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A B S T R A C T

The spherical harmonics ($P_N$) method is a radiative transfer equation solver, which approximates the radiative intensity as a truncated series of spherical harmonics. For general 3-D configurations, $N(N+1)/2$ intensity coefficients must be solved from a system of coupled second-order elliptic PDEs. In 2-D axisymmetric applications, the number of equations and intensity coefficients reduces to $(N+1)^2/4$ if the geometric relations of the intensity coefficients are taken into account. This paper presents the mathematical details for the transformation and its implementation on the OpenFOAM finite volume based CFD software platform. The transformation and implementation are applicable to any arbitrary axisymmetric geometry, but the examples to test the new formulation are based on a wedge grid, which is the most common axisymmetric geometry in CFD simulations, because OpenFOAM and most other platforms do not have true axisymmetric solvers. Two example problems for the new axisymmetric $P_N$ formulation are presented, and the results are verified with that of the general 3-D $P_N$ solver, a Photon Monte Carlo solver and exact solutions.

© 2015 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

The study of radiative heat transfer in high-temperature applications with a strongly varying participating medium has become increasingly important in various practical applications like combustion, manufacturing and environmental systems. The Radiative Transfer Equation (RTE) is an integro-differential equation in six independent variables (3 spatial and 2 directional, and wavenumber) [1], which is exceedingly difficult to solve. As a result, approximate solution methods to the RTE, such as the spherical harmonics method (SHM), discrete ordinates method (DOM), the finite volume method (FVM), or the Monte Carlo method are frequently employed to solve radiation problems. Each of these approximate methods has their well-known advantages and drawbacks. The SHM offers an approximate solution to the radiative transfer equation (RTE) by transforming the RTE into a system of elliptic PDEs. This method approximates the radiative intensity as a truncated series of spherical harmonics that decouple the directional and spatial variations of the intensity field. The SHM has been widely applied to particle transport problems [2–4], and some of the derivations for cylindrical geometries have been presented in [5,6].

For axisymmetric problems, physical quantities such as temperature, heat flux, radiative intensity, and chemical species concentrations vary only radially and axially and are, therefore, two-dimensional. As a result, for many of these applications, the transport equations are solved on a 2-D or a thin wedge 3-D computational domain in order to reduce the computational effort. Like the development of the general $P_N$ method [7,8], the application of axisymmetric formulations of $P_N$ method were limited [9,10]...
because of the cumbersome mathematics. Recently, the general $P_N$ (up to $P_1$) equations and boundary conditions for 3-D geometries have been formulated [11–13] and solved [14] for various cases including a full cylinder with variable radiative properties and a real flame.

In this paper, the 2-D axisymmetric version of $P_N$ and its boundary conditions are deduced from the 3-D $P_N$ formulation. The 2-D axisymmetric formulation is implemented in OpenFOAM [15] C++ open source libraries. OpenFOAM provides the mesh generator, the numerical PDE solvers and the input/output handlers for the example problems shown in this paper. It also includes various CFD calculation modules, which the radiation module can be directly coupled with. Like other modern CFD codes, OpenFOAM uses the finite-volume method with unstructured mesh topology. A wedge is the most common way to represent an axisymmetric full cylinder in the finite-volume CFD simulation. Thus, the 2-D axisymmetric example cases in this paper are based on a 3-D finite-volume wedge. Demonstration problems presented here are the 3-D wedge versions of axisymmetric cases presented in [14]. The results of high-order $P_N$ are found to be very close to the exact solution of the RTE, and the results are also verified against those of the 3-D $P_N$ solver.

2. Formulation

**Axisymmetric conditions:** The radiative transfer equation (RTE) is an integro-differential equation with spatial and directional dependence [1],

$$
\dot{s} \cdot \nabla I + I = (1 - \omega)I_b + \frac{\omega}{4\pi} \int \phi(\dot{s}') d\Omega
$$

where $\dot{s}$ is an optical coordinate, and $\beta_i$ is the radiative extinction coefficient; $I_b$ is the blackbody radiative intensity (Planck function); and $\omega$ is the scattering albedo. The $P_N$ approximation is based on approximating the radiative intensity field $I(\dot{s}, s)$ as a series of products of intensity coefficients $I_n^m$ and spherical harmonics $Y^m_n$, whereby the spatial and the directional ($\dot{s}$) dependencies are decoupled:

$$
I(\dot{s}, s) = \sum_{n=0}^{N} \sum_{m=-n}^{n} I_n^m(\dot{s})Y_n^m(s)
$$

Spherical harmonics satisfy Laplace’s equation in spherical coordinates and are defined here as

$$
Y_n^m(\cos \theta) = \begin{cases} 
\cos (m \psi) P_n^m(\cos \theta) & \text{for } m \geq 0 \\
\sin (m \psi) P_n^m(\cos \theta) & \text{for } m < 0
\end{cases}
$$

and $P_n^m(\cos \theta)$ are associated Legendre polynomials. The position-dependent intensity coefficients $I_n^m(\dot{s})$ are determined by applying the series approximation to the RTE.

The radiative intensity depends on position $r, \theta, \phi$ and direction $\dot{s}(\theta, \psi)$ where $\theta$ is the polar angle (measured from the z-axis), and $\psi$ is the azimuthal angle (measured counter-clockwise from the x-axis). If the physical system is axisymmetric, then the radiative intensity varies radially with r and axially with z, but not azimuthally with $\phi$. Fig. 1 illustrates several location–direction combinations, which have identical intensities for axisymmetric conditions. At a fixed location $r(\phi_1, z)$ the radiative intensity in the direction $\dot{s}(\theta, \psi + \phi_1)$ is equal to the radiative intensity at some other location $r(\phi_2, z)$ in the direction $\dot{s}(\theta, \psi + \phi_2)$, which has the same deflection angle relative to its position vector $\dot{r}$. One may conclude from Fig. 1 that

$$
\bar{I}(r, \phi, z; \theta, \psi + \phi) = \bar{I}(r, 0, z; \theta, \psi)
$$

for any $\phi$, as long as the problem is axisymmetric. When $\phi=0$, the radiative intensity is evaluated along the x-axis. Considering the general case at some arbitrary $\phi$ and a reference case when $\phi=0$, the radiative intensity as approximated by the spherical harmonic series expansion equation (2) yields, for a given $n$, the equality

$$
\bar{I}_n^m(r, \phi, z)P_n^m(\theta) + \sum_{m=1}^{n} I_n^m(r, \phi, z)\left[ \cos m \psi \cos m \phi - \sin m \psi \sin m \phi \right] P_n^m(\theta)
$$

$$
= \bar{I}_n^m(r, 0, z)P_n^m(\theta) + \sum_{m=1}^{n} I_n^m(r, 0, z)\cos m \psi P_n^m(\theta)
$$

$$
+ \sum_{m=1}^{n} I_n^{-m}(r, 0, z)\sin m \psi P_n^m(\theta)
$$

By comparing the $I_n^m$ terms, it follows that for $m=0$

$$
\bar{I}_n^m(r, \phi, z) = \bar{I}_n^m(r, 0, z)
$$

which implies that the intensity coefficients with $m=0$ must be functions of r and z only and are thus axisymmetric. Now comparing other like terms, $\cos m \psi P_n^m(\cos \theta)$ and $\sin m \psi P_n^m(\cos \theta)$ in Eq. (5), yields the following relations for intensity coefficients with $m>0$:

$$
I_n^m(r, 0, z) = I_n^m(r, \phi, z) \cos m \phi + I_n^{-m}(r, \phi, z) \sin m \phi
$$

$$
I_n^{-m}(r, 0, z) = -I_n^m(r, \phi, z) \sin m \phi + I_n^{-m}(r, \phi, z) \cos m \phi
$$

Inverting these relations to express $I_n^m(r, \phi, z)$ and $I_n^{-m}(r, \phi, z)$ in terms of the $I_n^m(r, 0, z)$ and $I_n^{-m}(r, 0, z)$ gives

$$
I_n^m(r, \phi, z) = I_n^m(r, 0, z) \cos m \phi + I_n^{-m}(r, 0, z) \sin m \phi
$$

$$
I_n^{-m}(r, \phi, z) = I_n^m(r, 0, z) \sin m \phi + I_n^{-m}(r, 0, z) \cos m \phi
$$

**Fig. 1.** Illustration of the invariance of intensity with respect to azimuthal angle $\psi$ at different locations for axisymmetric conditions.
Also, by symmetry at $\phi = 0$, $I(r, 0, z; \theta, \psi) = I(r, 0, z; \theta, -\psi)$, or
\[
\sum_{m = 1}^{\infty} I_m^m(r, 0, z)Y_m^m(\theta, \psi) = \sum_{m = 1}^{\infty} I_m^m(r, 0, z)Y_m^m(-\psi, \theta)
\]
which leads to $I_m^m(r, 0, z) = 0$ for any $m$. Thus, according to Eqs. (8), the intensity coefficients for arbitrary $\phi$ are related to the same $r$ and $z$-dependent variable $I_m^m(r, 0, z)$ as
\[
I_m^m(r, \phi, z) = I_m^m(r, 0, z) \cos m\phi
\]  
(10a)
\[
I_m^{-m}(r, \phi, z) = I_m^m(r, 0, z) \sin m\phi
\]  
(10b)
For axisymmetric problems, the dependence on $\phi$ of intensity coefficients with $m > 0$ are trigonometric factors (sines and cosines with periodicity equal to $m$) that multiply the same axisymmetric variable $I_m^m(r, 0, z)$. Hereafter, this axisymmetric variable will be denoted as $I_m^m(r, z)$. From Eqs. (10), it can be seen that the number of intensity coefficient variables of the $P_N$-approximation is reduced from $N(N + 1)/2$ to $(N + 1)^2/4$.

**Governing equations:** As formulated in [11] and simplified for isotropic scattering in [13], a set of $N(N + 1)/2$ second-order elliptic PDEs result after applying Eq. (2) to the RTE, with the same number of dependent variables $I_m^m$. Each PDE is associated with a spherical harmonic $Y_m^m$ and the differential operators are originally in Cartesian coordinates. To obtain the transformation of the PDEs for cylindrical coordinates, the relations of the differential operators are employed:
\[
\mathcal{L}_x = \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( r \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \right) = \frac{\cos \phi}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} = \frac{\sin \phi}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}
\]  
(11a)
\[
\mathcal{L}_y = \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( r \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \right) = \frac{\sin \phi}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}
\]  
(11b)
\[
\mathcal{L}_z = \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( r \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \right) = \frac{\cos \phi}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}
\]  
(11c)
Together with the coordinates transformation, the $(N + 1)^2/4$ governing equations of the 2-D, axisymmetric formulation of the $P_N$-approximation can be derived from the general 3-D $P_N$ governing equations with the axisymmetric relations of the intensity coefficients. Substituting Eqs. (10) for the $I_n^m$ of the 3-D $P_N$ governing equations, after considerable algebra, leads to a transformed set of PDEs for axisymmetric variables $I_n^m$ as:
For each $Y_n^m: n = 0, 2, \ldots, N + 1$ and $m = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, n$:
\[
\sum_{k = 1}^{n+1} \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
(1 + \delta_{m2})a_{km}^m \cos m\phi \left[ \mathcal{L}_{kr} - \frac{2m - 2}{\beta^2} \right] + \frac{m(m - 2) - m - 2}{\beta^2 r^2} \frac{1}{r} \mathcal{L}_{kr}^m
\end{array} \right. 
\]
\[
+ \frac{m(m - 2)}{\beta^2 r^2} \mathcal{L}_{kr}^m - \frac{1}{r^2} \mathcal{L}_{kr}^m - \frac{1}{r} \mathcal{L}_{kr}^m + \frac{1}{r} \mathcal{L}_{kr}^m
\]
\[
\frac{m - 1}{\beta^2} \mathcal{L}_{kr}^m - \frac{1}{\beta^2} \mathcal{L}_{kr}^m + \frac{1}{\beta^2} \mathcal{L}_{kr}^m
\]  
(15)
**Boundary conditions**: \((N+1)^2/4\) boundary conditions are required and are derived from the 3-D \(P_n\) formulation of Marshak's boundary conditions [13]. The boundary conditions are expressed in terms of local coordinates \(\vec{x}, \vec{y}\) (tangential to the surface) and \(\vec{z}\) (along surface normal \(\hat{n}\)), and a rotation function \(\Delta(-\gamma, -\beta, -\alpha)\) [13] is utilized to rotate local coordinates back to global coordinates for the calculation of boundary conditions, where the \(\alpha, \beta\) and \(\gamma\) are Euler angles [16].

Fig. 2 shows both the arrangements of the global and local coordinates for a general 2-D axisymmetric geometry. \(\beta\) can be calculated from surface normal \(\hat{n}\) as

\[
\beta = \cos^{-1}(n_z)
\]

(16)

The tangential directions of the boundary surfaces are defined in such a way that one tangential direction \((\hat{t}, \hat{\tau})\) is within the \(r\)-\(z\) plane and perpendicular to the \(r\)-axis, and \(\hat{t}, \hat{\tau}\) are perpendicular to the \(r\)-\(z\) plane. Therefore, the Eulerian angle \(\alpha\) is related to the azimuthal angle \(\phi\), Fig. 2(a), as

\[
\alpha = \pi + \phi
\]

(17)

In order to keep \(\hat{t}, \hat{\tau}\) in the \(r\)-\(\tau\) plane, \(\gamma = 0\). With the above conditions, the relationship between the local Cartesian coordinates and the global cylindrical coordinates are

\[
\hat{n} = -\sin \beta \hat{r} + \cos \beta \hat{z}
\]

(18a)

\[
\hat{t} = -\cos \beta \hat{r} - \sin \beta \hat{z}
\]

(18b)

\[
\hat{\tau} = -\hat{\phi}
\]

(18c)

from which the derivatives are found to be

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{r}} = -\sin \beta \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \cos \beta \frac{\partial}{\partial z}
\]

(19a)

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{x}} = -\cos \beta \frac{\partial}{\partial r} - \sin \beta \frac{\partial}{\partial z}
\]

(19b)

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{y}} = -\frac{1}{\vec{r}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}
\]

(19c)

As an example for the most common case of a fixed-radius cylinder (or wedge), for the vertical wall faces the Eulerian angle \(\beta = \pi/2\), and from Eq. (18),

\[
\hat{n} = -\hat{r}
\]

(20a)

\[
\hat{t} = -\hat{\tau}
\]

(20b)

\[
\hat{\tau} = -\hat{\phi}
\]

(20c)

Eq. (18) is also consistent for the bottom and top boundaries of the wedge, where the Eulerian angle \(\beta\) equals 0 and \(\pi\), respectively.

In order to derive the boundary conditions for the 2-D axisymmetric formulation from the \((N+1)/2\) boundary conditions of the 3-D formulation [13], the \(\Delta(-\gamma, -\beta, -\alpha) = \Delta(0, -\beta, \pi - \phi)\) in their expanded form [13] are substituted into the full set of Marshak’s boundary conditions. In addition, Eqs. (6) and (10) are employed, and the derivatives in the \(\vec{y}\)-direction are evaluated with Eq. (19c).

After tedious derivation, it is found that all \(\vec{y}\) related boundary conditions become zero identities, which reduces the total number of equations from \(N(N+1)/2\) to \((N+1)^2/4\). The \((N+1)^2/4\) remaining boundary conditions are associated with the local spherical harmonics \(\vec{Y}_n^m\), for certain combinations of \(m\) and \(n\) indices, i.e.,

\[
m = \left\{
\begin{array}{ll}
0, 1, \ldots, n, & n = 1, 3, \ldots, N - 2 \\
0, 2, \ldots, n - 1, & n = N
\end{array}
\right.
\]

(21)

For example, the boundary conditions for axisymmetric \(P_n\) (where \((N+1)^2/4 = 4\)) are associated with the local spherical harmonics \(\vec{Y}_1^1, \vec{Y}_2^1, \vec{Y}_1^0\) and \(\vec{Y}_2^0\).

The complete set of axisymmetric \(P_n\) boundary conditions then become

\[
I_{\omega} = \sum_{l=0}^{(N-1)/2} \sum_{m=0}^{2l} \frac{p_{2l,n}^m D_{|\alpha|\beta}^{2l} (\beta)}{I_{2l}^m} - \frac{1}{\beta} \sum_{l=0}^{(N-1)/2} \sum_{m=0}^{2l} \left( \delta_{\alpha m} u_{\alpha m}^m B_{|\alpha|\beta}^{2l} (\beta) \right) I_{2l}^m + \frac{1}{\beta} \sum_{l=0}^{(N-1)/2} \sum_{m=0}^{2l} \left( \delta_{\alpha m} u_{\alpha m}^m B_{|\alpha|\beta}^{2l} (\beta) \right) I_{2l}^m - \frac{1}{\beta} \sum_{l=0}^{(N-1)/2} \sum_{m=0}^{2l} \left( \delta_{\alpha m} u_{\alpha m}^m B_{|\alpha|\beta}^{2l} (\beta) \right) I_{2l}^m - \frac{1}{\beta} \sum_{l=0}^{(N-1)/2} \sum_{m=0}^{2l} \left( \delta_{\alpha m} u_{\alpha m}^m B_{|\alpha|\beta}^{2l} (\beta) \right) I_{2l}^m
\]

(22)

where \(i = (n+1)/2, \delta_{\pm} = (1 \pm \delta_{m1})(1 - \delta_{m0})\), and the constant coefficients \(u_{\alpha m}, v_{\alpha m}, w_{\alpha m}, p_{2l,n}^m\) are the same as in the 3-D formulation, and the \(D_{|\alpha|\beta}^{2l} (\beta)\) and \(B_{|\alpha|\beta}^m (\beta)\) are

\[
D_{|\alpha|\beta}^m (\beta) = (-1)^m d_{|\alpha|\beta}^m (\beta) + d_{|\alpha|\beta}^m (\beta)
\]

(23a)

\[
B_{|\alpha|\beta}^m (\beta) = m^l [(-1)^m d_{|\alpha|\beta}^m (\beta) - d_{|\alpha|\beta}^m (\beta)]
\]

(23b)

where the \(d\) are Wigner coefficients as given by the 3-D Marshak formulation in [11,13]. The partial derivatives in these boundary conditions are expressed in local optical coordinates as

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{r}} = \frac{1}{\beta} \frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{r}}
\]

(24a)
\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_z} = \frac{1}{\beta_t} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \] (24b)

### 3. Implementation

The solution of the coupled \((N+1)^2/4\) simultaneous PDEs and their boundary conditions is found iteratively by the finite volume based software OpenFOAM similar to the OpenFOAM implementation of the 3-D \(P_{\infty}\) [14].

For each \(Y^m_n\) PDE, in order to use the Laplacian operator of OpenFOAM, the derivatives of \(I^m_n\) are arranged as

\[ \frac{\delta}{2} c_{2m}^2 \left[ L_n + \frac{1}{\beta_t} L_r - \frac{1}{r} L_n \left( \frac{1}{\beta_t} \right) I^m_n \right] \]
\[ + c_{2m}^m \left[ L_n + \frac{1}{\beta_t} L_r - \frac{m^2}{\beta_t^2 r} - 2 L_{zz} \right] I_{n}^m \]
\[ + \left[ L_{zz} - (1 - \alpha \delta_{m0}) \right] I_{n}^m \]
\[ = a_{nm} \nabla \cdot \left( \frac{1}{\beta_t} \nabla I_n^m \right) + b_{nm} I_n^m + c_{nm} L_{zz} I_{n}^m \] (25)

where

\[ a_{nm} = \frac{-c_2^2 \frac{1}{\beta_t} (1 + \delta_m/2)}{2} \] (26a)
\[ b_{nm} = \frac{c_2^2 \left( \frac{\delta_m/2}{r} L_r \left( \frac{1}{\beta_t} \right) - \frac{m^2 + \delta_m/2}{\beta_t^2 r} \right) - (1 - \alpha \delta_m)}{2} \] (26b)
\[ c_{nm} = 1 - (3 + \delta_m/2) c_2^m \] (26c)

All terms other than the \(I_{n}^m\) are updated before each iteration. The preconditioned conjugate gradient (PCG) [17] algorithm is used to solve each PDE sequentially until \(I^0_n\) is converged to prescribed criteria.

The boundary conditions expressed in Eq. (22) cannot be directly implemented if the governing equations are solved iteratively. In the OpenFOAM implementation of the axisymmetric \(P_{\infty}\) formulation, the boundary conditions are transformed to Robin-type form to make sure that individual Robin-type boundary conditions can be explicitly associated with each governing equation, i.e.,

\[ I_n^m + k \frac{\partial I_n^m}{\partial \tau_z} = f \left( \frac{\partial I_n^m}{\partial \tau_z} \frac{\partial I_n^m}{\partial \tau_z} \frac{\partial I_n^m}{\partial \tau_z} \frac{\partial I_n^m}{\partial \tau_z} \right) \] (27)

where \(k\) is a scalar constant and \(f\) is a function of partial derivatives of other intensity coefficients, including the tangential derivatives of \(I_n^m\).

The boundary conditions are rearranged into matrices and vectors the same way as described in [14]:

\[ Q \cdot \mathbf{1} + \frac{1}{\beta_t} Q \cdot \mathbf{1} + Q \cdot \mathbf{1} + Q \cdot \mathbf{1} = I_{n} \mathbf{p} \] (28)

where the \(1/\beta_t(Q \cdot \mathbf{1})\) is the second term on the right-hand side of Eq (22). Since \(Q\) is a purely geometric quantity, it is better to leave the \(1/\beta_t\) outside the matrix. Then in the CFD calculation, just like other matrices in Eq. (28), \(Q\) only needs to be calculated once. Eq. (28) can be converted to \(N_2 = (N+1)^2/4\) Robin-type boundary conditions,

\[ \left( \beta_t + R_{jk} \right) I_j + Z_{jk} \frac{\partial I_k}{\partial \tau_z} \]
\[ = \delta_{jk} I_k - \sum_{k=1}^{N_2} \left[ X_{jk} \frac{\partial I_k}{\partial \tau_z} + (1 - \delta_{jk}) \right] \left( Z_{jk} \frac{\partial I_k}{\partial \tau_z} + R_{jk} I_k \right) \] (29)

where \(X, Z\) and \(R\) are defined as

\[ X = Q^{-1} \cdot Q_x \]
\[ Z = Q^{-1} \cdot Q_z \]
\[ R = Q^{-1} \cdot Q. \] (30)

and are evaluated through LU decomposition [18] of \(Q\). A similar stabilizer as in [14] for the 3-D formulation is also defined for the 2-D axisymmetric \(P_{\infty}\) for optically thin simulations.

### 4. Results and discussion

Two example problems are presented to explore the accuracy and computational efficiency of the axisymmetric \(P_{\infty}\) for fields with strongly varying temperatures and absorption coefficients. Although isotropic scattering adds no additional complexity or effort to \(P_{\infty}\) (as opposed to DOM), all the examples are limited to nonscattering media in this study simply to reduce parameters needed for presentation. In radiative heat transfer problems the “radiative heat source” (or negative divergence of radiative flux) is of greatest interest, which provides the contribution of radiation to the overall energy equation. Physically, the radiative heat source is the difference between local absorption and emission, and the former is quantified by the “incident radiation” \(G\), where

\[ -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{q} = -\kappa(4\pi I_b - G), \quad G = \int_{4\pi} I(\hat{s}) d\Omega = 4\pi I_0 \] (31)

#### Wedge enclosure with variable radiative properties

Many combustion problems in a cylinder are axisymmetric,
but CFD codes rarely have cylindrical coordinates and/or axisymmetric capability. In those cases generally a wedge mesh instead of the full cylinder is usually chosen to expedite the computation. The first test case is a wedge with strongly varying absorption coefficient and temperature field as shown in Eq. (32), where $\kappa$ is the absorption coefficient, and $\beta_r = \kappa$ for non-scattering case. In order to compare with the results from a 3-D cylinder, the mesh shown in Fig. 3 is a 10\degree piece of the cylinder and the radiative properties are the same as in the cylinder test case [14]. The wedge has 84 cells along the radius and 40 cells along the axis, while the tip of the wedge is cut off to avoid mathematical singularity points. The walls are taken as black cold walls and the center-line is taken as a symmetry plane:

$$I_b = 1 + \frac{20}{R^4} r^2 \left( R^2 - r^2 \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (32a)

$$\kappa = C_k \left[ 1 + \frac{15}{R^4} (R^2 - r^2)^2 \right]$$  \hspace{1cm} (32b)

$$C_k = 0.3 + z, \quad 0 \leq r \leq R = 0.5, 0 \leq z \leq 2.5$$  \hspace{1cm} (32c)

$$\tau_D = 2 \int_0^R \kappa \, dr = 7.5 C_k$$  \hspace{1cm} (32d)

The results at two heights are shown in Fig. 4. The results from $P_3$ to $P_7$ are very close to the exact solution, while $P_1$.
has certain levels of discrepancies with the exact solution and the discrepancy decreases with increasing optical thickness. Also the incident radiation \(G\) and the radiative heat source \(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{q}\) from \(P_5\) and \(P_7\) correctly catch the sharp gradient near the cylinder wall. It is also verified that for this case the axisymmetric \(P_N\) results overlap the 3-D \(P_N\) results, Fig. 5, to within a maximum discrepancy of 2% close to the center-line of the wedge/cylinder. The difference is due to the square cuboid block mesh at the center of the cylinder and the interpolation between two different
grids. An exact solution for this problem is calculated by direct integration of the RTE [1], which are shown by the black solid lines in the figures.

**Scaled flame with nongray radiative properties:** The axisymmetric \( P_N \) implementation is applied to an axisymmetric methane jet flame. The flame is a four-times scaled Sandia Flame D [19] with temperature and concentration fields strongly varying in both radial and axial directions. The wedge has 84 cells along the radius and 95 cells along the axis, and the walls are taken as black and cold and the center-line is taken as a symmetry plane. Fig. 6 shows the temperature and concentration fields for the quasi-steady flame, which are used as input parameters. The absorption coefficients \( \kappa \) of the participating gases are nongray and are calculated using the Full Spectrum Correlated-k (FSCK) model [20, 21] requiring a set number of evaluations of the spectral RTE (corresponding to quadrature points in the FSCK scheme). In the present implementation, eight quadrature points are used. The radiative heat source, \( -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{q} \), is shown in Fig. 7 for two axial locations. Location \( z = 1.0 \text{ m} \) is where water vapor has the highest mass fraction, while the maximum mass fraction of carbon dioxide is at \( z = 1.43 \text{ m} \). The results calculated by \( P_1 \) to \( P_7 \) together with the FSCK spectral model on the cylindrical mesh are compared to line-by-line (LBL) \( P_1 \) calculations and LBL-PMC calculations. The error incurred by FSCK can be evaluated by comparing the FSCK-\( P_1 \) results with the LBL-\( P_1 \) results, and is essentially negligible for most regions. The LBL-PMC results presented here are calculated on a different streamline-shape wedge mesh [22], and while this is a source of error, major differences between the FSCK-\( P_N \) solutions and LBL-PMC results are errors attributable to the \( P_N \) methods. As shown in Fig. 7, with the increase of the order of \( P_N \), the results get closer to the LBL-PMC results, and \( P_5 \) and \( P_7 \) successfully match the PMC results in most regions. The results prove that even under extremely alternating temperature fields and gas concentrations as in real combustion applications, the precision of the FSCK-\( P_5 \) and FSCK-\( P_7 \) are on the same level as LBL-PMC.

**Computation time comparison:** A CPU time comparison for different orders of \( P_N \) for the above cases is given in Table 1. All calculations were carried out on a single Intel (R) Xeon (R) CPU X7460 running at 2.66 GHz. The \( P_1 \) approximation solves a single PDE; \( P_3 \), \( P_5 \) and \( P_7 \) consist of 4, 9 and 16 strongly coupled PDEs with numerous cross-derivatives, respectively. The computation time of the 3-D \( P_N \) formulation on the cylinder mesh for both cases is also shown in Table 1. Comparing with the 3-D formulation, the axisymmetric formulation significantly reduces the computing time, which makes \( P_5 \) and \( P_7 \) competitive for practical applications.

The computation time is strongly related to the number of outer iterations required, which in turn depends on radiative properties. For optically thin cases, a boundary

---

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Computation cost of ( P_N ) method</th>
<th>Number of cells</th>
<th>( P_1 ) (s)</th>
<th>( P_3 ) (s)</th>
<th>( P_5 ) (s)</th>
<th>( P_7 ) (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case I: 3-D Cylinder</td>
<td>131 400</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>90.49</td>
<td>269.29</td>
<td>727.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case I: 2-D Wedge</td>
<td>3360</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>11.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case II: Flame(3-D, 1 quadrature)</td>
<td>957 600</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>1323.53</td>
<td>2566.52</td>
<td>6817.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case II: Flame(2-D, 1 quadrature)</td>
<td>7980</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>14.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Fig. 7.** Radiative source for Sandia FlameD \( \times 4 \) at two axial locations as calculated with various \( P_N \) approximations. (a) \( z = 1.00 \text{ m} \) and (b) \( z = 1.43 \text{ m} \).
condition stabilizer is utilized for high-order $P_N$, which will also slow down the convergence.

5. Summary and conclusion

A 2-D axisymmetric version of the spherical harmonics $P_N$ model (up to $P_7$) is formulated and implemented in OpenFOAM. The number of PDEs and intensity coefficients for the $P_N$-approximation is reduced from $N(N+1)/2$ to $(N+1)^2/4$ by employing axisymmetric relations. The coupled $(N+1)^2/4$ simultaneous PDEs and their boundary conditions are solved iteratively by the PCG method. Two example problems were tested for the 2-D axisymmetric $P_N$ formulation. The new formulation was verified by comparing computations to the intensity coefficients from the 3-D $P_N$ formulation, exact solutions and PMC results. The comparison shows that the 2-D formulation provides an accurate and faster approach for axisymmetric problems. The system of simultaneous PDEs are solved iteratively in the current implementation. Further development could employ a block-coupling approach [23] to improve the stability and computation efficiency.
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