

Vincent Bosboom, Herbert Egger\*, and Matthias Schlottbom

# Analysis and systematic discretization of a Fokker-Planck equation with Lorentz force

**Abstract:** The propagation of charged particles through a scattering medium in the presence of a magnetic field can be described by a Fokker-Planck equation with Lorentz force. This model is studied both, from a theoretical and a numerical point of view. A particular trace estimate is derived for the relevant function spaces to clarify the meaning of boundary values. Existence of a weak solution is then proven by the Rothe method. In the second step of our investigations, a fully practicable discretization scheme is proposed based on implicit time-stepping through the energy levels and a spherical-harmonics finite-element discretization with respect to the remaining variables. A full error analysis of the resulting scheme is given, and numerical results are presented to illustrate the theoretical results and the performance of the proposed method.

**Keywords:** Fokker-Planck equation, Lorentz force, Rothe method, spherical harmonics, finite elements

## 1 Introduction

The Boltzmann transport equation is a standard model for the propagation of particles or radiation through scattering media [3, 21, 25]. In the forward-peaked regime, the validity of the Fokker-Planck continuous slowing-down approximation has been established in [8, 27], and this model has been intensively studied for dose calculation in radiation therapy [19, 22]. In this paper, we consider an extension that includes the effect of the Lorentz force on the propagation of an electron beam in the presence of a magnetic field, which has applications in recent cancer treatment modalities [12, 26, 30]. The quasistatic distribution of electrons propagating through a biological medium is then described by the Fokker-Planck equation

$$-\partial_\epsilon(S\psi) + s \cdot \nabla_r \psi + G \cdot s \times \nabla_s \psi - T \Delta_s \psi = q \quad \text{on } \mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{E}. \quad (1)$$

Here  $\psi = \psi(r, s, \epsilon)$  is the phase-space density of electrons, depending on position  $r \in \mathcal{R}$ , propagation direction  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ , and energy level  $\epsilon \in \mathcal{E} = (\epsilon_{min}, \epsilon_{max})$ . Furthermore,  $\nabla_r \psi$  denotes the spatial gradient, and  $\nabla_s, \Delta_s$  the surface gradient and Laplace-Beltrami operator on the unit sphere; see [18, 27] for parametric representations of these operators. The coefficient  $G = G(r, \epsilon)$  represents the scaled external magnetic field, the parameters  $T = T(r, \epsilon)$  and  $S = S(r, \epsilon)$  are derived from the scattering phase function in the forward-peaked regime [27], and  $q = q(r, s, \epsilon)$  is the source density. Apart from the third term on the left hand side, the equation can be found in [19, Eq. (14)]. For models including the Lorentz force, see [6, Eq. (11)] and [30, Eq. (10)] as well as [12, 31]. The equation (1) is complemented by boundary conditions

$$\psi = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_{in} \times \mathcal{E} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S} \times \{\epsilon_{max}\}. \quad (2)$$

As usual, the boundary  $\Gamma = \partial\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S}$  here is decomposed into an inflow and an outflow part

$$\Gamma_{in} = \{(r, s) \in \partial\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S} : n(r) \cdot s < 0\}, \quad \Gamma_{out} = \Gamma \setminus \overline{\Gamma_{in}}, \quad (3)$$

with  $n(r)$  denoting the outward unit normal vector on  $\partial\mathcal{R}$ . In this presentation, we only consider homogeneous boundary data, but the extension to inhomogeneous conditions is straight-forward due to linearity of the problem. Let us briefly discuss the main contributions obtained in this manuscript.

**Vincent Bosboom, Matthias Schlottbom**, University of Twente, Department of Applied Mathematics, Enschede, The Netherlands, e-mail: v.bosboom@utwente.nl, m.schlottbom@utwente.nl

**\*Corresponding author: Herbert Egger**, Johannes Kepler Universität, Department of Mathematics and Johann Radon Institute for Computational and Applied Mathematics, Linz, Austria, e-mail: herbert.egger@jku.at

**Existence of weak solutions.** For vanishing magnetic field  $G = 0$  and spatially homogeneous stopping power  $S = S(\epsilon)$ , the existence of a solution to (1)–(2) can be deduced from the results in [18, 20], which are based on earlier work [13, 14]. These papers consider (1) as a stationary problem in phase-space  $\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{E}$ , and the existence proofs are based on Lions’ representation theorem [4, 28], which provides a very weak characterization of solutions. In this manuscript, we follow a different approach: We consider (1) as an evolution problem with respect to the energy  $\epsilon$ , which is interpreted as a pseudo-time variable. Following the physical background, one moves from high to low energies, and the condition  $\psi(\epsilon_{max}) = 0$  in (2) takes the role of an initial condition. By an implicit Euler time-stepping scheme, we construct a sequence of semi-discrete approximations, for which we establish uniform bounds in appropriate norms. Existence of a solution can then be established by weak compactness arguments. This approach allows us to consider also spatially varying coefficients and non-vanishing magnetic fields.

**Systematic discretization and error estimates.** Various methods can be employed for the numerical solution of the Fokker-Planck equation (1). A standard approach are Monte-Carlo methods, see e.g. [6, 17], which are extremely flexible, but pose severe computational challenges for applications in therapy planning. Alternative methods based on deterministic discretization paradigms have therefore been considered; see for instance [29–31]. In this paper, we utilize spherical-harmonics finite-element schemes, which have been proven successful discretization methods in the context of neutron transport and radiative heat transfer; see e.g. [1, 23]. Together with the time-stepping approach w.r.t. the energy variable, which is also used to prove existence of solutions on the continuous level, we obtain a fully practicable discretization scheme with provable stability properties. By extension of our previous work [15, 16], we are further able to provide a full discretization error analysis.

**A trace theorem for the Fokker-Planck equation.** The existence of boundary values for functions in anisotropic Sobolev spaces is a subtle issue. For the Boltzmann transport equation, the appropriate trace spaces are known [2, 11]. An additional technical difficulty arises for the Fokker-Planck approximation (1), which seems to have been overlooked in some previous work. As part of our analysis, we thus provide a rigorous proof of a corresponding trace estimate, Lemma 3, which might also be of independent interest.

**Outline.** The remainder of this article is organized as follows: In Section 2, we introduce some additional notation, our main assumptions, and some preliminary results. Section 3 is then concerned with the analysis of the problem. We establish the trace theorem, mentioned above, and prove existence of a weak solution. In Section 4, we introduce our fully discrete method and present its error analysis. For illustration of our theoretical results, some numerical tests are presented in Section 5.

## 2 Preliminaries and Notation

Throughout the manuscript, we use the following general assumptions on the problem data.

**Assumption 1.**  $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  is a bounded convex domain with smooth boundary,  $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  the unit sphere, and  $\mathcal{E} = (\epsilon_{min}, \epsilon_{max})$  a bounded interval. The parameter functions  $T$ ,  $S$  and  $G_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$  lie in  $W^{1,\infty}(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{E})$ . Moreover, the functions  $T$  and  $S$  are uniformly bounded from below, i.e., there exist constants  $c_S, c_T > 0$  such that  $c_S \leq S(r, \epsilon)$  and  $c_T \leq T(r, \epsilon)$  for a.e.  $r \in \mathcal{R}$  and  $\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}$ .

Bounds for a general function  $F$  and its derivatives will be denoted by  $C_F$  and  $C'_F$ , respectively. We use standard notation for function spaces, e.g.  $L^p(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S})$  for the class of measurable functions whose  $p$ -th power is integrable or  $C(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{E})$  for continuous functions on  $\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{E}$ . Furthermore, we use  $L^p(\mathcal{E}; X)$  to denote the Bochner spaces of functions  $f : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow X$  with values in some Banach space  $X$ . For ease of notation, we introduce the abbreviations

$$\langle u, v \rangle = \int_{\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S}} u v \, d(r, s) \quad \text{and} \quad \langle u, v \rangle_{\partial} = \int_{\partial \mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S}} u v \, d(r, s)$$

for the scalar products of  $L^2(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S})$  and  $L^2(\partial\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S})$ . The same symbols will be used later on also to denote duality products of certain Sobolev spaces, defined over the respective domains, and their dual spaces. By basic arguments, we obtain the following integration-by-parts formulas, which will be used later on.

**Lemma 1.** *Let Assumption 1 hold and  $u, v \in C^2(\overline{\mathcal{R}} \times \mathcal{S})$ . Then*

$$\begin{aligned}\langle s \cdot \nabla_r u, v \rangle &= -\langle u, s \cdot \nabla_r v \rangle + \langle n \cdot s u, v \rangle_{\partial} \\ \langle G \cdot s \times \nabla_s u, v \rangle &= -\langle u, G \cdot s \times \nabla_s v \rangle \\ \langle T \Delta_s u, v \rangle &= -\langle T \nabla_s u, \nabla_s v \rangle.\end{aligned}$$

For  $u, v \in C^1(\overline{\mathcal{E}}; L^2(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S}))$ , we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{E}} \langle \partial_{\epsilon} u, v \rangle d\epsilon = - \int_{\mathcal{E}} \langle u, \partial_{\epsilon} v \rangle d\epsilon + \langle u, v \rangle \Big|_{\epsilon_{min}}^{\epsilon_{max}}.$$

As a direct consequence, we obtain the following characterization of smooth solutions.

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $\psi$  be a smooth solution of (1)–(2). Then*

$$\int_{\mathcal{E}} \langle \psi, S \partial_{\epsilon} v \rangle - \langle \psi, s \cdot \nabla_r v \rangle - \langle \psi, G \cdot s \times \nabla_s v \rangle + \langle T \cdot \nabla_s \psi, \nabla_s v \rangle d\epsilon = \int_{\mathcal{E}} \langle q, v \rangle d\epsilon \quad (4)$$

for all smooth functions  $v \in C^1(\overline{\mathcal{E}} \times \overline{\mathcal{R}} \times \mathcal{S})$  with  $v(\epsilon_{min}) = 0$  and  $v = 0$  on  $\Gamma_{out} \times \mathcal{E}$ .

The claim follows immediately by multiplying (1) with a smooth test function  $v$ , integrating over  $\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{E}$ , using the above integration-by-parts formulas, and the boundary conditions for  $\psi$  and  $v$ . This variational characterization of smooth solutions can be used to introduce the following solution concept.

**Definition 1.** A function  $\psi \in L^{\infty}(\mathcal{E}; L^2(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S}))$  with  $\nabla_s \psi \in L^2(\mathcal{E}; L^2(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S}))$  satisfying (4) for all  $v \in C^1(\overline{\mathcal{R}} \times \mathcal{S} \times \overline{\mathcal{E}})$  with  $v(\epsilon_{min}) = 0$  and  $v = 0$  on  $\Gamma_{out} \times \mathcal{E}$ , is called a weak solution of (1)–(2).

Using the conditions of Assumption 1, existence of such a weak solution can be established.

## 3 Existence of solutions

The main goal of this section is to show the following generalization of corresponding results in [18, 20].

**Theorem 1.** *Let Assumption 1 hold. Then for any data  $q \in L^2(\mathcal{E}; L^2(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S}))$ , there exists a weak solution  $\psi$  of the system (1)–(2) in the sense of Definition 1.*

The remainder of the section is devoted to the proof of this assertion. Before going into the details, let us outline the main steps: By *time-stepping* with respect to the energy variable  $\epsilon$ , we will construct a sequence of approximate solutions, and then prove uniform bounds on these approximations in appropriate spaces. Existence of a weak-solution then follows by weak-compactness arguments.

### 3.1 Time discretization

Let  $\epsilon_{max} = \epsilon^M > \epsilon^{M-1} > \dots > \epsilon^0 = \epsilon_{min}$  denote a partition of the energy interval  $\mathcal{E} = (\epsilon_{min}, \epsilon_{max})$ . For ease of notation, we assume  $\epsilon^{m-1} = \epsilon^m - \Delta\epsilon$  to be equidistant. For any sequence  $(u^m)_{m \geq 0}$ , we write

$$\bar{\partial}_{\epsilon} u^m = \frac{1}{\Delta\epsilon} (u^{m+1} - u^m)$$

to denote the backward difference quotient. We use  $u^m = u(\epsilon^m)$  and  $\bar{u}^m = \frac{1}{\Delta\epsilon} \int_{\epsilon^m}^{\epsilon^{m+1}} u(\epsilon) d\epsilon$  to denote the evaluation and local averages of a function  $u$  depending on the energy variable  $\epsilon$ . Following the physical

origin of the problem, we traverse through (1) from high to low energy and, in view of (2), choose  $\psi^M = 0$ . The approximations  $\psi^m$  for  $\psi(e^m)$ ,  $m \leq M - 1$ , are then obtained by solving recursively

$$-\bar{\partial}_\epsilon(S\psi)^m + s \cdot \nabla \psi^m + G^m \cdot s \times \nabla_s \psi^m - T^m \Delta_s \psi^m = \bar{q}^m \quad \text{in } \mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S}, \quad (5)$$

$$\psi^m = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_{in}. \quad (6)$$

Let us note that a local average of the source term is used on the right hand side of (5). Apart from this modification and the reverse transition through the energy levels, from high to low, this method amounts to a standard implicit Euler *time-stepping* scheme, if  $\epsilon$  is interpreted as pseudo-time.

### 3.2 A trace theorem

Extending the considerations of [2, 15], the natural function spaces for the analysis of (5)–(6) turn out to be

$$\mathbb{V} := \{v \in L^2(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S}) : \nabla_s v \in L^2(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S})\}, \quad (7)$$

$$\mathbb{W} := \{v \in \mathbb{V} : s \cdot \nabla_r v \in \mathbb{V}^*, |s \cdot n|^{1/2} v \in L^2(\Gamma)\}, \quad (8)$$

with  $\mathbb{V}^*$  denoting the dual space of  $\mathbb{V}$ . In order to verify that  $\mathbb{W}$  is actually well-defined, one has to ensure that functions  $v \in \mathbb{V}$  with directional derivatives  $s \cdot \nabla_r v \in \mathbb{V}^*$  have well-defined traces. This can be guaranteed by the following technical result.

**Lemma 3 (Trace estimate).** *Assume that  $\mathcal{R}$  is convex with smooth boundary. Then there exists a constant  $C > 0$ , depending only on  $\mathcal{R}$ , such that for all  $v \in \mathbb{V}$  with  $s \cdot \nabla_r v \in \mathbb{V}^*$ , one has*

$$\int_{\Gamma_{in}} |v|^2 |s \cdot n| \tau^2 d(r, s) \leq C \left( \|s \cdot \nabla_r v\|_{\mathbb{V}^*}^2 + \|v\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S})}^2 \right)^{1/2} \|v\|_{\mathbb{V}}.$$

Here  $\tau = \tau(r, s)$  is the length of the intersection of  $\mathcal{R}$  with the line  $t \mapsto r + ts$ .

*Proof.* We adapt the proof of [24, Thm. 2.2]. Let  $\Gamma_{in}(s) = \{r \in \partial\mathcal{R} : n(r) \cdot s < 0\}$  and  $\Gamma_{out}(s) = \partial\mathcal{R} \setminus \overline{\Gamma_{in}(s)}$  be the inflow and the outflow part of  $\partial\mathcal{R}$  for a fixed direction  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ . We split  $\tau = \tau_- + \tau_+$ , where  $\tau_-$  is the distance along the line segment from  $(r, s)$  to the inflow boundary  $\Gamma_{in}(s)$ , while  $\tau_+$  is the corresponding distance to the outflow boundary. We further define  $z(r, s) = 1 - \tau_-(r, s)/\tau(r, s)$ , and observe that  $z(r, s) = 1$  for  $r \in \Gamma_{in}(s)$  and  $z(r, s) = 0$  for  $r \in \Gamma_{out}(s)$ . For  $r \in \Gamma_{in}(s)$ , we then see that  $z(r + ts, s) = 1 - t/\tau(r, s)$  and  $s \cdot \nabla_r z(r + ts, s) = -1/\tau(r, s)$ . By the fundamental theorem of calculus, we then compute

$$\begin{aligned} v(r, s)^2 &= (v(r, s)z(r, s))^2 = - \int_0^{\tau(r, s)} s \cdot \nabla_r (v(r + ts, s)z(r + ts, s))^2 dt \\ &= -2 \int_0^{\tau(r, s)} s \cdot \nabla_r v(r + ts, s) v(r + ts, s) \left( \frac{\tau(r, s) - t}{\tau(r, s)} \right)^2 - v(r + ts, s)^2 \frac{\tau(r, s) - t}{\tau(r, s)^2} dt, \end{aligned}$$

for any  $v \in C^1(\overline{\mathcal{R}} \times \mathcal{S})$ . Multiplying the latter identity by  $|s \cdot n| \tau(r, s)^2$  and integrating over  $\Gamma_{in}(s)$  yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Gamma_{in}(s)} |v|^2 |s \cdot n| \tau(r, s)^2 dr &= -2 \int_{\Gamma_{in}(s)} \int_0^{\tau(r, s)} \left( s \cdot \nabla_r v(r + ts, s) v(r + ts, s) (\tau - t)^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - v(r + ts, s)^2 (\tau - t) \right) |s \cdot n| dt dr. \end{aligned}$$

By integration over  $\mathcal{S}$  and using the identity  $\int_{\Gamma_{in}(s)} \int_0^{\tau(r,s)} f(r+ts) |s \cdot n| dt dr = \int_{\mathcal{R}} f(r) dr$ , which holds for any  $f \in L^1(\mathcal{R})$ , see for instance in [9, Lem. 1], we then immediately obtain the identity

$$\int_{\Gamma_{in}} |v|^2 |s \cdot n| \tau(r, s)^2 d(r, s) = -2 \int_{\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S}} s \cdot \nabla_r v v \tau_+^2 - v^2 \tau_+ d(r, s).$$

An application of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality now shows that

$$\int_{\Gamma_{in}} |v|^2 |s \cdot n| \tau(r, s)^2 d(r, s) \leq 2 \|s \cdot \nabla_r v\|_{\mathbb{V}^*} \|v \tau_+^2\|_{\mathbb{V}} + 2 \|v \tau_+^{1/2}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S})}^2.$$

To estimate the last term, we use that  $\tau_+ \leq \text{diam}(\mathcal{R})$  and that  $\nabla_s \tau_+$  is bounded because  $\partial \mathcal{R}$  is smooth. Therefore,  $\|v \tau_+^2\|_{\mathbb{V}} \leq C \|v\|_{\mathbb{V}}$  with constant depending on  $\mathcal{R}$ . This shows validity of the bounds for smooth functions, and the claim of the lemma finally follows by a density argument.  $\square$

### 3.3 Well-posedness of the time-stepping scheme

Due to Lemma 3, the space  $\mathbb{W}$  is well-defined, and  $\mathbb{V}$  and  $\mathbb{W} \subset \mathbb{V}$  are both Hilbert spaces, when equipped with their natural norms. Following [15], we further decompose functions of the angular variable via

$$\psi = \psi^+ + \psi^- \quad \text{with} \quad \psi^\pm(s) = \frac{1}{2}(\psi(s) \pm \psi(-s))$$

into *even* and *odd* parts. This decomposition carries over to functions in  $\mathbb{V}$  and  $\mathbb{W}$ . As a next step, we introduce some abbreviations for the differential operators appearing in (1), namely

$$\mathcal{A}u = s \cdot \nabla_r u \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{G}u = G(\epsilon^m) \cdot s \times \nabla_s u \quad \forall u \in \mathbb{W}.$$

For the surface Laplacian, we apply integration by parts and use a weak characterization, i.e.,

$$\langle \mathcal{T}u, v \rangle = \langle T(\epsilon^m) \nabla_s u, \nabla_s v \rangle \quad \forall u, v \in \mathbb{W}.$$

Note that  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  implicitly depend on the time step  $m$ , and we write  $\mathcal{G}^m$  and  $\mathcal{T}^m$  to indicate this dependence, if required. By elementary arguments, see [15], one can then verify the following observation.

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $\psi^m \in \mathbb{W}$  solve (5)–(6) for given  $\psi^{m+1} \in \mathbb{V}$  and  $\bar{q}^m \in L^2(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S})$ . Then*

$$-\langle \bar{\partial}_\epsilon (S\psi)^m, v \rangle + a(\psi^m, v) = \langle \bar{q}^m, v \rangle \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{U} \quad (9)$$

with mixed regularity space  $\mathbb{U} = \mathbb{W}^+ \oplus \mathbb{V}^-$  and bilinear form  $a : \mathbb{U} \times \mathbb{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by

$$a(u, v) = \langle \mathcal{G}u, v \rangle + \langle |s \cdot n| u^+, v^+ \rangle + \langle \mathcal{A}u^+, v^- \rangle - \langle u^-, \mathcal{A}v^+ \rangle + \langle \mathcal{T}u, v \rangle, \quad \forall u, v \in \mathbb{U}. \quad (10)$$

Let us note that the variational identity (9) makes sense for functions  $\psi^m \in \mathbb{U}$ , and we accept such functions as solutions for (5)–(6). Under Assumption 1, the existence of such solutions can be established.

**Lemma 5.** *For any  $\bar{q}^m, \psi^{m+1} \in L^2(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S})$ , the system (5)–(6) has a unique solution  $\psi^m \in \mathbb{U}$ .*

*Proof.* We closely follow the arguments given in [15] and, therefore, stay very brief in the sequel. By a slight rearrangement of terms, one can see that (9) is equivalent to the problem

$$b(u, v) = \ell(v) \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{U} \quad (11)$$

with solution  $u = \psi^m$ , bilinear form  $b(u, v) = \frac{1}{\Delta \epsilon} \langle S^m \psi^m, v \rangle + a(u, v)$ , and right hand side  $\ell(v) = \langle \bar{q}^m, v \rangle + \frac{1}{\Delta \epsilon} \langle S^{m+1} \psi^{m+1}, v \rangle$ . We next define a generalized collision operator  $\mathcal{C} = \frac{1}{\Delta \epsilon} S^m + \mathcal{T}$  and the norm

$$\|u\|_{\mathbb{U}}^2 = \|u\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 + \|u^+\|_{\mathcal{D}}^2 + \|\mathcal{A}u^+\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-1}}^2,$$

where  $\|u\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 = \langle \mathcal{C}u, u \rangle$  and  $\|u\|_{\mathcal{G}}^2 = \langle |s \cdot n|u, u \rangle_{\partial}$ . This norm is equivalent to the natural norm on  $\mathbb{W}^+ \oplus \mathbb{V}^-$ , and thus  $\mathbb{U}$  is a Hilbert space when endowed with this norm. It is not difficult to verify that  $b : \mathbb{U} \times \mathbb{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is bilinear and continuous, and that  $\ell : \mathbb{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is linear and continuous. From the integration-by-parts formulas of Lemma 1, one can further deduce that  $\langle \mathcal{G}v, v \rangle = 0$  for all  $v \in \mathbb{V}$ . This immediately implies

$$b(u, u) = \|u\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 + \|u^+\|_{\mathcal{G}}^2.$$

Choosing  $v = \mathcal{C}^{-1}\mathcal{A}u^+$  as a test functions and observing that  $v$  and  $\mathcal{G}u^-$  are odd functions, we further get

$$\begin{aligned} b(u, \mathcal{C}^{-1}\mathcal{A}u^+) &= \langle (\mathcal{C} + \mathcal{G})u^-, \mathcal{C}^{-1}\mathcal{A}u^+ \rangle + \langle \mathcal{A}u^+, \mathcal{C}^{-1}\mathcal{A}u^+ \rangle \\ &\geq -\frac{1}{2}\|(\mathcal{C} + \mathcal{G})u^-\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-1}}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|\mathcal{A}u^+\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-1}}^2 \geq -\frac{1}{2}(1 + C_G^2)\|u^-\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|\mathcal{A}u^+\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-1}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used Young's inequality, the basic identity  $\|(\mathcal{C} + \mathcal{G})u^-\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-1}}^2 = \|u^-\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 + \|\mathcal{G}u^-\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-1}}^2$ , as well as the bound  $\|\mathcal{G}u^-\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-1}} \leq C_G\|u^-\|_{\mathcal{C}}$ . The latter estimate follows from the boundedness of  $G$  and elementary properties of the operators. Setting  $v = u + \gamma\mathcal{C}^{-1}\mathcal{A}u^+$  with  $\gamma = 2/(2 + C_G^2)$ , we thus obtain

$$b(u, v) \geq \|u^+\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 + \frac{\gamma}{2}\|u^-\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 + \frac{\gamma}{2}\|\mathcal{A}u^+\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-1}}^2 + \|u^+\|_{\mathcal{G}}^2 \geq \frac{\gamma}{2}\|u\|_{\mathbb{U}}^2.$$

Similarly, using the test function  $v = u - \gamma\mathcal{C}^{-1}\mathcal{A}u^+$ , one can show that  $a(v, u) \geq \frac{\gamma}{2}\|u\|_{\mathbb{U}}^2$ . Furthermore

$$\|v\|_{\mathbb{U}} = \|u + \gamma\mathcal{C}^{-1}\mathcal{A}u^+\|_{\mathbb{U}} \leq C_A\|u\|_{\mathbb{U}},$$

for some positive constant  $C_A > 0$  independent of  $u$ . These inequalities verify the stability conditions of the Babuska-Aziz lemma [5], and we can thus conclude the existence of a unique solution  $u \in \mathbb{U}$  of our variational problem together with an a-priori bound  $\|u\|_{\mathbb{U}} \leq C\|\ell\|_{\mathbb{U}^*} \leq C'(\|\bar{q}^m\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S})} + \|\psi^{m+1}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S})})$ .  $\square$

This clarifies the well-posedness of (5)–(6) for a single time step. By induction over  $m$  and noting that  $\mathbb{U} \subset L^2(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S})$ , we then obtain existence of a semi-discrete solution  $\psi^m$ ,  $0 \leq m \leq M$  in  $\mathbb{U}$ .

### 3.4 Uniform bounds

The constants of the a-priori bounds in the last step of the previous proof depend on the step size parameter. In the following, we show that the semi-discrete approximation can be bounded independent of  $\Delta\epsilon$ . To this end, we mimic the basic identity

$$\partial_{\epsilon}(S\psi^2) = 2\partial_{\epsilon}(S\psi)\psi - (\partial_{\epsilon}S)\psi^2,$$

which follows immediately by the product rule of differentiation. A corresponding discrete version reads

$$\bar{\partial}_{\epsilon}(S\psi^2)^m = 2(\bar{\partial}_{\epsilon}(S\psi))^m\psi^m - (\bar{\partial}_{\epsilon}S)^m(\psi^m)^2 + \Delta\epsilon S^{m+1}(\bar{\partial}_{\epsilon}\psi^m)^2. \quad (12)$$

The last term stems from the dissipative nature of the backward difference quotient. We can now prove the following a-priori bounds, which will allow us to prove existence of a weak solution later on.

**Lemma 6.** *Let Assumption 1 hold and  $\psi^m$ ,  $0 \leq m \leq M$  denote a solution of (5)–(6). Then*

$$\sup_{0 \leq m \leq M} \|\psi^m\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S})}^2 + \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} \Delta\epsilon \|\nabla_s \psi^m\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S})}^2 \leq C\|q\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E}; L^2(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S}))} \quad (13)$$

with a constant  $C$  that is independent of the time step  $\Delta\epsilon$ .

*Proof.* Solutions of (5)–(6) are characterized by (9). When testing this identity with  $v = \psi^m$ , we get

$$-\langle \bar{\partial}_{\epsilon}(S^m\psi^m), \psi^m \rangle + \langle |s \cdot n|\psi^{m,+}, \psi^{m,+} \rangle_{\partial} + \langle T^m \nabla_s \psi^m, \nabla_s \psi^m \rangle = \langle \bar{q}^m, \psi^m \rangle.$$

Note that some of the terms appearing in the bilinear form  $a(\cdot, \cdot)$  vanish due to anti-symmetry. Using the expression (12), we may rewrite the term involving  $\bar{\partial}_\epsilon(S^m \psi^m)$  as

$$\begin{aligned} -2\Delta\epsilon \langle \bar{\partial}_\epsilon(S^m \psi^m), \psi^m \rangle &= \langle S^m \psi^m, \psi^m \rangle - \langle S^{m+1} \psi^{m+1}, \psi^{m+1} \rangle + \langle (S^m - S^{m+1}) \psi^m, \psi^m \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle S^{m+1}(\psi^{m+1} - \psi^m), (\psi^{m+1} - \psi^m) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

The last term on the right-hand side is positive, and the third term can be bounded by

$$\langle (S^m - S^{m+1}) \psi^m, \psi^m \rangle \geq -\Delta\epsilon C'_S c_S^{-1} \langle S^m \psi^m, \psi^m \rangle,$$

where we used the upper and lower bounds on  $S'$  and  $S$  provided by Assumption 1. For abbreviation, we introduce the new constant  $\tilde{C}_S = C'_S/c_S$ . A combination of the previous estimates leads to

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \Delta\epsilon \tilde{C}_S) \langle S^m \psi^m, \psi^m \rangle &+ 2\Delta\epsilon \langle T^m \nabla_s \psi^m, \nabla_s \psi^m \rangle \\ &\leq \langle S^{m+1} \psi^{m+1}, \psi^{m+1} \rangle + 2\Delta\epsilon \langle \bar{q}^m, \psi^m \rangle \\ &\leq \langle S^{m+1} \psi^{m+1}, \psi^{m+1} \rangle + \Delta\epsilon \langle \bar{q}^m, \bar{q}^m \rangle + \Delta\epsilon c_S^{-1} \langle S^m \psi^m, \psi^m \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Assuming  $\Delta\epsilon$  sufficiently small, e.g.,  $\Delta\epsilon \leq c_S/(2(C'_S + 1))$ , the leading term on the left hand side can be bounded from below by the positive constant  $1 - \Delta\epsilon(\tilde{C}_S + c_S^{-1})$ . We may then apply this inequality recursively, to see that

$$\langle S^m \psi^m, \psi^m \rangle + \sum_{k=m}^{M-1} \Delta\epsilon \langle T^k \nabla_s \psi^k, \nabla_s \psi^k \rangle \leq \hat{C}_S \sum_{k=m}^{M-1} \Delta\epsilon \|\bar{q}^k\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S})}^2. \quad (14)$$

The constant  $\hat{C}_S$  only depends on  $c_S$ ,  $C'_S$  and the size  $|\mathcal{E}|$  of the energy interval. The assertion of the lemma now follows by observing that  $\sum_{k=0}^{M-1} \Delta\epsilon \|\bar{q}^k\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S})}^2 \leq \|q\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E}; L^2(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S}))}^2$ , which follows immediately from the definition of the local averages  $\bar{q}^k$ , and noting that  $S$  and  $T$  are uniformly positive.  $\square$

### 3.5 Proof of existence

Let  $\psi^m$ ,  $0 \leq m \leq M$  denote a solution of the time stepping procedure (5)–(6) with step size  $\Delta\epsilon$  as constructed in Lemma 5. Then we define a piecewise constant extension  $\psi_{\Delta\epsilon} \in L^2(\mathcal{E}; \mathbb{U})$  such that  $\psi_{\Delta\epsilon}(\epsilon) = \psi^m$  for  $\epsilon \in (\epsilon^{m-1}, \epsilon^m]$ . From the uniform bounds of the previous lemma, we immediately conclude that

$$\|\psi_{\Delta\epsilon}\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{E}; L^2(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S}))} + \|\nabla_s \psi_{\Delta\epsilon}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{E}; L^2(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S}))} \leq C,$$

with a uniform constant  $C$  independent of  $\Delta\epsilon$ . By the Banach-Alaoglu theorem [7, p. 66], we may thus select a sequence of functions  $\psi_{\Delta\epsilon}$  for different values of  $\Delta\epsilon$ , and a limit  $\psi \in L^\infty(\mathcal{E}; L^2(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S}))$  with derivative  $\nabla_s \psi \in L^2(\mathcal{E}; L^2(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S}))$ , such that

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{\Delta\epsilon} &\rightharpoonup^* \psi && \text{in } L^\infty(\mathcal{E}, L^2(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S})) \\ \psi_{\Delta\epsilon} &\rightharpoonup \psi && \text{in } L^2(\mathcal{E}, L^2(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S})) \\ \nabla_s \psi_{\Delta\epsilon} &\rightharpoonup \nabla_s \psi && \text{in } L^2(\mathcal{E}, L^2(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S})) \end{aligned}$$

with step size  $\Delta\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ . We will now show that  $\psi$  is a weak solution to (1)–(2) in the sense of Definition 1. Let  $v \in C^1(\overline{\mathcal{R}} \times \mathcal{S} \times \overline{\mathcal{E}})$  be a smooth test function with  $v(\epsilon_{min}) = 0$  and  $v = 0$  on  $\Gamma_{out} \times \mathcal{E}$ .

*Step 1.* By definition of the extension  $\psi_{\Delta\epsilon}$ , we see that

$$\begin{aligned} - \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} \Delta\epsilon \langle \bar{\partial}_\epsilon(S\psi)^m, v^m \rangle &= \sum_{m=1}^M \langle S^m \psi^m, v^m - v^{m-1} \rangle \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^M \int_{\epsilon^{m-1}}^{\epsilon^m} \langle S_{\Delta\epsilon} \psi_{\Delta\epsilon}, \partial_\epsilon v \rangle d\epsilon \rightarrow \int_{\mathcal{E}} \langle S\psi, \partial_\epsilon v \rangle d\epsilon \quad \text{as } \Delta\epsilon \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used that  $\psi^M = 0$  and  $v^0 = v(\epsilon_{min}) = 0$  by assumption, and we denoted by  $S_{\Delta\epsilon}$  the piecewise constant approximation of  $S$  with  $S_{\Delta\epsilon}(\epsilon) = S(\epsilon^m)$  for  $\epsilon \in (\epsilon^{m-1}, \epsilon^m]$ . Let us further note that the difference  $\|S_{\Delta\epsilon} - S\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{E}; L^\infty(\mathcal{R}))} \rightarrow 0$  by Assumption 1, which yields the convergence in the last step.

*Step 2.* Using integration-by-parts and the boundary conditions for  $v$ , one can show that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} \Delta\epsilon \left( \langle s \cdot \nabla_r \psi^{m,+}, v^{m,-} \rangle + \langle |s \cdot n| \psi^{m,+}, v^{m,+} \rangle_{\partial} - \langle \psi^{m,-}, s \cdot \nabla_r v^{m,+} \rangle \right) \\ = - \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} \Delta\epsilon \langle \psi^m, s \cdot \nabla_r v^m \rangle \rightarrow - \int_{\mathcal{E}} \langle \psi, s \cdot \nabla_r v \rangle d\epsilon \quad \text{as } \Delta\epsilon \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

For the first equality, we used the same arguments as in the derivation of the variational principle (9); for details, let us refer to [15]. This observation thus handles the spatial derivative terms.

*Step 3.* The convergence of the remaining terms in the definition of a weak solution follows immediately from their definition and the weak convergence of the functions  $\psi_{\Delta\epsilon}$  stated above.

By adding up the contributions and using (5)–(6), we see that the limit function  $\psi$  satisfies (4).  $\square$

## 4 The numerical method

In order to obtain an implementable discretization strategy, we use a Galerkin approximation of the time-stepping procedure (9) with respect to space and angle. For this purpose, we consider a  $P_N$ -FEM approximation as proposed in [15] for the discretization of stationary problems in radiative transfer. The fully discrete method then automatically inherits the structural properties of the continuous problem and the semi-discrete approximation studied before. As a consequence, we can prove the existence of a unique discrete solution, uniform bounds, as well as discrete stability and error estimates. A similar approach was used in [16] for the discretization of instationary problems in radiative transfer. In the following, we briefly introduce the basic ingredients, then formally state the method for later discussion, and finally provide a convergence analysis.

### 4.1 Approximation spaces of the $P_N$ -finite element method

Let  $\mathcal{T}_h$  denote a geometrically conforming quasi-uniform partition of  $\mathcal{R}$  into tetrahedra, i.e., a typical finite element mesh [10], and let  $\mathbb{X}_h^+$  be the corresponding finite element spaces consisting of continuous piecewise linear functions, and  $\mathbb{X}_h^-$  the space of piecewise constant functions on the mesh  $\mathcal{T}_h$ , respectively. Further, let  $Y_\ell^m$  with  $\ell \geq 0$  and  $-\ell \leq m \leq \ell$  denote the spherical harmonics, and recall that they form an orthogonal basis of  $L^2(\mathcal{S})$ . Some further useful properties of these functions are that  $Y_\ell^m$  is even if and only if  $\ell$  is even, and that  $Y_\ell^m$  are the eigenfunctions of the Laplace-Beltrami operator  $-\Delta_s$  with eigenvalue  $\ell(\ell+1)$ . The approximation spaces for the  $P_N$ -finite element method are then simply defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}_{h,N}^- &= \{v_h^- = \sum_{\substack{\ell=0 \\ \ell \text{ odd}}}^N \sum_{m=-\ell}^{\ell} v_\ell^m Y_\ell^m : v_\ell^m \in \mathbb{X}_h^-\}, \\ \mathbb{W}_{h,N}^+ &= \{v_h^+ = \sum_{\substack{\ell=0 \\ \ell \text{ even}}}^N \sum_{m=-\ell}^{\ell} v_\ell^m Y_\ell^m : v_\ell^m \in \mathbb{X}_h^+\}. \end{aligned}$$

We further set  $\mathbb{U}_{h,N} = \mathbb{W}_{h,N}^+ \oplus \mathbb{V}_{h,N}^-$ , which is the discrete approximation space for the solution. Let us recall from [15] the compatibility conditions  $\mathcal{A}\mathbb{W}_{h,N}^+ \subset \mathbb{V}_{h,N}^-$ , which is satisfied for order  $N$  odd.



## 4.2 The $P_N$ -finite element scheme

The fully discrete scheme for (1)–(2) is obtained by Galerkin approximation of the time-stepping scheme (9) in the approximation spaces stated above. We thus set  $\psi_{h,N}^M = 0$ , and look for discrete approximation  $\psi_{h,N}^m \in \mathbb{U}_{h,N}$  for  $m = M - 1, \dots, 0$ , such that

$$-\langle \bar{\partial}_\epsilon (S\psi_{h,N})^m, v_{h,N} \rangle + a(\psi_{h,N}^m, v_{h,N}) = \langle \bar{q}^m, v_{h,N} \rangle \quad \forall v_{h,N} \in \mathbb{U}_{h,N}. \quad (15)$$

Let us note that, similar as in (9), the bilinear form  $a(\cdot, \cdot)$  implicitly depends on the iteration index  $m$ . For the analysis of the discrete problem, we make an additional assumption, which, however, could be removed by the usual arguments for the analysis of non-conforming Galerkin schemes.

**Assumption 2.** Assumption 1 holds. Moreover,  $N$  is odd, and for each  $\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}$  the functions  $T(\cdot, \epsilon), S(\cdot, \epsilon)$  are piecewise constant on the mesh  $\mathcal{T}_h$ .

As a direct consequence of this assumption, we see that the operator  $\mathcal{C}$  defined in the proof of Lemma 5 is piecewise constant in space, which yields validity of the compatibility condition

$$\mathcal{C}^{-1} \mathcal{A} \mathbb{W}_{h,N}^+ \subset \mathbb{V}_{h,N}^-. \quad (16)$$

This allows us to transfer the proof of Lemma 5 almost verbatim to the discrete setting.

**Lemma 7.** *Under Assumption 2, the scheme (15) is well-defined.*

In the following section, we derive quasi-optimal error estimates for the proposed method.

## 4.3 Error analysis

Let  $a(\cdot, \cdot)$  be the bilinear form introduced in (10). For given  $u \in \mathbb{U}$ , let  $u_{h,N} \in \mathbb{U}_{h,N}$  denote the solution of

$$a(u_{h,N}, v_{h,N}) = a(u, v_{h,N}) \quad \forall v_{h,N} \in \mathbb{U}_{h,N}. \quad (17)$$

Then with the same reasoning as used in the proof of Lemma 5, one can show that the bilinear form  $a(\cdot, \cdot)$  is inf-sup stable on the discrete space  $\mathbb{U}_{h,N}$ , which leads to the following assertions.

**Lemma 8** (Elliptic projection). *Let Assumption 2 hold. Then for any  $u \in \mathbb{U}$ , the system (17) has a unique solution  $u_{h,N} \in \mathbb{U}_{h,N}$ . The mapping  $\Pi_{h,N} : \mathbb{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{U}_{h,N}$ ,  $u \mapsto u_{h,N}$  is a projection and satisfies*

$$\|u - \Pi_{h,N} u\|_{\mathbb{U}} \leq C \inf_{v_{h,N} \in \mathbb{U}_{h,N}} \|u - v_{h,N}\|_{\mathbb{U}}, \quad (18)$$

with a constant  $C$  that is independent of the discretization parameters  $\Delta\epsilon, h, N$ .

The proof is rather standard and follows along the lines of a similar result presented in [15]. Let us emphasize that the bilinear form  $a(\cdot, \cdot)$  in (10), and consequently also the projection  $\Pi_{h,N}$ , will depend on the time point  $\epsilon^m$  in general. We will write  $a^m(\cdot, \cdot)$  and  $\Pi_{h,N}^m$  or  $\Pi_{h,N}(\epsilon)$  below, if this dependence is important. We are now in the position to state and proof our second main result.

**Theorem 2** (Error estimate). *Let Assumption 2 hold and let  $\psi$  be a sufficiently smooth solution of (1)–(2). Further assume that  $S, R \in C^2(\bar{\mathcal{E}}; L^\infty(\mathcal{R}))$ . Then there holds*

$$\sup_{0 \leq m \leq M} \|\psi(\epsilon^m) - \psi_{h,N}^m\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S})} \leq C \left( \Delta\epsilon \|\psi\|_{W^{2,\infty}(\mathcal{E}; \mathbb{U})} + \sup_{0 \leq m \leq M} \inf_{v_{h,N} \in \mathbb{U}_{h,N}} \|\psi(\epsilon^m) - v_{h,N}\|_{\mathbb{U}} \right)$$

with a constant  $C > 0$  which does not depend on the discretization parameters  $h, N, \Delta\epsilon$ .

*Proof.* The error analysis is based on more or less standard arguments, but for completeness, we present the most important technical details in the following.

*Step 1: Error splitting.* Using the abbreviation  $(\Pi_{h,N}\psi)^m = \Pi_{h,N}^m\psi(\epsilon^m)$ , we can split the error as

$$\psi(\epsilon^m) - \psi_{h,N}^m = [\psi(\epsilon^m) - \Pi_{h,N}^m\psi(\epsilon^m)] + [(\Pi_{h,N}\psi)^m - \psi_{h,N}^m].$$

The projection error  $\psi(\epsilon^m) - \Pi_{h,N}^m\psi(\epsilon^m)$  can be estimated immediately using (18). For the discrete error component  $e_{h,N}^m = (\Pi_{h,N}\psi)^m - \psi_{h,N}^m$ , we will extend the stability estimates of Lemma 6.

*Step 2: Equation for  $e_{h,N}^m$ .* Using (17) and (15), we can see that

$$-\langle \bar{\partial}_\epsilon (S e_{h,N})^m, v_{h,N} \rangle + a^m(e_{h,N}^m, v_{h,N}) = \langle \partial_\epsilon (S\psi)^m - \bar{\partial}_\epsilon ((S\Pi_{h,N}\psi)^m), v_{h,N} \rangle. \quad (19)$$

Using the discrete product rule  $\bar{\partial}_\epsilon (S\Pi_{h,N}\psi)^m = (\bar{\partial}_\epsilon S^m)(\Pi\psi)^{m+1} + S^m\bar{\partial}_\epsilon ((\Pi_{h,N}\psi)^m)$ , we can write

$$\partial_\epsilon (S\psi)^m - \bar{\partial}_\epsilon (S\Pi_{h,N}\psi)^m = (S' - \bar{\partial}_\epsilon S)^m (\Pi_{h,N}\psi)^m + (S'(\psi - \Pi_{h,N}\psi))^m \quad (20)$$

$$+ (\bar{\partial}_\epsilon S^m) ((\Pi_{h,N}\psi)^m - (\Pi_{h,N}\psi)^{m+1}) \quad (21)$$

$$+ S^m \left( ((\partial_\epsilon \psi)^m - (\partial_\epsilon \Pi_{h,N}\psi)^m) + ((\partial_\epsilon \Pi_{h,N}\psi)^m - \bar{\partial}_\epsilon (\Pi_{h,N}\psi)^m) \right), \quad (22)$$

where  $(\partial_\epsilon \psi)^m$  and  $(\partial_\epsilon \Pi_{h,N}\psi)^m$  denote the evaluation of the corresponding terms in  $\epsilon = \epsilon^m$ . The terms on the right-hand side of (20) can be further estimated by

$$\|(S' - \bar{\partial}_\epsilon S)^m \Pi_{h,N}^m \psi(\epsilon^m)\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S})} \leq C \Delta \epsilon \|S''\|_\infty \|\psi(\epsilon^m)\|_{\mathbb{U}}, \quad (23)$$

$$\|(S'(\psi - \Pi_{h,N}\psi))^m\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S})} \leq C \|S'\|_\infty \inf_{v_{h,N} \in \mathbb{U}_{h,N}} \|\psi(\epsilon^m) - v_{h,N}\|_{\mathbb{U}}, \quad (24)$$

where we used (18) in the last expression. For the remaining terms, we need to investigate in more detail the differentiability properties of the mapping  $\epsilon \mapsto \Pi_{h,N}(\epsilon)\psi(\epsilon)$ , which we do next.

*Step 3: Derivatives of  $\Pi_{h,N}(\epsilon)\psi(\epsilon)$ .* By formally differentiating (17), we observe that

$$a(\partial_\epsilon \Pi_{h,N}\psi, v_{h,N}) = a(\partial_\epsilon \psi, v_{h,N}) - a'(\Pi_{h,N}\psi - \psi, v_{h,N}), \quad (25)$$

for all  $v_{h,N} \in \mathbb{U}_{h,N}$ , where the bilinear form  $a' : \mathbb{U} \times \mathbb{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is defined by

$$a'(u, v) = \langle T'(\epsilon) \nabla_s u, \nabla_s v \rangle + \langle G'(\epsilon) \cdot s \times \nabla_s u, v \rangle \quad \forall u, v \in \mathbb{U}.$$

Here,  $G'$  and  $T'$  denote the derivatives of  $G$  and  $T$  with respect to  $\epsilon$ . By Assumption 1, the functions  $G'$  and  $T'$  are bounded. Therefore,  $\partial_\epsilon \Pi_{h,N}(\epsilon)\psi(\epsilon) \in \mathbb{U}$ . By rearranging (25) and using (18), we further see

$$\|\partial_\epsilon \Pi_{h,N}(\epsilon)\psi(\epsilon) - \partial_\epsilon \psi(\epsilon)\|_{\mathbb{U}} \leq C \inf_{v_{h,N} \in \mathbb{U}_{h,N}} \|\psi(\epsilon) - v_{h,N}\|_{\mathbb{U}}, \quad (26)$$

which we can use to estimate the first term in (22). By differentiating the expression (25) another time with respect to  $\epsilon$ , we similarly obtain that

$$a(\partial_\epsilon^2 \Pi_{h,N}\psi, v_{h,N}) = a(\partial_\epsilon^2 \psi, v_{h,N}) + 2a'(\partial_\epsilon \psi - \partial_\epsilon \Pi_{h,N}\psi, v_{h,N}) + a''(\psi - \Pi_{h,N}\psi, v_{h,N}), \quad (27)$$

for all  $v_{h,N} \in \mathbb{U}_{h,N}$ , where  $a''$  is defined similarly to  $a'$ , but replacing  $T'$  and  $G'$  by  $T''$  and  $G''$ , respectively. From (27) and (26) we then deduce that

$$\|\Pi_{h,N}\psi\|_{W^{2,\infty}(\mathcal{E};\mathbb{U})} \leq C \|\psi\|_{W^{2,\infty}(\mathcal{E};\mathbb{U})}. \quad (28)$$

*Step 4: Putting it all together.* Estimate (28) implies that

$$\|(\Pi_{h,N}\psi)^{m+1} - (\Pi\psi)^m\|_{\mathbb{U}} + \|(\partial_\epsilon \Pi_{h,N}\psi)^m - \bar{\partial}_\epsilon (\Pi_{h,N}\psi)^m\|_{\mathbb{U}} \leq \Delta \epsilon C \|\psi\|_{W^{2,\infty}(\mathcal{E};\mathbb{U})}, \quad (29)$$

which we use to estimate the term in (21) and the second term in (22). By combination of the previous estimates (23), (24), (26), and (29), we can then bound

$$\|\partial_\epsilon (S\psi)^m - \bar{\partial}_\epsilon (S\Pi_{h,N}\psi)^m\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S})} \leq C \left( \Delta \epsilon \|\psi\|_{W^{2,\infty}(\mathcal{E};\mathbb{U})} + \inf_{v_h \in \mathbb{U}_{h,N}} \|\psi(\epsilon^m) - v_h\|_{\mathbb{U}} \right).$$

In combination with (14) for  $\bar{q}^m = (\partial_\epsilon (S\psi))^m - \bar{\partial}_\epsilon ((S\Pi_{h,N}\psi)^m)$ , we thus obtain

$$\sup_m \|(\Pi_{h,N}\psi)^m - \psi_{h,N}^m\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S})} \leq C \left( \Delta \epsilon \|\psi\|_{W^{2,\infty}(\mathcal{E};\mathbb{U})} + \sup_m \inf_{v_h \in \mathbb{U}_{h,N}} \|\psi(\epsilon^m) - v_h\|_{\mathbb{U}} \right). \quad (30)$$

Together with the previous estimates, this finally proves the bounds of the theorem.  $\square$

## 5 Numerical results

We now illustrate the theoretical findings derived in the previous section by some numerical tests.

### 5.1 Setup of the test problem

We consider a three-dimensional problem but, for simplicity, we assume that the solution is homogeneous in the spatial direction  $z$  and hence can be written as  $\psi(r, s, \epsilon)$  with  $r = (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ . For our computational tests, we use the spatial domain  $\mathcal{R} = (-1, 1)^2$  and the energy interval  $\mathcal{E} = (1, 2)$ . We consider three different discretizations in order to highlight different sources of the error, i.e.,

1. the approximation error by the finite element approximation for the spatial part of the solution depending on the mesh size  $h$ ;
2. the truncation error induced by stopping the spherical harmonic expansion at order  $N$ ;
3. the error in the energy discretization depending on the energy step  $\Delta\epsilon$ .

Different model parameters will be chosen for the different test scenarios to emphasize the different error contributions. For all our computations, the exact solution is given by

$$\psi(r, s, \epsilon) = \chi(x, y) f(\epsilon) \sum_{l=0}^{N_{\max}} \frac{Y_l^0(s)}{(l+1)^2},$$

with  $\chi(x, y) = \sin(\pi x) \sin(\pi y)$ , smooth function  $f$  with  $f(\epsilon_{\max}) = 0$ , and the source term  $q(r, s, \epsilon)$  is constructed to satisfy (1). By construction the exact solution  $\psi$  for our test problems thus satisfies the homogeneous boundary conditions (2) used in our analysis.

### 5.2 Computational results

In order to assess the convergence behavior, we look at the following error quantities:

$$\begin{aligned} e_{h,N}^{\pm} &:= \max_m \|\psi^{\pm}(\epsilon^m) - \psi_{h,N}^{m,\pm}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S})}, \\ (E_{h,N}^+)^2 &:= \max_m \|s \cdot \nabla_r \psi^+(\epsilon^m) - s \cdot \nabla_r \psi_{h,N}^{m,+}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S})}^2 + \|\psi^+(\epsilon^m) - \psi_{h,N}^{m,+}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{S})}^2. \end{aligned}$$

**Test 1: Convergence in  $h$ .** We take our exact solution  $\psi$  with  $N_{\max} = 2$ . In this case the source term will contain moments up to order  $N_{\max} + 2 = 4$ , and we take  $N = 5$ . Furthermore, we take a step size of  $\Delta\epsilon = 10^{-2}$ , and choose the parameters  $S = (1 + r^2)$ ,  $T = (1 + r^2)$ ,  $f = 2 - \epsilon$ ,  $G_1 = 0$ ,  $G_2 = 0$ ,  $G_3 = -\epsilon$ . With these choices the errors due to the truncation of the spherical harmonics and the energy discretization will be negligible. We now compute the numerical solutions on a sequence of refined meshes. Since we use piecewise-linear basis function in space to estimate  $\psi_{h,N}^{m,+}$  and piecewise-constant basis functions for  $\psi_{h,N}^{m,-}$  we expect that by standard interpolation estimates that the errors behave as  $e_h^+ = O(h^2)$ ,  $e_h^- = O(h)$  and  $E_h^+ = O(h)$ . The results of our numerical experiments are listed in Table 1. We estimated the error of convergence (eoc) as  $\log_2(e_{2h}^+/e_h^+)$ . In agreement with standard interpolation estimates we indeed find the predicted convergence results for all errors.

**Test 2: Convergence in  $N$ .** We now choose our exact solution  $\psi$  with  $N_{\max} = 20$ . Furthermore we take  $1/h = 256$  and  $\Delta\epsilon = 10^{-2}$ , and we set the parameters to  $S = 1$ ,  $T = 1$ ,  $f = 2 - \epsilon$ ,  $G_1 = 0$ ,  $G_2 = 0$ ,  $G_3 = -1$ . With these choices the errors due to the spatial and energy discretization should be relatively negligible. We compute the numerical solutions for  $N \in \{1, 3, 5, 7\}$ . The results of the numerical tests are depicted in Table 2. Since  $N_{\max} > N$  we expect a truncation error proportional to  $\sum_{l=N+1}^{N_{\max}} \frac{1}{(l+1)^2} \approx \frac{1}{N}$ . This is confirmed by the data in Table 2, where all errors are of order  $O(1/N)$ .

**Test 3: Convergence in  $\Delta\epsilon$ .** For this test we choose our exact solution with  $N_{\max} = 2$ , and we fix  $N = 5$  and  $h = 1/128$ . Furthermore, we choose the parameters  $S = (1 + r^2)e^3$ ,  $T = (1 + r^2)e^2$ ,  $f = 1 - e^{\epsilon-2}$ ,  $G_1 = 0$ ,  $G_2 = 0$ ,  $G_3 = -\epsilon$ . This ensures that the error due to the time discretization dominates the total error. We compute the numerical solution for different time steps  $1/\Delta\epsilon \in \{2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64\}$ . The numerical results are shown in Table 3. We estimated the eoc in the same way as in the other tests. We observe a convergence of the order  $O(\Delta\epsilon)$  for all errors, which again is in agreement with Theorem 2.

**Tab. 1:** Errors for different mesh sizes  $h$ , with estimated order of convergence (eoc).

$1/h$	$e_h^+$	eoc	$e_h^-$	eoc	$E_h^+$	eoc
8	9.00e-02	—	1.46e-01	—	6.45e-01	—
16	1.87e-02	2.26	7.03e-02	1.05	2.72e-01	1.25
32	4.33e-03	2.11	3.40e-02	1.05	1.28e-01	1.09
64	1.04e-03	2.05	1.67e-02	1.02	6.22e-02	1.04
128	2.57e-04	2.02	8.30e-03	1.01	3.07e-02	1.02
256	6.37e-05	2.01	4.13e-03	1.01	1.53e-02	1.01

**Tab. 2:** Errors for different values of  $N$ , with estimated order of convergence (eoc).

$N$	$e_h^+$	eoc	$e_h^-$	eoc	$E_h^+$	eoc
1	1.24e-01	—	7.46e-02	—	2.06e-01	—
3	4.81e-02	0.85	3.58e-02	0.67	8.44e-02	0.81
5	2.68e-02	1.15	2.22e-02	0.93	4.63e-02	1.17
7	1.73e-02	1.29	1.58e-02	1.02	3.10e-02	1.19

**Tab. 3:** Errors for different values of  $\Delta\epsilon$ , with estimated order of convergence (eoc).

$1/\Delta\epsilon$	$e_h^+$	eoc	$e_h^-$	eoc	$E_h^+$	eoc
2	1.23e+00	-	5.36e-01	-	2.84e+00	-
4	8.20e-01	0.58	3.44e-01	0.64	1.95e+00	0.55
8	4.70e-01	0.80	1.90e-01	0.86	1.13e+00	0.78
16	2.50e-01	0.91	9.89e-02	0.94	6.11e-01	0.89
32	1.29e-01	0.95	5.04e-02	0.97	3.17e-01	0.94
64	6.57e-02	0.98	2.58e-02	0.97	1.62e-01	0.97

**Funding:** VB and MS acknowledge support by the Dutch Research Council (NWO) via the Mathematics Clusters grant no. 613.009.133. <http://dx.doi.org/10.13039/501100003246>, "Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek". HE was supported by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF, <http://dx.doi.org/10.13039/501100002428>) via grant F 9002.

## References

- [1] R. T. Ackroyd. *Finite Element Methods for Particle Transport: Applications to Reactor and Radiation Physics*. Taylor & Francis Inc., 1997.

- [2] V. Agoshkov. *Boundary Value Problems for Transport Equations*. Modeling and Simulation in Science, Engineering and Technology. Birkhäuser, Boston, 1998.
- [3] E. Akkermans and G. Montambaux. *Mesoscopic Physics of Electrons and Photons*. Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- [4] W. Arendt, I. Chalendar, and R. Eymard. Lions' representation theorem and applications. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 522:Paper No. 126946, 2023.
- [5] I. Babuška. Error-bounds for finite element method. *Numer. Math.*, 16:322–333, 1970/71.
- [6] H. Bouchard and A. Bielajew. Lorentz force correction to the Boltzmann radiation transport equation and its implications for Monte Carlo algorithms. *Phys. Med. Biol.*, 60:4963–4971, 2015.
- [7] Haim Brezis. *Functional Analysis, Sobolev Spaces and Partial Differential Equations*. Springer New York, 2011.
- [8] S. Chandrasekhar. Stochastic problems in physics and astronomy. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 15(1):1–89, 1943.
- [9] M. Choulli and P. Stefanov. An inverse boundary value problem for the stationary transport equation. *Osaka J. Math.*, 36:87–104, 1999.
- [10] Philippe G. Ciarlet. *The finite element method for elliptic problems*. SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 2002.
- [11] R. Dautray and J. L. Lions. *Mathematical Analysis and Numerical Methods for Science and Technology. Evolution Problems II*. Springer, Berlin, 1993.
- [12] J. de Pooter, I. Billas, L. de Prez, S. Duane, R.-P. Kapsch, C. P. Karger, B. van Asselen, and J. Wolthaus. Reference dosimetry in MRI-linacs: evaluation of available protocols and data to establish a code of practice. *Phys. Med. Biol.*, 66:05TR02, 2021.
- [13] P. Degond. Global existence of smooth solutions for the Vlasov-Fokker-Planck equation in 1 and 2 space dimensions. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup.*, 19:519–542, 1986.
- [14] P. Degond and S. Mas-Gallic. Existence of solutions and diffusion approximation for a model Fokker-Planck equation. *Transport Theory Statist. Phys.*, 16:589–636, 1987.
- [15] H. Egger and M. Schlottbom. A mixed variational framework for the radiative transfer equation. *Math. Mod. Meth. Appl. Sci.*, 22:1150014, 2012.
- [16] H. Egger and M. Schlottbom. A class of Galerkin schemes for time-dependent radiative transfer. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 54:3577–3599, 2016.
- [17] Kent A Gifford, John L Horton, Todd A Wareing, Gregory Failla, and Firas Mourtada. Comparison of a finite-element multigroup discrete-ordinates code with monte carlo for radiotherapy calculations. *Physics in Medicine and Biology*, 51(9):2253–2265, apr 2006.
- [18] W. Han, Y. Li, Q. Sheng, and J. Tang. A numerical method for generalized Fokker-Planck equations. In *Recent advances in scientific computing and applications*, pages 171–179. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2013.
- [19] H. Hensel, R. Iza-Teran, and N. Siedow. Deterministic model for dose calculation in photon radiotherapy. *Phys. Med. Biol.*, 51:675–693, 2006.
- [20] M. Herty, C. Jörres, and A. N. Sandjo. Optimization of a model Fokker-Planck equation. *Kinetic and Related Models*, 5:465–503, 2012.
- [21] A. Ishimaru. *Single Scattering and Transport Theory*, volume 1. Academic Press, New York, 1978.
- [22] E.W. Larsen, M.M. Miften, B.A. Fraass, and I.A.D. Bruinvis. Electron dose calculations using the method of moments. *Med. Phys.*, 24(1):111–125, 1998.
- [23] E. E. Lewis and W. F. Miller Jr. *Computational Methods of Neutron Transport*. John Wiley & Sons Inc., 1984.
- [24] T. A. Manteuffel, K. J. Ressel, and G. Starke. A boundary functional for the least-squares finite- element solution of neutron transport problems. *SIAM J. Numer. anal.*, 37:556–586, 1999.
- [25] Michael. F. Modest. *Radiative Heat Transfer*. Academic Press, Amsterdam, 2nd edition, 2003.
- [26] Vassiliev O., Wareing T., McGhee J., Failla G., Salehpour M., and Mourtada F. Validation of a new grid-based Boltzmann equation solver for dose calculation in radiotherapy with photon beams. *Phys. Med. Biol.*, 55:581–598, 2010.
- [27] G. C. Pomraning. The Fokker-Planck operator as an asymptotic limit. *M3AS*, 2:21–36, 1992.
- [28] R. E. Showalter. *Monotone operators in Banach space and nonlinear partial differential equations*, volume 49 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1997.
- [29] J. St. Aubin, A. Keyvanloo, and B. Fallone. Discontinuous finite element space-angle treatment of the first order linear Boltzmann transport equation with magnetic fields: Application to MRI-guided radiotherapy. *Med. Phys.*, 43:195–204, 2016.
- [30] J. St. Aubin, A. Keyvanloo, O. Vassiliev, and B. Fallone. A deterministic solution of the first order linear boltzmann transport equation in the presence of external magnetic fields. *Med. Phys.*, 42:780–793, 2015.
- [31] A. Swan, R. Yang, O. Zelyak, and J. St. Aubin. Feasibility of streamline upwind Petrov-Galerkin angular stabilization of the linear Boltzmann transport equation with magnetic fields. *Biomed. Phys. Engrg. Express*, 7:015017, 2020.