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The forcing term in the lattice Boltzmann equation (LBE) is usually used to mimic Navier-Stokes equations with a body force. To derive axisymmetric model, forcing terms are incorporated into the two-dimensional (2D) LBE to mimic the additional axisymmetric contributions in 2D Navier-Stokes equations in cylindrical coordinates. Many axisymmetric lattice Boltzmann D2Q9 models were obtained through the Chapman-Enskog expansion to recover the 2D Navier-Stokes equations in cylindrical coordinates [I. Halliday et al., Phys. Rev. E 64, 011208 (2001); K. N. Premnath and J. Abraham, Phys. Rev. E 71, 056706 (2005); T. S. Lee, H. Huang, and C. Shu, Int. J. Mod. Phys. C 17, 645 (2006); T. Reis and T. N. Phillips, Phys. Rev. E 75, 056703 (2007); J. G. Zhou, Phys. Rev. E 78, 036701 (2008)]. The theoretical differences between them are discussed in detail. Numerical studies were also carried out by simulating two different flows to make a comparison on these models’ accuracy and τ sensitivity. It is found all these models are able to obtain accurate results and have the second-order spatial accuracy. However, the model C [J. G. Zhou, Phys. Rev. E 78, 036701 (2008)] is the most stable one in terms of τ sensitivity. It is also found that if density of fluid is defined in its usual way and not directly relevant to source terms, the lattice Boltzmann model seems more stable.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The lattice Boltzmann method (LBM) has been proposed as an alternative numerical scheme for solving the incompressible Navier-Stokes (NS) equations [1,2]. The forcing term or source term is usually added to the lattice Boltzmann equation (LBE) to mimic Navier-Stokes equations with a body force [3–5].

To avoid three-dimensional (3D) simulation and simulate the axisymmetric flow more efficiently, the forcing-term strategy is also applied to derive the two-dimensional (2D) axisymmetric LBM [6–12]. To mimic the additional axisymmetric contributions in 2D Navier-Stokes equations in cylindrical coordinates, several spatial and velocity-dependent source terms were proposed to insert into the common LBE [6].

However, in the derivation of Halliday et al. [6], some important terms are not considered in their derivation. Hence, the model is not able to recover the NS equation at the macroscopic level correctly and it can only give poor simulation results for fluid flows in confined or expended tubes [7]. If the swirl velocity is not considered, the model of Peng et al. [8] is identical as that of Halliday et al. [6].

Later, Lee et al. [7] and Reis and Phillips [9,10] also derived modified axisymmetric D2Q9 models following the same procedure of Halliday et al. [6]. The revised axisymmetric D2Q9 model proposed by Lee et al. [7] is able to recover the NS equation correctly. These models [6–10] are basically identical because their derivation procedures are the same. In Appendix A, the models of Reis and Phillips [9] and Lee et al. [7] are proven basically identical, although they are obtained independently. Minor differences between them are also illustrated. This kind of derivation procedure hereafter is referred as method A. Model of Lee et al. [7] hereafter is referred as model A.

In method A, the derivation begins from the common LBE and the density of fluid and velocity are defined as their usual way. While through applying a different derivation strategy (referred as method B), Premnath and Abraham [11] obtained another model. In the derivation, the trapezium rule was used to integrate the Boltzmann equation and forcing term was written in a fixed form $S_\tau = \frac{F_{\text{eq}}}{\rho \beta^* \frac{\tau}{\nu}} f^\tau_0$ [13], which includes the equilibrium distribution function (EDF). This model here is referred as model B1. On the other hand, the forcing term $S_\rho$ can also be written in a power series in the particle velocity [14] and the density of fluid can be defined as usual [4]. Following the same derivation procedure (i.e., method B), we can also obtain a model referred as B2.

In the above models, the second source term involves more complicated terms which are of $O(u^2)$ [12]; that is, inconsistent with the LBM. To solve the problem, Zhou [12] introduced a centered scheme [15] for both the first and second source terms. The strategy (hereafter it is referred as method C) makes the derivation procedure much simpler and the added source terms looks more concise and simple.

In this paper, the theoretical difference between these three-type models [6–9,11,12] would be analyzed in detail. Numerical studies on two different flows with three curved-wall boundary treatments [16–18] were also carried out to make a comparison on accuracy and seek which model is more stable in terms of $\tau$ sensitivity.

II. THEOREUTICAL STUDY

A. Three-type forcing strategies and models

Here, we consider the axisymmetric flows of an incompressible liquid with an axis in the $x$ direction. The continuity (1) and Navier-Stokes momentum (2) in the pseudo-Cartesian coordinates $(x,r)$ are used to describe the flow in axial and radial directions [19],

$$\partial_t \rho u_x = - \frac{u_t}{\tau},$$

(1)
\[
\begin{align*}
\rho \partial_t u + \rho \partial_t (u du) + \nabla \cdot (u \rho) &= 0 \\
\partial_t \phi + \nabla \cdot \left( \phi \rho \right) &= \frac{\nabla \cdot (u \phi)}{\rho}
\end{align*}
\]

where \(u_\beta = x, r\) is the two components of velocity, \(u_\alpha\) is the velocity \(u_r\) or \(u_t\). It should notice that the LB models considered in this paper are all limited to nonswirling flows.

In the following descriptions, the source term \(S_i = S_i^{(1)} + \delta S_i^{(2)}\) would be incorporated into the 2D LBE to mimic the additional axisymmetric contributions in 2D Navier-Stokes equations in cylindrical coordinates. \(S_i^{(1)}\) and \(S_i^{(2)}\) are the first and second source terms, respectively.

For method A, the LBE is in its usual way and a forcing term is added directly on the right-hand side of LBE as

\[
f_i(x + e_i \delta_t + \delta_\beta) - f_i(x, t) = -\frac{f_i^{eq}_r(x, t)}{\tau} + \delta S_i(x, t).
\]

In Eq. (3), \(e_i\)'s are the discrete velocities. For the D2Q9 model, they are given by

\[
[e_0, e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, e_5, e_6, e_7, e_8] = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

The equilibrium distribution function is defined as

\[
f_i^{eq}(x, t) = \omega_i \rho \left[ 1 + e_{\alpha \beta} = 0 \right] \left[ \frac{1}{c_s^2} \right] \left( \frac{c_{\alpha \beta}}{c_s^2} - \frac{\delta_{\alpha \beta}}{c_s^2} \right).
\]

For the D2Q9 model, \(\omega_i = 1 = 9\) for \(i = 1, 2, 3, 4\), \(\omega_i = 1 = 1, 3, 8\), \(c_s = \frac{c_s}{\sqrt{3}}\), where \(c_s^2 = \frac{5}{3}\) is the ratio of lattice spacing \(\delta_t\) and time step \(\delta_t\).

The macrovariables are defined as

\[
p_{\alpha \beta} = \sum_i e_{i\alpha \beta} = \sum_i e_{i\alpha \beta}^{f_\alpha}, \quad \rho = \sum_i f_i^{(0)} = \sum_i f_i^{f_\alpha}.
\]

Through the Chapman-Enskog expansion, we know \(f_i^{(0)} + \delta f_i^{(1)} + \delta f_i^{(2)}\) and the distribution function \(f_i^{(0)}, f_i^{(1)}, f_i^{(2)}\) is constrained by the following relationships:

\[
\begin{align*}
\sum_{i=0}^8 f_i^{(0)} &= \rho \frac{c_s^2}{c_s^2} = \rho, \\
\sum_{i=0}^8 e_{i\alpha \beta}^{f_\alpha} &= \rho_{\alpha \beta}.
\end{align*}
\]

Applying the Chapman-Enskog expansion, to recover NS equations, the constraints for source terms can be obtained (refer to the Appendix A). The expression of \(S_i^{(1)}, S_i^{(2)}\) are derived as [7]

\[
\begin{align*}
S_i^{(1)} &= -\omega_i \rho u_r / r, \\
S_i^{(2)} &= \frac{\omega_i}{2 \rho} \left[ \partial_\beta \left( \nabla \cdot (u \rho) \right) + \left| \nabla \cdot \left( \frac{\partial_\beta (u \rho)}{\rho} \right) \right| \right] - \frac{\rho u_r}{r \rho} \\
&\quad - \nabla \cdot \left( \frac{\partial_\beta (u \rho)}{\rho} \right) - \omega_i (1 - \tau) \partial_\beta \left( \nabla \cdot (u \rho) \right).
\end{align*}
\]

They are basically identical as those in Refs. [9, 10]; the minor difference is also illustrated in Appendix A.

For method B, the derivation begins from a fixed general format of the source term \(S_i\) [13] and the trapezium rule is used to integrate the Boltzmann equation. If the second-order integration is applied to the collision and source term [13], the LBE is

\[
f_i(x + e_i \delta_t + \delta_\beta) - f_i(x, t) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \Omega_{i\alpha \beta}^{(x, t)} \right] + \delta S_i(x, t).
\]

Hence, the evolution equation for \(f_i\) is [13]

\[
f_i(x + e_i \delta_t + \delta_\beta) - f_i(x, t) = \frac{1}{2} \Omega_{i\alpha \beta}^{(x, t)} + \delta S_i(x, t).
\]

where \(\Omega_{i\alpha \beta}^{(x, t)} = -\frac{f_i^{eq}_r(x, t)}{\tau} \), \(\tau = 0.5\). In this LBE, the kinetic viscosity \(\nu\) is defined as \(\nu = c_s^2 \tau\) [13] and \(\tau = 0.5\). Notice, there is a coefficient \(\tau = (1 - \frac{1}{2})\) before the source term \(\Delta S_i\). Equation (13) is the actual LBE used in our numerical LBM code when we study the model B.

From Eqs. (5) and (11), the momentum of fluid \(\rho u_{\alpha}\) is defined as

\[
\rho u_{\alpha} = \sum_i e_{i\alpha} \left[ \frac{\nabla \cdot \left( \frac{x_{i\alpha} \rho}{\tau} \right)}{\rho} \right] = \sum_i e_{i\alpha} f^{eq}_r.
\]

From the above equation and Eq. (7), we further obtained

\[
\rho u_{\alpha} = \sum_i e_{i\alpha} \left[ \frac{\nabla \cdot \left( \frac{x_{i\alpha} \rho}{\tau} \right)}{\rho} \right] = \sum_i e_{i\alpha} S_i.
\]
Hence, in the method B, the common momentum of fluid \( \rho u^* \) obtained from \( \rho u^* = \sum \epsilon_i e_i \) should be altered as \( \rho u_t \) in Eq. (14) and the EDF should be calculated with this altered velocity. At the same time, the density \( \rho \) is defined as

\[
\rho = \sum_i \left( \bar{f}_i + \frac{1}{2} \Omega_i + \frac{1}{2} \delta S_i \right) = \sum_i \bar{f}_i + \frac{1}{2} \sum_i \delta S_i,
\]

which is different from the common formula \( \rho = \Sigma \bar{f}_i \).

In the derivation of Premnath and Abraham [11], the forcing term \( S_i \) is written in a fixed form \( S_i = \frac{\bar{f}_i + \partial_x(e_i)}{\rho \epsilon} \) [13], where \( F_a \) is the function of the body force in NS equations. Through the Chapman-Enskog expansion, to recover the NS equations, Premnath and Abraham [11] obtained the first and second source terms as

\[
S_i^{(1)} = -\omega_i \rho u_t / r, \\
S_i^{(2)} = \left( \frac{e_{i\alpha} - u_{i\alpha}}{\rho c_s^2} \right) f_i \left[ \frac{\nu}{\rho} \partial_x (\rho u_{i\alpha}) - \frac{\rho \nu u_{i\alpha}}{\rho c_s^2} \delta_{i\alpha} - \frac{\partial \rho u_t}{r} \right].
\]

(16)

This model is referred as model B1.

On the other hand, deriving an axisymmetric model base on definitions of \( \rho = \Sigma \bar{f}_i \) and \( \rho u_t = \Sigma \epsilon_i e_i + \frac{1}{2} \delta \Sigma \epsilon_i e_i \delta S_i \) is also possible [4]. Here, we derived a model referred as model B2 using this strategy. In our derivation, the forcing term \( S_i \) is written in a power series in the particle velocity [14].

\[
S_i = \omega_i \left( A + \frac{e_{i\alpha} B_{\alpha r}}{c_s^2} + \frac{C_{\alpha\beta} e_{i\alpha} e_{i\beta}}{c_s^2} - \frac{\delta_{i\alpha} \delta_{i\beta}}{r} \right),
\]

(17)

where \( A, B_{\alpha r} \) and \( C_{\alpha\beta} \) are functions of the body force in the NS equation. Through the Chapman-Enskog expansion, these functions can be obtained (refer to Appendix B).

For method C, the LBE is written as

\[
f_j(x + \mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{\delta}_i + \mathbf{\delta}) - f_j(x, \mathbf{t}) = -\frac{f_j - f_j^0}{\tau} + \delta S_i \big|_{(x\mathbf{t})}.
\]

(18)

In the derivation, a centered scheme [15] is applied to the source terms \( S_i \) and it is written as \( S_i \big|_{(x\mathbf{t})} \) [16].

Through the Taylor-series expansion, the source term can be written as \( S_i \big|_{(x\mathbf{t})} = S_i \big|_{(x\mathbf{t})} + \frac{1}{2} \delta \partial_x (e_i) S_i \). It is noted that, the centered scheme [15] here does not necessarily mean that the derived model is implicit. Actually, the model is still an explicit one because the term \( \frac{1}{2} \delta \partial_x (e_i) S_i \) in the Taylor expansion would be eliminated in the derivation, while only the terms \( S_i^{(1)} \big|_{(x\mathbf{t})} \) and \( S_i^{(2)} \big|_{(x\mathbf{t})} \) appear finally.

Through the Chapman-Enskog expansion, to recover the NS equations, Zhou [12] obtained the constraints for first and second source terms as \( \Sigma S_i^{(1)} = -\partial_x (e_i) / \tau \) and \( \Sigma e_i e_i S_i^{(2)} = -\partial_x e_i \). Zhou [12] choose source terms as \( S_i^{(1)} = -\frac{\partial_x (e_i)}{\tau} \) and \( S_i^{(2)} = \frac{\partial_x e_i}{\tau} \). Actually, more naturally, \( S_i^{(1)} \) and \( S_i^{(2)} \) can be written as \( S_i^{(1)} = -\frac{\partial_x (e_i)}{\tau} \) and \( S_i^{(2)} = \frac{\partial_x e_i}{\tau} \) since they all satisfy the constraints.

### B. Minor-type errors in existed models

As discussed in above section, the existed axisymmetric models can be classified as three groups. Here, we would discuss the minor errors in existed models which derived using methods A and B.

In the derivation of Reis and Phillips [9,10], there are some type errors. The first one is their Eq. (36) should be \( \partial_x (e_i) = \rho c_s^2 \), and \( \partial_x (e_i) = \rho c_s^2 \). In the following part, to compare directly with relevant equations in Refs. [9,10], subscript “y” while not “r” is used although they all stand for the axial coordinate. Another type error is their Eq. (46) that should be

\[
\left( 2\nu - \frac{1}{6} + \frac{1}{y} \right) \left( \frac{\partial x}{\partial \nu} - \frac{3Q_{xx} - \frac{\rho \nu u_t}{2}}{2} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{Q_{xx}}{y} + \frac{\rho \nu u_t}{2} \right).
\]

(19)

where \( Q_{xx} \) is defined in Ref. [10] as \( Q_{xx} = \sum \epsilon_i e_i e_i / \rho \) and \( \partial_x = -\frac{Q_{xx}}{2} \). It is also noted that in the above derivation, equations \( 2\nu - \frac{1}{6} + \frac{1}{y} = \frac{1}{2} + 4\nu \) are used. A detailed analysis in Appendix B and in Eq. (19) illustrate that there are some type errors in the very last equations in Refs. [9,10]. They should be

\[
S_i^{(2)} = \frac{3 \omega_i e^2_i}{2} \left( \frac{1}{6} - \frac{3}{2} \frac{\rho \nu u_t}{2} \right) - \frac{3 \omega_i e^2_i}{2} \left( \frac{1}{6} - \frac{3}{2} \frac{\rho \nu u_t}{2} \right) - \frac{3 \omega_i e^2_i}{2} \left( \frac{1}{6} - \frac{3}{2} \frac{\rho \nu u_t}{2} \right) - \frac{3 \omega_i e^2_i}{2} \left( \frac{1}{6} - \frac{3}{2} \frac{\rho \nu u_t}{2} \right).
\]

(20)

It is noted that here \( \omega = \frac{1}{r} \), which is different from the weighting factor \( \omega_a \).

For the model of Premnath and Abraham [11], the trapezium rule is used to integrate the Boltzmann equation, but the forcing-term formula [11,13] is inconsistent with the second-order truncation error in LBM [12]. In Ref. [11], there is a type error in the axisymmetric NS equation [i.e., Eq. (2) in Ref. [11]], where the term \( -2\mu x^2 \) is missing and so as the second source term.

### III. NUMERICAL STUDY

In this section, we would like to make a comparison of accuracy and \( \tau \) sensitivity of the three-type models. In this numerical study, two flows would be simulated. One is the flow through a constricted tube (Fig. 1); the other is the flow over an axisymmetric sphere placed in a 3D circular tube.
lattice nodes are not necessary to be known. Hence, the singularity problem is avoided.

In all of our simulations, Reynolds number defined as $Re=U_0/D/v$, where $U_0$ is the central value of the inlet parabolic velocity. The zero velocities are initialized everywhere. In defining the steady state, our criterion is

$$\eta = \sum_{i,j} \frac{||u(x_i,r_j,t+\delta t) - u(x_i,r_j,t)||}{||u(x_i,r_j,t)||} < 10^{-6},$$

where the summation is over the entire system.

For the first flow, all models (models A, B1, B2, and C) with different boundary-condition treatments [16–18] are used to simulate the same case with $S_0=D$, $Re=10$. In the simulation, first a uniform grid with $N_x \times N_r = 441 \times 22$ ($N_r$ is the lattice nodes in radial direction) was used. The nonstenotic radius is represented by 21 lattice nodes and $N_r$ includes one extra layer beyond the wall boundary. One of the results obtained by model C with $\tau=0.8$ and Yu’s wall boundary condition [17] was illustrated in Fig. 2. In the figure, the velocity profiles in positions $x=0$, $0.5D$, $D$, and $2D$ are compared with those of the finite-volume method (FVM). Both the axial and radial velocity components obtained from the LBM agree well with those of the FVM. Notice, here the results obtained by the FVM are regarded as accurate results because a very fine grid (i.e., $1321 \times 61$) is used in FVM simulations. It is found that all models are able to give accurate results which looks like Fig. 2.

In the following section, we would discuss the accuracy issue of these models. Here, a variable $E$ is defined to measure the discrepancies between the velocities obtained from LBM and FVM,
The error simulated using the four models with different relaxation time is illustrated in Fig. 3. It is found that the errors are all very small and the error trends of all models are similar.

\[
E = \frac{\sum_{ij} |u_i(x_i, r_j) - u_{ax}(x_i, r_j)|}{\sum_{ij} |u_{ax}(x_i, r_j)|},
\]

(21)

where \(u_i(x_i, r_j)\) is the axial velocity on the discrete lattice point \((x_i, r_j)\) and \(u_{ax}(x_i, r_j)\) is the accurate axial velocity obtained through the FVM. The summation in Eq. (21) is only over the total 46 lattice nodes in positions \(x=0, 0.5D, D, \) and \(2D\) (refer to the left graph of Fig. 2). Here, the case was simulated using the four models with different relaxation time. The error [i.e., Eq. (21)] as a function of the relaxation time is illustrated in Fig. 3. It is found that the errors are all very small and the error trends of all models are similar.

Guo’s, Yu’s, and Bouzidi’s curved-wall boundary treatments are all found on the second-order accuracy in space [16–18]. Here, the spatial accuracy for the axisymmetric flow simulations was studied. Figure 4 illustrates the numerical error [Eq. (21)] as a function of lattice nodes in tube’s radius \(N_r\) when model A is used to simulate the case. We can see that all the spatial accuracy is around the second order. In our simulations when finer meshes or the \(\tau\) changes, the \(U_r\) can be changed so as to make simulated Reynolds number fixed because \(Re=2U_0N_r\delta/(\nu^2\delta(\tau-0.5))\). It is also found when applying models B1, B2, and C, the spatial accuracies of these boundary treatments are all consistent with the LBM (second-order accuracy).

Then, we would like to compare which model is more stable. The “stable” in the paper means that the model’s computational stability is not sensitive to \(\tau\). As we know, when \(\tau\) is close to 0.5, the numerical instability may appear. In our study, how stable a LB model is demonstrated by the minimum \(\tau\) value at which the numerical instability does not appear. The \(\tau\) sensitivity may be dependent on the model as well as the boundary conditions and flow. To evaluate the effect of the boundary conditions and flow, in the following studies, all boundary conditions and the two different flows were used.

Although it is hard to find out the exact \(\tau_{\min}\) numerically, here we obtained \(\tau_{\min}\) with an accuracy of \(\pm 0.005\) since we tried to find the \(\tau_{\min}\) from \(\tau=1.0\) with a decreasing step size of 0.005. The \(\tau_{\min}\) values of these models are listed in Table I. From Table I, we can see that even \(\tau_{\min}=0.52\), the computation of model C is still stable when Yu’s [17] or Guo’s [16] boundary condition is applied. Compared with Yu’s and Guo’s method, Bouzidi’s method slightly makes the computations of models B1, B2, and C less stable. It is found that for any boundary treatment, \(\tau_{\min}\) of model C [12] is the smallest one. It seems that Zhou’s model [12] is the most stable one among these four models.

Form Table I, it is also found that model B2 is more stable than model B1. As the main difference between these two models is the density definition, for model B1, \(\rho=\sum_i f_i\) while in model B2, \(\rho=\sum_{i=1}^N f_i\); it seems a usual defi-
It is noted that most partial derivatives in the source term are almost identical to those in Refs. [9,10] or in Ref. [7], which is illustrated in Appendix A, makes no difference in terms of \( \tau \) sensitivity.

Furthermore, our numerical tests show that the source term chosen as that in Refs. [9,10] or in Ref. [7], which is illustrated in Appendix A, makes no difference in terms of \( \tau \) sensitivity.

**IV. CONCLUSION**

Through theoretical and numerical analyses of three-type axisymmetric lattice Boltzmann D2Q9 models, it is found that all these models are able to mimic the 2D Navier-Stokes equation in the cylindrical coordinates accurately. However, as a centered scheme is applied to the source terms, the derivation procedure of method C [12] seems the simplest one. Applying a centered scheme to the source terms may make the derivation of the forcing term in the LBM simple. At the same time, in terms of sensitivity to \( \tau \), the model of Zhou [12] is the most stable model. It is also found that if the density of fluid is defined in its usual way and not directly relevant to source terms, the lattice Boltzmann model seems more stable.

**TABLE II.** \( \tau_{\min} \)'s of the four models when the flow over an axisymmetrical sphere placed in a 3D circular tube was simulated with mesh 661 \( \times \) 32.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Model A</th>
<th>Model B</th>
<th>Model B2</th>
<th>Model C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yu(^a)</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>0.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guo(^b)</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>0.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouzidi(^c)</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>0.555</td>
<td>0.555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Reference [7].
\(^b\)Reference [11].
\(^c\)Reference [12].
\(^d\)Reference [17].
\(^e\)Reference [16].
\(^f\)Reference [18].

**FIG. 6.** Velocity profiles in different position for flows over an axisymmetrical sphere placed in a 3D circular tube with Re=100, mesh 601 \( \times \) 32, and \( \tau=0.61 \). Yu’s curve-wall boundary treatment was applied.

**TABLE I.** \( \tau_{\min} \)'s for the four models when the flow through a constricted tube was simulated with mesh 441 \( \times \) 22.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Model A</th>
<th>Model B</th>
<th>Model B2</th>
<th>Model C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yu(^d)</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>0.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guo(^e)</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>0.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouzidi(^f)</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>0.555</td>
<td>0.555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^d\)Reference [7].
\(^e\)Reference [11].
\(^f\)Reference [12].
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