## A SIMPLE AND EFFECTIVE PDE MODEL FOR BUSHFIRES THEORY AND COMPUTATION

#### Glen Wheeler w./ Serena Dipierro, Enrico Valdinoci, Valentina Wheeler

School of Mathematics and Applied Statistics, University of Wollongong

June 4, 2024



Supported by

Wildfires are a global phenomenon. In Australia they have been especially impactful. Let me give a brief impression of what a massive problem they are for Australia.



The remains of a burnt property in Bruthen, SA.

### Local air quality.



Melbourne, Australia, pre-COVID.

Dangerous smoke crosses borders.



Bushfire smoke seen from space crossing the Pacific.

#### Mental health cost.



A showground being transformed into an evacuation centre.

GW

#### Economic cost.



Destroyed buildings in Eden-Monaro.

THE 81ST FUJIHARA SEMINAR

#### Climate feedback.



Jetbourne photograph of smoke plumes from East Gippsland.

### Habitat damage.



Ash and debris on Boydtown beach.

THE 81ST FUJIHARA SEMINAR

### Agricultural.



Sheep moving through fire grounds in Bega.

THE 81ST FUJIHARA SEMINAR



An out of control fire line in Bowraville, NSW.

Emergency response to bushfires, especially at the catastrophic rating level, needs to be (drastically) more efficient. Our small contribution is to enhance the existing modelling and prediction technology.

The study of bushfire propagation requires, in general, the understanding of very complex and intertwined phenomena, involving (at least)

fluid mechanics

The study of bushfire propagation requires, in general, the understanding of very complex and intertwined phenomena, involving (at least)

- fluid mechanics
- physics

GW

- fluid mechanics
- physics
- chemistry

- fluid mechanics
- physics
- chemistry
- meteorology, and

- fluid mechanics
- physics
- chemistry
- meteorology, and
- thermodynamics.

The study of bushfire propagation requires, in general, the understanding of very complex and intertwined phenomena, involving (at least)

- fluid mechanics
- physics
- chemistry
- meteorology, and
- thermodynamics.

A thorough bushfire analysis should combine weather and climate models with fuel and terrain models, describing accurately flaming combustion phenomena and eddy formation in different spatial and temporal scales (see e.g. Bakhshaii-Johnson '19).

The study of bushfire propagation requires, in general, the understanding of very complex and intertwined phenomena, involving (at least)

- fluid mechanics
- physics
- chemistry
- meteorology, and
- thermodynamics.

A thorough bushfire analysis should combine weather and climate models with fuel and terrain models, describing accurately flaming combustion phenomena and eddy formation in different spatial and temporal scales (see e.g. Bakhshaii-Johnson '19).

The "ultimate" universal bushfire model is not available yet, and it is customary to approach the problem under different perspectives, so that often the different models are classified into the categories of "physical" (or "theoretical"), "semi-physical" (or "semi-empirical"), and "empirical", see e.g. Perry '98, Pastor-Zárate-Planas-Arnaldos '03; sometimes "mathematical" models have been considered as a separate category closely related to "simulation", see e.g. Sullivan '09 x3.

On the one hand, it is desirable to describe bushfires by a model which is as complete and accurate as possible,

On the one hand, it is desirable to describe bushfires by a model which is as complete and accurate as possible,but, on the other hand, we consider it also important to have "simple" (though not simplistic) models according to three principles:

On the one hand, it is desirable to describe bushfires by a model which is as complete and accurate as possible,but, on the other hand, we consider it also important to have "simple" (though not simplistic) models according to three principles:

rigorous mathematical treatment

On the one hand, it is desirable to describe bushfires by a model which is as complete and accurate as possible,but, on the other hand, we consider it also important to have "simple" (though not simplistic) models according to three principles:

- rigorous mathematical treatment
- qualitative understanding of the main processes involved

On the one hand, it is desirable to describe bushfires by a model which is as complete and accurate as possible,but, on the other hand, we consider it also important to have "simple" (though not simplistic) models according to three principles:

- rigorous mathematical treatment
- qualitative understanding of the main processes involved
- fast simulations.

On the one hand, it is desirable to describe bushfires by a model which is as complete and accurate as possible,but, on the other hand, we consider it also important to have "simple" (though not simplistic) models according to three principles:

- rigorous mathematical treatment
- qualitative understanding of the main processes involved
- fast simulations.

We feel as though this would make the model reliable and concretely usable in real-time.

Simple models can also act as initial blueprints from which more complex models can be built.

The model that we propose consists of a single scalar equation, in which the effects coming from fluid dynamics and chemical combustion are encoded by state parameters and interaction kernels.

The model that we propose consists of a single scalar equation, in which the effects coming from fluid dynamics and chemical combustion are encoded by state parameters and interaction kernels.

More specifically, the equation on which we focus our attention has the form

$$\partial_t u = c\Delta u + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( u(y,t) - \Theta(y,t) \right)_+ K(x,y) \, dy + \left( \left( \omega - \frac{\beta(u)\nabla u}{|\nabla u|^\alpha} \right) \cdot \nabla u \right)_-, \tag{1}$$

where  $u, \Theta : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$  and  $c : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to (0, +\infty)$  are real functions depending on the space point  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and time  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $K : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \to [0, +\infty)$  is an interaction kernel,  $\omega : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^n$  is a time-dependent vector field,  $\beta : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\alpha \in [0, 2]$ , and we used the notation for the "positive and negative parts" of a function

$$f_+(x) := \max\{0, f(x)\} \text{ and } f_-(x) := \max\{0, -f(x)\}.$$
 (2)

The model that we propose consists of a single scalar equation, in which the effects coming from fluid dynamics and chemical combustion are encoded by state parameters and interaction kernels.

More specifically, the equation on which we focus our attention has the form

$$\partial_t u = c\Delta u + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( u(y,t) - \Theta(y,t) \right)_+ K(x,y) \, dy + \left( \left( \omega - \frac{\beta(u)\nabla u}{|\nabla u|^\alpha} \right) \cdot \nabla u \right)_-, \tag{1}$$

where  $u, \Theta : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$  and  $c : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to (0, +\infty)$  are real functions depending on the space point  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and time  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $K : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \to [0, +\infty)$  is an interaction kernel,  $\omega : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^n$  is a time-dependent vector field,  $\beta : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\alpha \in [0, 2]$ , and we used the notation for the "positive and negative parts" of a function

$$f_+(x) := \max\{0, f(x)\} \text{ and } f_-(x) := \max\{0, -f(x)\}.$$
 (2)

**Interpretation.** In this model, u = u(x, t) represents the temperature of the environment at the space point  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , at time *t* (in many applications, one can focus on the case n = 2, and deal with a given region with suitable, e.g. Dirichlet, conditions).

### The model

$$\partial_t u = c\Delta u + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( u(y,t) - \Theta(y,t) \right)_+ \mathcal{K}(x,y) \, dy + \left( \left( \omega - \frac{\beta(u) \nabla u}{|\nabla u|^\alpha} \right) \cdot \nabla u \right)_- \, .$$

As customary, one assumes that temperature spreads through a **heat equation**, in which c = c(x, t) denotes the environmental diffusion coefficient (the case of constant *c* modeling a homogeneous environment).

#### The model

$$\partial_t u = c\Delta u + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( u(y,t) - \Theta(y,t) \right)_+ \mathcal{K}(x,y) \, dy + \left( \left( \omega - \frac{\beta(u)\nabla u}{|\nabla u|^\alpha} \right) \cdot \nabla u \right)_- \, .$$

As customary, one assumes that temperature spreads through a **heat equation**, in which c = c(x, t) denotes the environmental diffusion coefficient (the case of constant *c* modeling a homogeneous environment).

The specific model for bushfires accounts for three additional phenomena, namely combustion, wind, and convection.

#### The model

$$\partial_t u = c\Delta u + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( u(y,t) - \Theta(y,t) \right)_+ \mathcal{K}(x,y) \, dy + \left( \left( \omega - \frac{\beta(u)\nabla u}{|\nabla u|^\alpha} \right) \cdot \nabla u \right)_- \, .$$

As customary, one assumes that temperature spreads through a **heat equation**, in which c = c(x, t) denotes the environmental diffusion coefficient (the case of constant *c* modeling a homogeneous environment).

The specific model for bushfires accounts for three additional phenomena, namely combustion, wind, and convection.

The **combustion** is described by an effective ignition temperature  $\Theta = \Theta(x, t)$ , above which the fuel burns. The case of a constant  $\Theta(x, t) = \Theta_0$  represents the ideal situation of fuel homogeneously spread across the environment, with infinite abundance of fuel at every point. In this case, the fuel burns at temperature  $\Theta_0$  and affects nearby points through the interaction potential *K*. Note that when the temperature *u* of the fuel is below the effective ignition temperature  $\Theta$ , the combustion effect disappears, in view of the positive part of the function considered in the integral).

The model

$$\partial_t u = c\Delta u + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( u(y,t) - \Theta(y,t) \right)_+ \mathcal{K}(x,y) \, dy + \left( \left( \omega - \frac{\beta(u) \nabla u}{|\nabla u|^\alpha} \right) \cdot \nabla u \right)_-.$$

Situations in which the availability of fuel varies in space and time are of course modeled by nonconstant functions  $\Theta$ .

#### The model

$$\partial_t u = c\Delta u + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( u(y,t) - \Theta(y,t) \right)_+ K(x,y) \, dy + \left( \left( \omega - \frac{\beta(u) \nabla u}{|\nabla u|^\alpha} \right) \cdot \nabla u \right)_-.$$

Situations in which the availability of fuel varies in space and time are of course modeled by nonconstant functions  $\Theta$ . We stress that the model can also include a memory effect, in which the burned fuel turns into ash and is not any longer subject to combustion. This can be done, for instance, by considering the case in which

$$\Theta(x,t) := \begin{cases} \tan\left(\frac{\pi}{2F}\int_{0}^{t}\left(u(x,\tau)-\bar{\Theta}(x)\right)_{+}d\tau\right) & \text{if } \int_{0}^{t}\left(u(x,\tau)-\bar{\Theta}(x)\right)_{+}d\tau < F, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$
(3)

In this framework, F = F(x, t) accounts for the fuel available (for instance, *F* can be taken to be constant; the case F = F(x) corresponds to the situation of an initial amount of fuel F(x) available at the point *x*, and the case

The model

$$\partial_t u = c\Delta u + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( u(y,t) - \Theta(y,t) \right)_+ K(x,y) \, dy + \left( \left( \omega - \frac{\beta(u)\nabla u}{|\nabla u|^{\alpha}} \right) \cdot \nabla u \right)_- \, .$$

Moreover, the constitutional ignition temperature at a given point *x* is  $\overline{\Theta}(x)$  (the case of a constant ignition temperature  $\overline{\Theta}(x) = \Theta_0$  accounting for a uniformly distributed fuel). Above this ignition temperature, the fuel burns, and the amount of fuel burned is described by the quantity

$$B(x,t) := \int_0^t \left( u(x,\tau) - \bar{\Theta}(x) \right)_+ d\tau.$$
(4)

The model

$$\partial_t u = c \Delta u + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( u(y,t) - \Theta(y,t) \right)_+ K(x,y) \, dy + \left( \left( \omega - \frac{\beta(u) \nabla u}{|\nabla u|^\alpha} \right) \cdot \nabla u \right)_- \, .$$

Moreover, the constitutional ignition temperature at a given point *x* is  $\overline{\Theta}(x)$  (the case of a constant ignition temperature  $\overline{\Theta}(x) = \Theta_0$  accounting for a uniformly distributed fuel). Above this ignition temperature, the fuel burns, and the amount of fuel burned is described by the quantity

$$B(x,t) := \int_0^t \left( u(x,\tau) - \bar{\Theta}(x) \right)_+ d\tau.$$
(4)

We highlight the difference between the constitutional ignition temperature  $\overline{\Theta}$  and the effective ignition temperature  $\Theta$ .

#### The model

$$\partial_t u = c \Delta u + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( u(y,t) - \Theta(y,t) \right)_+ K(x,y) \, dy + \left( \left( \omega - \frac{\beta(u) \nabla u}{|\nabla u|^\alpha} \right) \cdot \nabla u \right)_- \, .$$

Moreover, the constitutional ignition temperature at a given point x is  $\overline{\Theta}(x)$  (the case of a constant ignition temperature  $\overline{\Theta}(x) = \Theta_0$  accounting for a uniformly distributed fuel). Above this ignition temperature, the fuel burns, and the amount of fuel burned is described by the quantity

$$\boldsymbol{B}(\boldsymbol{x},t) := \int_0^t \left( \boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{x},\tau) - \bar{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\boldsymbol{x}) \right)_+ \boldsymbol{d}\tau.$$
(4)

We highlight the difference between the constitutional ignition temperature  $\overline{\Theta}$  and the effective ignition temperature  $\Theta$ . Namely, while  $\overline{\Theta}$  can be thought as a specific property of the combustible (which is modeled to ignite above this temperature, in the ideal situation of infinite amount of fuel available), the quantity  $\Theta$  takes into account the past state of the fuel and the propellant *B* already burned.

#### The model

$$\partial_t u = c\Delta u + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( u(y,t) - \Theta(y,t) \right)_+ K(x,y) \, dy + \left( \left( \omega - \frac{\beta(u)\nabla u}{|\nabla u|^\alpha} \right) \cdot \nabla u \right)_- \, .$$

Moreover, the constitutional ignition temperature at a given point *x* is  $\overline{\Theta}(x)$  (the case of a constant ignition temperature  $\overline{\Theta}(x) = \Theta_0$  accounting for a uniformly distributed fuel). Above this ignition temperature, the fuel burns, and the amount of fuel burned is described by the quantity

$$B(x,t) := \int_0^t \left( u(x,\tau) - \bar{\Theta}(x) \right)_+ d\tau.$$
(4)

We highlight the difference between the constitutional ignition temperature  $\overline{\Theta}$  and the effective ignition temperature  $\overline{\Theta}$ . Namely, while  $\overline{\Theta}$  can be thought as a specific property of the combustible (which is modeled to ignite above this temperature, in the ideal situation of infinite amount of fuel available), the quantity  $\Theta$  takes into account the past state of the fuel and the propellant *B* already burned. Indeed, comparing (3) and (4), the effective ignition temperature in this case can be written in the form

$$\Theta = \tan\left(\frac{\pi B}{2F}\right),\,$$

hence when the quantity of burned combustible B reaches the threshold F, the ignition term in (1) vanishes.

The model

$$\partial_t u = c\Delta u + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( u(y,t) - \Theta(y,t) \right)_+ K(x,y) \, dy + \left( \left( \omega - \frac{\beta(u) \nabla u}{|\nabla u|^\alpha} \right) \cdot \nabla u \right)_-.$$

The effect of the environmental **wind** is modeled by a vector  $\omega = \omega(x, t)$  inducing a transport term in equation (1).

The model

$$\partial_t u = c\Delta u + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( u(y,t) - \Theta(y,t) \right)_+ K(x,y) \, dy + \left( \left( \omega - \frac{\beta(u) \nabla u}{|\nabla u|^\alpha} \right) \cdot \nabla u \right)_-.$$

The effect of the environmental **wind** is modeled by a vector  $\omega = \omega(x, t)$  inducing a transport term in equation (1).

The **convection** is encoded by an additional wind term of the form  $\frac{\beta(u)\nabla u}{|\nabla u|^{\alpha}}$ . The function  $\beta$  can be thought as supported above the ignition temperature, so that this term is active only in the burning region, directed along, or opposite to (depending on the sign of  $\beta$ ) the gradient temperature. The exponent  $\alpha$  can be taken in the interval [0, 2] to further modulate the intensity of this term with respect to the temperature gradient.

The model

$$\partial_t u = c\Delta u + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( u(y,t) - \Theta(y,t) \right)_+ K(x,y) \, dy + \left( \left( \omega - \frac{\beta(u) \nabla u}{|\nabla u|^\alpha} \right) \cdot \nabla u \right)_-.$$

The effect of the environmental **wind** is modeled by a vector  $\omega = \omega(x, t)$  inducing a transport term in equation (1).

The **convection** is encoded by an additional wind term of the form  $\frac{\beta(u)\nabla u}{|\nabla u|^{\alpha}}$ . The function  $\beta$  can be thought as supported above the ignition temperature, so that this term is active only in the burning region, directed along, or opposite to (depending on the sign of  $\beta$ ) the gradient temperature. The exponent  $\alpha$  can be taken in the interval [0, 2] to further modulate the intensity of this term with respect to the temperature gradient.

The negative part in the term regarding the environmental wind and the convective term accounts for the fact that wind can spread the fire faster, but cannot stop it, hence these terms provide a contribution only when their direction is oriented opposite to the gradient temperature, which is in turn a proxy for the direction of the front.

The model

$$\partial_t u = c\Delta u + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( u(y,t) - \Theta(y,t) \right)_+ \mathcal{K}(x,y) \, dy + \left( \left( \omega - \frac{\beta(u)\nabla u}{|\nabla u|^\alpha} \right) \cdot \nabla u \right)_- dy$$

We stress that the total wind term, consisting of the superposition of environmental and pyrogenic winds, provides a contribution only when this function takes negative values. This means that the wind and convective terms provide a contribution only when their direction is oriented opposite to the gradient temperature, that is in the direction of the fire front (which goes from higher to lower values of the temperature, and note that, in our notation (2), the negative part of a function is nonnegative).

### The model

$$\partial_t u = c\Delta u + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( u(y,t) - \Theta(y,t) \right)_+ \mathcal{K}(x,y) \, dy + \left( \left( \omega - \frac{\beta(u) \nabla u}{|\nabla u|^\alpha} \right) \cdot \nabla u \right)_-$$

We stress that the total wind term, consisting of the superposition of environmental and pyrogenic winds, provides a contribution only when this function takes negative values. This means that the wind and convective terms provide a contribution only when their direction is oriented opposite to the gradient temperature, that is in the direction of the fire front (which goes from higher to lower values of the temperature, and note that, in our notation (2), the negative part of a function is nonnegative).

In the absence of environmental wind, the pyrogenic flow takes the form  $\frac{(-\beta)_{-}}{|\nabla u|^{\alpha-2}} = \frac{\beta_{+}}{|\nabla u|^{\alpha-2}}$ , contributing only for positive values of  $\beta$ . In this spirit, the role of the negative part in the last term of (1) is to *spread* the fire in the direction of the wind: as the simulations confirm, without the negative part, the burning region will tend to mainly *translate* in the direction of the wind.

17/32

#### The model

$$\partial_t u = c\Delta u + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( u(y,t) - \Theta(y,t) \right)_+ K(x,y) \, dy + \left( \left( \omega - \frac{\beta(u)\nabla u}{|\nabla u|^{\alpha}} \right) \cdot \nabla u \right)_- \, .$$

Terms related to a fire-induced wind (also known as "fire wind" or "pyrogenic flow") have been introduced in the literature to account for the significant buoyant upflow over the fire region, created by the strong temperature gradient, producing local low pressure, which acts as a sink with horizontal pressure gradient and draws in the surrounding air (see Smith-Morton-Leslie '75).

#### The model

$$\partial_t u = c\Delta u + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( u(y,t) - \Theta(y,t) \right)_+ \mathcal{K}(x,y) \, dy + \left( \left( \omega - \frac{\beta(u)\nabla u}{|\nabla u|^{\alpha}} \right) \cdot \nabla u \right)_- \, .$$

Terms related to a fire-induced wind (also known as "fire wind" or "pyrogenic flow") have been introduced in the literature to account for the significant buoyant upflow over the fire region, created by the strong temperature gradient, producing local low pressure, which acts as a sink with horizontal pressure gradient and draws in the surrounding air (see Smith-Morton-Leslie '75).

The possibility of modeling the wind advection by a transport term, in various forms, has also been previously considered in the literature, see e.g. equation (2.2) in Harris-McDonald '22. In terms of concrete applications, the combination of pyrogenic and environmental wind can be a delicate issue: indeed, on the one hand, in case of wind-driven fires it is expected the effect of pyrogenic wind to be less prominent (see Beer '91), on the other hand pyrogenic winds can be produced even by relatively small wildfires (as observed in Lareau-Clements '17).

GW

#### The model

$$\partial_t u = c\Delta u + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( u(y,t) - \Theta(y,t) \right)_+ K(x,y) \, dy + \left( \left( \omega - \frac{\beta(u) \nabla u}{|\nabla u|^{\alpha}} \right) \cdot \nabla u \right)_- \, .$$

As a sanity check, we remark that, since both the positive and negative parts of a function are, in our notation (2), nonnegative, the solutions of (1) are always *supersolutions of the heat equation* (which is consistent, from the physical point of view, with the fact that bushfires can only increase the environmental temperature).

#### The model

$$\partial_t u = c \Delta u + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( u(y,t) - \Theta(y,t) \right)_+ K(x,y) \, dy + \left( \left( \omega - \frac{\beta(u) \nabla u}{|\nabla u|^\alpha} \right) \cdot \nabla u \right)_- \, .$$

As a sanity check, we remark that, since both the positive and negative parts of a function are, in our notation (2), nonnegative, the solutions of (1) are always *supersolutions of the heat equation* (which is consistent, from the physical point of view, with the fact that bushfires can only increase the environmental temperature).

We have begun the development of existence theory for this model, for which we present the following two theorems.

## LOCAL AND GLOBAL WELL-POSEDNESS

#### Theorem 1 (DVWW '24)

Let  $\Omega$  be a bounded domain of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with  $C^2$  boundary. Let also  $K \in L^2(\Omega \times \Omega)$ ,  $\Theta \in L^{\infty}(\Omega \times (0,1))$ ,  $\omega \in L^{\infty}(\Omega \times (0,1))$ ,  $\beta \in W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R})$ , and  $\gamma \in (1,2]$ . Then, there exists  $T_* \in (0,1]$ , depending only on n,  $\Omega$ ,  $\|K\|_{L^2(\Omega \times \Omega)}$ ,  $\|\omega\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega \times (0,1))}$ , and  $\|\beta\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R})}$ , such that if  $T \in (0, T_*]$  then, given  $g \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ , the problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u(x,t) = \Delta u + \int_{\Omega} \left( u(y,t) - \Theta(y,t) \right)_+ K(x,y) \, dy \\ + \left( \left( \omega(x,t) - \frac{\beta(u(x,t))\nabla u(x,t)}{|\nabla u(x,t)|^{\gamma}} \right) \cdot \nabla u(x,t) \right)_- & \text{for } (x,t) \in \Omega \times (0,T), \end{cases}$$
$$\begin{aligned} u(x,t) = 0 & \text{for } (x,t) \in (\partial\Omega) \times (0,T), \\ u(x,0) = g(x) & \text{for } x \in \Omega \end{cases}$$

possesses a solution  $u \in L^2((0, T), H_0^1(\Omega))$ .

## LOCAL AND GLOBAL WELL-POSEDNESS

#### Theorem 2 (DVWW '24, convective terms with linear scaling)

Let  $\Omega$  be a bounded domain of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with  $C^2$  boundary. Let also  $K \in L^2(\Omega \times \Omega)$ ,  $\Theta \in L^{\infty}(\Omega \times (0,1))$ ,  $\omega \in L^{\infty}(\Omega \times (0,1))$  and  $\beta \in W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R})$ . Then, there exist  $\varepsilon_0 \in (0,1)$ , depending only on n,  $\Omega$  and  $\|\Theta_-\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega \times (0,1))}$ , and  $T_{\star} \in (0,1]$ , depending only on n,  $\Omega$ ,  $\|K\|_{L^2(\Omega \times \Omega)}$ ,  $\|\omega\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega \times (0,1))}$ , and  $\|\beta\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R})}$ , such that if

 $\|K\|_{L^2(\Omega\times\Omega)} + \|\omega\|_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,1))} + \|\beta\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leqslant \varepsilon_0$ 

and  $T \in (0, T_*]$  then, given  $g \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ , the problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{t}u(x,t) = \Delta u + \int_{\Omega} \left( u(y,t) - \Theta(y,t) \right)_{+} K(x,y) \, dy \\ + \left( \left( \omega(x,t) - \frac{\beta(u(x,t))\nabla u(x,t)}{|\nabla u(x,t)|} \right) \cdot \nabla u(x,t) \right)_{-} & \text{for } (x,t) \in \Omega \times (0,T), \end{cases}$$
$$\begin{aligned} u(x,t) = 0 & \text{for } (x,t) \in (\partial\Omega) \times (0,T), \\ u(x,0) = g(x) & \text{for } x \in \Omega \end{cases}$$

<sub>GW</sub> possesses a solution  $u \in L^2((0,T),\ H^1_0(\Omega))_{ au$ He 81st Fujihara seminar

## LOCAL AND GLOBAL WELL-POSEDNESS

### Theorem 3 (DVWW '24)

Let  $\Omega$  be a bounded domain of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with  $C^2$  boundary. Let also  $K \in L^2(\Omega \times \Omega)$ ,  $\Theta \in L^{\infty}(\Omega \times (0, +\infty))$ ,  $\omega \in L^{\infty}(\Omega \times (0, +\infty))$ ,  $\beta \in W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R})$ , and  $\gamma \in (1, 2]$ . Then, given  $g \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ , the problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{t}u(x,t) = \Delta u + \int_{\Omega} \left( u(y,t) - \Theta(y,t) \right)_{+} \mathcal{K}(x,y) \, dy \\ + \left( \left( \omega(x,t) - \frac{\beta(u(x,t))\nabla u(x,t)}{|\nabla u(x,t)|^{\gamma}} \right) \cdot \nabla u(x,t) \right)_{-} & \text{for } (x,t) \in \Omega \times (0,+\infty), \end{cases}$$
$$u(x,t) = 0 \quad \text{for } (x,t) \in (\partial\Omega) \times (0,+\infty), \\ u(x,0) = g(x) \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega \end{cases}$$
$$possesses a solution \ u \in L^{2}((0,+\infty), \ H^{1}_{0}(\Omega)).$$

The model presented in (1) is simple enough to allow for an agile and effective numerical implementation, producing sufficiently precise results in real-time. As concrete examples, we confronted our numerical outputs with supervised experiments of fires performed in the lab as well as with real data collected on the occasion of natural bushfires.

The model presented in (1) is simple enough to allow for an agile and effective numerical implementation, producing sufficiently precise results in real-time. As concrete examples, we confronted our numerical outputs with supervised experiments of fires performed in the lab as well as with real data collected on the occasion of natural bushfires.

Numerical simulations were written in C++ with a standard finite-element method, using the library FreeFEM++. Our simulations used the weak formulation of the PDE (1) for *u* on a unit square with Dirichlet zero boundary conditions. For the convolution kernel K(x, y) we used an approximation to the Dirac mass, which allows close non-local interactions and facilitates fast computation. For parameters, we used  $c = 10^{-3}$ ,  $\Theta(y, t) = 1$ , and  $\beta(u) = 0$ . The first figure uses wind with  $\omega = (-1, 0.4)$ , otherwise  $\omega = 0$ . For the finite element method we used piecewise continuous elements and divided the domain into a mesh with 10,000 individual elements. Our simulations were run on a standard laptop without special processing power.

The model presented in (1) is simple enough to allow for an agile and effective numerical implementation, producing sufficiently precise results in real-time. As concrete examples, we confronted our numerical outputs with supervised experiments of fires performed in the lab as well as with real data collected on the occasion of natural bushfires.

Numerical simulations were written in C++ with a standard finite-element method, using the library FreeFEM++. Our simulations used the weak formulation of the PDE (1) for *u* on a unit square with Dirichlet zero boundary conditions. For the convolution kernel K(x, y) we used an approximation to the Dirac mass, which allows close non-local interactions and facilitates fast computation. For parameters, we used  $c = 10^{-3}$ ,  $\Theta(y, t) = 1$ , and  $\beta(u) = 0$ . The first figure uses wind with  $\omega = (-1, 0.4)$ , otherwise  $\omega = 0$ . For the finite element method we used piecewise continuous elements and divided the domain into a mesh with 10,000 individual elements. Our simulations were run on a standard laptop without special processing power.

We remark that we did not make special effort to change parameters in (1) drastically to fit pictures, but instead tried to make only natural, broad choices. In a real-world scenario, we expect that parameters are at best approximated, so fine-tuning them would be counterproductive in our view.





Observed isochrones for spot fire E14 investigated in Cruz-Sullivan-Kidnie-Hurley-Nichols '16, compared to isochrones from our simulation taken at evenly spaced iterations of the scheme. The red line is the fire front with temperature above ignition, and temperature decreasing below ignition as the colours progress from blue to green, then yellow.



Experiment CF-14 from Viegas-Raposo-Davim-Rossa '12, with a 30 degree cone angle. Frames taken from an infrared camera at thirty second intervals. Simulation frames taken at evenly spaced iterations of the numerical simulation.

GW



Experimental vs. Simulation Frames. Experiment conducted at the Pyrotron CSIRO Canberra February 2024. Experimental frames taken at one-minute intervals. A magenta outline is traced around the approximate fire line. Simulation frames taken at evenly spaced iterations of the numerical simulation.



Here we take the approximated burned area as a measure of validation. The matching is almost perfect after up to 3 minutes, and a small deviation takes place at minute 4 and minute 5. This small deviation has also to be expected, since our simulations are based on ideal Dirichlet conditions, while the experimental fire may be affected by slightly approximated boundary conditions allowing for a faster diffusion near the boundary. Note also the coarseness of the fuel used for the experimental fire.

GW

We have put forth a model for bushfires relying on partial differential equations:

$$\partial_t u = c\Delta u + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( u(y,t) - \Theta(y,t) \right)_+ \mathcal{K}(x,y) \, dy + \left( \left( \omega - \frac{\beta(u)\nabla u}{|\nabla u|^\alpha} \right) \cdot \nabla u \right)_- \, .$$

We have put forth a model for bushfires relying on partial differential equations:

$$\partial_t u = c\Delta u + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( u(y,t) - \Theta(y,t) \right)_+ K(x,y) \, dy + \left( \left( \omega - \frac{\beta(u) \nabla u}{|\nabla u|^\alpha} \right) \cdot \nabla u \right)_- \, .$$

The front of the fire can be modeled by the level set of the temperature function corresponding to the ignition temperature. The velocity of the front in the normal direction when the ignition temperature  $\Theta_0$  is constant takes the form

$$-c\mathcal{H}+\frac{c\partial_{\nu}^{2}u}{|\nabla u|}+\frac{1}{|\nabla u|}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n}}\left(u(y,t)-\Theta_{0}\right)_{+}\mathcal{K}(x,y)\,dy+\left(\left(\omega-\frac{\beta(u)\nabla u}{|\nabla u|^{\alpha}}\right)\cdot\nabla u\right)_{-},$$

where H is the mean curvature of the burning region.

We have put forth a model for bushfires relying on partial differential equations:

$$\partial_t u = c\Delta u + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( u(y,t) - \Theta(y,t) \right)_+ \mathcal{K}(x,y) \, dy + \left( \left( \omega - \frac{\beta(u)\nabla u}{|\nabla u|^\alpha} \right) \cdot \nabla u \right)_- dy$$

The front of the fire can be modeled by the level set of the temperature function corresponding to the ignition temperature. The velocity of the front in the normal direction when the ignition temperature  $\Theta_0$  is constant takes the form

$$-c\mathcal{H}+\frac{c\partial_{\nu}^{2}u}{|\nabla u|}+\frac{1}{|\nabla u|}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n}}\left(u(y,t)-\Theta_{0}\right)_{+}\mathcal{K}(x,y)\,dy+\left(\left(\omega-\frac{\beta(u)\nabla u}{|\nabla u|^{\alpha}}\right)\cdot\nabla u\right)_{-},$$

where *H* is the mean curvature of the burning region. In summary:

The basic model can be easily generalised to comprise additional phenomena, including a memory effect to identify regions which have been already burned, variations of the environment in space and time, different types of heat diffusions along the ground and in the air, etc.

We have put forth a model for bushfires relying on partial differential equations:

$$\partial_t u = c\Delta u + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( u(y,t) - \Theta(y,t) \right)_+ \mathcal{K}(x,y) \, dy + \left( \left( \omega - \frac{\beta(u)\nabla u}{|\nabla u|^\alpha} \right) \cdot \nabla u \right)_- dy$$

The front of the fire can be modeled by the level set of the temperature function corresponding to the ignition temperature. The velocity of the front in the normal direction when the ignition temperature  $\Theta_0$  is constant takes the form

$$-c\mathcal{H}+\frac{c\partial_{\nu}^{2}u}{|\nabla u|}+\frac{1}{|\nabla u|}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n}}\left(u(y,t)-\Theta_{0}\right)_{+}\mathcal{K}(x,y)\,dy+\left(\left(\omega-\frac{\beta(u)\nabla u}{|\nabla u|^{\alpha}}\right)\cdot\nabla u\right)_{-},$$

- The basic model can be easily generalised to comprise additional phenomena, including a memory effect to identify regions which have been already burned, variations of the environment in space and time, different types of heat diffusions along the ground and in the air, etc.
- Albeit non-standard, the partial differential equation is endowed with a solid mathematical theory,

We have put forth a model for bushfires relying on partial differential equations:

$$\partial_t u = c\Delta u + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( u(y,t) - \Theta(y,t) \right)_+ K(x,y) \, dy + \left( \left( \omega - \frac{\beta(u)\nabla u}{|\nabla u|^{\alpha}} \right) \cdot \nabla u \right)_-$$

The front of the fire can be modeled by the level set of the temperature function corresponding to the ignition temperature. The velocity of the front in the normal direction when the ignition temperature  $\Theta_0$  is constant takes the form

$$-c\mathcal{H}+\frac{c\partial_{\nu}^{2}u}{|\nabla u|}+\frac{1}{|\nabla u|}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n}}\left(u(y,t)-\Theta_{0}\right)_{+}\mathcal{K}(x,y)\,dy+\left(\left(\omega-\frac{\beta(u)\nabla u}{|\nabla u|^{\alpha}}\right)\cdot\nabla u\right)_{-},$$

- The basic model can be easily generalised to comprise additional phenomena, including a memory effect to identify regions which have been already burned, variations of the environment in space and time, different types of heat diffusions along the ground and in the air, etc.
- Albeit non-standard, the partial differential equation is endowed with a solid mathematical theory,
- The description of the geometric front combines a smoothing effect, encoded by the mean curvature term (with a positive sign, allowing for the descriptions of moving fronts starting, for instance, by domains with corners),

We have put forth a model for bushfires relying on partial differential equations:

$$\partial_t u = c\Delta u + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( u(y,t) - \Theta(y,t) \right)_+ K(x,y) \, dy + \left( \left( \omega - \frac{\beta(u)\nabla u}{|\nabla u|^{\alpha}} \right) \cdot \nabla u \right)_-$$

The front of the fire can be modeled by the level set of the temperature function corresponding to the ignition temperature. The velocity of the front in the normal direction when the ignition temperature  $\Theta_0$  is constant takes the form

$$-c\mathcal{H}+\frac{c\partial_{\nu}^{2}u}{|\nabla u|}+\frac{1}{|\nabla u|}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n}}\left(u(y,t)-\Theta_{0}\right)_{+}\mathcal{K}(x,y)\,dy+\left(\left(\omega-\frac{\beta(u)\nabla u}{|\nabla u|^{\alpha}}\right)\cdot\nabla u\right)_{-},$$

- The basic model can be easily generalised to comprise additional phenomena, including a memory effect to identify regions which have been already burned, variations of the environment in space and time, different types of heat diffusions along the ground and in the air, etc.
- Albeit non-standard, the partial differential equation is endowed with a solid mathematical theory,
- The description of the geometric front combines a smoothing effect, encoded by the mean curvature term (with a positive sign, allowing for the descriptions of moving fronts starting, for instance, by domains with corners),
- The model can be efficiently implemented through numerical simulations,

We have put forth a model for bushfires relying on partial differential equations:

$$\partial_t u = c\Delta u + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( u(y,t) - \Theta(y,t) \right)_+ \mathcal{K}(x,y) \, dy + \left( \left( \omega - \frac{\beta(u)\nabla u}{|\nabla u|^{\alpha}} \right) \cdot \nabla u \right)_-$$

The front of the fire can be modeled by the level set of the temperature function corresponding to the ignition temperature. The velocity of the front in the normal direction when the ignition temperature  $\Theta_0$  is constant takes the form

$$-\mathcal{CH}+\frac{\mathcal{c}\partial_{\nu}^{2}u}{|\nabla u|}+\frac{1}{|\nabla u|}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n}}\left(u(y,t)-\Theta_{0}\right)_{+}\mathcal{K}(x,y)\,dy+\left(\left(\omega-\frac{\beta(u)\nabla u}{|\nabla u|^{\alpha}}\right)\cdot\nabla u\right)_{-},$$

- The basic model can be easily generalised to comprise additional phenomena, including a memory effect to identify regions which have been already burned, variations of the environment in space and time, different types of heat diffusions along the ground and in the air, etc.
- Albeit non-standard, the partial differential equation is endowed with a solid mathematical theory,
- The description of the geometric front combines a smoothing effect, encoded by the mean curvature term (with a positive sign, allowing for the descriptions of moving fronts starting, for instance, by domains with corners),
- The model can be efficiently implemented through numerical simulations,
- The simulations run in real-time and are in agreement both with the data collected in supervised lab experiments and with those coming from real bushfire events.

# THAT'S ALL FOLKS!

Thanks for your attention!

## THAT'S ALL FOLKS! I

- [BJ19] A. Bakhshaii and E. A. Johnson, A review of a new generation of wildfire-atmosphere modeling, Can. J. Forest Res. 49 (2019), no. 6, 565–574, DOI 10.1139/cjfr-2018-0138.
- [Bee91] T. Beer, The interaction of wind and fire, Boundary-Layer Meteorol. 54 (1991), 287–308, DOI 10.1007/BF00183958.
- [CSG<sup>+</sup>12] M. Cruz, A. Sullivan, J. Gould, N. Sims, A. Bannister, J. Hollis, and R. Hurley, *Anatomy of a catastrophic wildfire: the Black Saturday Kilmore East fire in Victoria, Australia*, Forest Ecology and Management **284** (2012), 269–285.
- [CSK<sup>+</sup>16] M. Cruz, A. Sullivan, S Kidnie, R Hurley, and S Nichols, *The effect of grass curing and fuel structure on fire behaviour: final report*, Report No EP 166414 (2016).
  - [DV24] S. Dipierro and E. Valdinoci, *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations from an Elementary Viewpoint: A Fresh Glance at the Classical Theory*, World Scientific, 2024.
  - [DVWW] S. Dipierro, E. Valdinoci, G. Wheeler, and V. M. Wheeler, *Existence theory for a bushfire equation*, Preprint, arXiv:2402.15762.
  - [HM22] S. J. Harris and N. R. McDonald, *Fingering instability in wildfire fronts*, J. Fluid Mech. **943** (2022), Paper No. A34, 26, DOI 10.1017/jfm.2022.452. MR4439510
  - [Hec12] F. Hecht, New development in FreeFem++, J. Numer. Math. 20 (2012), no. 3-4, 251-265.
- [HMSS16] J. E. Hilton, C. Miller, J. J. Sharples, and A. L. Sullivan, *Curvature effects in the dynamic propagation of wildfires*, Intern. J. Wildland Fire **25** (2016), 1238–1251.
  - [HSS17] J. E. Hilton, J. J. Sharples, and W. Swedosh, *Simulation of spot fire coalescence with dynamic feedback*, 22nd Intern. Congress Modelling and Simul. (2017), 1111–1117.

## THAT'S ALL FOLKS! II

- [HSS<sup>+</sup>18] J. E. Hilton, A. L. Sullivan, W. Swedosh, J. Sharples, and C. Thomas, *Incorporating convective feedback in wildfire simulations using pyrogenic potential*, Environm. Modelling Softw. **107** (2018), 12–24, DOI https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2018.05.009.
  - [LC17] N. P. Lareau and C. B. Clements, *The Mean and Turbulent Properties of a Wildfire Convective Plume*, J. Appl. Meteorol. Clim. **56** (2017), no. 8, 2289–2299, DOI 10.1175/JAMC-D-16-0384.1.
  - [Mar51] G. H. Markstein, *Experimental and Theoretical Studies of Flame-Front Stability*, J. Aeronaut. Sci. **18** (1951), no. 3, 199–209, DOI 10.2514/8.1900.
  - [MW09] R. Monneau and G. S. Weiss, Pulsating traveling waves in the singular limit of a reaction-diffusion system in solid combustion, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire 26 (2009), no. 4, 1207–1222, DOI 10.1016/j.anihpc.2008.09.002. MR2542721
- [PZPA03] E. Pastor, L. Zárate, E. Planas, and J. Arnaldos, Mathematical models and calculation systems for the study of wildland fire behaviour, Progr. Energy Combust. Sci. 29 (2003), no. 2, 139–153, DOI https://doi.org/10.1016/S0360-1285(03)00017-0.
  - [Per98] G. L. W. Perry, Current approaches to modelling the spread of wildland fire: a review, Progr. Phys. Geogr. Earth Environm. 22 (1998), no. 2, 222–245, DOI 10.1177/030913339802200204.
- [STW<sup>+</sup>13] J. J. Sharples, I. N. Towers, G. E. Wheeler, V. M. Wheeler, and J. A. McCoy, *Modelling fire line merging using plane curvature flow*, MODSIM2013, 20th International Congress on Modelling and Simulation (2013), 256–262.
  - [SML75] R. K. Smith, B. R. Morton, and L. M. Leslie, *The role of dynamic pressure in generating fire wind*, J. Fluid Mech. **68** (1975), no. 1, 1–19, DOI 10.1017/S0022112075000651.

# THAT'S ALL FOLKS! III

- [Sul09a] A. Sullivan, *Wildland surface fire spread modelling, 1990–2007. 1: Physical and quasi-physical models*, Intern. J. Wildland Fire **18** (2009), 349–368, DOI 10.1071/WF06143.
- [Sul09b] \_\_\_\_\_, Wildland surface fire spread modelling, 1990–2007. 2: Empirical and quasi-empirical models, Intern. J. Wildland Fire **18** (2009), 369–386, DOI 10.1071/WF06142.
- [Sul09c] \_\_\_\_\_, Wildland surface fire spread modelling, 1990–2007. 3: Simulation and mathematical analogue models, Intern. J. Wildland Fire **18** (2009), 387–403, DOI 10.1071/WF06144.
- [VRDR12] D. X Viegas, J. R Raposo, D. A Davim, and C. G Rossa, Study of the jump fire produced by the interaction of two oblique fire fronts. Part 1. Analytical model and validation with no-slope laboratory experiments, International Journal of Wildland Fire 21 (2012), no. 7, 843–856.