$ so that longitudinal diffusion can be neglected in comparison with transverse diffusion. This choice is important when considering the averaged description of (2.1), which should then be written with a small parameter $pe$ instead of a large parameter $Pe$ on the right-hand side. In the following, we will keep using the Péclet number $Pe$ parameter for the problem. Of course, this choice should give equivalent results as those obtained from the use of the small parameter $pe$, as will be explained in section 5.1.1.

In the case of a Newtonian fluid, the velocity field develops a parabolic Poiseuille flow $v(r) = 2(1 - r^2)$. Because of its particular importance, all the numerical results will be given in this case. However, all the theoretical results obtained in this paper still hold for general nonnegative velocity fields $v(r) \geq 0$ that are analytical in 0. General velocity profiles are of interest for applications associated with non-Newtonian fluid, such as, for example, blood, for which different analytical models have been proposed for the velocity profile in a tube [15]. This can also be useful in the treatment of turbulent dispersion in tubes, for which the Poiseuille solution is replaced by the turbulent average velocity field, following the double averaging procedure in Pedras and Lemos [29].

Because of its relevance to many research areas, this partial differential problem has received much attention. Three basic classes of boundary conditions are naturally associated with this cylindrical geometry: adiabatic Neumann boundary condition $\partial_r T(r = 1, \phi, z) = 0$ (we shall refer to it as $\mathcal{N}$ in the following), constant temperature Dirichlet boundary condition $T(r = 1, \phi, z) = 0$ (we shall refer to it as $\mathcal{D}$ in the following), or mixed Robin boundary condition $\partial_r T(r = 1, \phi, z) + \gamma T(r = 1, \phi, z) = 0$, where $\gamma > 0$ may be called Thiele modulus by reference to the case of heterogeneous reaction (we shall refer to it as $\mathcal{R}$ in the following). Furthermore, the passive scalar reference value is chosen so that, far away from the origin, it reaches its equilibrium state, $T(r, \infty) = 0$. The only missing boundary condition is the initial value of the scalar field at the cylinder origin $z = 0$, $T(r, 0) \equiv T_0(r)$, which has to be specified. It is easy to note that the PDE problem (2.1) is not tensorized, so that it does not independently factorize the radial coordinate $r$ and the longitudinal one $z$. While very simple, the linear problem (2.1) does not have any explicit general solution. Hence, many authors have been interested in the special limit for which a variable separation can be found. In the limit of a large Péclet number, $Pe \gg 1$, when neglecting the longitudinal diffusion compared to the radial one, (2.1) degenerates to

$$(2.2) \qquad \left( \Delta_c + \frac{1}{r^2} \partial_\phi^2 \right) T = Pev(r)\partial_z T,$$

where $\Delta_c$ stands for the cylindrical part of the Laplace operator $\Delta_c \equiv 1/r\partial_r(r\partial_r)$ and $\phi$ is the azimuthal angle. It can be shown that such an approximation is $O(1/Pe^2)$, because in this limit, the longitudinal typical variations scale linearly with $Pe$ [14]. Equation (2.2) associated with either Neumann $\mathcal{N}$, Dirichlet $\mathcal{D}$, or Robin $\mathcal{R}$ boundary conditions is then a separable problem for which the PDE degenerates into a Sturm–Liouville ODE problem. Graetz [17] has found that its general solution is associated with the discrete sets $L_N$, $N \in \mathbb{Z}$, of eigenvalues depending on the boundary condition

$$(2.3) \qquad T(r,\phi,z) = \sum_{N\in\mathbb{Z}}\sum_{l\in L_N} c_{N,l}G_{N,l}(r)e^{iN\phi}e^{\frac{l}{Pe}z}.$$

We define the generalized Graetz functions $G_{N,l}$ as the functions of $r$ that satisfy

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{cases} (\Delta_c - \frac{N^2}{r^2})G_{N,l} = lv(r)G_{N,l} & \text{with} \quad \mathcal{D}: G_{N,l}(1) = 0, \quad \mathcal{N}: \partial_r G_{N,l}(1) = 0, \\ \frac{G_{N,l}(r)}{r^N}(r=0) = 1, & \mathcal{R}: \ G_{N,l}(1) + \gamma\partial_r G_{N,l}(1) = 0. \end{cases}$$

For a general—analytical in 0—velocity field $v(r)$ one can use the Frobenius method (cf., e.g., [35]) to see that the equation

$$\left(\Delta_c - \frac{N^2}{r^2}\right)y = lv(r)y,$$

which is singular in 0, has two linearly independent solutions $y_1$ and $y_2$; the first one regular in 0 satisfies $y_1(r)/r^N(r=0) \neq 0$, and the second one being singular in 0: $y_2(0) = \pm\infty$. As a result, (2.4) with initial condition $G_{N,l}/r^N(r=0) = 1$ defines a unique function $G_{N,l}$—which we will call the generalized Graetz function—for each $l \in \mathbb{C}$ and $N \in \mathbb{Z}$. Thus the following conditions in (2.4), $G_{N,l}(1) = 0$ for $\mathcal{D}$, $\partial_r G_{N,l}(1) = 0$ for $\mathcal{N}$, or $G_{N,l}(1) + \gamma\partial_r G_{N,l}(1) = 0$ for $\mathcal{R}$, only select among these generalized Graetz functions those satisfying the correct boundary condition.

Historically, the cylindrical Graetz functions $G_{0,l}$ has been associated with a parabolic Poiseuille flow $v(r) = 2(1-r^2)$ and it is usually found in the literature that the function $G_{0,l}$ is the eigenfunction of $\sqrt{-l}$ rather than $l$. However, this notation will be kept for the sake of simplicity in the rest of the paper, and Appendix A gives a more detailed discussion of Graetz eigenfunctions and their relations with confluent hypergeometric functions—or Kummer's functions.

Because (2.4) defines a self-adjoint Sturm–Liouville problem, the eigenvalues associated either with the Dirichlet, Neumann, or Robin conditions are real. Moreover, the chosen far-field extinction boundary condition $T(r,\infty) = 0$ selects, among those, negative eigenvalues. $L_N$ is, therefore, a discrete set $L_N \subset \mathbb{R}^-$ of ordered eigenvalues $L_N = \{\cdots < l_{i,N} < \cdots < l_{1,N} < l_{0,N} \leq 0\}$. For convenience, we will use specific notation for the sets associated with Dirichlet, Neumann, or Robin boundary conditions, i.e.,

$$L_N^{\mathcal{D}} = \{l \in \mathbb{R}^-, G_{N,l}(1) = 0\}, \qquad L_N^{\mathcal{N}} = \{l \in \mathbb{R}^-, \partial_r G_{N,l}(1) = 0\},$$
$$(2.5) \qquad\qquad \text{or} \qquad L_N^{\mathcal{R}} = \{l \in \mathbb{R}^-, G_{N,l}(1) + \gamma\partial_r G_{N,l}(1) = 0\}.$$

Graetz computed the first eigenvalue with two-digit precision in [17]. Tables 2.1 and 2.2 give the numerical estimates of the first three eigenvalues associated with a parabolic flow, Dirichlet and Neumann boundary conditions. More complete and

TABLE 2.1
*First three elements ($i = 0, 1, 2$) of sets $L_N^{\mathcal{D}}$ for Dirichlet boundary conditions, $N = 0, 1, 2, 3$ and a parabolic velocity field $v(r) = 2(1 - r^2)$.*

| $l_{i,N}^{\mathcal{D}}$ | $i = 0$ | $i = 1$ | $i = 2$ |
|---|---|---|---|
| $N = 0$ | $-3.656793458$ | $-22.30473055$ | $-56.96051540$ |
| $N = 1$ | $-10.69115115$ | $-37.38965286$ | $-80.07477640$ |
| $N = 2$ | $-21.24944651$ | $-56.05580310$ | $-106.8036412$ |
| $N = 3$ | $-35.46611328$ | $-78.38573690$ | $-137.2070675$ |

TABLE 2.2
*First three elements ($i = 0, 1, 2$) of sets $L_N^{\mathcal{N}}$ for Neumann boundary conditions, $N = 0, 1, 2, 3$ and a parabolic velocity field $v(r) = 2(1 - r^2)$.*

| $l_{i,N}^{\mathcal{N}}$ | $i = 0$ | $i = 1$ | $i = 2$ |
|---|---|---|---|
| $N = 0$ | $0$ | $-12.8398060$ | $-41.93087773$ |
| $N = 1$ | $-4.160532810$ | $-25.33493287$ | $-62.48391850$ |
| $N = 2$ | $-12.83980600$ | $-41.93087773$ | $-87.08337035$ |
| $N = 3$ | $-26.13743028$ | $-62.80555035$ | $-115.8424000$ |

precise computations of the eigenvalues can be found, for example, in [37]. Solution given by (2.3) can be completed by the orthogonality properties of the eigenfunctions,

$$(2.6) \quad \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^1 G_{N,l}(r)e^{iN\phi}\overline{G_{N',l'}(r)}e^{-iN'\phi}v(r)r\,dr\,d\phi = 0 \qquad \text{if} \quad N \neq N' \text{ or } l \neq l',$$

where the overbar denotes a complex conjugate. Hence, using (2.6), the constant coefficients $c_{N,l}$ in decomposition (2.3) are directly related to the projection of the initial conditions over its corresponding eigenfunction $G_{N,l}$:

$$(2.7) \qquad c_{N,l} = \frac{\displaystyle\int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^1 T_0(r,\phi)\overline{G_{N,l}(r)}e^{-iN\phi}v(r)r\,dr\,d\phi}{2\pi \displaystyle\int_0^1 |G_{N,l}(r)|^2 v(r)r\,dr}.$$

Hence, using the eigenfunctions defined in (2.4) the complete solution of the high Péclet limit of the convection-diffusion problem (2.2) within a tube admits a complete spectral representation. Incidentally, the convergence of this representation is known to be rather slow [37]. This is especially true when describing the solution near the origin $z = 0$. In this limit, even if (2.3) and (2.7) describe the true mathematical solution, the Lévêque [20] asymptotic expansion should be preferred because of its simplicity.

Nevertheless, this spectral representation is very useful when only part of the solution is required, as, for example, for the far-field behavior when $z > Pe/(l_1 - l_0)$ for which the solution exponentially converges to the first eigenfunction. In the following, we will concentrate on the first eigenfunctions and their associated eigenvalues. We will be furthermore interested in the averaged description of the solution. It should be noted that a uniform averaging along the disk section of the cylinder only keeps axisymmetrical modes. A more detailed discussion about nonasymmetrical contributions to the averaged description will be discussed in section 5.1.3. The amplitude

decomposition (2.7) nevertheless shows that every axisymmetrical eigenvalue $l_{i,0}$ contributes to uniformly averaged concentration solution. This should be kept in mind in the following because many results associated with averaged descriptions in the literature have neglected contributions from eigenvalue $l_{i,0}$, with $i \geq 1$. In the following, we will, for example, see (what is already obvious from directly averaging solutions (2.3) and (2.7), which lead to no contribution of $l \neq 0$ modes for which $\langle v(r)G_{N,l} \rangle = 0$) that a uniform averaging does not permit one to capture any decaying eigenvalue associated with the Neumann boundary conditions.

**2.2. Weighted volume averaging method.** In this section we present an improved version of the volume averaging method introduced in [39] that nevertheless remains closely related to this first method—which we will call the *standard volume averaging method*. The improvement is based on the introduction of weighted averaging operators as proposed in [16] when the standard volume averaging method considers only averaging associated with the Lebesgue measure. The use of weighted averages had been considered long ago for averaging transport equations [12, 13, 22, 25]. The intentions were to correctly regularize the microscale fields with the objective of improving comparison with experiments. It is interesting to note that this paper emphasizes another important and fundamental role of weighted averages more related to the mathematical structure of the operator to be averaged.

**2.2.1. Definition and notation.** To introduce general weighted averaging operators we first introduce the standard averaging operator $\langle \ \rangle$ corresponding to the Lebesgue measure on each cylinder section for functions with radial symmetry,

$$\langle T \rangle (\phi, z) = 2 \int_0^1 T(r, \phi, z) r \, dr,$$

and we now define a general weighted averaging operator $\langle \ \rangle^\star$, sometimes simply denoted $\star$, associated with any normalized weight function $w(r)$—i.e., such that $\langle w \rangle = 1$—in cylindrical coordinates as

$$(2.8) \qquad \langle T \rangle^\star(\phi, z) \equiv T^\star(\phi, z) = \langle Tw \rangle(\phi, z) = 2 \int_0^1 T(r, \phi, z) w(r) r \, dr.$$

In the next sections of this paper we will examine special cases of weight function $w$. First, a uniform weight $w = 1$ is associated with the standard volume averaging method [39]. Another interesting case, introduced in the preceding section is "mixing-cup" averaging, where the weight function has a dependence exactly similar to that of the velocity field $w(r) \equiv v(r)/\langle v \rangle$. The resulting averaged temperature is also often called bulk temperature. As mentioned in the previous section, this weight function is interesting considered in this context precisely because it corresponds exactly to the orthogonalization operator associated with the Graetz eigenfunctions, as illustrated in (2.6). In the following, the averaging operator is either defined using a specific weight function yet to be specified $w$, or, on the contrary, to simplify the notation, a generic $\star$ is used for averaging (2.8). Now, averaging the theoretical solution (2.3) leads to

$$(2.9) \qquad T^\star(\phi, z) = \sum_{N \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{l \in L_N} C_{N,l} e^{iN\phi} e^{\frac{l}{Pe}z} \quad \text{with} \quad C_{N,l} = c_{N,l} G^\star_{N,l} \in \mathbb{R}.$$

It should be noted that a supplementary average along the azimuthal direction $\phi$ could be performed. If uniform along $\phi$, such an average will only preserve the

axisymmetric mode $N = 0$ in (2.9). If the azimuthal averaging is chosen nonuniform along $\phi$, then the averaged solution could have contributions from nonaxisymmetric mode $N \neq 0$. In the following, we will be mainly interested in averaging along the radial coordinate. Thus the macroscopic field depends on the azimuthal angle $\phi$. The results that are presented for the convergence of averaging models will be discussed for any azimuthal mode $N$. Those averaged models could easily been averaged a second time along $\phi$ to find longitudinally varying averaged equations as finally discussed in section 5.1.3.

As mentioned in the introduction, the volume averaging method is a general technique whose purpose is to find a macroscopic description, i.e., an averaged description of a microscopic field that fulfills some PDE problem, without explicitly solving the complete problem, but solving some simplified version of it. Greek letters will be reserved for quantities associated with the volume averaging predictions. Prediction for the scalar field $T$ is thus denoted $\Theta$. In general, the prediction is decomposed into a macroscopic volume averaging prediction $\Theta^\star$ and some local deviation $\theta$ to this macroscopic behavior:

$$(2.10) \qquad \Theta(r, \phi, z) = \Theta^\star(\phi, z) + \theta(r, \phi, z) \; = \sum_{N \in \mathbb{Z}} \left( \Theta_N^\star(z) + \theta_N(r, z) \right) e^{iN\phi}$$

with the associated condition $\langle \theta \rangle^\star = 0$. In the upscaling techniques considered in this paper, the derivation is sought generally under the form of a mapping onto the macroscopic variables and derivatives. The averaged of the microscale equation will be discussed in detail later. This macroscale equation can be used to show that $\Theta^\star$ also decomposes into a sum of exponential modes:

$$(2.11) \qquad \Theta^\star(\phi, z) = \sum_{N \in \mathbb{Z}} \Theta_N^\star(z) e^{iN\phi}$$

with

$$(2.12) \qquad \Theta_N^\star(z) = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_N} C_{N,\lambda} e^{\frac{\lambda}{Pe} z} \quad \text{with} \quad C_{N,\lambda} = c_{N,\lambda} \Gamma_{N,\lambda}^\star \in \mathbb{R},$$

where the corresponding Greek letters have been used to describe the approximated discrete spectrum $\Lambda_N$ and its corresponding approximated eigenvalues $\lambda$, as well as the corresponding approximated eigenfunction $\Gamma_{N,\lambda}$, approximating $G_{N,l}$ with an approximated amplitude $c_{N,\lambda}$ that will be more explicitly defined in section 4.

The main purpose of section 4 is to find from which conditions it is possible to find intersections between $\Lambda_N$ and the eigenvalue set $L_N$ (2.5) of the theoretical problem (2.2). It will be found in section 4.1 that *only a part of the spectrum $L_N$ can be approximated by elements of $\Lambda_N$*. It will, furthermore, be shown in section 4.2 that elements of $\Lambda_N$ converges toward these elements of $L_N$ that can be approximated when increasing the order of the averaging method. The rate of convergence is consequently studied in section 4.3.

**2.2.2. Weighted volume averaging technique.** In this section we present the principal steps of the weighted volume averaging technique. The next section will a posteriori justify the classical assumptions made in this section, from examining the weighted volume averaging method generalized to higher order. We will study here both Neumann and Dirichlet Graetz problems. The case of Dirichlet boundary conditions associated with the Graetz problem has been previously examined in the

context of the standard volume averaging technique in [16]. The first step of the method is to average the governing equation (2.2), so that $\langle 2.2 \rangle^\star$ is

$$(2.13) \qquad Pe\partial_z \langle v\Theta \rangle^\star = \langle \Delta_c\Theta \rangle^\star + \frac{1}{r^2}\langle \partial_\phi^2\Theta \rangle^\star = \langle \Delta_c\Theta \rangle^\star + \frac{1}{r^2}\partial_\phi^2\langle \Theta \rangle^\star.$$

The next step is to use decomposition (2.10) and (2.11) in (2.13), so that a macroscopic equation is defined for $\Theta_N^\star$:

$$(2.14) \qquad \langle \Delta_c\Theta_N \rangle^\star - N^2\left\langle \frac{\Theta_N}{r^2} \right\rangle^\star = Pe\partial_z \langle v\Theta_N \rangle^\star.$$

The completeness of this macroscopic equation necessitates the knowledge of deviation $\theta_N$. The problem associated with the deviation $\theta_N$ is now obtained from subtracting (2.14) from (2.2):

$$(2.15) \qquad (v - \langle v \rangle^\star)Pe\partial_z\Theta_N^\star + Pe\partial_z(v\theta_N - \langle v\theta_N \rangle^\star) = \mathcal{L}_N^\star\Theta_N,$$

where $\mathcal{L}_N^\star$ stands for the nonlocal differential operator:

$$\mathcal{L}_N^\star\Theta_N = \Delta_N\Theta_N - \langle \Delta_N\Theta_N \rangle^\star,$$

$$(2.16) \qquad \Delta_N\Theta_N = \Delta_c\Theta_N - \frac{N^2}{r^2}\Theta_N,$$

$$\langle \Delta_N\Theta \rangle^\star = \langle \Delta_c\Theta_N \rangle^\star - N^2\left\langle \frac{1}{r^2}\Theta_N \right\rangle^\star.$$

This operator is neither local nor self-adjoint. It is nevertheless invertible, as shown in Appendix C. The first term of (2.15) is a macroscopic source term that enters in the microscopic problem defined for deviation $\theta_N$. So far, no hypothesis has been made and the above equations are exact. These equations are nevertheless not closed because the coupling between the deviation and the macroscopic field still remains unsolved. Finding this coupling is in fact exactly identical to solving the original problem (2.2), the resolution of which we precisely want to avoid.

Hence, the key step is then to find a suitable hypothesis to close deviation problem (2.14) so that it should depend only on the macroscopic field $\Theta_N^\star$. First, it should be kept in mind that the governing equation (2.2) is linear. As a consequence, it is obvious that the deviation $\theta_N$ dependence with the macroscopic field $\Theta_N^\star$ has to be linear here. Such a linear dependence is in fact very generally admitted in most of the application of the method [39] and comes from the assumption of scale separation. Hence, one writes the "closure hypothesis" by introducing the additional closure field or mapping variables $\alpha_{0,1}(r)$ which relates the deviation $\theta_N(r, z)$ to the macroscopic field $\Theta_N^\star(z)$,

$$\theta_N(r, z) = \big(w(r)\alpha_{0,N}(r) - 1\big)\Theta_N^\star(z) + w(r)\alpha_{1,N}(r)Pe\partial_z\Theta_N^\star(z),$$

or, equivalently,

$$(2.17) \qquad \Theta_N(r, z) = \alpha_{0,N}(r)\Theta_N^\star(z) + \alpha_{1,N}(r)Pe\partial_z\Theta_N^\star(z).$$

It is clear that additional terms are required to obtain an exact solution, and it is our objective to understand *what has been kept* in such an approximate solution. Using the closure hypothesis (2.17) in (2.15) we obtain

$$(\mathcal{L}_N^\star\alpha_{0,N})\Theta_N^\star + (\mathcal{L}_N^\star\alpha_{1,N} - v(r)\alpha_{0,N} + \langle v\alpha_{0,N} \rangle^\star)Pe\partial_z\Theta_N^\star$$
$$-(v(r)\alpha_{1,N} - \langle v\alpha_{1,N} \rangle^\star)Pe^2\partial_z^2\Theta_N^\star = 0.$$

The condition of this equality is that each coefficient multiplying the macroscopic field variations $\Theta^\star, \partial_z\Theta^\star, \partial_z^2\Theta^\star$ is equal to zero. Nevertheless, (2.17) has introduced a closure hypothesis with only two terms, so that the first two terms should also be considered here self-consistently. This last point is further discussed in the next section. Hence, problems associated with the closure fields $\alpha_{0,N}$ and $\alpha_{1,N}$ are

$$(2.18) \quad \begin{cases} \left(\mathcal{L}_N^\star \alpha_{0,N}\right)(r) = 0, \\ \alpha_{0,N}^\star = 1, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} \left(\mathcal{L}_N^\star \alpha_{1,N}\right)(r) = v(r)\alpha_{0,N}(r) - \langle v\alpha_{0,N}\rangle^\star, \\ \alpha_{1,N}^\star = 0 \end{cases}$$

with $\quad \alpha_{i,N}(1) = 0$ for $\mathcal{D}, \quad \partial_r\alpha_{i,N}(1) = 0$ for $\mathcal{N} \quad$ or
$$\alpha_{i,N}(1) + \gamma\partial_r\alpha_{i,N}(1) = 0 \text{ for } \mathcal{R}, \quad i = 1,2.$$

These problems can be solved analytically for a Neumann, Dirichlet, or Robin boundary condition, and their resolution is detailed in Appendix C. When introducing these solutions in the macroscopic problem (2.14), one finds the macroscopic problem

$$(2.19) \qquad K_{0,N}\Theta_N^\star + K_{1,N}Pe\partial_z\Theta_N^\star - \langle v\alpha_{1,N}\rangle\, Pe^2\partial_z^2\Theta_N^\star = 0,$$

which involves the *effective parameters*

$$(2.20) \qquad K_{0,N} = \langle \Delta_N\alpha_{0,N}\rangle^\star, \quad K_{1,N} = \langle \Delta_N\alpha_{1,N}\rangle^\star - \langle v\alpha_{0,N}\rangle^\star,$$

and the solution for $\Theta_N^\star$ decomposes to a sum of exponential modes with an associated characteristic length $Pe/\lambda$, which then defines the set $\Lambda_{1,N}$ of eigenvalues predicted by the volume averaging technique

$$(2.21) \qquad \Lambda_{1,N} = \{\, \lambda\, / \quad K_{0,N} + K_{1,N}\lambda - \langle v\alpha_{1,N}\rangle\, \lambda^2 = 0\, \}.$$

**2.2.3. Explicit results.** This section gives the solutions of problem (2.18), i.e., the mapping variables, and (2.19) obtained for different values of the weighted function $w$.

- *Standard volume averaging, $w = 1$, axisymmetric mode $N = 0$.*

The solution for the closure function has been found equal to the following:

$$(2.22) \quad \text{for } \mathcal{D}: \begin{cases} \alpha_{0,0}(r) = 2(1 - r^2), \\ \alpha_{1,0}(r) = \frac{r^6}{9} - \frac{r^4}{2} + \frac{r^2}{2} - \frac{1}{9}; \end{cases} \quad \text{for } \mathcal{N}: \begin{cases} \alpha_{0,0}(r) = 1, \\ \alpha_{1,0}(r) = -\frac{r^4}{8} + \frac{r^2}{4} - \frac{1}{12}. \end{cases}$$

Thus constants $K_{0,0}$ and $K_{1,0}$ can be computed:

$$(2.23) \qquad \text{for } \mathcal{D}: \begin{cases} K_{0,0} = -16, \\ K_{1,0} = -2; \end{cases} \quad \text{for } \mathcal{N}: \begin{cases} K_{0,0} = 0, \\ K_{1,0} = -1. \end{cases}$$

These calculations permit us to compute the associated approximated eigenvalues by solving (2.21). As already observed in [16], the resulting Dirichlet eigenvalue $\lambda_{0,0}^{\mathcal{D}} \simeq -3.874877690$ gives a rather good approximation of the Graetz value $l_{0,0}^{\mathcal{D}} \simeq -3.656793458$ up to 6%. On the contrary, the Neumann eigenvalue $l_1^N \simeq -12.839806$ is completely missed by the volume averaging method, which nevertheless gives the trivial solution zero, $l_{0,0}^{\mathcal{N}} = 0$. This trivial solution is of course of great practical interest since it corresponds to the exact solution when the temperature at the origin is constant; it also gives the correct averaged temperature of the far-field solution.

- *Flow averaging, $w = v/\langle v\rangle = 2(1 - r^2)$, axisymmetric mode $N = 0$.*

The solution for the closure function has been found equal to the following:

(2.24)

$$\text{for } \mathcal{D}: \begin{cases} \alpha_{0,0}(r) = \frac{3}{2}(1 - r^2), \\ \alpha_{1,0}(r) = \frac{r^6}{12} - \frac{3r^4}{8} + \frac{57r^2}{160} - \frac{31}{480}; \end{cases} \quad \text{for } \mathcal{N}: \begin{cases} \alpha_{0,0}(r) = 1, \\ \alpha_{1,0}(r) = -\frac{r^4}{8} + \frac{r^2}{4} - \frac{1}{16}. \end{cases}$$

Thus constants $K_{0,0}$, $K_{1,0}$ can be computed:

(2.25)
$$\text{for } \mathcal{D}: \begin{cases} K_{0,0} = -3, \\ K_{1,0} = -\frac{63}{40}; \end{cases} \quad \text{for } \mathcal{N}: \begin{cases} K_{0,0} = 0, \\ K_{1,0} = -1. \end{cases}$$

The approximate Dirichlet eigenvalue in this case is found equal to $\lambda_{0,0}^{\mathcal{D}} \simeq -3.809523810$, which is 4% from the theoretical Graetz eigenvalue $l_{0,0}^{\mathcal{D}}$. The Neumann trivial solution $\lambda_{0,0}^{\mathcal{N}} = 0$ is also found and the first Neumann nontrivial eigenvalue $\lambda_{1,0}^{\mathcal{N}}$ is also totally missed in the case of a flow averaging.

The following section investigates the capacity of the method to find the correct answer to the problem while generalizing it by introducing higher order closure hypothesis.

**3. Weighted volume averaging method of higher order.** The notation and methodological steps in this section are closely following those previously presented in sections 2.2.1 and 2.2.2. More precisely, the solution we are looking for is decomposed as (2.10), and the same exact steps (2.13)–(2.15) are now considered again.

The improvement of the method consists in a generalization of the closure hypothesis (2.17). This is introduced in order to ameliorate the results previously obtained in section 2.2.3, with, for instance, the hope to capture the first nontrivial Neumann eigenvalue $l_{1,0}^{\mathcal{N}}$.

From the property (4.2) of the exact solution that will be studied in section 4.1.1, and from the previously examined closure relation (2.17) let us now introduce a generalized closure relation:

(3.1)
$$\Theta_N(r, z) = \sum_{n=0}^{p} \alpha_{n,N}(r) Pe^n \partial_z^n \Theta_N^{\star}(z)$$

with $p \geq 1$. The case $p = 1$ has been analyzed in section 2.2.2, and we now follow the same steps. Using (3.1) in the deviation equation (2.15) it is found, assuming $\alpha_{-1,N}(r) = 0$, that

$$\sum_{n=0}^{p} (\mathcal{L}_N^{\star} \alpha_{n,N} - v\alpha_{n-1,N} + \langle v\alpha_{n-1,N}\rangle^{\star}) Pe^n \partial_z^n \Theta_N^{\star}(z)$$
$$- (v\alpha_{p,N} - \langle v\alpha_{p,N}\rangle^{\star}) Pe^{p+1} \partial_z^{p+1} \Theta_N^{\star}(z) = 0.$$

The condition of this equality gives, at each order, the closure problem associated with the closure functions $\alpha_{n,N}(r)$, whose solvability is left to Appendix C, and which is to be solved recursively:

(3.2)
$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_N^{\star} \alpha_{n,N} &= v(r)\alpha_{n-1,N}(r) - \langle v\alpha_{n-1,N}\rangle^{\star} & \text{with} & \alpha_{-1,N}(r) = 0, \\ \alpha_{0,N}^{\star} = 1 & \text{or} \quad \alpha_{n,N}^{\star} = 0 & & \text{for} & n \geq 1, \\ \alpha_{n,N}(1) &= 0 & & \text{for} & \mathcal{D}, \\ \partial_r \alpha_{n,N}(1) &= 0 & & \text{for} & \mathcal{N}. \end{cases}$$

The resolution of these problems is detailed in Appendix C.2.

From solving (3.2) it is possible to find the generalized macroscopic closed problem at order $p$:

$$(3.3) \qquad \sum_{n=0}^{p} K_{n,N} Pe^n \partial_z^n \Theta_N^\star(z) - \langle v\alpha_{p,N} \rangle^\star Pe^{p+1} \partial_z^{p+1} \Theta_N^\star(z) = 0,$$

where the macroscopic coefficients $K_{n,N}$ are given by

$$(3.4) \qquad K_{n,N} = \langle \Delta_N \alpha_{n,N} \rangle^\star - \langle v\alpha_{n-1,N} \rangle^\star, \quad K_{n,N} \in \mathbb{R}.$$

The predicted solutions of (3.3) then decompose into a sum of exponentials with modes $\lambda/Pe$ for $\lambda$ belonging to the set of predicted eigenvalues at order $p$, $\Lambda_{p,N}$, defined as the zeros set of a $p+1$ order polynomial:

$$(3.5) \qquad \Lambda_{p,N} = \left\{ \lambda \Big/ \sum_{n=0}^{p} K_{n,N} \lambda^n - \langle v\alpha_{p,N} \rangle^\star \lambda^{p+1} = 0 \right\}.$$

As previously, $\Lambda_{p,N}$ is independent of $Pe$, but does depend on the chosen boundary conditions and the order $p$ of the closure relation. This last point naturally leads to the concept of convergence.

DEFINITION 3.1 (convergence of the weighted volume averaging method). *The elements of all sets $\Lambda_{p,N}$ define sequences of predicted eigenvalues: $(\lambda_{i,p})_{p\geq 1, i\geq 0}$, $\lambda_{i,p} \in \Lambda_{p,N}$.*

*We shall say that the method is convergent toward some eigenvalue $l_i \in L_N$ of the theoretical problem (2.2) if there exists a sequence of predicted eigenvalues $(\lambda_{i,p})_{p\geq 1, i\geq 0}$ such that $\lambda_{i,p} \in \Lambda_{p,N}$ and $\lim_{p\to+\infty} \lambda_{i,p} = l_i \in L_N$.*

We will establish the convergence for a characterized part of the spectrum in section 4.3.

**4. Convergence analysis.** Previous sections have mainly considered the explicit application of the averaging method to Graetz problem. The necessary material and notation being now defined, this section considers the mathematical analysis of the convergence of these averaging methods. This convergence analysis requires two different steps. The first step introduces two necessary conditions over eigenvalues for convergence to hold. The second step gives the proof that these two necessary conditions are sufficient. In the two subsequent sections, the results are derived in a general context, and formally apply to any mode $N$, as well as any boundary conditions $\mathcal{D}$, $\mathcal{N}$, or $\mathcal{R}$ and any flow $v(r)$. Hence, in order to simplify notation, the analysis does not mention, unless necessary to avoid confusion, which azimuthal mode it refers to, nor the boundary conditions that are considered. Finally, specific situations will be considered in section 4.3 for analyzing the numerical convergence.

**4.1. Restricted convergence of weighted averaging methods.** We define in the two following sections two sets, the validity—$D_{val}^\star$—and the accessibility—$D_{acc}^\star$—domains, which are disks lying in the complex plane $\mathbb{C}$. As we will see, a necessary condition for the weighted averaging method to converge toward an eigenvalue $l \in L$ is that this eigenvalue belongs to both of these domains.

**4.1.1. Validity domain $D_{val}^\star$.** The variables of the initial problem (2.2) can be separated so that any solution $T(r,\phi,z)$ may be written as a product of functions of $r$, $\phi$, and $z$ only. Let us first show in this section that the exact solution of the problem

can be formally written as a regular asymptotic expansion of the macroscopic field $T^\star(\phi, z)$. First let us decompose $T$ as

$$(4.1) \qquad T(r, \phi, z) = \sum_{N \in \mathbb{Z}} T_N(r, z) e^{iN\phi}.$$

The aim of this section is to analyze under which condition the $N$th component $T_N(r, z)$ in decomposition (4.1) of the theoretical solution $T(r, \phi, z)$ can be written as the following expansion of $T_N^\star(z)$:

$$(4.2) \qquad T_N(r, z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} a_n(r) Pe^n \partial_z^n T_N^\star(z)$$

(where the index $N$ on the closure functions $a_n(r)$ has been omitted for simplicity) to be compared with the general closure hypothesis (3.1) for $\Theta_N(r, z)$.

Let us recall the form of the original solution (2.3),

$$(4.3) \qquad T_N(r, z) = \sum_{l \in L_N} c_l T_l(r, z) \quad \text{with} \quad c_l \in \mathbb{R}, \quad T_l(r, z) = G_{N,l}(r) e^{\frac{l}{Pe} z},$$

so that (4.2) is true for $T_N(r, z)$ if and only if it holds for each function $T_l(r, z)$ standing in the decomposition (4.3) of $T_N(r, z)$. Comparing then the expression for $T_l$ in (4.2) and (4.3), one can see that (4.2) holds for $T_l(r, z)$ if and only if the following equality over the Graetz eigenfunctions $G_l$ holds:

$$(4.4) \qquad \sum_{n \geq 0} a_n(r) l^n = \frac{G_{N,l}(r)}{G_{N,l}^\star}.$$

We will prove that both functions $G_{N,l}(r)$ and $G_{N,l}^\star$ are analytical with respect to $l$, so that the expansion of $G_{N,l}(r)/G_{N,l}^\star$ on the form (4.4) is only possible for $l$ belonging to a disk $D_{val}^\star$ centered on zero whose radius $R$ is equal to the smallest root of $G_l^\star$.

DEFINITION 4.1. *Let us call validity domain the disk $D_{val}^\star \subset \mathbb{C}$,*

$$D_{val}^\star = \{l, \quad |l| < R\}, \quad where \quad R = \inf\{|l| \ / \ G_{N,l}^\star = 0\},$$

*depending only on the averaging operator $\star$ and on $N$.*

Now, one can see that the decomposition (4.2) is not true in general. It is true only if all the eigenvalues $l$ standing in the decomposition (4.3) of $T_N(r, z)$ belong to the validity domain $D_{val}^\star$. An important consequence is that a closure formulation (3.1) only makes sense for eigenvalues lying in $D_{val}^\star$. Hence, a necessary—but not sufficient—condition for an eigenvalue $l \in L$ to be predicted by the averaging method is to lie within $D_{val}^\star$. It is also interesting to note that $D_{val}^\star$ depends only on the averaging operator $\star$ and $N$, but not on the boundary conditions.

We summarize this condition, as well as the definition of the new functions $a_n(r)$, in the following lemma.

LEMMA 4.2. *The base functions $T_l(r, z) = G_{N,l}(r) e^{\frac{l}{Pe} z}$ for problem (2.2) can be written*

$$T_l(r, z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} a_n(r) Pe^n \partial_z^n T_l^\star(z)$$

*if and only if $l \in D_{val}^{\star}$ defined by*

$$D_{val}^{\star} = \{l/|l| \leq R\}, \quad where \quad R = \inf\{|l|/G_{N,l}^{\star} = 0\},$$

*and the functions $a_n(r)$ are the solution of the recursive scheme*

(4.5)
$$\begin{cases} \Delta_N a_n(r) = v(r)a_{n-1}(r) & with \quad a_{-1}(r) = 0, \\ a_0^{\star} = 1 \quad and \quad a_n^{\star} = 0 & for \quad n \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* In Appendix B we give the proof that the functions $G_{N,l}(r)$, $\partial_r G_{N,l}(r)$, and $\Delta_N G_{N,l}(r)$ are analytical with respect to $l$ on the whole complex plane $\mathbb{C}$. More precisely there exists a set of functions $(q_n(r))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ (depending also on $N$) defined by (B.4) such that for $r \in [0,1]$ and $l \in \mathbb{C}$ one has

$$G_{N,l}(r) = \sum_{n \geq 0} q_n(r)l^n , \quad \partial_r G_{N,l}(r) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \partial_r q_n(r)l^n , \quad \Delta_N G_{N,l}(r) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \Delta_N q_n(r)l^n.$$

As a result the three functions $\frac{G_{N,l}(r)}{G_{N,l}^{\star}}$, $\frac{\partial_r G_{N,l}(r)}{G_{N,l}^{\star}}$, $\frac{\Delta_N G_{N,l}(r)}{G_{N,l}^{\star}}$ are analytical with respect to $l$ for $l \in D_{val}^{\star}$ and $r \in [0,1]$ and there exist three sets of functions $(a_n(r))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(b_n(r))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, and $(c_n(r))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that for $l \in D_{val}^{\star}$ and $r \in [0,1]$,

(4.6)
$$\frac{G_{N,l}}{G_{N,l}^{\star}}(r) = \sum_{n \geq 0} a_n(r)l^n , \quad \frac{\partial_r G_{N,l}}{G_{N,l}^{\star}}(r) = \sum_{n \geq 0} b_n(r)l^n , \quad \frac{\Delta_N G_{N,l}}{G_{N,l}^{\star}}(r) = \sum_{n \geq 0} c_n(r)l^n.$$

Using the integration theorem on these series one gets

$$b_n(r) = \partial_r a_n(r) \quad and \quad c_n(r) = \Delta_N a_n(r) \quad \forall\, n \in \mathbb{N},$$

so that

(4.7)
$$\frac{\Delta_N G_{N,l}}{G_{N,l}^{\star}}(r) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \Delta_N a_n(r)l^n.$$

Now the function $\frac{G_{N,l}}{G_{N,l}^{\star}}(r)$ is the unique solution of the ODE:

(4.8)
$$\Delta_N f = lv(r)f \quad and \quad f^{\star} = 1.$$

Rewriting (4.8) with (4.6) and (4.7) gives that the functions $(a_n(r))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are exactly given by the recursive scheme (4.5).  □

**4.1.2. Accessibility domain $D_{acc}^{\star}$.** The eigenvalues predicted by the averaging method are the roots of the polynomial equation (3.5). Let us consider—as $p \to \infty$—the limit set of predicted eigenvalues $\Lambda_{\infty}$ defined as the zeros set of the series $\sum_{n \geq 0} K_n \lambda^n$:

(4.9)
$$\Lambda_{\infty} = \left\{ \lambda \,\middle/\, \sum_{n \geq 0} K_n \lambda^n = 0 \right\},$$

where the index $N$ on the macroscopic coefficient, assumed to be fixed, has been omitted. Among the eigenvalues predicted with the averaging method at order $p$, the only ones that make sense are those approximating some $\lambda \in \Lambda_{\infty}$, and by increasing

the order $p$ of the method one can only improve the computation on these modes $\lambda \in \Lambda_\infty$. As a result, for an eigenvalue $l \in L$ of the theoretical problem (2.2) to be approximated by the averaging method, and for this method to be convergent as $p \to \infty$ to this eigenvalue $l \in L$, it is necessary—but not sufficient—that the series $\sum_{n \geq 0} K_n l^n$ be convergent.

With definition (3.4) of the macroscopic coefficient $K_n$, the series $\sum_{n \geq 0} K_n l^n$ make sense for $l \in D^\star_{acc}$ defined as follows.

DEFINITION 4.3. *Let us call accessibility domain $D^\star_{acc} \subset \mathbb{C}$ the disk of all the complex $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ such that the series*

$$(4.10) \qquad \sum_{n \geq 0} \alpha_n(r)\lambda^n, \quad \sum_{n \geq 0} \Delta_N \alpha_n(r)\lambda^n, \quad \sum_{n \geq 0} \partial_r \alpha_n(r)\lambda^n$$

*are convergent for $r \in [0, 1]$. If $\lambda \in D^\star_{acc}$, we say that $\lambda$ is accessible by the averaging method.*

Contrary to the validity domain $D^\star_{val}$, the accessibility domain $D^\star_{acc}$ does not depend only on the averaging operator $\star$ and on $N$, but also on the boundary conditions that influences the computation of functions $\alpha_n$.

**4.1.3. Evaluation of $D^\star_{val}$ and $D^\star_{ac}$.** We here focus on the numerical evaluation of the two previously introduced domains $D^\star_{val}$ and $D^\star_{ac}$.

To compute the radius of the validity domain $D^\star_{val}$, we need to compute the smallest root of the function of $l$, $G^\star_{N,l}$. For this, we give in Appendix B an expansion of the generalized Graetz functions $G_{N,l}(r)$ with the help of a set of functions $q_n(r)$ defined in (B.4): $G_{N,l}(r) = \sum_{n \geq 0} q_n(r)l^n$. The computation of these functions $q_n(r)$ make it possible to compute the radius of $D^\star_{val}$ as the smallest root of the polynomial $\sum_{n \geq 0} q^\star_n l^n$.

To compute the radius of the accessibility domain $D^\star_{acc}$ one needs an upper bound on the three functions $\alpha_n(r)$, $\partial_r \alpha_n(r)$, and $\Delta_N \alpha_n(r)$ for $r \in [0, 1]$. Experiments based on the computation of these functions showed that $\Delta_N \alpha_n(r = 1)$ is a good upper bound for these functions and the radius of $D^\star_{acc}$ is equal to the convergence radius of the series $\sum_{n \geq 0} \Delta_N \alpha_n(r = 1)\lambda^n$.

Radii for $D^\star_{val}$ and $D^\star_{acc}$ for some chosen weight functions $w(r)$ are given in Table 4.1. Comparing Table 4.1 with Tables 2.1 and 2.2 shows that the standard and the flow averaging method can only capture $l^\mathcal{D}_{0,0}$ for $\mathcal{D}$ and $l^\mathcal{N}_{0,0} = 0$ for $\mathcal{N}$. This result is self-consistent with the computations previously examined in section 2.2.3. To capture the first nontrivial eigenvalue for $\mathcal{N}$ one needs to use other averaging operators. Moreover, it will be shown in section 4.2 that the two necessary conditions introduced in the previous sections are actually sufficient for the convergence to hold. In addition, it will appear that the first nontrivial eigenvalue for $\mathcal{N}$, $l^\mathcal{N}_{1,0} \simeq -12.8398060$, and even the second eigenvalue for $\mathcal{D}$, $l^\mathcal{D}_{1,0} \simeq -22.30473055$, can be captured when using adapted averaging operators.

TABLE 4.1
*Radius of $D^\star_{val}$ and $D^\star_{acc}$ for different weights and for $N = 0$.*

| $w(r)$ | $D^\star_{val}$ | $D^\star_{acc}$, $\mathcal{D}$ | $D^\star_{acc}$, $\mathcal{N}$ |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 7.84 | 15.899 | 10.568 |
| $2(1 - r^2)$ | $-l^\mathcal{N}_1 \simeq 12.839$ | 18.632 | 12.839 |
| $1/(2r)$ | 354.75 | 24.789 | 14.665 |
| $10(1 - r)^3$ | >500 | 29.82 | 23.33 |

FIG. 4.1. *Computation of the accessibility domain $D_{acc}^\star$ for a Robin boundary condition versus the parameter $\gamma$ and for $N = 0$. The four weighting functions $w$ considered on Table 4.1 have been analyzed. Black circles stands for the flow-averaging method with $w = v/\langle v \rangle$, and white circles for the classical uniform volume averaging $w = 1$. White squares are for $w = 1/(2r)$ and black squares are for $w = 10(1-r)^3$.*

**4.2. Convergence theorem.** We introduced in the previous subsection two necessary conditions associated with any eigenvalue $l \in L$ to be captured by the averaging method. We prove here that these conditions are actually sufficient for the convergence to hold. More precisely, the eigenvalues predicted by the averaging method when $p \to \infty$ are exactly the eigenvalues of the theoretical problem (2.2) that both belong to the validity and accessibility domains.

THEOREM 4.4. *Between the set of eigenvalues $L$ of theoretical problem (2.2) and the three following sets: the validity domain $D_{val}^\star$ defined in Definition 4.1, the limit set of predicted eigenvalues $\Lambda_\infty$ in (4.9), and the accessibility domain $D_{acc}^\star$ defined in Definition 4.3, one has the relation (for any azimuthal mode $N$, any boundary condition $\mathcal{D}$, $\mathcal{N}$, or $\mathcal{R}$, and any averaging operator $\star$)*

$$(4.11) \qquad \Lambda_\infty \cap D_{val}^\star = L \cap D_{val}^\star \cap D_{acc}^\star,$$

*which means that the eigenvalues predicted by the averaging method inside $D_{val}^\star$ exactly converge toward the theoretical eigenvalues of (2.2) being inside $D_{val}^\star \cap D_{acc}^\star$.*

*Proof.* We recall that we defined in (2.4) the generalized Graetz functions $G_{N,l}(r)$ for each $l \in \mathbb{C}$ and each $N \in \mathbb{Z}$ as the unique solution for the ODE,

$$(4.12) \qquad \Delta_N G_{N,l} = lv(r)G_{N,l}(r), \quad \frac{G_{N,l}(r)}{r^N}(r=1) = 1,$$

and that for Neumann, Dirichlet, or Robin boundary conditions, the associated sets of theoretical eigenvalues are given by (2.5).

Using Lemma 4.2, one has that

$$L^{\mathcal{N}} \cap D_{val}^\star = \left\{ l \in \mathbb{C}, \ \sum_{n \geq 0} \partial_r a_n(1) l^n = 0 \right\},$$

$$L^{\mathcal{D}} \cap D_{val}^\star = \left\{ l \in \mathbb{C}, \ \sum_{n \geq 0} a_n(1) l^n = 0 \right\}, \quad \text{or}$$

$$L^{\mathcal{R}} \cap D_{val}^\star = \left\{ l \in \mathbb{C}, \ \sum_{n \geq 0} (a_n(1) + \gamma \partial_r a_n(1)) l^n = 0 \right\},$$

where the functions $(a_n(r))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ are those defined by the recursive scheme (4.5). For simplicity, one introduces the quantities $A_n$ defined as follows:

(4.13)
for $\mathcal{D}$ : $A_n = a_n(1)$;   for $\mathcal{N}$ : $A_n = \partial_r a_n(1)$;   for $\mathcal{R}$ : $A_n = a_n(1) + \gamma \partial_r a_n(1)$.

Thus for $\mathcal{D}$, $\mathcal{N}$, or $\mathcal{R}$ cases one has

$$L \cap D^\star_{val} = \left\{ l \in \mathbb{C}, \ \sum_{n\geq 0} A_n l^n = 0 \right\}.$$

Let us consider the two functions of $l$ as the sum of the following series in $l$:

$$A_l = \sum_{n\geq 0} A_n l^n, \qquad K_l = \sum_{n\geq 0} K_n l^n,$$

which are convergent for $l \in D^\star_{val} \cap D^\star_{acc}$.

Then, to prove (4.11) one exactly has to show that

(4.14)                    $\forall\, l \in D^\star_{val} \cap D^\star_{acc}$ : $A_l = 0$   if and only if   $K_l = 0$.

To prove this, one has to find a relation between $A_n$ and the macroscopic coefficient $K_n$. For this, one introduces the set of functions $(e_n(r))$ associated with the difference between functions $a_n(r)$ and $\alpha_n(r)$ defined in (4.5) and (3.2):

(4.15)                          $e_n(r) = \alpha_n(r) - a_n(r)$ .

These functions, by subtracting (4.5) from (3.2), are exactly defined by the following recursive scheme:

(4.16)
$$\begin{cases} \Delta_N e_n(r) = K_n + v(r)e_{n-1}(r) & \text{with } e_{-1}(r) = 0, \\ e_n^\star = 0, \\ e_n(1) = -A_n & \text{for } \mathcal{D}, \\ \partial_r e_n(1) = -A_n & \text{for } \mathcal{N}, \\ e_n(1) + \gamma \partial_r e_n(1) = -A_n & \text{for } \mathcal{R}. \end{cases}$$

This recursive formula does depend on both macroscopic coefficients $K_n$ and $A_n$. Let us finally define the macroscopic difference function $E_l(r)$ by

$$E_l(r) = \sum_{n\geq 0} e_n(r)l^n = \sum_{n\geq 0} \alpha_n(r)l^n - \sum_{n\geq 0} a_n(r)l^n,$$

which is well defined for $l \in D^\star_{val} \cap D^\star_{acc}$.

We search a differential problem satisfied by $E_l(r)$.

Thanks to Lemma 4.9 on $D^\star_{val}$ and to Definition 4.3 of $D^\star_{val}$, the series

$$\sum_{n\geq 0} a_n(r)l^n, \quad \sum_{n\geq 0} \partial_r a_n(r)l^n, \quad \sum_{n\geq 0} \Delta_N a_n(r)l^n \quad \text{and}$$
$$\sum_{n\geq 0} \alpha_n(r)l^n, \quad \sum_{n\geq 0} \partial_r \alpha_n(r)l^n, \quad \sum_{n\geq 0} \Delta_N \alpha_n(r)l^n$$

converge for all $l \in D^\star_{val} \cap D^\star_{acc}$ and all $r \in [0,1]$. Then, using the integration theorem and the properties (4.16) of functions $e_n(r)$ one has

$$\forall\, l \in D^\star_{val} \cap D^\star_{acc} \quad \forall\, r \in [0,1] \quad : \begin{cases} \Delta_N E_l(r) = K_l + v(r)E_l(r), \\ E^\star_l = 0, \\ E_l(1) = -A_l & \text{for } \mathcal{D}, \\ \partial_r E_l(1) = -A_l & \text{for } \mathcal{N}, \\ E_l(1) + \gamma \partial_r E_l(1) = -A_l & \text{for } \mathcal{R}. \end{cases}$$

$K_l$ or $A_l$ being fixed, this problem has one and only one solution so that $A_l$ is a function of $K_l$ and vice versa. Now, it is easy to check that the solution associated with $A_l = 0$ is $E_l = 0$, which eventually fixes $K_l = 0$. Conversely, and for the same reason, $K_l = 0$ fixes $A_l = 0$. This ensures (4.14), which proves Theorem 4.4. □

It is interesting to note that because $E_l = 0$ is the solution associated with a converging eigenvalue $\lambda_\infty \in \Lambda_\infty = l \in L$, the ratio between the predicted eigenfunction and its value at $r = 0$ also converges to the theoretical Graetz eigenfunction. This leads to the following important corollary.

COROLLARY 4.5. *For an eigenvalue $l \in L \cap D^\star_{val} \cap D^\star_{acc}$, with an associated set of approximated eigenvalues $(\lambda_p)_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\lim_{p \to \infty} \lambda_p = l$, let us define the approximated eigenfunction $\Gamma_{\lambda_p}$ as*

$$(4.17) \qquad \Gamma_{\lambda_p}(r) = \frac{1}{\rho} \sum_{n=0}^{p} \alpha_n(r)\lambda_p^n \quad with \quad \rho = \sum_{n=0}^{p} \frac{\alpha_n(r)}{r^N}(r=0)\lambda_p^n;$$

*then $\Gamma_{\lambda_p}$ converges toward the generalized Graetz function $G_{N,l}$,*

$$(4.18) \qquad \lim_{p \to \infty} \|\Gamma_{\lambda_p} - G_{N,l}\| = 0.$$

*Moreover, defining the amplitude $c_\lambda$, in the same way as $c_l$ defined in (2.7),*

$$(4.19) \qquad c_{\lambda_p} = \frac{\displaystyle\int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^1 T_0(r)\overline{\Gamma_{\lambda_p}(r)}e^{-iN\phi}v(r)r\,dr}{2\pi \displaystyle\int_0^1 |\Gamma_{\lambda_p}(r)|^2 v(r)r\,dr}; \quad then \quad \lim_{p \to \infty} |c_{\lambda_p} - c_l| = 0.$$

Hence, not only does Theorem 4.4 give a necessary and sufficient condition for an eigenvalue to converge, but also the eigenmode will converge to the corresponding theoretical solution. We now numerically study the convergence of various eigenmodes for different averaging operator $w$.

**4.3. Convergence evaluation.** This section studies the numerical evaluation of the convergence to either the eigenvalue, the eigenfunction, or the eigenmode amplitude for a Poiseuille parabolic velocity profile $v(r) = 2(1 - r^2)$.

We calculate the closure functions $\alpha_n$ from the recursive scheme (3.2), so that the coefficients $K_n$ defined in (3.4) of the eigenvalues polynomial (3.5) can be computed. From the obtained solution leading to $p + 1$ eigenvalues, we select the larger one in $\mathbb{R}^-$. Figure 4.2 displays the relative error of this approximated eigenvalue for different weighting functions $w$. For the first Dirichlet eigenvalue, Figure 4.2(a) displays exponential convergence rates. Moreover, when comparing the results of Figure 4.2(a) with Table 4.1, it is not surprising to observe that a larger radius of convergence $D^\star_{acc}$ gives rise to a faster convergence rate. As demonstrated in the previous section, the second

FIG. 4.2. *Relative error for axisymmetrical $N = 0$ eigenvalues $l_{0,0}$ and $l_{0,1}$. (a) Relative error $E_0^{\mathcal{D}} = |\lambda_{0,p}^{\mathcal{D}} - l_{0,0}^{\mathcal{D}}|/l_{0,0}^{\mathcal{D}}$ between the predicted eigenvalue and the theoretical one $l_{0,0}^{\mathcal{D}} = -3.656793458$, versus the order $p$ of the approximation. Black circles stand for the flow-averaging method with $w = v/\langle v \rangle$, and white circles for the classical uniform volume averaging $w = 1$. White squares are for $w = 1/(2r)$ and black squares are for $w = 10(1 - r)^3$. In every case the convergence is exponential, as indicated by the observed semilog linear behavior. (b) We use the same conventions for the second Dirichlet eigenvalue $l_{0,1}^{\mathcal{D}} = -22.30473055$ convergence $E_1^{\mathcal{D}} = |\lambda_{1,p}^{\mathcal{D}} - l_{0,1}^{\mathcal{D}}|/l_{0,1}^{\mathcal{D}}$. (c) We use the same conventions for the second Neumann eigenvalue convergence $l_{0,1}^{\mathcal{N}} = -12.8398060$ with $E_1^{\mathcal{N}} = |\lambda_{1,p}^{\mathcal{N}} - l_{0,1}^{\mathcal{N}}|/l_{0,1}^{\mathcal{N}}$.*

eigenvalue for the Dirichlet or Neumann boundary condition is not accessible to the standard volume averaging methods—$w = 1$—or the kinematic volume averaging—$w = v/\langle v \rangle$. On the contrary, two other weighting functions $w$ have been proposed in Table 4.1, the convergence of which has been established for the second eigenvalue in the previous section. Figures 4.2(b) and (c) study their convergence on the second eigenvalue in the Dirichlet and Neumann cases. It is interesting to observe on these figures that the convergence rate still looks exponential, even if the convergence rate is much slower than those observed in Figure 4.2(a). More modes should indeed be needed for an acceptable precision to be obtained.

Moreover, for finite values of the spectral cut-off $p$, the second eigenvalue could not always be captured. For example, this can be observed in Figure 4.2(b) in the case of weighting function $w = 10(1-r)^3$, for which the eigenvalue becomes real, so that it is considered to be captured by the approximation for $p \geq 12$ only. This example also illustrates that an empirical test of the convergence is not always successful. If one would have guessed, ignoring the convergence proof, from the computation of the first 10 mapping variables $\alpha_p$, $p < 10$, that the first eigenvalue computed in Figure 4.2(b) is captured by the weighting function $w = 10(1-r)^3$, it would have found the wrong answer. Figure 4.3 displays the convergence of the amplitude and the eigenfunction defined in Corollary 4.5 for the first Dirichlet mode. It is interesting to note that even the first approximation $p = 1$ that has been detailed in section 2.2.3 permits a rather precise amplitude and eigenmode estimate for every tested weighting function $w$. The convergence rate displayed on Figure 4.3 is also found to be exponential, as already observed for the eigenvalue convergence. This result does not seem very surprising, for the generalized averaging method has many characteristics in common with a spectral discrete method.

Finally, nonaxisymmetrical mode convergence have been investigated. The convergence of the leading order $N = 1$ eigenvalue is represented on Figure 4.4. It is interesting to observe that low order approximation (e.g., $p < 5$) gives rise to a rather precise estimation of this first nonaxisymmetric mode. It should then be noted that for both Neumann and Dirichlet boundary conditions, $|l_{1,0}|$ is smaller than $|l_{0,1}|$.

FIG. 4.3. *Relative error for axisymmetrical $N = 0$ eigenmode. (a) Relative error $E_c = |c_{\lambda_{0,p}^{\mathcal{D}}} - c_{l_{0,0}^{\mathcal{D}}}|/c_{l_{0,0}^{\mathcal{D}}}$ between the predicted amplitude and its theoretical value associated with a uniform initial temperature $T_0 = 1$ at $z = 0$ for the first Dirichlet eigenmode, versus the order $p$ of the approximation. (b) Absolute error $E_G = \|\Gamma_{\lambda_{0,p}^{\mathcal{D}}} - G_{l_{0,0}^{\mathcal{D}}}\| = \langle w(\Gamma_{\lambda_{0,p}^{\mathcal{D}}} - G_{l_{0,0}^{\mathcal{D}}})^2 \rangle$ on the predicted eigenfunction for the first Dirichlet eigenmode.*



FIG. 4.4. *We use the same conventions as in Figure 4.2 for the relative error for nonaxisymmetrical $N = 1$ eigenvalues $l_{1,0}$. (a) Relative error $E_0^{\mathcal{N}} = |\lambda_{0,p}^{\mathcal{N}} - l_{1,0}^{\mathcal{N}}|/l_{1,0}^{\mathcal{N}}$ between the predicted eigenvalue and the theoretical Neumann one $l_{1,0}^{\mathcal{N}} = -4.160532810$, versus the order $p$ of the approximation. (b) We use the same conventions for the first Dirichlet eigenvalue convergence $l_{1,0}^{\mathcal{D}} = -10.69115115$ with $E_0^{\mathcal{D}} = |\lambda_{1,p}^{\mathcal{D}} - l_{1,0}^{\mathcal{D}}|/l_{1,0}^{\mathcal{D}}$.*

Hence, the better convergence of Figures 4.4(a) and (b) compared to Figures 4.2(b) and (c) can be qualitatively understood. Neumann and Dirichlet situations give lower and upper bounds for the convergence of the more general Robin boundary condition when varying $\gamma$ from 0 to infinity. Hence, the Robin case should converge the same way as it is observed in the above figures.

## 5. Discussion and conclusion.

**5.1. Discussion.** This section discusses the results obtained in the previous sections in the light of previous analysis found in the literature.

**5.1.1. Context of the presented analysis.** As already mentioned in section 2.1 after defining the convection diffusion problem, (2.1), different characteristic lengths can be chosen for making dimensionless the longitudinal dimension $z$, and this leads to different Péclet numbers $Pe \gg 1$ or $pe \ll 1$. Any choice should lead to consistent results. When choosing the Péclet number $Pe \gg 1$, it is known that

longitudinal variations along $z$ scale linearly with $Pe$. This result holds as an asymptotic expansion discarding $O(1/Pe^2)$ terms [1], and leads to the simplified constitutive equation (2.2). Balakotaiah and Chang [5] mention that the condition $Pe \gg 6.93$ is necessary for neglecting axial diffusion. The linear scaling of $z$ variations with $Pe$ is described in solution (2.3) and used in the average description of the problem (2.12). From this nondimensionalization choice, it appears that standard [39] "ad hoc" closure relations used in (2.17) and (3.1) do not depend on the Péclet number because each $z$ derivative cancels the corresponding algebraic dependence in $Pe$. It then appears that closure relations (2.17) and (3.1) are in fact an asymptotic expansion that involves the eigenvalue $l$ of the problem as a small parameter. The validity range of this asymptotic expansion, which should better be described as an analytic expansion of the eigenfunction with the eigenvalue, is investigated in section 4, while in the meantime the "ad hoc" closure relations are a posteriori justified by the convergence proof obtained in the same section. All the validity range results for eigenvalues are obtained independently from the value of the Péclet number, but are valid for $Pe \gg 1$ since the starting constitutive equation (2.2) derives from (2.1) discarding $O(1/Pe^2)$ terms [1].

**5.1.2. Comparison with other convergence results.** It is now interesting to more clearly compare our analysis with previously obtained convergence results. For example, some convergence criteria have been discussed in the context of center manifold approximations of the convection-diffusion problem (2.1) by Balakotaiah and Chang in [4]. In the case of spatially varying solutions, the solution is projected over Graetz eigenfunctions, and a criterion has been found by summing the expansion series. The convergence criterion can be expressed in the same framework by considering the smallest longitudinal variations associated with a critical $\lambda_c$. In the case of Dirichlet boundary conditions, it was found $\lambda_c^{\mathcal{D}} = 13.80$ in [4], whereas $\lambda_c^{\mathcal{N}} = 37.7$ was obtained in the case of Neumann boundary conditions. These values have to be compared with the results in Table 4.1. One has to note, that, in our case, the convergence radius $D_{acc}$ obtained from computing the expansion series is not the only relevant parameter for convergence. $D_{val}$, which comes from the analyticity condition on the averaged Graetz eigenfunction that we wish to approximate, must also be considered. The convergence radius is the minimum of $D_{acc}$ and $D_{val}$.

The Lyapunov–Schmidt reduction technique such as used in [5, 11] is also another method that should be compared to our analysis. As mentioned in the introduction, this approximation shares much similarities with ours, and the results are also quite similar. In this case, the considered equation (2.1) is written by making dimensionless the longitudinal direction $z$ by $L$ so that the Péclet number is replaced by the small parameter $pe = PeR/L$, as already indicated in section 2.1. The first step of the Lyapunov–Schmidt reduction approximation is to look for a regular asymptotic expansion solution of (2.1) in terms of the small parameter $pe$. The solution is then decomposed into two parts similar to (2.10) and (3.1) (but based on a splitting of the linear operator eigenfunctions into "master" eigenfunctions of the kernel of the adjoint operator and "slave" eigenfunctions of the image of the adjoint operator; see, for example, [11]). In the case of the Neumann boundary condition and weighting function $w = 1$, the first closure field solutions that we have obtained are exactly the same as those previously obtained in [5, 11]. More precisely, the first slave mode computed in equation (31) of [11] or equation (3.8) of [5] corresponds to the Neumann solution $\alpha_{1,0}$ found in (2.22). Nevertheless, higher expansion closure fields differ from those of Chakraborty and Balakotaiah [11]. By summing the expansion series, those authors

have been able to find a convergence radius for the approximation. Following criteria equation (73) of [11], and the discussion in section 3 of [5], the convergence radius of the Neumann boundary conditions with uniform averaging is $\lambda_c^{\mathcal{N}} = 48 \times 0.288 = 13.8$, which should be compared with the value 10.56 in Table 4.1.

This comparison shows that some of our convergence results are very similar to those previously obtained in the literature with other approaches.

**5.1.3. Azimuthal averaging.** In this section we discuss the possibility and the interest of azimuthal averaging. First, it should be noted that relation (2.7) gives the amplitude of each nonaxisymmetrical mode of the theoretical solution. If, for example, an initial condition is chosen with a pulse at a given location $(r_0, \phi_0)$, i.e., $T_0(r, \phi) = \delta(r - r_0)\delta(\phi - \phi_0)$, then all nonaxisymmetrical modes, $N \neq 0$ will be represented with a weight $c_{N,l} = G_{N,l}(r_0)v(r_0)r_0 / \int_0^1 |G_{N,l}(r)|^2 v(r)r \, dr$ because the Fourier transform of the Dirac distribution is uniform. In that case, if one averages the theoretical solution with a uniform weight function along the azimuthal angle $\phi$, all nonaxisymmetrical mode,s $N \neq 0$ will not contribute to the averaged concentration because $\langle e^{iN\phi} \rangle_\phi = 0$ for $N \neq 0$. This is not true when using a nonuniform averaging operator $w_\phi$ along the azimuthal angle $\phi$. In this case, there should be some contribution to the averaged concentration coming from nonaxisymmetrical mode $N \neq 0$, summing $c_{N,l}\langle e^{iN\phi} w_\phi \rangle_\phi \langle G_{N,l} \rangle^\star$ contributions.

Some of these nonaxisymmetrical contributions to the true averaged concentration solution could indeed be captured by an averaging method, as shown in the previous sections. Hence, for each nonaxisymmetrical eigenvalue $l$, one can obtain the appropriate averaging approximation $c_{\lambda_p}\langle e^{iN\phi} w_\phi \rangle_\phi \langle \Gamma_{\lambda_p} \rangle^\star$ of its contribution to the averaged solution.

**5.2. Conclusion.** This paper analyzes the convergence of volume averaging methods on unidirectional convection-diffusion problems. Neumann, Robin, and Dirichlet boundary conditions have been considered. The last problem is of a great interest in the case of local nonequilibrium conditions, i.e., averaged temperature not equal to the value at the boundary for which approximate solutions are more difficult to obtain.

Concentrating on the stationary solution associated with large Péclet numbers, it has been found that volume averaging methods converge toward the exact solution. A necessary and sufficient condition for this convergence to occur has been found for any unidirectional velocity field, which depends on the averaging operator $w$. This condition has been obtained in a general form as related to the analytical character of the averaged eigenfunction with the eigenvalue $\lambda$. This condition has in fact a general scope, because it is the basis for writing "closure relations" as a power series of the eigenvalue.

It is interesting to note that the convergence also depends, obviously, on the eigenvalue to be captured. In the case of a parabolic velocity profile, the convergence to the Graetz solution has been studied in more detail. In the case of Dirichlet boundary conditions, "natural" operators $w = 1$ or $w = v$ allow the convergence to the first nontrivial eigenvalue. In the case of a Neumann boundary condition, these usual weighting operators do not capture the first nontrivial eigenvalue of the Graetz problem. In this case, it is necessary to use other averaging operators $w$ to get the first spatially decaying mode, some of which have been proposed in this paper.

This result shows that averaging over some spatial volume unavoidably degenerates the space of mathematically accessible solutions. Nevertheless, despite smooth-

ing out the small scales—the large eigenvalues—the averaged solution can lead to an asymptotically exact representation of the large scale structure—the small eigenvalues —of the solution. It is expected that this conclusion could be of some general scope when decreasing the dimension number of a problem by averaging along part of its dimensions.

Moreover, the mathematical proof presented in this paper has been complemented in the case of a parabolic Poiseuille flow by some numerical computation of convergence rates. They have been found to be exponential, as expected from a spectral discrete method. It should also be of some general scope when averaging linear problems. It is interesting to note that the convergence toward nontrivial eigenvalues is directly related to a correct evaluation of the heat transfer between the fluid and the solid boundary. As a matter of fact it should be kept in mind that the Nusselt number $Nu$, defined as usual as the dimensionless number associated with the heat (or mass) transfer [14] scales asymptotically, when $z \gg Pe/(l_1 - l_0)$, as $Nu = l_1^2/2$. Hence, convergence toward the eigenvalue of the averaged model is also directly related to a correct evaluation of the asymptotic transfer between the flow and the solid.

Different extensions of this work could be considered. First, a direct transposition of the convergence proof in the case of a plane geometry, with transverse velocity field, should be easily obtained. The quantitative results on the accessibility domain as well as on the convergence accuracy could nevertheless be different in that case. The second extension of interest should be related to more complicated situations associated with a coupling with conduction in some external solid domain.

**Appendix A. Graetz functions and Kummer's functions.** The generalized Graetz functions are the eigenfunctions of the operator $\frac{1}{1-r^2}\Delta_N$,

$$(A.1) \qquad \frac{1}{1-r^2}\Delta_N \equiv \frac{1}{1-r^2}\left(\partial_r^2 + \frac{1}{r}\partial_r - \frac{N^2}{r^2}\right).$$

One wants to solve the self-adjoint Sturm–Liouville problem

$$(A.2) \qquad \frac{1}{1-r^2}\Delta_N f = -\ell^2 f,$$

where we have introduced the positive eigenvalue $\ell^2 = -l$ to compare to (2.4). Defining a new function $y$, from $f(r) = r^N e^{-\frac{\ell}{2}r^2} y(\ell r^2)$, $y$ is then a solution of the hypergeometric equation

$$(A.3) \qquad z\partial_z^2 y + (1 + N - z)\partial_z y - \left(\frac{1+N}{2} - \frac{\ell}{4}\right)y = 0.$$

In its more general form, the hypergeometric equation reads

$$(A.4) \qquad z\partial_z^2 y + (c - z)\partial_z y - ay = 0,$$

which possesses two solutions called confluent hypergeometric functions, and when $c = 1$,
- the first one is singular at $z = 0$ and is not considered here;
- the other one is regular, convergent, and denoted $\Phi(a, c, z)$, It is defined by the Kummer's series (with infinite radius of convergence)

$$(A.5) \qquad \Phi(a, c, z) = 1 + \frac{a}{c}z + \frac{a(a+1)}{c(c+1)}\frac{z^2}{2} + \cdots + \frac{a\cdots(a+n-1)}{c\cdots(c+n-1)}\frac{z^n}{n!} + \cdots.$$

$f$ is proportional to the Graetz function $G_{N,\ell}$,

$$(A.6) \qquad G_{N,\ell}(r) = r^N e^{-\ell r^2/2} \Phi\left(\frac{1+N}{2} - \frac{\ell}{4}, 1 + N, \ell r^2\right).$$

**Appendix B. Analyticity in $l$ of the Graetz functions.** In this appendix we prove that the generalized Graetz functions defined in (2.4) $G_{N,l}(r)$ are analytical in $l$ on the whole complex field $\mathbb{C}$. More precisely, for the closure functions $q_{N,n}(r)$ defined in (B.4) one has for each $l \in \mathbb{C}$

$$(B.1) \qquad G_{N,l}(r) = \sum_{n \geq 0} q_{N,n}(r)l^n, \quad \partial_r G_{N,l}(r) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \partial_r q_{N,n}(r)l^n.$$

We point out that this result is true for any $N \in \mathbb{Z}$ and for any flow $v(r)$ that is nonnegative and analytical in 0.

We shall prove this result in two steps:
- in section B.1 we prove that (B.1) is true when $l$ belongs to a disk $D \subset \mathbb{C}$ which we characterize;
- in section B.2 we prove that $D = \mathbb{C}$.

We first recall the following definitions:

For a given value $N \in \mathbb{Z}$ of the axisymmetric parameter, the operator $\Delta_N$ is defined as

$$\Delta_N \equiv \partial_r^2 + \frac{1}{r}\partial_r - \frac{N^2}{r^2},$$

so that $\Delta_{-N} = \Delta_N$. Hence, we will consider the case $N \geq 0$ only.

The operator $\Delta_N$ can be written under a divergence form

$$(B.2) \qquad \Delta_N f = \frac{1}{r^{N+1}} \partial_r\left(r^{2N+1}\partial_r\left(\frac{f}{r^N}\right)\right).$$

For each $l \in \mathbb{C}$ the Graetz function $G_{l,N}$ is the only solution for the following ODE:

$$(B.3) \qquad \begin{cases} \Delta_N G_{N,l} = lv(r)G_{N,l}(r), \\[2mm] \dfrac{G_{N,l}}{r^N}(0) = 1. \end{cases}$$

We define the set of closure functions $q_{N,n}$, for $n \geq 0$, as follows:

$$(B.4) \qquad \begin{cases} \Delta_N q_{N,n} = v(r)q_{N,n-1}(r) \quad \text{with } q_{N,-1} = 0, \\[2mm] \dfrac{q_{N,0}}{r^N}(0) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \dfrac{q_{N,n}}{r^N}(0) = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad n \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

**B.1. A criterion for the Graetz function to be analytical in $l$.**

THEOREM B.1. *Let $D$ be the convergence disk of the series*

$$(B.5) \qquad \sum_{n \geq 0} q_{N,n}(1)l^n,$$

*where the closure functions $q_{N,n}$ are defined in* (B.4). *Then for all $l \in D$,*

$$G_{N,l}(r) = \sum_{n \geq 0} q_{N,n}(r)l^n, \quad \partial_r G_{N,l}(r) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \partial_r q_{N,n}(r)l^n,$$

(B.6)

$$and \quad \Delta_N G_{N,l}(r) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \Delta_N q_{N,n}(r)l^n.$$

*Proof.* We begin by proving that for a fixed $l \in D$ the three series $\sum_{n \geq 0} q_{N,n}(r)l^n$, $\sum_{n \geq 0} \partial_r q_{N,n}(r)l^n$, and $\sum_{n \geq 0} \Delta_N q_{N,n}(r)l^n$ are uniformly convergent for $r \in [0,1]$.

First of all the recursive definition (B.4) of the functions $q_{N,n}$ implies that, for all $n \geq 0$, $q_{N,n}(r) = r^N \psi_n(r)$, where $\psi_n$ is a nonnegative, nondecreasing, continuous function on $[0,1]$,

(B.7)

$$q_{N,0} = r^N \quad and \quad q_{N,n}(r) = r^N \int_0^r \frac{1}{y^{2N+1}} \int_0^y x^{N+1} v(x) q_{N,n-1}(x) \, dx \, dy \quad for \quad n \geq 1,$$

so that $0 \leq q_{N,n}(r) \leq q_{N,n}(1)$ and the series $\sum_{n \geq 0} q_{N,n}(r)l^n$ is uniformly converging on $[0,1]$ for $l \in D$.

In the same way $\Delta_N q_{N,n}(r) = v(r)q_{N,n-1}(r)$, and so one has $0 \leq \Delta_N q_{N,n}(r) \leq \|v\|q_{N,n-1}(1)$ and the series $\sum_{n \geq 0} \Delta_N q_{N,n}(r)l^n$ is uniformly converging on $[0,1]$ for $l \in D$.

Now one has

$$\begin{aligned}
0 \leq \partial_r q_{N,n}(r) = Nr^{N-1} &\int_0^r \frac{1}{y^{2N+1}} \int_0^y x^{N+1} v(x) q_{N,n-1}(x) \, dx \, dy \\
&+ \frac{1}{r^{N+1}} \int_0^r x^{N+1} v(x) q_{N,n-1}(x) dx \\
&\leq Nr^{N-1} q_{N,n}(1) + \frac{\|v\|}{N+2} r q_{N,n-1}(1) \\
&\leq C \left( q_{N,n}(1) + q_{N,n-1}(1) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the constant $C$ depends only on $N$ and $v$ so that the series $\sum_{n \geq 0} \partial_r q_{N,n}(r)l^n$ is uniformly converging on $[0,1]$ for $l \in D$.

Now, for a given value $l \in D$ we introduce the two functions defined on $[0,1]$,

$$F(r) = \sum_{n \geq 0} q_{N,n}(r)l^n, \quad H(r) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \Delta_N q_{N,n}(r)l^n,$$

since these are uniformly converging series, and since $\sum_{n \geq 0} \partial_r q_{N,n}(r)l^n$ is also a uniformly converging series for $r \in [0,1]$, one can use the integration theorem, which implies that

$$H(r) = \Delta_N F(r) \quad for \ r \in [0,1],$$

and at the same time one has with (B.4) that $H(r) = lv(r)F(r)$ and that $\frac{F}{r^N}(0) = 1$. The unicity of the solutions of (B.3) ensures then that $F(r) = G_{N,l}(r)$, and this ends the proof. $\square$

**B.2. Analyticity on the whole complex field $\mathbb{C}$.**

LEMMA B.2. *The series*

$$\sum_{n \geq 0} q_{N,n}(1)l^n$$

*is convergent on the whole complex plane $\mathbb{C}$ and so (B.1) is true for all $l \in \mathbb{C}$.*

*Proof.* With the integral formulation (B.7) on the closure functions $q_{N,n}$ one has

$$q_{N,n+m}(1) = \int_0^1 \frac{1}{y_1^{2N+1}} \int_0^{y_1} x_1^{N+1} v(x_1) q_{N,n+m-1}(x_1) \, dx_1 \, dy_1$$

$$= \int_0^1 \frac{1}{y_1^{2N+1}} \int_0^{y_1} x_1^{2N+1} v(x_1) \cdots \int_0^{x_{m-1}} \frac{1}{y_m^{2N+1}}$$

$$\times \int_0^{y_m} x_m^{N+1} v(x_m) q_{N,n}(x_m) dx_m dy_m \cdots dx_1 dy_1,$$

and since $0 \leq q_{N,n}(r) \leq r^N q_{N,n}(1)$ (see (B.7)), we have

$$\frac{q_{N,n+m}(1)}{q_{N,n}(1)} \leq \int_0^1 \frac{1}{y_1^{2N+1}} \int_0^{y_1} x_1^{2N+1} v(x_1) \cdots \int_0^{x_{m-1}} \frac{1}{y_m^{2N+1}}$$

$$\times \int_0^{y_m} x_m^{2N+1} v(x_m) dx_m \, dy_m \cdots dx_1 \, dy_1$$

$$\leq \|v\|^m \int_0^1 \frac{1}{y_1^{2N+1}} \int_0^{y_1} x_1^{2N+1} \cdots \int_0^{x_{m-1}} \frac{1}{y_m^{2N+1}}$$

$$\times \int_0^{y_m} x_m^{2N+1} dx_m \, dy_m \cdots dx_1 \, dy_1,$$

where $\|v\| = \sup v(r)$.

This upper bound can be computed explicitly,

$$\frac{q_{N,n+m}(1)}{q_{N,n}(1)} \leq \|v\|^m \frac{1}{2(2N+2)} \cdots \frac{1}{2m(2N+2m)} := \alpha_m,$$

and $\alpha_m^{-1/m}$ is a lower bound for the radius of convergence of the series (B.2). One can easily check that

$$\alpha^{-1/m} \geq 2\frac{2N+2}{\|v\|}(m!)^{1/m},$$

and so $\alpha^{-1/m}$ grows up to infinity. As a result the series (B.2) is convergent on the whole complex plane $\mathbb{C}$. $\quad\square$

**Appendix C. Invertibility of the operator $\mathcal{L}_N^\star$ and resolution of the closure problems.** In this appendix we prove that the closure problems

(C.1) $\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_N^\star \alpha_n & = \quad v(r)\alpha_{n-1}(r) - \langle v\alpha_{n-1} \rangle^\star \quad \text{with } \alpha_{-1}(r) = 0, \\ \\ \alpha_0^\star = 1 \quad \text{or} \qquad\qquad \alpha_n^\star = 0 \qquad\qquad \text{for } n \geq 1 + \text{boundary condition} \end{cases}$

for a boundary condition either of a homogeneous Dirichlet, homogeneous Neumann, or Robin type,

(C.2) $\qquad \alpha_n(1) = 0, \quad \partial\alpha_n(1) = 0, \quad \text{or} \quad \partial\alpha_n(1) + \gamma\alpha_n(1) = 0,$

has one and only one bounded solution for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

The operator $\mathcal{L}_N^\star$ is defined for $N \in \mathbb{Z}$ and for a normalized averaging operator $\star$ (i.e., such that $\langle 1 \rangle^\star = 1$) by

(C.3)
$$\mathcal{L}_N^\star f = \Delta_N f - \langle \Delta_N f \rangle^\star;$$

for the operator $\Delta_N$,

$$\Delta_N f = \partial_r^2 f + \frac{1}{r} \partial_r f - \frac{N^2}{r^2} f.$$

Because $\Delta_N = \Delta_{-N}$ we will only consider here the proof for $N \geq 0$.

We proceed in two steps: in section C.1 we prove a lemma on the general solution of $\Delta_N f = g$ and in section C.2 we apply that lemma to the problems (C.1) for every boundary condition (C.2).

**C.1. A technical lemma.**

LEMMA C.1. *Let $g$ be a continuous function defined on $[0,1]$ and such that $g^\star = 0$. Then for all $A \in \mathbb{R}$ the ODE*

(C.4)
$$\Delta_N f - A = g,$$

(C.5)
$$f^\star = M \in \mathbb{R}$$

*has one and only one bounded solution on $[0,1]$.*

*Moreover, this solution fulfills*

$$\langle \Delta_N f \rangle^\star = A$$

*and then is a solution of*

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_N^\star f = g, \\ f^\star = M. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* We define the function $\psi_1(r)$,

(C.6)
$$\psi_1(r) = -r^N \int_r^1 \frac{1}{y^{2N+1}} \int_0^y x^{N+1} g(x) \, dx \, dy,$$

which is well defined since $g$ is continuous in $0$ for $N \geq 0$, and the function $\psi_2(r)$,

(C.7)
$$\psi_2(r) = \frac{r^N - r^2}{N^2 - 4} \quad \text{if } N \neq 2 \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_2(r) = \frac{r^2}{4} \ln(r) \quad \text{for } N = 2.$$

Any solution of (C.4) is of the form

$$f(r) = \lambda r^N + \mu r^{-N} + A\psi_2(r) + \psi_1(r) \quad \text{if } N \neq 0, \quad \text{or}$$
$$f(r) = \lambda r^N + \mu \ln(r) + A\psi_2(r) + \psi_1(r) \quad \text{if } N = 0.$$

Then all bounded solutions of (C.4) on $[0,1]$ are on the form

(C.8)
$$f(r) = \lambda r^N + A\psi_2(r) + \psi_1(r),$$

and (C.5) gives

$$\lambda = \frac{M - A\psi_2^\star - \psi_1^\star}{\langle r^N \rangle^\star}.$$

Thus (C.4) and (C.5) have only one bounded solution.

Since $g^\star = 0$ one also has $\langle r^N \rangle^\star = A$.  $\square$

### C.2. Resolution of the closure problems.

*Homogeneous Dirichlet case.* We consider the solution $f$ as in (C.8) of (C.4) and (C.5) and search for a value of $A$ such that $f(1) = 0$.

We have

$$(C.9) \qquad f(1) = \frac{M - A\psi_2^\star - \psi_1^\star}{\langle r^N \rangle^\star}.$$

So there is only one bounded solution $f$ of (C.4) and (C.5) such that $f(1) = 0$; it is defined as

$$f(r) = \frac{M - A\psi_2^\star - \psi_1^\star}{\langle r^N \rangle^\star} r^N + A\psi_2(r) + \psi_1(r),$$

$$A = \frac{M - \psi_1^\star}{\psi_2^\star},$$

and $A$ is well defined because $\psi_2$ is negative and so $\psi_2^\star \neq 0$.

Consequently, the closure problems (C.1) for an homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition are well posed.

*Homogeneous Neumann case.* We consider the solution $f$ as in (C.8) of (C.4) and (C.5) and search for a value of $A$ such that $\partial_r f(1) = 0$.

By multiplying (C.4) by $r^{N+1}$ and integrating over $[0, 1]$ one gets

$$(C.10) \qquad \partial_r f(1) = Nf(1) + \frac{A}{N+2} + \int_0^1 r^{N+1} g(r)\, dr,$$

and since

$$f(1) = \frac{M - A\psi_2^\star - \psi_1^\star}{\langle r^N \rangle^\star},$$

there is only one solution defined as

$$f(r) = \frac{M - A\psi_2^\star - \psi_1^\star}{\langle r^N \rangle^\star} r^N + A\psi_2(r) + \psi_1(r),$$

$$A\left(\frac{1}{N+2} - N\frac{\psi_2^\star}{\langle r^N \rangle^\star}\right) = N\frac{\psi_1^\star - M}{\langle r^N \rangle^\star} - \int_0^1 r^{N+1} g(r)\, dr,$$

where A is well defined because $\psi_2$ is negative and so $\frac{1}{N+2} - N\frac{\psi_2^\star}{\langle r^N \rangle^\star} \neq 0$.

Consequently the closure problems (C.1) for an homogeneous Neumann boundary condition are well posed.

*Robin case.* We consider the solution $f$ as in (C.8) of (C.4) and (C.5) and search for a value of $A$ such that $\partial_r f(1) + \gamma f(1) = 0$ for $\gamma > 0$.

With (C.9) and (C.10) we have

$$\partial_r f(1) + \gamma f(1) = A\left(\frac{1}{N+2} - (N+\gamma)\frac{\psi_2^\star}{\langle r^N \rangle^\star}\right) - (N+\gamma)\frac{\psi_1^\star - M}{\langle r^N \rangle^\star} + \int_0^1 r^{N+1} g(r)\, dr,$$

and so there is only one solution defined as

$$f(r) = \frac{M - A\psi_2^\star - \psi_1^\star}{\langle r^N \rangle^\star} r^N + A\psi_2(r) + \psi_1(r),$$

$$A\left(\frac{1}{N+2} - (N+\gamma)\frac{\psi_2^\star}{\langle r^N \rangle^\star}\right) = (N+\gamma)\frac{\psi_1^\star - M}{\langle r^N \rangle^\star} - \int_0^1 r^{N+1} g(r)\, dr,$$

where $A$ is well defined for $\gamma \geq 0$.

Consequently the closure problems (C.1) for an homogeneous Neumann boundary condition are well posed.

## REFERENCES

[1] R. ARIS, *On the dispersion of a solute in a fluid flowing through a tube*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Ser. A, 235 (1956), pp. 65–77.

[2] H. ARKIN, L. X. XU, AND K. R. HOLMES, *Recent developments in modeling heat transfer in blood perfused tissues*, IEEE Trans. Biomed. Engrg., 41 (1994), pp. 97–107.

[3] J. W. BAISH, P. S. AYYASWAMY, AND K. R. FOSTER, *Heat transport mechanisms in vascular tissues: A model comparison*, J. Biomech. Engrg., 108 (1986), pp. 324–331.

[4] V. BALAKOTAIAH AND H. C. CHANG, *Dispersion of chemical solutes in chromatographs and reactors*, Proc. Trans. Roy. Soc. Lond. Ser. A, 351 (1995), pp. 39–75.

[5] V. BALAKOTAIAH AND H. C. CHANG, *Hyperbolic homogenized models for thermal and solutal dispersion*, SIAM J. Appl. Math., 63 (2003), pp. 1231–1258.

[6] J. BENSOUSSAN, L. LIONS, AND G. PAPANICOLAOU, *Asymptotic Analysis for Periodic Structure*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1978.

[7] A. BERMAN, *Laminar flow in channels with porous walls*, J. Appl. Phys., 24 (1953), pp. 1232–1235.

[8] A. BOURGEAT, M. QUINTARD, AND S. WHITAKER, *Eléments de comparaison entre la méthode d'homogénéisation et la méthode de prise de moyenne avec fermeture*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. II Méc. Phys. Chim. Sci. Univers Sci. Terre, 306 (1988), pp. 463–466.

[9] H. BRENNER, *Dispersion resulting from flow through spatially periodic porous media*, Philos. Trans. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A, 297 (1980), pp. 81–133.

[10] M. D. BRYDEN AND H. BRENNER, *Multiple-timescale analysis of taylor dispersion in converging and diverging flows*, J. Fluid Mech., 311 (1996), pp. 343–359.

[11] S. CHAKRABORTY AND V. BALAKOTAIAH, *Low-dimensional models for describing mixing effects in laminar flow turbulent reactors*, Chem. Engrg. Sci., 57 (2002), pp. 2545–2564.

[12] J. H. CUSHMAN, *On unifying the concepts of scale, instrumentation and stochastics in the development of multiple phase transport theory*, Water Res. Resour., 20 (1984), pp. 1668–1676.

[13] J. H. CUSHMAN, L. S. BENNETHUM, AND B. X. HU, *A primer on tools for porous media*, Adv. Water Resour., 25 (2002), pp. 1043–1067.

[14] W. DEEN, *Analysis of Transport Phenomena*, Oxford University Press, London, 1947.

[15] Y. C. FUNG, *Biomechanics: Mechanical Properties of Living Tissues*, 2nd ed., Springer, New York, 1996.

[16] F. GOLFIER, M. QUINTARD, AND S. WHITAKER, *Heat and mass transfer in tubes: An analysis using the method of volume averaging*, J. Por. Media, 5 (2002), pp. 169–185.

[17] L. GRAETZ, *On the thermal conductivity of liquids*, Ann. Phys. Chem., 18 (1883), pp. 79–94.

[18] S. HASSANIZADEH AND W. GRAY, *General conservation equations for multi-phase systems 1 averaging procedure*, Adv. Water Resour., 2 (1979), pp. 131–144.

[19] S. KAKAC, R. K. SHAH, AND A. E. BERGLES, *Low Reynolds Number Flow Heat Exchangers*, Hemisphere Publishing, Washington, D.C., 1983.

[20] M. A. LÉVÊQUE, *Les lois de transmission de la chaleur par convection*, Annales des Mines, Paris, 13 (1928), pp. 201–409.

[21] E. M. LUNGU AND H. K. MOFFAT, *The effect of wall conductance on heat diffusion in duct flow*, J. Engrg. Math., 16 (1982), pp. 121–136.

[22] C. M. MARLE, *On macroscopic equations governing multiphase flow with diffusion and chemical reactions in porous media*, Internat. J. Engrg. Sci., 20 (1982), pp. 643–662.

[23] C. MEI, J. L. AURIAULT, AND C. NG, *Some applications of the homogenization theory*, Adv. Appl. Mech., 32 (1996), pp. 278–348.

[24] G. N. MERCER AND A. J. ROBERTS, *A center manifold description of contaminant dispersion in channels with varying flow properties*, SIAM J. Appl. Math., 50 (1990), pp. 1547–1565.

[25] M. QUINTARD AND S. WHITAKER, *Transport in ordered and disordered porous media: Volume-averaged equations, closure problems and comparison with experiment*, Chem. Engrg. Sci., 48 (1993), pp. 2537–2564.

[26] A. NAKAYAMA, F. KUWAHARA, A. NAOKI, AND G. XU, *A volume averaging theory and its sub-control-volume model for analyzing heat and fluid flow within complex heat transfer equipment*, in Proceedings of the 12th International Heat Transfer Conference, Vol. 2, J. Taine, ed., Grenoble, Elsevier, Paris, 2002, pp. 851–856.

[27] A. NAKAYAMA, F. KUWAHARA, M. SUGIYAMA, AND G. XU, *A two-energy equation model for conduction and convection in porous media*, Int. J. Heat Mass Transfer, 44 (2001), pp. 4375–4379.

[28] D. A. NELSON, *Invited editorial on "Pennes' 1948 paper revisited,"* J. Appl. Physiol., 85 (1998), pp. 2–3.

[29] M. PEDRAS AND M. D. LEMOS, *Macroscopic turbulence modeling for incompressible flow through undeformable porous media*, Int. J. Heat Mass Transfer, 44 (2001), pp. 1081–1093.

[30] H. H. PENNES, *Analysis of tissue and arterial blood temperatures in the resting human forearm*, J. Appl. Physiol., 1 (1948), pp. 93–122.

[31] C. G. PHILLIPS, S. R. KAYE, AND C. D. ROBINSON, *Time-dependent transport by convection and diffusion with exchange between two phases*, J. Fluid Mech., 297 (1995), pp. 373–401.

[32] M. QUINTARD AND S. WHITAKER, *Convection, dispersion, and interfacial transport of contaminants: Homogeneous porous media*, Adv. Water Resour., 17 (1994), pp. 221–239.

[33] A. J. ROBERTS, *The utility of an invariant manifold description of the evolution of a dynamical system*, SIAM J. Appl. Math., 20 (1989), pp. 1447–1458.

[34] S. ROSENCRANS, *Taylor dispersion in curved channels*, SIAM J. Appl. Math., 57 (1997), pp. 1216–1241.

[35] S. L. ROSS, *Differential Equations*, Blaisdell, London, 1964.

[36] E. SANCHEZ-PALENCIA, *Nonhomogeneous Media and Vibration Theory*, Lecture Notes in Phys. 127, Springer, New York, 1980.

[37] R. K. SHAH AND A. L. LONDON, *Laminar flow forced convection in ducts*, Adv. Heat Trans., Suppl. 1 (1978).

[38] G. I. TAYLOR, *Dispersion of solute matter in solvent flowing slowly through a tube*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Ser. A., 219 (1953), pp. 186–203.

[39] S. WHITAKER, *The Method of Volume Averaging*, Kluwer Academic, Norwell, MA, 1999.

[40] W. R. YOUNG AND S. JONES, *Shear dispersion*, Phys. Fluid, 3 (1991), pp. 1087–1101.

[41] Z.-G. YUAN, W. H. SOMERTON, AND K. S. UDELL, *Thermal dispersion in thick-walled tubes as a model of porous media*, Int. J. Heat Mass Transfer, 34 (1991), pp. 2715–2726.