

# Computational Cost Optimization for Numerical Integration of the Smoluchovski Equation via Stochastic Sampling of the Coagulation Kernel

Vincent C. Mader

May 23, 2023

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Preface</b>	<b>6</b>
1.1	Acknowledgements . . . . .	6
1.2	Abstract . . . . .	7
<b>2</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1	“As of yet unsorted Things to put into the Introduction” . . . . .	8
2.1.1	<b>QUES</b> What even is coagulation? . . . . .	8
2.1.2	<b>QUES</b> How to model the gas inside the disk? . . . . .	8
2.1.3	<b>QUES</b> What characterizes a dust particle? . . . . .	8
2.1.4	<b>QUES</b> What is a particle distribution function? . . . . .	9
2.1.5	<b>QUES</b> What is the dust particle distribution function? . . . . .	9
2.1.6	<b>QUES</b> Assumptions needed for the (naive/simple) particle mass distribution. . . . .	10
2.1.7	<b>QUES</b> What is the dust particle mass distribution function? . . . . .	10
2.2	“Proto-Planetary Disks” . . . . .	10
2.2.1	<b>QUES</b> What is the interstellar medium composed of? . . . . .	10
2.2.2	<b>QUES</b> How do protoplanetary disks form? . . . . .	11
2.2.3	<b>QUES</b> Why does a star form at the center of the disk? . . . . .	11
2.2.4	<b>QUES</b> What does a protoplanetary disk look like? . . . . .	11
2.2.5	<b>QUES</b> What is a protoplanetary disk made up of? . . . . .	11
2.2.6	<b>QUES</b> How is mass distributed inside the disk? . . . . .	11
2.3	“Particle Kinematics inside the Disk” . . . . .	12
2.3.1	<b>QUES</b> How does the central star influence the disk around it? . . . . .	12
2.3.2	<b>QUES</b> How does the gas affect the dust? . . . . .	12
2.3.3	<b>QUES</b> What other effects are there? . . . . .	12
2.4	“Particle Collisions” . . . . .	12
2.4.1	<b>QUES</b> Why do particles collide? . . . . .	12
2.4.2	<b>QUES</b> What happens when particles collide? (from standpoint of particle mass distr.)	13
2.4.3	<b>QUES</b> How do collisions lead to the formation of planetary cores? . . . . .	13
2.4.4	<b>QUES</b> How can particle collisions be modeled? . . . . .	13
2.5	The Smoluchovski Coagulation Equation . . . . .	13
2.5.1	<b>QUES</b> What is the Smoluchovski coagulation equation? . . . . .	13
2.5.2	<b>QUES</b> What is the coagulation kernel? . . . . .	14
2.6	“Coagulation” . . . . .	14
2.7	Notes on the Structure of this Thesis . . . . .	14
2.7.1	<b>QUES</b> What is the structure of this thesis? . . . . .	14
<b>3</b>	<b>Definition of a Disk Model</b>	<b>17</b>
3.1	“Notes on what we plan to do in this section” . . . . .	17
3.1.1	<b>QUES</b> How to formulate a model for the PPD, its contents, & the planet formation processes? . . . . .	17
3.1.2	<b>QUES</b> How to model the central star? . . . . .	18
<b>4</b>	<b>“First/Basic/Naive Implementation”</b>	<b>18</b>
4.1	“Notes on what we plan to do in this section” . . . . .	18
4.2	Discretization of the Mass Axis . . . . .	18
4.2.1	<b>QUES</b> Why do we even need to discretize at all? . . . . .	18
4.2.2	<b>QUES</b> How to discretize the mass axis in a linear fashion? . . . . .	18
4.3	Discretization & Initialization of the Particle Mass Distribution Function . . . . .	19
4.3.1	<b>QUES</b> How to discretize the dust particle mass distribution function? . . . . .	19

4.3.2	<b>QUES</b> How to initialize the particle mass distribution function? . . . . .	19
4.4	Discretization of the Smoluchovski Coagulation Equation . . . . .	20
4.4.1	<b>QUES</b> How to discretize the Smoluchovski equation? . . . . .	20
4.5	Definition of the Kernel for simple Stick-and-Hit Coagulation . . . . .	20
4.5.1	<b>QUES</b> How to implement stick-and-hit coagulation on a linear mass axis? . . . . .	20
4.6	Integration of the Smoluchovski Equation . . . . .	21
4.6.1	<b>QUES</b> How to discretize the time axis in a linear fashion? . . . . .	21
4.6.2	<b>QUES</b> What is the difference between additive/multiplicative incrementation of time . . . . .	21
4.6.3	<b>QUES</b> How to integrate the Smoluchovski equation using an explicit Euler scheme? . . . . .	21
4.6.4	<b>QUES</b> Why does the mass error increase over time? -> “Mass Outflow” . . . . .	22
<b>5</b>	<b>“Other Methods of Integration”</b>	<b>23</b>
5.1	“Logarithmic Time Axis” . . . . .	23
5.1.1	<b>QUES</b> How to discretize the time axis in a logarithmic fashion? . . . . .	23
5.2	“Implicit Solvers” . . . . .	23
<b>6</b>	<b>Implementation of a Logarithmic Representation for the Mass Axis</b>	<b>24</b>
6.1	Reasons for Making Use of a Logarithmic Representation . . . . .	24
6.2	Challenges Associated with a Logarithmic Representation . . . . .	24
6.3	Definition of the Logarithmic Mass Axis . . . . .	24
6.3.1	<b>QUES</b> How to discretize the mass axis in a logarithmic fashion? . . . . .	24
6.4	Implementation of the Kovetz-Olund algorithm . . . . .	25
6.4.1	Reasons for the Necessity of the Kovetz-Olund Algorithm . . . . .	25
6.4.2	Implementation of the Kovetz-Olund Algorithm . . . . .	25
6.5	Implementation of Near-Zero-Cancellation Handling for Coagulation . . . . .	26
6.5.1	<b>QUES</b> Where can Near-Zero-Cancellation occur in general? . . . . .	26
6.5.2	<b>QUES</b> Where can Near-Zero-Cancellation occur in our model? . . . . .	26
6.5.3	Handling Near-Zero-Cancellation for Stick-and-Hit Coagulation . . . . .	27
<b>7</b>	<b>Inclusion of Fragmentation Processes into the Model</b>	<b>28</b>
7.1	“First/Simple/Naive Attempt” . . . . .	28
7.1.1	<b>QUES</b> How to implement naive fragmentation? . . . . .	28
7.2	The MRN Distribution . . . . .	28
7.3	“Redistribution of Mass onto the Bins using MRN Distribution” . . . . .	28
7.3.1	<b>QUES</b> How to implement MRN distribution (for initialization)? . . . . .	28
7.3.2	<b>QUES</b> How to implement MRN distribution for fragmentation? . . . . .	29
7.3.3	<b>QUES</b> Test integration speed with MRN distribution enabled. Is there a slowdown? . . . . .	29
7.4	“Implementation of Near-Zero-Cancellation Handling for Fragmentation” (?) . . . . .	29
<b>8</b>	<b>Implementation of a more Physical Model for the Dust in the PPD</b>	<b>30</b>
8.1	Definition of the Dust Particle Reaction Rates . . . . .	30
8.2	Definition of the Dust Particle Collision Rates . . . . .	30
8.2.1	<b>QUES</b> How to define the particle collision rate? . . . . .	30
8.3	Definition of the Collision Cross Section . . . . .	30
8.3.1	<b>QUES</b> How to implement realistic collision cross sections? . . . . .	30
8.4	Definition of the Relative Particle Velocity . . . . .	30
8.4.1	<b>QUES</b> How to implement realistic relative velocities between dust particles? . . . . .	30
<b>9</b>	<b>“Implementation of a more Physical Model for the Gas in the PPD” (?)</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>Implementation of a more Physical Model for the Relative Particle Velocities</b>	<b>32</b>

10.1	Definition of the Relative Velocity due to Radial Drift . . . . .	32
10.2	Definition of the Relative Velocity due to Differential Settling . . . . .	32
10.3	Definition of the Relative Velocity due to Turbulence . . . . .	32
10.4	Definition of the Azimuthal Relative Velocity . . . . .	32
11	“Recap of what we have so far”	33
12	Implementation of Stochastic Kernel Sampling	34
13	Appendix	35
13.1	Testing: Can I use <i>subfigures</i> for “multicol” L <sup>A</sup> T <sub>E</sub> X plots in Emacs org-mode? . . . . .	35
13.2	<b>TODO</b> Sort . . . . .	35
13.2.1	Necessary Simplifications . . . . .	35
13.2.2	Discretization of the Mass Axis . . . . .	37
13.2.3	Disk Scale Height . . . . .	43
13.2.4	Kepler Frequency . . . . .	44
13.2.5	Midplane Temperature . . . . .	45
13.2.6	Total Disk Mass Calculation . . . . .	47
13.2.7	Midplane Gas Pressure . . . . .	47
13.2.8	Gas Surface Density . . . . .	48
13.2.9	Gas Volume Density . . . . .	49
13.2.10	Gas Volume Number Density . . . . .	50
13.2.11	Gas Pressure Gradient . . . . .	50
13.2.12	Gas Molecular Viscosity . . . . .	51
13.2.13	Mean Free Path . . . . .	52
13.2.14	Mean Thermal Velocity of Gas Particles . . . . .	53
13.2.15	Sound Speed . . . . .	54
13.2.16	Stokes Number . . . . .	56
13.2.17	Reynold’s Number . . . . .	57
13.2.18	Stopping Time . . . . .	58
13.2.19	Particle Mass Distribution Function . . . . .	59
13.2.20	Discretization . . . . .	60
13.2.21	Normalization . . . . .	60
13.2.22	Initialization . . . . .	61
13.2.23	Particle Kinematics in the Disk . . . . .	62
13.2.24	Relative Velocities . . . . .	67
13.2.25	Particle-Particle Collisions . . . . .	74
13.2.26	Smoluchovski Coagulation Equation . . . . .	77
13.2.27	Coagulation Kernel . . . . .	78
13.2.28	Introduction . . . . .	79
13.2.29	Gain & Loss Term . . . . .	80
13.2.30	The Kovetz-Olund algorithm . . . . .	80
13.2.31	Near-Zero-Cancellation Handling . . . . .	81
13.2.32	<b>QUES</b> Where to talk about discretization of the radial axis? . . . . .	82
13.2.33	<b>QUES</b> Where to talk about Stokes? . . . . .	82
13.2.34	<b>QUES</b> Where to talk about the Toomre parameter? . . . . .	82
13.2.35	General . . . . .	82
13.2.36	PPD Formation . . . . .	83
13.2.37	Disk Model . . . . .	84
13.2.38	Particle Kinematics . . . . .	84

13.2.39 Results . . . . .	87
13.2.40 Construction of a Kernel for Hit-and-Stick Coagulation . . . . .	87
13.3 Testing Mass Conservation . . . . .	87
<b>14 QUESTIONS</b>	<b>87</b>
14.1 <b>QUES</b> Hat es einen bestimmten Grund, dass Du in “Dust Evolution with Binning Methods” immer partielle statt totale zeitliche Ableitungen der Teilchen-Massen-Distributions-Funktion verwendest? . . . . .	87
14.2 <b>QUES</b> Wie <i>genau</i> bastel ich mir meine Bins? . . . . .	87

## List of Figures

1 plots of.... . . . .	35
------------------------	----

## List of Tables

# 1 Preface

## 1.1 Acknowledgements

## 1.2 Abstract

What is the topic of this thesis?

- We want to **test whether** the numerical **integration** of the Smoluchovski **coagulation equation** can be **sped up** via **stochastic sampling** of the kernel.
- Depending on how accurate one wants to model the involved processes, the integration of the coagulation equation can become quite costly (from a computational standpoint).
- This is due to the “high dimensionality” of the problem.
  - 3 dimensions of space (in principle)
  - 3 dimensions of mass (explain why -> fragmentation)
  - X dimensions of porosity
  - + maybe other attributes of the dust particles
- Therefore, the idea is that a big gain in computational performance could be gained by only including the “relevant” parts of the kernel into the integration. (“relevant” according to what criterion?)
- Finding out whether this works (and by **how much** the computational cost can be reduced) is the big goal of this thesis.

## 2 Introduction

### 2.1 “As of yet unsorted Things to put into the Introduction”

#### 2.1.1 QUES What even is coagulation?

Coagulation is

- the process of particles sticking together and forming larger bodies
- the most-likely origin of planetary cores [citation needed]
- a complex process
  - coagulation + fragmentation
  - ...

How can you model coagulation?

- Smoluchovski equation
- ... [other ansatz?]

#### 2.1.2 QUES How to model the gas inside the disk?

What are the most relevant properties of the gas?

- density
- viscosity
- velocity
- ... [QUES]

QUES Write this section

- Give broad overview
  - More detail can be given later.

#### 2.1.3 QUES What characterizes a dust particle?

A dust particle has the following attributes:

Particle position:

- This can be given either
  - in cartesian coordinates  $(x, y, z)$ , or
  - in cylindrical coordinates  $(r, \varphi, z)$ .
- Due to the (approximately) circular shape of the disk, cylindrical coordinates are the more fitting choice here.

Particle velocity:

- Analogously to the particle position, the preferred system of coordinates is a cylindrical one here.
- Thus, we write the particle velocity as  $(v_r, v_\varphi, v_z)$ .

Particle mass:



- In a very naive/simple model, the particles are assumed to
  - be perfectly spherical (with radius  $a$ ), and
  - share a common solid density  $\rho_s$ .
- This is of course not the case in reality, but we will make this assumption throughout the thesis (if not otherwise stated.)
- Thus, the particle mass  $m$  can be calculated directly from the particle radius. The two quantities are related by the equation

$$m = \frac{4}{3}\pi a^3 \cdot \rho_s$$

Time:

- With the exception of the particle mass, all of the quantities discussed above can not assumed to be constant with time (in this model -> in reality, none of them are constant).
- Thus, the temporal parameter  $t$  is included into the model as well.

Porosity:

- (not included in the model)
  - Particles have “fractal-like” shape, not spherical.

QUES:

- Think re:
  - Only list attributes & their labels/symbols here.
  - Make model assumptions elsewhere?

#### 2.1.4 QUES What is a particle distribution function?

- Consider a distribution of particles.
- Let the particles have various different properties, e.g. position, velocity, and mass.
- Assume these properties to *not* be distributed homogenously among the particles.
- The distribution can then be described by a fitting *particle distribution function*

$$f(\dots) = \dots$$

QUES: Continue writing this section.

- What is a particle distribution function *generally*?

#### 2.1.5 QUES What is the dust particle distribution function?

QUES: Apply the definition of a general particle distribution function (from above) to the (special) case of a protoplanetary disk.

- We assumed the relevant properties to be
  - radial position in the disk (radial distance from star)
  - height above the midplane

- particles mass
- These properties (in general) depend on time.

Therefore, we can write the distribution function for dust particles inside the modeled PPD as

$$f(r, z, m, t)$$

- NOTE:
  - After this section, focus (for now) on naive/simple particle *mass distribution function*.

### 2.1.6 QUES Assumptions needed for the (naive/simple) particle mass distribution.

Consider a distribution of dust particles with different masses  $m$ .

- Let them all have the same material density  $\rho_s$  (and other properties).
- Also, (for now) assume that their shape is always spherical.

Then, each dust particle is characterized solely by its mass, and hence its radius  $a$ :

$$m = \frac{4\pi}{3} \rho_s a^3$$

### 2.1.7 QUES What is the dust particle mass distribution function?

The particle mass distribution function  $n(m)$  is defined in such a way that the integral

$$N = \int_0^\infty n(m) \, dm$$

is the total number of dust particles per unit volume.

Following from that, the integral

$$\rho = \int_0^\infty m \cdot n(m) \, dm$$

gives the total dust mass per unit volume, i.e. the dust density.

## 2.2 “Proto-Planetary Disks”

### 2.2.1 QUES What is the interstellar medium composed of?

The interstellar medium consists mainly of low-mass particles, which can be categorized into

1. atomic gas (mostly atomic hydrogen & helium), and (to a lesser extent)
2. larger dust particles (characterized mainly by their mass & porosity) [citations needed]

### 2.2.2 QUES How do protoplanetary disks form?

- Why does it even happen?
  - A cloud of gas/dust collapses under its own gravity.
- What happens?
  - The cloud flattens out into a disk.
- Why does the cloud flatten out?
  - Angular momentum is conserved.
  - There is a most likely a non-zero *total* angular momentum. When an object is hit, and it's not hit *exactly* in the center, it starts to spin.
  - Gravity pulls the particles inwards, but rotation (centrifugal/centripetal forces) opposes gravity.
  - Thus, a disk is formed.

### 2.2.3 QUES Why does a star form at the center of the disk?

- gravity  $\rightarrow$  high pressure  $\rightarrow$  nuclear fusion

### 2.2.4 QUES What does a protoplanetary disk look like?

QUES: Talk about

- approximately (first-order) circular shape of a PPD,
- disk flaring, midplane, ...
- ...

QUES: Include pictures: observations.

QUES: Include pictures: diagrams/graphs of simplified disk.

### 2.2.5 QUES What is a protoplanetary disk made up of?

- It's made of the same material that made up the original cloud.
- This is mostly gas, and a little bit of dust.

### 2.2.6 QUES How is mass distributed inside the disk?

Most of the mass inside PPDs is concentrated inside the star at its center. [citation needed]

- We can take a (kind of random) look at our own solar system, where [how much? I believe about 99] percent of the mass is concentrated inside the Sun.

QUES: Find data/sources about mass distribution inside PPDs.

The model used in this thesis will be based on the assumption that this is the case. Let  $M_*$  label the stellar mass, and  $M_{\text{disk}}$  label the disk mass.

Then, we can define a “disk-to-star” mass ratio, which we label  $q_{\text{dts}}$ . If not otherwise stated, the value of this ratio will be assumed to be...

QUES: Choose value of “disk-to-star” mass ratio.

Let us now turn our attention to the mass not concentrated inside the star, but spread across the protoplanetary disk. It is comprised mostly [citation needed] of atomic/molecular gas (mostly hydrogen & helium) [citation needed] and larger (but still very small [how small?]) dust particles [citation needed].

QUES: Talk about element composition of interstellar medium, and how that translates into the composition of the disk. QUES: Talk about approximate scale of dust particles.

Analogously to before, we can define a “dust-to-gas” mass ratio, which we label  $q_{\text{dtg}}$ .

If not stated otherwise, a value of ... will be used throughout this thesis.

QUES: Talk about how to choose the “dust-to-gas” ratio, cite others.

## 2.3 “Particle Kinematics inside the Disk”

### 2.3.1 QUES How does the central star influence the disk around it?

- The star exerts its gravitational influence onto the disk.
  - As a first order approximation, the matter in the disk moves around the star on Keplerian trajectories.
- The lighter particles in the disk move on sub-Keplerian trajectories though.
  - “This is due to the radiation pressure”.

### 2.3.2 QUES How does the gas affect the dust?

- The sub-Keplerian motion of the gas leads to a non-zero relative velocity between gas and dust particles.
  - This results in a drag force acting on the dust particles.
  - Therefore, the dust particles are “slowed down” and spiral inwards.

### 2.3.3 QUES What other effects are there?

TODO: Talk about (relative) velocity components.

## 2.4 “Particle Collisions”

### 2.4.1 QUES Why do particles collide?

In a PPD, dust particles move around at

- partly systematic, and
- partly random

velocities.

This includes [QUES: sort this out]

- Keplerian motion
- drag from interaction with gas
- Brownian motion
- radial drift

- turbulence
- ...

This causes the dust particles to occasionally collide with each other.

[...coagulation...] [...fragmentation...]

#### **2.4.2 QUES What happens when particles collide? (from standpoint of particle mass distr.)**

Collisions can be regarded as two-body collisions:

- The occurrence of three-body interactions is so tiny that it can be neglected entirely (negligible).

Outcomes:

1. bouncing
2. merging
3. fragmentation

Bouncing:

- Here: The only property we trace is the particle mass.
- Therefore, “nothing happens”.

Merging:

- The two original particles with masses  $m_1$  and  $m_2$  “disappear”.
- A single new particle with mass  $m_{\text{tot}} = m_1 + m_2$  “appears”.

Fragmentation:

- The two original particles with masses  $m_1$  and  $m_2$  also “disappear”.
- But: A whole series/range of particles can appear, with a total mass of  $m_{\text{tot}} = m_1 + m_2$

The input to a collision event are therefore always two bodies, but the output can be any number of particles.

#### **2.4.3 QUES How do collisions lead to the formation of planetary cores?**

#### **2.4.4 QUES How can particle collisions be modeled?**

[“ensemble approach”]

[...]

- Particle collisions can be modeled using the Smoluchovski equation.

[...]

### **2.5 The Smoluchovski Coagulation Equation**

#### **2.5.1 QUES What is the Smoluchovski coagulation equation?**

The general time evolution of the particle mass distribution function due to collision can (by virtue of the two-body nature) be expressed using the Smoluchovski coagulation equation.

... background ... [1916 Smoluchovski]

The coagulation equation reads

$$\frac{dn}{dt}(m, t) = \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty K(m, m', m'') \cdot n(m', t) \cdot n(m'', t) \, dm' \, dm''$$

Here,  $K(m, m', m'')$  labels the “so-called” *coagulation kernel*.

This general form of the (temporal) evolution equation of the particle mass distribution function encompasses all possible collision outcomes (bouncing, merging, fragmentation).

### 2.5.2 QUES What is the coagulation kernel?

- NOTE:
  - Stay very general/“vague” here.
  - Details will follow in sections on stick-and-hit / fragmentation.
- First problem to look at:
  - simple case of Stick-and-Hit coagulation
- But before we do that, we need to talk about discretization...
  - discretization of mass axis
  - discretization of dust particle (mass) distribution function
  - discretization of kernel
  - discretization of time axis
- ... and about numerical integration of the Smoluchovski equation
  - for that, we need to talk about discretization of the time axis

## 2.6 “Coagulation”

## 2.7 Notes on the Structure of this Thesis

### 2.7.1 QUES What is the structure of this thesis?

- ...
- 1. Introduction
- 2. Attempt A
  - (a) “Stick-and-Hit Coagulation”
  - (b) “Initialization of the Dust Particle Mass Distribution Function”
  - (c) “Implementation of Physical Reaction Rates”
    - i. “Implementation of Physical Collision Rates”
      - A. “Implementation of Physical Collision Cross Section”
      - B. “Implementation of Physical Relative Velocities”

ii. "..."

### 3. Attempt B

- Give context/introduction.
  - (a) What is the goal?
  - (b) (?) How do planets form?
  - (c) How do PPDs form?
  - (d) What makes up a disk?
  - (e) What does a disk "look" like?
    - radially
  - (f) .....
- Implement a first hands-on approach of what we're even talking about:
  - (a) How do we **discretize** the particle mass distribution function?
    - Here: Do it on a **linear** grid.
  - (b) How do we discretize the Smoluchovski equation?
  - (c) How do we define a (simple/naive) coagulation kernel?
    - Here: Include only **stick-and-hit** coagulation.
    - Here: Set reaction rates to 1.
  - (d) How do we define the initial particle mass distribution?
    - Here: Use Dirac-delta distribution.
  - (e) How do we **integrate** the Smoluchovski equation?
    - Here: Do it **explicitly**.
- Move to a **logarithmic** representation.
  - (a) How do you define a logarithmic (discrete) mass axis?
    - Why even do this? -> Talk about involved scales.
    - What are the problems here?
      - Talk about resulting masses not lying on grid points.
      - Talk about near-zero cancellation.
  - (b) How do we fix the grid-point problem?
    - Implement **Kovetz-Olund** algorithm.
  - (c) How do we fix the cancellation problem?
    - Implement **cancellation handling**.
- Move away from explicit integration, use **implicit integration**.
  - (a) Implement **logarithmic time axis**.

- (b) ...
- Include **fragmentation** into the model.
  - (a) What is a first attempt at doing this?
    - Move mass into the smallest-mass bin.
  - (b) How can one do this more accurately?
    - Implement MRN distribution.
  - (c) (?) Implement cancellation handling.
- (?) Implement initial distribution using MRN
  - (a) ...
- Implement **physical reaction rates**.
  - (a) What are the reaction rates made up of?
    - ...
  - (b) What are the collision rates made up of?
    - Define collision rate from cross section & rel. velocity.
  - (c) How is the collision cross section defined?
    - Define cross section.
  - (d) How are the relative velocities defined?
    - Define total rel. velocity.
- (?) Implement **physical gas model** (radial). <- Do this here?
  - (a) ...
- Implement **physical relative velocities**.
  - (a) ... (RD, AZ, DS, TU)
- Implement **stochastic sampling** of the kernel.
  - (a) ...



### 3 Definition of a Disk Model

#### 3.1 “Notes on what we plan to do in this section”

##### 3.1.1 QUES How to formulate a model for the PPD, its contents, & the planet formation processes?

The choice of a model is not at all trivial, and a lot of assumptions will have to be made (in order to not complicate things too much).

This can not be assumed to be a comprehensive and/or physically accurate model. The attempt is to formulate a model that is *good enough* to capture the “behavior [...]” qualitatively, “and even quantitatively in an approximate way”.

We assume:

A protoplanetary disk is essentially made up of... [citations needed]

- the star at its center, (We assume it to already have formed.)
- the atomic/molecular gas, and
- the dust.

The disk can be assumed to be (approximately) symmetrical. [citation needed]

- This simplifies the treatment by “not including” the azimuthal direction. [except for rel. vel., there it *is* included!]
- The [later introduced] particle distribution function does not depend on  $\varphi$ .

We have to think about...

1. how the mass is distributed inside the disk, i.e.
  - the ratio between stellar mass & gas/dust mass,
  - the ratio between gas & dust mass.
2. how to model the gas, i.e.
  - its relevant properties (and how their are distributed radially)
    - densities, viscosities, sound speed, [...]
    - kinematics (velocities, relative velocities -> collisions -> coagulation)
  - ...
3. how to model the dust.
  - interaction with the gas
  - interaction with other dust [-> coagulation]

QUES:

- Talk more about the central star. If it has already formed...
  - then *when* are we?
  - how old is the disk already?

### 3.1.2 QUES How to model the central star?

What do we need to define?

- Stellar mass
  - Default:

$$M_{\text{star}} = 1 \cdot M_{\odot}$$

- Stellar luminosity
  - Default:

$$L_{\text{star}} = 1 \cdot L_{\odot}$$

## 4 “First/Basic/Naive Implementation”

### 4.1 “Notes on what we plan to do in this section”

- Here, we only take a look at the simple case of...
  - ...simple *linear* mass axis discretization.
  - ...simple *Dirac-delta* initialization.
  - ...simple *explicit Euler* integration.

### 4.2 Discretization of the Mass Axis

#### 4.2.1 QUES Why do we even need to discretize at all?

Due to the discrete nature of number representation on computers, for numerical treatment it is necessary to move away from the continuous representation of the mass grid, the evolution equations, and the coagulation kernel. Instead, a discrete analogon has to be constructed.

#### 4.2.2 QUES How to discretize the mass axis in a linear fashion?

- Here: The relevant dimension is that of *mass*.
  - We look at the distribution of differently-sized particles in the disk, and how that distribution (defined on the mass axis) changes with time.
- In reality, the involved scales for the masses of particles in the disk range from those of individual atoms up to those of planets.
  - I.e., approximately from 1 proton mass to 1 Jupiter mass. That’s quite the range!
  - In this thesis, we will limit this range, since we’re specifically interested in the evolution of the distribution of *dust particles*.
  - Let  $m_{\text{min}}$  and  $m_{\text{max}}$  label the minimum and maximum masses “relevant to our discussion”, respectively. **TODO:** Define minimum & maximum mass relevant for dust.
  - Therefore it will not make sense to use a linear representation of the mass axis, since “small masses will be under-, and large masses overrepresented”. **TODO:** Is the sentence about overrepresentation correct?
- Let’s not get ahead of ourselves & start with a very simple/basic model:
  - We will start off by discretizing the mass axis in a linear fashion.

- Therefore, we will “split” the axis into a number of “grid points” / “bins”.
- Let  $\mathcal{N}_m$  label the number of grid points.
  - TODO: Decide: Is  $N_m$  the number of grid points, or the number of bins? Be consistent here!
- TODO: Define the grid spacing.

### 4.3 Discretization & Initialization of the Particle Mass Distribution Function

#### 4.3.1 QUES How to discretize the dust particle mass distribution function?

$$n_i := n(m_i)$$

To be more specific, the current time value should be included into the notation as well. We define:

$$n_{i,\xi} := n(m_i, t_\xi)$$

#### 4.3.2 QUES How to initialize the particle mass distribution function?

Now, let us turn our attention to the initialization of the particle mass distribution function.

Options:

1. Dirac-delta distribution
2. MRN distribution

What would be best?

- MRN is more physical than Dirac-delta. (see later chapter)
- It does not *really* make that much of a difference though.
- The information about the initialization is quickly lost anyways.
- Both 1. & 2. qualitatively lead to the same results (even if not quantitatively).

Observation:

- Using the MRN distribution leads to a significant slowdown of the integration. (minutes, instead of seconds)
- This might be because I chose  $m_{\max}$  to be the largest mass grid bin.
  - Do not do this!
  - This is unphysical!
  - Instead use  $\approx 0.5\mu\text{m}$
- Test whether this problem persists!

## 4.4 Discretization of the Smoluchovski Coagulation Equation

### 4.4.1 QUES How to discretize the Smoluchovski equation?

With  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$  “being indices”:

$$\frac{dn_k}{dt} = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}_m} \sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{N}_m} K_{kij} \cdot n_i \cdot n_j$$

Equivalent formulation: [which one to use? I like the lower one <3]

$$\frac{dn_k}{dt} = \sum_{i=0}^{\mathcal{N}_m-1} \sum_{j=0}^{\mathcal{N}_m-1} K_{kij} \cdot n_i \cdot n_j$$

## 4.5 Definition of the Kernel for simple Stick-and-Hit Coagulation

### 4.5.1 QUES How to implement stick-and-hit coagulation on a linear mass axis?

Let us first turn our attention to the simple case of stick-and-hit coagulation: Here, two particles with masses  $m_1$  and  $m_2$  collide, and subsequently merge into a single particle with combined mass  $m_{\text{tot}} = m_1 + m_2$ .

Let  $C(m_1, m_2)$  be the rate at which collisions occur between such a pair of particles. Then, let

$$R(m_1, m_2)$$

label the rate of collision events that lead to a merging of the two particles into a single new one.

Of course, in actuality not every collision leads to a merge event. For simplicity, we will for now will assume that it does. As such, we can write

$$R(m_1, m_2) = C(m_1, m_2)$$

Later on, we will more carefully examine how the collision+sticking rate can be calculated.

[...also talk about definition of collision rate...] [...also talk about “reaction rates”...] [...difference between “collision”, “collision+merge”, “reaction” rates (fragmentation?)...]

[...collision+sticking rate, sticking probability, “Dust evolution w/ binning methods” eq.1.6-1.11...]

[...move the above elsewhere? -> “collisions” section?] [...]

A kernel describing the stick-and-hit coagulation process can be written as

$$K(m, m_1, m_2) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \delta_D(m - m_1 - m_2) - \delta_D(m - m_1) - \delta_D(m - m_2) \right] \cdot R(m_1, m_2)$$

Here,  $\delta_D$  labels the Dirac delta function.

[...]

## 4.6 Integration of the Smoluchovski Equation

### 4.6.1 QUES How to discretize the time axis in a linear fashion?

Let the temporal domain be divided into  $\mathcal{N}_t$  discrete “bins”. Then, let  $\xi$  be the index used to uniquely identify each time step, i.e.

$$\xi \in \mathbb{N} \cap [0, \mathcal{N}_m - 1]$$

When discretizing the time axis in a linear way, this leads to

$$t_\xi = t_0 + \xi \cdot \Delta t$$

Here,  $t_0$  labels the time value at the start of the simulation (can be set to  $t_0 = 0$  without loss of generality), and  $\Delta t$  labels the size of each time step.

The step size needs to be chosen sufficiently small as to assure stability of the integration scheme.

[... CFL criterion...] [... implicit integration...]

### 4.6.2 QUES What is the difference between additive/multiplicative incrementation of time

- TODO: Move?

#### 1. Additive time-steps

- straightforward approach
- incrementation of time via

$$t_{n+1} = t_n + \Delta t$$

#### 2. Multiplicative time-steps

- more appropriate here [explain why]

$$t_{n+1} = t_n \cdot q_t$$

### 4.6.3 QUES How to integrate the Smoluchovski equation using an explicit Euler scheme?

As above, we use the notation  $n_{i,\xi}$  to label the dust particle mass distribution function evaluated for the mass  $m_i$  at a point in time  $t_\xi$ .

The goal now is to compute the distribution function’s value after one additional step in time, i.e. at the time

$$t_{\xi+1} = t_\xi + \Delta t$$

This can be done by making use of an explicit Euler integration scheme [when?]. For a sufficiently small time step  $\Delta t$ , we can thus arrive at an approximate expression for the distribution function’s updated value via the transformation

$$\begin{aligned}
n_{k,\xi} &\rightarrow n_{k,\xi} + \Delta t \cdot \frac{dn_{k,\xi}}{dt} \\
&= n_{k,\xi} + \Delta t \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{\mathcal{N}_m-1} \sum_{j=0}^{\mathcal{N}_m-1} K_{kij} \cdot n_i \cdot n_j
\end{aligned}$$

If the step size is chosen too large, the method will break down due to the insufficient stability properties of the explicit Euler integration scheme.

Instead, [...implicit Euler/Radau...] [see above]

#### 4.6.4 QUES Why does the mass error increase over time? -> “Mass Outflow”

## 5 “Other Methods of Integration”

### 5.1 “Logarithmic Time Axis”

#### 5.1.1 QUES How to discretize the time axis in a logarithmic fashion?

As the temporal domain spans over multiple orders of magnitude for the processes involved in planet formation, it makes sense to discretize the time axis in a logarithmic fashion. [write this differently?]

[...]

### 5.2 “Implicit Solvers”

## 6 Implementation of a Logarithmic Representation for the Mass Axis

### 6.1 Reasons for Making Use of a Logarithmic Representation

### 6.2 Challenges Associated with a Logarithmic Representation

### 6.3 Definition of the Logarithmic Mass Axis

#### 6.3.1 QUES How to discretize the mass axis in a logarithmic fashion?



## 6.4 Implementation of the Kovetz-Olund algorithm

### 6.4.1 Reasons for the Necessity of the Kovetz-Olund Algorithm

Even in a highly simplified scenario, where only hit-and-stick coagulation is included, the definition of the kernel  $K_{kij}$  is not at all trivial. To assure both the consistency and accuracy of the algorithm, one has to take care of two separate problems, namely:

1. The conservation of mass *has* to be assured, otherwise the numerical solution can not be assumed to remain stable for long. In the case of stick-and-hit coagulation, this means that for every pair of colliding particles, a single new particle has to be created. At the same time, the two initial particles have to be removed from the distribution. During this process, the total mass should remain unaffected down to machine precision.
2. When using a logarithmically spaced grid for the discretized mass axis, it can not be assumed that after a collision of two dust particles with masses  $m_i$  and  $m_j$  the resulting particle will carry a mass  $m_k = m_i + m_j$  whose value can be mapped trivially onto the grid. In general, the corresponding index will not be an integer, and instead lie between somewhere between the two neighboring grid points with indices  $k$  and  $k+1$ . Therefore, the result of the merging of  $m_i$  and  $m_j$  has to be divided in some sensible way between these two neighboring bins.

### 6.4.2 Implementation of the Kovetz-Olund Algorithm

An elegant way for solving the two problems listed above is given in the paper by [Kovetz & Olund, 1969], where they used the following procedure:

1. The stick-and-hit coagulation kernel is split into two parts. The first is the *gain* of particles in bin  $k$  due to the collision of particles from the bins  $i$  and  $j$ . The second is the *loss* of particles from bin  $k$  due to collisions of particles in bin  $k$  with particles from any other bin  $j$ .

$$\frac{dn_k}{dt} = \sum_{i,j} K_{kij}^{\text{gain}} n_i n_j - \sum_j K_{kj}^{\text{loss}} n_k n_j$$

In other words, the total kernel [from above, cite eq.] can be written as

$$K_{kij} = K_{kij}^{\text{gain}} - K_{ij}^{\text{loss}} \delta_{ki}$$

Splitting the kernel like this into a gain & a loss term is a quite general approach, and can be used in more complex scenarios as well (including e.g. particle fragmentation processes).

2. For the scenario of pure hit-and-stick coagulation, a unique discretization of the kernel can be defined such that both the number of particles and the conservation of total mass are handled correctly. To do this, consider a pair of colliding particles with indices  $i$  and  $j$ . Then, let the index  $\bar{k}$  be chosen in such a way that the condition

$$m_{\bar{k}} \leq m_i + m_j < m_{\bar{k}+1}$$

is satisfied.

3. As stated before, in hit-and-stick coagulation, a single new particle emerges for each pair of colliding particles. Using the definitions from above, this condition can be expressed as follows:

$$K_{\bar{k},ij}^{\text{gain}} + K_{\bar{k}+1,ij}^{\text{gain}} \stackrel{!}{=} K_{ij}^{\text{loss}}$$

4. The second condition is that of mass conservation, which can be written as:

$$m_{\bar{k}} K_{\bar{k},ij}^{\text{gain}} + m_{\bar{k}+1} K_{\bar{k}+1,ij}^{\text{gain}} \stackrel{!}{=} (m_i + m_j) K_{ij}^{\text{loss}}$$

5. Now, for the splitting of the resulting particle's mass onto two bins, let us define the parameter  $\varepsilon$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} K_{\bar{k},ij}^{\text{gain}} &= K_{ij}^{\text{loss}} \cdot (1 - \varepsilon), \text{ and} \\ K_{\bar{k}+1,ij}^{\text{gain}} &= K_{ij}^{\text{loss}} \cdot \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

This assures that [equation from pt 3] is satisfied. If we now plug this definition into [equation from pt 4] and solve for  $\varepsilon$ , we arrive at

$$\varepsilon := \frac{m_i + m_j - m_{\bar{k}}}{m_{\bar{k}+1} - m_{\bar{k}}}$$

This is the algorithm of [Kovetz & Olund (1969)], and it was also used in subsequent papers like [Brauer et al. (2008)] and [Birnstiel et al. (2010)].

## 6.5 Implementation of Near-Zero-Cancellation Handling for Coagulation

### 6.5.1 QUES Where can Near-Zero-Cancellation occur in general?

When using floating-point numbers following the representation defined by the IEEE-754 standard, it can occur that

$$a + b = a \quad \text{for} \quad b \neq 0$$

Typically, this happens when

$$|b| < \varepsilon_m \cdot |a|$$

Here,  $\varepsilon_m$  labels the *machine precision*.

[Add: How big is  $\varepsilon_m$  for an f32, how big for an f64?]

### 6.5.2 QUES Where can Near-Zero-Cancellation occur in our model?

Let  $i$  and  $j$  once again be the indices used to label two colliding particles. Additionally, assume now that particle  $i$  is *much smaller* than particle  $j$ .

The detailed balance approach from above requires the removal of both the big and the small particle from the mass distribution, followed by the re-insertion of a new particle carrying the initial pair's combined mass. This new particle would then have a mass which is nearly identical to that of the bigger one of the original two particles, it would be only a tiny bit heavier.

In the approach defined above this would mean that  $\bar{k} = j$ , i.e. the resulting particle will reside in the same bin as the larger original one. Also, it would follow that  $\varepsilon \ll 1$ .

Let us now take a look at the particle mass distribution in the bin  $\bar{k}$  and, more specifically, by how much it changes from one timestep to the next. For this particular pair of  $i$  and  $\bar{k} = j$ , we can write:

$$\frac{dN_{\bar{k}}}{dt} = K_{\bar{k},i\bar{k}}^{\text{gain}} n_i n_{\bar{k}} - K_{\bar{k}i}^{\text{loss}} n_i n_{\bar{k}}$$

Plugging in [equation from above] leads to

$$\frac{dN_{\bar{k}}}{dt} = (1 - \varepsilon) K_{\bar{k}i}^{\text{loss}} n_i n_{\bar{k}} - K_{\bar{k}i}^{\text{loss}} n_i n_{\bar{k}}$$

Here, the two terms almost cancel each other out. What remains is a contribution which is proportional to  $\varepsilon$ .

If  $\varepsilon$  is small enough, the double-precision accuracy of the floating point representation will lead to breakdown of the method. [rewrite this sentence, copied almost exactly from Kees]

### 6.5.3 Handling Near-Zero-Cancellation for Stick-and-Hit Coagulation

It is relatively easy to identify the particle pairs  $(i, j)$  for which the scenario detailed above will occur. Let  $i$  (without loss of generality) be the index of the larger one of the two colliding masses. Cancellation may then occur when the resulting  $k$  is equal to  $j$ .

In that case, we carry out the subtraction in [previous equation] analytically, and write:

$$\frac{dN_{\bar{k}}}{dt} = -\varepsilon K_{ki}^{\text{loss}} n_i n_{\bar{k}}$$

[Elaborate on this, see “Dust Evolution with Binning Methods”]

## 7 Inclusion of Fragmentation Processes into the Model

### 7.1 “First/Simple/Naive Attempt”

#### 7.1.1 QUES How to implement naive fragmentation?

- “Pulverization”

### 7.2 The MRN Distribution

- introduced by Mathis-Rumpl-Nordsieck, 1977

### 7.3 “Redistribution of Mass onto the Bins using MRN Distribution”

#### 7.3.1 QUES How to implement MRN distribution (for initialization)?

Particle mass distribution function is defined by the condition:

$$\rho = \int_{m_{\min}}^{m_{\max}} n(m) \cdot m \, dm$$

Ansatz: power law with  $q = -11/6$  (see ‘sizedistributions.pdf’)

$$n(m) \sim m^q$$

Choose constant  $A$  such that

$$n(m) = A \cdot m^q$$

Plug into the integral from above

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= \int A \cdot m^q \cdot m \, dm \\ &= \int A \cdot m^{q+1} \, dm \\ &= \frac{A}{q+2} m^{q+2} \Big|_{m_{\min}}^{m_{\max}} \\ &= \frac{A}{q+2} (m_{\max}^{q+2} - m_{\min}^{q+2}) \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging for  $A$  leads to

$$A = \frac{(q+2) \cdot \rho}{m_{\max}^{q+2} - m_{\min}^{q+2}}$$

Now we only need to choose values for  $m_{\min}$  and  $m_{\max}$ .

- For the minimum mass, no lower limit exists. For it, the value corresponding to the smallest bin can be chosen [citation needed].
- For the maximum mass, an upper limit has to be chosen. It can be left as a free parameter to be set in ‘config.toml’, or set to something approximating  $0.5 \, \mu\text{m}$ . [see 2004 Dullemond & Dominik] ^ max. in interstellar medium (use for  $m_{\min}$ ?)

### 7.3.2 QUES How to implement MRN distribution for fragmentation?

Let  $m_i$  and  $m_j$  be the masses of two particles that are involved in a collision leading to fragmentation.

How do we model this?

- Distribute the mass  $m_{\text{tot}} = m_i + m_j$  onto bins with  $m < m_{\text{tot}}$ .
- For this, use the MRN distribution  $n(m) = Am^q$ .
- For this, find the value of  $A$ .
- For this, use the formula from [Summarize: How to implement MRN distri].
- For this, find a value for  $m_{\text{max}}$ .

How do we choose a value for  $m_{\text{max}}$ ?

- Can it be larger than  $\max(m_i, m_j)$  ?
  - “Some merging, some fragmenting”
  - “ $1 + 1 \rightarrow 1.5 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1$ ”
- If...
  - ...yes: It can at most be equal to  $m_i + m_j$
  - ...no: It can at most be equal to  $\max(m_i, m_j)$
- In either case, it can't really be *equal* to either of the two values.
  - That would be stick-and-hit in case “yes”, and bouncing in case “no”.
  - It can at most be equal to the mass corresponding to the next-lower bin.

Answer:

- We don't really know.
- It doesn't *really* matter that much anyhow.
- One could specify the method in ‘config.toml’, or just use one of the methods.

### 7.3.3 QUES Test integration speed with MRN distribution enabled. Is there a slow-down?

## 7.4 “Implementation of Near-Zero-Cancellation Handling for Fragmentation” (?)

## 8 Implementation of a more Physical Model for the Dust in the PPD

### 8.1 Definition of the Dust Particle Reaction Rates

### 8.2 Definition of the Dust Particle Collision Rates

#### 8.2.1 QUES How to define the particle collision rate?

The collision rate for a pair of masses  $m_1$  and  $m_2$  can be written as

$$C(m_1, m_2, \Delta v) = \sigma(m_1, m_2) \cdot \langle |\vec{v}_1 - \vec{v}_2| \rangle$$

Here,  $\sigma(m_1, m_2)$  labels the cross section for a collision event. The relative velocity between such two particles is given by the difference  $\vec{v}_1 - \vec{v}_2$ , its absolute value is  $|\vec{v}_1 - \vec{v}_2|$ , and  $\langle |\vec{v}_1 - \vec{v}_2| \rangle$  is the expectation value of that quantity.

[Simplification was done here] [Elaborate: Give more precise formula]

In our notation:

$$C_{ij} = \sigma_{ij} \cdot \langle \Delta v_{ij} \rangle$$

### 8.3 Definition of the Collision Cross Section

#### 8.3.1 QUES How to implement realistic collision cross sections?

The cross section for a collision of two particles  $i$  and  $j$  with radii  $a_i$  and  $a_j$  can be written as

$$\sigma_{ij} = \pi \cdot (a_i + a_j)^2$$

Here, the radii can be computed from the corresponding masses  $m_i$  and  $m_j$  from equation [Summarize: Assumptions needed for the (naive/simple) particle mass distribution.].

[Add plot here]

### 8.4 Definition of the Relative Particle Velocity

#### 8.4.1 QUES How to implement realistic relative velocities between dust particles?

## 9 “Implementation of a more Physical Model for the Gas in the PPD” (?)

## 10 Implementation of a more Physical Model for the Relative Particle Velocities

10.1 Definition of the Relative Velocity due to Radial Drift

10.2 Definition of the Relative Velocity due to Differential Settling

10.3 Definition of the Relative Velocity due to Turbulence

10.4 Definition of the Azimuthal Relative Velocity



## 11 “Recap of what we have so far”

## 12 Implementation of Stochastic Kernel Sampling




Figure 1: plots of...

## 13 Appendix

### 13.1 Testing: Can I use *subfigures* for “multicol” $\LaTeX$ plots in Emacs org-mode?

- Yes! See below:

### 13.2 TODO Sort

#### 13.2.1 Necessary Simplifications

- PPD is a 3D object.
  - This is too complex to model fully.
  - We will take advantage of symmetries.
  - This is of course a big simplification.
  - It is assumed that the model is still sophisticated enough to arrive at realistic results. (TODO: Argue why this is possible.)
- In reality, disk properties are functions
  - $f(x, y, z)$  of the three cartesian coordinates, or
  - $f(r, \phi, z)$  in cylindrical coordinates. (TODO: Elaborate on meaning of variables.)
- Simplifications
  1. Assume radial symmetry.

$$f(r, \phi, z) \rightarrow f(r, z)$$

(TODO: Explain why one can do this.)

2. Integrate vertically.

$$f(r, z) \rightarrow f(r)$$

(TODO: Explain why one can do this.)

- As such, the disk model used in this thesis depends only on the radial coordinate  $r$ . This is of course a very simplified model making use of a rather big assumption. (TODO: Explain for what this is good enough, and where it may fall short.)

### 13.2.2 Discretization of the Mass Axis

#### 1. Introduction

- The continuous range of masses inside the disk is partitioned into  $\mathcal{N}_m \in \mathbb{N}$  “bins”.
- Change in notation: Use indices to label the mass grid bins:

$$m \rightarrow m_i \quad \text{with} \quad i \in \mathbb{N} \cap [0, \mathcal{N}_m)$$

- For the lower & upper boundaries of the resulting mass grid, an appropriate choice of a minimum mass value  $m_{\min}$  and maximum mass value  $m_{\max}$  has to be made.





## 2. Discretization of the Mass Axis on a Linear Scale

- Pro: Simpler to implement than logarithmic grid.
- Con: Under-representation of small, over-representation of large masses.
- Later: Logarithmic, better representation of all orders of magnitude.
- The bins are defined in such a way that the boundaries are centered around the mass  $m_i$ . The lower and upper boundaries of a bin with index  $i$  are then given by the masses  $m_{i-1/2}$  and  $m_{i+1/2}$ .
- In the linear case, the “width” of each bin is given by

$$m_{i+1/2} - m_{i-1/2} = \frac{m_{\max} - m_{\min}}{\mathcal{N}_m}$$

- Note that this width is constant across all bins, independent of their labeling indices. This will change once the switch to a logarithmic grid is made. [...]

## 3. Mass-Index Conversion on Linear Scale



#### 4. Discretization of the Mass Axis on a Logarithmic Scale

- As above,  $\mathcal{N}_m$  is used to label the number of bins, and the grid boundaries are labeled  $m_{\min}$  and  $m_{\max}$  to signify the lower and upper bound of the grid, respectively,
- In contrast to the linear grid, the “width”, i.e. additive offset from one bin to the next is not the same for all bins in the logarithmic grid.
- Instead, the *relative* mass increase from one mass grid point to the next is what stays the same for all bins  $i$ .
- The factor describing this relative mass increase is labeled  $q_m$ . It has to be chosen in such a way as to satisfy the conditions

$$m_{i+1} = q_m \cdot m_i$$

$$m_{\max} = m_{\min} \cdot (q_m)^{\mathcal{N}_m}$$

- This leads to the expression

$$q_m = \sqrt[\mathcal{N}_{\text{grid}}]{\frac{m_{\max}}{m_{\min}}}$$

#### 5. Mass-Index Conversion on Logarithmic Scale

- (a) Index to Mass With the above definition of the relative mass increase  $q_m$  from one grid point to the next, the conversion from index to mass becomes trivial. It can be described by

$$m(i) = m_{\min} \cdot q_m^i$$





- (b) Mass to Index To arrive at a description for the inverse conversion from mass to index, we simply rearrange the above for  $i$ . The resulting law can then be written as

$$i(m) = \frac{1}{\log(q_m)} \cdot \log\left(\frac{m_i}{m_{\min}}\right)$$

Here, attention needs to be given to one additional step: Since the resulting  $i$  is not necessarily an integer, the right-hand side of the above equation needs to be “floored” (integer division).

[explain: why nearest-lower index, not upper? just convention?]





6. “Things to Watch out for” When switching from a linear representation of the mass grid to a logarithmic representation one, several points need to be addressed to guarantee both stability and accuracy of the algorithm.

For hit-and-stick collisions:

- (a) Mass conservation [rename section?] In a merge event, the masses corresponding to the two colliding particles have to be removed from the mass distribution, and exactly one new particle has to be added. It is important that this particle’s mass is exactly equal to the sum of the two colliding particles’ masses, to ensure conservation of mass.
- (b) “Non-integer indices of resulting mass” [rename section] In a merge event between two masses  $m_i$  and  $m_j$ , the resulting mass

$$m_{\text{res}} = m_i + m_j$$

does not necessarily correspond exactly to any of the mass grid points.

Instead,  $m_{\text{res}}$  typically lies somewhere in between two grid points. In this case, the mass thus has to be divided between the nearest neighboring grid points in some sensible way.

Let the nearest neighbors in the grid be labeled by the indices  $k$  and  $k + 1$ , with  $m_k$  being the mass point just below the mass resulting from the merge event, and  $m_{k+1}$  the mass point just above, such that


$$m_{\bar{k}} < m_{\text{res}} < m_{\bar{k}+1}$$

i.e.

$$m_{\bar{k}} \leq m_i + m_j < m_{\bar{k}+1}$$

### 13.2.3 Disk Scale Height

$$H_p = \frac{c_s}{\Omega_K}$$




### 13.2.4 Kepler Frequency

Kepler velocity:

$$v_K = \sqrt{\frac{GM_*}{r}}$$


Kepler frequency:

$$\Omega_K = \sqrt{\frac{GM_*}{r^3}}$$



### 13.2.5 Midplane Temperature

$$\sigma_{\text{SB}} \cdot T^4 = \frac{\alpha_{\text{fl}}}{2} \cdot L_{\text{star}}$$



1. Derivation Flux at distance  $r$  from star:

$$B(r) = \frac{\alpha_{\text{fl}}}{2} \frac{L_{\text{star}}}{4\pi r^2}$$

Now use Stefan-Boltzmann law:

$$B(T) = \sigma_{\text{SB}} \cdot T^4$$

Midplane temperature at distance  $r$  from star:


$$\begin{aligned} T_{\text{mid}} &= \left[ \frac{B(r)}{\sigma_{\text{SB}}} \right]^{1/4} \\ &= \left[ \frac{\alpha_{\text{fl}}}{2} \cdot \frac{L_{\text{star}}}{4\pi r^2 \cdot \sigma_{\text{SB}}} \right]^{1/4} \end{aligned}$$

Rearrange for  $T_{\text{mid}}$  to arrive at the above definition.

### 13.2.6 Total Disk Mass Calculation

### 13.2.7 Midplane Gas Pressure

$$P_g = \rho_g \cdot c_s^2$$




### 13.2.8 Gas Surface Density

How is it defined?

$$\Sigma_g = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \rho_g(z) \, dz$$

How can it be written as a function of the distance to the star? Ansatz: Use a power law, such that


$$\Sigma_g \sim \frac{1}{r^k}$$





### 13.2.9 Gas Volume Density


$$\rho_g = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{\Sigma_g}{H_p}$$



### 13.2.10 Gas Volume Number Density

$$n_g = \frac{\rho_g}{2.3 \cdot m_p}$$

### 13.2.11 Gas Pressure Gradient



### 13.2.12 Gas Molecular Viscosity

$$\nu_{\text{mol}} = \frac{\bar{u} \cdot \lambda_{\text{mfp}}}{2}$$

### 13.2.13 Mean Free Path

$$\lambda_{\text{mfp}} = \frac{1}{n_g \cdot \sigma_{\text{H}_2}}$$

with


- (volume) particle number density

#### 13.2.14 Mean Thermal Velocity of Gas Particles

$$u_{\text{th}} \bar{v} = \sqrt{\frac{8}{\pi}} \cdot c_s$$

### 13.2.15 Sound Speed

$$c_s = \sqrt{\frac{k_B \cdot T_{\text{mid}}}{2.3 \cdot m_p}}$$




## 1. Derivation

$$2.3 \cdot m_p \cdot c_s^2 = k_B \cdot T_{\text{mid}}$$


Why though?

### 13.2.16 Stokes Number





### 13.2.17 Reynold's Number




### 13.2.18 Stopping Time

= the ratio of the momentum of a particle divided by the drag force acting on it.

$$\tau_s = \frac{mv}{F_d}$$

$$\tau_s = \begin{cases} \frac{\rho_s a}{\rho_g \bar{u}} & \text{for } \lambda_{\text{mfp}}/a \gtrsim \frac{4}{9} \\ \frac{2\rho_s a^2}{9\nu_{\text{mol}}\rho_g} & \text{for } \text{Re} < 1 \\ \frac{2^{0.6}\rho_s a^{1.6}}{9\nu_{\text{mol}}^{0.6}\rho_g^{1.4}u^{0.4}} & \text{for } 1 < \text{Re} < 800 \\ \frac{6\rho_s a}{\rho_g u} & \text{for } \text{Re} > 800 \end{cases}$$



### 13.2.19 Particle Mass Distribution Function

- Continuous
- Let  $n(m)$  be the particle mass distribution function, i.e. the number of particles per unit volume that possess a mass  $m$ .
- Total number of particles per unit volume:

$$N = \int_0^{\infty} n(m) \, dm$$

- Total mass per unit volume: (mass density)

$$\rho = \int_0^{\infty} m \cdot n(m) \, dm$$

- Total disk mass: (correct?)

$$m_D = \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \rho \, d\phi \, dr \, dz$$

### 13.2.20 Discretization

Just as we discretized the range of masses, so we also have to discretize the particle mass distribution function. For this, we define:

$$n_i := n(m_i)$$

The number of particles per unit unit volume in bin  $i$  is then calculated by integration over the particle mass distribution function from the lower to the upper bin boundary:

$$N_i = \int_{m_{i-1/2}}^{m_{i+1/2}} n(m) \, dm$$

The mass density  $\rho_i$  in the bin  $i$  is given by

$$\rho_i = \int_{m_{i-1/2}}^{m_{i+1/2}} m \cdot n(m) \, dm$$

To arrive at the total mass density independent of particle mass, one has to sum over all bins:

$$\rho = \sum_{i=0}^{\mathcal{N}_m-1} \rho_i$$

### 13.2.21 Normalization

All of the following distributions (here labeled  $f$ ) are normalized in such a way that the condition

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) \, dx = 1$$

holds. This then assures that the total disk mass

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\mathcal{N}_m-1} N_i = 1$$

is equal to unity (bounded, not too large, easy conservation-checking). [Is this correct?]

1. NOTE (delete later)

- $x$  labels the values  $m_i$  of the discretized mass grid.
- $f(x)$  labels the discretized particle mass distribution function

$$N_i = \int_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^{i+\frac{1}{2}} n(m) \, dm$$

### 13.2.22 Initialization

1. Dirac-delta Together with the normalization criterion from above, the Dirac-delta distribution  $\delta_D$  is defined by the condition

$$\delta_D(x) = 0 \quad \forall x \neq 0$$

Assuming all particles have a starting mass  $m_0$ , we can write the initial discrete mass distribution function as

$$N_i = \delta_D(m_i - m_0)$$

2. Gaussian The Gaussian distribution  $f_{\text{Gauss}}$  is given by

$$f_{\text{Gauss}}(x) = \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \frac{(x - \mu)^2}{\sigma^2}\right)$$

Here,  $\mu$  labels the “expectation value” around which the distribution is centered, and  $\sigma^2$  is the variance distribution’s variance (“width”).

Assuming a Gaussian state in the beginning of the simulation, the initial discrete mass distribution function can then be written as

$$N_i = f_{\text{Gauss}}(m_i)$$

3. Flat (homogenous) Choose  $N_i$  in such a way that

$$N_i = C \quad \forall i$$

with a constant  $C$ .

The normalization condition leads to

$$C = \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}_m}$$

and thus also

$$N_i = \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}_m}$$

4. “True Flat” Choose  $N_i$  in such a way that

$$m_i \cdot N_i = C \quad \forall i \in [0, \mathcal{N}_m - 1) \cap \mathbb{N}$$

with a constant  $C \in \mathbb{R}$ .

This leads to

$$N_i = \frac{C}{m_i}$$

Before we can construct the discretized initial particle density distribution function though, we need to find out what  $C$  is. A constraint for this is given by the normalization condition

$$1 = \sum_{i=0}^{\mathcal{N}_m-1} N_i$$

Plugging in and rearranging for  $C$  leads to

$$C = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=0}^{\mathcal{N}_m-1} \frac{1}{m_i}}$$

### 13.2.23 Particle Kinematics in the Disk

1. Brownian Motion

## 2. Radial Drift

### 3. Azimuthal “Drift?”




#### 4. Turbulent Motion

## 5. Settling

### 13.2.24 Relative Velocities

#### 1. Brownian Motion

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta u_{ij}^{\text{BR}} &= \sqrt{\frac{8k_B T}{\pi} \cdot \frac{m_i + m_j}{m_i \cdot m_j}} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{8}{\pi \beta \mu_{ij}}}\end{aligned}$$



## 2. Radial Drift

$$\Delta u_{\text{RD}} = |u_r(m_1) - u_r(m_2)|$$

dust radial velocity:


$$u_r = \frac{u_g}{1 + \text{St}^2} - \frac{2u_n}{\text{St} + \text{St}^{-1}}$$

gas radial velocity:

$$u_g = -\frac{3}{\Sigma_g \sqrt{r}} \cdot \partial_r (\Sigma_g \nu_g \sqrt{r})$$


particle maximum drift velocity:

$$u_n = -\frac{E_d}{2\rho_g \Omega_K} \cdot \frac{\partial P_g}{\partial r}$$




### 3. Azimuthal Relative Velocity

$$\Delta u_{ij} = \left| u_n \cdot \left( \frac{1}{1 + \text{St}_i^2} - \frac{1}{1 + \text{St}_j^2} \right) \right|$$



#### 4. Turbulent Motion




5. Differential Settling

$$\Delta u_{\text{DS}} = |u_i - u_j|$$

$$u_i = ts \cdot \Omega_K^2 \cdot z$$

$$\text{St} = \Omega_K \cdot t_s$$






## 6. Total Relative Velocity

$$\Delta u_{ij} = \Delta u_{\text{BR}} + \Delta u_{\text{RD}} + \Delta u_{\text{AZ}} + \Delta u_{\text{TU}} + \Delta u_{\text{DS}}$$

$$\Delta u_{ij} = \sqrt{\Delta u_{\text{BR}}^2 + \Delta u_{\text{RD}}^2 + \Delta u_{\text{AZ}}^2 + \Delta u_{\text{TU}}^2 + \Delta u_{\text{DS}}^2}$$



### 13.2.25 Particle-Particle Collisions

1. Introduction In a two-body collision, we label the particles' masses  $m_1$  and  $m_2$ , and their velocities  $\vec{v}_1$  and  $\vec{v}_2$ . The relative velocity is then given by the difference  $\Delta\vec{v} := \vec{v}_2 - \vec{v}_1$ . For its absolute value we define the shorthand notation  $\Delta v := |\Delta\vec{v}| = |\vec{v}_2 - \vec{v}_1|$ .

The probability of more than two particles colliding at the same time is so tiny that three-body-collisions can be neglected entirely [citation needed].


2. Collision Outcomes

- What outcomes are there?
  - (a) Bouncing
  - (b) Merging
  - (c) Fragmentation
- What happens in bouncing?
  - ...
- What happens in merging?
  - ...
- What happens in fragmentation?
  - ...

### 3. Collision Cross Section


$$\sigma_{ij} = \pi \cdot (a_i + a_j)^2$$

$$a_i \sim m_i^{1/3}$$



#### 4. Collision Rate

$$C_{ij} = \sigma_{ij} \cdot \langle \Delta v \rangle$$



### 13.2.26 Smoluchovski Coagulation Equation

A commonly-used method of formulating a general description for the temporal evolution of a protoplanetary disk's particle mass distribution is given by the Smoluchovski coagulation equation:

$$\frac{\partial n(m, t)}{\partial t} = \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty K(m, m_1, m_2) \cdot n(m_1, t) \cdot n(m_2, t) \, dm_1 \, dm_2$$

Here,  $K(m, m_1, m_2)$  labels the *coagulation kernel*, into which all information on the collisional dynamics is encoded. It summarizes all aspects of the collisions.

- integro-differential equation, population balance equation
- introduced by M.V. Smoluchovski in 1916
- can be used to determine the temporal evolution of the number density per mass  $n(m)$  of particles as they coagulate.

### 13.2.27 Coagulation Kernel

- examples: (here? later...)
- Stick-and-Hit
- Fragmentation

### 13.2.28 Introduction

The kernel  $K_{kij}$  is approximately equal to the right-hand side of the following statement:

$$K_{kij} \approx (m_{k+1/2} - m_{k-1/2}) \cdot K(m_k, m_i, m_j)$$

[explain why]

Here,  $m_i = (m_{i+1/2} + m_{i-1/2})/2$  (same for  $j$  and  $k$ ).

The discrete kernel is a 3D matrix of dimension  $\mathcal{N}_m \times \mathcal{N}_m \times \mathcal{N}_m$ . [why]

- $K = K_{\text{coag}} + K_{\text{frag}}$

### 13.2.29 Gain & Loss Term

Inserting the kernel into the Smoluchovski equation

- we see: there is a positive term and a negative term (gain & loss)
- why loss term?  $\rightarrow$  when two particles merge, the original particles are no longer there
- why gain term?  $\rightarrow$  when two particles merge, a new particle emerges [...] [reformulate] [generalize to include fragmentation] [add equation 1.11 from “Dust Evolution with Binning Methods”]

### 13.2.30 The Kovetz-Olund algorithm

The two points outlined above are addressed by an algorithm outlined by [cite: Kovetz & Olund, 1969].

To solve the issues at hand by separating the kernel into two parts:

$$\frac{\partial N_k}{\partial t} = \sum_{i,j} K_{kij}^{\text{gain}} N_i N_j - \sum_j K_{kj}^{\text{loss}} N_k N_j$$

This is equivalent to the above-stated formulation of the discrete Smoluchovski equations, if

$$K_{kij} = K_{kij}^{\text{gain}} - K_{kij}^{\text{loss}} \cdot \delta_{ki}$$

Here,  $\delta_{ki}$  labels the Kronecker-delta.

This approach is suitable for both hit-and-stick coagulation as well as when fragmentation processes are included into the model.

For the simpler hit-and-stick case:

- Let  $(i, j)$  be a pair of colliding (& merging) particles.
- Each collision of two particles results in exactly one new particle. This condition can be expressed as

$$K_{k,ij}^{\text{gain}} + K_{k+1,ij}^{\text{gain}} = K_{ij}^{\text{loss}}$$

- Mass conservation

$$m_{\bar{k}} K_{\bar{k},ij}^{\text{gain}} + m_{\bar{k}+1} K_{\bar{k}+1,ij}^{\text{gain}} = (m_i + m_j) \cdot K_{ij}^{\text{loss}}$$

- Linear ansatz for distributing the  $m_{\text{res}}$  onto the two bins  $\bar{k}$  and  $\bar{k} + 1$ :

$$\begin{aligned} K_{\bar{k},ij}^{\text{gain}} &= (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot K_{ij}^{\text{loss}} \\ K_{\bar{k}+1,ij}^{\text{gain}} &= \varepsilon \cdot K_{ij}^{\text{loss}} \end{aligned}$$

- This leads to

$$\varepsilon = \frac{m_i + m_j - m_{\bar{k}}}{m_{\bar{k}+1} - m_{\bar{k}}}$$



### 13.2.31 Near-Zero-Cancellation Handling

#### 1. “Cases where near-zero cancellation occurs” [rename section]

- Collision events between particles of very different sizes/masses, e.g. very small mass  $m_i$ , very big mass  $m_j$  fuse.
- Resulting mass  $m_{\bar{k}}$  differs only by a tiny bit from  $m_j$

$$m_{\bar{k}} = m_i + m_j \approx m_j$$

- The new particle will be assigned to “the same bin”

$$\bar{k} = j$$

- Here,  $\varepsilon \ll 1$ . [explain why]
- Smoluchovski eq.:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial N_k}{\partial t} &= K_{\bar{k},i\bar{k}}^{\text{gain}} N_i N_{\bar{k}} - K^{\text{loss}} N_i N_{\bar{k}} \\ \frac{\partial N_{k+1}}{\partial t} &= K_{k+1,i\bar{k}}^{\text{gain}} N_i N_{\bar{k}} \end{aligned}$$

- Loss term and gain term related by: [link to eq. from K.O. algorithm]

$$K_{\bar{k},ij}^{\text{gain}} = (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot K_{ij}^{\text{loss}}$$

- Plugging it in:

$$\frac{\partial N_k}{\partial t} = (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot K_{\bar{k},ik}^{\text{loss}} N_i N_{\bar{k}} - K^{\text{loss}} N_i N_{\bar{k}}$$

- For  $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_m$  (machine precision), this will not give accurate results.

#### 2. Solution

- Identify cases where method breaks down,
- then carry out the cancellation analytically.

“Undangerous” cases: All pairs  $i, j$  for which  $\bar{k} > \max(i, j)$

- Here, simply use  $K_{\bar{k},ij}^{\text{gain}}$  and  $K_{\bar{k},ij}^{\text{loss}}$  (no risk of near-zero cancellation).

“Dangerous” cases: All pairs  $i, j$  for which  $\bar{k} = \max(i, j)$

- Here, use  $-\varepsilon K_{\bar{k},\min(i,j)}^{\text{loss}}$

### 13.2.32 QUES Where to talk about discretization of the radial axis?

### 13.2.33 QUES Where to talk about Stokes?

1. Stokes' Law The force of viscosity on a small sphere moving through a viscous fluid is given by

$$F_d = 6\pi\mu Rv$$

2. Stokes' Number = the ratio of the characteristic time of a particle to the characteristic time of the flow (or of an obstacle).

$$\text{St} = \frac{t_0 u_0}{l_0} = \frac{\tau_s}{\tau_{\text{ed}}}$$

where  $\tau_{\text{ed}}$  is the eddy turn-over time and  $\tau_s$  is the stopping time

3. Stokes' Regime = the regime where the drag force on a particle is described by the Stokes law.
  - This is not directly related to the Stokes number.

### 13.2.34 QUES Where to talk about the Toomre parameter?

1. Toomre parameter

### 13.2.35 General

TODOs:

- Auf Fehler/Tuecken eingehen, Tipps geben.
- Logarithmische Zeit-Skala einfuehren.
- Beispiel mit linearem Mass Grid machen.
- Stability Analysis machen, Limits testen.
- Do local & global disk simulations.
- Importance kernel sampling machen.
- Vergleiche
  - linear/logarithmic
  - near-zero cancellation handling on/off
  - cross section on/off
  - relative velocities on/off (each)
  - Kovetz-Olund on/off
- Compare performance at the end.
  - sampling vs. no sampling
  - ? parallelization vs. no parallelization
  - ? rust vs. python
- Talk about kernel variants:
  - constant

- linear
- quadratic

### **13.2.36 PPD Formation**

Processes:

1. Newtonian gravitational n-body interaction  
⇒ Keplerian motion (+gas pressure)
2. Particle Collisions  
⇒ Angular momentum averages out.  
⇒ Cloud flattens out into a disk (oriented perpendicular to total angular momentum).
3. Merge events (“coagulation”).  
⇒ Larger bodies form (slowly, over many orders of magnitude).  
⇒ This eventually leads to the formation of planetary cores.

### 13.2.37 Disk Model

#### 1. Introduction What do we need to define?

- Properties of central star
- Properties of disk
- Location inside the disk (loc. of “measurement”)

#### 2. Disk around Star What do we need to define?

- Disk mass

- Default:

$$M_{\text{disk}} = q_{m,\text{disk}} \cdot M_{\text{star}}$$

- Ratio of disk mass to stellar mass

- Default:

$$q_{m,\text{disk-to-star}} = 0.01$$

- Ratio of dust to gas

- Default:

$$q_{m,\text{dust-to-gas}} = 0.01$$

- Flaring Angle of Disk

- Default:

$$\alpha_{\text{fl}} = 0.05 \text{ rad}$$

#### 3. Location in Disk What do we need to define?

- Coordinate system: Cylindrical.

- Radial distance to star  $r$

- Default:

$$r = 10 \text{ au}$$

- Vertical distance above midplane

- TODO

- Azimuthal angle

- Assume radial symmetry  $\rightarrow$  no dependence on azimuthal angle.

### 13.2.38 Particle Kinematics

#### 1. Introduction Two competing motions:

- Settling towards the mid-plane.
- Turbulent stirring back up again. [?]

#### Velocity profiles:

- For pairs of masses, the relative velocities follow a probability density function  $\pi(\Delta v)$ .

- Relative speed differences stem from:
  - Brownian motion,
  - differential settling,
  - relative motions caused by turbulence,
  - etc. (above are most important).
- If the relative velocities are due to
  - turbulent stirring:  $\rightarrow$  Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution.
  - systematic differential drift:  $\rightarrow$  Dirac  $\delta_D$  function.

In absence of coagulation:

- Eventually, equilibrium is reached.
- Then, the upper layers of disk are devoid of dust of particular size.
- Below a certain  $Z$ , the grains are fully mixed with the gas.
  - This leads to a more or less constant abundance.  
(e.g. Dubrulle et al. 1995; Takeuchi & Lin 2002)

Thus, the motion of particles in the disk is partly systematic (driven by e.g. Keplerian forces), and partly random (e.g. thermal motion). [...]

This leads to occasional particle collision events.

## 2. Particle Collisions

- (a) **Merging Probability** In reality, not every collision leads to a merge event. The probability that it does, i.e. the merging probability  $P(m_1, m_2, \Delta v)$ , depends not only on the particle masses  $m_1$  and  $m_2$ , but also on the absolute value of their relative velocity  $\Delta v$ .

If the relative velocity of two colliding particles is low, this usually leads to a merge event [citation needed]. For high values of  $\Delta v$  on the other hand, this assumption can not be made [citation needed]. Here, the particles either bounce, which does not change the particle mass distribution at all, or they undergo fragmentation. [...]

The merging probability, also called “sticking coefficient” has to be measured empirically. [...]

- (b) **Collision-and-Merging Rate**

The rate of collision events that leading to a merging of the two colliding particles depends on both the collision rate  $C(m_1, m_2)$ , as well as on the merging probability  $P(m_1, m_2, \Delta v)$ . It can be written as

$$R(m_1, m_2) = \int_0^\infty C(m_1, m_2, \Delta v) \cdot P(m_1, m_2, \Delta v) \, d\Delta v$$

If every collision leads to merging, then  $R = C$  (hit-and-stick case). the collision-and-merging rate  $R$  is equal to the collision rate.

Since the inclusion of velocity dispersion into the calculation of  $R$  leads to an increased computational cost, a simplification can be made by using the mean value of the relative velocity  $\langle \Delta v \rangle$  instead. This leads to the (mostly sufficiently [citation needed]) approximate expression

$$R(m_1, m_2) \approx C(m_1, m_2, \langle \Delta v \rangle) \cdot P(m_1, m_2, \langle \Delta v \rangle)$$

### 13.2.39 Results

#### 1. First Runs

- (a) Hit-and-Stick Collision on Linear Mass Grid
- (b) Hit-and-Stick Collision on Logarithmic Mass Grid

### 13.2.40 Construction of a Kernel for Hit-and-Stick Coagulation

Assuming simple hit-and-stick coagulation, the kernel can be written as

$$K(m, m_1, m_2) = \frac{1}{2} [\delta(m - m_1 - m_2) - \delta(m - m_1) - \delta(m - m_2)] \cdot R(m_1, m_2)$$

Here, the coefficient  $R(m_1, m_2)$  labels the collision-and-merging rate.

### 13.3 Testing Mass Conservation

## 14 QUESTIONS

**14.1 QUES** Hat es einen bestimmten Grund, dass Du in “Dust Evolution with Binning Methods” immer partielle statt totale zeitliche Ableitungen der Teilchen-Massen-Distributions-Funktion verwendest?

**14.2 QUES** Wie *genau* bastel ich mir meine Bins?

Genauer?

- Wo sollte ich die Grid Cell Centers, und wo die Grid Cell Boundaries benutzen?

Zwischen den beiden habe ich vermutlich bis jetzt noch nicht konsequent genug differenziert.

Vermutlich:

- Die Centers ueberall dort, wo ein  $m_k$  vorkommt.
- Die Boundaries ausschliesslich zur Berechnung von  $\Delta m_k$ .