

Why does the double-Gauss approach perform well in slab transport problems?

This article has been downloaded from IOPscience. Please scroll down to see the full text article.

1993 J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 26 L59

(<http://iopscience.iop.org/0305-4470/26/2/006>)

View [the table of contents for this issue](#), or go to the [journal homepage](#) for more

Download details:

IP Address: 171.66.16.68

The article was downloaded on 01/06/2010 at 19:46

Please note that [terms and conditions apply](#).

## LETTER TO THE EDITOR

# Why does the double-Gauss approach perform well in slab transport problems?

K Ganguly

Institute of Numerical Transport Theory, Department of Mathematics, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX 79409, USA

Received 30 July 1992

**Abstract.** The double-Gauss approach in transport calculations performs well because it is a full-range type formulation.

The traditional discrete-ordinates ( $S_N$ ) method does not perform well for relatively high absorption cases when the order of approximation is not too large. The discrepancy may be attributed to the use of orthogonal polynomials  $P_N(\mu)$  in  $(-1, 1)$  to evaluate Gauss-Legendre quadrature coefficients. This process regularizes the singular eigenfunction in the transient range according to the classical polynomial theory, which, however, does not produce a natural basis for use in transport theory. Intriguingly, the double-Gauss method, which uses the Legendre polynomials in the half-range, performs very well for slab problems [1]. The reason for this is due to the fact that the double-Gauss approach is a full-range type formulation [2] like the  $F_N$  method. We demonstrate this in the following with an example of double  $S_2$ . The conclusion is, however, true for any order of approximation.

We have observed that any attempt to use basis functions other than the Case eigenfunctions or a suitable approximate set of these functions may not always produce optimal results. Recently, the singular eigenfunctions have, indeed, been approximated by regular rational functions [3]. However, it is useful to be in the framework of ordinary differential equations as in the usual spherical harmonics or discrete-ordinates method from a computational point of view. An indirect approach [2, 4] to solve the transient integral problem involving the singular eigenfunction is, therefore, important. Siewert's work on the  $F_N$  method [2] and then its generalization by Sengupta [5] demonstrate the importance of the full-range weight function  $\mu$  to solve the half-range transport problem. The  $F_N$  method was originally derived from the Plackzek lemma, which relates the solution of the half-space problem to an infinite medium problem.

In the framework of discrete-ordinates, we can derive the full-range formulation by choosing the zeros of orthogonal polynomials with respect to  $\mu$  in  $(0, 1)$  followed by a reflection of the zeros on the other half  $(-1, 0)$ . This ensures that the entire range of the independent variable has been used together with the full-range weight function  $\mu$ , with respect to which the complete set of eigenfunctions of the full-range problem are orthogonal. The weights in the quadrature formula may then be obtained in a Gaussian way. For example, the quadrature coefficients for double- $S_2$  type formulation are obtained from:

$$\sum_{i=1}^2 w_i \mu_i^n = \int_0^1 (\mu) \cdot \mu^n d\mu \quad n = 0, 1, 2, 3$$

i.e.

$$w_1 + w_2 = \frac{1}{2} \quad (1)$$

$$w_1 \mu_1 + w_2 \mu_2 = \frac{1}{3} \quad (2)$$

$$w_1 \mu_1^2 + w_2 \mu_2^2 = \frac{1}{4} \quad (3)$$

$$w_1 \mu_1^3 + w_2 \mu_2^3 = \frac{1}{5}. \quad (4)$$

The solution of (1)-(4) yields  $\mu_{1,2} = (6 \pm \sqrt{6})/10$  and  $w_{1,2} = (3\sqrt{6} \pm 2)/12\sqrt{6}$ . The direction-cosines are zeros of  $10\mu^2 - 12\mu + 3 = 0$ , which is orthogonal to  $\mu$  in  $(0, 1)$ . The numerical solution based on these quadrature coefficients is, however, not satisfactory. The reason is the following. When we use the quadrature formula  $\int_0^1 f(\mu) d\mu = \sum_{i=1}^2 (w_i/\mu_i) f(\mu_i)$ , we obtain  $W_1 + W_2 = 0.8838$ , where  $W_i = w_i/\mu_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . We observe that the formulation does not satisfy the conservation condition

$$W_1 + W_2 = 1 \quad (5)$$

which is an important property of discrete-ordinates. If we now replace (4) by (5), we obtain the new set

$$W_1 + W_2 = 1$$

$$W_1 \mu_1 + W_2 \mu_2 = \frac{1}{2}$$

$$W_1 \mu_1^2 + W_2 \mu_2^2 = \frac{1}{3}$$

$$W_1 \mu_1^3 + W_2 \mu_2^3 = \frac{1}{4}$$

which coincides with the double-Gauss formula based on Legendre polynomial orthogonal with respect to unity in  $(0, 1)$ . The direction cosines are zeros of  $\mu^2 - \mu + \frac{1}{6} = 0$ , a second-order orthogonal polynomial with respect to unity in  $(0, 1)$ . This set performs remarkably well for 'sum' results for all  $c$  (number of secondaries per primary), including both highly absorbing and scattering cases. For example, the leakage values for the constant source problem (source=1) are 0.5433 and 2.6058 for  $c = 0.1$  and  $c = 0.9$  respectively. For the traditional discrete-ordinates  $S_4$ , these values are 0.5654 and 2.6401, where as the exact results are 0.5435 and 2.6103. The performance of the double-Gauss set is equally satisfactory for the albedo problem. This is explained by the fact that the double-Gauss approach is a full-range formulation (like the  $F_N$  method), with the inclusion of the conservation condition.

However, the eigenvalues of the double-Gauss get worse compared to the traditional  $S_N$  method. For example, the asymptotic eigenvalues with flux representation of the form  $\exp(-x/\nu)$  are:  $\nu_0(\text{double } S_2) = 2.0765$ ,  $\nu_0(S_4) = 1.9027$ ,  $\nu_0(\text{exact}) = 1.9032$  for  $c = 0.9$ . This calls for a theory based on the quadrature set, dependent on the medium [6]. Further work in this direction is in progress.

The author gratefully acknowledges fruitful discussions with Professor A Sengupta.

## References

- [1] Bell G I and Glasstone S 1985 *Nuclear Reactor Theory* (Malabar, FL: Krieger)
- [2] Siewert C E and Benoist P 1979 *Nucl. Sci. Engng* 69 156
- [3] Sengupta A and Venkatesan C K 1988 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* 21 1341
- [4] Ganguly K and Sengupta A 1980 *Nucl. Sci. Engng* 74 1
- [5] Sengupta A 1988 *J. Stat. Phys.* 51 657
- [6] Ganguly K, Allen E J and Victory H D Jr 1991 *Transport Theor. Stat. Phys.* 20 3