Coordinated
Science
Laboratory

THE PSEUDO-SHOCK : A NON-LINEAR PROBLEM OF TRANSLATIONAL RELAXATION

B. L. Hicks

REPORT R-236   JUNE, 1965

THE PSEUDO-SHOCK: A NON-LINEAR
PROBLEM OF TRANSLATIONAL RELAXATION

B. L. Hicks

Abstract

The Boltzmann equation has been solved by Nordsieck's Monte Carlo method
for the case of translational relaxation of a gas of elastic spheres whose in-
itial velocity distribution function has the form

$$f(\vec{v},0) = \frac{1}{2}\left\{\exp[-\pi(\vec{v}-\vec{1}u)^2] + \exp[-\pi(\vec{v}+\vec{1}u)^2]\right\} .$$

The Mach number

$$M = (6\pi/5)^{\frac{1}{2}}u$$

describes the relative separation of the two peaks of the bimodal distribution
function and therefore controls the degree of initial departure from equilibri-
um. Calculations have been made for M = 0.5, 1, 2, 4, and 6, which includes a
range of initial conditions from very close to very far from thermal
equilibrium.

In the early part of the translational relaxation we find that relaxation
by a factor of e^{-1} requires, on the average, 1.27 ± 0.044 collisions for the
lateral temperature and 0.80 ± 0.033 collisions for the Boltzmann function H.
The temperature relaxation rate is thus smaller by a factor of 1.58 ± 0.120
than the entropy relaxation rate. (The uncertainties are stated as 90% confi-
dence limits.) These collision numbers are essentially independent of M and
time, at least until each molecule has made about ten collisions. Our calcu-
lations agree with earlier, more qualitative results in the literature that

correspond to different initial conditions. We have also shown that in a Krook model of our relaxation process, the ratio of the two collision numbers is somewhat smaller than two late in the relaxation and, as shown also by Offerhaus, approaches two asymptotically.

Solution of the Boltzmann equation for any other reasonable initial conditions could be obtained with the same Monte Carlo program. For example, the relaxation of the asymmetric bi-modal distribution functions used by Mott-Smith to describe shock wave structure could be studied.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

The series of internal CSL reports, "Numerical Studies of Strong Shock Waves",[1-6] describes successive steps in our efforts to calculate the velocity distribution functions within a shock wave by solving the Boltzmann equation. We have shown that Nordsieck's Monte Carlo method of evaluating the collision integral in the Boltzmann equation appears to be both reliable and feasible. Earlier methods of evaluation have been less accurate and efficient.[7,8,9] The chief difficulty yet remaining to be overcome in the shock problem is that of insuring an adequate rate of convergence of the iterative method of solution of the Boltzmann equation. We therefore decided to apply the Monte Carlo method to a simpler problem than the shock wave in order to

- -

1. Numerical Studies of Strong Shock Waves. Part I. Illiac Solutions of a Boltzmann Difference Equation by Nordsieck's Method. B. L. Hicks and J. K. Aggarwal. CSL Report I-111. (1962)

2. _____. Part II. Results of Illiac Calculations. B. L. Hicks and J. K. Aggarwal. CSL Report I-117. (1963)

3. _____. Part III. Studies of the Monte Carlo and Integration Programs. B. L. Hicks. CSL Report I-122. (1963)

4. _____. Part IV. Description of the 1604 Program. J. K. Aggarwal and B. L. Hicks. CSL Report I-123. (1963)

5. _____. Part V. Equations and Scaling. B. L. Hicks. CSL Report I-124. (1963)

6. _____. Part VI. Subroutines and Tables. B. L. Hicks and M. A. Smith. CSL Report I-125. (1964)

7. "Molecular Dynamics by Electronic Computers". B. J. Alder and T. Wainwright in Transport Processes in Statistical Mechanics (Interscience Publishers, 1958), pp. 97-131.

8. "Investigation of the Many Body-Problem by Electronic Computers", B. J. Alder and T. Wainwright, in The Many Body-Problem (Interscience Publishers, 1963), pp. 511-522.

9. G. A. Bird, "Approach to Translational Equilibrium in a Rigid Sphere Gas". Phys. of Fl. 6, 1518 (1963).

demonstrate at once the utility of the method in a real problem and to learn from this exercise some new tricks to use on the shock structure problem.

We chose at Nordsieck's suggestion the simpler problem of calculating the translational relaxation of a uniform gas. In particular, we chose as the initial out-of-equilibrium condition a bimodal velocity distribution. This condition resembles that which obtains within a shock wave, and could be made more like a shock wave by simple extensions of the calculations reported here. Hence we call our problem of relaxation the "pseudo-shock" problem.

We have solved the Boltzmann equation numerically for initial conditions ranging from near thermal equilibrium to very far from thermal equilibrium. The numerical results are readily interpretable physically and suggest a new numerical technique that should be useful in the shock wave problem.

We are indebted to Mrs. Margaret Smith who has performed most of the programming and data reduction for our study of the pseudo-shock.

2. Formulation of the problem

We shall treat the behavior of a uniform monatomic gas that is not in thermal equilibrium. We shall consider hard sphere molecules of diameter σ and mass m. Molecules with other force fields can be studied if their differential cross sections are known. We shall suppose that there are no external forces. The behavior to be considered is then that of a simple translational relaxation which is governed by the Boltzmann equation.

One set of units will be used in the body of the paper. A second set, "machine units", will be used in the Sect. 4.3. (See also Part I(1).) In the first set, the units are the values, denoted by the subscript 1, of various properties of a reference gas. Thus n_1, T_1 are the units of number density and temperature. The unit of length $\ell_1 = 1/(2\pi n_1 \sigma^2) =$ ((mean free path)$_1/\sqrt{2}$). The unit of velocity

$c_1 = (2\pi kT_1/m)^{\frac{1}{2}} = $ (mean speed)$_1 \times (\pi/2)$. The unit of time is therefore (mean free time)$_1 \times (\sqrt{2}/\pi)$ and of the velocity distribution function is $n_1/c_1{}^3$. In these units the Boltzmann equation may be written

$$df/d\tau = a - bf = \int (FF' - ff')|\vec{N}\cdot\vec{v}_r| d\vec{v'} (d\vec{N}/4\pi) \qquad (2\text{-}1)$$

where $f = f(\vec{v},\tau)$ is the time-dependent velocity distribution function, τ is the time variable, $\vec{N}$ gives the direction of the line of centers during a collision, $\vec{v}_r = \vec{v'} - \vec{v}$, and f, f', F, F' denote the four values of f corresponding to the four velocities $\vec{v}$, $\vec{v'}$, $\vec{V}$, $\vec{V'}$ characterizing a binary collision.

We specify, as the initial condition at $\tau = 0$, a symmetrical bimodal velocity distribution function for a spatially uniform gas

$$f(\vec{v},0) = f_0 = \frac{1}{2}\left\{\exp\left[-\pi(\vec{v}-\vec{i}u)^2\right] + \exp\left[-\pi(\vec{v}+\vec{i}u)^2\right]\right\} . \qquad (2\text{-}2)$$

At all later times the velocity distribution function depends only upon τ and the velocity components $(v_x, v_\perp)$ which are cylindrical polar coordinates in velocity space. In our units the parameter u is related to a Mach number by the equation

$$M = (6\pi/5)^{\frac{1}{2}}u . \qquad (2\text{-}3)$$

For $M \ll 1$ the gas described by f_0 is almost in thermal equilibrium at temperature $t = 1$ and with number density $n = 1$. For $M \gg 1$, the gas described by f_0 is very far from equilibrium, and, in fact, consists of two oppositely directed streams of gas, each at temperature $t = 1$ moving essentially parallel to the x axis at a speed large compared to the thermal velocity.

We shall be interested in the behavior of the velocity distribution function f, the collision integral (a-bf), the "lateral" temperature

$$T_\perp/T_1 \;=\; t_\perp \;=\; (\pi/n) \int v_\perp{}^2 f \, d\vec{v} \tag{2-4}$$

and the Boltzmann function

$$H \;=\; \int f \log f \, d\vec{v} \ . \tag{2-5}$$

The number density $n \equiv 1$ throughout the relaxation process. The reduced temperature

$$T/T_1 \;=\; t \;=\; (2\pi/3n) \int v^2 f \, d\vec{v} \;=\; 1 + (5/9)M^2 \;=\; 1 + \frac{2}{3}\pi u^2 \tag{2-6}$$

is likewise constant throughout the relaxation process.*

The initial and final ($\tau \to \infty$) values of $t_\perp$ are equal, respectively, to 1 and t. The initial values of H can be computed analytically for two values of M:

$$H(0) \;=\; -\frac{3}{2}, \qquad M = 0 \tag{2-7}$$

$$H(0) \;=\; -\frac{3}{2} - \ln 2 \ , \qquad M = \infty \ . \tag{2-8}$$

For other values of M, H(0) must be computed by numerical quadrature. The asymptotic value of H is given by

$$H(\infty) \;=\; -\frac{3}{2}(1 + \ln t) \tag{2-9}$$

corresponding to the asymptotic velocity distribution function

$$f_\infty(\vec{v}) \;=\; f_\infty \;=\; t^{-\frac{3}{2}} \exp(-\pi v^2/t) \ . \tag{2-10}$$

- -

*As we shall see later (and compensate for) n and t do not remain exactly constant during the numerically calculated relaxation process.

3. Theoretical Expectations

From Boltzmann's Theorem we know that

$$dH/d\tau < 0 \qquad (3\text{-}1)$$

during the relaxation. The asymptotic value of H for an equilibrium gas with given t and for n = 1 is given by Eq. (2-9), and according to Eq. (3-1) this value must be the lowest value reached by H during the relaxation.

Let $\delta f = \delta f(\vec{v}, \tau)$ represent the departure of the velocity distribution function from $f_\infty = f(\vec{v}, \infty)$, its equilibrium value. Then

$$f = f_\infty + \delta f \qquad (3\text{-}2)$$

and

$$t_\perp = t + (\pi/n) \int v_\perp^2 \, \delta f \, d\vec{v} \quad . \qquad (3\text{-}3)$$

An equation similar to (3-3) holds for any moment of f.

It will be convenient to interpret the time scale and collision rates in terms of the behavior of the equilibrium gas, described by f_∞. We may expect the time constant for the equilibrium gas and for the asymptotic part of the relaxation to be inversely proportional to the mean molecular speed and therefore to $t^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. The asymptotic relaxation for different Mach numbers should then be similar when plotted against $(t^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau)$. The number of collisions n suffered by a molecule in the equilibrium reference gas in (reduced) time $\Delta\tau$ is

$$n = (\sqrt{2}/\pi) t^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta\tau = 0.450 \, t^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta\tau \quad . \qquad (3\text{-}4)$$

The relaxation will be almost complete when $(t^{\frac{1}{2}}\tau) \gg 10$. In this asymptotic range, $|\delta f/f_\infty| \ll 1$ and

$$H \cong H_\infty + \frac{1}{2} \int \delta f^2 \, f_\infty^{-1} \, (1 - \delta f / 3 f_\infty) \, d\vec{v} + \dots \quad . \qquad (3\text{-}5)$$

The term in (δf) is missing from Eq. (3-5) because n and t are constant during the relaxation. Offerhaus[10] has discussed the $(\delta f)^2$ term but not the $(\delta f)^3$ term in this equation.

To get a more detailed view of the relaxation process let us describe the process approximately by the Krook model,[11] in which the Boltzmann equation is replaced by

$$df/d\tau = b(\mathcal{F} - f) . \qquad (3\text{-}6)$$

In this equation $\mathcal{F}$ is a Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution function having the same (constant) values of n and t as does the (non-equilibrium) function f. Therefore, $\mathcal{F} = f_\infty$ is independent of τ. The solution of Eq. (3-6) then is

$$f = f_\infty + (f_0 - f_\infty) e^{-b\tau} \qquad (3\text{-}7)$$

where b may or may not depend upon $\vec{v}$, according to the nature of the Krook model. Notice that f, in Eq. (3-7), is a linear combination of f_0 and f_∞. We may thus say that Eq. (3-7) corresponds, for our translational relaxation problem, to a Mott-Smith model of the process as well as to a Krook model.

We now have an explicit form for δf to use,

$$\delta f = (f_0 - f_\infty) e^{-b\tau} , \quad (t^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau \gg 1) . \qquad (3\text{-}8)$$

- -

10. M. F. Offerhaus, Theory of Relaxation Phenomena in a Monatomic Gas. Akad. 64, 115 (1961), see Sect. 5.

11. Bhatnaghar, Gross, and Krook. "A Model for Collision Processes in Gases." Phys. Rev. 94, 511 (1954).

The relaxation of $t_\perp$ (or other moments) is similar to that of f:

$$t_\perp = t + (\pi/n) \int (f_0 - f_\infty) v_\perp^2 e^{-b\tau} d\vec{v} \ . \tag{3-9}$$

But for large enough times, namely, for

$$\left| \delta f / 3 f_\infty \right| = (f_0 - f_\infty) e^{-b\tau} / 3 f_\infty \ll 1 \ , \tag{3-10}$$

we find that

$$H = H_\infty + \frac{1}{2} \int e^{-2b\tau} (f_0 - f_\infty)^2 f_\infty^{-1} \ d\vec{v} \ . \tag{3-11}$$

The time constant $b(\vec{v})$ of the (asymptotic) relaxation for each velocity bin increases with increase of the speed v. Let b_1 be the smallest value of b. Then for large enough times the relaxation of the corresponding velocity bin will dominate the relaxation process and we may write in place of Eqs. (3-9), (3-11)

$$t_\perp = t + (1-t) e^{-b_1 \tau} \tag{3-12}$$

$$H = H_\infty + \frac{1}{2} e^{-2b_1 \tau} \int (f_0 - f_\infty)^2 f_\infty^{-1} \ d\vec{v} \ . \tag{3-13}$$

Results of the same form follow from the alternative assumption that b = constant. For example, we may assume that b_1 in the Krook model corresponds to the value $b(0)$ for the equilibrium gas; then

$$b_1 = b(0) = t^{\frac{1}{2}}/\pi \ . \tag{3-14}$$

Insofar as the Krook model is valid for the asymptotic part of the relaxation process we thus can predict that the time constant b_H for the relaxation of H is one-half as large as the time constant $b_\perp = b_1$ for the asymptotic relaxation of $t_\perp$. It may also be shown for the Krook model that the term

in δf^3 is negative, for large enough values of M, which has the apparent effect of making $b_H/b_\perp > 1/2$ when $b_H\tau \sim 1$. Even without appealing to the Krook model we can show that this is a reasonable result when we look at the $(\delta f)^3/f_\infty^2$ term in the integrand of Eq. (3-4). This term behaves near a residual peak like t^3 and elsewhere like $t^{-\frac{3}{2}}$. Remembering that $\int \delta f d\vec{v} = 0$, we see that for large enough t, the integral of $\delta f^3/f_\infty^2$ is positive and the corresponding contribution to H is negative.

For large values of M we can also make a prediction about the _early_ part of the relaxation process. In this case few collisions occur except between molecules moving with velocities u and (-u) nearly parallel to the x axis. For $t^{\frac{1}{2}}\tau \ll 1$ only a small number of molecules will have collided and these will be distributed uniformly in velocity space along the circle v = u. We may expect then (for $M \gg 1$ and $(t^{\frac{1}{2}}\tau) \gg 1$) that we will see in isoline plots of f a "bridging" along a circular arc between the two delta functions at $v_x = \pm u$, $v_\perp = 0$.

It should be noted that one analytical treatment[12] of translational relaxation has been based upon superposition throughout the relaxation of two Maxwell-Boltzmann distributions the separation of whose centers continuously decreases. This model cannot account for the directional randomization just discussed, but addition of a third Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution might yield asymptotic results similar to those suggested by the Krook model.

We are now ready to consider the numerical methods used in solving the translational relaxation problem.

- -

12. K. Suchy, "New Methods in the Kinetic Theory of Rarified Gases." Ergeb. exakt. Naturwiss. 35, 103 (1964).

4. Numerical Methods

4.1 Evaluation of the Collision Integral by Monte Carlo Sampling

The most difficult part of the translational relaxation problem is evaluation of the collision integral. It is fortunate, since no other suitable method (analytical or numerical) is yet available, that Nordsieck's Monte Carlo method is well developed.

The method was described in the first report of the series.[1] The collision integral is first replaced by an integral over a finite region of velocity space that is of volume R and that includes most of the molecules. The average value of the integrand over this region is then approximated by the average of a large and fair sample of N values of the integrand. The value of the collision integral is then given by the product of this average value with the volume R. The integrand is a function of eight independent variables derived from $\vec{v}$, $\vec{v}'$, and $\vec{n}$. Nordsieck's Monte Carlo method insures fairness of the sampling in the eight-dimensional space of these variables. The sampling and Monte Carlo quadrature make use of 226 velocity bins in the $(v_x, v_\perp)$ plane.

In a numerical solution of the Boltzmann equation, it is the speed and accuracy of the evaluation of the collision integral that must be our primary concern before we look at other characteristics of the over-all method of solution. For samples of moderate size and velocity distributions that cover about 200 velocity cells, statistical fluctuations contribute the only significant error, for the statistical error is then much larger than the quadrature error. (Truncation error is generally small except for large values of the speed v where the collision integral itself is small.) Thus, with our present Monte Carlo program,* the calculation of 226 values of (a-bf), for a

- -

*Detailed tests of this program have not yet been described in reports. Tests of earlier programs are described in Part III.[3]

sample of $N = 10^4$ collisions, is performed in 50 sec. on the CDC 1604 computer and yields statistical errors (expressed as probable errors) in a and bf individually of ±15%. The bias, owing to quadrature error, amounts to ±2% in uncorrected a or bf for a well-covered velocity space for an equilibrium gas. The bias in (a-bf) is not now directly determinable for a non-equilibrium gas but is reduced by the method described in Sec. 4.4. We would like to emphasize that some bias in (a-bf), caused by quadrature error, is to be expected whether the numerical integration uses sampling techniques or not.

The computing time is proportional to N, and the statistical error is proportional to $N^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. For many calculations it is not practical nor is it necessary to reduce the statistical error to the same level as the bias. We have obtained significant results in the relaxation problem with relatively small samples ($N = 10^4$).

For $M \gg 1$, only a few velocity bins, in effect, are used in Monte Carlo (or other) numerical evaluation of the collision integral. The large resulting quadrature error then presents the primary difficulty in solving the relaxation problem adequately for large Mach numbers. (See Sect. 6.32.)

4.2 Integration of the Boltzmann Equation

Consideration of the various sources of error and of factors influencing the computing speed indicated that Euler quadrature in the time variable would give appropriate accuracy and speed. For each velocity bin the integration formula is

$$f(\tau_1 + \Delta\tau) = f(\tau_1) + \Delta\tau (df/d\tau)\Big|_{\tau_1} . \tag{4-1}$$

In view of the discussion in Section 3 we chose $\Delta\tau$ to be approximately proportional to $t^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ so that quadrature errors in the forward integration are approximately equal, on a fractional basis, for different Mach numbers.

We may add two further notes about the forward integration process. A process of higher order than the Euler would require recalculation of (a-bf) one or more times before a step in time is made. Improvements in accuracy of the time-wise integration must take into account, however, that by far the most time-consuming part of the whole problem, even with the help of a Monte Carlo process, is the evaluation of the collision integral. Thus, (see Sect. 4.1) one forward step in time takes 50 sec., for a sample of 10^4 collisions. We can, however, on the basis of a reasonable assumption, easily correct the results of the Euler integration and thereby achieve about the same accuracy in calculation of $t_\perp$ and H as though we had used a higher order integration process.

The assumption used is that __each__ function (f, $t_\perp$ and H) which we later discuss is nearly an exponential function, $\exp(-\beta t^{\frac{1}{2}}\tau)$. For the function $f(\tau)$, for example, we may then write the expression for the derivative at the midpoint of an interval as

$$f'\left(\tau + \frac{1}{2}\Delta\tau\right) = -\beta t^{\frac{1}{2}} f\left(\tau + \frac{1}{2}\Delta\tau\right) \cong -\beta t^{\frac{1}{2}} f(\tau)\left[1 - \frac{1}{2}\beta t^{\frac{1}{2}}\Delta\tau\right] .$$

$$(4-2)$$

Each increment Δf from an Euler integration should then be multiplied by the (constant) correction factor $[1 - \frac{1}{2}\beta t^{\frac{1}{2}}\Delta\tau]$ and logarithmic slopes should be corrected by the same factor. We assume that the logarithmic slopes of the functions $t_\perp$ and H should be corrected by the factors $[1 - \frac{1}{2}\beta_\perp t^{\frac{1}{2}}\Delta\tau]$ and $[1 - \frac{1}{2}\beta_H t^{\frac{1}{2}}\Delta\tau]$ where $\beta_\perp$ and β_H are determined later. The correction made of the slopes of the H curves is greater than that of the $t_\perp$ curves but is less than 15%. Higher order corrections would not change the values of the slopes by more than 1%.

4.3   Integrals involving f and (a-bf)

As in our earlier work[1,5] we calculate n, nt, $nt_\perp$ and H (each of which involves integration of f over velocity space), and $dn/d\tau$, $d(nt)/d\tau$ (each of which involves integration of (a-bf) over velocity space) by numerical quadratures in velocity space. Combined quadrature and truncation errors have been reduced to less than 1% for all values of M for large values of $(t^{\frac{1}{2}}\tau)$, but, for large Mach numbers, $(M \geqslant 4)$, it is not possible, for a given number of velocity bins (226 in our case), to keep the quadrature errors this small for $(t^{\frac{1}{2}}\tau) < 1$. (See discussion of Table II in Sect. 6.2.)

To facilitate control of the truncation error we introduced two related parameters K_1 and p. The parameter K_1 is used to scale the variable $\vec{v}$ so as to "fill" the velocity space, for a given function f. Thus

$$\vec{v}_m = K_1 \vec{v} \tag{4-3}$$

where 226 fixed values of $(v_x, v_\perp)_m$ (velocity components in "machine" units) describe the velocity cells in the truncated region R over which numerical integrations are carried out. Though it is not in principle necessary, we keep K_1 fixed during the time-wise integration of the Boltzmann equation for any one value of M.

As a simple measure of truncation error (in calculating integrals over f) we use the integer p in the equation

$$f_\infty (24/K_1) = 10^{-p}, \tag{4-4}$$

$v_m = 24$ being the radius of the spherical region R. Combination of Eqs. (4-4) and (2-10) then gives a value of K_1 for each value of M or t. We took p to be 4.

We have not examined the fractional truncation error in the evaluation of (a-bf). We would expect it to be less than the corresponding errors in integrals over f because the integrand of the collision integral contains products of velocity distribution functions and therefore decreases much more rapidly than f as the speed v increases.

4.4   Least Square Adjustment of Calculated Collision Integrals

As we have noted above, some bias in values of the collision integral calculated by numerical quadrature is unavoidable. To reduce the resultant accumulation of errors in the forward integration of the Boltzmann equation in time we have devised a least square adjustment of the collision integrals that are calculated by Monte Carlo sampling. This method is preferable to the "moment correction" method[1,4,5] used for the shock problem two years ago because it less often produces negative and therefore unacceptable values of f.

Let us first consider the values of n and t calculated from the f's generated by our numerical treatment of the Boltzmann equation. These values of n and t would remain constant throughout the relaxation process if there were no error in calculating them. We will go far toward enforcing constancy of these values if we adjust the values of (a-bf) as little as possible, in a least square sense, while imposing the two conditions

$$dn/d\tau = \int (df/d\tau)d\vec{v} = 0 \qquad (4\text{-}5)$$

$$d(nt)/d\tau = (2\pi/3)\int v^2(df/d\tau)d\vec{v} = 0 \qquad (4\text{-}6)$$

Both the Monte Carlo calculation of the function $(df/d\tau)$ and the numerical quadrature used to approximate the integrals in Eq. (4-5,6) introduce errors in the values of $dn/d\tau$ and $d(nt)/d\tau$. As noted before, the adjustment process therefore maintains the constancy of the computed values of n and of t.

The least square condition, subject to Eqs. (4-5) and (4-6), is

$$\delta \sum_{s=0}^{225} (p_s - P_s)^2 p_s^{-2} = 0 \qquad (4\text{-}7)$$

in which p_s and P_s are the values of $df/d\tau$ (for the sth velocity bin) before and after adjustment. Solution of the least square problem yields a simple explicit formula for P_s in terms of moments of $df/d\tau$ that are approximated by weighted sums. Note that we minimize the mean square value of the _fractional_ adjustment of p_s, a procedure that is consistent with a characteristic of Nordsieck's Monte Carlo method, namely, the approximately constant fractional error of the values of $df/d\tau$ that it produces.

We checked the effectiveness of the correction method by obtaining Monte Carlo solutions of the Boltzmann equation for M = 0 both with and without the correction of (a-bf). For M = 0 the gas is _initially_ in equilibrium so that properties of the gas that are calculated by the Monte Carlo method should deviate from the equilibrium values of these properties only because of fluctuations and bias in the Monte Carlo method.

With a program which uses the correction method, the f and a isolines for M = 0 differ in only a few bins from the equilibrium isolines. This is true both after two and 20 steps in time. The isolines of (a-bf) indicate probable errors of about 24% relative to a. When no corrections of (a-bf) have been made then t, $t_\perp$ and $|H|$ increase by 1.6, 1.6 and 1.7%, respectively, after the 20 steps in time. Correction of (a-bf) yields of course a constant computed value of t (low by 0.3% owing to quadrature and truncation error in integrating f to get t) and yields values of $t_\perp$ and H that fluctuate _near_ the equilibrium values. These fluctuations in $t_\perp$ amount to ~0.4% and in H to ~0.05%.

The mean value of |H| as calculated from the corrected (a-bf) is low by 0.3% (quadrature and truncation error over f) and perhaps shows a slight downward bias amounting to 0.1% in 20 steps in time. The size of the fluctuations will be used later in interpreting the pseudo-shock calculations.

These results show that the least square adjustment of the values of (a-bf) does indeed reduce the trends away from equilibrium that are produced by unavoidable slight bias in the Monte Carlo (or other) calculation of (a-bf).

4.5   Monte Carlo Fluctuations

As in an earlier investigation[3] we wished to study statistical variation of quantities that had been calculated with the help of Monte Carlo sampling. Therefore we made four runs of the same type but each run with a different and independent sample. For each run we chose to use a sample of $N = 10^4$ collisions for each of ten steps in time, starting at $\tau = 0$ for each Mach number, and also at $\tau = 10\Delta\tau$, so that we could judge the effects of the Mach number and of the phase of the relaxation upon the variances among the runs.

We shall be concerned chiefly in later sections with the variance of the derivatives of $t_\perp$ and H as functions of $(t^{\frac{1}{2}}\tau)$.

5.   Parameters

The parameters that define the numerical treatment of the translational relaxation process are $\Delta\tau$, N, p, and the first random number used in generating a sequence of independent samples for a given run. Except as specified otherwise, the sequences of samples were wholly independent of one another. There is only one physical parameter governing the relaxation process, namely M. Parameters used in the various runs are summarized in Table I.

Table I. Summary of Pseudo Shock Calculations

$\underline{M}$	interval $\Delta\tau$	$t^{\frac{1}{2}}\Delta\tau$	Range of $(\tau/\Delta\tau)$	$\underline{p}$	no. of runs (a)	$\underline{N}$
0	.25	.25	1-20	4	1	10,923
			1-20		1 (b)	
.5	.25	.2668	1-10	4	4	10,923
			11-16		1	
			11-30		1	
1	.25	.3118	1-10	4	4	10,923
			11-20		4	
			11-30		1	
2	.25	.4488	1-10	4	4	10,923
			11-20		4	
			11-30		1	
	.125	.2244	1-10	4	1	43,691
4	.125	.3931	1-10	4	4	10,923
			11-20		4	
			11-30		1	
	.0625	.1965	1-4	4	1	43,691
6	.0625	.2864	1-20	4	1 (c)	10,923
			1-20	3	1 (c)	
			1-20	2	1 (c)	
			1-10	4	3	
			11-20		3	
			21-30		1	
10	.0625	.4700	1-10	4	4	10,923
			11-20		4	
			21-30		1	

(a) All runs were made with independent samples unless indicated otherwise.

(b) No (a-bf) corrections.

(c) These three runs were made with the same sample.

16

6. Results and Discussion

6.1 Preliminary Comparison with Theoretical Expectations

In interpreting our computational results we shall be interested in the behavior of the lateral temperature $t_\perp$ and the Boltzmann function H, and, to a lesser extent, in the detailed appearance of isoline plots of f, a, and (a-bf). The behavior of $t_\perp$ and H is shown in Figs. 1 and 2 for five values of the Mach number M. In each figure, the abscissa is $t^{\frac{1}{2}}\tau$ where t is the (reduced) equilibrium temperature given by Eq. (2-6) and τ is the (reduced) time variable.* The ordinates in Figs. 1 and 2 represent the absolute value of the differences $(t_q'(0)-t_{\perp M}(\tau))$ and $(H'(\infty) - H_M(\tau))$, calculated from the Monte Carlo results, where $t_q(0)$ and $H'(\infty)$ are the asymptotic values of $t_\perp$ and H. Discussion of the estimation of these and other asymptotic values will be deferred to later sections. Let us now state briefly what these figures show that was predicted in Sect. 3.

The numerical results do satisfy Boltzmann's Theorem, at least until the relaxing gas is close enough to equilibrium so that the Monte Carlo fluctuations produce fluctuations of H above and below the equilibrium value $H'(\infty)$. Except for M = 0.5, the range of $(H_M(\tau) - H'(\infty))$ before such deviations occur is two or more decades. Both $t_\perp$ and H (which are measures of departure from equilibrium) relax as though a single relaxation mechanism were effective <u>from the onset of the relaxation</u> process. Time constants for different values of M are proportional to $t^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, as indicated by the parallelism of the relaxation curves plotted with $t^{\frac{1}{2}}\tau$ on the abscissa. The time constant for relaxation

- -

*We recall that $0.450t^{\frac{1}{2}}\tau$ is the number of collisions that have occurred in reduced time τ in the reference gas. (See Eq. (3-4).)

Figure 1.   Translational relaxation of reduced temperature. The collision
number is calculated for a reference gas which is in equilibrium
and has the same total translational energy as the relaxing gas.
Mach number M.

Figure 2.   Translational relaxation of the Boltzmann function. The collision
            number is calculated for a reference gas which is in equilibrium
            and has the same total translational energy as the relaxing gas.
            Mach number M.

of H does appear to be about one-half as large as for the relaxation of $t_\perp$.

In Fig. 3 the predicted "bridging" is clearly visible in the f-isolines for M = 4. These isolines (see Table I) were calculated for $\Delta\tau = 0.0625$ corresponding to a collision of only one molecule in 11 in the reference gas, showing the sensitivity of Nordsieck's method. Our examination of the isolines for f, a and (a-bf) also shows that they approach, for $t^{\frac{1}{2}}\tau \gg 1$, the shapes characteristic of equilibrium, as we would expect.

Although a more careful discussion of these points will be given later, we can already see that agreement with the theoretical expectations gives considerable indirect support to the validity of our Monte Carlo solution of the Boltzmann equation for the pseudo-shock.

6.2   Asymptotic Behavior

Let us first examine the behavior of $t_\perp$ and H for large times, i.e. for $\tau \cong 20\,\Delta\tau$. We have made a number of different estimates, given in Table II, of both the initial and asymptotic values of $t_\perp$ and H. These estimates are derived from different combinations of analytical formulas, numerical integrations, and Monte Carlo calculations. It is necessary to consider various estimates of $n(\tau)$ and $t(\tau)$ as well as of $t_\perp(\tau)$ and $H(\tau)$.

Let us use the subscript a to indicate a wholly analytical calculation; the subscript q to indicate a result derived by numerical integration of an analytical $f(\vec{v},\tau)$ over $\vec{v}$; and the subscript M to indicate a result derived by numerical integration of a Monte Carlo $f(\vec{v},\tau)$ over $\vec{v}$. Initial and asymptotic values of the various estimates are indicated by the values 0 and ∞ of the argument τ.

Figure 3.   Early stages in the relaxation of the velocity distribution func-
            tion f for a Mach number of 4.0. v_x and $v_\perp$ are cylindrical polar
            coordinates in velocity space. The (reduced) time interval
            $\Delta\tau = 0.0625$ corresponds to a collision of one molecule in eleven
            in a reference gas.

Table II. Limiting Values of Macroscopic Properties of the Relaxing Gas

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.
M	n_a	$n_q(0)$	$n_q(\infty)$	t_a	$t_q(0)$	$t_q(\infty)$	$t_{\perp q}(0)$	$t_{\perp q}(\infty)$	$t_{\perp M}(\infty)$
0.0	1.000	..99973		1.000	..99743		.99736		
0.5	1.000	.99982	.99956	1.1389	1.1363	1.1334	.99817	1.1333	1.14
1.0	1.000	1.0002	.99995	1.5556	1.5539	1.5500	.99893	1.5499	1.55
2.0	1.000	1.0015	1.0012	3.2222	3.2201	3.2119	.99691	3.2117	3.22
4.0	1.000	1.0148	1.0146	9.8889	9.8686	9.8436	.96952	9.8429	9.87
6.0	1.000	1.0780	1.0777	21.000	20.865	20.813	.83621	20.812	20.8
10.0	1.000	1.2914	1.2913	56.556	53.976	53.876	.92132	53.871	
∞	1.000			∞					

1.	11.	12.	13.	14.	15.	16.
M	$H_a(0)$	$H_q(0)$	$H_a(\infty)$	$H_q(\infty)$	$H'(\infty)$	$H_M(\infty)$
0.0	-1.5000	-1.4958	-1.5000		-1.4961	
0.5		-1.6696	-1.6951	-1.6873	-1.6915	-1.689
1.0		-1.9557	-2.1628	-2.1570	-2.1614	-2.160
2.0		-2.1797	-3.2551	-3.2528	-3.2575	-3.254
4.0		-2.1947	-4.9371	-4.9871	-4.9923	-4.989
6.0		-2.1861	-6.0668	-6.4430	-6.4486	-6.442
10.0		-2.8784	-7.5528	-9.3284	-9.3331	
∞	-2.1932		-∞			

In the second column of Table II appear the analytical values of $n(\tau)$, namely n_a, which has the value unity at all times because the number of molecules is conserved. In column 3 is the estimate $n_q(0)$, obtained by numerical integration over the analytical values of $f(\vec{v},0)$ given by Eq. (2-2). Truncation errors are negative for $n_q(0)$ (as they are also for numerical integrations yielding estimates of $|H(\tau)|$ and of all the positive functions in Table II) and decrease as M increases. The quadrature errors in $n_q(0)$ are apparently positive and increase (unavoidably, for a fixed number of velocity bins) as M increases. The error in $t_q(0)$ (column 6) is negative and smaller in absolute value than the error in $n_q(0)$. (Note that numerical quadrature yields values of (nt) and $(nt_\perp)$ rather than t and $t_\perp$ directly.)

We must emphasize at this point that our digital computer solution of the Boltzmann equation produces and uses values of $t_\perp$, H, $dn/d\tau$ etc. that have been obtained by numerical integration. In "clamping" the values of $n(\tau)$ and $t(\tau)$, by the method described in Section 4.4, we are then fixing the values of $n_M(\tau)$, $t_M(\tau)$ at their _initial_ values, $n_q(0)$, $t_q(0)$. As the translational relaxation proceeds, the quadrature errors (over $\vec{v}$) in H and $t_\perp$ decrease and are much less than 1% for all Mach numbers for $(t\,\overset{1}{\overset{}{2}}\tau) \gg 1$. (The quadrature errors in (a-bf) presumably decrease even more rapidly.) The proper interpretation of our relaxation calculations is then that we are following the _relaxation of a gas whose asymptotic density and temperature are_ $\underline{n_q(0)}$ _and_ $\underline{t_q(0)}$. We shall therefore base several estimates of the asymptotic values of other functions upon these values $n_q(0)$ and $t_q(0)$.

The velocity distribution function for a gas in thermal equilibrium and having the density and temperature $n_q(0)$, $t_q(0)$ is

$$f_\infty(\vec{v}) = n_q(0)[t_q(0)]^{-\frac{3}{2}} \exp[-\pi v^2/t_q(0)] . \tag{6-1}$$

(Compare eq. (2-10).) Numerical integration over this function gives the values $n_q(\infty)$, $t_q(\infty)$ listed in columns 4 and 7 of Table II. The differences between $n_q(0)$ and $n_q(\infty)$ and between $t_q(0)$ and $t_q(\infty)$ are very small, which testifies to the small combined truncation and quadrature errors of our numerical integration over $\vec{v}$ for functions $f(\vec{v})$ that "fill" properly the part of $\vec{v}$ space we use for numerical integration.

Having given this much detailed discussion of the quantities appearing in the first seven columns of Table II, we can discuss rather briefly the related quantities listed in columns 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 of the Table. The initial values of $t_{\perp q}(0)$ in column 8 exhibit small deviations from the correct value $t_{\perp a} \equiv 1$ for low Mach numbers and larger errors for high Mach numbers much as did $t_q(0)$. Also, as we might expect, $t_{\perp q}(\infty)$ in column 9 agrees very well with $t_q(\infty)$ for all values of M.

There seems to be no analytical formula for $H_a(0)$ as a function of M. The initial and asymptotic $(M \rightarrow \infty)$ values shown in the Table in column 11 are, however, given by the Eqs. (2-7,8). Note the small range of H as compared to that of t. The initial values $H_q(0)$ obtained by numerical integration over $\vec{v}$ are given in column 12 and show large departures from the correct values only for M = 10. Exact values of $H_a(\infty)$ (column 13) are given by Eq. (2-9) and may be compared with the values of $H_q(\infty)$ (column 14) obtained by numerical integration of $[f(\vec{v},\infty)\ln f(\vec{v},\infty)]$ over $\vec{v}$. The agreement is good except, as for M = 6, 10, where $n_q(0)$ is much different from unity. In view of our earlier discussion a more useful comparison is that between $H_q(\infty)$ and

$$H'(\infty) = n_q(0)[\ln n_q(0) - 1.5 \ln t_q(0) - 1.5] \tag{6-2}$$

As we would expect, these two sets of values of $H(\infty)$ agree within much less than 1%.

We are now ready to discuss the behavior of the relaxing gas as determined from the Monte Carlo calculations. From our discussion in Section 3 we expect that $t_\perp(\tau)$ and $H(\tau)$ will each, to a first approximation, relax exponentially to their equilibrium values. To explore this possibility we plotted $[t_q(0) - t_{\perp M}(\tau)]$ and $[H_M(\tau) - H'(\infty)]$ on logarithmic scales vs. $(t^{\frac{1}{2}}\tau)$ on a linear scale as in Figures 1 and 2. For analysis of the early part of the relaxation process the asymptotic values chosen for subtraction from $t_{\perp M}(\tau)$ and $H_M(\tau)$ need be values only approximately equal to $t_q(0)$ and $H'(\infty)$. For the later parts of the relaxation, where the departure from the equilibrium values is small, it is necessary to choose these values to be $t_q(0)$ and $H'(\infty)$ (or other values such as $t_{\perp q}(\infty)$ and $H_q(\infty)$ that approximate closely to them).

The straight and parallel parts of the curves in Figures 1 and 2 will be discussed in a later section; we are concerned here only with the apparent asymptotic behavior* of the functions $t_{\perp M}(\tau)$ and $H_M(\tau)$. From these curves we derived estimates of the asymptotic values of $[t_q(0) - t_{\perp M}(\infty)]$ and of $[H_M(\infty) - H'(\infty)]$ and from these calculated values of $t_{\perp M}(\infty)$ and $H_M(\infty)$ as given in columns 10 and 16 of Table II. The values of $t_{\perp M}(\infty)$ are equal, within the uncertainty of estimating them (say 0.3%), to the values of $t_q(0)$. The values of $H_M(\infty)$ for $M \leq 10$, are equal to the values of $H_q(\infty)$ or $H'(\infty)$ within 0.2% or less, an error level comparable with the difference between $H_q(\infty)$ and $H'(\infty)$.

- -

*Careful numerical analysis of the Krook model shows that we would not be able, in the Monte Carlo calculations, to find at what time the quantity $[H_M(\tau) - H'(\infty)]$ becomes accurately proportional to $[t_q(0) - t_{\perp M}(\tau)]^2$, say within 2%, because of the smallness of these differences and the very gradual change of slope of the curves in the asymptotic region.

We may thus conclude that our Monte Carlo integration of the Boltzmann equation produces the correct asymptotic behavior of $t_\perp$ and H except for small errors that are to be expected from the nature of the numerical integrations over $\vec{v}$.

We may make a few remarks about the asymptotic statistical fluctuations of $t_{\perp M}(\tau)$ and of $H_M(\tau)$. The fluctuations of $t_{\perp M}$ (for M > 0) are roughly equal to the fluctuations in $t_{\perp M}$ found in Section 4.4 for an initial state of equilibrium (M = 0). The fluctuations of $H_M(\tau)$ (for M > 0), however, amount to about 0.01% for all Mach numbers and are therefore smaller by a factor of about five than were found for M = 0. Note that this remarkably small level of fluctuation was obtained with a rather small Monte Carlo sample, namely, 10^4 collisions.

6.3. Behavior for $(t \frac{1}{2} \tau)) < 10$

6.31 $M \leqslant 6$

Two striking features of the curves in Figures 1 and 2 are evident for $M \leqslant 6$: they are almost straight and are nearly parallel. To discover how nearly straight and parallel we can say they are, we need to examine in detail various sources of error. We restrict our first discussion to the first ten steps in $\Delta\tau$ (for which $(t \frac{1}{2}\tau) < 5$).

Data to permit estimation of the fluctuations in slope owing to the Monte Carlo calculations of the collision integral were obtained by the method described in Section 4.5. A typical "fan" generated by this method is shown in Figure 4. Since we were primarily interested in the apparent constancy of the slope as M changes we decided to examine first the mean slope and the (sample) standard deviation S for each set of four runs of ten intervals each. The slopes were determined by fitting a straight line (that passed through the

Figure 4. Temperature relaxation computed with four independent sequences of Monte Carlo samples. Each sample contains 10,923 collisions. Mach number M = 2.0.

point for $\tau = 0$) to the curve for each sample. The results are given in Table III and have been corrected for quadrature error in integrations with respect to τ. (See Section 4.1.) It is unnecessary to correct for the difference between t_a and $t_q(0)$ in the abscissa variable ($t^{\frac{1}{2}}\tau$) because this difference is so small. (See Table II.)

Inspection shows that the variation among the mean slopes for the different Mach numbers is generally no larger than the 90% confidence limits for each Mach number. To make a more careful judgement we take the following steps:

a) Comparison of **S** - from variance ratio tests[13] we conclude that the sample standard deviations for the different Mach numbers are not significantly different at the 5% level.

b) Comparison of the means - an analysis of variations[13] shows that the sample means for the slopes of the H curves are not significantly different from one another at the 5% level. The mean slopes for $t_{\perp}$ agree with one another even better than do the mean slopes for H.

We may thus conclude that the logarithmic slopes of the relaxation curves (plotted vs ($t^{\frac{1}{2}}\tau$)) are independent of M for $t^{\frac{1}{2}}\tau \leqslant 5$ and $M \leqslant 6$, and are equal, respectively, to 0.3539 ± 0.0122 and 0.5607 ± 0.0233, the mean values of the slopes for $t_{\perp}$ and H. These values of mean slope and 90% confidence limits agree with values obtained less formally for the range $5 \leqslant (t^{\frac{1}{2}}\tau) \leqslant 10$. Detailed analysis in this range is less profitable because the estimated slopes are sensitive (for ($t^{\frac{1}{2}}\tau$) near 10) to statistical fluctuations, to the exact choice of the nominal asymptotic values of the two variables, and to quadrature and truncation errors in integrations over $\vec{v}$.

- -

13. C. E. Weatherburn, A First Course in Mathematical Statistics (Cambridge 1961) Chap. X and XI.

Table III. Monte Carlo Fluctuations of Slope of Relaxation Curves

M	$t_\perp$			H		
	mean slope	sample s.d. S	90% confidence limits	mean slope	sample s.d. S	90% confidence limits
0.5	.3598	.0139	.0189	.5596	.0338	.0459
1.0	.3451	.0133	.0180	.6120	.0197	.0267
2.0	.3536	.0150	.0203	.5638	.0268	.0363
2.0*	.3528*	.0150*	.0203*	.5948*	.0268*	.0363*
4.0	.3599	.0430	.0583	.5348	.0842	.1143
6.0	.3522	.0565	.0767	.4989	.0708	.0961
mean	.3539			.5607		

*The starred values of mean slopes were obtained from one special run with a sample four times larger than any sample used for the other runs. For this special run we take the value of S and of the confidence limits to be the same as for the values given in the line above for the same Mach number M.

The analysis of the early part of the relaxation process has thus far dealt with the apparent parallelism of the curves, each curve having been assumed to be straight. We now ask, "How straight are the curves?" Inspection of the mean curves for each fan (and also the curves for the special large sample at $M = 2.0$) show no indication of curvature that cannot be attributed to statistical fluctuations or to small uncertainties in the choice of the asymptotic values of $t_q(0)$ and $H'(\infty)$.

Our over-all conclusions are that $t_\perp$ and H (for $M \leqslant 6$ and $(t^{\frac{1}{2}}\tau < 10)$ each relaxes as though it were governed by a single relaxation process.

$$t_\perp(\tau) = 1 + (t-1) \exp(-\beta_\perp t^{\frac{1}{2}}\tau) \tag{6-6}$$

$$H(\tau) = H(0) + [H(\infty) - H(0)] \exp(-\beta_H t^{\frac{1}{2}}\tau) \tag{6-7}$$

where

$$\beta_\perp = 0.3539 \pm 0.0122 \tag{6-8}$$

$$\beta_H = 0.5607 \pm 0.0233 \tag{6-9}$$

and are independent of M. The uncertainties are stated in terms of 90% confidence limits and are based upon observed Monte Carlo fluctuations. The uncertainties do not include estimates of possible systematic errors.

The ratio $\beta_H/\beta_\perp = 1.584 \pm 0.120$ (90% confidence limit) which, as predicted in Sect. 3, is somewhat smaller than the known asymptotic value of two.

Eq. (3-13) for the Krook model ($b_1 = b(0)$) corresponds to $\beta_\perp = \pi^{-1} = 0.318$. We may interpret the larger value, 0.354, obtained

by the Monte Carlo solution of the Boltzmann equation by finding for what molecular speed $b(v)$ (for the equilibrium gas) is equal to $0.354 \, t^{\frac{1}{2}}$. This speed is $0.51\bar{v}$ where $\bar{v}$ is the mean molecular speed. Molecules whose speed is less than $0.51\bar{v}$ relax more slowly than those whose speed is larger than $0.51\bar{v}$. This conclusion could be examined in detail by analysis of the time variation of the velocity distribution functions output in our calculations for each velocity bin.

The number of collisions in a reference gas necessary for relaxation by a factor of e^{-1} is $\sqrt{2}/(\pi\beta) = 0.450/\beta$. The relaxation of $t_{\perp}$ and of H may then be described as follows: 1.27 ± 0.044 collisions of each molecule are required for relaxation of $t_{\perp}$ by the factor e^{-1}, and 0.80 ± 0.033 collisions are required for relaxation of H by the same factor. (The provisional value of this second number obtained by Alder and Wainwright[7] for a different starting condition was about one.) Each number is representative of the translational relaxation process initially and up to the time that relaxation by a factor of e^{-2} or e^{-3} has occurred. Asymptotically, only 0.64 collisions per molecule may be necessary for relaxation of H by the factor e^{-1}. (See ..... Sect. 3.)

6.32 M > 6

For large enough values of M we should expect that the computational methods used here would break down. Errors then would enter because of the small number of velocity bins in which $f(\vec{v},0)$ is sensibly different from zero. The resulting quadrature errors amount to 29% and 5%, for n and t respectively, for M = 10. Even more serious quadrature errors arise in the Monte Carlo (or any other) numerical evaluation of the collision integral. In spite of these problems, $t_{\perp M}(\tau) \to t_q(0)$ and $H_M(\tau) \to H'(\infty)$ for M = 10 as τ increases. However, the behavior of $t_{\perp M}(\tau)$ and $H_M(\tau)$ for small times exhibits very large

fluctuations. We have not, therefore, presented our results in detail for $M = 10$.

It is possible that semi-analytical calculations like those of Alder and Wainwright[7] would give accurately the detailed pattern of translational relaxation for $M \gg 1$. Our methods could be used in relaxation calculations for values of $M > 6$ if we used a substantially larger number of velocity bins.

Distribution list as of March 1, 1965

1 Dr. Chalmers Sherwin
Deputy Director (Research & Technology)
DD&RE Rm 3E1060
The Pentagon
Washington, D. C. 20301

1 Dr. Edward M. Reilley
Asst. Director (Research)
Ofc. of Defense Res & Eng
Department of Defense
Washington, D. C. 20301

1 Dr. James A. Ward
Office of Deputy Director (Research and
Information Rm 3D1037)
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D. C. 20301

1 Director
Advanced Research Projects Agency
Department of Defense
Washington, D. C. 20301

1 Mr. Charles Yost, Director
for Materials Sciences
Advanced Research Projects Agency
Department of Defense
Washington, D. C. 20301

20 Defense Documentation Center
Cameron Station, Bldg. 5
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Attn: TISIA

1 Director
National Security Agency
Fort George G. Meade, Maryland 20755
Attn: Librarian C-332

1 Chief of Research and Development
Headquarters, Department of the Army
Washington, D. C. 20310
Attn: Physical Sciences Division P & E

1 Chief of Research and Development
Headquarters, Department of the Army
Washington, D. C. 20310
Attn: Mr. L. H. Geiger, Rm 34442

1 Research Plans Office
U. S. Army Research Office
3045 Columbia Pike
Arlington, Virginia 22204

1 Commanding General
U. S. Army Materiel Command
Attn: AMCRD-RS-PE-E
Washington, D. C. 20315

1 Commanding General
U. S. Army Strategic Communications
Command
Washington, D. C. 20315

1 Commanding Officer
U. S. Army Materials Research Agency
Watertown Arsenal
Watertown, Massachusetts 02172

1 Commanding Officer
U. S. Army Ballistics Research Lab.
Aberdeen Proving Ground
Aberdeen, Maryland 21005
Attn: V. W. Richards

1 Commanding Officer
U. S. Army Ballistics Research Lab.
Aberdeen Proving Ground
Aberdeen, Maryland 21005
Attn: Keats A. Pullen, Jr.

1 Commanding Officer
U. S. Army Ballistics Research Lab.
Aberdeen Proving Ground
Aberdeen, Maryland 21005
Attn: George C. Francis, Computing Lab.

1 Commandant
U. S. Army Air Defense School
P. O. Box 9390
Fort Bliss, Texas 79916
Attn: Missile Sciences Div., C&S Dept.

1 Commanding General
U. S. Army Missile Command
Redstone Arsenal, Alabama 35809
Attn: Technical Library

1 Commanding General
Frankford Arsenal
Philadelphia, Pa. 19137
Attn: SMUFA-1310 (Dr. Sidney Ross)

1 Commanding General
Frankford Arsenal
Philadelphia, Pa. 19137
Attn: SMUFA-1300

1 U. S. Army Munitions Command
Picatinney Arsenal
Dover, New Jersey 07801
Attn: Technical Information Branch

1 Commanding Officer
Harry Diamond Laboratories
Connecticut Ave. & Van Ness St., N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20438
Attn: Mr. Berthold Altman

1 Commanding Officer
Harry Diamond Laboratories
Attn: Library
Connecticut Ave. & Van Ness St., N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20438

1 Commanding Officer
U. S. Army Security Agency
Arlington Hall
Arlington, Virginia 22212

1 Commanding Officer
U. S. Army Limited War Laboratory
Aberdeen Proving Ground
Aberdeen, Maryland 21005
Attn: Technical Director

1 Commanding Officer
Human Engineering Laboratories
Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland 21005

1 Director
U. S. Army EngineerGeodesy. Intelligence
and Mapping, Research & Devel. Agency
Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060

1 Commandant
U. S. Army Command and General
Staff College
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas 66207
Attn: Secretary

1 Dr. H. Robl, Deputy Director
U. S. Army Research Office (Durham)
Box CM, Duke Station
Durham, North Carolina 27706

1 Commanding Officer
U. S. Army Research Office (Durham)
P. O. Box CM, Duke Station
Durham, North Carolina 27706
Attn: CRD-AA-IP (Richard O. Ulsh)

1 Commanding General
U. S. Army Electronics Command
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703
Attn: AMSEL-SC

1 Director
U. S. Army Electronics Laboratories
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703
Attn: Dr. S. Benedict Levin, Director
Institute for Exploratory Research

1 Director
U. S. Army Electronics Laboratories
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703
Attn: Mr. Robert O. Parker, Executive
Secretary, JSTAC (AMSEL-RD-X)

1 Superintendent
U. S. Military Academy
West Point, New York 10996

1 The Walter Reed Institute of Research
Walter Reed Army Medical Center
Washington, D. C. 20012

1 Director
U. S. Army Electronics Laboratories
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703
Attn: AMSEL-RD-DR

1 Director
U. S. Army Electronics Laboratories
Attn: AMSEL-RD-X
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703

1 Director
U. S. Army Electronics Laboratories
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703
Attn: AMSEL-RD-XE

1 Director
U. S. Army Electronics Laboratories
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703
Attn: AMSEL-RD-XC

1 Director
U. S. Army Electronics Laboratories
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703
Attn: AMSEL-RD-XS

1 Director
U. S. Army Electronics Laboratories
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703
Attn: AMSEL-RD-NR

1 Director
U. S. Army Electronics Laboratories
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703
Attn: AMSEL-RD-NE

1 Director
U. S. Army Electronics Laboratories
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703
Attn: AMSEL-RD-NO

1 Director
U. S. Army Electronics Laboratories
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703
Attn: AMSEL-RD-NP

1 Director
U. S. Army Electronics Laboratories
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703
Attn: AMSEL-RD-SA

1 Director
U. S. Army Electronics Laboratories
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703
Attn: AMSEL-RD-SE

1 Director
U. S. Army Electronics Laboratories
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703
Attn: AMSEL-RD-SR

1 Director
U. S. Army Electronics Laboratories
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703
Attn: AMSEL-RD-SS

1 Director
U. S. Army Electronics Laboratories
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703
Attn: AMSEL-RD-PE

1 Director
U. S. Army Electronics Laboratories
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703
Attn: AMSEL-RD-PF

1 Director
U. S. Army Electronics Laboratories
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703
Attn: AMSEL-RD-PR

1 Director
U. S. Army Electronics Laboratories
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703
Attn: AMSEL-RL-GF

1 Director
U. S. Army Electronics Laboratories
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703
Attn: AMSEL-RD-ADT

1 Director
U. S. Army Electronics Laboratories
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703
Attn: AMSEL-RD-FU#1

1 Commanding Officer
U. S. Army Electronics R&D Activity
Fort Huachuca, Arizona 85163

1 Commanding Officer
U. S. Army Engineers R&D Laboratory
Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060
Attn: STINFO Branch

1 Commanding Officer
U. S. Army Electronics R&D Activity
White Sands Missile Range
New Mexico 88002

1 Director
Human Resources Research Office
The George Washington University
300 N. Washington Street
Alexandria, Virginia

1 Commanding Officer
U. S. Army Personnel Research Office
Washington 25, D. C.

1 Commanding Officer
U. S. Army Medical Research Laboratory
Fort Knox, Kentucky

1 Commanding General
U. S. Army Signal Center and School
Attn: Chief, Office of Academic
Operations
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703

2 Dr. Richard H. Wilcox, Code 437
Department of the Navy
Washington, D. C. 20360

1 Chief, Bureau of Weapons
Attn: Technical Library, DL1-3
Department of the Navy
Washington, D. C. 20360

1 Chief, Bureau of Ships
Department of the Navy
Washington, D. C. 20360
Attn: Code 680

1 Chief, Bureau of Ships
Department of the Navy
Washington, D. C. 20360
Attn: Code 732

1 Commander
U. S. Naval Air Development Center
Johnsville, Pennsylvania
Attn: NADC Library

1 Commanding Officer
Naval Electronics Laboratory
San Diego, California 92052
Attn: Code 2222(Library)

1 Commanding Officer
Naval Electronics Laboratory
San Diego, California 92052
Attn: Code 2800, C. S. Manning

1 Commanding Officer and Director
(Code 142 Library)
David W. Taylor Model Basin
Washington, D. C. 20007

6 Director
Naval Research Laboratory
Washington, D. C. 20390
Attn: Technical Information Office
(Code 2000)

1 Commanding Officer
Office of Naval Research Branch Office
219 S. Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604

1 Chief of Naval Operations
Department of the Navy
Washington, D. C. 20350
Attn: OP-07T

1 Chief of Naval Operations
Department of the Navy
Washington, D. C. 20350
Attn: OP-03EG

1 Commanding Officer
Office of Naval Research Branch Office
1000 Geary Street
San Francisco, California 94109

1 Commanding Officer
U. S. Naval Weapons Laboratory
Asst. Director for Computation
Dahlgren, Virginia 22448
Attn: G. H. Gleissner (Code K-4)

1 Inspector of Naval Material
Bureau of Ships Technical Representative
1902 West Minnehaha Avenue
St. Paul 4, Minnesota

5 Lt. Col. E. T. Gaines, SREE
Chief, Electronics Division
Directorate of Engineering Sciences
Air Force Office of Scientific Research
Washington, D. C. 20333

1 Director of Science & Technology
Deputy Chief of Staff (R & D)
USAF
Washington, D. C.
Attn: AFRST-EL/GU

1 Director of Science & Technology
Deputy Chief of Staff (R & D)
USAF
Washington, D. C.
Attn: AFRST-SC

1 Karl M. Fuechsel
Electronics Division
Director of Engineering Sciences
Air Force Office of Scientific Research
Washington, D. C. 20333

1 Lt. Col. Edwin M. Myers
Headquarters, USAF (AFRDR)
Washington 25, D. C.

1 Director, Air University Library
Maxwell Air Force Base
Alabama 36112
Attn: CR-4803a

1 Commander
Research & Technology Division
AFSC (Mr. Robert L. Feik)
Office of the Scientific Director
Bolling AFB 25, D. C.

1 Commander
Research & Technology Division
Office of the Scientific Director
Bolling AFB 25, D. C.
Attn: RTHR

1 Commander
Air Force Cambridge Research Laboratories
Attn: Research Library
CRMXL-R
L. G. Hanscom Field
Bedford, Massachusetts 01731

1 Dr. Lloyd Hollingsworth
AFCRL
L. G. Hanscom Field
Bedford, Massachusetts 01731

1 Commander
Air Force Cambridge Research Laboratories
Attn: Data Sciences Lab
(Lt. S. J. Kahne, CRB)
L. G. Hanscom Field
Bedford, Massachusetts 01731

1 Commander
Air Force Systems Command
Office of the Chief Scientist
(Mr. A. G. Wimer)
Andrews AFB, Maryland 20331

1 Commander
Air Force Missile Development Center
Attn: MDSGO/Major Harold Wheeler, Jr.
Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico

1 Commander
Research & Technology Division
Attn: MAYT (Mr. Evans)
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base
Ohio 45433

1 Directorate of Systems Dynamics Analysis
Aeronautical Systems Division
Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio 45433

1 Hqs. Aeronautical Systems Division
AF Systems Command
Attn: Navigation & Guidance Laboratory
Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio 45433

1 Commander
Rome Air Development Center
Attn: Documents Library, RAALD
Griffiss Air Force Base
Rome, New York 13442

1 Commander
Rome Air Development Center
Attn: RAWI-Major W. H. Harris
Griffiss Air Force Base
Rome, New York 13442

1 Lincoln Laboratory
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
P. O. Box 73
Lexington 73, Massachusetts
Attn: Library A-082

Distribution list as of March 1, 1965 (Cont'd.)

1   Lincoln Laboratory
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
P. O. Box 73
Lexington 73, Massachusetts
Attn: Dr. Robert Kingston

1   APGC (PGAPI)
Eglin Air Force Base
Florida

1   Mr. Alan Barnum
Rome Air Development Center
Griffiss Air Force Base
Rome, New York 13442

1   Director
Research Laboratory of Electronics
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

1   Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn
55 Johnson Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201
Attn: Mr. Jerome Fox
       Research Coordinator

1   Director
Columbia Radiation Laboratory
Columbia University
538 West 120th Street
New York, New York 10027

1   Director
Coordinated Science Laboratory
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61803

1   Director
Stanford Electronics Laboratories
Stanford University
Stanford, California

1   Director
Electronics Research Laboratory
University of California
Berkeley 4, California

1   Professor A. A. Dougal, Director
Laboratories for Electronics and Related
   Science Research
University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712

1   Professor J. K. Aggarwal
Department of Electrical Engineering
University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712

1   Director of Engineering & Applied Physics
210 Pierce Hall
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

1   Capt. Paul Johnson (USN Ret.)
National Aeronautics & Space Agency
1520 H. Street, N. W.
Washington 25, D. C.

1   NASA Headquarters
Office of Applications
400 Maryland Avenue, S.Q.
Washington 25, D. C.
Attn: Code FC Mr. A. M. Greg Andrus

1   National Bureau of Standards
Research Information Center and Advisory
   Serv. on Info. Processing
Data Processing Systems Division
Washington 25, D. C.

1   Dr. Wallace Sinaiko
Institute for Defense Analyses
Research & Eng. Support Div.
1666 Connecticut Avenue, N. W.
Washington 9, D. C.

1   Data Processing Systems Division
National Bureau of Standards
Conn. at Van Ness
Room 239, Bldg. 10
Washington 25, D. C.
Attn: A. K. Smilow

1   Exchange and Gift Division
The Library of Congress
Washington 25, D. C.

1   Dr. Alan T. Waterman, Director
National Science Foundation
Washington 25, D. C.

1   H. E. Cochran
Oak Ridge National Laboratory
P. O. Box X
Oak Ridge, Tennessee

1   U. S. Atomic Energy Commission
Office of Technical Information Extension
P. O. Box 62
Oak Ridge, Tennessee

1   Mr. G. D. Watson
Defense Research Member
Canadian Joint Staff
2450 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W.
Washington 8, D. C.

1   Martin Company
P. O. Box 5837
Orlando, Florida
Attn: Engineering Library MP-30

1   Laboratories for Applied Sciences
University of Chicago
6220 South Drexel
Chicago, Illinois 60637

1   Librarian
School of Electrical Engineering
Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana

1   Donald L. Epley
Dept. of Electrical Engineering
State University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

1   Instrumentation Laboratory
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
68 Albany Street
Cambridge 39, Massachusetts
Attn: Library WI-109

1   Sylvania Electric Products, Inc.
Electronics System
Waltham Labs. Library
100 First Avenue
Waltham 54, Massachusetts

2   Hughes Aircraft Company
Centinela and Teale Streets
Culver City, California
Attn: K. C. Rosenberg, Supervisor
       Company Technical Document Center

3   Autonetics
9150 East Imperial Highway
Downey, California
Attn: Tech. Library, 3041-11

1   Dr. Arnold T. Nordsieck
General Motors Corporation
Defense Research Laboratories
6767 Hollister Avenue
Goleta, California

1   University of California
Lawrence Radiation Laboratory
P. O. Box 808
Livermore, California

1   Mr. Thomas L. Hartwick
Aerospace Corporation
P. O. Box 95085
Los Angeles 45, California

1   Lt. Col. Willard Levin
Aerospace Corporation
P. O. Box 95085
Los Angeles 45, California

1   Sylvania Electronic Systems-West
Electronic Defense Laboratories
P. O. Box 205
Mountain View, California
Attn: Documents Center

1   Varian Associates
611 Hansen Way
Palo Alto, California 94303
Attn: Tech. Library

1   Huston Denslow
Library Supervisor
Jet Propulsion Laboratory
California Institute of Technology
Pasadena, California

1   Professor Nicholas George
California Institute of Technology
Electrical Engineering Department
Pasadena, California

1   Space Technology Labs., Inc.
One Space Park
Redondo Beach, California
Attn: Acquisitions Group
STL Technical Library

1   The Rand Corporation
1700 Main Street
Santa Monica, California
Attn: Library

1   Miss F. Cloak
Radio Corp. of America
RCA Laboratories
David Sarnoff Research Center
Princeton, New Jersey

1   Mr. A. A. Lundstrom
Bell Telephone Laboratories
Room 2E-127
Whippany Road
Whippany, New Jersey

1   Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory, Inc.
4455 Genesee Street
Buffalo 21, New York
Attn: J. P. Desmond, Librarian

1   Sperry Gyroscope Company
Marine Division Library
155 Glenn Cove Road
Carle Place, L. I., New York
Attn: Miss Barbara Judd

1   Library
Light Military Electronics Dept.
General Electric Company
Armament & Control Products Section
Johnson City, New York

1   Dr. E. Howard Holt
Director
Plasma Research Laboratory
Rennselaer Polytechnic Institute
Troy, New York

1   Battele-DEFENDER
Battelle Memorial Institute
505 King Avenue
Columbus 1, Ohio

1   Laboratory for Electroscience Research
New York University
University Heights
Bronx 53, New York

1   National Physical Laboratory
Teddington, Middlesex
England
Attn: Dr. A. M. Uttley, Superintendent,
       Autonomics Division

1   Dr. Lee Huff
Behavioral Sciences
Advanced Research Projects Agency
The Pentagon (Room 3E175)
Washington, D. C. 20301

1   Dr. Glenn L. Bryan
Head, Personnel and Training Branch
Office of Naval Research
Navy Department
Washington, D. C. 20360

1   Instituto de Fisica Aplicado
"L. Torres Quevedo"
High Vacuum Laboratory
Madrid, Spain
Attn: Jose L. de Segovia

1   Stanford Research Institute
Attn: G-037 External Reports
       (for J. Goldberg)
Menlo Park, California 94025

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA R&D

(Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall report is classified)

1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author)	2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION
University of Illinois Coordinated Science Laboratory Urbana, Illinois 61803	Unclassified 2b. GROUP

3. REPORT TITLE

THE PSEUDO-SHOCK: A NON-LINEAR PROBLEM OF TRANSLATIONAL RELAXATION

4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates)

5. AUTHOR(S) (Last name, first name, initial)

Hicks, B. L.

6. REPORT DATE June, 1965	7a TOTAL NO. OF PAGES 31	7b. NO. OF REFS. 13
8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO. DA 28 043 AMC 00073(E) b. PROJECT NO. 20014501B31F d.	9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) R-236 9b. OTHER REPORT NO(S) (Any other numbers that may be assigned this report)	

10. AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES

Qualified requesters may obtain copies of this report from DDC. DDC release to OTS is authorized.

11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY U. S. Army Electronics Labs. Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703

13. ABSTRACT

The Boltzmann equation has been solved by Nordsieck's Monte Carlo method for the case of translational relaxation of a gas of elastic spheres whose initial velocity distribution function has the form

$$f(v,0) = \frac{1}{2}\{\exp[-\pi(v-iu)^2] + \exp[-\pi(v+iu)^2]\} \ .$$

The Mach number

$$M = (6\pi/5)^{\frac{1}{2}}u$$

describes the relative separation of the two peaks of the bimodal distribution function and therefore controls the degree of initial departure from equilibrium. Calculations have been made for M = 0.5, 1, 2, 4, and 6, which includes a range of initial conditions from very close to very far from thermal equilibrium.

In the early part of the translational relaxation we find that relaxation by a factor of e^{-1} requires, on the average, 1.27±0.044 collisions for the lateral temperature and 0.80±0.033 collisions for the Boltzmann function H. The temperature relaxation rate is thus smaller by a factor of 1.58 ±0.120 than the entropy relaxation rate. (The uncertainties are stated as 90% confidence limits.) These collision numbers are essentially independent of M and time, at least until each molecule has made about ten collisions.

DD FORM 1473
1 JAN 64

KEY WORDS	LINK A		LINK B		LINK C	
	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT
Boltzmann equation Monte Carlo translational relaxation pseudo-shock Krook model Mach number Temperature relaxation rate Entropy relaxation rate collision numbering						

INSTRUCTIONS

1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY: Enter the name and address of the contractor, subcontractor, grantee, Department of Defense activity or other organization (corporate author) issuing the report.

2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION: Enter the overall security classification of the report. Indicate whether "Restricted Data" is included. Marking is to be in accordance with appropriate security regulations.

2b. GROUP: Automatic downgrading is specified in DoD Directive 5200.10 and Armed Forces Industrial Manual. Enter the group number. Also, when applicable, show that optional markings have been used for Group 3 and Group 4 as authorized.

3. REPORT TITLE: Enter the complete report title in all capital letters. Titles in all cases should be unclassified. If a meaningful title cannot be selected without classification, show title classification in all capitals in parenthesis immediately following the title.

4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES: If appropriate, enter the type of report, e.g., interim, progress, summary, annual, or final. Give the inclusive dates when a specific reporting period is covered.

5. AUTHOR(S): Enter the name(s) of author(s) as shown on or in the report. Enter last name, first name, middle initial. If military, show rank and branch of service. The name of the principal author is an absolute minimum requirement.

6. REPORT DATE: Enter the date of the report as day, month, year; or month, year. If more than one date appears on the report, use date of publication.

7a. TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES: The total page count should follow normal pagination procedures, i.e., enter the number of pages containing information.

7b. NUMBER OF REFERENCES: Enter the total number of references cited in the report.

8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER: If appropriate, enter the applicable number of the contract or grant under which the report was written.

8b, 8c, & 8d. PROJECT NUMBER: Enter the appropriate military department identification, such as project number, subproject number, system numbers, task number, etc.

9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S): Enter the official report number by which the document will be identified and controlled by the originating activity. This number must be unique to this report.

9b. OTHER REPORT NUMBER(S): If the report has been assigned any other report numbers (either by the originator or by the sponsor), also enter this number(s).

10. AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES: Enter any limitations on further dissemination of the report, other than those imposed by security classification, using standard statements such as:

   (1) "Qualified requesters may obtain copies of this report from DDC."

   (2) "Foreign announcement and dissemination of this report by DDC is not authorized."

   (3) "U. S. Government agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified DDC users shall request through

                                ."

   (4) "U. S. military agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified users shall request through

                                ."

   (5) "All distribution of this report is controlled. Qualified DDC users shall request through

                                ."

If the report has been furnished to the Office of Technical Services, Department of Commerce, for sale to the public, indicate this fact and enter the price, if known.

11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES: Use for additional explanatory notes.

12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY: Enter the name of the departmental project office or laboratory sponsoring (paying for) the research and development. Include address.

13. ABSTRACT: Enter an abstract giving a brief and factual summary of the document indicative of the report, even though it may also appear elsewhere in the body of the technical report. If additional space is required, a continuation sheet shall be attached.

It is highly desirable that the abstract of classified reports be unclassified. Each paragraph of the abstract shall end with an indication of the military security classification of the information in the paragraph, represented as (TS), (S), (C), or (U).

There is no limitation on the length of the abstract. However, the suggested length is from 150 to 225 words.

14. KEY WORDS: Key words are technically meaningful terms or short phrases that characterize a report and may be used as index entries for cataloging the report. Key words must be selected so that no security classification is required. Identifiers, such as equipment model designation, trade name, military project code name, geographic location, may be used as key words but will be followed by an indication of technical context. The assignment of links, roles, and weights is optional.

DD FORM **1473**
1 JAN 64

Abstract (continued)

Our calculations agree with earlier, more qualitative results in the literature that correspond to different initial conditions. We have also shown that in a Krook model of our relaxation process, the ratio of the two collision numbers is somewhat smaller than two late in the relaxation and, as shown also by Offerhaus, approaches two asymptotically.

Solution of the Boltzmann equation for any other reasonable initial conditions could be obtained with the same Monte Carlo program. For example, the relaxation of the asymmetric bi-modal distribution functions used by Mott-Smith to describe shock wave structure could be studied.