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## PROGRAM ABSTRACT

1. Name of Program: VARIANT- a new nodal module for the DIF3D ${ }^{1,2}$ neutronics code
2. Computer for which Program is Designed and Other Machine Version Packages Available: CRAY X-MP, Sun SPARCstations, IBM RS6000 series.
3. Description of Problem Solved: VARIANT solves the multigroup steady-state neutron diffusion and transport equations in two- and three-dimensional Cartesian and hexagonal geometries using variational nodal methods. The transport approximations involve complete spherical harmonic expansions up to order P5. Eigenvalue, adjoint, fixed source, gamma heating, and criticality (concentration) search problems are permitted. Anisotropic scattering is treated, and although primarily designed for fast reactor problems, upscattering options are also included.
4. Method of Solution: The neutron and transport equations are solved using a variational nodal method ${ }^{3-7}$ with one mesh cell (node) per hexagonal assembly (Cartesian geometry node sizes are specified by the user). The nodal equations are derived from a functional incorporating nodal balance, and reflective and vacuum boundary conditions through Lagrange multipliers. Expansion of the functional in orthogonal spatial and angular (spherical harmonics) polynomials leads to a set of response matrix equations relating partial current moments to flux and source moments. The equations are solved by fission source iteration in conjunction with a coarse mesh rebalance acceleration scheme. The inner iterations are accelerated by a partitioned matrix scheme equivalent to a synthetic diffusion acceleration method ${ }^{6}$.
5. Restrictions on the Complexity of the Problems: Problem dimensions are all variable. Enough memory must be allocated to contain all the information for at least one energy group. Flux and source expansions of up to sixth order are allowed. Partial curreri expansions up to second order are allowed. Angular and scattering expansion's of up to $\mathrm{P}_{5}$ are allowed. The typical limiting factor for a
problem lies in the storage of response matrices for problems involving large numbers of unique node types. For highly heterogeneous problems involving thousands of different node types, calculation and storage of response matrices represents the primary computational cost.
6. Typical Running Time: The times provided apply to a three dimensional isotropic problem for a small LMR with $30^{\circ}$ planar symmetry, 9 energy groups, 14 axial mesh planes and 16 rings of hexagons. The problem consisted of 1694 nodes with 24 compositions and 216 unique node types. Each outer iteration required 70 inner iterations ( 5 groups required 10 inner iterations and 4 groups required 4 inner iterations). The diffusion calculation required 18 outer iterations and the transport calculation required 19 outer iterations. The diffusion calculation iterations used 41 CPU seconds on a CRAY X-MP/14, 47 seconds on an IBM RS6000, and 107 seconds on a SPARC 20/50. The transport calculation for this problem (with a $\mathrm{P}_{3}$ angular expansion) required 231 seconds on the CRAY XMP/14, 1046 seconds on an IBM RS6000 and 2183 seconds on a SPARC 20/50.
7. Unusual Features: Variational nodal methods incorporate a number of attractive features. These include a standard hierarchy of space-angle approximation, well behaved small mesh limits, and the absence of both ray effects and artificial diagonal streaming depressions. Dimensionless parts of the response matrices involving integrals in space and angle are pre-computed once using MATHEMATICA for each geometry option. The results are stored in FORTRAN data statements and used to generate response matrix sets for unique nodes (defined by cross section and dimension data) prior to fission source iteration. Anisotropic scattering (up to order $\mathrm{P}_{5}$ ) is also available. VARIANT achieves near Monte Carlo accuracy at a fraction of the cost.
8. Related and Auxiliary Programs: VARIANT reads and wrices the standard interface files specified the Committee on Computer Code Coordination (CCCC).
9. Status: VARIANT is currently in use on the Reactor Analysis Division network which consists of Sun SPARCstations and IBM RS6000 series workstations. Modules for perturbation calculations, and inhomogeneous nodes are under development.
10. K. L. Derstine, "DIF3D: A Code to Solve One-, Two-, and ThreeDimensional Finite Difference Diffusion Theory Problems," ANL-82-64, Argonne National Laboratory (1982).
11. R. D. Lawrence, "The DIF3D Nodal Neutronics Option for Two- and Three-Dimensional Diffusion Theory Calculations in Hexagonal Geometry," ANL-83-1, Argonne National Laboratory (1983).
12. G. Palmiotti, C. B. Carrico, and E. E. Lewis, "Variational Nodal Methods with Anisotropic Scattering," Nuclear Science and Engineering, 115, 233243, 11/93
13. J.Y. Doriath, F. Malvagi, G. Palmiotti, J. M. Ruggieri, C. B. Carrico, E. E. Lewis, and G. Gastaldo, "Variational Nodal Method (VNM) to Solve 3D Transport Equation: Applications to EFR Design," Proceedings of Mathematical Methods and Supercomputing in Nuclear Applications, Karlsruhe, Germany, 4/93, I-571
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15. C.B. Carrico and E.E. Lewis, "Variational Nodal Solution Algorithms for Multigroup Criticality Problems," Proc. Int. Topl. Mtg. Advances in Mathematics, Computations and Reactor Physics, April 28-May 1, 1991, Pittsburgh, Penn.
16. E.E. Lewis, C.B. Carrico, and G. Palmiotti, "Variational Nodal Formulation for the Spherical Harmonics Equations," Nuclear Science and Engineering, in press.
17. Machine Requirements: At least 8 Mb of memory are recommended for program and file buffer storage on short word machines like SPARCstations and RS6000 workstations. External data storage must be available for approximately 40 scratch and interface files. Fourteen of these files are random access scratch files (grouped into 6 file groups) and the remainder are sequential access files with formatied or unformatted record types.
18. Programming Languages Used: FORTRAN 77 is used. The program can be executed entirely in FORTRAN. Dynamic memory allocation routines on the workstations are written in C or supplied from host machine libraries.
19. Operating System: No special requirements are made on the operating system.
20. Other Programming or Operating Information or Restrictions: The stand-alone source code contains approximately 120,000 lines of FORTRAN statements (including DIF3D driver and edit routines).
21. Name and Establishment of Author or Contributor:
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# VARIANT: VARIational Anisotropic Nodal Transport for Multidimensional Cartesian and Hexagonal Geometry Calculation 

by

G. Palmiotti, E. E. Lewis, and C. B. Carrico


#### Abstract

The theoretical basis, implementation information and numerical results are presented for VARIANT (VARIational Anisotropic Neutron Transport), a FORTRAN module of the DIF3D code system at Argonne National Laboratory. VARIANT employs the variational nodal method to solve multigroup steady-state neutron diffusion and transport problems. The variational nodal method is a hybrid finite element method that guarantees nodal balance and permits spatial refinement through the use of hierarchical complete polynomial trial functions. Angular variables are expanded with complete or simplified $P_{1}, P_{3}$ or $P_{5}$ spherical harmonics approximations with full anisotropic scattering capability. Nodal response matrices are obtained, and the within-group equations are solved by red-black or four-color iteration, accelerated by a partitioned matrix algorithm. Fission source and upscatter iterations strategies follow those of DIF3D. Two- and three-dimensional Cartesian and hexagonal geometries are impk : nented. Forward and adjoint eigenvalue, fixed source, gamra heating, and criticality (concentration) search problems may be performed.


## I. INTRODUCTION

VARIANT (VARIational Anisotropic Neutron Transport) is a FORTRAN module of the DIF3D code system ${ }^{1}$ at Argonne National Laboratory. It performs multigroup neutron transport calculations in both Cartesian and hexagonal geometries in two and three dimensions. Both forward and adjoint calculations may be performed. Spherical harmonics are employed to treat the angular variables; at present $\mathrm{P}_{1}, \mathrm{P}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{P}_{5}$ approximations are implemented in all geometries and include both within-group and group-to-group anisotropic scattering. The spatial dependence of the flux variables is represented by complete polynomials within coarse mesh nodes, and along internode interfaces. Polynomials as high as fourth order for Cartesian and sixth order for hexagonal geometries are implemented.

Solutions of the within-group neutron transport equation are obtained using the variational nodal method, which originated at Northwestern University and has been developed in close collaboration with Argonne National Laboratory. ${ }^{2-10}$ The defining feature of the mett.od is a variational principle for the even-parity form of the transport equation in which odd-parity Lagrange multipliers aleng the node interfaces guarantee neutron conservation for each node. The well-founded variational formulation allows computational algorithms to be derived using the classical Ritz procedure: known trial functions in angle and in space are used to approximate the flux variables and obtain sets of linear algebraic equations for each node, with inter-node coupling specified by concomitant continuity conditions. For computations effectiveness a transformation of variables is then employed to reduce the nodal equations to response matrix form.

The systematic use of the Ritz procedure allows well-defined hierarchies of approximations in angle and in space to be generated. Diffusion or $\mathrm{P}_{1}$ theory is the naturai lowest-order angular approximation to arise from the formulation, allowing diffusion calculations to be compared easily to higher-order spherical harmonics solutions. The treatment of the spatial variables parallels hybrid finite element methods. The formalism allows polynomials of increasing degrees to be used in examining spatial truncation errors by p convergence as an alternaive to the standard h convergence obtained from mesh refinement. In addition to the standard spherical harmonic hierarchy of angular approximations, VARIANT's variational formulation is also adapted easily to reduced angular and simplified spherical harmonics approximations, ${ }^{8,11}$ thus providing additional flexibility in trade-offs between accuracy and computational cost.

The foregoing approach contrasts significantly with those nodal methods which were first formulated and applied with great success for diffusion theory and then extended to transport theory. They begin with a statement of nodal balance and employ transverse integration procedures to obtain approximate quasi-one-dimensional equations whose solutions provide the necessary auxiliary conditions. While highly successful in obtaining fast, coarse mesh diffusion solutions, these approaches have been confounded to some extent by the complexity of space-angle coupling found in the transport equation. Difficulties have been encountered in going beyond spatially flat interface assumptions and in reconciling the angular approximation within the nodes with those along the interfaces. Such methods provide only one space-angle "transport approximation" and allow neither space-angle refinement to examine truncation error nor straight-forward provisions for reconstructing intranodal flux distributions. Moreover, they provide neither the capability to treat anisotropic scattering nor straight-forward provisions for adjoint calculations. Discrete ordinate nodal methods circumvent some of these shortcomings by using a standard $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}}$ hierarchy of angular approximations, but they have not been developed sufficiently for reactor calculations to evaluate their potential. More extensive discussions of competing nodal transport methods may be found elsewhere. ${ }^{12,13}$

As a module of the DIF3D code system, VARIANT makes extensive use of other system modules to perform those operations which do not pertain either to the generation of the response matrices or to the within-group solution algorithms. These include node generation, outer iteration on the fission source and its acceleration, input of both geometry and cross section files and output editing. Substantial modifications were made to handle the input of anisotropic scattering cross section, which had not been a part of the original DIF3D code.

A unique feature of VARIANT is the central role played by symbolic manipulation in generating the nodal response matrices. For each new geometry or level of space-angle approximation, the Ritz procedure spawns many - in most cases thousands - of multidimensional integrals over known trial functions. Error-free evaluation of these large arrays of integrals is intractable by hand. However they are easily put in dimensionless form. Thus we utilize symbolic manipulation in the form of the Mathematica software package ${ }^{14}$ to automate the analytical evaluation of the integrals. The resulting arrays of numbers are stored as DATA statements in the FORTRAN subroutines which generate the
response matrices. Thus the symbolic manipulation is performed only once for each new geometry or for each new approximation in space or angle which is added to VARIANT.

Since the variational nodal equations are cast in response matrix form, VARIANT is also able to make extensive use of existing coding in the nodal option ${ }^{15}$ of the DIF3D. The node numbering and other data handling capability for performing red-black or four color response matrix iterations in Cartesian and hexagonal geometries, respectively is retained in VARIANT. Nodal coding previously developed by R. Lawrence ${ }^{15-17}$ also serves as an excellent point of departure from which to implement the partitioned matrix algorithm developed for VARIANT to accelerate the iterative solution of the within-group response matrix equations.

The remainder of this report is organized as follows. In Chapter 2 the variational nodal method is described and the derivation of the response matrix equations presented. Sipecial attention is given to the treatment of boundary conditions and inclusion of anisotropic scattering. In Chapter 3 the response matrix solutions algorithm and the partitioned matrix acceleration techniques are described. In Chapters 4 and 5 respectively numerical examples and user information are presented.

## II. THE VARIATIONAL NODAL METHOD

In this Chapter we set forth the theory behind the variational nodal method and derive the linear algebraic equations used in the resulting multigroup response matrix algorithm. For simplicity, in Sectinns II. A and B we first formulate the problem and discretize the equations assuming sotropic scattering, and make use only of some of the more general properties of the space-angle approximations. In Section II. C we then examine the spherical harmonics approximation, the associated boundary conditions and spatial approximations in more detail. In Section II. D we generalize the variational nodal method to include both within-group and group-to-group anisotropic scattering. Finally, in Section II. E. we present the symbolic manipulation evaluation of the integrals involved in the coupling coefficient calculations.

## II. A. The Variational Formulation

In this section we present the variational basis for the computational algorithms which constitute the variational nodal method. We begin with the within-group transport equation with isotropic scattering and sources:

$$
\begin{equation*}
[\mathbf{\Omega} \cdot \mathbf{\nabla}+\sigma(\mathbf{r})] \Psi(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{\Omega})=\int \mathrm{d} \Omega^{\prime} \sigma_{s}(\mathbf{r}) \Psi\left(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{\Omega}^{\prime}\right)+\mathrm{S}(\mathbf{r}) \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\sigma$ is the total cross section, and $\sigma_{\mathrm{s}}$ is the within-group scattering cross section; $\Psi$ represents the angular flux and $S$ the group source; $\mathbf{r}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ are the neutron position and direction of travel. In the following subsections we first rewrite this equation in even parity form, and then set forth the variational principle and its properties. The section concludes with a demonstration of the nodal balance property of the variational principle.

## II. A. 1 The Even-Parity Equations

The definitions of the even- and odd-parity flux components are

$$
\begin{equation*}
\psi(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{\Omega})=\frac{1}{2}[\Psi(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{\Omega})+\Psi(\mathbf{r},-\mathbf{\Omega})] \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\chi(\mathbf{r}, \boldsymbol{\Omega})=\frac{1}{2}[\Psi(\mathbf{r}, \boldsymbol{\Omega})-\Psi(\mathbf{r},-\boldsymbol{\Omega})] \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

respectively. To formulate the problem variationally, we first obtain the even-parity equation with isotropic scattering and sources. This is accomplished by first evaluating Eq. 2.1 at and $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ and at $-\Omega$ and then adding one half of the results to obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{\Omega} \cdot \nabla \chi(\mathbf{r}, \boldsymbol{\Omega})+\sigma(\mathbf{r}) \psi(\mathbf{r}, \boldsymbol{\Omega})=\sigma_{\mathbf{s}}(\mathbf{r}) \int \mathrm{d} \Omega^{\prime} \psi\left(\mathbf{r}, \boldsymbol{\Omega} \mathbf{\Omega}^{\prime}\right)+\mathrm{S}(\mathbf{r}) \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Likewise, subtracting the results yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{\Omega} \cdot \nabla \psi(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{\Omega})+\sigma(\mathbf{r}) \chi(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{\Omega})=0 \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

The even parity equation,

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\mathbf{\Omega} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla} \sigma^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla} \psi+\sigma \psi=\sigma_{s} \phi+\mathrm{S}, \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

is then obtained by using Eq. 2.5 to express the odd-parity flux in terms of $\psi$ as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\chi=-\sigma^{-1} \mathbf{\Omega} \cdot \nabla \psi \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

and then eliminating it from Eq. 2.4.

The scalar flux is written in terms of the even-parity flux as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\phi=\int \mathrm{d} \Omega \psi, \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the current vector in terms of the odd-parity flux as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{J}=\int \mathrm{d} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \boldsymbol{\chi} \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus combing Eqs. 2.7 and 2.9, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{J}=-\sigma^{-1} \int \mathrm{~d} \Omega \Omega \Omega \cdot \nabla \psi \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

On reflected boundaries, both even- and odd-parity flux components must meet the angular symmetry conditions. Vacuum boundaries may be shown to reduce to the conditions ${ }^{18}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\psi(r, \Omega)= \pm \chi(r, \Omega) \tag{2.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{\Omega}_{>}^{<} 0
$$

where $\mathbf{n}$ is the outward normal on the vacuum surface.

## II. A. 2 The Nodal Variational Principle

The even-parity transport equation may be formulated as a variational principle in terms of a global functional, $F$, which is a superposition of volume and surface contributions from the $v$ spatial nodes and $\gamma$ nodal interfaces comprising the problem domain:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{F}[\Psi, \chi]=\sum_{v} \mathrm{~F}_{\mathrm{v}}[\Psi, \chi], \tag{2.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the contribution from node $v$ is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{v}}[\psi, \chi]=\int_{v} \mathrm{dV}\left\{\int \mathrm{~d} \Omega\left[\sigma^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \nabla \psi)^{2}+\sigma \psi^{2}\right]-\sigma_{\mathrm{s}} \phi^{2}-2 \phi S\right\}+2 \int_{\gamma} \mathrm{d} \Gamma \int \mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{r} \psi \chi \tag{2.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the absence of the interface term containing $\chi$, Eqs. 2.12 and 2.13 reduce to the functional first formulated by Vladimirov ${ }^{19}$, and since used as the basis for many finiteelement and related approximations to the transport equation. The use of $\chi$ as a Lagrange multiplier at node interfaces is the unique feature which differentiates this functional from previous even-parity variational formulations and gives rise to the variational nodal method. For as we shall see, the continuity requirements of more conventional spatial finite element approximations are relaxed, while neutron conservation is enforced on each node.

Requiring this functional to be stationary with respect to variations in $\psi$ and $\chi$ may be shown to lead to the even-parity Euler-Lagrange equation within each node and the continuity of both even and odd-parity fluxes across the interfaces. This is accomplished as follows. ${ }^{19}$ Suppose we let $\Psi_{v}$ be the reference even parity flux for $r \in V_{v}$, and $\chi_{\gamma}$ the corresponding odd parity flux for $\mathbf{r} \in \Gamma_{\gamma}$. Next, we examine the effect of taking arbitrary variations about the reference functions:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\psi=\Psi_{v}+\delta \psi, & \mathbf{r} \in V_{v} \\
\chi=\chi_{\gamma}+\delta \chi, & \mathbf{r} \in \Gamma_{\gamma} \tag{2.15}
\end{array}
$$

Substituting these variations into Eq. 2.13, we may write

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{F}_{v}\left[\psi_{v}+\delta \psi, \chi_{\gamma}+\delta \chi\right]=\mathrm{F}_{v}\left[\psi_{v}, \chi_{\gamma}\right]+\delta \mathrm{F}_{v}[\psi, \chi]+\delta^{2} \mathrm{~F}_{v}[\Psi, \chi] \tag{2.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the three terms on the right are referred to respectively as the zero, first and second variations with respect to $\psi$ and $\chi$. The zero variation is just Eq. 2.13 evaluated with the
reference solution, while the second variation contains only products of the variations, $(\delta \psi)^{2}$ and $\delta \psi \delta \chi$. Here, the first variation is the focus of interest, since for the functional of Eq. 2.12 to be stationary, the sum of these variations must vanish.

The contribution of node $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$ to the first variation may be written explicitly as

$$
\begin{align*}
& \delta F_{v}[\psi, \chi]=2 \int_{v} \mathrm{dV}\left\{\int \mathrm{~d} \Omega\left[\sigma^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \nabla \delta \psi) \boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla} \psi_{v}+\sigma \psi_{v} \delta \psi_{v}\right]-\delta \phi\left(\sigma_{s} \phi_{v}+S\right)\right\} \\
&+2 \int_{\gamma} \mathrm{d} \Gamma \int \mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{v}\left(\chi_{\gamma} \delta \psi+\psi_{v} \delta \chi\right) \tag{2.17}
\end{align*}
$$

To put the first variation in more transparent form, we utilize the identity

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla} \delta \psi) \mathbf{\Omega} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla} \psi_{v}=-\delta \psi \boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla} \sigma^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla} \psi_{v}+\nabla \cdot\left(\boldsymbol{\Omega} \delta \psi \sigma^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla} \psi_{v}\right) \tag{2.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

along with the divergence theorem,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{v} \mathrm{dV} \int \mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \nabla\left(\delta \psi \Omega \cdot \nabla \psi_{v}\right)=\int_{\gamma} \mathrm{d} \Gamma \int \mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \mathrm{n}_{r} \delta \psi \Omega \cdot \nabla \psi_{v} \tag{2.18a}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int \mathrm{d} \Omega \delta \psi=\delta \phi \tag{2.18b}
\end{equation*}
$$

to rearrange terms and obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
\delta F_{v}[\psi, \chi] & =2 \int_{v} \mathrm{dV} \int \mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \delta \psi\left[-\boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \nabla \sigma^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \nabla \psi_{v}+\sigma \psi_{v}-\sigma_{s} \phi_{v}-S\right] \\
& +2 \int_{\gamma} \mathrm{d} \Gamma \int \mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\gamma} \delta \psi\left(\sigma^{-1} \mathbf{\Omega} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla} \psi_{v}+\chi_{\gamma}\right)+2 \int_{\gamma} \mathrm{d} \Gamma \int \mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\gamma} \psi_{v} \delta \chi \tag{2.19}
\end{align*}
$$

Requiring Eq. 2.12, the global functional, to be stationary is equivalent to requiring the fist order variation to vanish:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\delta F[\psi, \chi]=\sum_{v} \delta F_{v}[\psi, \chi]=0 \tag{2.20}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus, the volume term from each $\delta \mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{v}}$ must vanish if $\delta \mathrm{F}$ is to vanish. But since $\delta \psi$ within each node is arbitrary, this takes place only if the bracketed term in Eq. 2.19 vanishes. But this term and Eq. 2.6 are identical. Thus within each node, the even-parity transport equation is the functional's Euler-Lagrange equation.

The terms over the internal interfaces must be treated somewhat differently. Consider the interface between nodes $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$ and $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}^{\prime}}$. Any such interface, designated by $\Gamma_{\gamma}$ and $\mathbf{n}_{\gamma}$, is opposite another node interface, say $\Gamma_{\gamma}$ and $\mathbf{n}_{\gamma}$, such that $\Gamma_{\gamma}=\Gamma_{\gamma}$ and $\mathbf{n}_{\gamma}=-\mathbf{n}_{\gamma}$. From Eq. 2.19 we see that the contribution of this interface to the variation of Eq. 2.20 may be written as the sum of just two integrals,

$$
\begin{equation*}
2 \int_{\gamma} \mathrm{d} \Gamma \int \mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \mathrm{n}_{\gamma} \delta \psi\left(\sigma^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \nabla \psi_{v}-\sigma^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \nabla \psi_{v}\right)+2 \int_{y} \mathrm{~d} \Gamma \int \mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\gamma} \delta \chi\left(\psi_{v}-\psi_{v}\right) \tag{2.21}
\end{equation*}
$$

since the $\chi_{\gamma} \delta \psi$ terms in the second integral of Eq. 2.19 cancel. For the second term to vanish with arbitrary variations, the even parity flux must be continuous across the interface. Likewise, for the first term to vanish the flux gradient terms, which are seen from Eq. 2.7 to represent the odd-parity flux, must also be continuous across the interface. Thus the exact interface conditions are met. Finally, note that discontinuities in the cross sections at the node interface have no effect on the foregoing argument (we would need only to place nodal subscripts on the cross sections).

We have yet to consider the boundary conditions on the outer surface of the problem domain. The functional is not varied on reflective boundaries. Rather, the essential symmetry conditions are imposed on the angular distribution of even- and oddparity fluxes. This causes the $\psi \chi$ term in Eq. 2.13 to be identically equal to zero on reflected boundaries. On vacuum boundaries, the replacement of the $\psi \chi$ term with the integral

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\gamma} d \Gamma \int d \Omega\left|n_{\gamma} \Omega\right| \psi^{2} \tag{2.22}
\end{equation*}
$$

yields Eq. 2.11. These are referred to as modified natural boundary conditions. We shall return to a more detailed treatment of boundary conditions.

Before proceeding, we observe that the natural lowest-order angular approximation with the foregoing variational formulation is the diffusion or $\mathrm{P}_{1}$ approximation. If we require the even-parity flux to be independent of angle, $\psi(r, \Omega) \rightarrow \phi(r)$, and likewise take $\chi(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{\Omega}) \rightarrow 3 \mathbf{\Omega} \cdot \mathbf{J}(\mathbf{r})$, the diffusion equation becomes the Euler -Lagrange equation, and continuity of the scalar flux and normal current component across interfaces is imposed by the Lagrange-multiplier term.

## II. A. 3 Nodal Balance

An important property of the nodal formulation is the imposition of neutron balance over each node. Nodal balance may be demonstrated as follows. Suppose we define the volume-averaged scalar flux for a particular node as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{\phi}=\frac{1}{V_{v}} \int_{v} \phi(\mathbf{r}) \mathrm{dV} \tag{2.23}
\end{equation*}
$$

and write the even parity flux as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\psi(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{\Omega})=\bar{\phi}+\psi_{0}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{\Omega}) \tag{2.24}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the second term is required only to be orthogonal to $\bar{\phi}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{v} d V \int d \Omega \psi_{0}(r, \Omega)=0 \tag{2.25}
\end{equation*}
$$

Likewise, we define the average source as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{S}=\frac{1}{V_{v}} \int_{v} S(\mathbf{r}) \mathrm{dV} \tag{2.26}
\end{equation*}
$$

and write

$$
\begin{equation*}
S(\mathbf{r})=\mathbf{S}+\mathbf{S}_{0}(\mathbf{r}) \tag{2.27}
\end{equation*}
$$

with the orthogonality condition

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{v} S_{0}(\mathbf{r}) d V=0 \tag{2.28}
\end{equation*}
$$

If we insert Eqs. 2.24 and 2.27 into the functional given by Eq. 2.13, and utilize the orthogonality conditions, and the definition of $\mathbf{J}$, we may rearrange terms to obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{F}_{v}[\psi, \chi]=\left(\sigma-\sigma_{S}\right) V_{v} \bar{\phi}^{2}-2 \mathrm{~V}_{v} \bar{\phi} \overline{\mathbf{S}}+2 \bar{\phi} \int_{\gamma} d \Gamma n_{\gamma} \cdot J \\
& \quad+\int_{v} \mathrm{dV}\left\{\int \mathrm{~d} \Omega\left\{\sigma^{-1}\left(\Omega \cdot \nabla \psi_{0}\right)^{2}+\sigma \psi_{0}^{2}\right]-\sigma_{s}\left(\int \mathrm{~d} \Omega \psi_{0}\right)^{2}\right\}+2 \int_{\gamma} \mathrm{d} \Gamma \int \mathrm{~d} \Omega \Omega_{\gamma} \cdot n_{v} \psi_{0} \chi \tag{2.29}
\end{align*}
$$

Note that only the first three terms contain $\bar{\phi}$. Thus if we let $\bar{\phi} \rightarrow \bar{\phi}+\delta \bar{\phi}$ and require $F_{v}$ to be stationary with respect to arbitrary variations $\delta \Phi$, we obtain the nodal balance equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\sigma-\sigma_{s}\right) V_{v} \bar{\phi}+\int_{\gamma} d \Gamma n_{r} \cdot \mathbf{J}=V_{v} \bar{S} \tag{2.30}
\end{equation*}
$$

which just states that absorption plus leakage must be equal to the number of source neutrons produced in the node. This proof that nodal balance is preserved whether $\psi_{0}$ represents the exact solution or only some approximation thereof. The approximate case is very important, for it states that nodal neutron balance is maintained, independent of the even- and odd-parity flux approximations which are used.

## II. B. Transport Equation Discretization

In this section we utilize the foregoing variational formulation to discretize the transport equation and obtain a set of linear equations suitable for efficient numerical computations. Accomplishing this entails choosing a suitable set of space-angle trial functions and employing it in a classical Ritz procedure. The equations which result from the Ritz procedure are then cast in a form suitable for within-group response matrix calculations. These, in turn, are embedded in a multigroup formalism. The choice of trial functions is central to the development of accurate and computationally efficient methods. Generally, we utilize orthogonal polynomials in space and spherical harmonics in angle. We defer, however, a detailed discussion of trial functions and their associated boundary conditions to Section II. D. In this section, we need specify only some of the more general properties of the trial functions necessary to carry out the discretization.

## II. B.1 The Ritz Procedure

The classical Ritz procedure consists of approximating the dependent variable or variables in a variational principle with a set of known trial or basis functions, and determining the unknown coefficients by requiring the functional to be stationary with respect to variations in the coefficients. We apply the Ritz procedure by approximating the even- and odd-parity fluxes as separable expansions of spatial and angular trial functions with unknown coefficients. With the convention hereafter that repeated English (but not Greek) subscripts imply summation, these take the form:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\psi(\mathbf{r}, \Omega) \approx \mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{i}}(\mathbf{r}) \mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{m}}(\Omega) \zeta_{\mathrm{im}} \quad \mathbf{r} \in V_{v} \tag{2.31}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\chi(\mathbf{r}, \Omega) \approx h_{j \gamma}(\mathbf{r}) \mathbf{k}_{\mathrm{n} \gamma}(\Omega)_{\chi_{\mathrm{jn}}} . \quad \mathbf{r} \in \Gamma_{\gamma} \tag{2.32}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since, at present, only isotropic scattering is considered, the even-parity group source is independent of angle and may be approximated as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{r})=\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{i}}\left(\mathbf{r} \mathrm{~s}_{\mathrm{i}} \quad \mathbf{r} \in \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{v}}\right. \tag{2.33}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the scalar flux as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\phi(\mathbf{r}) \approx \mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{i}}(\mathbf{r}) \delta_{1 \mathrm{~m}} \zeta_{\mathrm{im}} . \tag{2.34}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\mathbf{r} \in \mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}
$$

In the foregoing equations the $\zeta_{\mathrm{im}}$ and $\chi_{\mathrm{jn} \gamma}$ are arrays of unknown coefficients, and the $s_{\mathrm{i}}$ are source coefficients. The $f_{\mathrm{i}}(\mathbf{r})$ and $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{j}}(\mathbf{r})$ represent spatial basis functions which are complete polynomials. They are orthonormal over the node volume and surfaces, respectively, meeting the conditions

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{V} f_{i}(\mathbf{r}) f_{\mathrm{f}^{\prime}}(\mathbf{r}) \mathrm{dV}=\delta_{i i^{\prime}} \tag{2.35}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\gamma} h_{j \gamma}(\mathbf{r}) h_{j^{\prime} \gamma}(\mathbf{r}) d \Gamma=\delta_{i^{\prime}} \tag{2.36}
\end{equation*}
$$

The angular basis functions, $\mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{m}}^{+}(\boldsymbol{\Omega})$, within the node are even-parity spherical harmonics meeting the orthonormality conditions

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int \mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{m}}^{+}(\Omega) \mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{m}}^{+}(\Omega) \mathrm{d} \Omega=\delta_{\mathrm{mm}^{\prime}} . \tag{2.37}
\end{equation*}
$$

The odd-parity basis function, $\mathbf{k}_{\mathrm{m}}(\mathbf{\Omega})$, along the interfaces consist of odd-order spherical harmonics; their form is discussed further in section II. C.

Inserting the expansions of $\Psi, \chi$, and $S$ into Eq. 2.13 results in the reduced functional

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{V}}\left[\zeta_{\mathrm{im}}, \chi_{\mathrm{jm}]}\right]=\zeta_{i m} \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{ii}^{\prime \prime}} \zeta_{\mathrm{i}^{\prime} \mathrm{m}^{\prime}}-2 \zeta_{\mathrm{im}} \mathrm{~s}_{\mathrm{im}}+2 \sum_{\gamma} \zeta_{\mathrm{im}} \mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{ij} \gamma}^{\mathrm{mn}} \chi_{\mathrm{jn} \gamma} \tag{2.38}
\end{equation*}
$$

where for convenience we have defined $\mathrm{s}_{\mathrm{im}}=\delta_{0 \mathrm{~m}} \mathrm{~s}_{\mathrm{i}}$. The matrices in this equation are defined as

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{i i^{\prime}}^{m m^{\prime}}=\sigma^{-1} P_{i i^{\prime}}^{\mathrm{k} \mid} H_{\mathrm{k} 1}^{m m^{\prime}}+V_{v} \delta_{\mathrm{ii}}\left(\sigma \delta_{m m^{\prime}}-\sigma_{s} \delta_{1 \mathrm{~m}} \delta_{1 \mathrm{~m}^{\prime}}\right) \tag{2.39}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{M}_{\mathrm{ij}}^{\mathrm{m}} \mathrm{~m}=\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{ij} \gamma} \mathbf{E}_{\mathrm{mn}} . \tag{2.40}
\end{equation*}
$$

Eact of the elements of these matrices is given in terms of integrals over known spatial or angular trial functions as defined in Table I. The isotropic source moments are given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{s}_{\mathrm{i}}=\int \mathrm{dVf}(\mathbf{r}) \mathrm{S}(\mathbf{r}) \tag{2.41}
\end{equation*}
$$

The reduced functional may be written in a more compact form by defining $\zeta$ and $\chi_{\gamma}$ as partitioned vectors formed from the successive columns of $\zeta_{\mathrm{im}}$ and $\chi_{\mathrm{jn}} \gamma$, which are the arrays of unknown coefficients. The resulting functional appears as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{F}_{v}[\zeta, \chi]=\zeta^{\mathrm{T}} \mathrm{~A} \zeta-2 \zeta^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{s}+2 \sum_{\gamma} \zeta^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{M}_{\gamma} \chi_{\gamma} \tag{2.42}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the partitioning of $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{s}$ and $\mathbf{M}$ is consistent with that of $\zeta$ and $\chi_{\gamma}$. We may eliminate the sum over the surfaces by defining a single vector over the surfaces

$$
\begin{equation*}
\boldsymbol{\chi}^{\mathrm{T}}=\left[\boldsymbol{\chi}_{1}^{\mathrm{T}}, \boldsymbol{\chi}_{2}^{\mathrm{T}}, \cdots, \boldsymbol{\chi}_{y}^{\mathrm{T}}, \cdots\right] \tag{2.42a}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the corresponding coupling matrix

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{M}=\left[\mathbf{M}_{1}, \mathbf{M}_{2}, \cdots, \mathbf{M}_{r}, \cdots\right] \tag{2.42b}
\end{equation*}
$$

Equation 2.42 may then be written as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{v}}[\zeta, \chi]=\zeta^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{A} \zeta-2 \zeta^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{s}+2 \zeta^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{M} \boldsymbol{\chi} \tag{2.42c}
\end{equation*}
$$

Requiring the functional to be stationary with respect to variations in $\zeta^{\mathbf{T}}$ then yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
\zeta=\mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{s}-\mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{M} \boldsymbol{X} \tag{2.43}
\end{equation*}
$$

The variation with respect to $\chi_{\gamma}$ across an interface leads to the requirement that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\psi_{\gamma}=\mathbf{M}_{\gamma}^{\mathrm{T}} \zeta \tag{2.44}
\end{equation*}
$$

be continuous across each interface. Thus for the surfaces of the node we form an evenparity vector, whose subvectors are the $\Psi_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$, in terms of the internal trial function $\zeta$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\boldsymbol{\Psi}=\mathbf{M}^{\mathrm{T}} \boldsymbol{\zeta} \tag{2.44a}
\end{equation*}
$$

Combining Eqs.2.43 and 2.44a, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\boldsymbol{\Psi}=\mathbf{M}^{\mathbf{T}} \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{s}-\mathbf{M}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{M} \boldsymbol{X} \tag{2.45}
\end{equation*}
$$

This equation relates the even-parity flux moments on the node interfaces to the source moments within the node and to the odd-parity flux moments on the node interfaces.

## II. B. 2 Multigroup Response Matrix Equations

Equation 2.45 may be viewed as a generalization of the $\mathrm{T}^{-1}$ form of a within-group response matrix equation, which has previously been developed only for diffusion theory. ${ }^{21}$ To obtain a response matrix in conventional form, we introduce the change of variables

$$
\begin{equation*}
j^{ \pm}=\frac{1}{4} \Psi \pm \frac{1}{2} \chi \tag{2.46}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathbf{j}^{+}$and $\mathbf{j}^{-}$are, respectively, outgoing and incoming partial current-like moments, each integrated over the corresponding node surface $\Gamma_{\gamma}$. In the diffusion approximation these reduce to the partial currents. Inverting Eq. 2.46 then yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
\boldsymbol{\Psi}=2\left(\mathbf{j}^{+}+\mathbf{j}^{-}\right) \tag{2.46a}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\boldsymbol{x}=\mathbf{j}^{+}-\mathbf{j}^{-} . \tag{2.46b}
\end{equation*}
$$

Combining Eqs. 2.45 and 2.46 , we may then write the nodal response matrix equation in the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{j}^{+}=\mathbf{B s}+\mathbf{R j}^{-} \tag{2.47}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{gather*}
\mathbf{R}=[\mathbf{G}+\mathbf{I}]^{-1}[\mathbf{G}-\mathbf{I}]  \tag{2.48}\\
\mathbf{B}=[\mathbf{G}+\mathbf{I}]^{-1} \mathbf{C} \tag{2.49}
\end{gather*}
$$

The matrices $\mathbf{G}$ and $\mathbf{C}$ are partitioned into submatrices defined for each interface. The submatrices are defined as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{G}_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}=\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{M}_{\gamma}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{M}_{\gamma}, \tag{2.50}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{C}_{\gamma}=\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{M}_{\gamma}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{A}^{-1} . \tag{2.51}
\end{equation*}
$$

Once the partial current moments are determined, the even-parity flux moments for the node interior can be determined from the coefficients given by Eq. 2.43. Using Eq. 2.46b, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\zeta=\mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{s}-2 \mathbf{C}\left(\mathbf{j}^{+}-\mathbf{j}^{-}\right), \tag{2.52}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the first subvector $\phi$ of the vector $\zeta$ contains the scalar flux moments.
The multigroup coupling equation for group $g$ is given in the standard form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{S}=\frac{\chi_{\mathrm{g}}}{\mathrm{k}} \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{fg}^{\prime} \phi_{g^{\prime}}}+\sigma_{\mathrm{gg}} \phi_{\mathrm{g}^{\prime}}, \tag{2.53}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the cross section notation is conventional. With the scalar flux expanded in each group as indicated in Eq. 2.53, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{s}_{\mathrm{gi}}=\mathrm{k}^{-1} \delta_{\mathrm{m} 0} \chi_{\mathrm{g}} \mathrm{v} \sigma_{\mathrm{fg}^{\prime}} \zeta_{\mathrm{g}^{\prime} i 0}+\sigma_{\mathrm{g}}{ }_{\mathrm{g}} \zeta_{\mathrm{g}^{\prime} i 0} \tag{2.54}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the subscript $g$ is added to the source moments to denote the energy group, and we continue to use the shorthand notation $\mathrm{s}_{\mathrm{im}}=\delta_{0 \mathrm{~m}} \mathrm{~s}_{\mathrm{i}}$. The group source moments depend only on the corresponding scalar flux moments, $\zeta_{g^{\prime} i 0}$, in the higher energy groups, $\mathrm{g}^{\prime}<\mathrm{g}$.

## II. C The Spatial and Angular Trial Functions

We next examine the trial functions is space and angle in more detail. In choosing the level of the spatial approximation, attention must be given to the rank of the matrix which couples the nodal to the interface approximations. Likewise, care must be taken in the coupling of the angular approximations if the classical spherical harmonics equations are to be obtained.

## II. C. 1 Spatial Approximations

The spatial trial functions are taken to be complete polynomials both within the nodes and along the interfaces. The internal polynomial is taken to be of a higher order than that on the interface. In cases where there are relatively few response matrix types, there is little
penalty in making the interior polynomial of high enough order that it differs little for the exact spatial solution. However, in problems with many response matrix types, the formation of the response matrices, particularly the inversion of the A matrix, becomes expensive as the dimension of the A matrix grows with the number of space-angle trial functions. Therefore an important question is that of determining the lowest reasonable order for the complete polynomial for the node interior.

An important criteria is that the D matrix must have full rank. ${ }^{22}$ Spatial approximations which result in rank deficient matrices prevent convergence of the red-black response matrix solution algorithms from being carried to completion. Round-off errors introduce extraneous solutions which do not grow, but persist in preventing eigenvalue calculations from being converged beyond the sixth or seventh decimal place.

## II. C. 2 Angular Approximations

The even- and odd-order spherical harmonics angular trial functions appearing in the $\mathbf{g}$ and $\mathbf{k}$ vectors must be specified with care. Variational nodal methods based on spherical harmonics expansions solve the even-angular-parity flux equations within the nodes, while continuity between nodes is provided by even- and odd-parity flux moments. In three-dimensional odd-order $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{N}}$ approximations, there are $\mathrm{N}(\mathrm{N}+1) / 2$ coupled secondorder differential equations within each node. There are, however, $\mathrm{N}(\mathrm{N}+1) / 2$ even- and $(\mathrm{N}+1)(\mathrm{N}+2) / 2$ odd-parity moments across the interfaces. Thus $\mathrm{N}+1$ odd-parity continuity conditions must be eliminated, since additional conditions would result in an overdetermined set of nodal equations. To derive general $P_{N}$ approximations, we turn to the use of the Rumyantsev interface conditions. ${ }^{23}$ As detailed elsewhere, ${ }^{9}$ the Rumyantsev conditions are identical to those imposed by the variational nodal functional, provided the choice of odd-parity trial functions is restricted to those that result in a full rank matrix coupling odd- and even-parity moments. This is accomplished most simply by deleting the $\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{n}} \pm_{\mathrm{n}}$ terms from the odd-order interface expansions. ${ }^{9}$

To apply the odd-order $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{N}}$ approximation to the foregoing functional we expand the even- and odd- parity fluxes in terms of the spherical harmonics defined by

$$
Y_{p q}(\Omega)=C_{p q} P_{p}^{q}(\mu) \begin{align*}
& \cos (q \omega)  \tag{2.55}\\
& \sin (q \omega)
\end{align*}, \quad \begin{array}{r}
p=0,1,2, \cdots, N \\
|q|=0,1,2, \cdots, p
\end{array}
$$

where $P_{p}^{q}(\mu)$ are the associated Legendre polynomials. The coefficients $C_{p q}$ are chosen such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int \mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{pq}}(\Omega) \mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{p}^{\prime} \mathrm{q}^{\prime}}(\Omega) \mathrm{d} \Omega=\delta_{\mathrm{pp}} \delta_{\mathrm{qq}^{\prime}} \tag{2.56}
\end{equation*}
$$

and we follow the convention that $\mathrm{q} \geq 0$ signifies the cosine series and $\mathrm{q}<0$ the sine series. Within the nodes, we approximate the even-parity flux by

$$
\psi(\mathbf{r}, \boldsymbol{\Omega})=\sum_{\mathrm{pq}} \mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{pq}}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}) \zeta_{\mathrm{pq}}(\mathbf{r}) \quad \begin{align*}
& \mathrm{p}=0,2,4 \cdots, \mathrm{~N}-1  \tag{2.57}\\
& |\boldsymbol{q}|=0,1,2, \cdots, \mathrm{p}
\end{align*}
$$

At the interfaces we employ the odd-parity flux approximation

$$
\chi(\mathbf{r}, \boldsymbol{\Omega})=\sum_{\mathrm{pq}} \mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{pq}}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}) \chi_{\mathrm{pq}}(\mathbf{r}), \quad \begin{gather*}
\mathrm{p}=1,3,5 \cdots, \mathrm{~N}  \tag{2.58}\\
|\mathrm{q}|=0,1,2, \cdots, \mathrm{p}-1
\end{gather*}
$$

where the angles in the odd-parity expansion are defined in terms of $\mathbf{n}$, the outward normal to the interface. A central point is the deletion of the $\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{p}} \pm \mathrm{p}, \mathrm{p}=1,3,5, \ldots \mathrm{~N}$ terms from the odd-parity expansion of Eq. 2.58. These deletions yield the correct number of odd-parity interface conditions. Equally important, it is demonstrated elsewhere that the resulting spherical harmonics formulation satisfies the Rumyantsev interface conditions and results in a full-rank coupling matrices between the even-order spherical harmonics expansions within the nodes and the odd-order expansion at the interfaces. ${ }^{9}$

We may write the variational nodal form of the spherical harmonics equations compactly by first expressing the expansions of Eqs. 2.31 and 2.32 as vector relationships. Define the vector of even- parity angular trial functions $\mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{m}}^{+}(\boldsymbol{\Omega})$ as

$$
\begin{equation*}
g(\Omega)^{\mathrm{T}}=\left[\mathrm{Y}_{00}, Y_{2-2}, Y_{2-1}, Y_{20}, Y_{21}, Y_{22}, Y_{4-4}, \cdots\right] \tag{2.59}
\end{equation*}
$$

and a corresponding vector consisting of the odd-parity trial functions $\mathbf{k}_{\mathrm{m}}(\mathbf{\Omega})$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
k(\Omega)^{T}=\left[Y_{10}, Y_{3-2}, Y_{3-1}, Y_{30}, Y_{31}, Y_{32}, Y_{5-4}, \cdots\right] \tag{2.60}
\end{equation*}
$$

The foregoing conditions are general and may be applied to any odd-order spherical harmonics approximation. In earlier implementations of the variational nodal
method a somewhat different form of the interface conditions were used in P3 approximations. ${ }^{2-7}$ For the three-dimensional $P_{3}$ approximation the correct number of odd-parity conditions may be obtained by requiring continuity of the $P_{1}(\mu), P_{1}(\eta), P_{1}(\xi)$ and $P_{3}(\mu), P_{3}(\eta), P_{3}(\xi)$ moments, where $\mu$ is the direction cosine perpendicular to and $\eta$ and $\xi$ paraliel to the interface. These moments have lead to consistently accurate numerical results in two- and three-dimensional calculations.

The fortuitous correspondence of the number of required conditions with the number of odd-order Legendre polynomials with direction cosines perpendicular and parallel to the interface, however, holds only for the P3 approximation. They therefore cannot be extended to P5 or higher approximations. Moreover they do not satisfy the Rumyantsev conditions and result in an angular coupling matrix which is rank deficient. Unlike rank deficiency in the spatial trial functions, there seems to be no effect on convergence if it appears in the angular variables.

A number of other angular approximations are also be employed within the framework of the variational nodal method to reduce the number of interface basis functions without a commensurate loss of accuracy. The reduced ${ }^{8,11}$ and the simplified spherical harmonics ${ }^{8}$ approximations are discussed elsewhere. With any set of angular trial functions used to approximate the transport equation, one must also specify a compatible set of approximate boundary conditions. Both reflected and vacuum boundary conditions are included in VARIANT. These two classes of conditions are treated somewhat differently, since in the variational formalation, reflected conditions are "essential" and must be imposed on the trial functions, while vacuum conditions are "modified natural" and are incorporated into the variational format through the addition of appropriate surface terms to the functional.

## II. C. 3 Reflected Boundary Conditions

With the foregoing angular trial functions, the Rumaynstev interface conditions are satisfied by requiring $\Psi_{\gamma}$ and $\chi_{\gamma}$ to be continuous across nodal interfaces. The components of the vector $\chi_{\gamma}$ are the odd-parity expansion coefficients $\chi_{\text {jny }}$ along the interface. In contrast, the vector $\Psi_{\gamma}$ is expressed by Eq. 2.44 as a linear combination of the even-parity coefficients $\zeta_{i m}$ within the nodes. In expanded form these linear combinations may be written as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Psi_{\mathrm{j} m \gamma}=\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{ij} \gamma} \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{mm}} \zeta_{\mathrm{ir}} \tag{2.61}
\end{equation*}
$$

Reflected boundary conditions are essential in the variational formulations and therefore must be imposed directly on the $\Psi_{j n \gamma}$ and $\chi_{j \mathrm{jry}}$ coefficients. To do this, we first note that the index $n$ in the $\Psi_{\mathrm{jmy}}$ and $\chi_{\mathrm{jny}}$ coefficients corresponds to the odd-parity spherical harmonic ordering in the vector $\mathbf{k}(\Omega)$ as defined in Eq. 2.60.

As shown elsewhere, ${ }^{9}$ the angular symmetry conditions for reflected boundary conditions are satisfied if the $\psi_{\mathrm{jny}}$ coefficients are set equal to zero for values of n corresponding to $\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{pq}}$ with even q , and the $\chi_{\mathrm{jny}}$ coefficient are set to zero for terms corresponding to odd $q$. Suppose we partition the vectors of interface vectors according to even and odd values of $q$ :

$$
\Psi_{\gamma}=\left[\begin{array}{l}
\Psi_{e}  \tag{2.62}\\
\Psi_{o}
\end{array}\right] \quad \chi_{\gamma}=\left[\begin{array}{l}
\chi_{e} \\
\chi_{o}
\end{array}\right]
$$

Then the reflective boundary conditions are then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Psi_{0}=0, \quad \chi_{e}=0 \quad r \in \Gamma_{r} \tag{2.63}
\end{equation*}
$$

and therefore the scalar product vanishes:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Psi_{\gamma}^{T} x_{\gamma}=0 \quad r \in \Gamma_{r} \tag{2.64}
\end{equation*}
$$

This result, combined with Eq. 2.44, causes the Lagrange multiplier term $\zeta^{T_{\mathbf{M}}^{\gamma}} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \chi_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$ to vanish for reflected boundaries from the reduced functional, Eq. 2.42 and from subsequent equations. If Eqs. 2.63 are inserted into Eq. 2.46 for the partial current moments, we obtain on reflected boundaries

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{j}_{e}=\mathbf{j}_{e}^{+}, \quad \mathbf{j}_{o}^{-}=-\mathbf{j}_{o}^{+} \quad \mathbf{r} \in \Gamma_{\mathrm{r}} \tag{2.65}
\end{equation*}
$$

which are the conditions employed in the response matrix solution algorithm.

## II. C. 4 Vacuum Boundary Conditions

Vacuum boundary conditions, in contrast to reflected conditions, are modified natural boundary conditions. By modifying the functional with an appropriate surface term along the vacuum, the exact condition is obtained by requiring the functional to be
stationary along the boundary. There are three ways in which this characteristic of vacuum boundary conditions can be incorporated into the computational algorithm.

The first is the classical approach described in Section II.A. We remove the Lagrange multiplier integral from Eq. 2.13 along the vacuum boundary and replace it with the integral, shown as Eq. 2.22. Then when the functional is required to be stationary with respect to variations $\delta \psi(\mathbf{r}, \Omega), \mathbf{r} \in \Gamma_{v}$, the correct vacuum boundary conditions results. However, it is in terms of the gradient of the even parity flux rather than the odd-parity Lagrange multiplier with which we would like to work. For if the Ritz procedure is applied using this formulation, the partial current moments along the vacuum boundary are eliminated, and the condition is incorporated into a response matrix of reduced dimension. This approach is awkward to apply, gives rise to response matrices which are boundary-condition-dependent and is difficult to incorporated into iterative solution algorithms for the resporse matrix equations.

The foregoing difficulty is circumvented by retaining the odd-parity Lagrange multiplier on the vacuum boundary as follows. Instead of replacing the vacuum surface term in the functional by Eq. 2.13, we add the following term consisting of two integrals,

$$
\begin{equation*}
I=\int_{v} d \Gamma \int d \Omega|n \cdot \Omega| \psi^{2}-2 \int_{v} d \Gamma \int d \Omega n \cdot \Omega \psi \chi \tag{2.66}
\end{equation*}
$$

to yield

$$
\begin{array}{r}
F_{v}[\psi, \chi]=\int_{v} d V\left[\int d \Omega \sigma^{-1}(\Omega \cdot \nabla \psi)^{2}+\sigma \phi^{2}\right]-2 \int_{v} d V \phi S+2 \int d \Gamma \int d \Omega \Omega \cdot n \psi \chi  \tag{2.67}\\
\iint_{v} d \Gamma \int d \Omega|\Omega \cdot n| \psi^{2}-2 \int_{v} d \Gamma \int d \Omega \Omega \cdot n \psi^{*} \chi
\end{array}
$$

Requiring the functional to be stationary with respect to $\delta \chi(r, \Omega)$ along the vacuum boundary then yields $\psi(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{\Omega})=\psi^{\prime \prime}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{\Omega})$. When combined with this condition, the variation $\delta \psi^{\prime \prime}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{\Omega})$ then yields the correct vacuum conditions given by Eq. 2.11.

To apply the Ritz procedure, we approximate $\psi$ " and $\chi$ similarly to Eqs. 2.31 and 2.32 on the vacuum boundary,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Psi^{\prime \prime}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{\Omega}) \approx \mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{i}}(\mathbf{r}) \mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{m}}^{+}(\mathbf{\Omega}) \zeta_{\mathrm{im}}^{\prime \prime} \quad \mathbf{r} \in \Gamma_{\mathrm{v}} \tag{2.68}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\chi(\mathbf{r}, \Omega) \approx \mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{j} \gamma}(\mathbf{r}) \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{n} \gamma}(\Omega) \chi_{\mathrm{j} n \gamma} \quad . \quad \mathbf{r} \in \Gamma_{\mathrm{v}} \tag{2.69}
\end{equation*}
$$

Equation 2.66 then takes the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{I}=\zeta_{\mathrm{im}}^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{i} \mathrm{i}^{\prime}} \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{mm} m^{\prime} \gamma} \zeta_{\mathrm{i}^{\prime} \mathrm{m}^{\prime}}^{\prime \prime}-2 \zeta_{\mathrm{im}}^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{ij} \gamma} \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{mn} \gamma} \chi_{\mathrm{j} n \gamma} \tag{2.70}
\end{equation*}
$$

where elements of the L and W arrays are given in terms of the angular and spatial trial functions respectively in Table 1. Defining

$$
\begin{equation*}
N_{\mathrm{ii}^{m} m^{\prime}}^{\mathrm{m}^{\prime}}=W_{\mathrm{ii}}{ }^{\prime} \gamma L_{\mathrm{mm}} \tag{2.71}
\end{equation*}
$$

and utilizing the definition of $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{ij} \mathrm{\gamma}}^{\mathrm{mn}}$, we may rewrite Eq. 2.70 as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{I}=\zeta_{\mathrm{im}}^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{ii}^{\prime} \gamma}^{\mathrm{mm}} \zeta_{\mathrm{i}^{\prime} \mathrm{m}^{\prime}}^{\prime \prime}-2 \zeta_{\mathrm{im}}^{\prime \prime} \mathbf{M}_{\mathrm{ij} \gamma}^{\mathrm{mn}} \chi_{\mathrm{jn} \gamma} \tag{2.72}
\end{equation*}
$$

Writing this expression in vector form and adding it to the reduced functional given by Eq. 2.42 then yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{v}}[\zeta, \chi]=\zeta^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{A} \zeta-2 \zeta^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{S}+2 \sum_{\gamma} \zeta^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{M}_{\gamma} \chi_{\gamma}+\zeta^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{N}_{\gamma_{v}} \zeta^{\prime \prime}-2 \zeta^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{M}_{\gamma_{v}} \chi_{\gamma_{\mathrm{v}}} \tag{2.73}
\end{equation*}
$$

Requiring the reduced functional to be stationary with respect to variations $\delta \chi$ yields $\zeta^{\prime \prime}=\zeta$ on the vacuum boundary and likewise taking $\delta \zeta^{\prime \prime}$ yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{N}_{\gamma} \zeta^{\prime \prime}=\mathbf{M}_{\gamma} \chi_{\gamma} \tag{2.74}
\end{equation*}
$$

Eliminating $\zeta$ " between these results and solving for $\zeta$ yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
\zeta=N_{\gamma}^{-1} \mathbf{M}_{\gamma} \chi_{\gamma} . \tag{v}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then applying Eq. 2.44 to obtain the even-parity surface variable, we obtain the vacuum boundary condition:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\boldsymbol{\Psi}_{\gamma}=\mathbf{M}_{\gamma}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{N}_{\gamma}^{-1} \mathbf{M}_{\gamma} \boldsymbol{x}_{\gamma} \tag{2.76}
\end{equation*}
$$

Finally, if we make the transformation of variables to the partial current moments defined by Eq. 2.46 we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{j}^{+}=\left(1 / 2 \mathbf{M}_{\gamma}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{N}_{\gamma}^{-1} \mathbf{M}_{\gamma}+\mathbf{I}\right)^{-1}\left(1 / 2 \mathbf{M}_{\gamma}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{N}_{\gamma}^{-1} \mathbf{M}_{\gamma}-\mathbf{I}\right) \mathbf{j}^{-} \tag{2.77}
\end{equation*}
$$

A somewhat simpler form of the vacuum boundary condition can be obtained by applying the requirement that the reduced functional be stationary only with respect to the angular variables. We begin again with the integrals of Eq. 2.66, but this time we expand the even- and odd-parity fluxes only in angle, allowing arbitrary spatial variation,

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\psi^{\prime \prime}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{\Omega}) \approx \mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{m}}^{+}(\mathbf{\Omega}) \zeta_{\mathrm{m}}^{\prime \prime}(\mathbf{r}) & \mathbf{r} \in \Gamma_{\mathrm{v}}(2.78) \\
\chi(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{\Omega}) \approx \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{m}}(\mathbf{\Omega}) \chi_{\mathrm{m}}(\mathbf{r}) & \mathbf{r} \in \Gamma_{\mathrm{v}}(2.79)
\end{array}
$$

Equation 2.66 then reduce to a difference of spatial integrals

Taking the appropriate variations now yields $\zeta_{m}^{\prime \prime}=\zeta_{m}$ and $L_{m m^{\prime}} \zeta_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime \prime}=E_{m n \gamma} \chi_{n \gamma}$, which in matrix form may be expressed as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{L} \zeta=\mathbf{E} \chi \quad r \in \Gamma_{\mathbf{v}} \tag{2.81}
\end{equation*}
$$

respectively. Therefore solving for $\zeta$ and combing the result with Eq.2.44 yields the vacuum boundary condition

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Psi=\mathbf{E}^{T_{\mathbf{L}}-1} \mathbf{E} \boldsymbol{\chi} . \quad \mathbf{r} \in \Gamma_{v} \tag{2.82}
\end{equation*}
$$

It may be shown with Eq. 2.46 that on the vacuum boundaries may be expressed in terms of the partial current moments as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{j}^{-}=\left[{ }_{2} \mathbf{E}^{\mathbf{T}} \mathbf{L}^{-1} \mathbf{E}+\mathbf{I}\right]^{-1}\left[\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{E}^{\mathbf{T}} \mathbf{L}^{-1} \mathbf{E}-\mathbf{I}\right] \mathbf{j}^{+} . \quad \mathbf{r} \in \Gamma_{\mathbf{v}} \tag{2.83}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here however $\Psi, \chi$ and the corresponding partial current vectors are spatially dependent, meaning that unlike Eq. 2.77 which imposes the condition only on the m spatial moments, here it is imposed at each point $r$ on the vacuum boundary. This is too strong a condition. It may be relaxed, however, by requiring that Eq. 2.83 hold only for the spatial moments $\int_{\nu} \mathrm{d} \mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{jm}}(r) \Psi_{\mathrm{n} \mathrm{\gamma}}(r)$ and $\int_{V} \mathrm{~d} \Gamma \mathrm{~h}_{\mathrm{jn} \mathrm{\gamma}}(r) \chi_{\mathrm{n} \gamma}(r)$ and therefore for the corresponding vector of the $\mathrm{j}_{\mathrm{in} \gamma}^{+}$and $\mathrm{j}_{\mathrm{i} \gamma \gamma}^{-}$.

## II. D Anisotropic Scattering

With the methodology thus far developed, we are now prepared to generalize the variational nodal method to include anisotropic scattering. The arguments contained in the preceding section concerning trial functions and boundary conditions remain valid. Thus we need only to repeat the operations of Sections II. A and B in generalizing the variational formalism and obtaining the multigroup response matrix equations with anisotropic scattering. ${ }^{7}$ Our starting point is the within-group transport equation with anisotropic scattering:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[\mathbf{\Omega} \cdot \mathbf{\nabla}+\sigma(\mathbf{r}) \Psi \Psi(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{\Omega})=\int \mathrm{d} \mathbf{\Omega}^{\prime} \sigma_{\mathrm{s}}\left(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{\Omega} \cdot \mathbf{\Omega}^{\prime}\right) \Psi\left(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{\Omega}^{\prime}\right)+\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{\Omega})\right. \tag{2.84}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\sigma$ is the total cross section, and $\sigma_{\mathrm{s}}$ is the within-group anisotropic scattering cross section; $\Psi$ represents the angular flux and $S$ the anisotropic group source.

## II. D. 1 Variational Formulation

To formulate the problem variationally, we must obtain the even-parity equation with isotropic scattering and sources. This is accomplished by first using the even-parity flux definitions in Eqs. 2.2 and 2.3 to obtain the following pair of second order equations which are generalizations of Eq. 2.4 and 2.5

$$
\begin{equation*}
\boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \nabla \chi(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{\Omega})+\sigma(\mathbf{r}) \psi(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{\Omega})=\int \mathrm{d} \mathbf{\Omega}^{\prime} \sigma^{+}\left(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{\Omega} \cdot \mathbf{\Omega}^{\prime}\right) \psi\left(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{\Omega}^{\prime}\right)+\mathrm{S}^{+}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{\Omega}) \tag{2.85}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{\Omega} \cdot \nabla \psi(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{\Omega})+\sigma(\mathbf{r}) \chi(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{\Omega})=\int \mathrm{d} \mathbf{\Omega}^{\prime} \sigma^{-}\left(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{\Omega} \cdot \mathbf{\Omega}^{\prime}\right) \chi\left(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{\Omega}^{\prime}\right)+\mathrm{S}^{-}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{\Omega}) \tag{2.86}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we have divided the anisotropic scattering kernel into even- and odd-parity components, $\sigma^{+}$and $\sigma^{-}$, each of which is expanded in spherical harmonics of corresponding parity,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma^{ \pm}\left(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{\Omega} \cdot \Omega^{\prime}\right)=\sigma_{\mathrm{m}}^{ \pm}(\mathbf{r}) \mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{m}}^{ \pm}(\Omega) \mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{m}}^{ \pm}\left(\Omega^{\prime}\right) \tag{2.87}
\end{equation*}
$$

Again repeated Englist indices denote summation, and the anisotropic cross section components, $\sigma_{m}$, do not contain a factor of $2 \ell+1$ (see reference 7 for a discussion of the expansion of the scattering kernel).Combining equations yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
\chi=-\sigma^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \nabla \psi+\sigma^{-1} S^{-}-\sigma^{-2} \int \mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{\prime} \tilde{\sigma}^{-}\left(\boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{\prime}\right)\left[\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{\prime} \cdot \nabla \psi\left(\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{\prime}\right)-\mathrm{S}\left(\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{\prime}\right)\right] \tag{2.88}
\end{equation*}
$$

where for brevity we have defined

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tilde{\sigma}\left(\Omega \cdot \Omega^{\prime}\right)=\left(1-\sigma_{m}^{-} / \sigma\right)^{-1} \sigma_{\mathrm{m}}^{-} \mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{m}}(\Omega) \mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{m}}\left(\Omega^{\prime}\right) \tag{2.89}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since Eq. 2.88 is an explicit relation for $\chi$ in terms of the even-parity flux and group source, we may substitute it into Eq. 2.85 to obtain the within-group even-parity equation with anisotropic scattering included:

$$
\begin{align*}
& -\boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla} \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \nabla \psi-\mathbf{\Omega} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla} \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{-2} \int \mathrm{~d} \mathbf{\Omega}^{\prime} \tilde{\sigma}\left(\boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \mathbf{\Omega}^{\prime}\right) \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{\prime} \cdot \nabla \psi\left(\mathbf{\Omega}^{\prime}\right)+\sigma \psi= \\
& \int \mathrm{d} \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{+}\left(\boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \mathbf{\Omega}^{\prime}\right) \psi\left(\mathbf{\Omega}^{\prime}\right)+\mathrm{S}^{+}-\boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \nabla \sigma^{-1}\left[\mathrm{~S}^{-}+\sigma^{-1} \int \mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{\prime} \tilde{\sigma}\left(\boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{S}^{-}\left(\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{\prime}\right)\right] \text {. } \tag{2.90}
\end{align*}
$$

The variational functional for the even-parity transport equation may be generalized to include anisotropic scattering terms in the foregoing equations. The global functional, F , is a superposition of volume and surface contributions as in Eq. 2.12 ${ }^{\circ}$ With anisotropic scattering, the contribution from node $v$ is

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{V}}[\psi, \chi]=\int_{v} \mathrm{dV} \int \mathrm{~d} \Omega\left[\sigma^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \nabla \psi)^{2}+\sigma \psi^{2}\right] \\
& \quad+\int_{v} \mathrm{dV}\left\{\tilde{\sigma}_{\mathrm{m}}^{-} \sigma^{-2}\left[\int \mathrm{~d} \Omega \mathrm{~g}_{\mathrm{m}}^{-} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \nabla \psi\right]^{2}-\sigma_{m}^{+}\left[\int \mathrm{d} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \mathrm{~g}_{\mathrm{m}}^{+} \psi\right]^{2}\right\}-2 \int_{v} \mathrm{dV} \int \mathrm{~d} \Omega \psi S^{+}  \tag{2.91}\\
& \quad+2 \int_{v} \mathrm{dV} \int \mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \nabla \psi \sigma^{-1}\left[S^{-}+\sigma^{-1} \int \mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{\prime} \tilde{\sigma}\left(\boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{\prime}\right) S^{-}\left(\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{\prime}\right)\right]+2 \int_{V} \mathrm{~d} \Gamma \int \mathrm{~d} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \mathrm{n} \psi \chi .
\end{align*}
$$

Requiring the functional to be stationary with respect to variations in $\psi$ yields Eq. 2.90 as the Euler-Lagrange equation within $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$ and Eq. 2.88 along the interfaces. The continuity of $\psi$ across the interfaces is assured by requiring the functional to be stationary with respect to interface variations in $\chi$, while the continuity of $\chi$ is imposed by Lagrange multiplier terms applied on nodal interfaces.

## II. D. 2 Within-Group Equations

A Ritz procedure employed to obtain the nodal response matrices for each energy group parallels the isotropic case. We first approximate the even- and odd-parity fluxes as separable expansions of spatial and angular trial functions, as in Eqs. 2.12 and 2.13. The even- and odd-parity group sources are expanded as

$$
\begin{equation*}
S^{ \pm}(r, \Omega) \approx f_{i}(r) g_{m}^{ \pm}(\Omega) s_{i m}^{ \pm}, \quad r \in V_{v} . \tag{2.92}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the source coefficients are given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
s_{\mathrm{m}}^{ \pm}=\int \mathrm{d} \Omega \mathrm{~g}_{\mathrm{m}}^{ \pm} \mathrm{S}^{ \pm} \tag{2.93}
\end{equation*}
$$

Inserting the expansions of $\Psi, \chi$, and $S$ into Eq. 2.91 results in the reduced functional

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{F}\left[\zeta_{\mathrm{im}}, \chi_{\mathrm{jn} \mathrm{\gamma}}\right]=\zeta_{\mathrm{im}} \tilde{A}_{\mathrm{ii}} \mathrm{~mm}^{\prime} \zeta_{\mathrm{i}^{\prime} \mathrm{m}^{\prime}}-2 \zeta_{\mathrm{im}} \mathrm{~s}_{\mathrm{im}}^{+}-2 \zeta_{\mathrm{im}} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{ii}} \mathrm{~mm}^{\prime} s_{\mathrm{i}^{\prime} m^{\prime}}^{-}+2 \sum_{\gamma} \zeta_{\mathrm{im}} M_{\mathrm{ij} \mathrm{\gamma}}^{\mathrm{mn}} \chi_{\mathrm{jn} \gamma} \tag{2.94}
\end{equation*}
$$

This differs from the isotropic scattering case in two respects. First, in the A matrix additional terms augment the isotropic case to account for the within-group anisotropic scattering:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\widetilde{A}_{\mathrm{ii}^{\prime}}^{m m^{\prime}}=A_{\mathrm{ii}}^{\mathrm{mm}^{\prime}}+\sigma^{-1} P_{\mathrm{ii}^{k}}^{\mathrm{k}} \sigma^{-l} \tilde{\sigma}_{\mathrm{p}} V_{k}^{m p} V_{l}^{m^{\prime} p}+V_{v} \delta_{i i} \sigma_{q}^{+} \delta_{m q} \delta_{m^{\prime} q} \tag{2.95}
\end{equation*}
$$

Second, the even- and odd-parity source moments:

$$
\begin{equation*}
s_{i m}^{ \pm}=\int d V f_{i}(\mathbf{r}) \int d \Omega g_{\mathrm{m}}^{ \pm}(\mathbf{\Omega}) \mathbf{S}^{ \pm}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{\Omega}) \tag{2.96}
\end{equation*}
$$

appear in conjunction with the array

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{ii}^{\prime}}^{\mathrm{mm}^{\prime}} \equiv\left(\sigma-\sigma_{\mathrm{m}^{\prime}}\right)^{-1} \mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{ii}^{\prime}}^{1} \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{l}}^{\mathrm{mm}^{\prime}} \tag{2.97}
\end{equation*}
$$

which operates on the odd-parity source. These are required to treat the anisotropic group-to-group scattering. The U and V matrices, which do not appear with isotropic scattering, are given in terms of the known angular and spatial trial functions. They are included in Table I.

Aside from the division of the group source into even- and odd-parity components the reduced functional is quite similar to its isotropic counterpart given in Eq. 2.42.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{v}}[\zeta, \chi]=\zeta^{\mathrm{T}} \tilde{\mathbf{A}} \zeta-2 \zeta^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{s}^{+}-2 \zeta^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{T} \mathbf{s}^{-}+2 \sum_{\gamma} \zeta^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{M}_{\gamma_{i}}^{\prime} \tag{2.98}
\end{equation*}
$$

Requiring the functional to be stationary with respect to variations in $\zeta^{\mathrm{T}}$ then yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
\zeta=\tilde{\mathbf{A}}^{-1} \mathbf{s}^{+}+\tilde{\mathbf{A}}^{-1} \mathbf{T} \mathbf{s}^{-}-\sum_{\gamma} \tilde{\mathbf{A}}^{-1} \mathbf{M}_{\gamma} \boldsymbol{x}_{\boldsymbol{\prime}} \tag{2.99}
\end{equation*}
$$

while the variation with respect to $\chi_{\gamma}$ across an interface again yields Eq. 2.44. Taken together, Eqs. 2.44 and 2.99 yield a result analogous to Eq. 2.45:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{Y}_{\gamma}=\mathbf{M}_{\gamma}^{\mathrm{T}} \widetilde{\mathbf{A}}^{-1} \mathbf{s}^{+}+\mathbf{M}_{\gamma}^{\mathrm{T}} \widetilde{\mathbf{A}}^{-1} \mathbf{T} \mathbf{s}^{-}-\sum_{\gamma} \mathbf{M}_{\gamma}^{\mathrm{T}} \widetilde{\mathbf{A}}^{-1} \mathbf{M}_{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\chi}_{\gamma} . \tag{2.100}
\end{equation*}
$$

To obtain a response matrix equations, the partial current variables defined by Eq. 2.46 are again introduced. The result is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{j}^{+}=\mathbf{B}^{+} \mathbf{s}^{+}+\mathbf{B} \cdot \mathbf{s}+\mathbf{R} \mathbf{j}^{-} \tag{2.101}
\end{equation*}
$$

where R is defined as before by Eq. 2.48 , while in the source moment terms

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{B}^{+}=[\mathbf{G}+\mathbf{I}]^{-1} \mathbf{C} \tag{2.102}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{B}^{-}=\mathbf{B}^{+} \mathbf{T} . \tag{2.103}
\end{equation*}
$$

For anisotropic scattering, however, $\mathbf{A}$ is replaced by $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$ in the definitions of the $\mathbf{G}$ and $\mathbf{C}$ matrices. Analogous to Eq. 2.43, the even-parity flux moments for the node interior are given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\zeta=\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}^{-1} \mathbf{s}^{+}+\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}^{-1} \mathbf{T} \mathbf{s}^{-}-2 \mathbf{C}\left(\mathbf{j}^{+}-\mathbf{j}^{-}\right) \tag{2.104}
\end{equation*}
$$

## II. D. 3 Multigroup Coupling Equations

In the case where only within-group anisotropic scattering is included, the oddparity source term vanishes and the even-parity source includes only scalar flux moments from other energy groups. The anisotropic scattering terms thus affect only the magnitudes of the $\mathbf{R}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ matrix elements. With group-to-group anisotropic scattering, however, the source for group g contains both even- and odd-parity components:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{S}^{+}(\Omega)=\frac{\chi_{\mathrm{g}}}{\mathrm{k}} \nu \Sigma_{\mathrm{fg}}{ }^{\prime} \int \mathrm{d} \Omega \psi_{\mathrm{g}}(\Omega)+\int \mathrm{d} \Omega^{\prime} \sigma_{\mathrm{gg}}^{+}\left(\boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{\prime}\right) \psi_{\mathrm{g}}\left(\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{\prime}\right) \tag{2.105}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
S^{-}(\boldsymbol{\Omega})=\int \mathrm{d} \Omega^{\prime} \sigma_{\mathrm{gg}}^{-}\left(\bar{\Omega} \cdot \bar{\Omega}^{\prime}\right)_{\mathrm{g}}\left(\mathbf{\Omega}^{\prime}\right) \tag{2.106}
\end{equation*}
$$

To eliminate the odd-parity flux from the group source terms we express the evenand odd- parity components of the group-to-group scattering cross section in terms of the like-parity spherical harmonics $\mathrm{g}^{+}$and g :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma_{\mathrm{gg}}^{ \pm}\left(\boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{\prime}\right)=\sigma_{\mathrm{gg}}{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{m}}^{ \pm}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}) \mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{m}}^{ \pm}\left(\mathbf{\Omega}^{\prime}\right) \tag{2.107}
\end{equation*}
$$

After a fair amount of algebraic manipulation the $\chi$ flux components within the nodes can be eliminated, and we obtain for $\mathbf{s}_{\text {gim }}^{ \pm}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
s_{g i m}^{+}=k^{-1} \delta_{m} \chi_{g} \nu \Sigma_{f g^{\prime}} \zeta_{g^{\prime} i 0}+\sigma_{g g^{\prime} m}^{+} \zeta_{g^{\prime} i m} \tag{2.108}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
s_{g i m}^{-}=\left(\sigma_{g^{\prime}}-\sigma_{g^{\prime} m}\right)^{-1} \sigma_{g g^{\prime} m^{\prime}}^{-} s_{g^{\prime} i m}^{*}-T_{i^{\prime} i}^{m^{\prime} m} \zeta_{g^{\prime} i^{\prime} m^{\prime}}, \tag{2.109}
\end{equation*}
$$

The even-parity group source moments depend only on the corresponding flux moments, $\zeta_{g^{\prime} i m}$, in the higher energy groups, $\mathrm{g}^{\prime}<\mathrm{g}$, and on $\zeta_{\mathrm{g}^{\prime} \mathrm{i} 0}$, the scalar flux moments. The oddparity source moments, however, are a function of the $s_{g^{\prime} \mathrm{im}}^{-}$for $\mathrm{g}^{\prime}<\mathrm{g}$ as well as of the
$\zeta_{g^{\prime} i m}$. Thus in multigroup calculations the $\mathrm{s}_{\mathrm{g}^{\prime} \mathrm{im}}^{-}$, as well as the $\zeta_{\mathrm{g}^{\prime} \mathrm{im}}$ must be stored for each energy group, and the odd-parity source are computed recursively from the sources in the higher energy groups. In the case of upscattering, the $g^{\prime}>g$ terms are taken from the previous iteration.

## II. E Evaluation of Nodal Integrals

In three dimensional geometry for a fourth order approximation the vector $\mathbf{f}$ has 35 elements, and for a quadratic approximation $h_{\gamma}$ has 6 elements. For a full $P_{5}$ approximation the nodal and interface angular trial function vectors each consist of 15 elements. The A matrix is a 275,625 ( $35 \times 35 \times 15 \times 15$ ) element array. For hexagonal-Z geometry, with 8 interfaces per node, the $\mathbf{M}$ matrix contains 378,000 ( $8 \times 35 \times 15 \times 15$ ) elements. Taking full advantage of symmetries of the coefficient submatrices, and of the orthogonality properties of the trial functions still leaves one with a staggering number of integrals to evaluate.

Performing these integrals by hand represents an intractable task. This problem is overcome through the use of a symbolic manipulation program to automate the evaluation of the cross-section mdependent integrals involved in generating the coefficients. To accomplish this we must break the matrices into volume and angular cross-section independent integrals which may be evaluated separately. The constituent parts are shown in Table $I$ in dimensionless form.

The individual submatrices consist of known functions of space and angle which may be explicitly integrated. The symbolic manipulation code MATHEMATICA ${ }^{14}$ is used to evaluate the integrals. The implementation of these integrals within the symbolic manipulation code is fairly straight forward. Initially, the functional definitions of Legendre polynomials and spherical harmonics are defined within the program. These functions are then used to build up the vectors of trial functions. A simple nested do loop structure then accesses the appropriate vector elements and constructs the integrand corresponding to a particular submatrix element. The integration is then carried out over the explicitly defined domain, and the result is stored as an element in an array corresponding to a given submatrix. The array is written to an ASCII file which in turn is read by a FORTRAN program which generates a FORTRAN DATA statement containing the integrated values. The integration process is thus totally automated, and it is relatively
simple, in principle, to generate the coefficient matrices for any desired set of trial functions using Legendre polynomials, for other sets of orthogonal polynomials.

In Appendix A we show the MATHEMATICA scripts used to generate the orthogonal polynomials as well as the submatrices needed to calculate the response matrix coefficients and the flux reconstruction arrays. A three-dimensional Cartesian node is shown in Figure 1. The local nodal coordinate system appears in Figure 2. For hexagonal geometry, Figure 3 shows the orientation of the positive directions along the sides.

## Table I. Integral Arrays of Spatial and Angular Basis Functions

$$
\begin{aligned}
& P_{i i^{\prime}}^{k l}=\int_{V} d V \nabla_{k} f_{i} \nabla_{1} f_{i^{\prime}} \quad H_{k l}^{m m^{\prime}}=\int d \Omega \Omega_{k} \Omega_{1} g_{m}^{+} g_{m^{\prime}}^{+} \\
& U_{i i^{\prime}}^{1}=\int_{v} d V f_{i^{\prime}} \nabla_{l^{\prime}} f_{i} \quad V_{l}^{m m^{\prime}}=\int d \Omega \Omega_{1} g_{m}^{+} g_{m^{\prime}}^{-} \\
& D_{i j \gamma}=\int_{\gamma} d \Gamma \mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{~h}_{\mathrm{j}} \quad \quad \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{mn} \gamma}=\int \mathrm{d} \Omega \widehat{\Omega} \cdot \hat{\mathrm{n}}_{\mathrm{r}} \mathrm{~g}_{\mathrm{m}}^{+} \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{n}} \\
& \mathrm{~W}_{\mathrm{ii}}{ }^{\prime} \gamma=\int_{\gamma} \mathrm{d} \Gamma \mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{i} \mathrm{f}^{\prime}} \quad \quad \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{mm}^{\prime} \gamma}=\int \mathrm{d} \Omega \mid \Omega \cdot \mathrm{nlg}_{\mathrm{m}}^{+} \mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{m}^{\prime}}^{-}
\end{aligned}
$$

Figure 1
Three-Dimensional Cartesian Node


Figure 2

> Local Nodal Coordinate System


Figure 3
Orientation of the Positive Directions Along the Sides for Hexagonal Geometry

## III. SOLUTION ALGORITHMS

In this Chapter we present those solution algorithms which are unique to the solution of the response matrix equations contained in VARIANT. In energy, VARIANT is a conventional multigroup code, utilizing algorithms already existing in the DIF3D shell of which it is a part. The energy-group equations are solved by fission source iteration in conjunction with a coarse mesh rebalance acceleration scheme. These iterations, referred to as outer iterations, are described in the DIF3D manual ${ }^{1}$ and in standard texts. To perform such fission source iterations in multigroup problems, it is necessary to be able to solve for the flux moments within a group, given the group source. In VARIANT we use a redblack within-group response matrix algorithm to solve for the partial currents and then reconstruct the flux moments. In Hexagonal geometry the two-color red-black scheme must be replaced by a four color algorithm, but otherwise the logic is the same. In sections III A. we set forth the basic red-black response matrix algorithm, but for brevity the derivation of the four color algorithm is omitted. The inner iterations are accelerated by a partitioned matrix scheme similar to a synthetic diffusion acceleration method. ${ }^{6}$ We examine the matrix partition in Section III B. In Sections III C and III D respectively the implementation of the inner and outer iterations are presented.

## III.A Red-Black Response Matrix Algorithm

The response matrix equations derived in Chapter 2 are represented in a local coordinate system centered about the node. Before we can describe the iterative solution algorithm quantitatively' we must express the coupled set of response matrix equations for all of the nodes in the problem domain in terms of the local equations. We consider here the case of two-dimensional X-Y geometry, before discussing the complication of hexagonal and three-dimensional configurations.

To begin, we first divide the problem into a red-black checkerboard domain. We may then add subscripts to Eq. 2.47 or 2.101 to indicate the $\kappa$ th red node

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{rk}}^{+}=\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{rk}} \mathrm{j}_{\mathrm{rk}}^{-}+\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{rk}} \quad \kappa=1,2,3, \cdots \boldsymbol{K}_{\mathrm{r}} \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where in the case of anisotropic scattering both even- and odd-parity group sources are contained in $\mathbf{q}_{\mathbf{r k}}$. Suppose we now define the partial current and source vectors for the red nodes

$$
\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{r}}^{ \pm}=\left[\begin{array}{c}
\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{r} 1}^{ \pm}  \tag{3.2}\\
\mathbf{j}_{2}^{ \pm} \\
\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{r} 3}^{ \pm} \\
\vdots \\
\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{rr}_{\mathrm{r}}}^{ \pm}
\end{array}\right] \quad \mathbf{q}_{\mathrm{r}}=\left[\begin{array}{c}
\mathbf{q}_{\mathrm{r} 1} \\
\mathbf{q}_{\mathrm{r} 2} \\
\mathbf{q}_{\mathbf{r} 3} \\
\vdots \\
\mathbf{q}_{\mathrm{rr}_{\mathrm{r}}}
\end{array}\right]
$$

and the corresponding block-diagonal global response matrices as

$$
\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{r}}=\left|\begin{array}{cccc}
\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{r} 1} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} &  \tag{3.3}\\
\mathbf{0} & \mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{r} 2} & \mathbf{0} & \\
\mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{r} 3} & \\
& & & \ddots
\end{array}\right|
$$

We may then write the global equations for the red nodes:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{r}}^{+}=\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{r}} \mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{r}}^{-}+\mathbf{q}_{\mathrm{I}} . \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

The equivalent equations for the black nodes are obtained simply by replacing $r$ subscripts with $b$ in the foregoing procedure. The combined set of equations for red and black nodes may thus be written as

$$
\left[\begin{array}{l}
\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{r}}^{+}  \tag{3.5}\\
\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{b}}^{+}
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{r}} & \mathbf{0} \\
\mathbf{0} & \mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{b}}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
\mathrm{j}_{\mathrm{r}} \\
\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{b}}
\end{array}\right]+\left[\begin{array}{c}
\mathbf{q}_{\mathrm{r}} \\
\mathbf{q}_{\mathrm{b}}
\end{array}\right] .
$$

We may now complete the global notation by noting that each component of the incoming partial current to a red cell is the identical to an outgoing partial current component from the adjoining black cell. This may be expressed in terms of a global connectivity matrix $\Pi_{\mathrm{rb}}$ as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{r}}^{-}=\Gamma_{\mathrm{rt}} \mathrm{j}_{\mathrm{b}}^{+} \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

for the red cells and

$$
\begin{equation*}
j_{b}^{-}=\Pi_{\mathrm{br}} \mathrm{j}_{\mathrm{r}}^{+} \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

for the black. Note that the connectivity matrices will have at most one non-zero entry per line and these will be equal to one at internal interfaces. Moreover, $\Pi_{i d}^{\mathrm{T}}=\Pi_{\mathrm{br}}$.

Equations 3.5 through 3.7 may now be used to obtain a single global response matrix equation

$$
\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\mathbf{I} & -\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{r}}  \tag{3.8}\\
-\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{br}} & \mathbf{I}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{r}} \\
\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{b}}
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{l}
\mathbf{q}_{\mathrm{r}} \\
\mathbf{q}_{\mathrm{b}}
\end{array}\right],
$$

where we have defined

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{rb}} \equiv \mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{r}} \mathbf{I I}_{\mathrm{t}} \tag{3.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{br}} \equiv \mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{b}} \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{\mathrm{br}} \tag{3.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

which unlike $\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{r}}$ and $\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{b}}$ are no longer block diagonal For brevity we have also deleted the + superscript from $\mathbf{j}_{r}$ and $\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{b}}$ since corresponding incoming partial currents have been eliminated.

The standard red-black iteration may be written as a matrix splitting in which $\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{br}}$ is moved to the right side of the equation:

$$
\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\mathbf{I} & 0  \tag{3.11}\\
-\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{br}} & \mathbf{I}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{r}} \\
\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{b}}
\end{array}\right]^{l+1}=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
0 & \mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{rb}} \\
0 & 0
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{r}} \\
\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{b}}
\end{array}\right]^{i}+\left[\begin{array}{l}
\mathbf{q}_{\mathrm{r}} \\
\mathbf{q}_{\mathrm{b}}
\end{array}\right]
$$

which reduces to the final two-step iteration process

$$
\begin{gather*}
\mathrm{j}_{\mathrm{r}}^{l+1}=\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{rb}} \mathrm{j}_{\mathrm{b}}^{l}+\mathbf{q}_{\mathrm{r}} \\
\mathrm{j}_{\mathrm{b}}^{l+1}=\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{br}} \mathrm{j}_{\mathrm{r}}^{l+1}+\mathbf{q}_{\mathrm{b}} \tag{3.12}
\end{gather*}
$$

where $l$ is the iteration index.

## III. B The Partitioned Matrix Algorithm

Since the dimensions of transport response matrices are often large, the time per red-black iterations can be quite long. For this reason a partitioned matrix algorithm has been developed which substantially shortens the CPU time required to converge a within-group calculation. ${ }^{6}$ The basic idea is to partition the response matrix between a diffusion-like response matrix with only one term per interface and the larger number of higher-order space-angle interface terms required to achieve accurate transport solutions. An iteration consists of using the existing higher-order terms as a quasi-source to solve the diffusion-
like response matrix equations. Then a single sweep is made through the nodes to update the higher-order moments using the new quasi-diffusion solution. The saving in using this partitioning are often quite large. In three-dimensional $P_{3}$ calculations with bilinear spatial dependence at the interfaces, for example, there are eighteen terms per interface, meaning that the dimension of the full response matrix is eighteen times that of the quasidiffusion calculation. In multigroup eigenvalue computations one such iteration per outer iteration is usually sufficient. In fixed source problems a larger number is required.

The procedure used in deriving the partitioned matrix algorithm parallel to considerable extent those utilized in section III. A. We First partition Eq. 2.47 or 2.101 for the K th red node to obtain an expanded form of Eq. 3.1:
where $\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{rk}}^{0 \pm}$ represents the flat, normal partial currents for a given node, and $\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{rk}}^{\text {at }}$ represents all other higher-order current moments.

We next construct global vectors for the red nodes, analogous to Eqs. 3.2

The equivalent partitioned vectors may be written for each black node by substituting $b$ for $r$. We may then write a partitioned matrix equation analogous to Eq. 3.5 as

To convert from local to global numbering we must make a partition of the $\Pi_{\mathrm{rb}}$ and $\Pi_{\mathrm{br}}$ matrices. These may be written as $\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{r}}^{\mathbf{0}}=\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{\mathrm{rb}}^{\mathbf{0}} \mathbf{j}_{b}^{0+}, \mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{r}}^{\mathbf{l}}=\Pi_{\mathrm{rb}}^{\mathbf{l}} \mathbf{j}_{b}^{\mathbf{l}+}, \mathbf{j}_{b}^{0-}=\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{\mathrm{br}}^{\mathbf{0}} \mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{r}}^{\mathbf{0}+}$ and $j_{b}^{l-}=\Pi_{b r}^{l} j_{r}^{l+}$. Using these expressions to eliminate the incoming currents from the right of Eq. 3.8 , we obtain

$$
\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
\mathbf{I} & -\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{r}}^{00} & \mathbf{0} & -\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{r}}^{\mathrm{ol}}  \tag{3.16}\\
-\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{br}}^{00} & \mathbf{I} & -\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{br}}^{\mathrm{ol}} & \mathbf{0} \\
\mathbf{0} & -\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{rb}}^{\mathrm{oo}} & \mathbf{I} & -\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{rb}}^{\mathrm{l}} \\
-\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{br}}^{10} & \mathbf{0} & -\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{br}}^{\mathrm{ll}} & \mathbf{I}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c}
\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{r}}^{\mathrm{o}} \\
\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{b}}^{\mathrm{o}} \\
\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{r}}^{\mathrm{l}} \\
\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{b}}^{\mathrm{l}}
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{c}
\mathbf{q}_{\mathrm{r}}^{\mathrm{o}} \\
\mathbf{q}_{\mathrm{b}}^{\mathrm{o}} \\
\mathbf{q}_{\mathrm{r}}^{\mathrm{l}} \\
\mathbf{q}_{\mathrm{b}}^{\mathrm{l}}
\end{array}\right]
$$

where analogously to Eqs. 3.9 and 3.10 we have defined

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{D}}^{\alpha \beta} \equiv \mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{r}}^{\alpha \beta} \Pi_{\mathrm{D}}^{\beta} \quad \alpha=0, \mathfrak{l} ; \beta=0, \mathrm{l} \tag{3.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{R}_{b r}^{\alpha \beta} \equiv \mathbf{R}_{b}^{\alpha \beta} \Pi_{b r}^{\beta} . \quad \alpha=0,1 ; \beta=0, \mathrm{l} \tag{3.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

We are now prepared to perform a matrix splitting. We move three of the non-zero submatrices in Eq. 3.16 to the right hand side as follows

Note that with the exception of the $\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{rt}}^{00}$ submartix the coefficient matrix on the left is lower triangular. This suggests that the iterative scheme created by adding the iteration index $l$ to
the partial currents on the right and $l+1$ on those to the left. If we separate the equations into two subsets, the iterative procedure is seen more clearly:

$$
\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\mathbf{I} & -\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{rb}}^{0 \mathrm{o}}  \tag{3.20}\\
-\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{br}}^{00} & \mathbf{I}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c}
\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{r}}^{\mathrm{o}} \\
\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{b}}^{\mathrm{o}}
\end{array}\right]^{l+1}=\left[\begin{array}{c}
\mathbf{q}_{\mathrm{r}}^{\mathrm{o}} \\
\mathbf{q}_{\mathrm{b}}^{\mathrm{o}}
\end{array}\right]+\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\mathbf{0} & \mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{rb}}^{0 \mathrm{ol}} \\
\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{br}}^{0 \mathrm{l}} & \mathbf{0}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{r}}^{l} \\
\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{b}}^{l}
\end{array}\right]^{l}
$$

and

$$
\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\mathbf{I} & 0  \tag{3.21}\\
-\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{br}}^{\mathrm{l}} & \mathbf{I}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{r}}^{\mathrm{l}} \\
\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{b}}^{\mathrm{l}}
\end{array}\right]^{l+\mathrm{l}}=\left[\begin{array}{c}
\mathbf{q}_{\mathrm{r}}^{\mathrm{l}} \\
\mathbf{q}_{\mathrm{b}}^{\mathrm{l}}
\end{array}\right]+\left[\begin{array}{cc}
0 & \mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{r}}^{\mathrm{to}} \\
\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{br}}^{10} & \mathbf{0}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c}
\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{r}}^{\mathrm{o}} \\
\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{b}}^{\mathrm{o}}
\end{array}\right]^{l+1}+\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\mathbf{0} & \mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{rb}}^{\mathrm{l}} \\
\mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c}
\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{r}}^{\mathrm{l}} \\
\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{b}}^{\mathrm{l}}
\end{array}\right]^{l}
$$

To solve for the $l+1$ iterate of $j_{r}^{0}$ and $j_{b}^{0}$ we must invert the operator on the left of the first equation. But this matrix has a much smaller dimension than that in the second equation; its dimension is only equal to the number of node interfaces in the problem domain. In fact the solution is quite analogous to solving the diffusion nodal equation with only the flat components of the current at each interface. For smaller problems it may be economical to invert Eq. 3.20 directly. In VARIANT we employ red-black iteration on Eq. 3.20 in the same manner described in III.B.

Once the $l+1$ iterate of $\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{r}}^{0}$ and $\mathrm{j}_{\mathrm{b}}^{\mathbf{0}}$ is known, the lower triangular structure on the left of the second equation, allows the $l+1$ iterate of $j_{r}^{l}$ and $j_{b}^{l}$ to be determined by a single successive sweep through the red and then the black nodes. For simplified coding, the red-black sweep of the second equation is replaced by a final sweep utilizing the entire response matrix. This modification may be shown to have no effect provided the quasidiffusion calculation is converged. If the quasi-diffusion solution is not completely converged, the inclusion of $\mathbf{j}_{r}^{0}$ and $\mathbf{j}_{b}^{0}$ in the final red-black sweep simply gives a slight improvement in the convergence.

## III. C Inner Iterations

In coding the calculation of the response matrices $\mathbf{R}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ of Eq. 2.47, the LINPACK and LAPACK subroutines related to matrix inversion and matrix multiplication have been used in order to improve computing times

Equation 2.67 is the basic equation solved by inner iteration once the source term is known. A guessed vector $\mathbf{j}^{-}$is used to start the calculation. Boundary conditions are used
to perform a complete sweep over the geometry and continuity conditions (outgoing partial current through an interface set equal to the incoming partial current for the adjacent node) are used to update the currents and perform inner iterations.

For boundary conditions the incoming partial currents on nodal surfaces which form part of the outer boundary of the solution domain are computed in terms of the outgoing partial current on the same surface:

$$
\mathbf{j}^{-}=\gamma \mathbf{j}^{+}
$$

where the albedo $\gamma$ is given by:

$$
\gamma=\frac{1-2 a}{1+2 a}
$$

with " $a$ " being the flux extrapolation constant. For the diffusion ( $\mathrm{P}_{1}$ ) approximation we have:

| zero flux boundary condition: | $\mathrm{a}=\infty$ | $\gamma=-1$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| zero incoming current boundary condition | $\mathrm{a}=0.5$ | $\gamma=0$ |
| zero flux at extrapolated boundaries | $\mathrm{a}=0.4692$ | $\gamma=0.4692$ |
| zero net current (reflective boundary condition | $\mathrm{a}=0$ | $\gamma=+1$ |

Periodic boundary conditions are treated by using the computed outgoing current across a boundary as an incoming current across the corresponding periodic boundary.

For the transport calculations, the void boundary condition is represented by Eq. 2.38. For the reflective and periodic boundary conditions, because of the spherical harmonics expansion chosen, $\gamma$ is set equal to +1 or -1 according to the moment of the partial current considered.

The total number of unknowns involved in a calculation is given by the number of nodes multiplied by the number of sides of the nodes and by the total number of moments of the partial current on each side. In hexagonal-Z geometry, a full $\mathrm{P}_{3}$ approximation, with a linear approximation on each surface results in 144 unknowns ( $8 \times 6 \times 3$ ) per node.

The unaccelerated inner iteration is performed by ordering the nodes and carrying out a red-black ( $\sigma_{1}$ ordering) sweep of the spatial grid. In hexagonal geometry, consistent with the existing algorithm of the DIF3D nodal option, a four color ordering has been applied.

The number of inner iterations $\mathbf{M g}$ in group $g$ for a plane is determined in a manner similar to that of the nodal option of DIF3D. Define:

$$
\begin{equation*}
k_{g}=\frac{1}{N_{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} k_{g}^{n} h \quad k_{g}^{n}=\sqrt{\sigma_{g}^{r, n} / D_{g}^{n}} \tag{3.22}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\sigma_{g}^{r, n}$ is the removal (absorption ioutscattering) cross section of the node $n$ and $D_{g}^{n}$ is the diffusion coefficient.

The dimension " $h$ " is taken equal to the lattice pitch in hexagonal geometry and to the square root of the area in $x-y$ geometry. The quantity kg is simply the averaged value of the node dimension measured in diffusion lengths. The convergence rate of the iterative procedure increases with increasing kg since the spectral radius of the Gauss-Seidel iteration matrix decreases with increasing node size. The decreased spectral radius of the iteration matrix is due to the decreasing value of the transmission coefficient with increasing node size, which in turn increases the diagonal dominance of the global coefficient matrix. In view of this observation, plus numerical results for a number of test problems, the following simple formula is used to determine the number of inner iterations in each group g:

$$
\mathbf{M}_{\mathrm{g}}=\left\{\begin{array}{cl}
5, & \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{g}}>1 \\
10, & 0.5<\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{g}}<1 \\
15, & \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{g}}<0.5
\end{array}\right\}
$$

The strategy adopted for the three-dimensional solution of Eq. 2.47 is consistent with the one used in the original DIF3D nodal option. Instead of considering the full matrix, $\mathbf{R}$ is split into the plane components and the axial ones. Then the contributions coming from the incoming axial partial currents are included in the source term. The inner (plane)iterations are performed in each plane to calculate the outgoing partial currents and axial inner iterations (sweeps) are then performed with an odd-even ordering of the planes. An algorithm, not present in the original code has been introduces to calculate the number of axial inner iterations $\mathrm{Max}^{\mathrm{ax}}$. It is similar to the planar algorithm, except that h in Eq. 3.22 is equal to the axial mesh size of the node, and the number of iterations is now selected to be

$$
M_{g}^{a x}=\left\{\begin{array}{ll}
2, & \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{g}}>0.5 \\
4, & \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{g}}<0.5
\end{array}\right\}
$$

In coding the algorithms, much care has been taken in order to insure a maximum use of vectorization, especially in solving Eqs. 3.20 and 3.21 , which are fully and optimally vectorized,

Several attempts have been made to take advantage of symmetry of the matrix and the presence of a significant number of zero values in the response matrix due to the orthogonality of the expansion functions. Unfortunately, the penalty associated with the use of an indirect addressing and a partial loss of vectorization has discouraged such an approach. Therofore, the full response matrices are presently used for the computation of the partial curreats.

## 1H. D Outer Mmrations

Once the partial currents are calculated the average flux in the node may be evaluated using Eq. 2.52. When the scalar flux moments are known, the $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{eff}}$ calculation can proceed as in a standard code, by the evaluation of the fission source. Than, a new outer iteration can be performed with the evaluation of the inner iteration process of the required quantities group by group (currents, fluxes, scattering sources).

An attempt was made to accelerate the convergence of the outer iterations by introducing the Chebychev polynomial method. The already existing machinery used by the finite difference optipn of DIF3D was employed. Unfortunately, the acceleration method turned oun to be ineffective, and sometimes slowed convergence. No clear reasons have been found to explain such a behavior. The Chebychev polynomial acceleration is independent of the algorithm used to solve the fixed source problem related to a single outer iteration, provided that the inner iterations are sufficiently converged. Nevertheless, it was found that greatly increasipg the number of full-matrix inner iterations has no positive impact on the efficiency of the Chebychev method when applied to the variational nodal method, Moreover, a similar trend has been observed when this acceleration method has been applied to the original DIF3D nodal option. A possible explanation is related to the presence of flux moments, and therefore of fission source moments. In this situation, the dominance ratio calculated to evaluate the acceleration parameters will not be representative of the entire iterative matrix because only the first moment of the fission source is used in its determination.

For this reason it was decided to apply and adapt the algorithms already existing in the DIF3D nodal option to accelerate the outer iterations: coarse mesh rebalancing and
asymptotic source extrapolation. Full details of these methods are given in Ref. 15. We only note that in calculating the leakage term of the coarse mesh rebalance equation we use only the first moment of the partial currents because of the physical meaning of the quantity. Slight differences are also caused by the fact that in our algorithm the partial currents appear as integrated quantities over the node surface, whereas in the original DIF3D nodal option, the partial currents are averaged values. The efficiency of the coarse mesh rebalance acceleration and the asymptotic source extrapolation methods has been verified for use in conjunction with the variational nodal method by several numerical tests.

## IV. NUMERICAL CALCULATIONS

Several numerical calculations have been carried out in order to determine the optimum order of spatial approximation for the flux, source and leakage dependence. Based on these results, it was decided to adopt a fourth order expansion for the flux dependence inside the node. A linear leakage spatial dependence has been adopted together with a quadratic expansion for the source. When using simplified spherical harmonics, a flat approximation on the leakage term is used. Because of error compensation, this approximation was found to give better results. Of course, all these approximation have been left parametrized in the code in such a way that the user can change them.

## IV. A Two Dimensional Results

In Table II we show the results obtained from an $x-y$ model of the EBR-II reactor similar to the one defined in reference 24 . The model has been modified in order to enhance the transport effect (more than $3 \%$ of $\Delta \mathrm{K} / \mathrm{K}$ ). A nine group energy structure is used.

Table II. EBR-II x-y Geometry (enhanced transport effect)

| Type of Calculation | $\mathbf{K}_{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}$ | CPU Time (sec) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{S}_{4}(\Delta)$ | 0.99314 | 3.5 |
| $\mathrm{~S}_{8}(\Delta)$ | 0.99070 | 5.5 |
| $\mathrm{~S}_{8}(4 \Delta)$ | 1.01417 | 24.4 |
| $\mathrm{~S}_{8}(16 \Delta)$ | 1.01980 | 20.0 |
| ${\text { VARIANT } P_{1} \text { (diffusion) }}^{\text {VARIANT } \mathrm{P}_{31}}$ | 0.99084 | $0.9(0.3+0.6)$ |
| VARIANT Simpl. $\mathrm{P}_{3}$ | 1.02361 | $2.1(1.1+0.6)$ |
| VARIANT $\mathrm{P}_{3}$ | 1.02409 | $1.2(0.6+0.6)$ |
| Reference | 1.02207 | $6.8(4.2+2.6)$ |

For VARIANT the breakdown of, respectively, response matrix coefficients and outer iteration CPU calculation time is given in parenthesis.

For this case we report also the $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}}$ results for different angular approximations and different mesh sizes the basic mesh grid $\Delta$, used in the nodal calculation, has been successively refined by dividing the mesh size by two (4 4 ) and four ( $16 \Delta$ )). The $S_{N}$ calculations have been carried out using the highly optimized TWODANT code ${ }^{25}$. The reference solutions have been obtained by extrapolation of the refined TWODANT finite difference calculations.

The $S_{N}$ calculations are very poor for the basic mesh grid where both $S_{4}$ and $S_{8}$ give results comparable with the diffusion calculation ( $\mathrm{P}_{1}$ solution of VARIANT). The $\mathrm{S}_{8}$ ( $16 \Delta$ ) calculation, which is still not as accurate as the $\mathrm{P}_{3}$ solution of VARIANT, requires a factor 3 more computation time. All calculations, as well as the ones presented in the following, have been carried out on a RISC 6000/350 IBM workstation.

The $\mathrm{P}_{31}$ (corresponding to the reduced angular approximation) and the simplified spherical harmonic calculations provide comparable results. They overestimate the reference solution by less than $0.2 \%$ of $\Delta \mathrm{K} / \mathrm{K}$, and, therefore, account for more than $90 \%$ of the total transport effect. The simplified spherical harmonic approximation requires almost half the time of the $\mathrm{P}_{31}$ calculation.

We also observe that for the full $P_{3}$ approximation most of the time is spent in the coupling coefficient calculation. This time is 14 times larger than that required for the corresponding $P_{1}$ (diffusion) calculation. The reason is related to the different number of floating point operation, which increases as the square of the response matrix dimension.

In Table III we show results for an EBR-II hexagonal 2D model. In this case the total transport effect is of the order of $1.3 \% \Delta \mathrm{~K} / \mathrm{K}$. The $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}}$ calculations were carried out with the TWOHEX ${ }^{26}$ code, using 6 triangles $(\Delta)$ or 24 triangles $(4 \Delta)$ per subassembly. Recall that in the case of the variational nodal method, only one node per subassembly is used.

Comparing computing times, we can note that the TWOHEX $S_{4}(\Delta)$ calculation requires 5 times more CPU time than the VARIANT $P_{3}$ solution, which is in satisfactory

Table III. EBR-II Hexagonal 2-D Geometry

| Type of Calculation | $\mathbf{K}_{\mathrm{er}}$ | CPU Time (sec) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{S}_{4}(\Delta)$ | 1.03240 | 89.5 |
| $\mathrm{~S}_{8}(\Delta)$ | 1.03274 | 268.2 |
| $\mathrm{~S}_{8}(4 \Delta)$ | 1.03285 | 1053 |
| VARIANT $_{\mathbf{1}}$ (diffusion) | 1.01882 | $2.6(0.4+2.2)$ |
| ${\text { VARIANT } \mathrm{P}_{31}}^{\text {VARIANT Simpl. } \mathrm{P}_{3}}$ | 1.03641 | $6.0(3.7+2.3)$ |
| VARIANT $\mathrm{P}_{3}$ | 1.03396 | $1.8(0.8+1.0)$ |
| Reference | 1.03326 | $17.6(9.0+8.6)$ |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ For VARIANT the breakdown of, respectively, response matrix coefficients and outer iteration CPU calculation time is given in parenthesis.
agreement with the reference solution. Again a significant time is spent in computing the response matrix coefficients. This is due to the presence of a large number (19) of nodes with different compositions. The simplified spherical harmonic calculation gives a solution that is clearly more accurate than the $\mathrm{P}_{31}$ solution and requires more than a factor 3 less time.

We also point out that, in hexagonal geometry, VARIANT provides better results than the nodal diffusion approximation of DIF3D ${ }^{15}$ for diffusion calculations when the solutions from both methodologies are compared against a reference solution obtained by extrapolating the finite difference results to a zero mesh size ${ }^{27}$. This is related to the fact that the variational nodal method employs a complete polynomial expansion to describe the flux intranodal spatial dependence, whereas in the case of the DIF3D nodal option, cross terms are neglected. This is not the case in Cartesian geometry where the two methods give almost identical results for diffusion calculation when similar approximations are used for the flux, source and leakage spatial dependence.

## IV. B Three Dimensional Results

The Takeda benchmark ${ }^{28}$ model 2 has been used totest the performance of VARIANT in three dimensional Cartesian geometry. This model is representative of a small FBR reactor and employs a four group energy structure. Results are shown in Table IV. The reference solution is provided by the ANL VIM ${ }^{29}$ Monte Carlo code using the same multigroup cross section set. Table IV also exhibits results (from reference 28 ) of $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}}$ solutions calculated by the THREEDANT code ${ }^{25}$.

Table IV. Takeda Benchmark Model 2 x-y-z Geometry Small FBR

| Type of Calculation | $\mathrm{K}_{\text {erf }}$ Rod Out | $\mathrm{K}_{\text {eff }}$ Rod In | Control Rod Worth | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPU Time } \\ \text { (sec) }^{\mathbf{a}} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Monte Carlo VIM | $\begin{gathered} 0.97344 \pm \\ 0.00036 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.95988 \pm \\ 0.00038 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1451 \pm \\ & 0.00057 \end{aligned}$ | $\sim 8 \mathrm{hrs}$ |
| Threedant $\mathrm{S}_{8}$ | 0.97348 | 0.95931 | 0.1517 | - |
| DIF3D Nodal Transport Option | 0.97138 | 0.95701 | 0.1546 | 11.7 (0.5 + 11.2$)$ |
| VARIANT $\mathrm{P}_{1}$ | 0.96913 | 0.95430 | 0.1604 | $44.5(0.3+44.2)$ |
| VARIANT $\mathrm{P}_{31}$ | 0.97228 | 0.95814 | 0.1518 | $46.9(1.6+45.3)$ |
| VARIANT <br> Simpl. $\mathrm{P}_{3}$ | 0.97429 | 0.96028 | 0.1497 | 28.7 (0.6 + 18.1) |
| VARIANT $\mathrm{P}_{3}$ | 0.97349 | 0.95942 | 0.1506 | $562(25+537)$ |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ For VARIANT the breakdown of, respectively, response matrix coefficients and outer iteration CPU calculation time is given in parenthesis.

The $P_{3}$ VARIANT results are very similar to the $S_{8}$ calculations. Both solutions are in very good agreement with the reference Monte Carlo calculation. Of course, the CPU time required by VARIANT is more than one order of magnitude less than that needed by VIM.

The simplified spherical harmonic solution is again more accurate than the $P_{31}$ solution and requires even less CPU time than the diffusion solution. For comparison, we have also displayed the results obtained by the transport option of the DIF3D nodal
calculation. Altough the time required is less than that for the simplified spherical harmonics, we observe that the latter solution provides better results for both $\mathrm{K}_{\text {eff }}$ and control rod worth.

Finally to test the code in 3D hexagonal geometry, we have considered the simplified model of EBR-II provided in reference 24 (see figure 4). Results are provided in Table V.

Table V. EBR-II Hexagonal-z Geometry

| Type of Calculation | $\mathbf{K}_{\text {eff }}$ | CPU Time (sec) ${ }^{\mathbf{2}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Monte Carlo VIM | $1.20423 \pm 0.00045$ | $\approx 4$ days |
| VARIANT $P_{1}$ | 1.17268 | $73(2+71)$ |
| VARIANT $P_{31}$ | 1.19523 | $213(42+171)$ |
| VARIANT Simpl. $P_{3}$ | 1.20292 | $47(5+42)$ |
| VARIANT $P_{3}$ | 1.20349 | $1542(308+1234)$ |

${ }^{a}$ For VARIANT the breakdown of, respectively, response matrix coefficients and outer iteration CPU calculation time is given in parenthesis.

The $P_{3}$ variational nodal eigenvalue is within a few tenths of one percent of the VIM Monte Carlo çode result. We note that the VIM calculation required a few days of CPU time against the 26 minutes required by VARIANT.

The simplified spherical harmonics calculation provides far superior results to the $P_{31}$ solution ( $96 \%$ of the total transport effect against $72 \%$ ) with a CPU time that again is lower than the diffusion calculation. This is mainly due to the lower number of outer iterations required to converge. The number of unknowns are the same for the diffusion and the simplified harmonic approximation (16 per node).

In Table VI the comparison for the hexagonal row axially integrated power obtained is shown. As we can see, the discrepancy between the $P_{3}$ and the VIM values does not exceed $0.5 \%$. The diffusion solution has discrepancies of the order of $5 \%$ in the reflector and blanket regions, whereas the maximum error for the simplified spherical harmonic calculation is of the order of $1 \%$ and occurs in the first ring of the reflector region.

Figure 4
EBR-II Representation for a Three Dimensional Criticality Problem


Table VI. EBR-II Ring Axially Integrated Power (MWth)

| Ring | VIM | ${\text { VARIANT } \mathbf{P}_{1}{ }^{a}}^{2}$ | VARIANT Simpl. P ${ }_{3}{ }^{2}$ | VARIANT P $_{3}{ }^{\mathbf{a}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 3.440 | $3.395(-1.31)$ | $3.425(-0.44)$ | $3.441(0.03)$ |
| 2 | 3.385 | $3.343(-1.25)$ | $3.373(-0.35)$ | $3.387(0.06)$ |
| 3 | 6.500 | $6.431(-1.06)$ | $6.486(-0.22)$ | $6.508(0.12)$ |
| 4 | 9.084 | $9.027(-0.63)$ | $9.098(0.15)$ | $9.117(0.36)$ |
| 5 | 10.975 | $10.938(-0.34)$ | $11.009(0.31)$ | $11.010(0.32)$ |
| 6 | 12.089 | $12.065(-0.20)$ | $12.089(0.00)$ | $12.067(-0.78)$ |
| 7 | 12.457 | $12.606(1.20)$ | $12.432(-0.20)$ | $12.400(-0.46)$ |
| 8 | $14.435 \times 10^{-2}$ | $15.166 \times 10^{-2}(5.06)$ | $14.587 \times 10^{-2}(1.05)$ | $14.492 \times 10^{-2}(-0.39)$ |
| 9 | $14.65 \times 10^{-2}$ | $15.40 \times 10^{-2}(5.17)$ | $14.763 \times 10^{-2}(0.76)$ | $14.676 \times 10^{-2}(0.17)$ |
| 10 | $13.112 \times 10^{-2}$ | $13.816 \times 10^{-2}(5.37)$ | $13.222 \times 10^{-2}(0.84)$ | $13.143 \times 10^{-2}(0.24)$ |
| 11 | $95.30 \times 10^{-3}$ | $10.058 \times 10^{-2}(5.53)$ | $96.098 \times 10^{-3}(0.83)$ | $95.595 \times 10^{-3}(0.30)$ |
| 12 | $64.846 \times 10^{-2}$ | $68.179 \times 10^{-2}(5.14)$ | $65.316 \times 10^{-2}(0.72)$ | $65.158 \times 10^{-2}(0.48)$ |
| 13 | $37.505 \times 10^{-2}$ | $39.165 \times 10^{-2}(4.43)$ | $37.627 \times 10^{-2}(0.33)$ | $37.614 \times 10^{-2}(0.29)$ |
| 14 | $21.972 \times 10^{-2}$ | $22.829 \times 10^{-2}(3.90)$ | $21.960 \times 10^{-2}(-0.05)$ | $21.984 \times 10^{-2}(0.05)$ |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Discrepancy (in percent) with respect to the reference VIM value is given in parenthesis.

## V. USER INFORMATION

VARIANT can be executed as an option in a standard DIF3D calculation. This section highlights information of particular interest to users of the variational nodal option and supplements the documentation provided in references 1 and 15 and the description of the BCD input files.

## V. A Data Management

In order to minimize differences with the original coding of DIF3D, data management has been kept with the same strategy of two large blocks of work space (fast and extended core memory) even as two-level computers are becoming obsolete. The philosophy of containment stays the same: extended core memory contains arrays which can be stored on external data files.

Because a large memory size is required to store nodal coupling coefficients, a special strategy has been introduced for their management. First, all the matrices involved in the response matrix equation and in the flux and source evaluations are mapped for unique nonzero values. This mapping is done before the total memory requirement is evaluated and demands a sizable quantity of memory (of the order of the one normally required in the fast core memory array).

If the memory allocated by the user for the extended core array is sufficient, matrices are used as they are; otherwise they are compressed and only unique elements are stored along with their location in the original matrices. Of course, with the compressed matrices computation time during outer iterations is penalized because of the use of indirect addressing.

Due to the methodology of modeling anisotropic scattering in VARIANT, a new COMPXS file structure has been implemented. The modification has been made in order to
preserve compatibility with already existing codes that use COMPXS files. The description of the new file structure is presented in Appendix B.

To enhance the performance on vector machines a new ordering of the partial current moments has been adopted. This is reflected in the new specification of the NHFLUX file structure shown in Appendix C. Contrary to the COMPXS file, the NHFLUX generated by VARIANT will be incompatible with existing codes that use partial currents with moments greater than first.

Recall that in order to reduce storage and computation time, the flux in VARIANT is evaluated, using Eq. 2.52 -- only up to the number of moments of the source expansion. This is done because only these moments of the flux are needed to compute the new outer iteration source distribution. Therefore, only these moments are stored on the NHFLUX file. In the case of the anisotropic calculation, the even-parity angular flux moments are also evaluated and stored on NHFLUX, because they are needed in the anisotropic source computation.

A post processor program, that reads the flux moments from the NHFLUX file, reconstructs the flux locally at designated points of specified subassemblies and computes the related reaction rates, will be soon made available.

## V. B Variational Nodal Parameters

A new card 12 of the BCD input file A.DIF3D (see Appendix D) has been introduced to specify the nodal variational parameters. Some comments on their meaning and use follow.

## V. B.1 Nodal Spatial Approximation

Default values for within the node flux spatial approximations are fourth order in Cartesian geometry and sixth order in hexagonal geometry. Linear dependence of the leakage
on the surface of the node is also recommended. These values eliminate rank deficiency from the nodal coupling coefficient matrices. ${ }^{22}$

Figure 5 shows the required internal order for a given surface approximation in order to insure rank sufficiency. For a linear approximation of the spatial leakage slope, a third order intra nodal flux expansion is needed for Cartesian geometry, and a sixth order expansion is needed for hexagonal geometry. For a very tight convergence criteria (e.g., $\sim 10^{-7}$ ), rank deficiency will result in a lack of convergence. For relaxed convergence criteria (e.g., $\sim 10^{-5}$ ), third order for Cartesian and fourth order for hexagonal geometry can be safely used in connection with linear approximation on the leakage term. For three-dimensional hexagonal geometries, the axial expansion is kept to fourth order in order to minimize the size of the response matrices while insuring rank sufficiency.

The order of the default source expansion polynomial is taken equal to one greater than the surface approximation. It has been found that in some cases (especially for thermal reactor configurations) an order equal to that used for the intra-nodal flux is necessary to insure good power distribution results.

## V. B. 2 Angular Approximations

Specification of the $P_{1}$ approximation for both flux and leakage will provide diffusion results. Using $P_{3}$ for the flux and $P_{1}$ for the leakage will trigger the use of the reduced angular approximation. With a negative value for the angular approximation variable input, the code will use the corresponding simplified spherical harmonics. Because of error compensation, the best results in this case are most often obtained with a flat (0) approximation for the spatial dependence of the leakage on the surface of the node. The flux angular expansion cannot be lower than the anisotropic order NPNO specified later.

Surface Expansion

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
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\equiv \text { projection deficient rank }
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## V. B. 3 Asymptotic Extrapolation Sentinel

A new option, (asymptotic extrapolation) has been introduced. This option is invoked by setting the sentinel to -1 . In this case only the fission sources are accelerated and no extra space is needed to store previous outer iteration partial currents. No significant penalty has been observed in the performance of the acceleration using this option.

## V. B. 4 Anisotropic Scattering Order (NPNO) and Extended Transport Approximation (NXTR)

No anisotropic order greater than either MAXORD (scattering order of cross sections on the COMPXS file) or the flux angular expansion is allowed.

An option (NEXTR parameter) to invoke the use of the total cross section, transport cross section, or extended transport approximation is described below.

NEXTR set to a negative value is intended solely to perform comparison calculation and should not be used for any other purpose. This setting forces the use of the zero moment of the total cross section for isotropic calculations, and the use of the transport cross section for anisotropic calculations.

The default value of 0 is strongly recommended for NEXTR. With this value the transport cross section is used for isotropic calculation. For the anisotropic calculations the total cross section is used unless the value of NPNO is lower than MAXORD. In this case the BHS approximation ${ }^{30}$ is applied (the extended transport approximation corrects the total cross section by taking into account the NPNO+1 order of the anisotropic scattering).

If NEXTR is specified to set at a value N greater than NPNO, an extended transport approximation is applied from NPNO +1 to NXTR. Be aware that if NXTR is greater than NPNO+1, this correction is done at the risk of the user; there is no proof that such correction will give reasonable results.

With these premises, having a pair of identical values for NPNO and NXTR ( $00,11,22,33$, etc.) will be strictly equivalent to having: $00,10,20,30$, etc.

## V. B.5 Nodal Coupling Coefficient Packing Option

The default value (0) results in no packing of the nodal coupling matrices unless the array length provided by the user for the extended core memory is not sufficient. The user can force the packing by providing a value of 1 for this option. This sometimes can be useful when it will allow the problem to run with all the group constants (cross sections, fluxes, currents) in core, thus reducing the input/output operations and therefore compensating for the increase in CPU time resulting from the use of indirect addressing to unpack the matrices during the iterations calculations. Workstations with poor input/output performances seem to benefit most from this strategy.

## V. B. 6 Radial Inner Iteration Algorithm

The default value (0) implies the use of the partitioned algorithm. For an outer iteration, n inner iteration are first performed on the first moment of the partial currents, the higher moments contributions are included in the source term. This is followed by a full sweep on all the moments. Sometimes, the full sweep matrix algorithm is necessary to avoid convergence problems. This is performed by applying the partitioned algorithm cycle $n$ times, where $n$ is the total number of inner iterations.

When the maximum number of outer iterations or convergence is reached, proper convergence of the inner iterations is checked. The last outer iteration is performed using the full sweep matrix algorithm. The inner iteration convergence criteria is identical to the pointwise fission source specified in convergence criteria card 5. Only the first moment of the partial currents is checked.

## V. C Limitations

Enough memory must be allocated to contain all the information for at least one energy group. Flux and source expansions up to sixth order are allowed in hexagonal geometry, fourth order in Cartesian geometry. Partial current expansion up to second order are allowed. Angular and scattering expansion of up to $\mathrm{P}_{5}$ are allowed. For highly heterogeneous reactor configurations involving thousands of different node types, calculation and storage of response matrices represents the primary computational cost. In problems of this type, it is highly desirable to store as many response matrices as possible in fast memory.

## V. D Programming Information

The programming structure of the nodal option of DIF3D has been retained for the VARIANT option. Many of the existing subroutines have been modified, keeping essentially the same functionality, and added with a new name where a V replaces an N . The list of modified subroutines can be found in Table VII. Table VIII lists the names of the new subroutines thiat were not part of the original version of DIF3D. The call tree for the main branches of the VARIANT option is shown in Fig. 6, keeping in mind that, referring to Fig. 7.1 of Ref. 15, VHINTT, VHSST and VSINIT have replaced NHINIT, NHSST and XSINIT. Subroutines starting with D belong to the LAPACK and LINPACK mathematical package. A new common block /VARIAN/, which contains parameters specific to the nodal variational option, has been added. Finally in Table IX we show the list of the original DIF3D subroutines that have been modified, without changing their name, in order to accommodate the new VARIANT option and the new COMPXS file structure with anisotropic scattering capability.
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Table VII. List of Modified Original DIF3D Subroutines, With Name Changes where a V Replaces an $\mathbf{N}$

| RVHFLX | VHCCPT | VLXZ | VSERRN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| VALINT | VHCMPT | VMBKRG | VSGET1 |
| VBLADD | VHCORE | VMFSYM | VSGET2 |
| VCCEL | VHDISK | VMINIT | VSINIT |
| VCCL3D | VHEDDM | VMJBDJ | VSTOU1 |
| VCHEX | VHGEOM | VMMTRX | VSTOU2 |
| VCHEXB | VHINED | VNHCCC | VSUPDT |
| VCMPXS | VHINIT | VNHFIN | VUTR1 |
| VCZ | VHINNR | VNHOUT | VUTR2 |
| VCZB | VHOED0 | VNHSTT | VUTR3 |
| VDSCTM | VHPEAK | VONVCK | VUTR4 |
| VEXBAL | VHPKED | VRCFIS | VUTR5 |
| VEXREA | VHPNT | VRCHEX | VXINIT |
| VFINI | VHSHAP | VRCSCT | VXSHAP |
| VFXREA | VHSST | VRCZ1 | VXYZCC |
| VHCC2D | VHXSEC | VSCREV | WVHFLX |
| VHCC3D | VLXHEX | VSEDIT |  |

Table VIII. List of the New Subroutines that Were Not Part of the Original Version of DIF3D

| CONCKI | MACXY | SRCSCP | VCOH3D |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HALCOP | MACXYZ | TVACBC | VCOXY |
| MACH2D | NPKCC | UNIEL | VCOXYZ |
| MACH3D | PCXY | VCOH2D | ZERMAP |

Table IX. List of Modified Original DIF3D Subroutines Without Name Changes

| BCDINP | EDITCR | SSTATE | OVL2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BININP | LINKR1 | COPIER | OVL3 |
| DIF3D | LINKR2 | DOMODS | OVL5 |
| DSST01 | NHSIGA | FARSET | SVSCAT |
| DSST02 | PDIF3D | HMG4C | UPDATE |
| DSST03 | RADF3D | ISOR58 | WREC1 |
| DXSREV | SSINIT | MAXBND | WREC4 |

Figure 6. Call Tree for the Main Branches of the VARIANT Option

| VEINIT | CLOSCF |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | DEFICF |  |  |  |
| - | HETOMAP |  |  |  |
| - | ICRED |  |  |  |
| - | ICRIT |  |  |  |
| - | NHZEMP |  |  |  |
| - | OPEACF |  |  |  |
| - | purger |  |  |  |
| - | PURES |  |  |  |
| - | POTM |  |  |  |
| - | VECCPT | ICRED |  |  |
| - | VECAPPT |  |  |  |
| - | VECORE | DEFICF |  |  |
| - | . | DELECF |  |  |
| - | - | EDITCR |  |  |
| - | - | ERROR |  |  |
| - | - | TNISET |  |  |
| - | - | unins |  |  |
| - | - | PURGCF |  |  |
| - | - | PURGE |  |  |
| - | - | WIPOUT |  |  |
| - | VFIDISX | DEFIDF |  |  |
| - |  | DOPC |  |  |
| - | - | ERROR |  |  |
| - | VEGEON | Geris |  |  |
| - | . | SPRCC | ERROR |  |
| - | . | - | LINES |  |
| - | . | - | mace2d | DCOPY |
| - | - | - | - | DGEMM |
| - | - | - |  | DGETF2 |
| - | - | - | - | DGETRI |
| - | - | - |  | DPOTF2 |
| - | - | - |  | DPOTRI |
| - | - | - | - , | DSCAL |
| - | - | - |  | DSYER |
| - | . | - |  | HALCOP |
| - | - | - | Mack3D | DGEner |
| - | - | - |  | DGETY2 |
| - | - | - | - | DGETRI |
| - | - | - |  | DPOTF2 |
| - | - | - |  | DPOTRI |
| - | - | , | - | DSCAL |
| - | - | - | - | DSYMEA |
| - | - | - |  | HaLCOP |
| - | - | - | Macxy | DCOPY |
| - | - | - |  | DGEmed |
| - | - | - |  | DGETF2 |
| - | - | - | - | DGETRI |
| - | - | - |  | DPOTF2 |
| - | - | - | - | DPOTRI |
| - | - | - |  | DSCAL |
| - | - | - | - | DSYEM |
| - | - | - |  | HALCOP |
| - | - | - | MACXYZ | DCOPY |
| - | - | - | - | DGEmy |
| - | - | . |  | DGETF2 |
| - | - | - | - | DGETRI |
| - | - | - | - | DPOTF2 |
| - | - | - | - | DPOTRI |
| - | - | - | - | DSCAL |
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| - | VONVCK |
| :---: | :---: |
| - | VSERRN |
| blikget |  |
| BLKPOT |  |
| closcr |  |
| FINGET |  |
| FINPUT |  |
| FLTSET |  |
| ICRED |  |
| OPENCF |  |
| PCRED |  |
| PCRIT |  |
| SEEK |  |
| vexren | ERROR |
| - | FLTSET |
| - | LINES |
| - | PCRED |
| - | PCRIT |
| - | REED |
| - | SEER |
| Vrsiny |  |
| vFXREA | ERROR |
| - | INrSET |
| . | LINES |
| - | PCRED |
| - | PCRIT |
| - | REED |
| VMINIT | FLTSET |
| VxImIT | FLTSET |


| VEIMIT | CLOSCF |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | ERROR |  |  |
| - | LINES |  |  |
| . | OPENCT |  |  |
| - | PSTCET |  |  |
| - | purcer |  |  |
| . | PURGE |  |  |
| - | PUIM |  |  |
| - | SEEA |  |  |
| - | vsast1 | BLKPOT |  |
| . | . | CLOSDF |  |
| - | . | ERROR |  |
| - | - | fequat |  |
| - | - | FINPUT |  |
| - | - | FLTSET |  |
| . | - | IEqJAT |  |
| - | . | LIMES |  |
| . | - | OPENDF |  |
| - | - | REED |  |
| . | . | RITE |  |
| - | - | VEEDIT | CERFLT |
| - |  |  | IINES |
| - | VSGET2 | BLKPUT |  |
| - | - | CLOSDF |  |
| . | - | FINPUT |  |
| - | - | OPENDF |  |
| . | . | REED |  |
| . | WIPOUT |  |  |
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## APPENDIX A

Mathematical Scripts Used to Generate the Orthogonal Polynomials and the Submatrices needed to Calculate the Response Matrix Coefficients and the Flux Reconstruction Arrays.

## ANGULAR TRIAL FUNCTIONS

## ( $x, y, z$ are direction cosines)

FILE: even_parity.functions.2d

```
(**************************************************************************)
(*
(* Even Parity spherical harmonics, through P4 terms: *)
(* Y[0,0], Y[2,2], Y[2,1], Y[2,0], Y[4,4], Y[4,3], Y[4,2], Y[4,1], Y[4,0] *)
(*
*)
(*******************************************************************************)
```

```
g={
    1,
    1/2 Sqrt[15] ( y^2 - z^2 ),
    -Sqrt[15] x y,
-1/2 Sqrt[5] (1-3 x^2),
    3/8 Sqrt[35] ( y^4 - 6 y^2 z^2 + ( z^4)),
-3/2 Sqrt[35/2] x y ( y^2 - 3 z^2 ) ,
-3/4 Sqrt[5] ( y^2 - z^2 ) ( 1 - 7 x^2) ),
    3/2 Sqrt[5/2] x y ( 3-7 x^2),
3/8 ( 3-30 x^2 + 35 x^4),
    }
```

FILE: odd_parity.functions.2d

```
(*************************************************************************)
(* *)
(* Odd Parity spherical harmonics, through P5 terms with \(Y[n, n]\) deleted: *)
(* \(Y[1,0], Y[3,2], Y[3,1], Y[3,0], Y[5,4], Y[5,3], Y[5,2], Y[5,1], Y[5,0] *)\)
(* *)
(****************************************************************************)
```

| $k=\{$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sqre [3] | $\mathbf{x}$, |
| 1/2 | Sqre [105] | $x\left(y^{\wedge} 2-z^{\wedge} 2\right)$, |
| 1/2 | Sqrt [21/2] | $y\left(1-5 x^{\wedge} 2\right)$, |
| 1/2 | Sqrt[7] | $x\left(5 x^{\wedge} 2-3\right)$, |
| -3/8 | Sqre [385] | $x\left(y^{\wedge} 4-6 y^{\wedge} 2 z^{\wedge} 2+z^{\wedge} 4\right)$, |
| $-1 / 8$ | Sqrt[385/2] | $y\left(9 x^{\wedge} 2-1\right)\left(y^{\wedge} 2-3 z^{\wedge} 2\right)$, |
| 1/4 | Sqrt [1155] | $x\left(3 x^{\wedge} 2-1\right)\left(y^{\wedge} 2-z^{\wedge} 2\right)$, |
| -1/8 | Sqrt[165] | $y\left(1-14 x^{\wedge} 2+21 x^{\wedge} 4\right)$, |
| 1/8 | Sqrt [11] | $x\left(63 x^{\wedge} 4-70 x^{\wedge} 2+15\right)$, |
|  |  |  |

FILE: even_parity.functions.3d

$g=\{$

```
1/2 Sqrt[15] ( y^2 - z^2 ),
    -Sqrt[15] x y,
-1/2 Sqrt[5] ( 1 - 3 x^2 ),
    -Sqrt[15] x z,
    -Sqrt[15] y z,
3/8 Sqrt[35] ( y^4 - 6 y^2 z z^2 + z^4 ),
-3/2 Sqrt[35/2] x y ( y^2 - 3 z^2 ),
-3/4 Sqrt[5] ( y^2 - z^2 ) ( 1 - 7 x^2 ),
3/2 Sqrt[5/2] x y ( 3-7 x^2),
3/8 ( 3-30 x^2 + 35 x^4),
3/2 Sqre[5/2] x z ( 3-7 x^2),
3/2 Sqrt[5] y z (1-7 x^2),
3/2 Sqrt[35/2] x z ( z^2 - 3 y^2)).
3/2 Sqrt[35] y z ( z^2 - y^2)
    }
```


## FILE: odd_parity.functions.3d

```
(****************************************************************************)
(*
(* Odd Parity spherical harmonics, through P5 terms with Y[n,n] deleted: *)
(* Y[1,0], Y[3,2], ......,Y[3,-2], Y[5,4], Y[5,3],....., Y[5,-3], Y[5,-4] *)
(*
(****************************************************************************)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & Sqrt [3] & x, \\
\hline 1/2 & Sqrt [105] & \(x\left(y^{\wedge} 2-z^{\wedge} 2\right)\), \\
\hline 1/2 & Sqrt[21/2] & \(y\left(1-5 x^{\wedge} 2\right)\), \\
\hline 1/2 & Sqrt [7] & \(x\left(5 x^{*} 2-3\right)\), \\
\hline 1/2 & Sqre [21/2] & \(\mathrm{z}\left(1-5 \mathrm{x}^{\wedge} 2\right)\), \\
\hline - & Sqrt[105] & \(x \mathrm{y}\) z, \\
\hline -3/8 & Sqrt [385] & \(x\left(y^{\wedge} 4-6 y^{\wedge} 2 z^{\wedge} 2+z^{\wedge} 4\right)\), \\
\hline -1/8 & Sqrt[385/2] & \(y\left(9 x^{\wedge} 2-1\right)\left(y^{\wedge} 2-3 z^{\wedge} 2\right)\), \\
\hline 1/4 & Sqrt[1155] & \(x\left(3 x^{\wedge} 2-1\right)\left(y^{\wedge} 2-z^{\wedge} 2\right)\), \\
\hline -1/8 & Sqrt [165] & \(y\left(1-14 x^{\wedge} 2+21 x^{\wedge} 4\right)\), \\
\hline 1/8 & Sqrt[11] & \(x\left(63 x^{\wedge} 4-70 x^{\wedge} 2+15\right)\), \\
\hline \(-1 / 8\) & Sqrt [165] & \(\mathrm{z}\left(1-14 x^{\wedge} 2+21 x^{\wedge} 4\right)\), \\
\hline -1/2 & Sqrt[1155] & \(x \mathrm{yz}\left(3 x^{\wedge} 2-1\right)\), \\
\hline -1/8 & Sqrt [385/2] & \(\mathrm{z}\left(9 \mathrm{x}^{\wedge} 2-1\right)\left(3 y^{\wedge} 2-z^{\wedge} 2\right)\), \\
\hline -3/2 & Sqrt [385] & \(x\left(y^{\wedge} 3 z-y z^{\wedge} 3\right)\) \\
\hline \} & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

FILE: AngInt.math used in several Mathematica scripts to calculate the angular integrals. The following relations are used:
(1) Integrate $\left[\operatorname{Sin}[x]^{\wedge}(m-1) \operatorname{Cos}[x]^{\wedge}(n-1), x,\{0, P i\}\right]=$ $\left(1+(-1)^{\wedge}(m-1)\right) \operatorname{Beta}(m / 2, n / 2) / 2$
(2) Integrate $\left[\operatorname{Sin}[x]^{\wedge}(m-1) \operatorname{Cos}[x]^{\wedge}(n-1), x,\{0,2 \operatorname{Pi}\}\right]=$ $\left(1+(-1)^{\wedge}(m-1)+(-1)^{\wedge}(n-1)+(-1)^{\wedge}(m-1)(-1)^{\wedge}(n-1)\right) \operatorname{Beta}(m / 2, n / 2) / 2$

The algorithm treats each integrand as a polynmial in sines and cosines of theta and phi (where phi is the azimuthal angle). The exponents are extracted, along with any leading coefficinets, and the values for the integrals in phi and theta are calculated using (1) and (2).

The integral values are summed term by term to arrive at the value of the integral of the entire integrand.

The variable "dummy is introduce to ensure the integrand has the proper polynomial structure (i.e. the number of terms is never less than 2). "dummy" is zeroed out prior to adding the term to the sum
nDig $=30$
<</usr/local/math2.2/Packages/Algebra/Trigonometry.m;
Angint [f_] := Module[
\{terms, sumTerms, coeff, exp1, exp2, exp3, exp4, c1, c2, c3, c4\},
integrand $=\mathrm{N}[$ Expand [ TrigReduce[ PowerExpand [ Sin[th] /(4 Pi) f ] ] ], nDig ] + dummy;
(* Get the number of terms in the integrand *)
terms $\quad=$ Length[ integrand ];
(* Calculate the integral for each term in the polynomial *)
sumTerms $=0$;
Do [
(******************************************
Print $[$ "Part $", 1, ": ~ ", ~ N[~ i n t e g r a n d[~[1]] ~] ~] ~$
******************************************************)
(* Check to see if term is a contant *)
If [
NumberQ[ integrand [[l]] ],
(* Constant term *)
coeff $=$ integrand[[l]];
$\operatorname{exp1}=0$;
$\operatorname{exp2}=0 ;$
$\exp 3=0$;
$\operatorname{exp4}=0$,
(* function of theta and phi *) If [

Length[ integrand[[1]]]>1,
If
NumberQ[ integrand [ $[1,1]]$ ],
coeff $=$ integrand [ [1, 1]],
coeff $=1.0$

```
        \jmath,
                    coeff = 1.0
                    ];
                (* Check for "dummy" structure term *)
                If [ Exponent[ integrand[[1]], dummy ] > 0, coeff = 0.0 ];
                (* Extract exponents of sines and cosines *)
                exp1 = Exponent[ integrand[[l]],Cos[th] ];
                exp2= Exponent[ integrand[[l]],Sin[th] ];
                exp3 = Exponent[ integrand[[l]],Cos[ph] ];
                exp4 = Exponent[ integrand[[1]],sin[ph] ]
                ];
            (*************************************************
        Print[ "Cos[th] power = ",expl ];
        Print[ "Sin[th] power = ",exp2 ];
        Print[ "Cos[ph] power = ", exp3 ];
        Print[ "Sin[ph] power = ", exp4 ];
        Print[ "Coefficient = ",coeff ];
        *************************************************)
        c1 = (1 + (-1)^ exp1)/2;
        c2 = (1 + (-1)^ exp3 + (-1)^ exp3 (-1)^ exp4 + (-1)^ exp4)/2;
        c3 = Beta[ (expl+1)/2,(exp2+1)/2];
        c4 = Beta[ (exp3+1)/2,(exp4+1)/2];
        (******************************************************
            DEBUG
        Print[ "c1, c2, c3, c4 = ",c1," ",c2," ",c3," ", c4 ];
            DEBUG
        *****************************************************)
        sumTerms = sumTerms + N[ coeff cl c2 c3 c4, nDig ],
        {1,terms}
        ];
    sumTerms
]
```

```
(*****************************************************************************
```

FILE: AngIntPos.math used in the vacuum boundary condition calculation. Same as AngInt.math except that accounts for absolute value of direction cosine in the integrand. The following relations are used:
(1) 2*Integrate $\left[\operatorname{Sin}[x]^{\wedge}(m-1) \operatorname{Cos}[x]^{\wedge}(n-1), x,\{0, P i / 2\}\right]=$ Beta(m/2,n/2)
(2) Integrate $\left[\sin (x]^{\wedge}(m-1) \cos [x]^{\wedge}(n-1), x,\{0,2 \operatorname{Pi}\}\right]=$ $\left(1+(-1)^{\wedge}(m-1)+(-1)^{\wedge}(n-1)+(-1)^{\wedge}(m-1)(-1)^{\wedge}(n-1)\right)$ Beta $(m / 2, n / 2) / 2$

The algorithm treats each integrand as a polynmial in sines and cosines of theta and phi (where phi is the azimuthal angle). The exponents are extracted, along with any leading coefficinets, and the values for the integrals in phi and theta are calculated using (1) and (2).

The integral values are summed term by term to arrive at the value of the integral of the entire integrand.

The variable "dummy is introduce to ensure the integrand has the proper polynomial structure (i.e. the number of terms is never less than 2). "dummy" is zeroed out prior to adding the term to the sum

```
nDig = 30
<</usr/local/math2.2/Packages/Algebra/Trigonometry.m;
AngIntPos [f_] := Module[
    {terms, sumTerms, coeff, expl, exp2, exp3, exp4, cl, c2, c3, c4 },
    integrand = N[ Expand[ TrigReduce[ PowerExpand[
                Sin[th]/(4 Pi) £ ] ] ], nDig ] + dummy;
    (* Get the number of terms in the integrand *)
    terms = Length[ integrand ];
    (* Calculate the integral for each term in the polynomial *)
    sumTerms = 0;
    Do [
    (*******************************************************
    Print[ "Part ",1,": ",N[ integrand[[1]] ] ];
    *******************************************************)
    (* Check to see if term is a contant *)
    If [
        NumberQ[ integrand[[l]] ],
```

        (* Constant term *)
        coeff \(=\) integrand[[l]];
        \(\operatorname{expl}=0\);
        \(\exp 2=0\);
        \(\exp 3=0\);
        \(\exp 4=0\),
        (* function of theta and phi *)
        If [
            Length[ integrand[[1]] ] > 1 ,
            If [
                NumberQ[ integrand[[1,1]] ],
                coeff \(=\) integrand \([1,1]]\),
    ```
                    coeff = 1.0
                    },
                    coeff=1.0
                    ];
                    (* Check for "dummy" structure term *)
                    If [ Exponent[ integrand[[1]],dummy] > 0, coeff = 0.0 ];
                    (* Extract exponents of sines and cosines *)
                expl = Exponent[ integrand[[1]],Cos[th] ];
                exp2 = Exponent[ integrand[[1]],Sin[th] ];
                exp3 = Exponent[ integrand[[1]], Cos[ph] ];
                exp4=Exponent[ integrand[[l]],Sin[ph] ]
                ];
        (*************************************************
        Print[ "Cos[th] power = ",exp1 ];
        Print[ "Sin[th] power = ",exp2 ];
        Print[ "Cos[ph] power = ", exp3 ];
        Print[ "Sin[ph] power = ", exp4 ];
        Print[ "Coefficient = ",coeff ];
        *************************************************)
        c1 = 1;
        c2 = (1 + (-1)^ exp3 + (-1)^ exp3 (-1)^ exp4 + (-1)^ exp4)/2;
        c3 = Beta[ (exp1+1)/2,(exp2+1)/2];
        c4 = Beta[ (exp3+1)/2,(exp4+1)/2];
        (*****************************************************
            DEBUG
        Print[ "cl, c2, c3, c4 m ",c1," ",c2," ",c3," ", c4 ];
            DEBUG
        ******************************************************)
        sumTerms = sumTerms + N[ coeff c1 c2 c3 c4, nDig ],
        {1,terms}
        ];
    sumTerms
]
```

```
(* A Mathematica script to generate the H matrix, which takes into account
    the angular dependence of the node interior.
    2d Geometry *)
ifa=9
rules ={x -> Cos[th],y -> Sin[th] Cos[ph],z -> Sin[th] Sin[ph]}
<<even_parity.functions.2d
g = g /. rules
O={Cos[th],Sin[th] * Cos[ph]}
<<AngInt.math
h = Table{0,{i,2},{j,2},{k,ifa},{1,ifa}}
Do[a=AngInt[ o[[i]] O[[j]] g[[k]] g[[l]] ];
    h[[i,j,k,l]]=a;
    a=a, (*
    h[[i,j,l,k]]=a;
    h[{j,i,k,l]]=a;
    h[[j,i,l,k]]=a, *)
    {i,2},{j, 2},{k,ifa},{1,ifa}]
(* Save ["hxy.dat",h] *)
stmp = OpenWrite["hxy.rawdata"]
WriteString[stmp,"H \n"]
Do[Write[stmp,N[h[[i,j,k,l]],16]],{1,ifa},{k,ifa},{j,2},{i,2}]
Close [stmp]
```

This MATHEMATICA script calculate the $E$ matrix (angular coupling) for 2-D X-Y geometry. The E matrix is defined as

$$
E=\text { Integrate }[g[i] k[j] \text { Omega }[j] . n,\{t h, 0, P i\},\{p h, 0,2 P i\}]
$$

where $g[i]$ are the even parity angular trial functions, $k[j]$ are the odd parity trial functions on a given face $n$ is the unit normal for the face

Omega.n is alway equalent to the "mu" direction in surface coordinates

The angular trial function set defined in this script covers up to a P5 expansion.

```
ifa = 9
<<AngInt.math
<<even parity.functions.2d
<<odd_parity.functions.2d
k = Sqrt[3] x k
k1 =k/. {x->u,y->n,z->B}
k2 =k /. {x->n,y->u,z->s}
trigl = {x->Cos[th],y->Sin[th] Cos[ph],z->Sin[th] Sin[ph]}
trig2 = {u->COs[th], n->Sin[th] Cos[ph],s->Sin[th] Sin[ph]}
g = g /. trigl
k1 = kl /. trig2
k2 = k2 /. trig2
e = Table{0,{i,2},{j,ifa},{1,ifa}]
Do[
    e[[1,i,j]] = AngInt[g[[i]]k1[[j]]];
    e[[2,i,j]] = AngInt[g[[i]]k2[[j]]],
    {i,ifa},{j,ifa}
]
    Save["exy.dat",e]
stmp = OpenWrite["exy.rawdata"]
WriteString[stmp,"E\n"]
Do[Write[stmp,N[e[[i,j,l]],16]],{1,ifa},{j,ifa},{i,2}]
Close [stmp]
```

This MATHEMATICA script calculate the $E$ matrix (angular coupling) for 2-D hexagonal geometry. The $E$ matrix is defined as

$$
E=\text { Integrate }[g[i] k[j] \text { Omega }[j] . n,\{t h, 0, P i\},\{p h, 0,2 \mathrm{Pi}\}]
$$

where $g[i]$ are the even parity angular trial functions, $k[j]$ are the odd parity trial functions on a given face $n$ is the unit normal for the face

Omega.n is alway equalent to the "mu" direction in surface coordinates
The angular trial function set defined in this script covers up to a P5 expansion.

```
************************************************************************)
(* Define number of angular moments *)
nAng = 9
(* Define even parity angular trial functions *)
<<even_parity.functions.2d
gg = g
Clear [g]
(* Define odd parity angular trial functions *)
<<odd parity.functions.2d
kx = Sqrt[3] x k
Clear[k]
(* Rotate odd parity functions into surface coordinates *)
c1 = 1/2
c2 = Sqrt[3]/2
gg = gg /. {x - u, y > v, z -> w}
k1 = kx /. {x - > u, y > v v, z -> w }
k2 = kx /. {x -> cl u + c2 v, y > c2 u - cl v, z -> w }
k3 = kx /. {x -> -c1 u + c2 v, y > c2 u + cl v, z -> w }
(* convert to direction cosines *)
trig={u->COs[th],v->Sin[th] COs[ph],w->Sin[th] Sin[ph]}
gg = gg /. trig
kl = kl /. trig
k2 = k2 /. trig
k3 = k3 /. trig
e= Table{0,{i,3},{j,nAng},{k,nAng}]
(* Calculate integrands for the E matrix *)
Print["Begin calculating v and w face data"]
<<AngInt.math
DO[
    Print[ "Generating e[i,",j,",",k,"]" ];
    e[[l,j,k]] = AngInt[ gg[[j]] kl[[k]] ];
    e[[2,j,k]] = AngInt[gg[[j]] k2[[k]] ];
    e[[3,j,k]] = AngInt[ gg[[j]] k3[[k]] ],
    {j,nAng}, {k,nAng}
```

(* Save E matrix, and generate raw data for data statement *)
(* Save["ehex.dat",e] *)
stmp = OpenWrite["ehex.rawdata"]
WriteString[stmp,"g\n"]
Do[
Write[ stmp, Chop[ N[ e[[i,j,k]], 12 ], 10^-14 ] ],
{k,nAng},{j,nAng},{i, 3}
J
Close [stmp]

```
```

(* A Mathematica script to generate the V matrix,
the angular dependence array needed in the anisotropic scattering
calculation. 2D Geometry *)
(* Define even parity angular trial functions *)
<<even_parity.functions.2d
gg = g
Clear[g]
(* Define odd-parity scattering functions *)
gm = {Sqrt[3]x,
Sqrt[3]y,
Sqre[7/4](5x%5E3-3x),
Sqrt[21/8](5x%5E2-1)y,
Sqre[105/4] (y^2-z^2)x,
Sqre[35/8] (y^2-3z^2)y,
1/8 Sqrt[11] x ( 63 x^4 - 70 x^2 + 15),
-1/8 Sqrt[165] y (1-14 x^2 + 21 x^4),
1/4 Sqrt[1155] x ( 3 x^2-1) ( y^2 - z^2),
-1/8 Sqrt[385/2] y ( 9 ( x 2 - 1) ( y^2 - 3 z^2 ),
-3/8 Sqrt[385] x ( y^4 - 6 y^2 z^2 + + z^4),
3/8 Sqrt[77/2] y (y^4 -10 y^2 z^2 + 5z ^4 4),
}

```

```

trig = {x->COs[th],y->Sin[th] Cos[ph],z->Sin[th]Sin[ph]}
gg = gg /. trig
gm = gm /. trig
v = Table{0,{i,2},{j,9},{k,12}]
(* Calculate integrands for the V matrix *)
<<AngInt.math
Do[
Print[ "Generating v[i,",j,",",k,"]" ];
v[[l,j,k]] = AngInt[ o[[l]]gg[[j]] gm[[k]] ];
v[[2,j,k]] = AngInt[ o[[2]]gg[[j]] gm[[k]] ],
{j, 9}, {k, 12}
J
(* Save V matrix, and generate raw data for data
statement *)
(* Save["vxy.dat",v] *)
stmp = OpenWrite["vxy.rawdata"]
WriteString[stmp,"V \n"]
Do[
Write[ stmp, Chop[ N[ v[[i,j,k]], 12 ], 10^-14 ] ],
{k,12},{j,9},{i,2}
]
Close [stmp]

```
```

(* A Mathematica script to generate vacuum boundary conditions.
2D Geometry *)
r1 = {x -> Cos[th],y > Sin[th]Cos[ph],z - ) Sin[th]Sin[ph]}
r2 = {u -> Cos[th],n -> Sin[th]Cos[ph],s -> Sin[th]Sin[ph]}
<<even_parity.functions.2d
gl=g /. rl
<<AngIntPos.math
<<exy.dat;
e1 = Table[ e[[1,i,j]],{i,9},{j,9}];
1= Table{0,{j,9},{k,9}];
uu = Table{0,{j,9},{k,9}];
vac = Table[0, {j,9},{k,9}];
ig = IdentityMatrix[9];
Do[
l[[j,k]] = AngIntPos[ Cos[th] gl[[j]] gl[[k]] ],
{j,9},{k,9}
];
uu = (Transpose[e1].Inverse[l] .e1)/2;
vac = Inverse [uu+i9]. (uu-i9);
(* Save["vacxy.dat",e1,1,uu,vac]
stmp = OpenWrite ["vacxy.out",FormatType->OutputForm]
Write[stmp, MatrixForm[N[vac,8]]]
Close [stmp] *)
stmp = OpenWrite ["vacxy.rawdata"]
WriteString[stmp,"P \n"]
Do[Write[stmp,N[vac[{i,j]], 16]],{j,9},{i,9}]
Close [stmp]

```
```

(* A Mathematica script to generate the H matrix, which takes into account
the angular dependence of the node interior.
3d Geometry *)
rules ={x -> Cos[th],y -> Sin[th] Cos[ph],2 -> Sin[th] Sin[ph]}
<<even_parity.functions.3d
<<AngInt.math
g=g/. rules
O={Cos[th],Sin[th] *Cos[ph],Sin[th] Sin[ph]}
h = Table{0,{i,3},{j,3},{k,15},{1,15}]
Dol
a=AngInt[ o[[i]] o[[j]] g{[k]] g[ll]] ];
h[{i,j,k,l]]=a;
h[{i,j,1,k]]=a;
h[(j,i,k,l])=a;
h[[j,i,l,k]]=a,
{i,3},{j,i,3},{k,15},{1,k,15}]
(* Save["hxyz.dat",h] *)
stmp = OpenWrite["hxyz.rawdata"]
WriteString[stmp, "H\n"]
Do[Write[stmp,N[h[{i,j,k,1]],16]],{1,15},{k,15},{j,3},{i,3}]
Close (stmp)

```

This MATHEMATICA script calculate the E matrix (angular coupling) for 3-D X-Y-Z geometry. The E matrix is defined as
\(E=\) Integrate \(\{g[i] k[j]\) Omega[j].n,\{th, \(0, \mathrm{Pi}\},\{\mathrm{ph}, 0,2 \mathrm{pi}\}]\)
where \(g[i]\) are the even parity angular trial functions, \(k[j]\) are the odd parity trial functions on a given face \(n\) is the unit normal for the face

Omega.n is alway equalent to the "mu" direction in surface coordinates
The angular trial function set defined in this script covers up to a P5 expansion.
```

ifa = 15
<<AngInt.math
<<even_parity.functions.3d
<<odd_parity.functions.3d
k = Sqrt[3] x k
kl = k /. {x->u,y->n,z->s}
k2 =k /. {x->n,y->u,z->s}
k3 =k/. {x->a,y->u,z->n}
trigl = {x->Cos[th],y->Sin[th] Cos[ph],z->Sin[th] Sin[ph]}
trig2 = {u->Cos[th], n->Sin[th] Cos[ph],s->Sin[th] Sin[ph]}
g=g /. trigl
kl = k1 /. trig2
k2 = k2 /. trig2
k3 = k3 /. trig2
e = Table[0,{i,3},{j,ifa},{l,ifa}]
Do[
e[[1,i,j]] = AngInt[g[[i]]kl[[j]]];
e[[2,i,j]]=AngInt[g[[i]]k2[[j]]];
e[[3,i,j]] = AngInt[g[[i]]k3[[j]]],
{i,ifa},{j,ifa}
]
(* Save["exyz.dat",e] *)
stmp = OpenWrite ["exyz.rawdata"]
WriteString[stmp,"E\n"]
Do[Write[stmp,N[e[[i,j,1]},16]],{1,ifa},{j,ifa},{i,3}]
Close [stmp]

```

This MATHEMATICA script calculate the \(E\) matrix (angular coupling) for 3-D hexagonal geometry. The \(E\) matrix is defined as
\[
E=\text { Integrate }[g[i] k[j] \text { Omega }[j], n,\{t h, 0, P i\},\{p h, 0,2 p j\}]
\]
where \(g[i]\) are the even parity angular trial functions,
\(k[j]\) are the odd parity trial functions on a given face n is the unit normal for the face

Omega.n is alway equalent to the "mu" direction in surface coordinates
The angular trial function set defined in this script covers up to a P5 expansion.
```

nAng = 15
<<AngInt.math
<<even_parity.functions.3d
<<odd_parity.functions.3d
gg = g
Clear[g]
kx = Sqrt[3] x k
clear[k]
(* Rotate odd parity functions into surface coordinates *)
c1 = 1/2
c2 = Sqrt[3]/2
gg = gg /. {x -> u, y -> v, z -> w}
k1 = kx /. { x -> u, y - > v, z -> w }
k2 = kx /. {x -> cl u + c2 v, y -> c2 u - cl v, z -> w }
k3 = kx /. { x - -cl u + c2 v, y >> c2 u + cl v, z -> w }
k4 = kx /. {x m w, y > u, z ->> v}
(* convert to direction cosines *)
trig = {u->Cos[th],v->Sin[th] Cos[ph],w->Sin[th] Sin[ph]}
gg = gg /. trig
k1 = k1 /. trig
k2 = k2 /. trig
k3 = k3 /. trig
k4 = k4 /. trig
Clear[e]
e = Table[0,{i,4},{j,nAng},{k,nAng}]
Do [
Print[ "Generating e[i,",j,",",k,"]" ];
e[[l,j,k]] = AngInt[gg[[j]] kl[[k]] ];
e[[2,j,k]] = AngInt[gg[[j]] k2[[k]] ];
e[[3,j,k]] = AngInt[gg[[j]] k3[[k]] ];
e[[4,j,k]] = AngInt[gg[[j]] k4[[k]] ],
{j,nAng}, {k,nAng}
]
(* Save E matrix, and generate raw data for data statement *)
(* Save ["ehexz.dat",e] *)
stmp = OpenWrite["ehexz. rawdata"]
WriteString [stmp, "E \n"]
Dol
Write[ stmp, Chopl $\left.N[e[[i, j, k]], 12], 10^{\wedge}-14\right]$ ], \{ $k$, nang $\},\{j$, nang $\},\{i, 4\}$
J
Close [stmp]

```
(* A Mathematica script to generate the V matrix,
    the angular dependence array needed in the anisotropic scattering
    calculation. 3D Geometry *)
trig = {x -> Cos[th],y -> Sin[th]Cos[ph],z -> Sin[th]Sin[ph]}
(* Define even parity angular trial functions *)
<<even_parity.functions.3d
gp = g
Clear[g]
gp = gp /. trig
(* Define odd-parity scattering functions *)
gm = {Sgrt[3]x,
    Sqrt[3]y,
    Sqrt[3] z,
    Sqrt[7/4](5x^3-3x),
    Sqrt[21/8] (5x^2-1)y,
    Sqrt[21/8] (5x^2-1)z,
    Sqrt[105/4](y^2-z^2)x,
    Sqrt[105]x*y*z,
    Sqrt[35/8](y^2-3z^2)y,
    Sqrt[35/8](3y^2-z^2)z,
    1/8 Sqrt[11] x ( 63 x^4 - 70 x^2 + 15 ),
    -1/8 Sqrt[165] y (1 - 14 x^2 + 21 x^4 ).
    -1/8 Sqrt[165] z (1 - 14 x^2 + 21 x^4 ).
    1/4 Sqrt[1155] x ( 3 x^2 - 1 ) ( y^2 - z^2 ),
    -1/2 Sqrt[1155] x y z ( 3 x^2 - 1),
    -1/8 Sqrt[385/2] y ( 9 x^2 - 1) ( y^2 - 3 z^2),
    -1/8 Sqrt[385/2] z ( 9 x^2 - 1) ( 3 y^2 - z^2),
    -3/8 Sqrt[385] x ( y^4 - 6 y^2 z^2 + + z^4),
    -3/2 Sqrt[385] x ( y^3 z - y z^3),
    3/8 Sqrt[77/2] y (y^4 -10 y^2 z^2 + 5z ^4),
    3/8 Sqrt[77/2] z (z^4 -10 y^2 z^2 + 5 y^4),
    }
gm = gm /. trig
O={\operatorname{Cos[th],Sin[th]*\operatorname{Cos[ph],Sin[th] Sin[ph]}}}\mathbf{T}=\operatorname{Sin}
    << AngInt.math
v= Table [0,{j,3},{k,15},{1,21}]
Do[v[[j,k,l]]=AngInt[o[[j]]gp[[k]]gm[[l]]}, {j,3},{k,15},{1,21}]
    (* Save["vxyz.dat",v] *)
Put[v ,"vxyz.rawdata"]
Do[PutAppend[N[v[[j,k,1]],16],"vxyz.rawdata"],{1,21},{k,15},{j,3}]
```

```
(* A Mathematica script to generate vacuum boundary conditions.
    3D Geometry *)
ifa=15
r1={x -> Cos[th],y -> Sin[th]COs[ph],z -> Sin[th]Sin[ph]}
r2 = {u -> Cos[th],n -> Sin[th]Cos[ph],s -> Sin[th] Sin[ph]}
<< even_parity.functions.3d
gl = g /. rl
<<AngIntPos.math
<<exyz.dat;
e1 = Table[ e[{1,i,j]],{i,ifa},{j,ifa}];
l = Table[0,{j,ifa},{k,ifa}];
uu = Table[0,{j,ifa},{k,ifa}];
vacz = Table[0,{j,ifa},{k,ifa}];
i4 = IdentityMatrix[ifa];
Do[
    l[[j,k]]=AngIntPos[ Cos[th] gl[[j]] gl[[k]] ].
        {j,ifa},{k,ifa}
    ];
Print["Inverting matrix"];
uu = (Transpose[el].Inverse[l].el)/2 ;
vacz = Inverse[uu+i4].(uu-i4);
(* Save["vacxyz.dat",e1,1,uu,vacz]
stmp = OpenWrite ["vacxyz.out", FormatType->OutputForm]
Write[stmp, MatrixForm[N[vacz,8]]]
Close [stmp] *)
stmp = OpenWrite["vacxyz.rawdata"]
WriteString[stmp,"P \n"]
Do[Write[stmp,N[vacz[[i,j]],16]],{j,ifa},{i,ifa}]
Close [stmp]
```


## SPATIAL TRIAL FUNCTIONS

FILE: f.surf.xy.dat

Trial functions on a side of a X-Y node. Expansion order: 2

```
l = {1, 2* *^ (1/2)*x, -5^(1/2)/2 + 6* 5^ (1/2)* *^2}
```

FILE: f.vol.xy.dat

Trial functions on the interior of a $X-Y$ node. Expansion order: 4

```
f={1, 2*\mp@subsup{3}{}{\wedge}(1/2)*x, 2*\mp@subsup{3}{}{\wedge}(1/2)*y, -5^(1/2)/2 + 6* 5^ (1/2)**^2, 12*x*y,
    -5^(1/2)/2 + 6* 5^(1/2)*y^2, -3*7^(1/2)*x + 20*7^ (1/2)* *^3.
    -(15* (1/2)*y) + 12*15^(1/2)* *^2*y, -(15^^(1/2)*x) + 12*15*^(1/2)*x* y^2,
    -3*7^(1/2)*y + 20*7^(1/2)*y^3,
    -21/8 + 210**^4 - (3* 5^ (1/2)* (-5^(1/2)/2 + 6* 5^ (1/2)* *^ 2))/2,
    -6*21^(1/2)*x*y + 40*21^ (1/2)*x^3*y,
```



```
        (5^}(1/2)*(-\mp@subsup{5}{}{\wedge}(1/2)/2+6*\mp@subsup{5}{}{\wedge}(1/2)*\mp@subsup{y}{}{\wedge}2))/2
    -6*21^(1/2)*x*y + 40*21^(1/2)*x* y^3,
    -21/8 + 210* y^4 - (3* 5^ (1/2)* (-5^ (1/2)/2 + 6* 5^ (1/2)* %^2))/2}
```

FILE: f.surf.hex.dat

Trial functions on a side of a hex node. Expansion order: 2

$$
1=\left\{1,3 * 2^{\wedge}(1 / 2) * 3^{\wedge}(1 / 4) * x,-5^{\wedge}(1 / 2) / 2+9 * 15^{\wedge}(1 / 2) * x^{\wedge} 2\right\}
$$

FILE: f.vol.hex.dat

Trial functions on the interior of an hex node. Expansion order: 6

```
f = {1., 3.531397147659254*x, 3.531397147659254*y,
    -0.992094737665681 + 12.37218113922247*x^2, 15.2127765851133*x*y,
    -1.386623516201175 + 4.220134183810281* *^2 + 13.07212295960745* y^2,
    -7.364172208855169*x + 45.55400150508527*x^3.
    -2.843918214276882*y + 52.77654471105122*x^2*y,
    -6.215410878336123*x + 15.34253644105606*x^3 + 69.31604172534397*x* y^2,
    -9.20730654962232*y + 30.49051331999612*x^2* y + 46.79193393431396* y^3,
    1.144405667459047 - 40.06601247254548*x^2 + 168.2602416904509*x^4 -
        1.406229436608328*y^2, -26.50296143625209*x*y + 193.4898333051816*x^3*y,
        0.937907092856306 - 25.07947109327715*x^2 + 54.30072427626424*x^4 -
        8.90944642896137*y^2 + 250.7950289971609*x^2* y^2,
    -50.42654572628691*x*y + 130.7053493868987*x^3*y +
        302.4959930449739*x* y^3, 1.539474445844345 - 8.59954682742715*x^2 +
        5.127712221713981*x^4 - 47.18963566829999*y^2 +
        173.7862848738076* (^2** y^2 + 163.2901353147327*y^4,
    11.6653537350933*x - 194.1305451511002*x^3 + 623.0154297905012*x^5 -
        5.717241004090825*x*y^2, 4.69185605425132*y - 157.7548620476962*x^2* y +
        717.9223962484047*x^4*y - 9.2171369165954*y^3,
    9.69755937019898*x - 106.9840393103204*x^3 + 197.8190140565777*x^5 -
        102.6298897072043*x* Y^2 + 917.106990708609**^3* y^2,
    5.264241230760947*y - 205.4054425941534*x^2*y + 464.0234379739513*x^4*y -
        27.72465200112097*y^3 + 1184.265472234982*x^2* y^3,
```

```
309.2541675819772*x*y^2 + 851.414464715421*** 3* y^2 +
1255.463567163217*x*y^4, 15.68457470472548*y - 111.28234482202*x^2*y +
132.8642324402051*x^4*y - 215.3509727206996*y^3 +
899.228572510356* x^2* y^3 + 561.3590955770824* y^5,
-1.060095787822545 + 83.019683621295*x^2 - 889.228572832441**^4 +
2313.052962198468**^6 - 1.293105354507158*%^2 -
11.53703521761299* (x^2* y^2 + 9.39119022184615* (^4.4.
0.0000108358095451932*** Y* (4.335238300855329*10^6 - 7. 246427*10^7* *^2 +
    2.452554741140914*10^8*x^4 - 4.901970000000001* 10^%* (% 2),
-1.342920857770678 + 63.30661830660211**^2 - 448.8548508855424* (^^4 +
    720.0866810090347*x^6 + 21.19039857921666*y^2 -
    682.8485950113241**^2* y^2 + 3419.545944882732*x^4* y^2 -
    41.92742357206419*y^4, 66.87661377195044*x*y - 878.806782568358*x^3*y +
    1698.779184200614*x^5*y - 388.6964335735138*x*y^3 +
    4389.10418853506*x^3*y^3, -0.69529255111581 + 33.14469660668448*x^2 -
    108.7042593792074* ** 4 + 17.72340254766733* *^6 + 23.12292942763903* y^2 -
    1326.755058402553*** 2** y 2 + 3138.811085482705*x^4** y^2 -
    84.7848146373795* y^4 + 5426.412021403232* *^ 2** y^4,
100.3195658795806*x*y - 505.5173873502208*x^3*y +
    447.2929180746544*x^5*y - 1647.523967451926*x*y^3 +
    4884.832425884538*x^3*y^3 + 4986.581349244301*x* y^5,
-1.735740046497104 + 18.46246594573035*x^2 - 45.48607275055156*x^4 +
    28.55381163561693*x^6 + 106.555405180707*y^2 - 891.974915726297*x^2** y^2 +
    1307.292857878233*x^4*y^2 - 918.732525582574*y^4 +
    4380.113505445939* *^2* y^4 + 1915.895220021416* %^6}
```

FILE: f.surfxy.xyz.dat

Trial functions on a surface of a X-Y-Z node. Expansion order: 2

```
f={1, 2* *^ (1/2)*x, 2* 3^ (1/2)*y, - 5^ (1/2)/2 + 6* 5^ (1/2)* *^2, 12* ** y,
```



FILE: f.vol.xyz.dat

Trial functions on the interior of a $X-Y-2$ node. Expansion order: 4


```
    12*x*y, -5^(1/2)/2 + 6*5^(1/2)*y^2, 12* y*z, -5^(1/2)/2 + 6* 5^^(1/2)* z^2,
    12*x*z, -3*7^(1/2)*x + 20*7^ (1/2)* (^^3, - (15^(1/2)*y) + 12*15^(1/2)***^2*y,
    -(15^(1/2)*x) + 12*15*^(1/2)*** y^2, -3*7^(1/2)*y + 20*7^(1/2)* y^3,
    -(15^(1/2)*z) + 12*15^(1/2)* y^2*z, - (15^^(1/2)*y) + 12*15^(1/2)*y*z^2,
    -3*7^(1/2)*z + 20*\mp@subsup{7}{}{\wedge}(1/2)* z^3, - (15^(1/2)*x) + 12*15^(1/2)*x* z^2,
    -(15^(1/2)*z) + 12*15^(1/2)*x^2*z, 24*3^(1/2)*x* y*z,
    -1/(80*(1/3600-(-1/(32*5^(1/2)) +(3*5^(1/2))/224)^2)^(1/2)) +
        x^4/(1/3600-(-1/(32*5^(1/2)) + (3* 5^ (1/2))/224)^2)^(1/2) -
        ((-1/(32* 5^(1/2)) + (3*5^(1/2))/224)* (-5^(1/2)/2 + 6* 5^(1/2)* *^2))/
            (1/3600-(-1/(32*\mp@subsup{5}{}{\wedge}(1/2))+(3*\mp@subsup{5}{}{\wedge}(1/2))/224)^2)^(1/2),
    -6*21^(1/2)*x*y + 40*21^(1/2)*x^3*y,
    -1/(144*(1/14400-(1/(32*5^(1/2)) - 5^(1/2)/288)^2)^(1/2)) -
        ((1/(32*\mp@subsup{5}{}{\wedge}(1/2)) - 5^ (1/2)/288)* (-5^(1/2)/2 + 6* 5^ (1/2)*** 2))/
        (1/14400 - (1/(32*5^(1/2)) - 5^(1/2)/288)^2)^(1/2) +
        ( (x^2* (% 2)/(1/14400-(1/(32*5^(1/2)) - 5^(1/2)/288)^2)^(1/2) -
        (-5^}(1/2)/2+6*\mp@subsup{5}{}{\wedge}(1/2)*\mp@subsup{y}{}{\wedge}2)
            (72*5^(1/2)* (1/14400-(1/(32*5^(1/2)) - 5^ (1/2)/288)^2)^(1/2)),
    -6*21^(1/2)*x*y + 40*21^(1/2)*x* %^3.
    -21/8 + 210* y^4 - (3* 5^ (1/2)* (-5^ (1/2)/2 + 6* 5^ (1/2)* ( y^2))/2,
```

```
-6*21^(1/2)* (% z + 40*21^(1/2)* *^3*z,
```



```
    (5^(1/2)* (-5^(1/2)/2 + 6*5^(1/2)* *^2))/2,
-6*21^(1/2)* y* z + 40*21^(1/2)* y* z^ 3,
-21/8 + 210* 2^4 - (3*5^ (1/2)* (-5^ (1/2)/2 + 6* 5^ (1/2)* 2^2))/2,
-6*21^(1/2)*x*z + 40*21^(1/2)*x*z^3,
-1/(144*(1/14400-(1/(32*5^(1/2)) - 5^(1/2)/288)^2)^(1/2)) -
    ((1/(32*5^(1/2)) - 5^(1/2)/288)*(-5^(1/2)/2 + 6*5^(1/2)**^2))/
        (1/14400-(1/(32*5^(1/2))-5^(1/2)/288)^2)^(1/2) +
        ( (*^2* (^2)/(1/14400-(1/(32*5^(1/2)) - 5^(1/2)/288)^2)^(1/2) -
        (-5^(1/2)/2 + 6*5^(1/2)*z^2)/
            (72*5^ (1/2)* (1/14400-(1/(32*5^(1/2)) - 5^ (1/2)/288)^2)^(1/2)).
-6*21^(1/2)*x*z + 40*21^(1/2)*x^3*z, -6*5^(1/2)*y*z + 72*5^(1/2)*x^2* y*z,
-6*\mp@subsup{5}{}{\wedge}(1/2)*x*z + 72*\mp@subsup{5}{}{\wedge}(1/2)*x*y^2*z, -6*\mp@subsup{5}{}{\wedge}(1/2)*x*y+72*\mp@subsup{5}{}{\wedge}(1/2)*x*y*z^2}
```

FILE: f.surfxy.hexz.dat

Trial functions on a $X-Y$ surface of a hex-Z node. Expansion order: 2
$f=\left\{1, \quad 3^{*} 2^{\wedge}(1 / 2) * 3^{\wedge}(1 / 4) * x, 2 * 3^{\wedge}(1 / 2) * y,-5^{\wedge}(1 / 2) / 2+9 * 15^{\wedge}(1 / 2) * x^{\wedge} 2\right.$, $\left.6 * 2^{\wedge}(1 / 2) * 3^{\wedge}(3 / 4) * x * y,-5^{\wedge}(1 / 2) / 2+6 * 5^{\wedge}(1 / 2) * y^{\wedge} 2\right\}$

FILE: E.surfh.hexz.dat

Trial functions on a hex surface of a hex-Z node. Expansion order: 2

```
f={1, (6*\mp@subsup{3}{}{*}(1/4)*x)/5^(1/2), (6*\mp@subsup{3}{}{\wedge}(1/4)*y)/\mp@subsup{5}{}{*}(1/2),
    -5*(5/127)^(1/2) + 36*(15/127)^(1/2)**^2, 18* (5/7)^ (1/2)*x*y,
    (-5* (635/903)^(1/2))/4 + (41*(-5*(5/127)^(1/2) + 36*(15/127)^(1/2)* (^2))/
        (4*903^(1/2)) + 9* (635/301)^ (1/2)* %^2}
```

FILE: f64.vol.hexz.dat

Trial functions on the interior of a hex- 2 node. Expansion order: 6 in the $X-Y$ plane, 4 in the $Z$ axis.

```
f = {1., 3.531397147659254*x, 3.531397147659254*y, 3.464101615137754*z,
    -0.992094737665681 + 12.37218113922247**^2, 15.2127765851133*x*y,
    -1.386623516201175 + 4.22013418381028* *^2 + 13.07212295960745* y^2,
    12.23311856289929*Y*z, -1.118033988749895 + 13.41640786499874*z^2,
    12.23311856289929*x*z, -7.364172208855168*x + 45.55400150508527*x^3,
    -2.843918214276883*y + 52.77654471105124*x^2*y,
    -6.215410878336125*x + 15.34253644105606* *^3 + 69.31604172534398* ** Y^2,
    -9.20730654962232* y + 30.49051331999613**^2* y + 46.79193393431396* y^3,
    -3.436716983117353*z + 42.85849266715744*y^2*z,
    -3.948222038857477*y + 47.37866446628973*y*z^2,
    -7.937253933193773*z + 52.91502622129182*z^3,
    -3.948222038857477*x + 47.37866446628973*x*z^2,
    -4.803404762060481*z + 45.28316225765551**^2*z + 14.61897364223524* y^2*z,
    52.6986039392208*x*y*z, 1.144405667459047 - 40.06601247254547*x^2 +
        168.2002416904509*x^4 - 1.406229436608328*y^2,
    -26.5029614362521*x*y + 193.4898333051816*x^3*y,
    0.937907092856306 - 25.07947109327715*x^2 + 54.30072427626425*x^4 -
        8.90944642896137* y^2 + 250.7950289971609* *^2* y^2,
    -50.42654572628692*x*y + 130.7053493868988*x^3*y +
    302.4959930449739* x* y^3, 1.539474445844345 - 8.59954682742714* (^2 2 +
    5.127712221713985*x^4 - 47.18963566829997*y^2 +
    173.7862848738076* (^ 2* Y^2 + 163.2901353147327* y^4,
```

```
-22.68916516138272*y*z + 140.3528101458449*Y^3*z,
1.109195636770142 + 8.88178419700125*10^-16*x^2 - 13.83251902862112* y^2 -
    13.31034764124171* z^2 + 165.9902283434534*y^2*z^2,
-28.02959589992768*y*z + 186.8639726661845*y*z*3,
1.125 - 45.00000000000001**^2 + 210.*z^4,
-28.02959589992768*x*z + 186.8639726661845*x*z^3,
1.550292220712804 - 14.615077773959*x^2 - 4.718253454585189*y^2 -
    18.60350664855365* 2^2 + 175.380933287508* x^2* z^2 +
    56.61904145502227*y^2*z^2, -25.51024084284776*x*z +
    157.8036901897536*x^3*z, -24.48571340145234*y*z +
    211.1407608441662**^2*y*z + 81.0858166384408*y^3*z,
-21.53081486238894*x*z + 53.14810526577217*x^3*z +
    240.1178120957201*x*y^2*z, -17.00840128541522*x*y +
    204.1008154249827*x*Y* z^2, 11.66535373509326*x - 194.1305451510995*x^3 +
    623.0154297904985*x^5 - 5.717241004090801*x*y^2,
4.691856054251322*y - 157.7548620476962*x^2*y + 717.9223962484051*x^4*y -
    9.2171369165954*Y^3, 9.69755937019897*x - 106.9840393103202*x^3 +
    197.8190140565769*x^5 - 102.6298897072043*x*y^2 +
    917.106990708609*x^3*y^2, 5.264241230760949*y -
    205.4054425941535*x^2*y + 464.0234379739516*x^4*y -
    27.72465200112097*y^3 + 1184.265472234982*x^2* y^3,
8.09990722997389*x - 32.6914364353943*x^3 + 9.0669661188542*x^5 -
    309.2541675819773*x*y^2 + 851.414464715421*x^3* y^2 +
    1255.463567163217*x*y^4, 15.68457470472548*y - 111.28234482202*x^2*y +
    132.8642324402053*x^4*y - 215.3509727206996*y^3 +
    899.228572510356*x^2* \^^3 + 561.3590955770824* y^5,
-1.060095787822544 + 83.019683621295*x^2 - 889.228572832441*x^4 +
    2313.052962198468*x^6 - 1.293105354507159*y^2 -
    11.53703521761299*x*2* y^2 + 9.39119022184614* y^4,
46.97581656109533*x*y - 785.2090285514575*x^3*y +
    2657.541607416357*x^5*y - 53.11681331625073*x*y^3,
-1.342920857770676 + 63.30661830660207*x^2 - 448.8548508855424*x^4 +
    720.0866810090344**^6 + 21.19039857921664*y^2 -
    682.8485950113239*x^2**^2 + 3419.545944882731*x^4*y^2 -
    41.92742357206416*y^4, 66.87661377195044*x*y - 878.806782568358*x^3*y +
    1698.719184200614*x^5*y - 388.6964335735138*x*y^3 +
    4389.10418853506*x^3* y^3, -0.6952925511158102 + 33.14469660668446*x^2 -
    108.7042593792074* x^4 + 17.72340254766721*x^6 + 23.12292942763903* y^2 -
    1326.755058402552* (^2** y^2 + 3138.811085482704*x^4* y^2 -
    84.7848146373794*y^4 + 5426.412021403232**^2* y^4,
100.3195658795807*x*y - 505.5173873502208*x^3*y +
    447.2929180746549*x^5*y - 1647.523967451927*x*y^3 +
    4884.832425884538*x^3* y^3 + 4986.581349244301*x* y^5,
-1.735740045497101 + 18.46246594573032* *^2 - 45.4880727505516* (^4 +
    28.55381163561682*x^6 + 106.5554051807069*y^2 -
    891.974915726297* *^2* y^2 + 1307.292857878232***4* y^2 -
```


(* A Mathematica script to generate othornormal trial functions over an XY node
(1) Define volume integral over the domain
(2) Define vector of complete polynomials up to order desired ( $g$ )
(3) Define first orthonormal trial function as $1 / s q r t(v o l u m e) ~(f[1])$
(4) Loop over lin. indep. polynomials to det. trial function coefficients

$$
f[n]=\operatorname{sum}(a[i] f[i]: i=1, n-1)+a[n] g[n]
$$

(a) calculate inner products and store in a
(b) using inner products calc a[n] -

$$
a[n]=1 / \operatorname{sqrt}\left(\left\langleg[n], g[n]>-\operatorname{sum}\left(\left\langle f[i], g[n]>^{\wedge} 2: i=1, n-1\right)\right)\right.\right.
$$

(c) using a[n], calculate all a[i]

$$
a[i]=-a[n]<f[i], g[n]>, i=1, n-1
$$

(d) using the coefficients stored in a, calculate the nth trial function using $\{1\}$
(* Define the volume integral over the node *)

```
VolInt[f_] := Integrate[f,{x,-1/2,1/2},{Y,-1/2,1/2}]
```

(* Define a vector consisting of the functions making up a complete
fourth order polynomial *)
$g=\left\{1, x, y, x^{\wedge} 2, x^{*} y, y^{\wedge} 2, x^{\wedge} 3, x^{\wedge} 2 * y, x^{*} y^{\wedge} 2, y^{\wedge} 3, x^{\wedge} 4, x^{\wedge} 3 \star y, x^{\wedge} 2{ }^{\star} y^{\wedge} 2, x^{*} y^{\wedge} 3, y^{\wedge} 4\right\}$
(* Define and initalize a vector for the orthogonal trial functions *)
$f=$ Table $[0,\{i, 15\}]$
(* Define and initialize a vector for the trial function coefficients *)
$a=\operatorname{Table}[0,\{i, 15\}]$
(* Define the first trial function as 1 *)
$f[[1]]=1$
(* Begin loop to determine trial functions *)
Dol
Print["Generating trial function ", n];
(* Calculate inner products *)
$\operatorname{Do}[a[[j]]=\operatorname{Vol} \operatorname{Int}[f[[j]] * g[[n]]],\{j, 1, n-1\}] ;$
$a[[n]]=\operatorname{VolInt}[g[[n]] * g[[n]]] ;$
(* Calculate sum of squares of inner products *)

```
    sum = 0;
    Do[ sum = sum+a[[j]]^2,{j,n-1} ];
(* Calculate the values of the coefficients *)
    a[[n]] = 1/Sqrt[a[[n]]-sum];
    Do[ a[[j]] = -a[[n]]*a[[j]], {j,n-1} ];
(* Store the trial function in f[n] *)
    sum = 0;
    Do[ sum = sum+a[[j]]*f[[j]],{j,n-1} ];
    f[[n]] = sum + a[[n]]*g[[n]],
(* End of Do loop *)
    {n,2,15} ]
(* Save the set of trial functions *)
Save["f.vol.xy.dat",f]
```

(* A Mathematica script to generate othornormal trial functions over an XY side *)
Volint [f_] $:=$ Integrate[f, $\{x,-1 / 2,1 / 2\}]$
$g=\left\{1, x, x^{\wedge} 2\right\}$
$1=\operatorname{Table}[0,\{i, 3\}]$
$a=\operatorname{Table}[0,\{i, 3\}]$
$1[$ [1] ] = 1
Do [
Print["Generating trial function ", n];
Do[ $a[[j]]=\operatorname{VolInt}[1[[j]] * g[[n]]],\{j, 1, n-1\}]$; $a[[n]]=\operatorname{VolInt}[g[[n]] * g[[n]]]$; Print["End of VolInt"];
sum $=0$;
Do[ sum $\left.=\operatorname{sum}+a[[j]]^{\wedge} 2,\{j, n-1\}\right] ;$ $a[[n]]=1 /$ Sqrt $[a[[n]]-s u m]$; Do[ $a[[j]]=-a[n]] * a[[j]],\{j, n-1\}]$; sum $=0$; Do[ sum $=\operatorname{sum}+a[[j]] * 1[[j]],\{j, n-1\}] ;$ $l[n]]=\operatorname{sum}+a[[n]] * g[[n]]$, $\{n, 2,3\}$ ]
Save["f.surf.xy.dat", 1]

```
(* A Mathematica script to generate the P matrix, which takes into account
    the spatial dependence of the node interior.
    X-Y Geometry *)
<<f.vol.xy.dat
VolInt[F_] := Integrate[f,{x,-1/2,1/2},{y,-1/2,1/2}]
s = {x, y}
p = Table[0,{i,15},{j,15},{k,2},{1,2}]
Do[
    If [k==l,
        Do[p[[i,j,k,l]] = VolInt[D[f[[i]],s[[k]]]*D[f[[j]],s[[l]]]];
            Print[i," ",j," ",k," ",l," ",p[[i,j,k,l]]];
                p[[j,i,k,l]] = p[[i,j,k,l]],
                {i,15}, {j,i,15}
        ],
        Do[p[[i,j,k,l]]= VolInt[D[f[[i]],s[[k]]]*D[f[[j]],s[[1]]]];
                    Princ[i," ",j," ",k," ",l," ",p[[i,j,k,l]]];
            p[[j,i,l,k]] = p[[i,j,k,l]],
            {i,15}, {j,15}
        ]
    ],
        {k,2}, {1,k,2}
]
(* Save ["pxy.dat",p] *)
Put ["P","pxy.rawdata"]
Do[PutAppend[N[p[[i,j,k,1]],16], "pxy.rawdata"],{1, 2},{k,2},{j, 15},{i,15}]
```

(* A Mathematica script to generate the D matrix, which couples the spatial dependence of the node surfaces to the node interior. X-Y Geometry

2


3
*)
<<f.vol.xy.dat
<<f.surf.xy.dat
$1=1 / . x->s$
$\mathrm{f} 1=\mathrm{f} / .\{\mathrm{x}->1 / 2, \mathrm{y}->\mathrm{s}\}$
$f 2=f . / .\{y->1 / 2, x->s\}$
$m \mathrm{~m}=\{1,-1,1,1,-1,1,-1,1,-1,1,1,-1,1,-1,1\}$
$m y=\{1,1,-1,1,-1,1,1,-1,1,-1,1,-1,1,-1,1\}$
Surfint[f_] := Integrate [f, $\{\mathrm{s},-1 / 2,1 / 2\}]$
$\mathrm{d}=\mathrm{Table}[0,\{\mathrm{i}, 4\},\{j, 15\},\{\mathrm{k}, 3\}]$
Do[ $d[[1, j, k]]=\operatorname{SurfInt}[f 1[[j]] * 1[[k]]] ;$
Print[" side 1 ", d[[1,j,k]]];
$d[[3, j, k]]=m x[[j]] * d[[1, j, k]] ;$
Print[" side 3 ", d[[3,j,k]]];
$d[[2, j, k]]=\operatorname{SurfInt}[f 2[[j]] * 1[[k]]]$;
Print[" side 2 ", d[[2,j,k]]];
$d[[4, j, k]]=m y[[j]] * d[[2, j, k]] ;$
Print[" side 4 ", d[[4,j,k]]],
$\{j, 15\},\{k, 3\}$
]
(* Save["dxy.dat",d] *)
Put [D, "dxy.rawdata"]
Do [PutAppend[N[d[[i,j,k]],16],"dxy.rawdata"],\{k,3\},\{j,15\},\{i,4\}]

```
(* A Mathematica script to generate the U matrix,
    the spatial dependence array needed in the anisotropic scattering
    calculation. X-Y Geometry *)
<<f.vol.xy.dat
VolInt[f_] := Integrate[f,{x,-1/2,1/2},{y,-1/2,1/2}]
s = {x, y}
u = Table[0,{i,15},{j,15},{1,2}]
Do[
    Do[u[[i,j,l]] = VolInt[f[[j]]*D[f[[i]],s[[l]]]];
                                    Print[i," ",j," ",1," ",u[[i,j,l]]],
        {i,15}, {j,15}
        ],
        {1,2}
]
(* Save["ury.dat",u] *)
Put[U, "uxy.rawdata"]
Do[PutAppend[N[u[[i,j,l]],16],"uxy.rawdata"],{1,2},{j,15},{i,15}]
```

(* A Mathematica script to generate othornormal trial functions over an hex node
(1) Define volume integral over the domain
(2) Define vector of complete polynomials up to order desired ( $g$ )
(3) Define first orthonormal trial function as $1 / s q r t(v o l u m e)(f[1])$
(4) Loop over lin. indep. polynomials to det. trial function coefficients

$$
f[n]=\operatorname{sum}(a[i] f[i]: i=1, n-1)+a[n] g[n]
$$

(a) calculate inner products and store in a
(b) using inner products calc a[n] -

$$
a[n]=1 / \operatorname{sqrt}\left(<g[n], g[n]>-\operatorname{sum}\left(<f[i], g[n]>^{\wedge} 2: i=1, n-1\right)\right)
$$

(c) using a[n], calculate all a[i]

$$
a[i]=-a[n]<f[i], g[n]>, \quad i=1, n-1
$$

(d) using the coefficients stored in a, calculate the nth trial function using $\{1\}$

```
Vol Int[f_] \(:=\left(b=3^{\wedge}(3 / 4) / S q r t[2] ;\right.\)
    Simplify[
    Integrate \([\mathrm{f},\{\mathrm{x},-\mathrm{b} / 3,0\},\{\mathrm{y},-\mathrm{x} /\) Sqrt \([3]-1 / \mathrm{b}, \mathrm{x} /\) Sqrt \([3]+1 / \mathrm{b}\}]+\)
    Integrate[f, \(\{x, 0, b / 3\},\{y, x / \operatorname{Sqrt}[3]-1 / b,-x / \operatorname{Sqrt}[3]+1 / b\}]])\)
\(g=\{1\),
                \(\begin{array}{lrr}x, & y, & \\ x^{\wedge} 2, & x^{\star} y, & y^{\wedge} 2,\end{array}\)
                \(x^{\wedge} 3, x^{\wedge} 2^{\star} y, \quad x^{\star} y^{\wedge} 2, \quad y^{\wedge} 3\),
                \(x^{\wedge} 4, x^{\wedge} 3^{*} y, x^{\wedge} 2^{\star} y^{\wedge} 2, \quad x^{*} y^{\wedge} 3, \quad y^{\wedge} 4\),
                \(x^{\wedge} 5, x^{\wedge} 4^{\star} y, x^{\wedge} 3^{\star} y^{\wedge} 2, x^{\wedge} 2^{\star} y^{\wedge} 3, \quad x^{\star} y^{\wedge} 4, \quad y^{\wedge} 5\),
                \(\left.x^{\wedge} 6, x^{\wedge} 5{ }^{\star} y, x^{\wedge} 4{ }^{\star} y^{\wedge} 2, x^{\wedge} 3^{\star} y^{\wedge} 3, ~ x^{\wedge} 2{ }^{*} y^{\wedge} 4, \quad x^{\star} y^{\wedge} 5, ~ y^{\wedge} 6\right\}\)
\(f=\operatorname{Table}[0,\{i, 28\}]\)
\(a=\) Table \([0,\{i, 28\}]\)
\(\mathrm{f}[\) [1] \(]=1\)
Dol
    Print["Generating trial function ", n];
    Do [a[[j]] = VolInt[f[[j]]*g[[n]]],\{j,1,n-1\}];
    \(a[[n]]=\operatorname{VolInt}[g[[n]] * g[[n]]]\);
    Print["End of VolInt"];
    sum \(=0\);
    Do [ sum \(\left.=\operatorname{sum}+a[[j]]^{\wedge} 2,\{j, n-1\}\right] ;\)
    \(a[[n]]=1 / \operatorname{Sqrt}[a[[n]]-s u m]\);
    Do[ \(a[[j]]=-a[n]] * a[[j]],\{j, n-1\}] ;\)
    sum = 0 ;
    Do[ sum \(=\) sum+a[[j]]*f[[j]], \(\{j, n-1\}]\);
    \(f[[n]]=\operatorname{sum}+a[[n]] * g[[n]]\),
    \(\{n, 2,28\}]\)
Save["f.vol.hex.dat",f]
```

(* A Mathematica script to generate othornormal trial functions over an hexagon side *)
VolInt[f_] $:=\left(b=3^{\wedge}(3 / 4) /\right.$ Sqrt [2];
b*Integrate [f, $\{x,-1 /(2 b), 1 /(2 b)\}])$
$g=\left\{1, x, x^{\wedge} 2\right\}$
$1=\operatorname{Table}[0,\{i, 3\}]$
$a=\operatorname{Table}[0,\{i, 3\}]$
$I[$ [1] ] $=1$
Do [
Print["Generating trial function ", n];
$\operatorname{Do}[a[[j]]=\operatorname{VolInt}[1[[j]] * g[[n]]],\{j, 1, n-1\}]$;
$a[[n]]=\operatorname{VolInt}[g[[n]] * g[[n]]]$;
Print ["End of VolInt"];
sum = 0;
Do $\left[\operatorname{sum}=\operatorname{sum}+a[[j]]^{\wedge} 2,\{j, n-1\}\right] ;$
$a[[n]]=1 / \operatorname{Sqrt}[a[[n]]-s u m]$;
Do[ $a[[j]]=-a[[n]] * a[[j]],\{j, n-1\}]$;
sum $=0$;
Do $[\operatorname{sum}=\operatorname{sum}+a[[j]] * 1[[j]],\{j, n-1\}] ;$ $I[[n]]=\operatorname{sum}+a[[n]] * g[[n]]$,
$\{n, 2,3\}]$
Save["f.surf.hex.dat",l]

```
(* A Mathematica script to generate the P matrix, which takes into account
    the spatial dependence of the node interior.
    hex Geometry *)
<<f.vol.hex.dat
VolInt[f_] := (b = 3^(3/4)/Sqrt[2];
                                    Simplify[
                                    Integrate[f,{x,-b/3,0},{y,-x/Sqrt[3]-1/b, x/Sqrt[3]+1/b}]+
                                    Integrate[f, {x,0, b/3},{y, x/Sqrt[3]-1/b,-x/Sqrt[3]+1/b}]])
s}={\mathbf{x},\textrm{y}
p = Table[0,{i,28},{j,28},{k,2},{1,2}]
Do[
    If [k==1,
        Do[p[[i,j,k,l]] = VolInt[D[f[[i]],s[[k]]]*D[f[[j]],s[[l]]]];
                        Print[i," ",j," ",k," ",l," ",p[[i,j,k,l]]];
            p[[j,i,k,l]] = p[[i,j,k,l]],
            {i,28}, {j,i,28}
        ],
        DO[p[[i,j,k,l]] = VolInt[D[f[[i]],s[[k]]]*D[f[[j]],s[[1]]]];
                    Print[i," ",j," ",k," ",l," ",p[[i,j,k,l]]];
            p[[j,i,l,k]] = p[[i,j,k,l]],
            {i,28}, {j,28}
        ]
    1,
    {k,2}, {1,k,2}
]
(* Save["phex.dat",p] *)
Put[P,"phex.rawdata"]
Do[PutAppend [N[p[[i,j,k,l]],16],"phex.rawdata"],{1,2},{k,2},{j,28},{i,28}]
```

(* A Mathematica script to generate the D matrix, which coupies the spatial dependence of the node surfaces to the node interior. hex Geometry

*)
(* Load vector of basis functions *)
$\ll f$.vol.hex.dat
(* Load vector of surface trial functions)
<<f.surf.hex.dat
(* Define vectors fn where fn is the vector of interior trial functions transformed to the surface $n$ 's coordinate system *)
$b=3^{\wedge}(3 / 4) /$ Sqrt [2]
(* the notation $a / .\left\{x->x^{\prime}, y \rightarrow y^{\prime}\right\}$ can be read as transform the expression "a" replacing $x$ with $x$ ' and $y$ with $y^{\prime}$ *)

```
1 = 1 /. x->s
fl=f/.{x b b/3 , y > s }
f2 =f/.{x - { b/6(2b s + 1), y -> -1/(4b) (2b s - 3) }
f3=f/.{x - { b/6(2b s - I), y > 1/(4b)(2b s + 3)}
f4 = f/.{x - - -b/3 , y > s
f5 =f/.{x - { b/6(2b s - 1), y - > -1/(4b) (2b s + 3)}
f6 = f/.{x - { b/6(2bs+1), y > 1/(4b)(2b s - 3)}
```

(* Define the surface integral on a node surface *)
Surfint[f_] := $b *$ Integrate [f, $\{s,-1 /(2 b), 1 /(2 b)\}]$
(* Define and initialize the elements of the D matrix *)
$d=\operatorname{Table}[0,\{\mathrm{i}, 6\},\{j, 28\},\{k, 3\}]$
(* Calculate the elements of the $D$ matrix. The $D$ matrix is defined as $D[i, j, k]=\operatorname{SurfInt}[f[j] * l[k]]$ on the $i t h$ nodal surface where $f$ and $l$ are vectors of orthogonal trial functions on the node interior and nodal surface i *)
$\operatorname{Do}[d[[1, j, k]]=\operatorname{SurfInt}[f 1[[j]] \star 1[[k]]] ;$
$d[[2, j, k]]=\operatorname{SurfInt}[f 2[[j]] *][[k]]] ;$
$d[[3, j, k]]=\operatorname{SurfInt}[f 3[[j]] * l[k]]]$;
$d[[4, j, k]]=\operatorname{Surfint}[f 4[[j]] \star l[[k]]] ;$
$d[[5, j, k]]=\operatorname{Surfint}[f 5[[j]] * 1[[k]]] ;$

```
        d[[6,j,k]] = SurfInt[f6[[j]]*l[[k]]],
        {j,28},{k,3}
]
```

(* Store the completed D matrix *)
(* Save["dhex.dat",d] *)
(* Write the numerical values of the $D$ matrix to an ascii file *)
Put [D, "dhex.rawdata"]
Do [PutAppend [N[d[[i,j,k]],16],"dhex.rawdata"],\{k,3\},\{j,28\},\{i,6\}]
(* A Mathematica script to generate the $U$ matrix, the spatial dependence array needed in the anisotropic scattering calculation. hex Geometry *)
$\ll f . v o l . h e x . d a t$
VolInt[f._] $:=\left(b=3^{\wedge}(3 / 4) /\right.$ Sqrt[2];
Simplify[
Integrate $[\mathrm{f},\{\mathrm{x},-\mathrm{b} / 3,0\},\{\mathrm{y},-\mathrm{x} / \mathrm{Sqrt}[3]-1 / \mathrm{b}, \mathrm{x} /$ Sqrt $[3]+1 / \mathrm{b}\}]+$ Integrate $[f,\{x, 0, b / 3\},\{y, x /$ Sqrt [3]-1/b, $-x /$ Sqrt [3] $+1 / b\}]])$
$\mathbf{s}=\{x, y\}$
$u=\operatorname{Table}[0,\{i, 28\},\{j, 28\},\{1,2\}]$
Do [
$\operatorname{Do}[u[[i, j, 1]]=\operatorname{Vol} \operatorname{Int}[f[[j]] * \operatorname{Df[[i]],s[[1]]]];}$ Print [i," ",j," ",l," ",u[ii,j,1]]], \{i,28\}, $\{j, 28\}$
].
$\{1,2\}$
]
(* Save ["uhex.dat",u] *)
Put [U ,"uhex.rawdata"]
Do [PutAppend [N[u[[i,j, 1]], 16], "uhex. rawdata"], \{1, 2\}, \{j, 28\}, $\{i, 28\}]$
(* A Mathematica script to generate othornormal trial functions over an XYZ node
(1) Define volume integral over the domain
(2) Define vector of complete polynomials up to order desired ( $g$ )
(3) Define first orthonormal trial function as l/sqrt (volume) (f[1])
(4) Loop over lin. indep. polynomials to det. trial function coefficients

$$
f[n]=\operatorname{sum}(a[i] f[i]: i=1, n-1)+a[n] g[n]
$$

(a) calculate inner products and store in a
(b) using inner products calc a[n] -

$$
a[n]=1 / \operatorname{sqrt}(<g[n], g[n]>-\operatorname{sum}(<f[i], g[n]>\wedge 2: i=1, n-1))
$$

(c) using a[n], calculate all a[i]

$$
a[i]=-a[n]<f[i], g[n]>, i=1, n-1
$$

(d) using the coefficients stored in a, calculate the nth trial function using $\{1\}$

```
VolInt[f_] := Integrate[f,{x,-1/2,1/2},{y,-1/2,1/2},{z,-1/2,1/2}]
g = {1,
    x,
    Y,
    z,
x^2,
    x*y,
    y*2,
    y*z,
    z^2,
    z*x,
x^3,
    x^2*y,
    x* y^2,
    y^3,
    y^2*z,
    y* z^^2,
    z^3,
    z^2*x,
    z*x^2,
    x*y*z,
x^4,
    x^3*y,
    x^2* y^2,
    x* y^^3,
    y^4,
    y^3*z,
    y^2*z^2,
    y* z^^3,
    z^4,
    z^ 3**,
    z^2**^2,
    z* *^3
    x^2* y* z,
    x* y^2*z,

\section*{\(\left.x * y^{\star} z^{\wedge} 2\right\}\)}
```

f=Table[0,{i,35}]
a=Table[0,{i,35}]
f[[1]] = 1
Do[
Print["Generating trial function ",n];
Do[ a[[j]] = VolInt[f[[j]]*g[[n]]],{j,1,n-1} ];
a[[n]] = VolInt[g[[n]]*g[[n]]];
Print["End of VolInt"];
sum = 0;
Do[ sum = sum+a[[j][^2,{j,n-I} ];
a[[n]] = 1/Sqrt[a[[n]]-sum];
Do[ a[[j]] = -a[[n]]*a[[j]], {j,n-i} ];
sum = 0;
Do[ sum = sum+a[{j]]*f[[j]],{j,n-1} ];
f[[n]] = sum + a[[n]]*g[[n]},
{n,2,35} ]
Save["f.vol.xyz.dat",f]

```
(1) Define volume integral over the domain
(2) Define vector of complete polynomials up to order desired (g)
(3) Define first orthonormal trial function as \(1 / s q r t\) (volume) (f[1])
(4) Loop over lin. indep. polynomials to det. trial function coefficients
\[
f[n]=\operatorname{sum}(a[i] f[i]: i=1, n-1)+a[n] g[n]
\]
(a) calculate inner products and store in a
(b) using inner products calc a[n] -
\[
a[n]=1 / \operatorname{sqrt}\left(<g[n], g[n]>-\operatorname{sum}\left(<f[i], g[n]>^{\wedge} 2: i=1, n-1\right)\right)
\]
(c) using a[n], calculate all a[i]
\[
a[i]=-a[n]<f[i], g[n]>, \quad i=1, n-1
\]
(d) using the coefficients stored in a, calculate the nth trial function using \(\{1\}\)
```

***************************************************************************)
(* Define the volume integral over the node *)
VolInt[f_] := Integrate[f,{x,-1/2,1/2},{y,-1/2,1/2}]
(* Define a vector consisting of the functions making up a complete
second order polynomial *)
g={1,x,y, x^2, x* y, y^2
(* Define and initalize a vector for the orthogonal trial functions *)
f = Table[0,{i,6}]
(* Define and initialize a vector for the trial function coefficients *)
a = Table[0,{i,6}]
(* Define the first trial function as 1 *)
f[[1]] = 1
(* Begin loop to determine trial functions *)
Do [
Print["Generating trial function ",n];
(* Calculate inner products *)
Do[ a[[j]] = VolInt[f[[j]]*g[[n]]],{j,1,n-1} ];
a[[n]] = VolInt[g[[n]]*g[[n]]];
(* Calculate sum of squares of inner products *)

```
```

    sum = 0;
    Do[ sum = sum+a[[j]]^2,{j,n-1} ];
    (* Calculate the values of the coefficients *)
a[[n]] = 1/Sqrt[a[[n]]-sum];
Do[ a[[j]] = -a[[n]]*a[[j]], {j,n-1} ];
(* Store the trial function in f[n] *)
sum = 0;
Do[ sum = sum+a[[j]]*f[[j]],{j,n-1} ];
f[[n]] = sum + a[[n]]*g[[n]],
(* End of Do loop *)
{n,2,6} ]
(* Save the set of trial functions *)
Save["f.surfxy.xyz.dat",f]

```
```

(* A Mathematica script to generate the P matrix, which takes into account
the spatial dependence of the node interior.
X-Y-Z Geometry *)
<<f.vol.xyz.dat
VolInt[f_] := Integrate[f,{x,-1/2,1/2},{y,-1/2,1/2},{2,-1/2,1/2}]
s = {x, y, z}
p=Table[0,{i,35},{j,35},{k,3},{1,3}]
DO[
If [k==1,
DO[p[[i,j,k,l]]= VolInt[D[f[[i]],s[[k]]]*D[f[[j]],s[[l]]]];
Print[i," ",j," ",k," ",l," ",p[[i,j,k,l]]];
p[[j,i,k,l]] = p[[i,j,k,l]],
{i,35}, {j,i,35}
],
Do[p[[i,j,k,l]]= VolInt[D[f[[i]],s[[k]]]*D[f[[j]],s[[l]]]];
Print[i," ",j," ",k," ",l," ",p[[i,j,k,l]]];
p[[j,i,l,k]] = p[[i,j,k,l]],
{i,35}, {j,35}
J
],
{k,3},{1,k,3}
]
(* Save["pxyz.dat",p] *)
Put[P,"pxyz.rawdata"]
Do[PutAppend[N[p[[i,j,k,1]],16], "pxyz.rawdata"],{1,3},{k,3},{j, 35},{i, 35}]

```
(* A Mathematica script to generate the D matrix, which couples the spatial dependence of the node surfaces to the node interior. X-Y-Z Geometry *)
<<f.surfxy.xyz.dat
\(1=\mathrm{f} / .\{\mathrm{x}->\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{y}->\mathrm{s}\}\)
Clear[f]
<<f.vol.xyz.dat
\(\mathrm{f} 1=\mathrm{f} / .\{\mathrm{x}->1 / 2, \mathrm{y}->\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{z}->\mathrm{s}\}\)
\(f 2=f / .\{y->1 / 2, x->t, z->s\}\)
\(f 3=£ / .\{z->1 / 2, x->t, y->s\}\)
\(\mathrm{f} 4=\mathrm{f} / .\{\mathrm{x}->-1 / 2, \mathrm{y}->\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{z}->\mathrm{s}\}\)
\(\mathrm{f} 5=\mathrm{f} / .\{y->-1 / 2, x->t, z->s\}\)
\(\mathrm{f} 6=\mathrm{f} / .\{\mathrm{z}->-1 / 2, \mathrm{x}->\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{y}->\mathrm{s}\}\)
(*mx \(=\) Table \([1,\{i, 35\}]\)
\(m y=\) Table \([1,\{i, 35\}]\)
\(m z=\) Table \([1,\{i, 35\}]\)
\(\mathrm{mxm}=\{2,6,10,11,13,18,20,22,24,30,32,34,35\}\)
mym \(=\{3,6,8,12,14,16,20,22,24,26,28,33,35\}\)
\(\mathrm{mzm}=\{5,8,10,15,17,19,20,26,28,29,32,33,34\}\)
Do[mx[[mxm[[i]]]]=-1;
\(\operatorname{my}[[\) mym [[i] \(]]]=-1\);
\(m z[\operatorname{mzm}[[i]]]]=-1\),
\{i,13\}
] *)
Surfint[f_] := Integrate[f, \(\{s,-1 / 2,1 / 2\},\{t,-1 / 2,1 / 2\}]\)
\(\mathrm{d}=\operatorname{Table}[0,\{i, 6\},\{j, 35\},\{k, 6\}]\)
\(\operatorname{Do}[d[[1, j, k]]=\operatorname{SurfInt}[f 1[[j]] * 1[[k]]] ;\)
Print[" side 1 ", d[[1,j,k]]];
(*d[ [3, j, k] \(]=\operatorname{mx}[[j]] * d[[2, j, k]] ; *)\)
\(d[[3, j, k]]=\operatorname{SurfInt}[f 4[[j]] * 1[[k]]] ;\)
Print [" side 3 ",d[[3,j,k]]];
\(d[[2, j, k]]=\operatorname{SurfInt}[f 2[[j]] * 1[[k]]] ;\)
Print [" side 2 ", d[[2,j,k]]];
(*d[[4,j,k]]=my[[j]]*d[[2,j,k]];*)
\(d[[4, j, k]]=\operatorname{SurfInt}[f 5[[j]] * 1[[k]]]\);
Print[" side 4 ", d[[4,j,k]]];
\(d[[5, j, k]]=\operatorname{Surfint}[f 3[[j]] *][[k]]]\);
Print [" side 5 ", d[[5,j,k]]];
(*d[[6,j,k]] = mz[[j]]*d[[5,j,k]];*)
\(d[[6, j, k]]=\operatorname{SurfInt}[f 6[[j]] * 1[[k]]] ;\)
Print [" side 6 ", d[\{6,j,k]]],
\(\{j, 35\},\{k, 6\}\)
]
(* Save["dxyz.dat",d] *)
Put [D, "dxyz.rawdata"]
Do [PutAppend [N[d[[i,j,k]],16],"dxyz. rawdata"], \{k, 6\},\{j,35\},\{i,6\}]
```

(* A Mathematica script to generate the U matrix,
the spatial dependence array needed in the anisotropic scattering
calculation. X-Y-Z Geometry *)
<<f.vol.xyz.dat
VolInt[f_] := Integrate[f,{x,-1/2,1/2},{y,-1/2,1/2},{z,-1/2,1/2}]
s = {x, y, z}
u = Table[0,{i,35},{j,35},{1,3}]
Do[
Do[u[[i,j,l]] = VolInt[f[[j]]*D[f[[i]],s[[l]]]];
Print[i," ",j," ",1," ",u[[i,j,l]]],
{i,35}, {j,35}
],
{1,3}
]
(* Save["uxyz.dat",u] *)
Put[U,"uxyz.rawdata"]
Do[PutAppend[N[u[[i,j,l]],16],"uxyz.rawdata"],{1,3},{j,35},{i,35}]

```
(* A Mathematica script to generate othornormal trial functions over an hex-Z node. Complete expansion order is: 6th order in \(X\) and \(Y\), 4 th order in \(Z\).
(1) Define volume integral over the domain
(2) Define vector of complete polynomials up to order desired (g)
(3) Define first orthonormal trial function as l/sqrt (volume) (f[1])
(4) Loop over lin. indep. polynomials to det. trial function coefficients
\[
f[n]=\operatorname{sum}(a[i] f[i]: i=1, n-1)+a[n] g[n]
\]
(a) calculate inner products and store in a
(b) using inner products calc a[n] -
\[
a[n]=1 / \operatorname{sqrt}(<g[n], g[n]>-\operatorname{sum}(<f[i], g[n]>\wedge 2: i=1, n-1))
\]
(c) using a[n], calculate all a[i]
\[
a[i]=-a[n]<f[i], g[n]>, i=1, n-1
\]
(d) using the coefficients stored in a, calculate the nth trial function using \(\{1\}\)
```

VolInt[f_] := (b = 3^(3/4)/Sqrt[2];
Simplify[
Integrate {f,{x,-b/3,0},{y,-x/Sqrt[3]-1/b, x/Sqrt[3]+1/b},{z,-1/2,1/2}]+
Integrate[f,{x,0, b/3},{y, x/Sqrt[3]-1/b,-x/Sqrt[3]+1/b},{z,-1/2,1/2}]])
g = {1,
x,y,z,
x^2,
x*y,
y^2,
y*z,
z^2,
z*x,
x^3,
x^2*y,
x* y^2,
y^3,
Y^2*z,
Y* (^2,
z^3,
z^2**,
z* (^2 ,
x* Y* z,
x^4,
x^3*y,
x^2* y^2,
x* y^3,
y^4,
Y^3*z,
Y^2* Z^2,
y* z^3,
z^4,
z^ 3*x,
z^2**^^2,
2* *^3,

```
        x^2*y*z,
        x* y^2*z,
        x* y* z^2,
        x^5,
        x^4*y,
        x^3* y^2,
        x^2* ( ^^3,
        x*y*4,
        Y^5,
        x^6,
            x^5*y,
            x^4* y^2,
            x^3* (}\mp@subsup{\mp@code{^^}}{}{\wedge
            x^2* (^^4,
            x* y^5,
            Y^6
            }
f = Table[0,{i,48}]
a = Table[0,{i,48}]
f[[1]] = 1
Do[
    Print["Generating trial function ",n];
    Do[ a[[j]] = VolInt[f[[j]]*g[[n]]],{j,1,n-1} ];
    a[[n]] = VolInt[g[[n]]*g[[n]]];
    Print["End of VolInt"];
    sum = 0;
    Do[ sum = sum+a[[j]]^2,{j,n-1} ];
    a[[n]] = 1/Sqrt[a[[n]]-sum];
    Do[ a[[j]] = -a[[n]]*a[[j]], {j,n-1} ];
    sum = 0;
    Do[ sum = sum+a[[j]]*f[[j]],{j,n-1} ];
    f[[n]] = sum + a[[n]]*g[[n]],
    {n,2,48} ]
Save["f.hex3d64.dat",f]
```

(1) Define volume integral over the domain
(2) Define vector of complete polynomials up to order desired ( g )
(3) Define first orthonormal trial function as $1 / s q r t(v o l u m e) ~(f[1])$
(4) Loop over lin. indep. polynomials to det. trial function coefficients

$$
f[n]=\operatorname{sum}(a[i] f[i]: i=1, n-1)+a[n] g[n]
$$

(a) calculate inner products and store in a
(b) using inner products calc a[n] -

$$
a[n]=1 / \operatorname{sqrt}(<g[n], g[n]>-\operatorname{sum}(<f[i], g[n]>\wedge 2: i=1, n-1))
$$

(c) using a[n], calculate all a[i]

$$
a[i]=-a[n]<f[i], g[n]>, i=1, n-1
$$

(d) using the coefficients stored in a, calculate the nth trial function using \{1\}

```
****************************************************************************)
(* Define the volume integral over the node *)
VolInt[f_] := (b=3^(3/4)/Sqrt[2] ;
    b*Integrate[f,{x,-1/(2 b),1/(2 b)},{y,-1/2,1/2}])
(* Define a vector consisting of the functions making up a complete
    fourth order polynomial *)
g={1,x,y, x^2, x* y, y^2 }
(* Define and initalize a vector for the orthogonal trial functions *)
f = Table[0,{i,6}]
(* Define and initialize a vector for the trial function coefficients *)
a = Table[0,{i,6}]
(* Define the first trial function as 1 *)
f[[l]] = 1
(* Begin loop to determine trial functions *)
Do[
    Print["Generating trial function ",n];
(* Calculate inner products *)
    Do[ a[[j]] = VolInt[f[[j]]*g[[n]]],{j,1,n-1} ];
    a[[n]] = VolInt[g[[n]]*g[[n]]];
(* Calculate sum of squares of inner products *)
```

```
    sum = 0;
    Do[ sum = sum+a[[j]]^2,{j,n-1} ];
(* Calculate the values of the coefficients *)
    a[[n]] = 1/Sqrt[a[[n]]-sum];
    Do[ a[[j]] = -a[[n]]*a[{j]], {j,n-1} ];
(* Store the trial function in f[n] *)
    sum = 0;
    Do[ sum = sum+a[[j]]*f[[j]],{j,n-1} ];
    f[[n]] = sum + a[[n]]*g[[n]],
(* End of Do loop *)
    {n,2,6} ]
(* Save the set of trial functions *)
Save["f.surfxy.hexz.dat",f]
```

(1) Define volume integral over the domain
(2) Define vector of complete polynomials up to order desired (g)
(3) Define first orthonormal trial function as $1 /$ sqrt (volume) (f[1])
(4) Loop over lin. indep. polynomials to det. trial function coefficients

$$
f[n]=\operatorname{sum}(a[i] f[i]: i=1, n-1)+a[n] g[n]
$$

(a) calculate inner products and store in a
(b) using inner products calc a[n] -

$$
a[n]=1 / \operatorname{sqrt}(<g[n], g[n]>-\operatorname{sum}(<f[i], g[n]>\wedge 2: i=1, n-1))
$$

(c) using a[n], calculate all a[i]

$$
a[i]=-a[n]<f[i], g[n]>, i=1, n-1
$$

(d) using the coefficients stored in a, calculate the nth trial function using $\{1\}$

```
VolInt[f_] := (b = 3^(3/4)/Sqrt[2];
    Simplify[
    Integrate[f, {x,-b/3,0},{y,-x/Sqrt[3]-1/b, x/Sqrt [3]+1/b}]+
    Integrate[f,{x,0, b/3},{y, x/Sqrt[3]-1/b,-x/Sqrt[3]+1/b}]j)
g = {1,
            x,y,
            x^2,x*y,y^2}
f = Table[0,{i,6}]
a = Table[0,{i,6}]
f[[1]] = 1
Do[
    Print["Generating trial function ",n];
    Do[ a[[j]] = VolInt[f[{j]]*g[[n]]],{j,1,n-1} ];
    a[[n]] = VolInt[g[[n]]*g[[n]]];
    Print["End of VolInt"];
    sum = 0;
    Do[ sum = sum+a[[j]]^2,{j,n-1} ];
    a[[n]] = 1/Sqrt[a[[n]]-sum];
    DO[ a[[j]] = -a[[n]]*a[[j]], {j,n-1} ];
    sum = 0;
    Do[ sum = sum+a[[j]]*f[[j]],{j,n-1} ];
    f[[n]] = sum + a[[n]]*g[[n]},
    {n,2,6} ]
Save["f.surfh.hexz.dat",f]
```

(* A Mathematica script to generate the $P$ matrix, which takes into account
the spatial dependence of the node interior.
hex-Z Geometry *)
<<f64.vol.hexz.dat
$\mathrm{f}=$ Simplify $[\mathrm{N}[\mathrm{f}, 15]$ ]
Volint[f_] := (
$b=3^{\text {A }}(3 / 4) /$ Sqrt [2] ;
Simplify[
Integrate $[f,\{x,-b / 3,0\},\{y,-x / \operatorname{Sqrt}[3]-1 / b, x / \operatorname{Sqrt}[3]+1 / b\},\{z,-1 / 2,1 / 2\}]+$
Integrate $[f,\{x, 0, b / 3\},\{y, x / \operatorname{Sqrt}[3]-1 / b,-x / \operatorname{Sqrt}[3]+1 / b\},\{z,-1 / 2,1 / 2\}]])$
$s=\{x, y, z\}$
$p=\operatorname{Table}\{0,\{i, 48\},\{j, 48\},\{k, 3\},\{1,3\}]$
Do [
If $[k==1$,
Do [
$\mathrm{p}[[\mathrm{i}, j, k, 1]]=\operatorname{Vol} \operatorname{Int}[\mathrm{D}[\mathrm{f}[[\mathrm{i}]], \mathrm{s}[[k]]] * \mathrm{D}[\mathrm{f}[[j]], \mathrm{s}[[1]]]] ;$
Print [ i," ", j," ",k," ", 1," ", N[ p[[i,j,k,1]] ] ];
$p[[j, i, k, l]]=p[[i, j, k, l]]$.
$\{i, 48\},\{j, i, 48\}$
〕,
Do [
$\mathrm{p}[[\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{j}, \mathrm{k}, \mathrm{l}]]=\operatorname{Vol} \operatorname{Int}[\mathrm{D}[\mathrm{f}[[\mathrm{i}]], \mathrm{s}[[\mathrm{k}]]] * \mathrm{D}[\mathrm{f}[[\mathrm{j}]], \mathrm{s}[[1]]]] ;$
Print [ i," ",j," ",k," ",l," ",N[p[[i,j,k,l]] ] ];
$p[[j, i, l, k]]=p[[i, j, k, l]]$.
$\{i, 48\},\{j, 48\}$
]
〕;
(* Save ["s64.phexz. dat", p],
$\{k, 3\},\{1, k, 3\}$
] *)
stmp $=$ OpenWrite["s64.phexz.rawdata"]
WriteString[stmp,"P \n"]
Do!
Write[ stmp, Chop[ $\left.\mathrm{N}[\mathrm{p}[[\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{j}, \mathrm{k}, \mathrm{l}]], 12], 10^{\wedge}-12\right] \mathrm{l}$ ], $\{1,3\},\{k, 3\},\{j, 48\},\{i, 48\}$
]
Close [stmp]

```
(* Script for calculating the hex-z D matrix. The sides are numbered
    as follows:
    Sides 1-6 : rectangular faces starting at x = b/3, numbered counter
        clockwise
    Side 7 : upper hexagonal face
    Side 8 : lower hexagonal face
*)
(* Number of internal moments *)
(* 4th order in z, 6th order in xy *)
nFluxMom = 48
(* Number of surface moments *)
(* quadratic in s and t *)
nCurrMom = 6
(* Load vector of surface trial functions *)
(* xy trial functions on the rectangular faces *)
<< f.surfxy.hexz.dat
f=Simplify[N[f,15]]
hxy = f
hxy = hxy /. { x - s s, y -> t }
Clear[f]
(* hex trial functions on the z faces *)
<< f.surfh.hexz.dat
f=Simplify[N[f,15]]
hz=f
hz=hz/.{x - { s,y > t }
Clear[f]
```

(* define a function which returns the appropriate surface trial function *)
$h\left[i_{-}, j_{-}\right]=(\operatorname{If}[i<7, h x y[[j]], h z[[j]]$ ] ;
(* Define surface integral: sides 1-6 - rectangular domain
sides 7-8 - hexagonal domain *)
surfint[f_,i_] $=1$
If [
$i<7, b=3^{\wedge}(3 / 4) /$ Sqrt [2] ;
b*Integrate [f, $\{s,-1 /(2 \mathrm{~b}), 1 /(2 \mathrm{~b})\},\{\mathrm{t},-1 / 2,1 / 2\}]$,
$b=3^{\wedge}(3 / 4) /$ Sqrt [2] ;
Simplify[
Integrate $[\mathrm{f},\{\mathrm{s},-\mathrm{b} / 3,0\},\{\mathrm{t},-\mathrm{s} / \operatorname{Sqrt}[3]-1 / \mathrm{b}, \mathrm{s} / \operatorname{Sqrt}[3]+1 / \mathrm{b}\}]+$
Integrate $[f,\{s, 0, b / 3\},\{t, s / \operatorname{Sqrt}[3]-1 / b,-s / \operatorname{sqrt}[3]+1 / b\}]$
]
J
!;
(* Load vector of internal basis functions, $f$ *)
<<f64.vol.hexz.dat
f=Simplify[N[f,15]]
(* Define vectors fp where $f p[[n]]$ is the vector of interior trial functions
$b=3^{\wedge}(3 / 4) / \operatorname{Sqrt}[2]$

```
fp = Table[ 0, {i,8} ]
fp[[1]]=f/.{x->> b/3 , y >> s , z -> t }
fp[[2]] = f/.{{x > b/6(2b s + 1), y >> -1/(4b)(2b s-3),z ->t}
fp[[3]] = f /.{x > b b/6(2b s-1), y > I/(4b)(2b s+3), z -> t }
fp[[4]]=f /.{x -> -b/3 , y > s m z -> t }
fp[[5]] = f /. {x -> b/6(2b s - 1), y >> - l/(4b) (2b s + 3), z -> t }
fp[[6]] = f /. {x - > b/6(2b s + 1), y > 1/(4b)(2b s - 3), z -> t }
fp[[7]] = f/.{{z->> 1/2,x x s, y-> t}
fp[[8]] = f/.{{ { > -1/2, x > s, y-> t}
(* Define and initialize the elements of the D matrix *)
d= Table [0,{i, 8},{j,nFluxMom},{k,nCurrMom }]
DO[
    d[[i,j,k]] = surfInt[ Simplify[ N[ fp[[i,j]] h[i,k], 14 ] ], i ];
    Print["Surface ",i," Pair[ ",j,", ",k," ] = ", N[ d[[i,j,k]] ] ],
        {i,8},{j,nFluxMom},{k,nCurrMom}
]
(* Store the completed D matrix *)
(* Save["s64.dhexz.dat",d] *)
(* Write the numerical values of the D matrix to an ascii file *)
stmp = OpenWrite["s64.dhexz.rawdata"]
WriteString[stmp,"D \n"]
Do[
    Write[ stmp, Chop[ N[ d[[i,j,k]],12], 10^-12 ] ],
        {k,nCurrMom}, {j,nFluxMom}, {i,8}
    ]
Close [stmp]
```

```
(* A Mathematica script to generate the U matrix,
    the spatial dependence array needed in the anisotropic scattering
    calculation. hex-z Geometry *)
<<f64.vol.hexz.dat
f=Simplify[N[f,15]]
VolInt[f_] := (b = 3^(3/4)/Sqrt[2];
    Simplify[
    Integrate[f, {x,-b/3,0}, {y,-x/Sqrt[3]-1/b, x/Sqrt[3]+1/b},{z,-1/2, 1/2}]+
    Integrate[f,{x,0, b/3},{y, x/Sqrt[3]-1/b,-x/Sqrt[3]+1/b},{z,-1/2, 1/2}]])
s = {x, y, z}
u=Table[0,{i,48},{j,48},{1,3}]
Do[
    Do[u[[i,j,l]] = VolInt[f[[j]]*D[f[[i]],s[[l]]]];
                    Print[i," ",j," ",1," ",u[{i,j,l]]],
        {i,48}, {j,48}
    ],
    {1,3}
]
(* Save["s64.uhexz.dat",u] *)
Put[U,"s64.uhexz.rawdata"]
Do[PutAppend[N{u[[i,j,1]],16],"s64.uhexz.rawdata"],{1,3},{j,48},{i,48}]
```

```
(* A Mathematica script to generate the P matrix, which takes into account
    the angular dependence of the node interior.
    2d Geometry *)
ifa=9
rules = {x -> Cos[th],y ->> Sin[th] Cos[ph],z -> Sin[th] Sin[ph]}
<<even_parity.functions.2d
g = g/. rules
```



```
<<AngInt.math
h = Table[0,{i,2},{j,2},{k,ifa},{l,ifa}}
Do[a=AngInt[ o[[i]] o[[j]] g[[k]] g[{l]] ];
    h[[i,j,k,l]]=a;
    a=a, (*
    h[[i,j, l,k]]=a;
    h[{j,i,k,l]]=a;
    h[[j,i,l,k]]=a, *)
    {i,2},{j,2},{k,ifa},{1,ifa}]
(* Save["hxy.dat",h] *)
stmp = OpenWrite["hxy.rawdata"]
Writestring[stmp,"H \n"]
Do[Write[stmp,N[h[[i,j,k,1]],16]],{1,ifa},{k,ifa},{j,2},{i,2}]
Close [stmp]
```

```
(* A Mathematica script to generate the P matrix, which takes into account
    the angular dependence of the node interior.
    3d Geometry *)
rules = {x -> Cos[th],y -> Sin[th] Cos[ph],z -> Sin[th] Sin[ph]}
<<even_parity.functions.3d
<<AngInt.math
g=g/. rules
```



```
h = Table [0,{i,3},{j,3},{k,15},{1,15}]
Do[
    a=AngInt[ o[[i]] o[[j]] g[[k]] g[[l]] ];
    h[[i,j,k,l]]=a;
    h[[i,j, ],k]]=a;
    h[[j,i,k,l]]=a;
    h[[j,i,l,k]]=a,
    {i,3},{j,i,3},{k,15},{1,k,15}]
(* Save["hxyz.dat",h] *)
stmp = OpenWrite["hxyz.rawdata"]
WriteString[stmp,"H \n"]
Do[Write [stmp,N[h[{i,j,k,1]], 16]],{1,15},{k,15},{j,3},{i,3}]
Close [stmp]
```
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APPENDIX D

DESCRIPTION OF THE BCD INPUT FILE A.DIF3D








```
CR OPTIMUM OVERRELAXATION FACTORS (TYPE 07)
C
CL FORMAT-----(I2,10X,5E12.5)
C
CD # COLUMNS CONTENTS...IMPLICATIONS, IF ANY
CD = ======= ==========================================================--
```








CD $C D$ $C D$ CD $C D$ CD CD CD CD CD CD $C D$ CD CD CD CD CD CD $C D$ CD CD CD CD CD CD CD CD CD CD $C D$ $C D$ CD CD
NODAL OUTER ITERATIONS ONLY ON FISSION SOURCES. NO EXTRA-SPACE IS NEEDED TO STORE PREVIOUS OUTER ITERATION CURRENTS.
O... PERFORM ASYMPTOTIC SOURCE EXTRAPOLATION ON THE NODAL OUTER ITERATIONS ON FISSION SOURCES AND CURRENTS.
1...DO NOT PERFORM ASYMPTOTIC SCURCE EXTRAPOLATION
$9 \quad 49-54$
ANISOTROPIC SCATTERING APPROXIMATION NPNO.
O...ISOTROPIC SCATTERING (DEFAULT).
N. . ANISOTROPIC SCATTERING ORDER (.LE. 3). N MUST BE LESS THAN OR EQUAL TO MAXORD, MAXIMUM ANISOTROPIC ORDER SPECIFIED IN ISOTXS OR COMPXS FILES.
$10 \quad 55-60$
EXTENDED TRANSPORT APPROXIMATION (NXTR) ON TOTAL CROSS SECTION.
$-1 .$. IF NPNO .EQ. 0 USE TOTAL CROSS SECTION PROVIDED IN COMPXS FILE, OTHERWISE USE TRANSPORT CROSS SECTION INSTEAD OF TOTAL ONE.
0... (DEFAULT).
IF NPNO .EQ. 0 USE TRANSPORT CROSS SECTION PROVIDED IN COMPXS FILE.
IF NPNO .GT. 0 AND NPNO .EQ. MAXORD USE TOTAL CROSS SECTION PROVIDED IN COMPXS FILE.
IF NPNO .GT. 0 AND NPNO .LT. MAXORD CORRECT TOTAL
CROSS SECTION PROVIDED IN COMPXS FILE WITH EXTENDED TRANSPORT APPROXIMATION TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE NPNO +1 ORDER SCATTERING CROSS SECTIONS (BHS APPROXIMATION).
N. . IF NXTR .LE. NPNO USE TOTAL CROSS SECTION. IF NXTR .GT. NPNO PERFORM EXTENDED TRANSPORT APPROXIMATION ON TOTAL CROSS SECTION FROM NPNO + 1 TO NXTR ORDER.
NODAL COUPLING COEFFICIENT PACKING OPTION.
0...NO PACKING WILL BE PERFORMED UNLESS NOT ENOUGH ECM MEMORY IS AVAILABLE (DEFAULT).
1...NODAL COUPLING COEFFICIENT WILL BE PACKED (ONLY UNIQUE ELEMENTS ARE STORED). THIS OPTION SHOULD BE USED, ESPECIALLY ON WORKSTATIONS, WHEN IT WILL ALLOW THE PROBLEM TO RUN WITH ALL GROUP FLUXES AND CURRENTS IN CORE.
RADIAL INNER ITERATION ALGORYTHM.
0...PARTITIONED MATRIX ALGORYTHM (DEFAULT).
1...FULL MATRIX ALGORYTHM. THIS ALGORYTHM IS SOMETIMES -
NECESSARY WITH VERY SMALL NODE MESH SIZE WHERE DIVERGENCE CAN OCCUR. THIS ALGORYTHM REQUIRES A SIGNIFICANTLY LARGER COMPUTATIONAL TIME. FULL MATRIX ALGORYTHM IS IMPOSED WHEN ONLY ONE OUTER ITERATION IS SPECIFIED (FIXED SOURCE PROBLEM).
THE NODAL OPTION IS INVOKED IN CARTESIAN GEOMETRY BY SPECIFYING GEOMETRY-TYPE SENTINELS 40 OR 44 ON THE A.NIP3 TYPE 03 CARD AND PROVIDING ANY ACCEPTABLE (E.G. DEFAULT) VALUES ON A.DIF3D TYPE 12 CARD.
*** THE CARTESIAN-GEOMETRY NODAL OPTION MAY NOT BE
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Intemal:

| C. H. Adams | K. N. Grimm | A. P. Olson |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S. K. Bhattacharyya | M. R. Hale | Y. Orechwa |
| R. N. Blomquist | N. A. Hanan | G. Palmiotti (36) |
| M. M. Bretscher | U. R. Hanebutte | R. B. Pond |
| L. L. Briggs | D. J. Hill | E. A. Rhodes |
| K. A. Bunde | R. N. Hill | R. W. Schaefer |
| J. E. Cahalan | R. N. Hwang | D. M. Smith |
| Y. I. Chang | G. R. Imel | C. G. Stenberg |
| J. M. Carpenter | K. Lawrin-Kovitz | J. A. Stillman |
| B. R. Chandler | H. S. Khail | C. E. Till |
| R. J. Comella | R. M. Lell | B. J. Toppel |
| J. R. Deen | J. J. Liaw | R. B. Turski |
| K. L. Derstine | M. J. Lineberry | D. C. Wade |
| T. Fanning | D. M. Malon | D. P. Weber |
| E. K. Fujita | J. E. Matos | R. A. Wigeland |
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