

Finite volume convergence analysis and error estimation for non-linear collisional induced breakage equation

Sanjiv Kumar Bariwal ^{1 *}, Rajesh Kumar ^{2†}

^{1,2}Department of Mathematics, Birla Institute of Technology and Science Pilani,
Pilani-333031, Rajasthan, India

Abstract: This article focuses on the finite volume method (FVM) as an instrument tool to deal with the non-linear collisional-induced breakage equation (CBE) that arises in the particulate process. Notably, we consider the non-conservative approximation of the CBE. The analysis of weak convergence of the approximated solutions under a feasible stability condition on the time step is investigated for locally bounded breakage and collision kernels. Subsequently, explicit error estimation of the FVM solutions in uniform mesh having the kernels in the class of $W_{loc}^{1,\infty}$ space. It is also shown numerically for the first-order convergent scheme by taking numerical examples.

Keywords: Non-linear breakage, Finite volume method, Weak Solution, Convergence, Error.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2020) 45L05, 45K05, 65R10

1 Introduction

Particulate processes are prominent in particle evolution dynamics and portray how particles might unite to generate extensive size of particle or break into tiny particles. These particles are labelled as Particle is entirely defined by a single size variable, such as its volume or mass. There are two types of particle breakage or fragmentation: linear breakage and nonlinear collision-induced breakage. The effectiveness of the linear breakage equation is well recognized in the study of significant phenomena in a variety of scientific fields, including engineering; for further references, see [1, 2]. It is thought that in order to increase the range of operations that can be assessed, it must be expanded. One conceivable expansion is to include nonlinearity in the breaking process which can occur when the fragmentation behaviour of a particle is determined not only by its characteristics and dynamic circumstances (as in linear breakage), but also by the state and properties of the entire system, i.e., by binary interactions. Collisional breakage could enable some mass transfer between colliding particles. As a result, daughter particles with more extensive volumes than the parent particles are generated. Non-linear models emerge in

* *Corresponding author.* Email address: p20190043@pilani.bits-pilani.ac.in

† *Email address:* rajesh.kumar@pilani.bits-pilani.ac.in

a wide range of contexts, including milling and crushing processes [3, 4], bulk distribution of asteroids [5, 6], fluidized beds [7, 8], etc.

The following partial integro-differential equation was used by Cheng and Redner [9] to obtain the binary collisional breakage equation, and is expressed the evolution of particles in terms of volume $x \in]0, \infty[$ at time $t \geq 0$ and is defined by

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{C}(t, m)}{\partial t} = \int_0^\infty \int_m^\infty \mathbb{K}(n, z) \mathbb{B}(m, n, z) \mathcal{C}(t, n) \mathcal{C}(t, z) dn dz - \int_0^\infty \mathbb{K}(m, n) \mathcal{C}(t, m) \mathcal{C}(t, n) dn \quad (1)$$

with the initial data

$$\mathcal{C}(0, m) = \mathcal{C}^{in}(m) \geq 0, \quad m \in \mathbb{R}^+ :=]0, \infty[. \quad (2)$$

In Eq.(1), $\mathcal{C}(t, m)$ is the concentration function with volume between m and $m + dm$, and the collision kernel $\mathbb{K}(m, n)$ depicts the collision frequency of particles of m and n volume for breakage event. In practice, $\mathbb{K}(m, n) \geq 0$ and $\mathbb{K}(m, n) = \mathbb{K}(n, m)$. The term $\mathbb{B}(m, n, z)$ is called the breakage distribution function, which defines the rate for production of m volume particles by splitting of n volume particle due to interaction with z . The function \mathbb{B} holds

$$\int_0^n m \mathbb{B}(m, n, z) dm = n, \quad \mathbb{B}(m, n, z) \neq 0 \text{ for } m \in (0, n) \text{ and } \mathbb{B}(m, n, z) = 0 \text{ for } m > n. \quad (3)$$

The first term in Eq.(1) explains gaining m volume particles due to collisional breakage between n and z volume particles, known as the birth term. The second term is labeled as the death term and describes the disappearance of m volume particles due to collision with particles of volume n .

It is also necessary to specify some integral features of the concentration function $\mathcal{C}(t, m)$, known as moments. The following equation defines the j^{th} moment of the solution as

$$M_j(t) = \int_0^\infty m^j \mathcal{C}(t, m) dm, \quad (4)$$

where the zeroth $M_0(t)$ and first $M_1(t)$ moments are equal to the total number and volume of particles in the system, respectively. Here, $M_1^{in} < \infty$ conveys the initial particles volume in the closed particulate system.

Before venturing into the specifics of the current work, let us reanalyze the existing literature on the linear breakage equation that has been widely investigated over the years concerning its analytical solutions [10, 11], similarity solutions [12, 13], numerical results [14, 15, 16] and references therein. There is a substantial body of work on the well-posedness of the coagulation and linear breakage equations (CLBE). The authors examined the existence of mass-conserving solutions to CLBE by having non-conservating approximations for unbounded coagulation and the breakage functions in [17]. Moreover, many publications are accessible for solving coagulation-fragmentation equations numerically, including the method of moments [18], finite element scheme [19], Monte Carlo methodology [20], and finite volume method (FVM)[21, 22, 23] to name a few.

Collisional breakage model is discussed in just a few mathematical articles in the literature, see [9, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28]. In [9], the general behaviour of CBE is reviewed for homogeneous breakage functions. The model's analytical and self-similar solutions are discovered in [24] for some combinations of breakage and collision kernels. The authors explained the global classical solutions of coagulation and collisional equation with collision kernel, growing indefinitely for large volumes in [27]. In addition, fewer publications in the physics literature [29, 30, 31] are committed to the CBE, with the majority dealing with scaling behavior and shattering transitions. Laurençot and Wrzosek [25] investigated the existence and uniqueness of a solution for coagulation with CBE in which they have used the following constraint over the kernels

$$\mathbb{K}(m, n) \leq (mn)^\alpha, \quad \alpha \in [0, 1) \text{ and } \mathbb{B}(m, n, z) \leq P < \infty, \text{ for } 1 \leq m < n.$$

They have also explored gelation and the long-term behavior of solutions. Further, in [32], the analysis of weak solution is developed with the coagulation dominating process where the collision kernel grows at most linearly at infinity.

Currently, in the numerical sense, it has been reported by several authors that the FVM is an appropriate option among the other numerical techniques for solving aggregation and breakage equations due to its mass conservation property. Therefore, FVM is presented for collision-induced breakage equation to analyze the concentration function.

None of the previous studies have taken into account the non-linear collisional breakage equation, primarily due to the complexity of the model and the analytical investigation involved. In this regard, it is mandatory to implement a numerical method to observe the concentration function for physical relevant kernels. Here we perform the weak convergence of the non-conservative numerical scheme (FVM) for solving the collisional breakage equation. Therefore, this article is an attempt to study the weak convergence analysis of the FVM for solving the model with nonsingular unbounded kernels and then error estimation for kernels being in $W_{loc}^{1, \infty}$ space over a uniform mesh. Thanks to the idea taken from Bourgade and Filbet [21], in which they have treated coagulation and binary fragmentation equation. The proof employs the weak L^1 compactness approach.

To proceed further, firstly, we will concentrate on the functional setting, having in mind that the initial concentration function contains the properties of mass conservation and finiteness of total particles in the system. Therefore, we construct the solution space that exhibits the convergence of the discretized numerical solution to the weak solution of the CBE (1), and is recognized as a weighted L^1 space such as

$$X^+ = \{\mathcal{C} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^+) \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}^+, m \, dm) : \mathcal{C} \geq 0, \|\mathcal{C}\| < \infty\}, \quad (5)$$

where $\|\mathcal{C}\| = \int_0^\infty (1+m)\mathcal{C}(m) \, dm$, and $\mathcal{C}^{in} \in X^+$, i.e., M_1^{in} is a finite quantity.

Now, the specifications of the kernels \mathbb{B} and \mathbb{K} are expressed in the following expression: both functions are measurable over the domain. There exist ζ, η with $0 < \zeta \leq \eta \leq 1$, $\zeta + \eta \leq 1$ and $\alpha \geq 0$, $\lambda > 0$ such that

$$H1 : \mathbb{B} \in L_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+), \quad (6)$$

$H2 :$

$$\mathbb{K}(m, n) = \begin{cases} \lambda mn & (m, n) \in]0, 1[\times]0, 1[\\ \lambda mn^{-\alpha} & (m, n) \in]0, 1[\times]1, \infty[\\ \lambda m^{-\alpha} n & (m, n) \in]1, \infty[\times]0, 1[\\ \lambda(m^\zeta n^\eta + m^\eta n^\zeta) & (m, n) \in]1, \infty[\times]1, \infty[. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

For the sake of understanding the breakage function, those are locally bounded [33], i.e., $\mathbb{B}(m, n, z) = \delta(m - 0.4n) + \delta(m - 0.6n)$, where both colliding particles will fragment into two particles of size 40% and 60% of the parent particles. One more example is

$$\mathbb{B}(m, n, z) = \begin{cases} \frac{2}{n} & \text{if } n > z, \\ \delta(m - n) & \text{if } n \leq z, \end{cases}$$

where only large size particle breaks into two smaller size particles.

This article's contents are organized as follows. The discretization methodology based on the FVM and non-conservative form of fully discretized CBE are introduced in Section 2. Next, Section 3 equips the convergence study of weak solution in L^1 space. In Section 4, error analysis of FVM solution with first-order accuracy is described for uniform meshes. Additionally, we have justified the theoretical error estimation via numerical results in Section 5. Consequently, in the final section, some conclusions are presented.

2 Numerical Scheme

In this section, we commence exploring the FVM for the solution of Eq.(1). It is based on the spatial domain being divided into tiny grid cells. Particle volumes ranging from 0 to ∞ are taken into account in Eq.(1). Nevertheless, we define the particle volumes to be in a finite domain for practical purposes. The scheme considers $]0, \mathfrak{R}]$ as truncated domain with $0 < R < \infty$. Thus the collisional breakage equation is truncated as

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{C}(t, m)}{\partial t} = \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \int_m^{\mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{K}(n, z) \mathbb{B}(m, n, z) \mathcal{C}(t, n) \mathcal{C}(t, z) dn dz - \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{K}(m, n) \mathcal{C}(t, m) \mathcal{C}(t, n) dn, \quad (8)$$

and

$$\mathcal{C}(0, m) = \mathcal{C}^{in}(m) \geq 0, \quad m \in]0, \mathfrak{R}]. \quad (9)$$

Consider a partitioning of the operating domain $]0, \mathfrak{R}]$ into small cells as $\wp_a :=]m_{a-1/2}, m_{a+1/2}]$, $a = 1, 2, \dots, \mathfrak{J}$, where $m_{1/2} = 0$, $m_{\mathfrak{J}+1/2} = \mathfrak{R}$, $\Delta m_a = m_{a+1/2} - m_{a-1/2}$ and consider $\hbar = \max \Delta m_a \forall a$. The grid points are the midpoints of each subinterval and are designated as $m_a \forall a$. Now, the expression of the mean value of the concentration function $\mathcal{C}_a(t)$ in the cell \wp_a is determined by

$$\mathcal{C}_a(t) = \frac{1}{\Delta m_a} \int_{m_{a-1/2}}^{m_{a+1/2}} \mathcal{C}(t, m) dm. \quad (10)$$

The time domain is limited to the range $[0, \mathfrak{T}]$ with $0 < \mathfrak{T} < \infty$, and it is discretized into N time intervals with time step Δt . The interval is defined as

$$\tau_n = [t_n, t_{n+1}[, \quad n = 0, 1, \dots, N - 1.$$

We now begin developing the scheme on non-uniform meshes. It has the big advantage of covering a larger area with fewer points than a uniform grid. The discretization differs slightly from that of Filbet and Laurecot [21], where they first converted the model (1) to a conservative equation using Leibniz integral rule, then discretized using FVM. Here, in this work, we have used a scheme based on finite volume implementation from the continuous equation (1).

To derive the discretized version of the CBE (8), we proceed as follows: integrating the Eq.(8) with respect to m over a^{th} cell yields the following discrete form

$$\frac{dC_a}{dt} = B_C(a) - D_C(a), \quad (11)$$

where

$$B_C(a) = \frac{1}{\Delta m_a} \int_{m_{a-1/2}}^{m_{a+1/2}} \int_0^{m_{j+1/2}} \int_m^{m_{j+1/2}} \mathbb{K}(n, z) \mathbb{B}(m, n, z) \mathcal{C}(t, n) \mathcal{C}(t, z) dn dz dm$$

$$D_C(a) = \frac{1}{\Delta m_a} \int_{m_{a-1/2}}^{m_{a+1/2}} \int_0^{m_{j+1/2}} \mathbb{K}(m, n) \mathcal{C}(t, m) \mathcal{C}(t, n) dn dm$$

along with initial distribution,

$$C_a(0) = C_a^{in} = \frac{1}{\Delta m_a} \int_{m_{a-1/2}}^{m_{a+1/2}} C_0(m) dm. \quad (12)$$

Implementing the midpoint rule to all of the above representations provide the semi-discrete equation after some simplifications as,

$$\frac{dC_a}{dt} = \frac{1}{\Delta m_a} \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=a}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathbb{K}_{j,l} C_j(t) C_l(t) \Delta m_j \Delta m_l \int_{m_{a-1/2}}^{p_j^a} \mathbb{B}(m, m_j, m_l) dm - \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathbb{K}_{a,j} C_a(t) C_j(t) \Delta m_j, \quad (13)$$

where the term p_j^a is expressed by

$$p_j^a = \begin{cases} m_a, & \text{if } j = a \\ m_{a+1/2}, & j \neq a. \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

Now, to obtain a fully discrete system, applying explicit Euler discretization to time variable t leads to

$$C_a^{n+1} - C_a^n = \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta m_a} \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=a}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathbb{K}_{j,l} C_j^n C_l^n \Delta m_j \Delta m_l \int_{m_{a-1/2}}^{p_j^a} \mathbb{B}(m, m_j, m_l) dm - \Delta t \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathbb{K}_{a,j} C_a^n C_j^n \Delta m_j. \quad (15)$$

For the convergence analysis, consider a function C^h on $[0, \mathfrak{T}] \times]0, \mathfrak{M}]$ which is represented by

$$C^h(t, m) = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} C_a^n \chi_{\wp_a}(m) \chi_{\tau_n}(t), \quad (16)$$

where $\chi_D(\mathbf{m})$ denotes the characteristic function on a set D as $\chi_D(\mathbf{m}) = 1$ if $\mathbf{m} \in D$ or 0 everywhere else. Also noting that

$$\mathcal{C}^{\hbar}(0, \cdot) = \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathcal{C}_a^{\text{in}} \chi_{\varphi_a}(\cdot) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^{\text{in}} \in L^1[0, \mathfrak{R}] \text{ as } \hbar \rightarrow 0.$$

The convergence result relies on the correct approximation of the kernels through finite volume on the computational domain $u, v, w \in (0, \mathfrak{R}]$ and is given as

$$\mathbb{K}^{\hbar}(u, v) = \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathbb{K}_{a,j} \chi_{\varphi_a}(u) \chi_{\varphi_j}(v), \quad (17)$$

$$\mathbb{B}^{\hbar}(u, v, w) = \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathbb{B}_{a,j,l} \chi_{\varphi_a}(u) \chi_{\varphi_j}(v) \chi_{\varphi_l}(w), \quad (18)$$

where

$$\mathbb{K}_{a,j} = \frac{1}{\Delta m_a \Delta m_j} \int_{\varphi_j} \int_{\varphi_a} \mathbb{K}(u, v) du dv, \quad \mathbb{B}_{a,j,l} = \frac{1}{\Delta m_a \Delta m_j \Delta m_l} \int_{\varphi_l} \int_{\varphi_j} \int_{\varphi_a} \mathbb{B}(u, v, w) du dv dw.$$

These kernel discretizations confirm the strong convergence of itself in L^1 space, i.e., $\mathbb{K}^{\hbar} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ and $\mathbb{B}^{\hbar} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$; see [21].

3 Weak Convergence

The objective of this section is to study the convergence of solution \mathcal{C}^{\hbar} to a function \mathcal{C} as \hbar and $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$.

Theorem 3.1. *Assume that the kernels hold the properties in (6-7) and \mathcal{C}^{in} satisfy (5). Furthermore, suppose that the time step Δt confirms the existence of a positive constant θ such that*

$$S(\mathfrak{T}, \mathfrak{R}) \Delta t \leq \theta < 1, \quad (19)$$

holds for

$$S(\mathfrak{T}, \mathfrak{R}) := \lambda(2\mathfrak{R} \|\mathcal{C}^{\text{in}}\|_{L^1} e^{2\lambda\mathfrak{R}\|\mathbb{B}\|_{L^\infty} M_1^{\text{in}} \mathfrak{T}} + M_1^{\text{in}}). \quad (20)$$

Then assurance of a subsequence arises that

$$\mathcal{C}^{\hbar} \rightarrow \mathcal{C} \text{ in } L^\infty([0, \mathfrak{T}]; L^1[0, \mathfrak{R}]),$$

where \mathcal{C} is the weak solution of problem (1-2) on $[0, \mathfrak{T}]$. This implies that, the function $\mathcal{C} \geq 0$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{\mathfrak{T}} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \mathcal{C}(t, \mathbf{m}) \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t}(t, \mathbf{m}) d\mathbf{m} dt - \int_0^{\mathfrak{T}} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \varphi(t, \mathbf{m}) \mathbb{K}(\mathbf{n}, z) \mathbb{B}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}, z) \mathcal{C}(t, \mathbf{n}) \mathcal{C}(t, z) d\mathbf{n} dz d\mathbf{m} dt \\ & + \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \mathcal{C}^{\text{in}}(\mathbf{m}) \varphi(0, \mathbf{m}) d\mathbf{m} + \int_0^{\mathfrak{T}} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \varphi(t, \mathbf{m}) \mathbb{K}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) \mathcal{C}(t, \mathbf{m}) \mathcal{C}(t, \mathbf{n}) d\mathbf{n} d\mathbf{m} dt = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where φ is compactly supported smooth functions on $[0, \mathfrak{T}] \times [0, \mathfrak{R}]$.

The main goal, based on the preceding theorem, is to show the weak convergence of the family of functions (\mathcal{C}^{\hbar}) to \mathcal{C} in $L^1]0, \mathfrak{R}[$ as \hbar and Δt approach zero, using the Dunford-Pettis theorem to establish compactness under weak convergence.

Theorem 3.2. *Assuming a sequence $\mathcal{C}^{\hbar} : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ in $L^1(\Omega)$ with $|\Omega| < \infty$ and satisfies the following properties*

1. *Equiboundedness of $\{\mathcal{C}^{\hbar}\}$, i.e.,*

$$\sup \|\mathcal{C}^{\hbar}\|_{L^1(\Omega)} < \infty \quad (22)$$

2. *Equiintegrability of $\{\mathcal{C}^{\hbar}\}$, iff*

$$\int_{\Omega} \psi(|\mathcal{C}^{\hbar}|) dm < \infty, \quad (23)$$

where $\psi : [0, \infty[\mapsto [0, \infty[$ is a increasing function with

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\psi(\nu)}{\nu} \rightarrow \infty.$$

Then \mathcal{C}^{\hbar} weakly sequentially compact set in $L^1(\Omega)$, see [34].

In order to prove Theorem 3.2, firstly, discuss the non-negativity and equiboundedness of \mathcal{C}^{\hbar} in L^1 and define the midpoint approximation of m as follows:

$$X^{\hbar} : m \in (0, R) \rightarrow X^{\hbar}(m) = \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} m_a \chi_{\varphi_a}(m).$$

Proposition 3.3. *Let us assume that time step satisfy condition (19) and growth condition of kernels hold (6-7). Then the non-negative family of \mathcal{C}^{\hbar} fulfills*

$$\int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} X^{\hbar}(m) \mathcal{C}^{\hbar}(t, m) dm \leq \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} X^{\hbar}(m) \mathcal{C}^{\hbar}(s, m) dm \leq \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} X^{\hbar}(m) \mathcal{C}^{\hbar}(0, m) dm =: M_1^{in}, \quad (24)$$

where $0 \leq s \leq t \leq \mathfrak{T}$, and

$$\int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \mathcal{C}^{\hbar}(t, m) dm \leq \|\mathcal{C}^{in}\|_{L^1} e^{2\lambda \mathfrak{R} \|\mathbb{B}\|_{L^\infty} M_1^{in} t}. \quad (25)$$

Proof. Mathematical induction is used to demonstrate the non-negativity of family \mathcal{C}^{\hbar} . At $t = 0$, it is known that $\mathcal{C}^{\hbar}(0) \geq 0$ belongs to $L^1]0, \mathfrak{R}[$. Let us assume that $\mathcal{C}^{\hbar}(t^n) \geq 0$ and

$$\int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \mathcal{C}^{\hbar}(t^n, m) dm \leq \|\mathcal{C}^{in}\|_{L^1} e^{2\lambda \mathfrak{R} \|\mathbb{B}\|_{L^\infty} M_1^{in} t^n}. \quad (26)$$

Now to justify $\mathcal{C}^{\hbar}(t^{n+1}) \geq 0$, start the indexing from $a = 1$. As a result, in this situation, we obtain from Eq.(15),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_1^{n+1} &= \mathcal{C}_1^n + \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta m_1} \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathbb{K}_{j,l} \mathcal{C}_j^n \mathcal{C}_l^n \Delta m_j \Delta m_l \int_{m_{1/2}}^{p_j^1} \mathbb{B}(m, m_j, m_l) dm - \Delta t \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathbb{K}_{1,j} \mathcal{C}_1^n \mathcal{C}_j^n \Delta m_j \\ &\geq \mathcal{C}_1^n - \Delta t \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathbb{K}_{1,j} \mathcal{C}_1^n \mathcal{C}_j^n \Delta m_j. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Moving further, we choose the first case for collisional kernel, case-(1): $\mathbb{K}(m, n) = \lambda(m^\zeta n^\eta + m^\eta n^\zeta)$, when $(m, n) \in]1, \mathfrak{R}[\times]1, \mathfrak{R}[$. Thus,

$$\mathcal{C}_1^{n+1} \geq \mathcal{C}_1^n - \Delta t \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \lambda(m_1^\zeta m_j^\eta + m_1^\eta m_j^\zeta) \mathcal{C}_1^n \mathcal{C}_j^n \Delta m_j,$$

using the fact that $\lambda(m_a^\zeta m_j^\eta + m_a^\eta m_j^\zeta) \leq \lambda(m_a + m_j)$, thanks to Young's inequality, we convert the above inequality into the following one

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_1^{n+1} &\geq \mathcal{C}_1^n - \lambda \Delta t \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} (m_1 + m_j) \mathcal{C}_1^n \mathcal{C}_j^n \Delta m_j \\ &\geq [1 - \lambda \Delta t (\mathfrak{R} \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathcal{C}_j^n \Delta m_j + M_1^{in})] \mathcal{C}_1^n. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Now, consider case-(2): $\mathbb{K}(m, n) = \lambda m^{-\alpha} n$, when $(m, n) \in]1, \mathfrak{R}[\times]0, 1[$. Putting this value in Eq.(27) and then imposing the condition $m^{-\alpha} \leq 1$ yield

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_1^{n+1} &\geq \mathcal{C}_1^n - \lambda \Delta t \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} m_j \mathcal{C}_1^n \mathcal{C}_j^n \Delta m_j \\ &\geq (1 - \lambda \Delta t M_1^{in}) \mathcal{C}_1^n. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

For case-(3): $\mathbb{K}(m, n) = \lambda m n^{-\alpha}$, when $(m, n) \in]0, 1[\times]1, \mathfrak{R}[$ with $n^{-\alpha} \leq 1$ and for case-(4): $\mathbb{K}(m, n) = \lambda(mn)$, when $(m, n) \in]0, 1[\times]0, 1[$ provide

$$\mathcal{C}_1^{n+1} \geq (1 - \lambda \Delta t \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathcal{C}_j^n \Delta m_j) \mathcal{C}_1^n. \quad (30)$$

All the results from case(1)-case(4) are collected, and the following inequality is achieved

$$\mathcal{C}_1^{n+1} \geq [1 - \lambda \Delta t (\mathfrak{R} \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathcal{C}_j^n \Delta m_j + M_1^{in})] \mathcal{C}_1^n. \quad (31)$$

Using conditions (19), (20) and Eq.(26), the non-negativity of \mathcal{C}_1^{n+1} is obtained. Thus, we assume that the computations for $a \geq 2$ go similar to $a = 1$ for all four cases and the results are obtained like the previous ones. Then, applying the stability condition (19) and the L^1 bound on \mathcal{C}^h yield $\mathcal{C}^h(t^{n+1}) \geq 0$.

Further, by summing (15) over a , the following time monotonicity result is obtained for the total mass as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{a=0}^{\mathfrak{J}} \Delta m_a m_a \mathcal{C}_a^{n+1} &= \sum_{a=0}^{\mathfrak{J}} \Delta m_a m_a \mathcal{C}_a^n + \Delta t \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=a}^{\mathfrak{J}} m_a \mathbb{K}_{j,l} \mathcal{C}_j^n \mathcal{C}_l^n \Delta m_j \Delta m_l \int_{m_{a-1/2}}^{p_j^a} \mathbb{B}(m, m_j, m_l) dm \\ &\quad - \Delta t \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} m_a \mathbb{K}_{a,j} \mathcal{C}_a^n \mathcal{C}_j^n \Delta m_j \Delta m_a. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Rearranging the summation's order and using the upper limit of p_j^a and Eq.(3) help the second term of the Eq.(32) on the right-hand side (RHS) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Delta t \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=a}^{\mathfrak{J}} m_a \mathbb{K}_{j,l} \mathcal{C}_j^n \mathcal{C}_l^n \Delta m_j \Delta m_l \int_{m_{a-1/2}}^{p_j^a} \mathbb{B}(m, m_j, m_l) dm \\
& \leq \Delta t \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathbb{K}_{j,l} \mathcal{C}_j^n \mathcal{C}_l^n \Delta m_j \Delta m_l \sum_{a=1}^j m_a \int_{m_{a-1/2}}^{m_{a+1/2}} \mathbb{B}(m, m_j, m_l) dm \\
& = \Delta t \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathbb{K}_{j,l} \mathcal{C}_j^n \mathcal{C}_l^n \Delta m_j \Delta m_l \sum_{a=1}^j m_a \mathbb{B}(m_a, m_j, m_l) \Delta m_a = \Delta t \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} m_j \mathbb{K}_{j,l} \mathcal{C}_j^n \mathcal{C}_l^n \Delta m_j \Delta m_l.
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

Eqs.(32) and (33) indicate about the approximate mass loss property

$$\sum_{a=0}^{\mathfrak{J}} \Delta m_a m_a \mathcal{C}_a^{n+1} \leq \sum_{a=0}^{\mathfrak{J}} \Delta m_a m_a \mathcal{C}_a^n \leq M_1^{in}. \tag{34}$$

It is then demonstrated that $\mathcal{C}^h(t^{n+1})$ satisfies a similar estimate to (26). This is done by multiplying (15) by Δm_i , excluding the negative term, and summing over a , as

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathcal{C}_a^{n+1} \Delta m_a & \leq \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathcal{C}_a^n \Delta m_a + \Delta t \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=a}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathbb{K}_{j,l} \mathcal{C}_j^n \mathcal{C}_l^n \Delta m_j \Delta m_l \int_{m_{a-1/2}}^{p_j^a} \mathbb{B}(m, m_j, m_l) dm \\
& \leq \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathcal{C}_a^n \Delta m_a + \Delta t \|\mathbb{B}\|_{\infty} \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathbb{K}_{j,l} \mathcal{C}_j^n \mathcal{C}_l^n \Delta m_j \Delta m_l \int_{m_{a-1/2}}^{m_{a+1/2}} dm \\
& \leq \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathcal{C}_a^n \Delta m_a + \Delta t \mathfrak{R} \|\mathbb{B}\|_{\infty} \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathbb{K}_{j,l} \mathcal{C}_j^n \mathcal{C}_l^n \Delta m_j \Delta m_l.
\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

Again, the above will be simplified for four cases of kernels:

Case-(1): $\mathbb{K}(m, n) = \lambda(m^\zeta n^\eta + m^\eta n^\zeta)$, when $(m, n) \in]1, \mathfrak{R}[\times]1, \mathfrak{R}[$. Substitute the value of $\mathbb{K}(m, n)$ in Eq.(35) and use the Young's inequality to get

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathcal{C}_a^{n+1} \Delta m_a & \leq \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathcal{C}_a^n \Delta m_a + \lambda \Delta t \mathfrak{R} \|\mathbb{B}\|_{\infty} \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} (m_j + m_l) \mathcal{C}_j^n \mathcal{C}_l^n \Delta m_j \Delta m_l \\
& \leq (1 + 2\lambda \Delta t \mathfrak{R} \|\mathbb{B}\|_{\infty} M_1^{in}) \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathcal{C}_a^n \Delta m_a.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, having (26) the L^1 bound of \mathcal{C}^h at time step n and $1 + m < \exp(m) \forall m > 0$ imply that

$$\sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathcal{C}_a^{n+1} \Delta m_a \leq \|\mathcal{C}^{in}\|_{L^1} e^{2\lambda \mathfrak{R} \|\mathbb{B}\|_{L^\infty} M_1^{in} t^{n+1}}.$$

As a consequence, the result (25) is accomplished.

Case-(2): $\mathbb{K}(m, n) = \lambda m^{-\alpha} n$, when $(m, n) \in]1, \mathfrak{R}[\times]0, 1[$, and Case-(3): $\mathbb{K}(m, n) = \lambda m n^{-\alpha}$, when $(m, n) \in]0, 1[\times]1, \mathfrak{R}[$ have similar computations. The value of $\mathbb{K}(m, n)$ after substituting in Eq.(35) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} C_a^{n+1} \Delta m_a &\leq \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} C_a^n \Delta m_a + \lambda \Delta t \mathfrak{R} \|\mathbb{B}\|_{\infty} \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} (m_j^{-\alpha} m_l) C_j^n C_l^n \Delta m_j \Delta m_l \\ &\leq \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} C_a^n \Delta m_a + \lambda \Delta t \mathfrak{R} \|\mathbb{B}\|_{\infty} \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} m_l C_j^n C_l^n \Delta m_j \Delta m_l \\ &\leq (1 + \lambda \Delta t \mathfrak{R} \|\mathbb{B}\|_{\infty} M_1^{in}) \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} C_a^n \Delta m_a. \end{aligned}$$

Again, using (26) and $1 + m < \exp(m) \forall m > 0$ provide the L^1 bound for \mathcal{C}^h at time step $n + 1$.
Case-(4): For $\mathbb{K}(m, n) = \lambda(mn)$, when $(m, n) \in]0, 1[\times]0, 1[$, inserting the value of \mathbb{K} in Eq.(35) employs

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} C_a^{n+1} \Delta m_a &\leq \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} C_a^n \Delta m_a + \lambda \Delta t \mathfrak{R} \|\mathbb{B}\|_{\infty} \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} m_j m_l C_j^n C_l^n \Delta m_j \Delta m_l \\ &\leq \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} C_a^n \Delta m_a + \lambda \Delta t \mathfrak{R} \|\mathbb{B}\|_{\infty} \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} m_l C_j^n C_l^n \Delta m_j \Delta m_l. \end{aligned}$$

To get the result (25) for $\mathcal{C}^h(t^{n+1})$, the computations are similar to the previous case. \square

Now, the uniform integrability can be demonstrated by considering a class of convex functions as $C_{VP, \infty}$. A non-negative function $\psi \in C_{VP, \infty}$, holds following conditions [34]:

- (i) $\psi(0) = 0$, $\psi'(0) = 1$ and ψ' is concave;
- (ii) $\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \psi'(\nu) = \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\psi(\nu)}{\nu} = \infty$;
- (iii) for $\theta \in]1, 2[$,

$$\Pi_{\theta}(\psi) := \sup_{\nu \geq 0} \left\{ \frac{\psi(\nu)}{\nu^{\theta}} \right\} < \infty. \quad (36)$$

It is given that $\mathcal{C}^{in} \in L^1]0, \mathfrak{R}[$. Thus, by the De la Vallée Poussin theorem, there exists a convex function $\psi \geq 0$, continuously differentiable on \mathbb{R}^+ , with $\psi(0) = 0, \psi'(0) = 1$, and ψ' concave

$$\frac{\psi(\nu)}{\nu} \rightarrow \infty, \text{ as } \nu \rightarrow \infty$$

and

$$\mathcal{I} := \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \psi(\mathcal{C}^{in})(m) dm < \infty. \quad (37)$$

Lemma 3.4 ([34]). Consider $\psi \in C_{VP,\infty}$. Then $\forall (z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+$,

$$z_1 \psi'(z_2) \leq \psi(z_1) + \psi(z_2).$$

At this point, we can demonstrate that the approximate solution \mathcal{C}^h is equiintegrable.

Proposition 3.5. Assume that $\mathcal{C}^{in} \geq 0 \in L^1[0, \mathfrak{R}[$ and (15) produces the family (\mathcal{C}^h) for any h and Δt , where Δt holds (19). Then (\mathcal{C}^h) is weakly sequentially compact in $L^1(]0, \mathfrak{T}[\times]0, \mathfrak{R}[)$.

Proof. We shall establish an estimate for the family \mathcal{C}^h , uniformly on h , similar to (37), in order to demonstrate the equiintegrability. In this regard, define the integral of $\psi(\mathcal{C}^h)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{\mathfrak{T}} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \psi(\mathcal{C}^h(t, \mathbf{m})) d\mathbf{m} dt &= \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \int_{\tau_n} \int_{\wp_a} \psi \left(\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathcal{C}_j^k \chi_{\wp_j}(\mathbf{m}) \chi_{\tau_k}(t) \right) d\mathbf{m} dt \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \Delta t \Delta \mathbf{m}_a \psi(\mathcal{C}_a^n). \end{aligned}$$

It follows from the discrete Eq.(15), as well as the convex property of ψ and $\psi' \geq 0$, that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} [\psi(\mathcal{C}_a^{n+1}) - \psi(\mathcal{C}_a^n)] \Delta \mathbf{m}_a &\leq \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} (\mathcal{C}_a^{n+1} - \mathcal{C}_a^n) \psi'(\mathcal{C}_a^{n+1}) \Delta \mathbf{m}_a \\ &\leq \Delta t \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=a}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathbb{K}_{j,l} \mathcal{C}_j^n \mathcal{C}_l^n \psi'(\mathcal{C}_a^{n+1}) \Delta \mathbf{m}_j \Delta \mathbf{m}_l \int_{\mathbf{m}_{a-1/2}}^{\mathbf{m}_{a+1/2}} \mathbb{B}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}_j, \mathbf{m}_l) d\mathbf{m} \\ &\leq \Delta t \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathbb{K}_{j,l} \mathcal{C}_j^n \mathcal{C}_l^n \psi'(\mathcal{C}_a^{n+1}) \Delta \mathbf{m}_j \Delta \mathbf{m}_l \mathbb{B}(\mathbf{m}_a, \mathbf{m}_j, \mathbf{m}_l) \Delta \mathbf{m}_a. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Case-(1): $\mathbb{K}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) = \lambda(\mathbf{m}^\zeta \mathbf{n}^\eta + \mathbf{m}^\eta \mathbf{n}^\zeta)$, when $(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) \in]1, \mathfrak{R}[\times]1, \mathfrak{R}[$. Substitute the value of $\mathbb{K}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})$ in Eq.(38) yields

$$\sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} [\psi(\mathcal{C}_a^{n+1}) - \psi(\mathcal{C}_a^n)] \Delta \mathbf{m}_a \leq \lambda \Delta t \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} (\mathbf{m}_j + \mathbf{m}_l) \mathcal{C}_j^n \Delta \mathbf{m}_j \mathcal{C}_l^n \Delta \mathbf{m}_l \Delta \mathbf{m}_a \mathbb{B}(\mathbf{m}_a, \mathbf{m}_j, \mathbf{m}_l) \psi'(\mathcal{C}_a^{n+1}).$$

The convexity result in Lemma 3.4 allows us to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} [\psi(\mathcal{C}_a^{n+1}) - \psi(\mathcal{C}_a^n)] \Delta \mathbf{m}_a &\leq 2\lambda \Delta t \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathbf{m}_j \mathcal{C}_j^n \Delta \mathbf{m}_j \mathcal{C}_l^n \Delta \mathbf{m}_l \Delta \mathbf{m}_a [\psi(\mathcal{C}_a^{n+1}) + \psi(\mathbb{B}(\mathbf{m}_a, \mathbf{m}_j, \mathbf{m}_l))] \\ &\leq 2\lambda \Delta t \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathbf{m}_j \mathcal{C}_j^n \Delta \mathbf{m}_j \mathcal{C}_l^n \Delta \mathbf{m}_l \Delta \mathbf{m}_a \psi(\mathcal{C}_a^{n+1}) \\ &\quad + 2\lambda \Delta t \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathbf{m}_j \mathcal{C}_j^n \Delta \mathbf{m}_j \mathcal{C}_l^n \Delta \mathbf{m}_l \Delta \mathbf{m}_a \psi(\mathbb{B}(\mathbf{m}_a, \mathbf{m}_j, \mathbf{m}_l)). \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

After employing Eq.(36) and Eq.(25) into the second term on RHS of the Eq.(39) lead to

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2\lambda\Delta t \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} m_j \mathcal{C}_j^n \Delta m_j \mathcal{C}_l^n \Delta m_l \Delta m_a \psi(\mathbb{B}(m_a, m_j, m_l)) \\
&= 2\lambda\Delta t \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} m_j \mathcal{C}_j^n \Delta m_j \mathcal{C}_l^n \Delta m_l \Delta m_a \frac{\psi(\mathbb{B}(m_a, m_j, m_l))}{\{\mathbb{B}(m_a, m_j, m_l)\}^\theta} \mathbb{B}(m_a, m_j, m_l)^\theta \\
&\leq 2\lambda\Delta t \mathfrak{R} \Pi_\theta(\psi) M_1^{in} \|\mathbb{B}\|_\infty^\theta \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathcal{C}_l^n \Delta m_l \\
&\leq 2\lambda\Delta t \mathfrak{R} \Pi_\theta(\psi) M_1^{in} \|\mathbb{B}\|_\infty^\theta \|\mathcal{C}^{in}\|_{L^1} e^{2\lambda\mathfrak{R}\|\mathbb{B}\|_{L^\infty} M_1^{in\mathfrak{T}}}. \tag{40}
\end{aligned}$$

Now, Eq.(39) and Eq.(40) imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} [\psi(\mathcal{C}_a^{n+1}) - \psi(\mathcal{C}_a^n)] \Delta m_a &\leq 2\lambda\Delta t M_1^{in} \|\mathcal{C}^{in}\|_{L^1} e^{2\lambda\mathfrak{R}\|\mathbb{B}\|_{L^\infty} M_1^{in\mathfrak{T}}} \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \Delta m_a \psi(\mathcal{C}_a^{n+1}) \\
&\quad + 2\lambda\Delta t \mathfrak{R} \Pi_\theta(\psi) M_1^{in} \|\mathbb{B}\|_\infty^\theta \|\mathcal{C}^{in}\|_{L^1} e^{2\lambda\mathfrak{R}\|\mathbb{B}\|_{L^\infty} M_1^{in\mathfrak{T}}}.
\end{aligned}$$

It can be easily simplified as

$$\begin{aligned}
(1 - 2\lambda\Delta t M_1^{in} \|\mathcal{C}^{in}\|_{L^1} e^{2\lambda\mathfrak{R}\|\mathbb{B}\|_{L^\infty} M_1^{in\mathfrak{T}}}) \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \Delta m_a \psi(\mathcal{C}_a^{n+1}) &\leq \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \Delta m_a \psi(\mathcal{C}_a^n) \\
&\quad + 2\lambda\Delta t \mathfrak{R} \Pi_\theta(\psi) M_1^{in} \|\mathbb{B}\|_\infty^\theta \|\mathcal{C}^{in}\|_{L^1} e^{2\lambda\mathfrak{R}\|\mathbb{B}\|_{L^\infty} M_1^{in\mathfrak{T}}}.
\end{aligned}$$

The inequality mentioned above suggests that

$$\sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \Delta m_a \psi(\mathcal{C}_a^{n+1}) \leq A \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \Delta m_a \psi(\mathcal{C}_a^n) + B,$$

where

$$A = \frac{1}{(1 - 2\lambda\Delta t M_1^{in} \|\mathcal{C}^{in}\|_{L^1} e^{2\lambda\mathfrak{R}\|\mathbb{B}\|_{L^\infty} M_1^{in\mathfrak{T}}})}, \quad B = \frac{2\lambda\Delta t \mathfrak{R} \Pi_\theta(\psi) M_1^{in} \|\mathbb{B}\|_\infty^\theta \|\mathcal{C}^{in}\|_{L^1} e^{2\lambda\mathfrak{R}\|\mathbb{B}\|_{L^\infty} M_1^{in\mathfrak{T}}}}{(1 - 2\lambda\Delta t M_1^{in} \|\mathcal{C}^{in}\|_{L^1} e^{2\lambda\mathfrak{R}\|\mathbb{B}\|_{L^\infty} M_1^{in\mathfrak{T}}})}.$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \Delta m_a \psi(\mathcal{C}_a^n) \leq A^n \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \Delta m_a \psi(\mathcal{C}_a^{in}) + B \frac{A^n - 1}{A - 1}. \tag{41}$$

The result of (37) and Jensen's inequality allows us to

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^{\mathbb{R}} \psi(\mathcal{C}^h(t, m)) dm &\leq A^n \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \Delta m_a \psi \left(\frac{1}{\Delta m_a} \int_{\wp_a} \mathcal{C}^{in}(m) dm \right) + B \frac{A^n - 1}{A - 1} \\
&\leq A^n \mathcal{I} + B \frac{A^n - 1}{A - 1} < \infty, \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, \mathfrak{T}]. \tag{42}
\end{aligned}$$

The computations for Case-(2), Case-(3) and Case-(4) are equivalent to the Case-(1). Only just, we got the different values of A and B, which are the following

$$A = \frac{1}{(1 - \lambda \Delta t M_1^{in} \|\mathcal{C}^{in}\|_{L^1} e^{2\lambda R \|\mathbb{B}\|_{L^\infty} M_1^{in} \mathfrak{T}})}, \quad B = \frac{\lambda \Delta t R \Pi_\theta(\psi) M_1^{in} \|\mathbb{B}\|_\infty^\theta \|\mathcal{C}^{in}\|_{L^1} e^{2\lambda R \|\mathbb{B}\|_{L^\infty} M_1^{in} \mathfrak{T}}}{(1 - \lambda \Delta t M_1^{in} \|\mathcal{C}^{in}\|_{L^1} e^{2\lambda R \|\mathbb{B}\|_{L^\infty} M_1^{in} \mathfrak{T}})}.$$

We can now assert that the family (\mathcal{C}^{\hbar}) is uniformly integrable thanks to the De la Vallée Poussin theorem. Therefore, the sequence (\mathcal{C}^{\hbar}) is weakly relatively sequentially compact in $L^1([0, \mathfrak{T}[\times]0, \mathfrak{R}[)$ according to the Dunford-Pettis theorem, which combines this conclusion with equiboundedness. \square

Remark 3.6. *Given that a subsequence of \mathcal{C}^{\hbar} converges weakly to \mathcal{C} in L^1 as in Proposition 3.5, and by using diagonal procedure, extraction of a subsequence is possible for \mathbb{K}^{\hbar} and \mathbb{B}^{\hbar} such that $\mathbb{K}^{\hbar} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ and $\mathbb{B}^{\hbar} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$.*

To prove the Theorem 3.1 completely, we used the following point approximations on the computational domain as

1. Right endpoint approximation: $\Xi^{\hbar} : \mathfrak{m} \in (0, \mathfrak{R}) \rightarrow \Xi^{\hbar}(\mathfrak{m}) = \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathfrak{m}_{a+1/2} \chi_{\wp_a}(\mathfrak{m})$.
2. Left endpoint approximation: $\xi^{\hbar} : \mathfrak{m} \in (0, \mathfrak{R}) \rightarrow \xi^{\hbar}(\mathfrak{m}) = \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathfrak{m}_{a-1/2} \chi_{\wp_a}(\mathfrak{m})$.

We will employ the subsequent lemma, which follows from the Egorov and Dunford-Pettis theorems, to demonstrate the weak convergence of the approximated solutions.

Lemma 3.7. *[[34]] Assuming a constant \mathcal{L} and open subset ϖ of \mathbb{R}^m , and two sequences (g_n) and (d_n) such that $(g_n) \in L^1(\varpi), g \in L^1(\varpi)$ and*

$$g_n \rightharpoonup g \in L^1(\varpi), \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

$(d_n) \in L^\infty(\varpi), d \in L^\infty(\varpi)$, and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}, |d_n| \leq \mathcal{L}$ with

$$d_n \rightarrow d, \quad \text{almost everywhere in } \varpi \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|g_n(d_n - d)\|_{L^1(\varpi)} = 0$$

and

$$g_n d_n \rightharpoonup g d \in L^1(\varpi), \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

We have now accumulated all the evidences required to support Theorem 3.1. Let $\varphi \in C^1([0, \mathfrak{T}[\times]0, \mathfrak{R}[)$ be a test function with compact support with in $[0, t_{N-1}]$ for small t . Define the left endpoint approximation for the space variable of φ on \wp_a and the finite volume for the time variable over τ_n by

$$\varphi_a^n = \frac{1}{\Delta t} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} \varphi(t, \mathfrak{m}_{a-1/2}) dt.$$

Multiplication of φ_a^n with (15) yields the following equation after employing the summation over n & a

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \Delta m_a (\mathcal{C}_a^{n+1} - \mathcal{C}_a^n) \varphi_a^n &= \Delta t \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=a}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathbb{K}_{j,l} \mathcal{C}_j^n \mathcal{C}_l^n \Delta m_j \Delta m_l \varphi_a^n \int_{m_{a-1/2}}^{p_j^a} \mathbb{B}(m, m_j, m_l) dm \\ &\quad - \Delta t \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathbb{K}_{a,j} \mathcal{C}_a^n \mathcal{C}_j^n \Delta m_a \Delta m_j \varphi_a^n. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

The left-hand side (LHS) of the aforementioned equation, open for n that leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \Delta m_a (\mathcal{C}_a^{n+1} - \mathcal{C}_a^n) \varphi_a^n &= \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \Delta m_a \mathcal{C}_a^{n+1} (\varphi_a^{n+1} - \varphi_a^n) + \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \Delta m_a \mathcal{C}_a^{in} \varphi_a^0 \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \int_{\tau_{n+1}} \int_{\varphi_a} \mathcal{C}^{\hbar}(t, m) \frac{\varphi(t, \xi^{\hbar}(m)) - \varphi(t - \Delta t, \xi^{\hbar}(m))}{\Delta t} dm dt \\ &\quad + \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \int_{\varphi_a} \mathcal{C}^{\hbar}(0, m) \frac{1}{\Delta t} \int_0^{\Delta t} \varphi(t, \xi^{\hbar}(m)) dt dm \\ &= \int_{\Delta t}^{\mathfrak{T}} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \mathcal{C}^{\hbar}(t, m) \frac{\varphi(t, \xi^{\hbar}(m)) - \varphi(t - \Delta t, \xi^{\hbar}(m))}{\Delta t} dm dt \\ &\quad + \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \mathcal{C}^{\hbar}(0, m) \frac{1}{\Delta t} \int_0^{\Delta t} \varphi(t, \xi^{\hbar}(m)) dt dm. \end{aligned}$$

With the aid of Lemma 3.7, $\mathcal{C}^{\hbar}(0, m) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^{in}$ in $L^1[0, \mathfrak{R}]$ will yield the following result since $\varphi \in C^1([0, \mathfrak{T}] \times [0, \mathfrak{R}])$ has compact support and a bounded derivative

$$\int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \mathcal{C}^{\hbar}(0, m) \frac{1}{\Delta t} \int_0^{\Delta t} \varphi(t, \xi^{\hbar}(m)) dt dm \rightarrow \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \mathcal{C}^{in}(m) \varphi(0, m) dm \quad (44)$$

as $\max\{\hbar, \Delta t\}$ goes to 0. Now, applying Taylor series expansion of φ , Lemma 3.7 and Proposition 3.5 confirm

$$\int_0^{\mathfrak{T}} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \mathcal{C}^{\hbar}(t, m) \frac{\varphi(t, \xi^{\hbar}(m)) - \varphi(t - \Delta t, \xi^{\hbar}(m))}{\Delta t} dm dt \rightarrow \int_0^{\mathfrak{T}} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \mathcal{C}(t, m) \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t}(t, m) dm dt,$$

for $\max\{\hbar, \Delta t\} \rightarrow 0$ and hence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Delta t}^{\mathfrak{T}} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \underbrace{\mathcal{C}^{\hbar}(t, m) \frac{\varphi(t, \xi^{\hbar}(m)) - \varphi(t - \Delta t, \xi^{\hbar}(m))}{\Delta t}}_{\mathcal{C}(\varphi)} dm dt \\ &= \int_0^{\mathfrak{T}} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \mathcal{C}(\varphi) dm dt - \int_0^{\Delta t} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \mathcal{C}(\varphi) dm dt \rightarrow \int_0^{\mathfrak{T}} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \mathcal{C}(t, m) \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t}(t, m) dm dt. \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

Now, the first term in the RHS of Eq.(43) is taken for observing the computation

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Delta t \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=a}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathbb{K}_{j,l} \mathcal{C}_j^n \mathcal{C}_l^n \Delta m_j \Delta m_l \varphi_a^n \int_{m_{a-1/2}}^{p_j^a} \mathbb{B}(m, m_j, m_l) dm \\
&= \Delta t \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathbb{K}_{a,l} \mathcal{C}_a^n \mathcal{C}_l^n \Delta m_a \Delta m_l \varphi_a^n \int_{m_{a-1/2}}^{m_a} \mathbb{B}(m, m_a, m_l) dm \\
&+ \Delta t \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=a+1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathbb{K}_{j,l} \mathcal{C}_j^n \mathcal{C}_l^n \Delta m_j \Delta m_l \varphi_a^n \int_{m_{a-1/2}}^{m_{a+1/2}} \mathbb{B}(m, m_j, m_l) dm.
\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

The first term on the RHS of Eq.(46) simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Delta t \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathbb{K}_{a,l} \mathcal{C}_a^n \mathcal{C}_l^n \Delta m_a \Delta m_l \varphi_a^n \int_{m_{a-1/2}}^{m_a} \mathbb{B}(m, m_a, m_l) dm \\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \int_{\tau_n} \int_{\Lambda_a^h} \int_{\wp_l} \mathbb{K}^h(m, z) \mathcal{C}^h(t, m) \mathcal{C}^h(t, z) \varphi(t, \xi^h(m)) \int_{\xi^h(m)}^{X^h(m)} \mathbb{B}(r, X^h(m), X^h(z)) dr dz dm dt \\
&= \int_0^{\mathfrak{T}} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{K}^h(m, z) \mathcal{C}^h(t, m) \mathcal{C}^h(t, z) \varphi(t, \xi^h(m)) \int_{\xi^h(m)}^{X^h(m)} \mathbb{B}(r, X^h(m), X^h(z)) dr dz dm dt.
\end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

Next, the second term of Eq.(46) leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Delta t \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=a+1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathbb{K}_{j,l} \mathcal{C}_j^n \mathcal{C}_l^n \Delta m_j \Delta m_l \varphi_a^n \int_{m_{a-1/2}}^{m_{a+1/2}} \mathbb{B}(m, m_j, m_l) dm \\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=a+1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \int_{\tau_n} \int_{\wp_a} \int_{\wp_l} \int_{\wp_j} \left\{ \mathbb{K}^h(n, z) \mathcal{C}^h(t, n) \mathcal{C}^h(t, z) \varphi(t, \xi^h(m)) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \frac{1}{\Delta m_i} \int_{\wp_a} \mathbb{B}(r, X^h(n), X^h(z)) dr \right\} dn dz dm dt \\
&= \int_0^{\mathfrak{T}} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \int_{\Xi^h(m)} \mathbb{K}^h(n, z) \mathcal{C}^h(t, n) \mathcal{C}^h(t, z) \varphi(t, \xi^h(m)) \mathbb{B}(X^h(m), X^h(n), X^h(z)) dn dz dm dt.
\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

Eqs.(46)-(48), Lemma 3.7 and Proposition 3.5 imply that as $\max\{\hbar, \Delta t\} \rightarrow 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Delta t \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=a}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathbb{K}_{j,l} \mathcal{C}_j^n \mathcal{C}_l^n \Delta m_j \Delta m_l \varphi_a^n \int_{m_{a-1/2}}^{p_j^a} \mathbb{B}(m, m_j, m_l) dm \\
&\rightarrow \int_0^{\mathfrak{T}} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \int_m \mathbb{K}(n, z) \mathcal{C}(t, n) \mathcal{C}(t, z) \varphi(t, m) \mathbb{B}(m, n, z) dn dz dm dt.
\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

Now, the last term of Eq.(43) can be simplified as

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta t \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathbb{K}_{a,j} \mathcal{C}_a^n \mathcal{C}_j^n \Delta m_a \Delta m_j \varphi_a^n \\
= \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \int_{\tau_n} \int_{\varphi_a} \int_{\varphi_j} \mathbb{K}^{\hbar}(m, n) \mathcal{C}^{\hbar}(t, m) \mathcal{C}^{\hbar}(t, n) \varphi(t, \xi^{\hbar}(m)) dn dm dt \\
\rightarrow \int_0^{\mathfrak{T}} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{K}(m, n) \mathcal{C}(t, m) \mathcal{C}(t, n) \varphi(t, m) dn dm dt, \tag{50}
\end{aligned}$$

for $\max\{\hbar, \Delta t\} \rightarrow 0$. Eqs.(43)-(50) deliver the desired results for the weak convergence as presented in Eq.(21).

4 Error Simulation

In this section, the error estimation is explored for CBE, which is based on the idea of [21]. Taking the uniform mesh is crucial for estimating the error component, i.e., $\Delta m_a = \hbar \forall a \in \{1, 2, \dots, \mathfrak{J}\}$. The error estimate is achieved by providing an estimation on the difference $\mathcal{C}^{\hbar} - \mathcal{C}$, where \mathcal{C}^{\hbar} is constructed using the numerical technique and \mathcal{C} represents the exact solution to the problem (1). By using the following theorem, we can determine the error estimate by making some assumptions about the kernels and the initial datum.

Theorem 4.1. *Assume that the collisional and breakage kernels hold $\mathbb{K} \in W_{loc}^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+)$, $\mathbb{B} \in W_{loc}^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+)$ and initial datum $\mathcal{C}^{in} \in W_{loc}^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^+)$. Moreover, assuming a uniform mesh and Δt that fulfill the condition (19) imply that the error estimation*

$$\|\mathcal{C}^{\hbar} - \mathcal{C}\|_{L^\infty(0,\mathfrak{T};L^1[0,\mathfrak{R}])} \leq \mathcal{H}(\mathfrak{T}, \mathfrak{R})(\hbar + \Delta t) \tag{51}$$

where $\mathcal{H}(\mathfrak{T}, \mathfrak{R}) \geq 0$ is a constant and \mathcal{C} is the weak solution to (1-2).

Before proving the theorem, consider the following proposition, which provides estimates on the approximate and precise solutions \mathcal{C}^{\hbar} and \mathcal{C} , respectively, given certain additional assumptions. These estimates are important in the analysis of the error.

Proposition 4.2. *Considering the kernels $\mathbb{K} \in L_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+)$, $\mathbb{B} \in L_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+)$ and initial function \mathcal{C}^{in} also exists in L_{loc}^∞ . Moreover, stability property (19) follows for Δt , then the estimation on \mathcal{C}^{\hbar} and \mathcal{C} to (1-2) as*

$$\|\mathcal{C}^{\hbar}\|_{L^\infty(]0,\mathfrak{T}[\times]0,\mathfrak{R}[)} \leq \mathcal{H}(\mathfrak{T}, \mathfrak{R}), \quad \|\mathcal{C}\|_{L^\infty(]0,\mathfrak{T}[\times]0,\mathfrak{R}[)} \leq \mathcal{H}(\mathfrak{T}, \mathfrak{R}).$$

Furthermore, if the kernels $\mathbb{K} \in W_{loc}^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+)$, $\mathbb{B} \in W_{loc}^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+)$ and $\mathcal{C}^{in} \in W_{loc}^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^+)$, then

$$\|\mathcal{C}\|_{W^{1,\infty}]0,\mathfrak{R}[} \leq \mathcal{H}(\mathfrak{T}, \mathfrak{R}). \tag{52}$$

Proof. The principal purpose of this proposition is to obtain a bound on the solution \mathcal{C} to Eq.(1). In consequence, integrating Eq.(8) with respect to the time variable provides the following result

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{C}(t, \mathbf{m}) &\leq \mathcal{C}^{in}(\mathbf{m}) + \int_0^t \int_0^{\mathfrak{A}} \int_{\mathbf{m}} \mathbb{K}(\mathbf{n}, z) \mathbb{B}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}, z) \mathcal{C}(s, \mathbf{n}) \mathcal{C}(s, z) d\mathbf{n} dz ds \\ &\leq \mathcal{C}^{in}(\mathbf{m}) + \|\mathbb{K}\|_{\infty} \|\mathbb{B}\|_{\infty} \|\mathcal{C}\|_{\infty,1}^2 t,\end{aligned}$$

where $\|\mathcal{C}\|_{\infty,1}$ represents the norm of \mathcal{C} in $L^{\infty}(0, \mathfrak{T}; L^1]0, \mathfrak{A}[)$. Hence,

$$\|\mathcal{C}\|_{L^{\infty}(]0, \mathfrak{T}[\times]0, \mathfrak{A}[)} \leq \mathcal{H}(\mathfrak{T}, \mathfrak{A}).$$

Now, let us go to the conclusion of an analysis of (52). First, integrate Eq.(8) over the time variable t , and then differentiate it with respect to \mathbf{m} which lead to

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial \mathcal{C}(t, \mathbf{m})}{\partial \mathbf{m}} &= \frac{\partial \mathcal{C}^{in}(\mathbf{m})}{\partial \mathbf{m}} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{m}} \left(\int_0^t \int_0^{\mathfrak{A}} \int_{\mathbf{m}} \mathbb{K}(\mathbf{n}, z) \mathbb{B}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}, z) \mathcal{C}(s, \mathbf{n}) \mathcal{C}(s, z) d\mathbf{n} dz ds \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{m}} \left(\int_0^t \int_0^{\mathfrak{A}} \mathbb{K}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) \mathcal{C}(t, \mathbf{m}) \mathcal{C}(t, \mathbf{n}) d\mathbf{n} \right).\end{aligned}$$

The following condition is produced by simplifying computations and using the maximum value over the \mathbf{m} domain as follows

$$\begin{aligned}\left\| \frac{\partial \mathcal{C}(t)}{\partial \mathbf{m}} \right\|_{\infty} &\leq \left\| \frac{\partial \mathcal{C}^{in}(\mathbf{m})}{\partial \mathbf{m}} \right\|_{\infty} + [\|\mathbb{K}\mathbb{B}\|_{\infty} \|\mathcal{C}\|_{\infty,1} \|\mathcal{C}\|_{\infty} + \|\mathbb{K}\|_{\infty} \|\mathbb{B}\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|\mathcal{C}\|_{\infty,1}^2 \\ &\quad + \|\mathbb{K}\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|\mathcal{C}\|_{\infty,1} \|\mathcal{C}\|_{\infty}] t + \|\mathbb{K}\|_{\infty} \|\mathcal{C}\|_{\infty,1} \int_0^t \left\| \frac{\partial \mathcal{C}}{\partial \mathbf{m}} \right\|_{\infty} ds,\end{aligned}$$

which can be written in a more coherent way

$$\left\| \frac{\partial \mathcal{C}(t)}{\partial \mathbf{m}} \right\|_{\infty} \leq \Upsilon(t) + v \int_0^t \left\| \frac{\partial \mathcal{C}}{\partial \mathbf{m}} \right\|_{\infty} ds,$$

where

$$\Upsilon(t) = \left\| \frac{\partial \mathcal{C}^{in}(\mathbf{m})}{\partial \mathbf{m}} \right\|_{\infty} + [\|\mathbb{K}\mathbb{B}\|_{\infty} \|\mathcal{C}\|_{\infty,1} \|\mathcal{C}\|_{\infty} + \|\mathbb{K}\|_{\infty} \|\mathbb{B}\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|\mathcal{C}\|_{\infty,1}^2 + \|\mathbb{K}\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|\mathcal{C}\|_{\infty,1} \|\mathcal{C}\|_{\infty}] t,$$

and

$$v = \|\mathbb{K}\|_{\infty} \|\mathcal{C}\|_{\infty,1}.$$

In addition, the following proof is established by the application of Gronwall's lemma and integration by parts:

$$\begin{aligned}\left\| \frac{\partial \mathcal{C}(t)}{\partial \mathbf{m}} \right\|_{\infty} &\leq \Upsilon(t) + \int_0^t \Upsilon(s) v e^{\int_s^t v dr} ds \\ &\leq \Upsilon(0) e^{vt} + (\|\mathbb{K}\mathbb{B}\|_{\infty} \|\mathcal{C}\|_{\infty,1} \|\mathcal{C}\|_{\infty} + \|\mathbb{K}\|_{\infty} \|\mathbb{B}\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|\mathcal{C}\|_{\infty,1}^2 \\ &\quad + \|\mathbb{K}\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|\mathcal{C}\|_{\infty,1} \|\mathcal{C}\|_{\infty}) [(e^{vt} - 1)].\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\left\| \frac{\partial \mathcal{C}}{\partial \mathbf{m}} \right\|_{L^{\infty}(]0, \mathfrak{T}[\times]0, \mathfrak{A}[)} \leq \mathcal{H}(\mathfrak{T}, \mathfrak{A}),$$

which concludes the result (52). \square

Next, the RHS of equation (15) is converted into the continuous form, and we obtain the first-order terms in that process which is explained in the following lemma. The discrete collisional birth-death part in (15) is expressed as

$$B_{\mathcal{C}}(a) - D_{\mathcal{C}}(a) = \frac{1}{\Delta m_a} \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=a}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathbb{K}_{j,l} \mathcal{C}_j^n \mathcal{C}_l^n \Delta m_j \Delta m_l \int_{m_{a-1/2}}^{p_j^a} \mathbb{B}(m, m_j, m_l) dm - \sum_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathbb{K}_{a,j} \mathcal{C}_a^n \mathcal{C}_j^n \Delta m_j. \quad (53)$$

The subsequent lemma offers a simplified version of the preceding discrete terms.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\mathcal{C}^{in} \in W_{loc}^{1,\infty}$, and $\Delta m_a = \hbar \forall a$ be the uniform mesh. Also presuming that \mathbb{K} and \mathbb{B} satisfy the following criteria: $\mathbb{K}, \mathbb{B} \in W_{loc}^{1,\infty}$, then for $(s, m) \in \tau_n \times \wp_i$, where $n \in \{0, 1, \dots, N-1\}$ and $a \in \{1, 2, \dots, \mathfrak{J}\}$ leads to*

$$B_{\mathcal{C}}(a) - D_{\mathcal{C}}(a) = \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \int_{\Xi^h(m)}^{\mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{K}^h(n, z) \mathbb{B}^h(m, n, z) \mathcal{C}^h(s, n) \mathcal{C}^h(s, z) dz dn - \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{K}^h(m, n) \mathcal{C}^h(s, m) \mathcal{C}^h(s, n) dn + \varepsilon(\hbar). \quad (54)$$

In the strong L^1 topology, $\varepsilon(\hbar)$ defines the first order term with regard to \hbar :

$$\|\varepsilon(\hbar)\|_{L^1} \leq \frac{\|\mathbb{K}\mathbb{B}\|_{L^\infty}}{2} \|\mathcal{C}^{in}\|_{L^1}^2 e^{4\lambda\mathfrak{R}\|\mathbb{B}\|_{L^\infty} M_1^{in} \mathfrak{T}} \hbar. \quad (55)$$

Proof. With a uniform mesh, start with the discrete birth term of Eq.(53) and transform it into the continuous form for $m \in \wp_a$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\Delta m_a} \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=a}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathbb{K}_{j,l} \mathcal{C}_j^n \mathcal{C}_l^n \Delta m_j \Delta m_l \int_{m_{a-1/2}}^{p_j^a} \mathbb{B}(m, m_j, m_l) dm \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \sum_{j=a+1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathbb{K}_{j,l} \mathcal{C}_j^n \mathcal{C}_l^n \Delta m_j \Delta m_l \frac{1}{\Delta m_a} \int_{m_{a-1/2}}^{m_{a+1/2}} \mathbb{B}(m, m_j, m_l) dm + \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathbb{K}_{a,l} \mathcal{C}_a^n \mathcal{C}_l^n \Delta m_l \int_{m_{a-1/2}}^{m_a} \mathbb{B}(m, m_a, m_l) dm \\ &= \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \int_{\Xi^h(m)}^{\mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{K}^h(n, z) \mathbb{B}^h(m, n, z) \mathcal{C}^h(s, n) \mathcal{C}^h(s, z) dz dn + \varepsilon(\hbar), \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

where $\varepsilon(\hbar) = \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathbb{K}_{a,l} \mathcal{C}_a^n \mathcal{C}_l^n \Delta m_l \int_{m_{a-1/2}}^{m_a} \mathbb{B}(m, m_a, m_l) dm$ is defined. Upon computing the L^1 norm of $\varepsilon(\hbar)$, the subsequent term is obtained

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varepsilon(\mathbb{F}, \hbar)\|_{L^1} &\leq \|\mathbb{K}\mathbb{B}\|_{L^\infty} \sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathcal{C}_a^n \Delta m_a \sum_{l=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathcal{C}_l^n \Delta m_l \int_{m_{a-1/2}}^{m_a} dm \\ &\leq \frac{\|\mathbb{K}\mathbb{B}\|_{L^\infty}}{2} \left(\sum_{a=1}^{\mathfrak{J}} \mathcal{C}_a^n \Delta m_a \right)^2 \hbar \\ &\leq \frac{\|\mathbb{K}\mathbb{B}\|_{L^\infty}}{2} \|\mathcal{C}^{in}\|_{L^1}^2 e^{4\lambda\mathfrak{R}\|\mathbb{B}\|_{L^\infty} M_1^{in} \mathfrak{T}} \hbar. \end{aligned}$$

Now, taking the discrete death term of (53) yields

$$\sum_{j=1}^J \mathbb{K}_{a,j} \mathcal{C}_a^n \mathcal{C}_j^n \Delta m_j = \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{K}^{\hbar}(m, n) \mathcal{C}^{\hbar}(s, m) \mathcal{C}^{\hbar}(s, n) dn. \quad (57)$$

Using the formula (54), Eq.(8) and Eq.(15) exhibit a relation between \mathcal{C}^{\hbar} and \mathcal{C} for $t \in \tau_n$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} |\mathcal{C}^{\hbar}(t, m) - \mathcal{C}(t, m)| dm &\leq \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} |\mathcal{C}^{\hbar}(0, m) - \mathcal{C}(0, m)| dm + \sum_{\beta=1}^3 (CB)_{\beta}(\hbar) \\ &+ \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} |\epsilon(t, n)| dm + \|\epsilon(\hbar)\|_{L^1} t, \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

where $(CB)_{\beta}(\hbar)$ represents the error terms for $\beta = 1, 2, 3$ as

$$\begin{aligned} (CB)_1(\hbar) &= \int_0^t \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \int_{\Xi^{\hbar}(m)}^{\mathfrak{R}} |\mathbb{K}^{\hbar}(n, z) \mathbb{B}^{\hbar}(m, n, z) \mathcal{C}^{\hbar}(s, n) \mathcal{C}^{\hbar}(s, z) \\ &- \mathbb{K}(n, z) \mathbb{B}(m, n, z) \mathcal{C}(s, n) \mathcal{C}(s, z)| dn dz dm ds, \end{aligned}$$

$$(CB)_2(\hbar) = \int_0^t \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \int_m^{\Xi^{\hbar}(m)} \mathbb{K}(n, z) \mathbb{B}(m, n, z) \mathcal{C}(s, n) \mathcal{C}(s, z) dn dz dm ds,$$

and

$$(CB)_3(\hbar) = \int_0^t \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} |\mathbb{K}^{\hbar}(m, n) \mathcal{C}^{\hbar}(s, m) \mathcal{C}^{\hbar}(s, n) - \mathbb{K}(m, n) \mathcal{C}(s, m) \mathcal{C}(s, n)| dn dm ds.$$

Considering $|t - t_n| \leq \Delta t$, the time discretization provides the following expression

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} |\epsilon(t, n)| dm &\leq \int_{t_n}^t \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \int_{\Xi^{\hbar}(m)}^{\mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{K}^{\hbar}(n, z) \mathbb{B}^{\hbar}(m, n, z) \mathcal{C}^{\hbar}(s, n) \mathcal{C}^{\hbar}(s, z) dn dz dm ds \\ &+ \int_{t_n}^t \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{K}^{\hbar}(m, n) \mathcal{C}^{\hbar}(s, m) \mathcal{C}^{\hbar}(s, n) dn dm ds + \int_{t_n}^t \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \epsilon(\hbar) dm ds. \end{aligned}$$

Given $\mathbb{K}, \mathbb{B} \in W_{loc}^{1, \infty}$ and for $m, n \in]0, \mathfrak{R}]$, we have

$$|\mathbb{K}^{\hbar}(m, n) - \mathbb{K}(m, n)| \leq \|\mathbb{K}\|_{W^{1, \infty}} \hbar.$$

As a result, it produces an estimate of $(CB)_1(\hbar)$ using the L^1 bounds on \mathcal{C}^{\hbar} and \mathcal{C} . To begin, divide the expression into four segments

$$\begin{aligned} (CB)_1(\hbar) &\leq \int_0^t \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} |\mathbb{K}^{\hbar}(n, z) - \mathbb{K}(n, z)| \mathbb{B}(m, n, z) \mathcal{C}(s, n) \mathcal{C}(s, z) dn dz dm ds \\ &+ \int_0^t \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{K}^{\hbar}(n, z) |\mathbb{B}^{\hbar}(m, n, z) - \mathbb{B}(m, n, z)| \mathcal{C}(s, n) \mathcal{C}(s, z) dn dz dm ds \\ &+ \int_0^t \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{K}^{\hbar}(n, z) \mathbb{B}^{\hbar}(m, n, z) |\mathcal{C}^{\hbar}(s, n) - \mathcal{C}(s, n)| \mathcal{C}(s, z) dn dz dm ds \\ &+ \int_0^t \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{K}^{\hbar}(n, z) \mathbb{B}^{\hbar}(m, n, z) \mathcal{C}^{\hbar}(s, n) |\mathcal{C}^{\hbar}(s, z) - \mathcal{C}(s, z)| dn dz dm ds. \end{aligned}$$

The above can be changed by applying Proposition 4.2 and simplifying it to

$$(CB)_1(\hbar) \leq (\|\mathbb{K}\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|\mathbb{B}\|_\infty + \|\mathbb{K}\|_\infty \|\mathbb{B}\|_{W^{1,\infty}}) t \mathfrak{R}^3 \|\mathcal{C}\|_\infty^2 \hbar + \mathfrak{R}^2 \|\mathbb{K}\|_\infty \|\mathbb{B}\|_\infty (\|\mathcal{C}\|_\infty + \|\mathcal{C}^\hbar\|_\infty) \int_0^t \|\mathcal{C}^\hbar(s) - \mathcal{C}(s)\|_{L^1} ds, \quad (59)$$

and similar estimation for $(CB)_3(\hbar)$ gives

$$(CB)_3(\hbar) \leq \|\mathbb{K}\|_{W^{1,\infty}} t \mathfrak{R}^2 \|\mathcal{C}\|_\infty^2 \hbar + \mathfrak{R} \|\mathbb{K}\|_\infty (\|\mathcal{C}\|_\infty + \|\mathcal{C}^\hbar\|_\infty) \int_0^t \|\mathcal{C}^\hbar(s) - \mathcal{C}(s)\|_{L^1} ds. \quad (60)$$

Finally, deal with the terms, $(CB)_2(\hbar)$ and $\int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} |\epsilon(t, n)| dm$, it is clear that

$$(CB)_2(\hbar) \leq \frac{t \mathfrak{R}^2}{2} \|\mathbb{K}\mathbb{B}\|_\infty \|\mathcal{C}\|_\infty^2 \hbar, \quad (61)$$

and

$$\int_0^{\mathfrak{R}} |\epsilon(t, n)| dm \leq (\|\mathbb{K}\mathbb{B}\|_\infty \|\mathcal{C}^\hbar\|_\infty^2 \mathfrak{R}^3 + \|\mathbb{K}\|_\infty \|\mathcal{C}^\hbar\|_\infty^2 \mathfrak{R}^2 + \|\epsilon(\hbar)\|_{L^1}) \Delta t. \quad (62)$$

Furthermore, substituting all the estimations (59)-(62) in (58) and applying the Gronwall's lemma conclude the result in (51). \square

5 Numerical Testing

To test the problem's theoretical error estimation, in this part of the article, the discussion over experimental error and experimental order of convergence (EOC) are concluded for two combinations of collision kernel and breakage distribution function.

The experimental domain for the volume variable is taken as $[1e - 3, 10]$ and computations are run from time 0 to 1. In order to observe the EOC of the FVS in the absence of analytical results, the following double mesh relation is used:

$$\text{EOC} = \ln \left(\frac{\|N_{\mathfrak{J}} - N_{2\mathfrak{J}}\|}{\|N_{2\mathfrak{J}} - N_{4\mathfrak{J}}\|} \right) / \ln(2). \quad (63)$$

Here, $N_{\mathfrak{J}}$ stands for the total number of particles having \mathfrak{J} cells, generated by scheme (15).

Test case 1: Consider $\mathbb{K}(n, z) = nz$ and $\mathbb{B}(m, n, z) = \delta(m - 0.4n) + \delta(m - 0.6n)$. The exponential decay initial condition (e^{-m}) supports this problem. The computational domain is divided into uniform subintervals of 30, 60, 120, and 240 number of cells. Table 1 represents the numerical errors and the EOC examined through Eq.(63). It is observed that the scheme provides the error in decreasing pattern as grid gets refined and it is of first-order convergence, as predicted by the theoretical results in Section 4.

Test case 2: For the second example, assume $\mathbb{K}(n, z) = n + z$ along with $\mathbb{B}(m, n, z) = \delta(m - 0.4n) + \delta(m - 0.6n)$. As analytical concentration function is unavailable in the literature, the error and the EOC are calculated via Eq.(63) for uniform cells with 30, 60, 120, 240, and 480 degrees of freedom. The computational volume domain and execution time are identical to the preceding test case. Again, according to Tables 2, the EOC of the FVS for this case is comparable to the first case, i.e., the first-order convergence is noticed.

Cells	Error	EOC
30	-	-
60	0.4271×10^{-4}	-
120	0.2006×10^{-4}	1.0899
240	0.0973×10^{-4}	1.0449
480	0.0479×10^{-4}	1.0224

Table 1: Test case 1

Cells	Error	EOC
30	-	-
60	0.4309×10^{-4}	-
120	0.2023×10^{-4}	1.0905
240	0.0981×10^{-4}	1.0452
480	0.0483×10^{-4}	1.0226

Table 2: Test case 2

6 Conclusions

This article proposed a theoretical convergence analysis of FVS for solving the collisional breakage equation for the non-uniform mesh. It yielded a non-conservative scheme, for which a weak convergence analysis has been executed with unbounded collision and breakage distribution kernels. The result was accomplished in the presence of Weak L^1 compactness method based on Dunford-Pettis and La Vallée Poussin theorems. In addition, explicit error estimation of the method was also explored for the kernels belonging to $W_{loc}^{1,\infty}$. We further confirmed that the FVS is first-order accurate for uniform meshes by using two numerical cases of the model.

7 Acknowledgments

The work of Sanjiv Kumar Bariwal and Rajesh Kumar is supported by CSIR India (file No. 1157/CSIR-UGC NET June 2019) and Science and Engineering Research Board (SERB), DST India (project MTR/2021/000866), respectively.

Conflict of Interest

There are no conflicts of interest related to this work.

References

- [1] R. B. Diemer, “Applications of the linear mass-sectional breakage population balance to various milling process configurations,” *AAPS PharmSciTech*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 1–17, 2021.
- [2] G. Danha, D. Hildebrandt, D. Glasser, and C. Bhondayi, “Application of basic process modeling in investigating the breakage behavior of ug2 ore in wet milling,” *Powder Technology*, vol. 279, pp. 42–48, 2015.

- [3] A. Spampinato and D. Axinte, “On modelling the interaction between two rotating bodies with statistically distributed features: an application to dressing of grinding wheels,” *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, vol. 473, no. 2208, p. 20170466, 2017.
- [4] S. Chen and S. Li, “Collision-induced breakage of agglomerates in homogenous isotropic turbulence laden with adhesive particles,” *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, vol. 902, 2020.
- [5] I. Kudzotsa, *Mechanisms of aerosol indirect effects on glaciated clouds simulated numerically*. University of Leeds, 2013.
- [6] J.-I. Yano, V. T. Phillips, and V. Kanawade, “Explosive ice multiplication by mechanical break-up in ice–ice collisions: a dynamical system-based study,” *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, vol. 142, no. 695, pp. 867–879, 2016.
- [7] B. Crüger, V. Salikov, S. Heinrich, S. Antonyuk, V. S. Sutkar, N. G. Deen, and J. Kuipers, “Coefficient of restitution for particles impacting on wet surfaces: An improved experimental approach,” *Particuology*, vol. 25, pp. 1–9, 2016.
- [8] K. F. Lee, M. Dosta, A. D. McGuire, S. Mosbach, W. Wagner, S. Heinrich, and M. Kraft, “Development of a multi-compartment population balance model for high-shear wet granulation with discrete element method,” *Computers & Chemical Engineering*, vol. 99, pp. 171–184, 2017.
- [9] Z. Cheng and S. Redner, “Scaling theory of fragmentation,” *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 60, no. 24, p. 2450, 1988.
- [10] R. M. Ziff, “New solutions to the fragmentation equation,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, vol. 24, no. 12, p. 2821, 1991.
- [11] R. M. Ziff and E. McGrady, “The kinetics of cluster fragmentation and depolymerisation,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, vol. 18, no. 15, p. 3027, 1985.
- [12] T. W. Peterson, “Similarity solutions for the population balance equation describing particle fragmentation,” *Aerosol Science and Technology*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 93–101, 1986.
- [13] G. Breschi and M. A. Fontelos, “A note on the self-similar solutions to the spontaneous fragmentation equation,” *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, vol. 473, no. 2201, p. 20160740, 2017.
- [14] E. S. Hosseininia and A. Mirghasemi, “Numerical simulation of breakage of two-dimensional polygon-shaped particles using discrete element method,” *Powder Technology*, vol. 166, no. 2, pp. 100–112, 2006.
- [15] M. Catak, N. Bas, K. Cronin, J. J. Fitzpatrick, and E. P. Byrne, “Discrete solution of the breakage equation using markov chains,” *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*, vol. 49, no. 17, pp. 8248–8257, 2010.
- [16] Y. Liao, R. Oertel, S. Kriebitzsch, F. Schlegel, and D. Lucas, “A discrete population balance equation for binary breakage,” *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Fluids*, vol. 87, no. 4, pp. 202–215, 2018.

- [17] P. K. Barik and A. K. Giri, “A note on mass-conserving solutions to the coagulation-fragmentation equation by using non-conservative approximation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.08038*, 2018.
- [18] M. M. Attarakih, C. Drumm, and H.-J. Bart, “Solution of the population balance equation using the sectional quadrature method of moments (sqmom),” *Chemical Engineering Science*, vol. 64, no. 4, pp. 742–752, 2009.
- [19] N. Ahmed, G. Matthies, and L. Tobiska, “Stabilized finite element discretization applied to an operator-splitting method of population balance equations,” *Applied Numerical Mathematics*, vol. 70, pp. 58–79, 2013.
- [20] Y. Lin, K. Lee, and T. Matsoukas, “Solution of the population balance equation using constant-number monte carlo,” *Chemical Engineering Science*, vol. 57, no. 12, pp. 2241–2252, 2002.
- [21] J.-P. Bourgade and F. Filbet, “Convergence of a finite volume scheme for coagulation-fragmentation equations,” *Math. Comp.*, vol. 77, no. 262, pp. 851–882, 2008.
- [22] S. K. Bariwal and R. Kumar, “Convergence and error estimation of weighted finite volume scheme for coagulation-fragmentation equation,” *Numerical Methods for Partial Differential Equations*, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 2561–2583, 2023.
- [23] S. K. Bariwal, P. K. Barik, A. K. Giri, and R. Kumar, “Numerical study of finite volume scheme for coagulation–fragmentation equations with singular rates,” *Journal of Hyperbolic Differential Equations*, vol. 20, no. 04, pp. 793–823, 2023.
- [24] M. Kostoglou and A. Karabelas, “A study of the nonlinear breakage equation: analytical and asymptotic solutions,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, vol. 33, no. 6, p. 1221, 2000.
- [25] P. Laurençot and D. Wrzosek, “The discrete coagulation equations with collisional breakage,” *Journal of Statistical Physics*, vol. 104, no. 1, pp. 193–220, 2001.
- [26] C. Walker, “Coalescence and breakage processes,” *Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences*, vol. 25, no. 9, pp. 729–748, 2002.
- [27] P. K. Barik and A. K. Giri, “Global classical solutions to the continuous coagulation equation with collisional breakage,” *ZAMP*, vol. 71, no. 1, pp. 1–23, 2020.
- [28] A. Das and J. Saha, “Existence and uniqueness of mass conserving solutions to the coagulation and collision-induced breakage equation,” *The Journal of Analysis*, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 1323–1340, 2022.
- [29] Z. Cheng and S. Redner, “Kinetics of fragmentation,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, vol. 23, no. 7, p. 1233, 1990.
- [30] M. H. Ernst and I. Pagonabarraga, “The nonlinear fragmentation equation,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, vol. 40, no. 17, p. F331, 2007.

- [31] P. Krapivsky and E. Ben-Naim, “Shattering transitions in collision-induced fragmentation,” *Physical Review E*, vol. 68, no. 2, p. 021102, 2003.
- [32] A. K. Giri and P. Laurençot, “Weak solutions to the collision-induced breakage equation with dominating coagulation,” *J. Differential Equations*, vol. 280, pp. 690–729, 2021.
- [33] A. Das, J. Kumar, M. Dosta, and S. Heinrich, “On the approximate solution and modeling of the kernel of nonlinear breakage population balance equation,” *SIAM journal on scientific computing*, vol. 42, no. 6, pp. B1570–B1598, 2020.
- [34] P. Laurençot and S. Mischler, “The continuous coagulation-fragmentation equations with diffusion,” *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, vol. 162, no. 1, pp. 45–99, 2002.