

cases	doc_1		doc_2		decision	id
					NOT DUPLICATES	1030
	authors	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Daniel M. SiegelPhilipp MÃ¶staDhruv DesaiSamantha Wu	authors			
	title	Recovery Schemes for Primitive Variables in General-relativistic Magnetohydrodynamics	title	Recovery schemes for primitive variables in general-relativistic magnetohydrodynamics		
	publication_date	2018-05-24 00:00:00	publication_date	2018-06-24 00:00:00		
	source	SupportedSources.OPENALEX	source	SupportedSources.PAPERS_WITH_CODE		
	journal	The Astrophysical Journal	journal			
	volume	859	volume			
	doi	10.3847/1538-4357/aabcc5	doi			
	urls	<ul style="list-style-type: none">https://openalex.org/W3099633474https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aabcc5http://arxiv.org/pdf/1712.07538	urls	<ul style="list-style-type: none">http://arxiv.org/pdf/1712.07538v2.pdfhttps://bitbucket.org/dsiegel/grmhd_con2prim		
	id	id-181322090729172306	id	id-59425991731311089		
	abstract		abstract	General-relativistic magnetohydrodynamic (GRMHD) simulations are an important tool to study a variety of astrophysical systems such as neutron star mergers, core-collapse supernovae, and accretion onto compact objects. A conservative GRMHD scheme numerically evolves a set of conservation equations for 'conserved' quantities and requires the computation of certain primitive variables at every time step. This recovery procedure constitutes a core part of any conservative GRMHD scheme and it is closely tied to the equation of state (EOS) of the fluid. In the quest to include nuclear physics, weak interactions, and neutrino physics, state-of-the-art GRMHD simulations employ finite-temperature, composition-dependent EOSs. While different schemes have individually been proposed, the recovery problem still remains a major source of error, failure, and inefficiency in GRMHD simulations with advanced microphysics. The strengths and weaknesses of the different schemes when compared to each other remain unclear. Here we present the first systematic comparison of various recovery schemes used in different dynamical spacetime GRMHD codes for both analytic and tabulated microphysical EOSs. We assess the schemes in terms of (i) speed, (ii) accuracy, and (iii) robustness. We find large variations among the different schemes and that there is not a single ideal scheme. While the computationally most efficient schemes are less robust, the most robust schemes are computationally less efficient. More robust schemes may require an order of magnitude more calls to the EOS, which are computationally expensive. We propose an optimal strategy of an efficient three-dimensional Newton-Raphson scheme and a slower but more robust one-dimensional scheme as a fall-back.		
	versions		versions			