



COMITETUL DE STAT PENTRU ENERGIA NUCLEARA
INSTITUTUL DE FIZICA ATOMICA

CRD-60 1975

THREE NUMERICAL METHODS FOR THE COMPUTATION
OF THE ELECTROSTATIC ENERGY

D.N.Poenaru and D. Galeriu

Bucharest - ROMANIA

THREE NUMERICAL METHODS FOR THE COMPUTATION
OF THE ELECTROSTATIC ENERGY

D.N.Poenaru and D.Galeriu, Institute for
Atomic Physics, Bucharest,
Romania

Abstract

The FORTRAN programs for computation of the electrostatic energy of a body with axial symmetry by Lawrence, Hill-Wheeler and Beringer methods are presented in detail. The accuracy, time of computation and the required memory of those methods are tested at various deformations for two simple parametrisations: two overlapping, identical spheres and a spheroid. On this basis the field of application of each method is recommended.

1. Introduction

In the liquid drop model of fission, the deformation energy is composed from the surface energy and the electrostatic (Coulomb) energy of an uniformly charged drop with sharp surface.

Generally speaking, the surface energy is not difficult to compute, but the Coulomb energy, E_c , is defined as a six-fold integral [1-4]:

$$E_c = \rho_e^2 \iiint \iiint \frac{d\vec{r}_1 d\vec{r}_2}{|\vec{r}_1 - \vec{r}_2|} \quad (1)$$

where ρ_e is the volume density of the electric charge..

One prefers to find the ratio of this quantity to the electrostatic energy E_{c_0} of a sphere with radius R_0 and the same volume. It is known that:

$$E_{c_0} = \frac{3q^2}{5R_0} = 16\pi^2 R_0^5 \rho_e^2 / 15 \quad (2)$$

By definition

$$B_c \equiv E_c / E_{c_0} = \frac{15}{16\pi^2 R_c^5} \iiint \iiint \frac{d\vec{r}_1 d\vec{r}_2}{|\vec{r}_1 - \vec{r}_2|} \quad (3)$$

In this work we will confine only to the shapes possessing axial and reflexion symmetry.

2. Three methods of computation.

Usually the eq.(3) can not be integrated analytically, and the numerical integration of a six-fold integral with the required accuracy (4 or 5 significant digits) is very time consuming. For these reasons, some methods were developed in order to decrease the problem complexity. For shapes with axial symmetry, three of these methods are frequently used, namely:

1^o Lawrence method [5], in which B_c is expressed as a three fold integral;

2^o Hill-Wheeler method [6], in which B_c is a two fold integral;

3^o Beringer method [7], in which B_c formula contains only a sum of terms.

These methods are based on the fact that the electrostatic energy of a drop can be calculated in terms of the self energies and the interaction energies of the smaller parts the body was divided into.

The relationships for B_c in the three cases mentioned before, are given by the following (4), (5) and respectively

(9) eqs.:

$$B_c = 120 \left(\frac{z^2 - z'}{2R_c} \right) \int_0^1 \int_0^1 z dz \int_0^1 \int_0^1 dy \int_0^1 \frac{\sin^2(\kappa w) dw}{z(y) + [z^2(y)^2 + \rho_1^2 + \rho_2^2 - 2\rho_1\rho_2 \cos(\kappa w)]^{1/2}} \quad (4)$$

where $(z''-z')$ is the drop length along the symmetry axis, $\rho_1 = \rho_1(z)$ is the surface equation in cylindrical coordinates, with ρ_1 and z so normalised that the intersection of the surface with the symmetry axis is 0 and 1, $\rho_2 = \rho_2(z, y)$.

$$B_c = \frac{3}{8\pi} \left(\frac{z''-z'}{2R_0} \right)^5 \int_{-1}^1 dx \left[\rho^2(x) - \frac{x}{2} \frac{\partial \rho^2(x)}{\partial x} \right] \cdot \int_{-1}^1 dy \left\{ E(a, k) + \left[\rho_1^2(y) - \rho^2 + (x-y) \left(\frac{\partial \rho_1^2}{\partial y} - (x-y) \right) \right] F(a, k) \right\} \quad (5)$$

where $\rho = \rho(x)$ is the surface eq. in cylindrical coordinates, having the intersection with the symmetry axis -1 and +1; $\rho_1 = \rho_1(y)$ and:

$$E(a, k) = a \mathcal{E}(k) \quad ; \quad F(a, k) = \mathcal{F}(k) / a \quad (6)$$

in which \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{F} are the elliptic integrals of first and second kind:

$$\mathcal{E}(k) = \int_0^{\pi/2} (1 - k^2 \sin^2 t)^{-1/2} dt \quad ; \quad \mathcal{F}(k) = \int_0^{\pi/2} (1 - k^2 \sin^2 t)^{1/2} dt \quad (7)$$

of argument

$$k = (2\sqrt{\rho\rho_1}/a) < 1 \quad ; \quad a^2 = (x-y)^2 + (\rho + \rho_1)^2 \quad (8)$$

when $x = y$ it follows that $\rho = \rho_1$, $k = 1$ and we get an indetermination of the type $0 \cdot \infty$ in the function to be integrated in eq. (5), because $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \infty$ in this case. This indetermination is removed, making \mathcal{E} finite quantity.

In the Beringer method [7], the drop is divided into N slices of the same thickness Δ , and each slice is replaced by one cylinder with the height Δ and the radius ρ_c (derived from the condition that the two equivalent bodies have the same volume). In this case B_c is calculated with the relationship:

$$E_c = \Delta^2 (E^S + 3.75 E^{int}) ; \Delta = \frac{z''-z'}{N} \quad (9)$$

where E^S is proportional to the sum of self energies of small cylinders, which due to the reflexion symmetry can be computed with the following formula:

$$E^S = 2 \sum_{i=1}^m E_{i,i}^S + E_{m+1}^S ; m = (N-1)/2 ; N - \text{odd} \quad (10)$$

where $E_{i,i}^S$ is approximated by a semiempirical relationship:

$$E_{i,i}^S = \rho_{e_i}^3 \left\{ 0.79577472 + \frac{\Delta}{\rho_{e_i} \rho_{e_{i+1}}} \left[\frac{\Delta}{\rho_{e_i}} (0.10883945 - 0.04851281 \ln \frac{\Delta}{\rho_{e_i}}) - 0.3125 \right] \right\} \quad (11)$$

with which we get errors smaller than $5 \cdot 10^{-5}$ if $(\Delta/\rho_{e_i}) < 0.5$ [7]

E^{int} is proportional to the sum of interaction energies between cylinders. Due to the reflexion symmetry, we have

$$E^{int} = \sum_{i=1}^m \left(2 \sum_{j=i+1}^{m+1} E_{ij}^{int} + \sum_{j=m+2}^N E_{ij}^{int} \right) \quad (12)$$

where

$$E_{ij}^{int} = \rho_{e_i}^3 \left\{ \rho_{e_j}^2 \left[(1+k_{ij}^2)^{1/2} - k_{ij} \right] 0.5 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} C_{2n} P_{2n}(0) \frac{g_{ij}^{2n}}{(1+k_{ij}^2)^{2n}} \left[\frac{g_{ij}^2}{2n+2} - \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. - \frac{n}{6} \left(\frac{\Delta}{\rho_{e_i}} \right)^2 \right] (1+k_{ij}^2)^{1/2} F(-n, -n+1, 1/2 ; -k_{ij}^2) \right\} \quad (13)$$

and

$$g_{ij} = (\rho_{e_j} / \rho_{e_i}) < 1 ; k_{ij} = (j-i) \Delta / \rho_{e_i} \quad (14)$$

The terms C_{2n} and $P_{2n}(0)$ are determined by using the relationships:

$$C_{2n} = \frac{(2n-1)!!}{2^n n!} = \frac{(2n-1)!!}{2^n n!}, \quad F_{2n}(0) = \frac{1-2n}{2n} P_{2(n-1)}(0) \quad (15)$$

$$C_0 = F_{00} = 1$$

and the hypergeometric series F is calculated with the relationship:

$$F = 1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^{n-1} \frac{T_{\ell}}{\ell} \quad ; \quad \frac{T_{\ell}}{\ell} = k_{\ell} \frac{(n-\ell+1)(\ell-n)}{(\ell-0.5)\ell} \frac{T_{\ell-1}}{\ell-1} \quad ; \quad T_0 = 1 \quad (16)$$

The integrals from the eqs.(4) and (5) are calculated numerically by using Gauss-Legendre method, which for example, in the case of eq.(4) leads to a relationship of the following form:

$$\int_0^1 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 dx dy dz G(x,y,z) = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^p w_i}{\prod_{j=1}^p \prod_{k=1}^p w_j w_k} G(x_i, x_j, x_k) \quad (27)$$

where the abscissae $\{x_i\}$ and the weighting factors $\{w_i\}$ for various number of points, p, are tabulated in ref. [8]. A similar relationship is used for the eq.(5) in which IBM subroutines allow to compute the elliptic integrals. The listing of the FORTRAN programs are given at the end.

3. Application for two connected spheres and for a spheroid.

Two parametrisations of the nuclear shape were selected for checking the methods, namely: two overlapping spheres (with a cusp) and the spheroid which allows to obtain very elongated shapes.

3.1. Two identical connected spheres (precision) with radius R and the separation of centers $2z_1$. We have for the Lawrence method

$$S_1^2(z) = \begin{cases} z^2 (a_2 - z) & , z \leq 0.5 \\ (1-2z)(a_2 - 1+z) & , 0.5 < z \leq 1 \end{cases} ; \quad a_2 = \frac{R}{R+z_1} \quad (18)$$

$$\frac{z_1^3 - z_1^2}{2R_0} = \frac{\bar{R} + z_1}{\bar{R}_0} \quad (19)$$

in which for a given z_1 , R is found from the condition of volume conservation:

$$2\bar{R}^3 + 3z_1\bar{R}^2 - z_1^3 = 2\bar{R}_0^3 \quad (20)$$

The quantities of interest for the Hill-Wheeler method have the following expressions:

$$\rho^2(x) = \begin{cases} a_z^2 - (x + \beta_1)^2, & x < 0 \\ a_z^2 - (x - \beta_1)^2, & x \geq 0 \end{cases}, \quad \beta_1 = \frac{z_1}{R + z_1} \quad (21)$$

$$\frac{\partial \rho^2(x)}{\partial x} = -2 \begin{cases} (x + \beta_1), & x < 0 \\ (x - \beta_1), & x \geq 0 \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

For the Beringer method we have:

$$\rho_{c_i}^2 = \Delta [r(2i-1) - \Delta(i^2 - i + 1/3)] \quad (23)$$

$$\rho_{c_{m+1}}^2 = \Delta [rN + \beta_1(1-N) - \Delta/6] / 2; \quad m = (N-1)/2 \quad (24)$$

$$\Delta = 2(r + \beta_1)/N; \quad r = R/R_0; \quad \beta_1 = z_1/R_0 \quad (25)$$

3.2. Spheroid with the ratio of semiaxis $d = c/a > 1$. The condition of volume conservation leads to

$$a^2c = R_0^3 \quad (26)$$

and the above formulae became:

$$\rho_1^2(z) = z(1-z)/d^2 ; \frac{z''-z'}{2R_0} = \frac{c}{R_0} = d^{2/3} \quad (27)$$

$$\rho^2(x) = (1-x)(1+x)/d^2 ; \frac{\partial \rho^2}{\partial x} = -2x/d^2 \quad (28)$$

$$\rho_{ci}^2 = \frac{\Delta}{d} \left\{ (2v-1)d^{-1/3} - \frac{\Delta}{d} [i(i-1) + 1/3] \right\}; \Delta = 2d^{2/3}N^{-1} \quad (29)$$

The analytical relationships [9] for the spheroid

$$B_c = \frac{1}{2e} (1-e^2)^{3/2} \ln \left(\frac{1+e}{1-e} \right) \quad (30)$$

where

$$e = \sqrt{1-d^{-2}} \quad (31)$$

allows us to check the methods at various deformations.

For every shape, the number of divisions, N, can be estimated from the condition $(\Delta / \rho_{ci}) \leq 0.5$, or

$$\rho_{ci}^2 / \Delta^2 \geq 4 \quad (32)$$

By substituting in this relationship the eqs.(24)-(26) for two overlapped identical spheres, we obtain

$$\frac{\rho_{ci}^2}{\Delta^2} = \frac{rN}{r+z_1} (i-0.5) - i^2 + i - 1/3 \geq 4 \quad (33)$$

$$\frac{\rho_{c_{m+1}}^2}{\Delta^2} = \frac{rN^2}{4(r+z_1)} + \frac{(1-N)Nz_1}{4(r+z_1)} - \frac{1}{12} \geq 4 \quad (34)$$

and one can see that the most severe condition (for two tangent spheres $r = z_1 = 2^{-1/3}$) is $N \geq 32$ following from the eq.(34).

In the case of a spheroid, from eqs. (29) and (32)

we have

$$\frac{\delta_{c_1}^4}{\Delta^2} = \frac{1}{\alpha^2} [(0.05)N - (11.1) - (1/2) - (1/2)] = + \quad (35)$$

and for $i = 1$, we get

$$N \geq 8\alpha^2 + 213 \quad (36)$$

In this way, for very elongated shapes (for example $\alpha = 10$)

$$N \geq 3001$$

4. Results and concluding remarks.

The order of magnitude of B_{c0} for actinide nuclei is 1000 keV, and consequently in order to reach an accuracy of 100 keV, the maximum bound of error for B_c must be lower than 10^{-4} .

By analyzing the results presented in tables 1 and 2, we can see that each of the three methods has some advantages, either from the accuracy - or from the computation speed point of view.

As it was expected, the error for Lawrence and Hill-Wheeler method rises very sharply with deformation. This is due to the fact that the approximation of the nuclear surface by a p-order polynomial is better for the sphere and is less suitable when the deformation increases. In this way, for two connected spheres, it was not possible to obtain an error lower than 10^{-4} with none of these two methods, even by using Hill-Wheeler method with 64×64 integration points.

It is important to point out that by using Cardan formula it was necessary to solve the eq.(20) (condition of volume conservation for two overlapping spheres) in double precision, even for simple precision calculations.

Generally speaking, for the same number of integration points, in double precision computations the Lawrence method is more accurate than the Hill-Wheeler method, but this accuracy is payed for by an increase of the computation time. The difference between the errors for the two methods is very pronounced in the case of the spheroid (see table 2).

The Beringer method allows us to obtain an error independent of deformation, but for the undistorted sphere, the error is higher than for the two preceding cases. Also for very elongated shapes, this method requires very high number of division points.

Therefore, for very distorted shapes, with cusp, but for which the ratio Δ/ξ_i preserves small value with a reasonable number of division points N , the Beringer method is most suitable one, especially when various accuracies are needed.

For small deformations, very accurate is the Lawrence method, but for moderate precision the Hill-Wheeler method is more convenient due to its lower computation time. Only the Hill-Wheeler method [2,3] was generalized for shapes without axial symmetry.

Concerning the memory places, the order of predilection of the three methods is: Lawrence, Hill-Wheeler and Beringer. The differences between the first and second methods are not very high, the total memory being in the range 18 - 21 k. We have used two versions of the Beringer method: one, which is resumed in the table 1, requesting only 22 k memory places, and the improved version listed at the end, with which we performed the calculations given in table 2. The high core memory needed for the latter version is about 50 k.

The authors are very indebted to Mr. M. Rizea for useful discussions and to Mrs. M. Marinascu for english correction of the text.

Table 2 Comparison of different methods of computation of the electrostatic energy for a spheroid

Ratio of semiaxes $r=c/a$			1.	1.2	2.	4.	8.	10.	Computation time		Total memory (bytes)
			$(B_c)_{\text{exact}}$	1.0000000	.9970360	.9579759	.8457310	.6976366	.6481190	$\frac{E - C_{\text{max}}}{C}$ (sec)	
p	Method	$E = (B_c)_{\text{exact}} - B_c$									
Simple precision	24	L ^(M)	$2 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$6 \cdot 10^{-4}$	10^{-3}	$8 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$6 \cdot 10^{-4}$	10^{-3}	48.33	37.39	17687
		H-W ^(M)	$4 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$4 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$2 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$-8 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$-6 \cdot 10^{-4}$	-10^{-3}	17.33	5.06	19871
	32	L	$4 \cdot 10^{-3}$	10^{-3}	$3 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$2 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$2 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$2 \cdot 10^{-3}$	98.5	87.98	17875
		H-W	$5 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$5 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$2 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$2 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$-2 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$-4 \cdot 10^{-4}$	20.83	8.26	19871
Double precision	24	L	10^{-7}	$2 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$2 \cdot 10^{-7}$	10^{-6}	$4 \cdot 10^{-7}$	10^{-6}	73.33	62.29	18479
		H-W	$7 \cdot 10^{-6}$	10^{-5}	-10^{-5}	-10^{-4}	$-5 \cdot 10^{-4}$	-10^{-3}	19.67	7.94	19743
	32	L	10^{-7}	$2 \cdot 10^{-7}$	10^{-7}	$2 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$2 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$2 \cdot 10^{-7}$	158.33	147.08	18735
		H-W	$3 \cdot 10^{-6}$	$2 \cdot 10^{-6}$	$-5 \cdot 10^{-6}$	$-5 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$-3 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$-5 \cdot 10^{-4}$	25.5	13.67	19743
	64	H-W	$4 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$3 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$-5 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$-6 \cdot 10^{-6}$	$-3 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$-6 \cdot 10^{-5}$	66.17	54.63	20599
	Var.	B	$0 \cdot 10^{-4}$	10^{-3}	10^{-4}						49631
		17	21	65							

^(M) Number of division points

MAIN LAWRENCE

RFAL*8 HC,AZ,X,Y,WI,WJ,ZO,R13,D
RFAL*8 ZIV(6)/70.000,0.0500,0.100,0.200,0.400,0.7900/
RFAL*8 AZV(6)/70.101,0.9512497330722500,0.90499562573766300,
1 0.81992476645142800,0.67873397996933300,0.500/
REAL*8 ZV(6)/0.101,0.10256354099747301,0.10525831128982401,
1 0.11106592360160701,0.12450740976646601,0.15874010519682001/
REAL*8 XN(32),WN(32)
COMMON /F/ AZ

COMPUTES (DOUBLE PRECISION) THE ELECTROSTATIC ENERGY 'BC' OF TWO
SYMMETRICAL SPHERES (PRECISION) BY USING THE LAWRENCE METHOD IN
CONNECTION WITH 32*32*32 POINTS GAUSS-LEGENDRE QUADRATURE. 'AZ'=
R/(R+Z1).

R13=0.101/10.301)
ZIV(6)=0.201**(-R13)

HALF OF THE 32 INTEGRATION POINTS AND WEIGHTS

XN(1)=.52415383284386915800
XN(2)=.5722359807913982500
XN(3)=0.6196436811260685400
XN(4)=0.6659343011410639200
XN(5)=0.7106756380653176700
XN(6)=0.7534499544661147000
XN(7)=0.7938578786203811600
XN(8)=0.8315221334651076000
XN(9)=0.8660910593701448400
XN(10)=0.8972418979839712000
XN(11)=0.9246838068662849900
XN(12)=0.948160577883026000
XN(13)=0.967453037968869000
XN(14)=0.9823811277937532200
XN(15)=0.4928057557726341700
XN(16)=0.9986319309247407800
WN(1)=0.482700442573639000-1
WN(2)=0.478193600396374300-1
WN(3)=0.469221995404022830-1
WN(4)=0.455869393478819420-1
WN(5)=0.438260465022019060-1
WN(6)=0.416559621134733780-1
WN(7)=0.390969478935351530-1
WN(8)=0.361728970544242530-1
WN(9)=0.329111113881809230-1
WN(10)=0.293420467392677740-1
WN(11)=0.254990296311880880-1
WN(12)=0.21417949011133400-1
WN(13)=0.171373314565107170-1
WN(14)=0.126960326546310300-1
WN(15)=0.81371973654528350-2
WN(16)=0.350930500473504830-2

THE OTHER POINTS CALCULATED BY PROPERTIES OF SYMMETRY

KI=16
KK=KI+KI
KI=KI+1
KJ=KK+1
DO 3 IJ=KI1,KK
IJ=KJ-11
WN(IJ)=WN(IJ)
XN(IJ)=0.101-XN(IJ)
DO 1 L=1,6
O=ZIV(L)
AZ=AZV(L)
ZO=ZV(L)

NUMERICAL INTEGRATION (GAUSS-LEGENDRE)

BC=0.000
DO 2 I=1,32
X=XN(I)
WJ=WN(I)
DO 2 J=1,32
Y=XN(J)
WJ=WN(J)
DO 2 K=1,32
BC=BC+WJ*WJ*WN(K)*FCTRR(X,Y,XN(K))
BC=0.1203*BC*(Z0**0.501)
WRITE(1,4)D,BC,ZO,AZ
FORMAT(1H,4025.15)
1 CONTINUE

C
C

FD

SUBROUTINE FD(X,F,DF)
IMPLICIT REAL*8(A-H,O-Z)
COMMON /F/R2

C
C
C

THIS SUBROUTINE IS CALLED BY 'GFUNC'. COMPUTES THE FUNCTION 'F'=R0**2
AND THE DERIVATIVE 'DF'=-D(R0**2)/DX IN THE CASE OF A SPHEROID

F=(O.1D1-X*X)/R2
DF=-[X*X]/R2
RETURN
END

C
C
C
C

DATA

32

0.0243507926634244	0.0486909570091397
0.072993121787799	0.0485754674415034
0.1214628192961205	0.0483447622344029
0.1696444204239928	0.0479993885964583
0.2174736437400071	0.0475401657148303
0.2646871622087674	0.04696818281671
0.311322871990211	0.0462847965813144
.3572401583376681	.0454916279274181
0.4022701579639916	0.0445905581637566
0.4463660172534641	0.0435837245293934
0.489403145707053	0.0424735151236536
0.5312794640198945	0.0412625632426235
0.571895646202634	0.0399537411327203
0.6111533551723932	0.0385501531786156
.6489654712546573	.03705512854024
0.6852363130542332	0.0354722132568824
0.7198818501716108	0.0338051618371416
0.7528199072605319	0.0320579283548515
0.7839723589433614	0.0302346570724025
0.8132653151227976	0.0283396726142595
0.8406292962525804	0.0263774697150547
0.8659993981540928	0.0243527025687109
0.8893154459951141	0.0222701738083832
0.9105221370785028	0.0201348231535302
0.9295691721319396	0.0179517157756973
0.9464113748584028	0.0157260304760247
0.9610087996520537	0.0134630478967186
0.9733268277899110	0.0111681394601311
J.9833362538846260	0.0088467508263639
0.9910133714767443	0.0065044579689784
0.9963401167719553	0.0041470332605625
0.9993050417357721	0.0017832807216964

MAIN BERINGE

IMPLICIT REAL*(A-H,I-Z)
DIMENSION RC(801),RC2(801),CPI(200)

DOUBLE PRECISION
COMPUTES THE ELECTROSTATIC ENERGY E_{TOT} OF A SPHEROID BY USING
BERINGER METHOD. $Z1=C/A$
THE VOLUME IS DIVIDED IN M CYLINDERS WITH THE SAME HEIGHT H

DO 70 JJ=1,6
READ(1,100)Z1
FORMAT(D8.1)

100

COMPUTATION OF THE SMALL CYLINDER RADIUS R_{C1} FROM THE CONDITION OF
VOLUME CONSERVATION. THE NUCLER SHAPE IS INTRODUCED ONLY IN THESE
QUANTITIES.

ZN=71+Z1
ZN=7N*ZN
N=IDINT(ZN)
N=N*N
N=N+N+1
IF(N.GT.801)N=801
M=(N-1)/2
M1=M+1
N1=N+1
AN=DFLOAT(N)
WRITE(3,400)N
FORMAT(IH,'N=',I4)
Z13=Z1*(1.00/3.03)
Z23=Z13*Z13
D=Z23/AN
D=D*D
DR=D/Z1
D2=D*D
C1=DR/Z13
C2=DR*DR
DO 30 J=1,M
A1=DFLOAT(J)
A11=A1-1.
N1=N1-J
RC2(J)=C1*(A1+A11)-C2*(A1*A11+0.3333333333333333D)
RC(J)=DSQRT(RC2(J))
RC2(N1)=RC2(J)
RC(N1)=RC(J)
30 RC2(M1)=1.00/Z23-C2/1.20
RC(M1)=DSQRT(RC2(M1))

400

30

E_{E1} IS PROPORTIONAL TO THE SELF ENERGY OF THE CYLINDER $E1$.

E1=0.40D
DO J=1,M
X=D/RC(J)
E1=E1+RC2(J)*RC(J)*(0.795774710D+X*(X*(0.108839450D -
1 0.048517810D*DELOG(X))-0.31250D))
CONTINUE
X=D/RC(M1)

1

FI=(E1+E1*RC2(I)*RC(I))*LOG(X)*(X*10.1098394500 -
 0.0485128100*LOG(X))-0.212500)

COMPUTES THE COEFFICIENTS CP(I)

CP(I)=-0.2500
 CI=CP(I)
 DO 10 I=2,200
 AA=DFLOAT(I)
 P=0.500/AA
 P1=P+P
 P=P-0.101
 CI=CI*P*(P+P1)
 CP(I)=CI
 CONTINUE

'CIJ' IS PROPORTIONAL TO THE INTERACTION BETWEEN CILINDERS 'I' AND 'J'
 'AK'=KIJ. 'G'=GIJ. 'K' IS THE SUMMATION INDEX.

EIJ=0.000
 DO 20 I=1,M
 I1=I+1
 DO 20 J=1,N
 AJ=DFLOAT(J-I)
 IF(RC(I1)-RC(J))2,2,3
 X1=D/RC(J)
 G=RC(I1)/RC(J)
 R1=RC(J)*RC2(J)
 GO TO 4
 X1=D/RC(I1)
 G=RC(J)/RC(I1)
 R1=RC(I1)*RC2(I1)
 AK=AJ*X1
 AK2=AK*AK
 AB=X1*X1/6.00
 AK21=1.000+AK2
 AK22=AK21*AK21
 SK=DSORT(AK21)
 G2=G*G
 AK22=0.101/AK22
 S=0.000
 K=1
 A2K=0.101
 G2K=0.101
 B=K
 B1=B+B
 G2K=G2K*G2
 A2K=A2K*AK22
 T=CP(K)*G2K*A2K
 SP=G2/(R1*2.000)-B*AB
 X=T*SP
 F=X
 IF(K.EQ.1) GO TO 222
 P=X
 K1=K-1
 DO 111 L=1,K1
 O=DFLOAT(L)
 PL=O-B
 P=(P/((O-0.500)*Q))+AK2*(0.101-BL)*BL
 ABP=DABS(P)
 IF(ABP.LT.(1.00-B*DABS(F))) GO TO 222
 F=F+P

111

```

222 S=S+F
      IF (DABS(F)-1.00-7*DABS(S)) 333,333,444
334 IF (K-200) 13,14,14
13 K=K+1
      GO TO 444
14 WRITE(3,200) F,S,I,J
200 FORMAT(1H ,*K=200*,5A,2D) 5.7,21+1
333 S=S*SK
11 RR=(S+0.500*0.2*(SK-AK))*R1
      IF (J.GT.M1) GO TO 22
      RB=RB+RB
22 EIJ=EIJ+RB
20 CONTINUE
      EIJ=3.7500*EIJ
      BC=0.2*(FI+EIJ)
200 WRITE(3,300) Z1,BC,II,EIJ,02,1
70 FORMAT(1H ,5D) 5.7,15)
      CONTINUE
      STOP
      END

```

REFERENCES

- / 1 / M.Brack, J.Damgaard, A.S.Jensen, H.C.Pauli, V.M.Strutinsky, C.Y.Wong, Rev.Mod.Phys. 44, 2, 320, 1972.
- / 2 / J.R.Nix, Ann.Rev. of Nucl.Sci., 22, 1972.
- / 3 / H.C.Pauli, Physics Reports 70, 2, 1973.
- / 4 / T.Johansson, S.G.Nilsson, Z.Szymansky, Annales de Physique 5, 6, 377, 1970.
- / 5 / J.N.P.Lawrence, Phys.Rev. 139, 5B, B1227, 1965.
- / 6 / D.L.Hill, J.A.Wheeler, Phys.Rev. 89, 5, 1102, 1953.
- / 7 / R.Berlinger, Phys.Rev. 131, 4, 1402, 1963.
- / 8 / M.Abramowitz, I.A.Stegun, Handbook of Mathematical Functions, Dover Publications Inc., New York, 1970
- / 9 / W.J.Swiatecki, Peaceful uses of Atomic Energy, Geneva, 15, 248, 1958.
- / 10 / D.Galeriu, D.N.Poenaru, Rev.Roum.Phys.- to be published.