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#### Abstract

The work presented in this paper is related to the development of entropy stable and positivity preserving Discontinuous Galerkin (DG) methods as a computational scheme for Boltzmann - Poisson (BP) systems modeling the probability distribution function of electronic transport along energy bands in semiconductor crystal lattices. We pose, using curvilinear coordinates in momentum space (that represent spherical or energy-angular variables), the corresponding Vlasov - Boltzmann equation with a linear collision operator with a singular measure, modeling the scattering mechanisms as functions of the energy band, i.e. the appropriate model of hot electron transport in nano scale devices.

We show stability results of semi-discrete DG schemes under an entropy norm for 1D in position (2D in momentum) and 2 D in position (with 3 D in momentum) as well, using the dissipative properties of the collisional operator given its entropy inequality. The entropy inequality we use depends on an exponential of the whole Hamiltonian dynamics rather than the Maxwellian associated just to the kinetic energy. For the 1D problem, knowledge of the analytic solution to the Poisson equation and of the convergence to a constant current is crucial to obtain full stability, i.e. the decrease of the entropy norm ( $L_{2}$ weighted by $e^{H}$ ) over time. For the 2D problem, specular reflection boundary conditions are considered in addition to periodicity in the estimate for stability under an entropy norm.

Regarding the proofs of positivity preservation in the DG scheme for the problem of 1D in position, inspired by the strategy in [15], 16] used in [5] and [6], we treat the collision operator as a source term and find convex combinations of the transport and collision terms which guarantee the positivity of the cell average of our numerical probability density function at the next time step. The positivity of the numerical solution to the probability density function in the whole domain is guaranteed by applying the limiters in [15, [16] that preserve the cell average but modify the slope of the piecewise linear solutions in order to make the function non - negative. The use of a spherical coordinate system whose radial component is the momentum magnitude $\vec{p}(|\vec{p}|, \mu=\cos \theta, \varphi)$ is slightly different to the choice in previous DG solvers for BP, since the proposed DG formulation gives simpler integrals involving just piecewise polynomial functions for both transport and collision terms, which is more adequate for Gaussian quadrature than previous approaches.


## 1 Introduction

The Boltzmann - Poisson system is a model for electron transport in semiconductors that represents the balance of transport and collision phenomena in the $(\vec{x}, \vec{p})$ position-momentum phase space for electrons in the conduction band,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial_{t} f+\partial_{\vec{x}} f \cdot \partial_{\vec{p}} \varepsilon(\vec{p})+\partial_{\vec{p}} f \cdot q \partial_{x} \Phi(\vec{x}, t)=Q(f)=\int_{\Omega_{\vec{p}}} S\left(\vec{p}^{\prime} \rightarrow \vec{p}\right) f^{\prime} d \vec{p}^{\prime}-f \int_{\Omega_{\vec{p}}} S\left(\vec{p} \rightarrow \vec{p}^{\prime}\right) d \vec{p}^{\prime} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\partial_{\vec{x}} \cdot\left(\epsilon \partial_{\vec{x}} \Phi\right)(\vec{x}, t)=q\left[N(\vec{x})-\int_{\Omega_{\vec{p}}} f(\vec{x}, \vec{p}, t) d \vec{p}\right], \quad \vec{E}(\vec{x}, t)=-\partial_{\vec{x}} \Phi(\vec{x}, t) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

The momentum variable is $\vec{p}=\hbar \vec{k}, \vec{k}$ is the crystal momentum wave vector, $\varepsilon(\vec{p})$ is the conduction energy band structure for electrons in the semiconductor, $f(\vec{x}, \vec{p}, t)$ is the probability density function (pdf) in the phase space for electrons in the conduction band at a given time, $\vec{v}(\vec{p})=\partial_{\vec{p}} \varepsilon(\vec{p})$ is the quantum mechanical electron group velocity, $q$ is the positive electric charge of a proton, $\Phi(\vec{x}, t)$ is the electric potential (we assume that the only force over the electrons is the self-consistent electric field, and that it is given by the negative gradient of the electric potential), $\epsilon$ is the permittivity of the material, $N(\vec{x})$ is the doping background (assumed fixed) in the semiconductor material, and $S\left(\vec{p}^{\prime} \rightarrow \vec{p}\right)$ is the scattering kernel that defines the gain and loss operators whose difference gives the collision integral operator $Q(f)$. We will assume in this work a linear collision operator, which is valid in the regime of low electron density, as the enforcement of the Pauli exclusion principle in this case via the collision operator structure is not needed.

For many quantum collision mechanisms, such as in semiconductors, the scattering kernel $S\left(\vec{p}^{\prime} \rightarrow\right.$ $\vec{p}$ ) depends on the difference $\varepsilon(\vec{p})-\varepsilon\left(\vec{p}^{\prime}\right)$, as in collision operators of the form $\delta\left(\varepsilon(\vec{p})-\varepsilon\left(\vec{p}^{\prime}\right)+l \hbar w_{p}\right)$ for electron - phonon collisions. This form is related to the energy conservation given by Planck's law, in which the jump in energy from one state to another is balanced with the energy of a phonon. The mathematical consequence of this is that we can obtain much simpler expressions for the integration of the collision operator if we express the momentum in curvilinear coordinates that involve the energy $\varepsilon(\vec{p})$ as one of the variables [10], [2], [3, [4, 11]. The other two momentum coordinates could be either an orthogonal system in the level set of energies, orthogonal to the energy gradient itself, or angular coordinates which are known to be orthogonal to the energy in the limit of low energies close to a local conduction band minimum, such as $(\mu, \varphi)$, the cosine of the polar angle and the azimuthal angle, respectively.
This gives both physical and mathematical motivations to pose the Boltzmann Equation for semiconductors in curvilinear coordinates for the momentum $\vec{p}\left(p_{1}, p_{2}, p_{3}\right)=\hbar \vec{k}\left(k_{1}, k_{2}, k_{3}\right)$, to later on choose a particular case of curvilinear coordinates such as $(\varepsilon, \mu, \varphi)$. We will assume in the rest of this paper that our system of curvilinear coordinates for the momentum is orthogonal. This happens in particular for the case $(\varepsilon, \mu, \varphi)$ in which $\varepsilon(|\vec{p}|)$ is a monotone increasing function, so this set of coordinates is equivalent to the spherical coordinate representation $(|\vec{p}|, \mu, \varphi)$ for the momentum.
The Boltzmann Equation for semiconductors (and more general forms of linear collisional plasma models as well) can be written in orthogonal curvilinear coordinates $\vec{p}\left(p_{1}, p_{2}, p_{3}\right)$ for the momentum $\vec{p}=\left(p_{x}, p_{y}, p_{z}\right)$ as

$$
\begin{gather*}
\partial_{t} f J+\partial_{\vec{x}} \cdot(J f \vec{v})+q\left[\partial_{p_{1}}\left(\frac{J f \partial_{\vec{x}} \Phi \cdot \hat{e}_{p_{1}}}{h_{1}}\right)+\partial_{p_{2}}\left(\frac{J f \partial_{\vec{x}} \Phi \cdot \hat{e}_{p_{2}}}{h_{2}}\right)+\partial_{p_{3}}\left(\frac{J f \partial_{\vec{x}} \Phi \cdot \hat{e}_{p_{3}}}{h_{3}}\right)\right]=C(f)  \tag{3}\\
C(f)=J Q(f)=J \int_{\Omega_{\vec{p}}} S\left(\vec{p}^{\prime} \rightarrow \vec{p}\right) J^{\prime} f^{\prime} d p_{1}^{\prime} d p_{2}^{\prime} d p_{3}^{\prime}-J f \int_{\Omega_{\vec{p}}} S\left(\vec{p} \rightarrow \vec{p}^{\prime}\right) J^{\prime} d p_{1}^{\prime} d p_{2}^{\prime} d p_{3}^{\prime} \tag{4}
\end{gather*}
$$

with $h_{j}=\left|\frac{\partial \vec{p}}{\partial p_{j}}\right|, j=1,2,3, h_{1} h_{2} h_{3}=J=\frac{\partial \vec{p}}{\partial\left(p_{1}, p_{2}, p_{3}\right)}$ the jacobian determinant of the transformation, $J^{\prime}=\frac{\partial \vec{p}^{\prime}}{\partial\left(p_{1}^{\prime}, p_{2}^{\prime}, p_{3}^{\prime}\right)}$, and $\hat{e}_{j}$ the unitary vectors associated to each curvilinear coordinate $p_{j}$ at the point $\left(p_{1}, p_{2}, p_{3}\right)$.
We notice that we have expressed the Boltzmann Eq. in divergence form with respect to the momentum curvilinear coordinates. We can write it even more compactly as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial_{t}(J f)+\partial_{\vec{x}} \cdot(J f \vec{v}(\vec{p}))+\sum_{j=1}^{3} \partial_{p_{j}}\left(J f \frac{q \partial_{\vec{x}} \Phi(\vec{x}, t) \cdot \hat{e}_{p_{j}}}{h_{j}}\right)=C(f) \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $J \geq 0$, we can interpret $J f\left(\vec{x}, p_{1}, p_{2}, p_{3}, t\right)$ as a probability density function in the phase space $\left(\vec{x}, p_{1}, p_{2}, p_{3}\right)$. This Boltzmann Eq. is a general form for orthogonal curvilinear momentum coordinates, from which previous energy-angular and spherical coordinate systems (such as in [4] and [12]) can be derived. For the spherical one in [12], the orthogonal curvilinear system is $(r, \mu, \varphi)$, with $r \propto k^{2}$, which is proportional to the energy in the limit as $|k| \rightarrow 0$, approaching the conduction band local minimum. The energy-angular one in [4] is $(w, \mu, \varphi)$, with $w \propto \varepsilon$, under the assumption that $\varepsilon(|p|)$ is a Kane band model.

The numerical method we will study in this work in connection to our Boltzmann-Poisson system is the Discontinuous Galerkin (DG) Finite Element Method (FEM), to be explained in Section 3. It was proposed by Reed and Hill [13] for hyperbolic equations in the context of neutron transport. It is defined such that its numerics captures the mathematics of the hyperbolic transport by defining the so-called fluxes in such a way that the information propagates numerically in the same fashion as a hyperbolic equation propagates information analytically. In the particular context of electron collisional transport in semiconductors, the DG method has been used in works such as [4, 12, 11] after an evolution of the numerical methods used to solve it that transitioned from Upwind Finite Differences [10] to WENO schemes [2], [3] and finally to mainly two schools, one related to the aforementioned development on DG methods for Boltzmann-Poisson, and the other related to Spherical Harmonics Expansions, for which a good overview can be found in [14]. There is a particular kind of DG methods called Positivity Preserving (PPDG), which is designed to preserve the positivity of the functions that are the unknown to be solved for, usually having the interpretation of densities needed to be non-negative, such as fluid densities or probability density functions. These positivity preserving DG methods were developed by Zhang and Shu [15], [16]. The main idea is that, given an initial condition which is positive, the PPDG method is such that after a time iteration the cell averages are preserved to be positive and, if the function is negative for a given region, a limiter is applied in the interval(s) of interest modifying the slope in such a way that after the modification the function is non-negative in the interval(s). It was designed in the context of the compressible Euler equations for fluids. Later works have incorporated this idea in different application contexts. Work related to our current problem was developed first in [5] for linear Vlasov - Boltzmann collisional transport equations in cartesian coordinates under quadratically confined electrostatic potentials, where the Boltzmann collision operator was linear (with bounded scattering functions), and later in [6] for a conservative phase space collisionless advection of neutral particles in curvilinear coordinates.

On the other hand, regarding works on entropy dissipation laws and stability under entropy norms for Boltzmann semiconductor models, analytical results have been obtained, for example, by [17], where moment closure hierarchies were studied for the Boltzmann-Poisson equation, getting an $f \log f$ type entropy dissipation law. We would also like to mention the work on [18] that studies the relative entropies for kinetic equations in bounded domains, obtaining results on irreversibility, stationary solutions, and uniqueness. Regarding specifically numerical works on this kind of problems, [19] studies the semiconductor Boltzmann equation based on spherical harmonics expansions and entropy discretizations. The convergence of numerical moment methods for linear kinetic equations was studied in [20]. A mixed spectral-difference method for the steady state BoltzmannPoisson system is presented in [21]. DG discretizations of first-order systems of conservation laws derivable as moments of the Boltzmann equation with Levermore closure were considered in [22] using standard energy analysis techniques; the problem does not include acceleration terms as no force field is considered. We should also mention the work in [23], where a high order DG scheme for solving nonlinear Fokker-Planck equations with a gradient flow structure was proposed, and it was shown to satisfy a discrete entropy dissipation law and to preserve steady-states, enforcing the positivity of the numerical solutions in the algorithm.

Our current work extends the contributions above mentioned by studying a Boltzmann-Poisson sys-
tem for collisional electronic transport in which the momentum is studied in curvilinear coordinates determined by the energy band structure appearing both in the transport and the electron-phonon collision operator. The latter models the discrete energy jumps with a Dirac delta distribution scattering term, which is clearly not a smooth bounded function and therefore more complex than previous collision operators studied in the context of entropy stable and positivity preserving DG methods for collisional electron transport. We study semi discrete stability properties (under an entropy norm) of the DG method for the Boltzmann - Poisson problem by means of the (semidiscrete) Hamiltonian energy functional, where, without loss of generality, we assume a suitable discretization for the Poisson equation, yielding an accurate mass preserving approximation for both the electrostatic potential and corresponding electric field, and later we present the proof of positivity preservation for the DG scheme for BP in the usual $L_{2}$ (Jacobian weighted) norm. For the positivity preserving work, we introduce the 3 D (1D in position, 2 D in momentum) plus time problem that we will focus on, a diode under symmetry assumptions in the momentum space.
The type of approximations and numerical schemes implementations for the Poisson part of the Boltzmann-Poisson system (with the Boltzmann part in the usual $L_{2}$ Jacobian weighted norm, without enforcing the preservation of positivity), have been studied in [12, 11]. Our contribution is to show the stability of a DG scheme under an entropy norm for the Boltzmann-Poisson system with curvilinear momentum (the Boltzmann part using an $L_{2}$ norm weighted not only by the Jacobian but in addition by the exponential of the Hamiltonian) that incorporates the full time dependent Hamiltonian, in the corresponding curvilinear coordinates, obtaining a stability result that gives certain control over $\partial_{t} f$ for the two dimensional position domain (and 3D in momentum) problem with specular reflection and periodic boundary conditions, and for the one dimensional space domain problem (with two dimensional momentum under symmetry assumptions) a full stability result, meaning specifically the decay of the entropy norm over time, using the knowledge of the convergence to a constant current in the limit of this time evolution problem and the solution to the Poisson problem in 1D.

## 2 Stability of DG schemes under entropy norms: 3D \& 5D plus time problems and general problem for orthogonal curvilinear momentum coordinates

### 2.1 1Dx-2Dp Diode Symmetric Problem

In the particular case of a 1D silicon diode problem, the main collision mechanisms are electronphonon scatterings

$$
\begin{equation*}
S\left(\vec{p}^{\prime} \rightarrow \vec{p}\right)=\sum_{j=-1}^{+1} c_{j} \delta\left(\varepsilon\left(\vec{p}^{\prime}\right)-\varepsilon(\vec{p})+j \hbar \omega\right), \quad c_{1}=\left(n_{p h}+1\right) K, c_{-1}=n_{p h} K \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $\omega$ the phonon frequency, assumed constant, and $n_{p h}=n_{p h}(\omega)$ the phonon density. $K, c_{0}$ are constants.
If we assume that the energy band just depends on the momentum norm, $\varepsilon(p), \quad p=|\vec{p}|$, and that the initial condition for the pdf has azimuthal symmetry, $\left.f\right|_{t=0}=f_{0}(x, p, \mu, t), \partial_{\varphi} f_{0}=0, \quad \vec{p}=$ $p\left(\mu, \sqrt{1-\mu^{2}} \cos \varphi, \sqrt{1-\mu^{2}} \sin \varphi\right)$, then the dimensionality of the problem is reduced to $3 \mathrm{D}+$ time, that is, 1D in $x$ and 2D in $(p, \mu)$. Then, the BP system for $f(x, p, \mu, t)$ and $\Phi(x, t)$ is written in spherical coordinates $\vec{p}(p, \mu, \varphi)$ for the momentum as

$$
\begin{gather*}
\partial_{t} f+\partial_{x}\left(f \partial_{p} \varepsilon \mu\right)+\left[\frac{\partial_{p}\left(p^{2} f \mu\right)}{p^{2}}+\frac{\partial_{\mu}\left(f\left(1-\mu^{2}\right)\right)}{p}\right] q \partial_{x} \Phi(x, t)=Q(f)  \tag{7}\\
-\partial_{x}^{2} \Phi=\frac{q}{\epsilon}\left[N(x)-2 \pi \int_{-1}^{+1} \int_{0}^{p_{\max }} f p^{2} d p d \mu,\right], \quad \Phi(0)=0, \Phi(L)=\Phi_{0} \tag{8}
\end{gather*}
$$

recalling that the charge density is given by

$$
\rho(x, t)=2 \pi \int_{-1}^{+1} \int_{0}^{p_{\max }} f(x, p, \mu, t) p^{2} d p d \mu .
$$

We have assumed that the permittivity $\epsilon$ is constant. The Poisson BVP with Dirichlet BC in 1D above has an analytic integral solution for $\Phi(x, t)$ and for $E(x, t)=-\partial_{x} \Phi(x, t)$ as well, which can be projected in the appropriate spaces for our numerical method. The solution is given by the integral formula (10]

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \Phi(x, t)=\left[\Phi_{0}+\frac{q}{\epsilon} \int_{0}^{L}\left[N\left(x^{\prime}\right)-\rho\left(t, x^{\prime}\right)\right]\left(L-x^{\prime}\right) d x^{\prime}\right] \frac{x}{L}-\frac{q}{\epsilon} \int_{0}^{x}\left[N\left(x^{\prime}\right)-\rho\left(t, x^{\prime}\right)\right]\left(x-x^{\prime}\right) d x^{\prime}, \\
& E(x, t)=-\left(\frac{\Phi_{0}}{L}+\frac{q}{\epsilon} \frac{1}{L} \int_{0}^{L}\left[N\left(x^{\prime}\right)-\rho\left(t, x^{\prime}\right)\right]\left(L-x^{\prime}\right) d x^{\prime}-\frac{q}{\epsilon} \int_{0}^{x}\left[N\left(x^{\prime}\right)-\rho\left(t, x^{\prime}\right)\right] d x^{\prime}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, in this 1D problem we only need to concern ourselves with the Boltzmann Equation, since given the electron density we know the solution for the potential and electric field in Poisson.

The collision operator in this problem has the form

$$
\begin{aligned}
& Q(f)=2 \pi\left[\left.\sum_{j=-1}^{+1} c_{j} \int_{-1}^{+1} d \mu^{\prime} f\left(x, p\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right), \mu^{\prime}\right) p^{2}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) \frac{d p^{\prime}}{d \varepsilon^{\prime}}\right|_{\varepsilon^{\prime}=\varepsilon(p)+j \hbar \omega} \chi(\varepsilon(p)+j \hbar \omega)\right. \\
& \left.-\left.f(x, p, \mu, t) \sum_{j=-1}^{+1} c_{j} 2 p^{2}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) \frac{d p^{\prime}}{d \varepsilon^{\prime}}\right|_{\varepsilon^{\prime}=\varepsilon(p)-j \hbar \omega} \chi(\varepsilon(p)-j \hbar \omega)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\chi(\varepsilon)$ is 1 if $\varepsilon \in\left[0, \varepsilon_{\max }\right]$ and 0 if $\varepsilon \notin\left[0, \varepsilon_{\max }\right]$, with $\varepsilon_{\max }=\varepsilon\left(p_{\max }\right)$.
The domain of the BP problem is $x \in[0, L], p \in\left[0, p_{\max }\right], \mu \in[-1,+1], t>0$.
Moreover, since $\varepsilon(p)$, then $\partial_{\vec{p}} \varepsilon=\frac{d \varepsilon}{d p} \hat{p}$. We assume that $\frac{d \varepsilon}{d p}>0$ is well behaved enough such that $p(\varepsilon)$ is a monotonic function for which $\frac{d p}{d \varepsilon}=\left(\frac{d \varepsilon}{d p}\right)^{-1}$ exists.
The collision frequency is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\nu(\varepsilon(p))=\left.\sum_{j=-1}^{+1} c_{j} 4 \pi \chi(\varepsilon(p)-j \hbar \omega) p^{2}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) \frac{d p^{\prime}}{d \varepsilon^{\prime}}\right|_{\varepsilon^{\prime}=\varepsilon(p)-j \hbar \omega}=\sum_{j=-1}^{+1} c_{j} n(\varepsilon(p)-j \hbar \omega) \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
n(\varepsilon(p)-j \hbar \omega)=\int_{\Omega_{\vec{p}}} \delta\left(\varepsilon\left(\vec{p}^{\prime}\right)-\varepsilon(\vec{p})+j \hbar \omega\right) d \vec{p}^{\prime} \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

is the density of states with energy $\varepsilon(p)-j \hbar \omega$.

### 2.1.1 DG scheme for Boltzmann-Poisson 1Dx-2Dp Problem

We start by writing the weak Form of the Transformed Boltzmann Eq.
Since for $f(x, p, \mu), g(x, p, \mu)$ we have that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\Omega_{x}} \int_{\Omega_{\vec{p}}} f g d \vec{p} d x=2 \pi \int_{\Omega_{x}} \int_{\Omega_{(p, \mu)}} f g p^{2} d p d \mu d x \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

we define our inner product of two functions $f$ and $g$ in the ( $x, p, \mu$ ) space as

$$
\begin{equation*}
(f, g)_{X \times K}=\int_{X} \int_{K} f g p^{2} d p d \mu d x \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $X \subset[0, L]$ and $K \subset\left[0, p_{\max }\right] \times[-1,+1]$.
The Boltzmann Equation for our problem can be written in weak form as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\partial_{t} f, g\right)_{\Omega}+\left(\partial_{x}\left(f \partial_{p} \varepsilon \mu\right), g\right)_{\Omega}+\left(\left[\frac{\partial_{p}\left(p^{2} f \mu\right)}{p^{2}}+\frac{\partial_{\mu}\left(f\left(1-\mu^{2}\right)\right)}{p}\right] q \partial_{x} \Phi(x, t), g\right)_{\Omega}=(Q(f), g)_{\Omega} \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\Omega=X \times K$. More specifically, we have that (assuming $\partial_{t} g=0$ )

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \partial_{t} \int_{\Omega} f g p^{2} d p d \mu d x+\int_{\Omega} \partial_{x}\left(f \partial_{p} \varepsilon \mu\right) g p^{2} d p d \mu d x \\
+ & \int_{\Omega} \partial_{p}\left(p^{2} f \mu\right) q \partial_{x} \Phi(x, t) g d p d \mu d x+\int_{\Omega} \partial_{\mu}\left(f\left(1-\mu^{2}\right)\right) q \partial_{x} \Phi(x, t) g p d p d \mu d x \\
= & \int_{\Omega} Q(f) g p^{2} d p d \mu d x
\end{aligned}
$$

We define now the DG-FEM Formulation for the Transformed Boltzmann Eq. in the $(x, p, \mu)$ domain. We will use the following mesh in the domain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Omega_{i k m}=X_{i} \times K_{k, m}=\left[x_{i^{-}}, x_{i^{+}}\right] \times\left[p_{k^{-}}, p_{k^{+}}\right] \times\left[\mu_{m^{-}}, \mu_{m^{+}}\right] \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{i^{ \pm}}=x_{i \pm 1 / 2}, \quad p_{k^{ \pm}}=p_{k \pm 1 / 2}, \quad \mu_{m^{ \pm}}=\mu_{m \pm 1 / 2} \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

We define the following notation for the internal product in our problem using the above mentioned mesh,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{i k m} f g p^{2} d p d \mu d x=(f, g)_{\Omega_{i k m}} \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

The semi-discrete Discontinuous Galerkin Formulation for our transformed Boltzmann Equation in curvilinear coordinates is to find $f_{h} \in V_{h}^{k}$ such that $\forall g_{h} \in V_{h}^{k}$ and $\forall \Omega_{i k m}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\partial_{t} \int_{i k m} f_{h} g_{h} p^{2} d p d \mu d x & \\
-\int_{i k m} \partial_{p} \varepsilon(p) f_{h} \mu \partial_{x} g_{h} p^{2} d p d \mu d x & \pm\left.\left.\int_{k m} \partial_{p} \varepsilon \widehat{f_{h} \mu}\right|_{x_{i \pm}} g_{h}\right|_{x_{i \pm}} ^{\mp} p^{2} d p d \mu \\
-\int_{i k m} p^{2}(-q E)(x, t) f_{h} \mu \partial_{p} g_{h} d \mu d x & \pm\left.\left.\int_{i m} p_{k \pm}^{2}\left(-q \widehat{E f_{h}} \mu\right)\right|_{p_{k \pm}} g_{h}\right|_{p_{k \pm}} ^{\mp} d \mu d x \\
-\int_{i k m}\left(1-\mu^{2}\right) f_{h}(-q E)(x, t) \partial_{\mu} g_{h} p d p d \mu d x & \pm\left.\left.\int_{i k}\left(1-\mu_{m \pm}^{2}\right)\left(-q \widehat{E f_{h}}\right)\right|_{\mu_{m \pm}} g_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m \pm}} ^{\mp} p d p d x \\
& =\int_{i k m} Q\left(f_{h}\right) g_{h} p^{2} d p d \mu d x
\end{aligned}
$$

The Numerical Flux used is the Upwind Rule. Therefore,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left.\widehat{f_{h} \mu}\right|_{x_{i \pm}} & =\left.\left(\frac{\mu+|\mu|}{2}\right) f_{h}\right|_{x_{i \pm}} ^{-}+\left.\left(\frac{\mu-|\mu|}{2}\right) f_{h}\right|_{x_{i \pm}} ^{+} \\
-\left.q \widehat{E \mu} f_{h}\right|_{p_{k \pm}} & =\left.\left(\frac{-q E \mu+|q E \mu|}{2}\right) f_{h}\right|_{p_{k \pm}} ^{-}+\left.\left(\frac{-q E \mu-|q E \mu|}{2}\right) f_{h}\right|_{p_{k \pm}} ^{+} \\
-\left.\left.q \widehat{E f}\right|_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m \pm}} & =\left.\left(\frac{-q E+|q E|}{2}\right) f_{h}\right|_{\bar{\mu}_{m \pm}} ^{-}+\left.\left(\frac{-q E-|q E|}{2}\right) f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m \pm}} ^{+}
\end{aligned}
$$

### 2.1.2 Stability of DG scheme under entropy norm for Periodic Boundary Conditions

We can prove the stability of the scheme under the entropy norm related to the interior product

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int f_{h} g_{h} e^{H} p^{2} d p d \mu d x \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

inspired in the strategy of Cheng, Gamba, and Proft [5]. These estimates are possible due to the dissipative property of the linear collisional operator applied to the curvilinear representation of the momentum, with the entropy norm related to the function $e^{H(\vec{x}, \vec{p}, t)}=\exp (\varepsilon(\vec{p})-q \Phi(\vec{x}, t))$, which clearly has a Hamiltonian structure generating a divergence free characteristic field for the equations of motion.
Existence and uniqueness as well as regularity of initial- boundary value problems associated to the Vlasov-Boltzmann equation (112) with periodic boundary conditions have been shown by Y. Guo [7, 8] for the non-linear Vlasov Boltzmann Poisson Maxwell system with initial data near a global Maxwellian distribution. It also shows the regularity propagation of the initial behavior; and further, with R. Strain [9], calculated almost exponential decay rates to such Maxwellian equilibrium. Additionally, in the particular case of the initial and boundary value problem, N. Ben-Abdallah and M. Tayeb [1] showed existence and uniqueness of solutions to the linear Vlasov Boltzmann with a continuous in space-time field $E(x, t)$ and non-negative initial and boundary conditions having the same polynomial decay in $L^{1} \cup L^{\infty}$ in one space dimension and higher dimensional phase-space (velocity). Such solution preserves the regularity and decay properties of the initial state. While this result uses low regularity of the integrating characteristic field $E(x, t)$ with non vanishing gradients, it is hoped that higher order Sobolev regularity may propagate for more regular fields, as well as more regular initial and boundary conditions satisfying at least polynomial decay. However we are not aware, at this point, whether such result is available. We also mention that in the same manuscript [1] the authors showed the existence of weak solutions to Boltzmann-Poisson for incoming data with polynomial decay in the case of one phase-space dimension.
Hence, whenever the spatial domain is a rectangle, the assumption of periodic boundary data in $\vec{x}$-space is the most suitable condition for stability of the transport flow along divergence free dynamics by means of entropy methods.
Indeed, for $f_{h} \in V_{h}^{k}$ such that $\forall g_{h} \in V_{h}^{k}$ and $\forall \Omega_{i k m}$

$$
\begin{align*}
\int_{i k m} \partial_{t} f_{h} g_{h} e^{H} p^{2} d p d \mu d x &  \tag{18}\\
-\int_{i k m} \partial_{p} \varepsilon(p) f_{h} \mu \partial_{x}\left(g_{h} e^{H}\right) p^{2} d p d \mu d x & \pm\left.\left.\int_{k m} \partial_{p} \varepsilon \widehat{f_{h} \mu}\right|_{x_{i \pm}} g_{h} e^{H}\right|_{x_{i \pm}} ^{\mp} p^{2} d p d \mu \\
-\int_{i k m} p^{2}(-q E)(x, t) f_{h} \mu \partial_{p}\left(g_{h} e^{H}\right) d \mu d x & \pm\left.\left.\int_{i m} p_{k^{ \pm}}^{2}\left(-q \widehat{E f_{h}} \mu\right)\right|_{p_{k \pm}} g_{h} e^{H}\right|_{p_{k \pm}} ^{\mp} d \mu d x \\
-\int_{i k m}\left(1-\mu^{2}\right) f_{h}(-q E)(x, t) \partial_{\mu}\left(g_{h} e^{H}\right) p d p d \mu d x & \pm\left.\left.\int_{i k}\left(1-\mu_{m \pm}^{2}\right)\left(-q \widehat{E f_{h}}\right)\right|_{\mu_{m \pm}} g_{h} e^{H}\right|_{\mu_{m \pm}} ^{\mp} p d p d x \\
& =\int_{i k m} Q\left(f_{h}\right) g_{h} e^{H} p^{2} d p d \mu d x
\end{align*}
$$

where we are including as a factor the inverse of a Maxwellian along the characteristic flow generated by the Hamiltonian transport field $\left(\partial_{p} \varepsilon(p), q \partial_{x} \Phi(x, t)\right)$

$$
\begin{equation*}
e^{H(x, p, t)}=\exp (\varepsilon(p)-q \Phi(x, t))=\left(e^{q \Phi(x, t)} e^{-\varepsilon(p)}\right)^{-1} \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is an exponential of the Hamiltonian energy, assuming the energy is measured in $K_{B} T$ units. We include this modified inverse Maxwellian factor because we can use some entropy inequalities related to the collision operator. Our collision operator satisfies the dissipative property

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\Omega_{\vec{p}}} Q(f) g d \vec{p}=-\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_{\vec{p}}} S\left(\vec{p}^{\prime} \rightarrow \vec{p}\right) e^{-\varepsilon\left(p^{\prime}\right)}\left(\frac{f^{\prime}}{e^{-\varepsilon\left(p^{\prime}\right)}}-\frac{f}{e^{-\varepsilon(p)}}\right)\left(g^{\prime}-g\right) d \vec{p}^{\prime} d \vec{p} \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

which can be also expressed as (multiplying and dividing by $e^{-q \Phi(x, t)}$ )

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\Omega_{\vec{p}}} Q(f) g d \vec{p}=-\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_{\vec{p}}} S\left(\vec{p}^{\prime} \rightarrow \vec{p}\right) e^{-H^{\prime}}\left(\frac{f^{\prime}}{e^{-H^{\prime}}}-\frac{f}{e^{-H}}\right)\left(g^{\prime}-g\right) d \vec{p}^{\prime} d \vec{p} . \tag{21}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore, if we choose a monotone increasing function $g\left(f / e^{-H}\right)$, namely $g=f / e^{-H}=f e^{H}$, we have an equivalent dissipative property but now with the exponential of the full Hamiltonian

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\Omega_{\vec{p}}} Q(f) \frac{f}{e^{-H}} d \vec{p}=-\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_{\vec{p}}} S\left(\vec{p}^{\prime} \rightarrow \vec{p}\right) e^{-H^{\prime}}\left(\frac{f^{\prime}}{e^{-H^{\prime}}}-\frac{f}{e^{-H}}\right)^{2} d \vec{p}^{\prime} d \vec{p} \leq 0 . \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

So we have found the dissipative entropy inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\Omega_{\vec{p}}} Q(f) f e^{H} p^{2} d p d \mu d \varphi=\int_{\Omega_{\vec{p}}} Q(f) \frac{f}{e^{-H}} d \vec{p} \leq 0 . \tag{23}
\end{equation*}
$$

As a consequence of this entropy inequality we obtain the following stability theorem of the scheme under an entropy norm.

Theorem 2.1 (Stability under the entropy norm $\int f_{h} g_{h} e^{H} p^{2} d p d \mu d x$ for a given periodic potential $\Phi(x, t))$ : Consider the semi-discrete solution $f_{h}$ to the DG formulation in (18) for the BP system in momentum curvilinear coordinates. We have then that

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \geq \int_{\Omega} f_{h} \partial_{t} f_{h} e^{H(x, p, t)} p^{2} d p d \mu d x=\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \partial_{t} f_{h}^{2} e^{H(x, p, t)} p^{2} d p d \mu d x . \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof Choosing $g_{h}=f_{h}$ in (18), and considering the union of all the cells $\Omega_{i k m}$, which gives us the whole domain $\Omega=\Omega_{x} \times \Omega_{p, \mu}$ for integration, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 \geq \int_{\Omega} Q\left(f_{h}\right) f_{h} e^{H} p^{2} d p d \mu d x & =\int_{\Omega} \partial_{t} f_{h} f_{h} e^{H} p^{2} d p d \mu d x \\
-\int_{\Omega} \partial_{p} \varepsilon(p) f_{h} \mu \partial_{x}\left(f_{h} e^{H}\right) p^{2} d p d \mu d x & +\int_{\partial_{x} \Omega} \partial_{p} \varepsilon \widehat{f_{h} \mu} f_{h} e^{H} p^{2} d p d \mu \\
-\int_{\Omega} p^{2}(-q E) f_{h} \mu \partial_{p}\left(f_{h} e^{H}\right) d \mu d x & +\int_{\partial_{p} \Omega} p^{2}\left(-q \widehat{E f_{h}} \mu\right) f_{h} e^{H} d \mu d x \\
-\int_{\Omega}\left(1-\mu^{2}\right) f_{h}(-q E) \partial_{\mu}\left(f_{h} e^{H}\right) p d p d \mu d x & +\int_{\partial_{\mu} \Omega}\left(1-\mu^{2}\right)\left(-q \widehat{E f_{h}}\right) f_{h} e^{H} p d p d x .
\end{aligned}
$$

We can express this in the more compact form

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \geq \int_{\Omega} \partial_{t} f_{h} f_{h} e^{H} p^{2} d p d \mu d x-\int_{\Omega} f_{h} \beta \cdot \partial\left(f_{h} e^{H}\right) d p d \mu d x+\int_{\partial \Omega} \widehat{f_{h}} \beta \cdot \hat{n} f_{h} e^{H} d \sigma, \tag{25}
\end{equation*}
$$

defining the transport vector $\beta$ with the properties

$$
\begin{align*}
\beta & =\left(p^{2} \mu \partial_{p} \varepsilon(p),-q E p^{2} \mu,-q E p\left(1-\mu^{2}\right)\right),  \tag{26}\\
\partial \cdot \beta & =-2 p q E \mu+2 p q E \mu=0, \\
\beta \cdot \partial H & =\left(p^{2} \mu \partial_{p} \varepsilon(p),-q E p^{2} \mu,-q E p\left(1-\mu^{2}\right)\right) \cdot\left(q E, \partial_{p} \varepsilon, 0\right)=0, \quad \partial_{\mu} H=0 .
\end{align*}
$$

We integrate by parts again the transport integrals, obtaining that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Omega} f_{h} \beta \cdot \partial\left(f_{h} e^{H}\right) d p d \mu d x & =-\int_{\Omega} \partial \cdot\left(f_{h} \beta\right) f_{h} e^{H} d p d \mu d x+\int_{\partial \Omega} f_{h} \beta \cdot \hat{n} f_{h} e^{H} d \sigma \\
& =-\int_{\Omega}\left(\beta \cdot \partial f_{h}\right) f_{h} e^{H} d p d \mu d x+\int_{\partial \Omega} f_{h} \beta \cdot \hat{n} f_{h} e^{H} d \sigma,
\end{aligned}
$$

but since

$$
\begin{equation*}
\beta \cdot \partial\left(f_{h} e^{H}\right)=\beta \cdot e^{H} \partial f_{h}+\beta \cdot f_{h} e^{H} \partial H=e^{H} \beta \cdot \partial f_{h} \tag{27}
\end{equation*}
$$

we have then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\Omega} f_{h} \beta \cdot \partial\left(f_{h} e^{H}\right) d p d \mu d x=\int_{\Omega}\left(\beta \cdot \partial f_{h}\right) f_{h} e^{H} d p d \mu d x=\frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial \Omega} f_{h} \beta \cdot \hat{n} f_{h} e^{H} d \sigma \tag{28}
\end{equation*}
$$

We can express our entropy inequality then as

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \geq \int_{\Omega} \partial_{t} f_{h} f_{h} e^{H} p^{2} d p d \mu d x-\frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial \Omega} f_{h} \beta \cdot \hat{n} f_{h} e^{H} d \sigma+\int_{\partial \Omega} \widehat{f}_{h} \beta \cdot \hat{n} f_{h} e^{H} d \sigma \tag{29}
\end{equation*}
$$

remembering that we are integrating over the whole domain by considering the union of all the cells defining our mesh. We distinguish between the boundaries of cells for which $\beta \cdot \hat{n} \geq 0$ and the ones for which $\beta \cdot \hat{n} \leq 0$, defining uniquely the boundaries. Remembering that the upwind flux rule is such that $\hat{f}_{h}=f_{h}^{-}$, we have that the value of the solution inside the cells close to boundaries for which $\beta \cdot \hat{n} \geq 0$ is $f_{h}^{-}$, and for boundaries $\beta \cdot \hat{n} \leq 0$ the value of the solution inside the cell close to that boundary is $f_{h}^{+}$. We have then that

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 & \geq \int_{\Omega} \partial_{t} f_{h} f_{h} e^{H} p^{2} d p d \mu d x-\frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial \Omega} f_{h} \beta \cdot \hat{n} f_{h} e^{H} d \sigma+\int_{\partial \Omega} f_{h}^{-} \beta \cdot \hat{n} f_{h} e^{H} d \sigma \\
0 & \geq \int_{\Omega} \partial_{t} f_{h} f_{h} e^{H} p^{2} d p d \mu d x-\frac{1}{2} \int_{\beta \cdot \hat{n} \geq 0} f_{h}^{-}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| f_{h}^{-} e^{H} d \sigma+\int_{\beta \cdot \hat{n} \geq 0} f_{h}^{-}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| f_{h}^{-} e^{H} d \sigma \\
& +\frac{1}{2} \int_{\beta \cdot \hat{n} \leq 0} f_{h}^{+}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| f_{h}^{+} e^{H} d \sigma-\int_{\beta \cdot \hat{n} \leq 0} f_{h}^{-}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| f_{h}^{+} e^{H} d \sigma,
\end{aligned}
$$

and using a notation $e_{h}$ for the boundaries that allows redundancy, balanced then by a factor of $1 / 2$, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
0 & \geq \int_{\Omega} \partial_{t} f_{h} f_{h} e^{H} p^{2} d p d \mu d x+\frac{1}{2}\left(-\frac{1}{2} \int_{e_{h}} f_{h}^{-}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| f_{h}^{-} e^{H} d \sigma+\int_{e_{h}} f_{h}^{-}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| f_{h}^{-} e^{H} d \sigma\right. \\
& \left.+\frac{1}{2} \int_{e_{h}} f_{h}^{+}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| f_{h}^{+} e^{H} d \sigma-\int_{e_{h}} f_{h}^{-}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| f_{h}^{+} e^{H} d \sigma\right) \\
0 & \geq \int_{\Omega} \partial_{t} f_{h} f_{h} e^{H} p^{2} d p d \mu d x+\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{2} \int_{e_{h}} f_{h}^{-}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| f_{h}^{-} e^{H} d \sigma\right. \\
& \left.+\frac{1}{2} \int_{e_{h}} f_{h}^{+}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| f_{h}^{+} e^{H} d \sigma-\int_{e_{h}} f_{h}^{-}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| f_{h}^{+} e^{H} d \sigma\right) \\
0 & \geq \int_{\Omega} \partial_{t} f_{h} f_{h} e^{H} p^{2} d p d \mu d x \\
& +\frac{1}{4}\left(\int_{e_{h}} f_{h}^{-} f_{h}^{-}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| e^{H} d \sigma-2 \int_{e_{h}} f_{h}^{-} f_{h}^{+}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| e^{H} d \sigma+\int_{e_{h}} f_{h}^{+} f_{h}^{+}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| e^{H} d \sigma\right) \\
0 & \geq \int_{\Omega} \partial_{t} f_{h} f_{h} e^{H} p^{2} d p d \mu d x+\frac{1}{4} \int_{e_{h}}\left(f_{h}^{+}-f_{h}^{-}\right)^{2}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| e^{H} d \sigma . \tag{30}
\end{align*}
$$

Since the second term is non-negative, we conclude therefore that

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \geq-\frac{1}{4} \int_{e_{h}}\left(f_{h}^{+}-f_{h}^{-}\right)^{2}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| e^{H} d \sigma \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \partial_{t} f_{h}^{2} e^{H(x, p, t)} p^{2} d p d \mu d x \tag{31}
\end{equation*}
$$

and in this sense is that the numerical solution has stability with respect to the considered entropy norm.

We also obtain the following result:

Corollary 2.2 (Stability under the entropy norm for a time independent Hamiltonian): If $\Phi=$ $\Phi(x)$, so $\partial_{t} H=0$, the stability under our entropy norm gives us that for $t \geq 0$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|f_{h}\right\|_{L_{e^{H} p^{2}}^{2}}^{2}(t)=\int_{\Omega} f_{h}^{2}(x, p, \mu, t) e^{H(x, p)} p^{2} d p d \mu d x \leq\left\|f_{h}\right\|_{L_{e^{H} p^{2}}^{2}}^{2}(0) . \tag{32}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof The corollary follows from the fact that, since $\partial_{t} H=-q \partial_{t} \Phi=0$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \geq \int_{\Omega} \partial_{t}\left(f_{h}^{2} e^{H(x, p)}\right) p^{2} d p d \mu d x=\frac{d}{d t} \int_{\Omega} f_{h}^{2}(x, p, \mu, t) e^{H(x, p)} p^{2} d p d \mu d x . \tag{33}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since the entropy norm is a decreasing function of time, our result follows immediately.
We perform further analysis of these discrete entropy inequalities applied to the Boltzmann Poisson system (112) for self consistent mean field charged transport, in the one space dimensional case, say $x \in[0, L]$, under the assumption for the Poisson equation solving the electrostatic potential $\Phi(x)$ that it satisfies periodic boundary conditions as much as the probability density $f(x, p, t)$. These boundary conditions on the electrostatic potential can be viewed as having neutral charges in a neighborhood containing the endpoints $\{0 ; L\}$ and zero potential bias, that is, the corresponding Poisson boundary value problem for the potential is

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\partial_{x}^{2} \Phi(x, t)=\frac{q}{\epsilon}\left[N(x)-\rho_{h}(x, t)\right], \quad \Phi(0, t)=\Phi(L, t), \quad \partial_{x} \Phi(0, t)=\partial_{x} \Phi(L), \quad \text { for all } t>0 . \tag{34}
\end{equation*}
$$

Indeed, these boundary conditions for the homogeneous problem imply that solutions are determined up to a constant. Thus, in order to obtain existence of solutions, the Fredlhom Alternative property indicates that existence holds provided the compatibility condition $\int_{0}^{L}\left[N\left(x^{\prime}\right)-\rho_{h}\left(x^{\prime}, t\right)\right] d x^{\prime}=$ 0 , which yields neutral total charges for all times $t$. In addition, to obtain uniqueness, one needs to prescribe an extra condition on the $x$-space average of the solution $\int_{0}^{L} \Phi(x, t) d x$.
Therefore the following Theorem also holds for the semi-discrete Vlasov Boltzmann-Poisson system in one $x$-space dimension, with spatial periodic boundary conditions, whose numerical solutions preserved the neutral charges for all times, where we take a compatible discretization of the periodic Poisson problem that is mass preserving as performed in [1], and so preserves the above mentioned charge neutrality condition for all time.

Theorem 2.3 (Stability under the entropy norm for a time dependent Hamiltonian in the mean field limit): If $\Phi=\Phi(x, t)$, solution of the boundary value problem (34) so the corresponding Hamiltonian $H(x, p, t)=\varepsilon(p)-q \Phi(x, t)$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|f_{h}\right\|_{L_{e} H_{p^{2}}}^{2}(t)=\int_{\Omega} f_{h}^{2}(x, p, \mu, t) e^{H(x, p, t)} p^{2} d p d \mu d x \leq\left\|f_{h}\right\|_{L_{e^{2} p^{2}}^{2}}^{2}(0) . \tag{35}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof Because of the divergence free structure of the Hamiltonian $H(x, p, t)=\varepsilon(p)-q \Phi(x, t)$ for every $t>0$, all estimates of Theorem 2.4 apply. In particular, starting from estimate (64), we perform the time differentiation with respect to the Hamiltonian to obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \geq-\int_{e_{h}} \frac{\left(f_{h}^{+}-f_{h}^{-}\right)^{2}}{2}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| e^{H} d \sigma \geq \int_{\Omega} \partial_{t}\left(f_{h}^{2} e^{H}\right) p^{2} d p d \mu d x-\int_{\Omega} f_{h}^{2} e^{H} \partial_{t} \Phi p^{2} d p d \mu d x \tag{36}
\end{equation*}
$$

since the only time dependent contribution comes from the potential part of the Hamiltonian, which is given in terms of the local mass density by means of the Poisson equation. Hence the solution of the periodic boundary value problem in $x$-space for the Poisson problem (34) takes the form

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Phi(x, t) & =B(t)+\frac{q}{\epsilon}\left[\frac{x}{L} \int_{0}^{L}\left[N\left(x^{\prime}\right)-\rho_{h}\left(t, x^{\prime}\right)\right]\left(L-x^{\prime}\right) d x^{\prime}-\int_{0}^{x}\left[N\left(x^{\prime}\right)-\rho_{h}\left(t, x^{\prime}\right)\right]\left(x-x^{\prime}\right) d x^{\prime}\right], \\
-\partial_{x} \Phi(x, t) & =-\frac{q}{\epsilon}\left(\frac{1}{L} \int_{0}^{L}\left[N\left(x^{\prime}\right)-\rho_{h}\left(t, x^{\prime}\right)\right]\left(L-x^{\prime}\right) d x^{\prime}-\int_{0}^{x}\left[N\left(x^{\prime}\right)-\rho_{h}\left(t, x^{\prime}\right)\right] d x^{\prime}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $B(t)$ is the integrating parameter due to the periodic boundary conditions. Uniqueness of solutions is obtained from imposing that $\Phi(x, t)$ has zero average over the domain for all times $t$, determining $B(t)$ by the following representation

$$
\begin{equation*}
0=\int_{0}^{L} \Phi(x, t) d x=B(t) L=\frac{1}{2} \frac{q}{\epsilon} \int_{0}^{L}\left[N\left(x^{\prime}\right)-\rho_{h}\left(t, x^{\prime}\right)\right]\left(x^{\prime}-L\right) x^{\prime} d x^{\prime} \tag{37}
\end{equation*}
$$

and thus, the potential is determined uniquely by

$$
\begin{align*}
\Phi(x, t)=\frac{q}{\epsilon}\left(\int_{0}^{L}\left[N-\rho_{h}\right]\left(t, x^{\prime}\right) \frac{\left(x^{\prime}-L\right) x^{\prime}}{2 L} d x^{\prime}\right. & +\frac{x}{L} \int_{0}^{L}\left[N-\rho_{h}\right]\left(t, x^{\prime}\right)\left(L-x^{\prime}\right) d x^{\prime} \\
& \left.-\int_{0}^{x}\left[N-\rho_{h}\right]\left(t, x^{\prime}\right)\left(x-x^{\prime}\right) d x^{\prime}\right) \tag{38}
\end{align*}
$$

The time dependent contribution of the Hamiltonian yields
$\partial_{t} \Phi(x, t)=\frac{q}{\epsilon}\left[\int_{0}^{L} \partial_{t} \rho_{h}\left(t, x^{\prime}\right) \frac{\left(L-x^{\prime}\right) x^{\prime}}{2 L} d x^{\prime}+\int_{0}^{x} \partial_{t} \rho_{h}\left(t, x^{\prime}\right)\left(x-x^{\prime}\right) d x^{\prime}-\frac{x}{L} \int_{0}^{L} \partial_{t} \rho_{h}\left(t, x^{\prime}\right)\left(L-x^{\prime}\right) d x^{\prime}\right]$,
as we have assumed that the doping $N(x)$ is independent of time $t$, which can be expressed more compactly as

$$
\partial_{t} \Phi(x, t)=\frac{q}{\epsilon}\left[\int_{0}^{L} \partial_{t} \rho_{h}\left(t, x^{\prime}\right)\left(L-x^{\prime}\right)\left(\frac{x^{\prime}}{2 L}-\frac{x}{L}\right) d x^{\prime}+\int_{0}^{x} \partial_{t} \rho_{h}\left(t, x^{\prime}\right)\left(x-x^{\prime}\right) d x^{\prime}\right]
$$

Therefore, replacing this exact formula for $\partial_{t} \Phi(x, t)$ into the inequality (36), yields a mean field, non-local, discrete entropy inequality

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 & \geq \partial_{t} \int_{\Omega} f_{h}^{2} e^{H} p^{2} d p d \mu d x \\
& -\frac{q}{\epsilon} \int_{\Omega} f_{h}^{2} e^{H}\left[\int_{0}^{L} \partial_{t} \rho_{h}\left(t, x^{\prime}\right)\left(L-x^{\prime}\right)\left(\frac{x^{\prime}}{2 L}-\frac{x}{L}\right) d x^{\prime}+\int_{0}^{x} \partial_{t} \rho_{h}\left(t, x^{\prime}\right)\left(x-x^{\prime}\right) d x^{\prime}\right] p^{2} d p d \mu d x
\end{aligned}
$$

We can substitute the partial time derivative of the density by the right hand side of a conservation equation that can be derived simply by integration of the Boltzmann Equation over the momentum domain. Therefore, since in 1D

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial_{t} \rho_{h}(x, t)+\partial_{x} J_{h}(x, t)=0 \tag{39}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $J_{h}(x, t)=\int_{\Omega_{p}} v(p) f_{h}(x, p, t) d p$, we have then

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 & \geq \partial_{t} \int_{\Omega} f_{h}^{2} e^{H} p^{2} d p d \mu d x \\
& +\frac{q}{\epsilon} \int_{\Omega} f_{h}^{2} e^{H}\left[\int_{0}^{L} \partial_{x} J\left(t, x^{\prime}\right)\left(L-x^{\prime}\right)\left(\frac{x^{\prime}}{2 L}-\frac{x}{L}\right) d x^{\prime}+\int_{0}^{x} \partial_{x^{\prime}} J_{h}\left(t, x^{\prime}\right)\left(x-x^{\prime}\right) d x^{\prime}\right] p^{2} d p d \mu d x
\end{aligned}
$$

We proceed with an integration by parts to simplify our second term. So

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 & \geq \partial_{t} \int_{\Omega} f_{h}^{2} e^{H} p^{2} d p d \mu d x \\
& +\frac{q}{\epsilon} \int_{\Omega} f_{h}^{2} e^{H}\left[J_{h}(t, 0) x-\int_{0}^{L} J_{h}\left(t, x^{\prime}\right) \frac{x-x^{\prime}+L / 2}{L} d x^{\prime}-J_{h}(t, 0) x+\int_{0}^{x} J_{h}\left(t, x^{\prime}\right) d x^{\prime}\right] p^{2} d p d \mu d x
\end{aligned}
$$

This term reduces to
$0 \geq \partial_{t} \int_{\Omega} f_{h}^{2} e^{H} p^{2} d p d \mu d x+\frac{q}{\epsilon} \int_{\Omega} f_{h}^{2} e^{H}\left[\int_{0}^{x} J_{h}\left(t, x^{\prime}\right) d x^{\prime}-\int_{0}^{L} J_{h}\left(t, x^{\prime}\right)\left(\frac{x-x^{\prime}}{L}+\frac{1}{2}\right) d x^{\prime}\right] p^{2} d p d \mu d x$.
This can be written equivalently as

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 & \geq \partial_{t} \int_{\Omega} f_{h}^{2} e^{H} p^{2} d p d \mu d x \\
& +\frac{q}{\epsilon} \int_{\Omega} f_{h}^{2} e^{H}\left[\int_{0}^{x} J_{h}\left(t, x^{\prime}\right)\left(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{x-x^{\prime}}{L}\right) d x^{\prime}-\int_{x}^{L} J_{h}\left(t, x^{\prime}\right)\left(\frac{1}{2}+\frac{x-x^{\prime}}{L}\right) d x^{\prime}\right] p^{2} d p d \mu d x
\end{aligned}
$$

The asymptotic and regular behaviour of our Boltzmann Poisson problem as time approaches infinity in the spatial domain given by the interval $[0, L]$ is well known [1, 7, 8, 9], in particular convergence to a stationary state given by the balance of transport due to collisions, and so the corresponding current $J(x, t)$ stabilizes over the whole domain interval to a constant value, i.e. $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} J_{h}(x, t)=J_{0_{h}}$. Hence, by continuity, for any given $\delta>0$, there exists a finite time $t_{\delta}>0$ such that $\left|J_{h}(x, t)-J_{0}\right|<\delta \forall x \in[0, L], \forall t>t_{\delta}$.
Therefore, since

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 & \geq \partial_{t} \int_{\Omega} f_{h}^{2} e^{H} p^{2} d p d \mu d x+\frac{q}{\epsilon} \int_{\Omega} f_{h}^{2} e^{H} \frac{J_{0}}{2 L}\left[\left.\left(L / 2-x+x^{\prime}\right)^{2}\right|_{0} ^{x}+\left.\left(x^{\prime}-x-L / 2\right)^{2}\right|_{x} ^{L}\right] p^{2} d p d \mu d x \\
& +\frac{q}{\epsilon} \int_{\Omega} f_{h}^{2} e^{H}\left[\int_{0}^{x}\left(J_{h}-J_{0_{h}}\right)\left(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{x-x^{\prime}}{L}\right) d x^{\prime}+\int_{x}^{L}\left(J_{h}-J_{0_{h}}\right)\left(\frac{x^{\prime}-x}{L}-\frac{1}{2}\right) d x^{\prime}\right] p^{2} d p d \mu d x
\end{aligned}
$$

and $\left.\left(L / 2-x+x^{\prime}\right)^{2}\right|_{0} ^{x}+\left.\left(x^{\prime}-x-L / 2\right)^{2}\right|_{x} ^{L}=0$, our equation reduces to

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 & \geq \partial_{t} \int_{\Omega} f_{h}^{2} e^{H} p^{2} d p d \mu d x \\
& +\frac{q}{\epsilon} \int_{\Omega} f_{h}^{2} e^{H}\left[\int_{0}^{x}\left(J_{h}-J_{0_{h}}\right)\left(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{x-x^{\prime}}{L}\right) d x^{\prime}+\int_{x}^{L}\left(J_{h}-J_{0_{h}}\right)\left(\frac{x^{\prime}-x}{L}-\frac{1}{2}\right) d x^{\prime}\right] p^{2} d p d \mu d x .
\end{aligned}
$$

Using our argument of convergence to a constant current as time goes to infinity,

$$
\begin{align*}
&\left|\int_{\Omega} f_{h}^{2} e^{H}\left[\int_{0}^{x}\left(J_{h}-J_{0_{h}}\right)\left(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{x-x^{\prime}}{L}\right) d x^{\prime}+\int_{x}^{L}\left(J_{h}-J_{0_{h}}\right)\left(\frac{x^{\prime}-x}{L}-\frac{1}{2}\right) d x^{\prime}\right] p^{2} d p d \mu d x\right| \leq \\
& \mid \int_{\Omega} f_{h}^{2} e^{H} \delta { \left.\left[x\left\|\frac{1}{2}-\frac{x-x^{\prime}}{L}\right\|_{\infty,[0, x]}+(L-x)\left\|\frac{x^{\prime}-x}{L}-\frac{1}{2}\right\|_{\infty,[x, L]}\right] p^{2} d p d \mu d x \right\rvert\,=} \\
&\left|\int_{\Omega} f_{h}^{2} e^{H} \delta\left[x \frac{1}{2}+(L-x) \frac{1}{2}\right] p^{2} d p d \mu d x\right|=\frac{\delta L}{2}\left|\int_{\Omega} f_{h}^{2} e^{H} p^{2} d p d \mu d x\right| \tag{40}
\end{align*}
$$

Finally, choosing $\delta>0$ such that for $t_{\delta}>0$ we have

$$
\frac{\delta L}{2}\left|\int_{\Omega} f_{h}^{2} e^{H} p^{2} d p d \mu d x\right|<\frac{1}{2}\left|\partial_{t} \int_{\Omega} f_{h}^{2} e^{H} p^{2} d p d \mu d x\right|
$$

then

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \geq \frac{d}{d t} \int_{\Omega} f_{h}^{2} e^{H} p^{2} d p d \mu d x \quad \forall t>t_{\delta} \tag{41}
\end{equation*}
$$

In particular, inequality (35) holds and Theorem 2.3 statement holds.

### 2.2 2DX-3DK Problem: DG scheme and Stability under an entropy norm for Periodic and Reflective Boundary Conditions

We consider now a 2 D problem in position space (which requires a 3 D dimensionality in momentum), using as momentum coordinates a normalized Kane energy band $\omega$, a normalized polar component $\mu$ and the azimuthal angle $\varphi$ (the same as in (4). This problem has the following semi-discrete DG formulation using an entropy norm: to find a function $f_{h}$ such that for all $g_{h}$ it holds that
$\int_{\Omega} Q\left(f_{h}\right) g_{h} e^{H} s(\omega) d \vec{\omega} d \vec{x}=\int_{\Omega} \partial_{t} f_{h} g_{h} e^{H} s(\omega) d \vec{\omega} d \vec{x}-\int_{\Omega} f_{h} \beta \cdot \partial\left(g_{h} e^{H}\right) d \vec{\omega} d \vec{x}+\int_{\partial \Omega} \widehat{f_{h}} \beta \cdot \hat{n} g_{h} e^{H} d \sigma$, defining $\partial=\partial_{(x, y, \omega, \mu, \varphi)}$ and the transport vector $\beta$ with the properties $\partial \cdot \beta=0$ and $\beta \cdot \partial H=0$,

$$
\begin{align*}
\left(\beta_{1}, \beta_{2}\right) & =c_{x} w\left(1+\alpha_{K} w\right)\left(\mu, \sqrt{1-\mu^{2}} \cos \varphi\right)  \tag{42}\\
\beta_{3} & =-c_{k} 2 w\left(1+\alpha_{K} w\right)\left[\mu E_{x}+\sqrt{1-\mu^{2}} \cos \varphi E_{y}\right]  \tag{43}\\
\beta_{4} & =-c_{k} \sqrt{1-\mu^{2}}\left(1+2 \alpha_{K} w\right)\left[\sqrt{1-\mu^{2}} E_{x}-\mu \cos \varphi E_{y}\right]  \tag{44}\\
\beta_{5} & =-c_{k} \frac{-\left(1+2 \alpha_{K} w\right) E_{y} \sin \varphi}{\sqrt{1-\mu^{2}}}  \tag{45}\\
\frac{-\partial \cdot \beta / c_{k}}{1+2 \alpha_{K} w} & =2\left[\mu E_{x}+\sqrt{1-\mu^{2}} \cos \varphi E_{y}\right]-2 \mu E_{x}-\left(\sqrt{1-\mu^{2}}-\frac{\mu^{2}}{\sqrt{1-\mu^{2}}}\right) \cos \varphi E_{y}-\frac{E_{y} \cos \varphi}{\sqrt{1-\mu^{2}}}
\end{align*}
$$

which is zero since

$$
\begin{aligned}
2\left[\mu E_{x}+\sqrt{1-\mu^{2}} \cos \varphi E_{y}\right]-2 \mu E_{x}-\left(\sqrt{1-\mu^{2}}-\frac{\mu^{2}}{\sqrt{1-\mu^{2}}}\right) \cos \varphi E_{y}-\frac{E_{y} \cos \varphi}{\sqrt{1-\mu^{2}}} & = \\
2 \sqrt{1-\mu^{2}} \cos \varphi E_{y}-\left(\sqrt{1-\mu^{2}}-\frac{\mu^{2}}{\sqrt{1-\mu^{2}}}\right) \cos \varphi E_{y}-\frac{E_{y} \cos \varphi}{\sqrt{1-\mu^{2}}} & = \\
\sqrt{1-\mu^{2}} \cos \varphi E_{y}+\frac{\mu^{2}}{\sqrt{1-\mu^{2}}} \cos \varphi E_{y}-\frac{E_{y} \cos \varphi}{\sqrt{1-\mu^{2}}} & = \\
\frac{\cos \varphi E_{y}}{\sqrt{1-\mu^{2}}}\left(1-\mu^{2}+\mu^{2}-1\right) & =0
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore $\partial \cdot \beta=0$. Moreover, for $H=\omega-2 c_{k} V(\vec{x}, t) / c_{x}$, we have that

$$
\partial H=\left(2 c_{k} E_{x} / c_{x}, 2 c_{k} E_{y} / c_{x}, 1,0,0\right)
$$

so
$\beta \cdot \partial H=2 c_{k} w\left(1+\alpha_{K} w\right)\left(\mu E_{x}+E_{y} \sqrt{1-\mu^{2}} \cos \varphi\right)-c_{k} 2 w\left(1+\alpha_{K} w\right)\left[\mu E_{x}+\sqrt{1-\mu^{2}} \cos \varphi E_{y}\right]=0$
We state now our result regarding the stability under an entropy norm for this problem under periodic and specular reflection boundary conditions.

Theorem 2.4 (Stability under the entropy norm $\int f_{h} g_{h} e^{H} s(\omega) d \vec{\omega} d \vec{x}$ for a given potential $\Phi(x, t)$ ): Consider the semi-discrete solution $f_{h}$ to the DG formulation for the BP system in radial energyangular coordinates (assuming a Kane band model) under periodic and specular reflection boundary conditions. We have then that

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \geq \int_{\Omega} f_{h} \partial_{t} f_{h} e^{H} s(\omega) d \vec{\omega} d \vec{x}=\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \partial_{t} f_{h}^{2} e^{H} s(\omega) d \vec{\omega} d \vec{x} . \tag{46}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof Choosing $g_{h}=f_{h}$ in the entropy inequality for the Boltzmann equation, and considering the union of all the cells (now $\Omega_{i j k m n}$ ), which gives us the whole domain $\Omega=\Omega_{x, y} \times \Omega_{\omega, \mu, \varphi}$ for integration, we have
$0 \geq \int_{\Omega} Q\left(f_{h}\right) f_{h} e^{H} s(\omega) d \vec{\omega} d \vec{x}=\int_{\Omega} \partial_{t} f_{h} f_{h} e^{H} s(\omega) d \vec{\omega} d \vec{x}-\int_{\Omega} f_{h} \beta \cdot \partial\left(f_{h} e^{H}\right) d \vec{\omega} d \vec{x}+\int_{\partial \Omega} \widehat{f_{h}} \beta \cdot \hat{n} f_{h} e^{H} d \sigma$.
We integrate by parts again the transport integrals, obtaining

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Omega} f_{h} \beta \cdot \partial\left(f_{h} e^{H}\right) d \vec{\omega} d \vec{x} & =-\int_{\Omega} \partial \cdot\left(f_{h} \beta\right) f_{h} e^{H} d \vec{\omega} d \vec{x}+\int_{\partial \Omega} f_{h} \beta \cdot \hat{n} f_{h} e^{H} d \sigma \\
& =-\int_{\Omega}\left(\beta \cdot \partial f_{h}\right) f_{h} e^{H} d \vec{\omega} d \vec{x}+\int_{\partial \Omega} f_{h} \beta \cdot \hat{n} f_{h} e^{H} d \sigma
\end{aligned}
$$

but since

$$
\begin{equation*}
\beta \cdot \partial\left(f_{h} e^{H}\right)=\beta \cdot e^{H} \partial f_{h}+\beta \cdot f_{h} e^{H} \partial H=e^{H} \beta \cdot \partial f_{h} \tag{47}
\end{equation*}
$$

we have then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\Omega} f_{h} \beta \cdot \partial\left(f_{h} e^{H}\right) d \vec{\omega} d \vec{x}=\int_{\Omega}\left(\beta \cdot \partial f_{h}\right) f_{h} e^{H} d \vec{\omega} d \vec{x}=\frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial \Omega} f_{h} \beta \cdot \hat{n} f_{h} e^{H} d \sigma . \tag{48}
\end{equation*}
$$

We can express our entropy inequality then as

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \geq \int_{\Omega} \partial_{t} f_{h} f_{h} e^{H} s(\omega) d \vec{\omega} d \vec{x}-\frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial \Omega} f_{h} \beta \cdot \hat{n} f_{h} e^{H} d \sigma+\int_{\partial \Omega} \widehat{f}_{h} \beta \cdot \hat{n} f_{h} e^{H} d \sigma \tag{49}
\end{equation*}
$$

remembering that we are integrating over the whole domain by considering the union of all the cells defining our mesh.
We will distinguish between the internal edges and the external ones where periodic and specular reflection boundary conditions are applied, that is, $\partial \Omega=I E \cup P B \cup R B$

$$
\begin{align*}
0 \geq & \int_{\Omega} \partial_{t} f_{h} f_{h} e^{H} s(\omega) d \vec{\omega} d \vec{x}-\frac{1}{2} \int_{I E \cup P B} f_{h} \beta \cdot \hat{n} f_{h} e^{H} d \sigma+\int_{I E \cup P B} \widehat{f_{h} \beta \cdot \hat{n} f_{h} e^{H} d \sigma} \\
& -\frac{1}{2} \int_{R B} f_{h} \beta \cdot \hat{n} f_{h} e^{H} d \sigma+\int_{R B} \widehat{f}_{h} \beta \cdot \hat{n} f_{h} e^{H} d \sigma \tag{50}
\end{align*}
$$

The calculation for internal edges and boundaries with periodic conditions both follow the same spirit, whereas the reflective boundary has to be treated separately as it will vanish by itself considering the inflow-outflow regions.

### 2.2.1 Specular Reflection Boundaries

We divide the reflection boundaries in inflow and outflow regions (remembering that we are dealing with hyper-surfaces)

$$
\begin{align*}
& -\frac{1}{2} \int_{R B} f_{h} \beta \cdot \hat{n} f_{h} e^{H} d \sigma+\int_{R B} \widehat{f_{h}} \beta \cdot \hat{n} f_{h} e^{H} d \sigma=  \tag{51}\\
& -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\beta \cdot \hat{n}>0} f_{h} \beta \cdot \hat{n} f_{h} e^{H} d \sigma+\int_{\beta \cdot \hat{n}>0} \widehat{f_{h}} \beta \cdot \hat{n} f_{h} e^{H} d \sigma  \tag{52}\\
& -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\beta \cdot \hat{n}<0} f_{h} \beta \cdot \hat{n} f_{h} e^{H} d \sigma+\int_{\beta \cdot \hat{n}<0} \widehat{f_{h}} \beta \cdot \hat{n} f_{h} e^{H} d \sigma \tag{53}
\end{align*}
$$

and remembering also that the specular reflection boundary condition relates the inflow and the outflow boundary by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.f(\vec{x}, \vec{p}, t)\right|_{-}=\left.f\left(\vec{x}, \vec{p}^{\prime}, t\right)\right|_{+} \tag{54}
\end{equation*}
$$

the integrals with a factor of $1 / 2$ vanish each other due to the specular reflection (after having done a transformation of coordinates from the inflow boundary to the outflow boundary), the remaning term being

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\int_{\beta \cdot \hat{n}>0} \widehat{f}_{h}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| f_{h} e^{H} d \sigma-\int_{\beta \cdot \hat{n}<0} \widehat{f}_{h}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| f_{h} e^{H} d \sigma= \\
\left.\left.\int_{\beta \cdot \hat{n}>0} \widehat{f}_{h}\right|_{+}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| f_{h}\right|_{+} e^{H} d \sigma-\left.\left.\int_{\beta \cdot \hat{n}<0} \widehat{f}_{h}\right|_{-}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| f_{h}\right|_{-} e^{H} d \sigma= \\
\left.\left.\int_{\beta \cdot \hat{n}>0} \widehat{f}_{h}\right|_{+}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| f_{h}\right|_{+} e^{H} d \sigma-\left.\left.\int_{\beta \cdot \hat{n}<0} \widehat{f}_{h}\right|_{-}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| f_{h}\right|_{-} e^{H} d \sigma= \\
\left.\left.\int_{\beta \cdot \hat{n}>0} \widehat{f}_{h}\right|_{+}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| f_{h}\right|_{+} e^{H} d \sigma-\left.\left.\int_{\beta \cdot \hat{n}<0} \widehat{f}_{h}\right|_{-}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| f_{h}^{\prime}\right|_{+} e^{H} d \sigma= \\
\left.\left.\int_{\beta \cdot \hat{n}>0} \widehat{f}_{h}\right|_{+}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| f_{h}\right|_{+} e^{H} d \sigma-\left.\int_{\beta \cdot \hat{n}>0} \widehat{f}_{h}\right|_{-} ^{\prime}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}|\left(\left.f_{h}^{\prime}\right|_{+}\right)^{\prime} e^{H^{\prime}} d \sigma \tag{59}
\end{array}
$$

but $H=H^{\prime}$ since $\varepsilon(|\vec{p}|)=\varepsilon\left(\left|\vec{p}^{\prime}\right|\right)$, so

$$
\begin{align*}
\left.\left.\int_{\beta \cdot \hat{n}>0} \widehat{f}_{h}\right|_{+}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| f_{h}\right|_{+} e^{H} d \sigma-\left.\int_{\beta \cdot \hat{n}>0} \widehat{f_{h}}\right|_{-} ^{\prime}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}|\left(\left.f_{h}^{\prime}\right|_{+}\right)^{\prime} e^{H^{\prime}} d \sigma & =  \tag{60}\\
\left.\int_{\beta \cdot \hat{n}>0}\left[\left.\widehat{f}_{h}\right|_{+}-\left.\widehat{f_{h}}\right|_{-} ^{\prime}\right]|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| f_{h}\right|_{+} e^{H} d \sigma & =0 \tag{61}
\end{align*}
$$

since by using the upwind rule as numerical flux, denoting $z=(\vec{x}, \vec{p})$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{f}_{h}=\lim _{\delta \rightarrow 0^{+}} f_{h}(z-\delta \beta(z)) \tag{62}
\end{equation*}
$$

### 2.2.2 Internal Edges and Periodic Boundaries

Both internal edges and periodic boundaries are characterized by the fact that each edge has a pairing with another unique edge for which the conditions $\hat{n}_{1}=-\hat{n}_{2}$ and $\beta_{1}=\beta_{2}$ hold, so the idea behind these calculations is to recognize and consider jointly these pairs.
We distinguish between the boundaries of cells for which $\beta \cdot \hat{n} \geq 0$ and the ones for which $\beta \cdot \hat{n} \leq 0$, defining uniquely the boundaries. Remembering that the upwind flux rule is such that $\hat{f}_{h}=f_{h}^{-}$, we have that the value of the solution inside the cells close to boundaries for which $\beta \cdot \hat{n} \geq 0$ is $f_{h}^{-}$, and for boundaries $\beta \cdot \hat{n} \leq 0$ the value of the solution inside the cell close to that boundary is $f_{h}^{+}$. We have then that

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 & \geq \int_{\Omega} \partial_{t} f_{h} f_{h} e^{H} s(\omega) d \vec{\omega} d \vec{x}-\frac{1}{2} \int_{I E \cup P B} f_{h} \beta \cdot \hat{n} f_{h} e^{H} d \sigma+\int_{I E \cup P B} f_{h}^{-} \beta \cdot \hat{n} f_{h} e^{H} d \sigma \\
0 & \geq \int_{\Omega} \partial_{t} f_{h} f_{h} e^{H} s(\omega) d \vec{\omega} d \vec{x}-\frac{1}{2} \int_{\beta \cdot \hat{n} \geq 0} f_{h}^{-}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| f_{h}^{-} e^{H} d \sigma+\int_{\beta \cdot \hat{n} \geq 0} f_{h}^{-}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| f_{h}^{-} e^{H} d \sigma \\
& +\frac{1}{2} \int_{\beta \cdot \hat{n} \leq 0} f_{h}^{+}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| f_{h}^{+} e^{H} d \sigma-\int_{\beta \cdot \hat{n} \leq 0} f_{h}^{-}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| f_{h}^{+} e^{H} d \sigma
\end{aligned}
$$

and using a notation $e_{h}$ for the boundaries that allows redundancy, balanced then by a factor of
$1 / 2$, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
0 & \geq \int_{\Omega} \partial_{t} f_{h} f_{h} e^{H} s(\omega) d \vec{\omega} d \vec{x}+\frac{1}{2}\left(-\frac{1}{2} \int_{e_{h}} f_{h}^{-}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| f_{h}^{-} e^{H} d \sigma+\int_{e_{h}} f_{h}^{-}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| f_{h}^{-} e^{H} d \sigma\right. \\
& \left.+\frac{1}{2} \int_{e_{h}} f_{h}^{+}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| f_{h}^{+} e^{H} d \sigma-\int_{e_{h}} f_{h}^{-}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| f_{h}^{+} e^{H} d \sigma\right) \\
0 & \geq \int_{\Omega} \partial_{t} f_{h} f_{h} e^{H} s(\omega) d \vec{\omega} d \vec{x}+\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{2} \int_{e_{h}} f_{h}^{-}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| f_{h}^{-} e^{H} d \sigma\right. \\
& \left.+\frac{1}{2} \int_{e_{h}} f_{h}^{+}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| f_{h}^{+} e^{H} d \sigma-\int_{e_{h}} f_{h}^{-}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| f_{h}^{+} e^{H} d \sigma\right) \\
0 & \geq \int_{\Omega} \partial_{t} f_{h} f_{h} e^{H} s(\omega) d \vec{\omega} d \vec{x} \\
& +\frac{1}{4}\left(\int_{e_{h}} f_{h}^{-} f_{h}^{-}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| e^{H} d \sigma-2 \int_{e_{h}} f_{h}^{-} f_{h}^{+}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| e^{H} d \sigma+\int_{e_{h}} f_{h}^{+} f_{h}^{+}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| e^{H} d \sigma\right) \\
0 & \geq \int_{\Omega} \partial_{t} f_{h} f_{h} e^{H} s(\omega) d \vec{\omega} d \vec{x}+\frac{1}{4} \int_{e_{h}}\left(f_{h}^{+}-f_{h}^{-}\right)^{2}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| e^{H} d \sigma . \tag{63}
\end{align*}
$$

Since the second term is non-negative, we conclude therefore that

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \geq-\frac{1}{4} \int_{e_{h}}\left(f_{h}^{+}-f_{h}^{-}\right)^{2}|\beta \cdot \hat{n}| e^{H} d \sigma \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \partial_{t} f_{h}^{2} e^{H(x, p, t)} s(\omega) d \vec{\omega} d \vec{x}, \tag{64}
\end{equation*}
$$

and it is in this sense that the numerical solution has stability with respect to the considered entropy norm.

### 2.3 A comment on the general problem for energy-curvilinear coordinates

We would like to point out that the transport vector in curvilinear momentum coordinates (that usually represent either a spherical or energy-angular set of coordinates, and could equally represent an energy level set type of orthogonal system of coordinates)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\beta=J\left(\vec{v}(\vec{p}), \frac{F \cdot \hat{e}_{p_{1}}}{h_{1}}, \frac{F \cdot \hat{e}_{p_{2}}}{h_{2}}, \frac{F \cdot \hat{e}_{p_{3}}}{h_{3}}\right) \tag{65}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $F(\vec{x}, t)=q \partial_{\vec{x}} \Phi(\vec{x}, t)$, has two important properties in the curvilinear momentum space directly related to their Hamiltonian nature, namely $\partial \cdot \beta=0$ and $\beta \cdot \partial H=0$, defining $\partial=\partial_{\left(\vec{x}, p_{1}, p_{2}, p_{3}\right)}$ as the gradient in the position - curvilinear momentum space.
Moreover, after the two physical examples presented above to the reader, it is clear that the results on stability under an entropy norm for the DG scheme rely on these 2 properties and once stablished for the general curvilinear momentum coordinate case the same kind of entropy stability result would apply for any DG scheme under that formulation of a transformed Boltzmann equation. We therefore prove these two properties for $\beta$ below.
For $\beta \cdot \partial H=0$, we have that

$$
\begin{align*}
\beta \cdot \partial H & =J\left(\nabla_{\left(p_{x}, p_{y}, p_{z}\right)} \varepsilon, \frac{F \cdot \hat{e}_{p_{1}}}{h_{1}}, \frac{F \cdot \hat{e}_{p_{2}}}{h_{2}}, \frac{F \cdot \hat{e}_{p_{3}}}{h_{3}}\right) \cdot\left(-F(\vec{x}, t), \partial_{\left(p_{1}, p_{2}, p_{3}\right)} \varepsilon\right)  \tag{66}\\
& =J\left[-\nabla_{\left(p_{x}, p_{y}, p_{z}\right)} \varepsilon \cdot F+F \cdot\left(\frac{\hat{e}_{p_{1}}}{h_{1}} \partial_{p_{1}} \varepsilon \frac{\hat{e}_{p_{2}}}{h_{2}} \partial_{p_{2}} \varepsilon \frac{\hat{e}_{p_{3}}}{h_{3}} \partial_{p_{3}} \varepsilon\right)\right]=0, \tag{67}
\end{align*}
$$

because the formula that relates the gradients in the cartesian ( $p_{x}, p_{y}, p_{z}$ ) and in the curvilinear ( $p_{1}, p_{2}, p_{3}$ ) momentum coordinates is precisely

$$
\begin{equation*}
\nabla_{\left(p_{x}, p_{y}, p_{z}\right)} \varepsilon=\frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial p_{1}} \frac{\hat{e}_{p_{1}}}{h_{1}}+\frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial p_{2}} \frac{\hat{e}_{p_{2}}}{h_{2}}+\frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial p_{3}} \frac{\hat{e}_{p_{3}}}{h_{3}} . \tag{68}
\end{equation*}
$$

The second property, related to the divergence of the transport field $\beta$ in the phase space with curvilinear momentum, follows from the divergence free property of the transport vector in cartesian space. That is, we know that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\nabla_{(\vec{x}, \vec{p})} \cdot(\vec{v}(\vec{p}), F(\vec{x}, t))=0 \tag{69}
\end{equation*}
$$

trivially due to dependance in alternate coordinates. However, using the formula that relates the divergence in the cartesian momentum space to the curvilinear one, we have that

$$
\begin{equation*}
0=\nabla_{\left(p_{x}, p_{y}, p_{z}\right)} F(x, t)=\frac{1}{J}\left[\frac{\partial\left(F_{1} J / h_{1}\right)}{\partial p_{1}}+\frac{\partial\left(F_{2} J / h_{2}\right)}{\partial p_{2}}+\frac{\partial\left(F_{3} J / h_{3}\right)}{\partial p_{3}}\right] \tag{70}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $F_{j}=F \cdot \hat{e}_{p_{j}}, j=1,2,3$. So

$$
\begin{align*}
0 & =\partial_{\left(p_{1}, p_{2}, p_{3}\right)} \cdot\left\{J\left(F_{1} / h_{1}, F_{2} / h_{2}, F_{3} / h_{3}\right)\right\}=\partial_{\left(p_{1}, p_{2}, p_{3}\right)} \cdot\left\{J\left(F \cdot \hat{e}_{p_{1}} / h_{1}, F \cdot \hat{e}_{p_{2}} / h_{2}, F \cdot \hat{e}_{p_{3}} / h_{3}\right)\right\} \\
& =\partial_{\left(p_{1}, p_{2}, p_{3}\right)} \cdot\left\{J\left(F \cdot \hat{e}_{p_{1}} / h_{1}, F \cdot \hat{e}_{p_{2}} / h_{2}, F \cdot \hat{e}_{p_{3}} / h_{3}\right)\right\}+\nabla_{\vec{x}} \cdot(J \vec{v}(\vec{p}))=\partial \cdot \beta \tag{71}
\end{align*}
$$

with $\partial=\partial_{\left(\vec{x}, p_{1}, p_{2}, p_{3}\right)}$, since $J$ only depends on the momentum.

## 3 Positivity Preservation in DG Scheme for BP

### 3.1 1Dx-2Dp problem: Preliminaries

Using the notation in [6], the semi-discrete DG formulation is written in the form below.
Find $f_{h} \in V_{h}^{k}$ such that $\forall g_{h} \in V_{h}^{k}$ and $\forall \Omega_{i k m}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\partial_{t} \int_{\Omega_{i k m}} f_{h} g_{h} p^{2} d p d \mu d x & \\
-\int_{\Omega_{i k m}} H^{(x)} f_{h} \partial_{x} g_{h} p^{2} d p d \mu d x & \pm\left.\left.\int_{\tilde{\Omega}_{k m}^{(x)}} \widehat{H^{(x)}} f_{h}\right|_{x_{i \pm}} g_{h}\right|_{x_{i \pm}} ^{\mp} p^{2} d p d \mu \\
-\int_{\Omega_{i k m}} p^{2} H^{(p)} f_{h} \partial_{p} g_{h} d \mu d x & \pm\left.\left. p_{k^{ \pm}}^{2} \int_{\tilde{\Omega}_{i m}^{(p)}} \widehat{H^{(p)}} f_{h}\right|_{p_{k \pm}} g_{h}\right|_{p_{k \pm}} ^{\mp} d \mu d x \\
-\int_{\Omega_{i k m}}\left(1-\mu^{2}\right) H^{(\mu)} f_{h} \partial_{\mu} g_{h} p d p d \mu d x & \pm\left.\left.\left(1-\mu_{m \pm}^{2}\right) \int_{\tilde{\Omega}_{i k}^{(\mu)}} \widehat{H^{(\mu)}} f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m \pm}} g_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m \pm}} ^{\mp} p d p d x \\
& =\int_{\Omega_{i k m}} Q\left(f_{h}\right) g_{h} p^{2} d p d \mu d x
\end{aligned}
$$

where we have defined the terms (taking in account that $\partial_{p} \varepsilon(p)>0$ )

$$
\begin{array}{cll}
H^{(x)}(p, \mu)=\mu \partial_{p} \varepsilon(p), & \left.\widehat{H^{(x)}} f\right|_{x_{i \pm}}=\left.\partial_{p} \varepsilon \widehat{f_{h} \mu}\right|_{x_{i \pm}}, & \tilde{\Omega}_{k m}^{(x)}=\left[r_{k-}, r_{k+}\right] \times\left[\mu_{m-}, \mu_{m+}\right]=\partial_{x} \Omega_{k m} \\
H^{(p)}(t, x, \mu)=-q E(x, t) \mu, & \left.\widehat{H^{(p)}} f\right|_{p_{k \pm}}=-\left.q \widehat{E f_{h}} \mu\right|_{p_{k \pm}}, & \tilde{\Omega}_{i m}^{(p)}=\left[x_{i-}, x_{i+}\right] \times\left[\mu_{m-}, \mu_{m+}\right]=\partial_{p} \Omega_{i m} \\
H^{(\mu)}(x, t)=-q E(x, t), & \left.\widehat{H^{(\mu)}} f\right|_{\mu_{m \pm}}=-\left.q \widehat{E f_{h}}\right|_{\mu_{m \pm}}, & \tilde{\Omega}_{i k}^{(\mu)}=\left[x_{i-}, x_{i+}\right] \times\left[r_{k-}, r_{k+}\right]=\partial_{\mu} \Omega_{i k}
\end{array}
$$

The weak form of the collisional operator in the DG scheme is, specifically,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \int_{\Omega_{i k m}} Q\left(f_{h}\right) g_{h} p^{2} d p d \mu d x=\int_{\Omega_{i k m}}\left[G\left(f_{h}\right)-\nu(\varepsilon(p)) f_{h}\right] g_{h} p^{2} d p d \mu d x= \\
& 2 \pi \int_{\Omega_{i k m}}\left(\left.\sum_{j=-1}^{+1} c_{j} \chi(\varepsilon(p)+j \hbar \omega) \int_{-1}^{+1} d \mu^{\prime}\left[f_{h}\left(x, p\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right), \mu^{\prime}\right) p^{2}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) \frac{d p^{\prime}}{d \varepsilon^{\prime}}\right]\right|_{\varepsilon^{\prime}=\varepsilon(p)+j \hbar \omega}\right) g_{h} p^{2} d p d \mu d x \\
& -4 \pi \int_{\Omega_{i k m}} f_{h}(x, p, \mu, t)\left(\left.\sum_{j=-1}^{+1} c_{j} \chi(\varepsilon(p)-j \hbar \omega)\left[p^{2}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) \frac{d p^{\prime}}{d \varepsilon^{\prime}}\right]\right|_{\varepsilon^{\prime}=\varepsilon(p)-j \hbar \omega}\right) g_{h} p^{2} d p d \mu d x . \tag{72}
\end{align*}
$$

The cell average of $f_{h}$ in $\Omega_{i k m}$ is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{f}_{i k m}=\frac{\int_{\Omega_{i k m}} f_{h} p^{2} d p d \mu d x}{\int_{\Omega_{i k m}} p^{2} d p d \mu d x}=\frac{\int_{\Omega_{i k m}} f_{h} d V}{V_{i k m}} \tag{73}
\end{equation*}
$$

where, for our particular spherical curvilinear coordinates,

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{i k m}=\int_{\Omega_{i k m}} d V, d V=\tau \prod_{d=1}^{3} z_{d}, \quad\left(z_{1}, z_{2}, z_{3}\right)=\mathbf{z}=(x, p, \mu), \quad \tau=\sqrt{\gamma \lambda}, \gamma=1, \lambda=p^{2} . \tag{74}
\end{equation*}
$$

The time evolution of the cell average in the DG scheme is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \partial_{t} \bar{f}_{i k m}= \\
- & \frac{1}{V_{i k m}}\left[\left.\int_{\partial_{x} \Omega_{k m}} \widehat{H^{(x)}} f_{h}\right|_{x_{i+}} p^{2} d p d \mu-\left.\int_{\partial_{x} \Omega_{k m}} \overrightarrow{H^{(x)}} f_{h}\right|_{x_{i-}} p^{2} d p d \mu\right. \\
+ & \left.p_{k^{+}}^{2} \int_{\partial_{p} \Omega_{i m}} H^{(p)} f_{h}\right|_{p_{k+}} d \mu d x-p_{k^{-}}^{2} \int_{\partial_{p} \Omega_{i m}} \widehat{H^{(p)}} f_{h} \mid p_{k_{k}} d \mu d x \\
+ & \left.\left.\left(1-\mu_{m+}^{2}\right) \int_{\partial_{\mu} \Omega_{i k}} \widehat{H^{(\mu)}} f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m+}} p d p d x-\left.\left(1-\mu_{m-}^{2}\right) \int_{\partial_{\mu} \Omega_{i k}} \widehat{H^{(\mu)}} f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m-}} p d p d x\right] \\
+ & {\left[2 \pi \int_{\Omega_{i k m}}\left(\left.\sum_{j=-1}^{+1} c_{j} \chi(\varepsilon(p)+j \hbar \omega) \int_{-1}^{+1} d \mu^{\prime}\left[f_{h}\left(x, p\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right), \mu^{\prime}\right) p^{2}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) \frac{d p^{\prime}}{d \varepsilon^{\prime}}\right]\right|_{\varepsilon^{\prime}=\varepsilon(p)+j \hbar \omega}\right) p^{2} d p d \mu d x\right.} \\
& \left.-4 \pi \int_{\Omega_{i k m}} f_{h}(x, p, \mu, t)\left(\left.\sum_{j=-1}^{+1} c_{j} \chi(\varepsilon(p)-j \hbar \omega)\left[p^{2}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) \frac{d p^{\prime}}{d \varepsilon^{\prime}}\right]\right|_{\varepsilon^{\prime}=\varepsilon(p)-j \hbar \omega}\right) p^{2} d p d \mu d x\right] \frac{1}{V_{i k m}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Regarding the time discretization, we will apply a TVD RK-DG scheme. These schemes are convex combinations of Euler methods. Therefore, it suffices if we consider the time evolution of the cell average in the DG scheme using a Forward Euler Method, so $\partial_{t} \bar{f}_{i k m} \approx\left(\bar{f}_{i k m}^{n+1}-\bar{f}_{i k m}^{n}\right) / \Delta t^{n}$, and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \bar{f}_{i k m}^{n+1}=\bar{f}_{i k m}^{n} \\
- & \frac{\Delta t^{n}}{V_{i k m}}\left[\left.\int_{\partial_{x} \Omega_{k m}} \widehat{H^{(x)}} f_{h}\right|_{x_{i+}} p^{2} d p d \mu-\left.\int_{\partial_{x} \Omega_{k m}} \widehat{H^{(x)}} f_{h}\right|_{x_{i-}} p^{2} d p d \mu\right. \\
+ & \left.p_{k^{+}}^{2} \int_{\partial_{p} \Omega_{i m}} \widehat{H^{(p)}} f_{h}\right|_{p_{k+}} d \mu d x-\left.p_{k^{-}}^{2} \int_{\partial_{p} \Omega_{i m}} \widehat{H^{(p)}} f_{h}\right|_{p_{k-}} d \mu d x \\
+ & \left.\left.\left(1-\mu_{m+}^{2}\right) \int_{\partial_{\mu} \Omega_{i k}} \overrightarrow{H^{(\mu)}} f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m+}} p d p d x-\left.\left(1-\mu_{m-}^{2}\right) \int_{\partial_{\mu} \Omega_{i k}} \widehat{H^{(\mu)}} f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m-}} p d p d x\right] \\
+ & {\left[2 \pi \int_{\Omega_{i k m}}\left(\left.\sum_{j=-1}^{+1} c_{j} \chi(\varepsilon(p)+j \hbar \omega) \int_{-1}^{+1} d \mu^{\prime}\left[f_{h}\left(x, p\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right), \mu^{\prime}\right) p^{2}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) \frac{d p^{\prime}}{d \varepsilon^{\prime}}\right]\right|_{\varepsilon^{\prime}=\varepsilon(p)+j \hbar \omega}\right) p^{2} d p d \mu d x\right.} \\
& -4 \pi \int_{\Omega_{i k m}} f_{h}(x, p, \mu, t)\left(\left.\sum_{j=-1}^{+1} c_{j} \chi(\varepsilon(p)-j \hbar \omega)\left[p^{2}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) \frac{d p^{\prime}}{d \varepsilon^{\prime}}\right]\right|_{\varepsilon^{\prime}=\varepsilon(p)-j \hbar \omega} ^{2} d p d \mu d x\right] \frac{\Delta t^{n}}{V_{i k m}},
\end{aligned}
$$

or more briefly,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{f}_{i k m}^{n+1}=\bar{f}_{i k m}^{n}+\Gamma_{T}+\Gamma_{C} \tag{75}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the transport and collision terms for the cell average time evolution are defined as

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \Gamma_{T}=-\frac{\Delta t^{n}}{V_{i k m}}\left[\left.\int_{\partial_{x} \Omega_{k m}} \widehat{H^{(x)}} f_{h}\right|_{x_{i+}} p^{2} d p d \mu-\left.\int_{\partial_{x} \Omega_{k m}} \widehat{H^{(x)}} f_{h}\right|_{x_{i-}} p^{2} d p d \mu\right. \\
&+\left.p_{k^{+}}^{2} \int_{\partial_{p} \Omega_{i m}} \overrightarrow{H^{(p)}} f_{h}\right|_{p_{k+}} d \mu d x-\left.p_{k^{-}}^{2} \int_{\partial_{p} \Omega_{i m}} \widehat{H^{(p)}} f_{h}\right|_{p_{k-}} d \mu d x \\
&\left.+\left.\left(1-\mu_{m+}^{2}\right) \int_{\partial_{\mu} \Omega_{i k}} \widehat{H^{(\mu)}} f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m+}} p d p d x-\left.\left(1-\mu_{m-}^{2}\right) \int_{\partial_{\mu} \Omega_{i k}} \widehat{H^{(\mu)}} f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m-}} p d p d x\right] \\
& \Gamma_{C}=\quad\left[2 \pi \int_{\Omega_{i k m}}\left(\left.\sum_{j=-1}^{+1} c_{j} \chi(\varepsilon(p)+j \hbar \omega) \int_{-1}^{+1} d \mu^{\prime}\left[f_{h}\left(x, p\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right), \mu^{\prime}\right) p^{2}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) \frac{d p^{\prime}}{d \varepsilon^{\prime}}\right]\right|_{\varepsilon^{\prime}=\varepsilon(p)+j \hbar \omega}\right) p^{2} d p d \mu d x\right. \\
&\left.-4 \pi \int_{\Omega_{i k m}} f_{h}(x, p, \mu, t)\left(\left.\sum_{j=-1}^{+1} c_{j} \chi(\varepsilon(p)-j \hbar \omega)\left[p^{2}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) \frac{d p^{\prime}}{d \varepsilon^{\prime}}\right]\right|_{\varepsilon^{\prime}=\varepsilon(p)-j \hbar \omega}\right) p^{2} d p d \mu d x\right] \frac{\Delta t^{n}}{V_{i k m}}
\end{aligned}
$$

### 3.2 Positivity preservation for 1Dx-2Dp DG scheme

We use the strategy of Zhang $\&$ Shu in [15, 16] for conservation laws, applied as well in 66 for conservative phase space collisionless transport in curvilinear coordinates, and in [5] for a VlasovBoltzmann problem with linear non-degenerate collisional forms, to preserve the positivity of the probability density function in our DG scheme treating the collision term as a source, this being possible since our collisional form is mass preserving. We will use a convex combination parameter $\alpha \in[0,1]$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{f}_{i k m}^{n+1}=\alpha \underbrace{\left(\bar{f}_{i k m}^{n}+\frac{\Gamma_{T}}{\alpha}\right)}_{I}+(1-\alpha) \underbrace{\left(\bar{f}_{i k m}^{n}+\frac{\Gamma_{C}}{1-\alpha}\right)}_{I I} \tag{76}
\end{equation*}
$$

and we will find conditions such that $I$ and $I I$ are positive, to guarantee the positivity of the cell average of our numerical probability density function for the next time step. The positivity of the numerical solution to the pdf in the whole domain can be guaranteed just by applying the limiters
in [15, 16] that preserve the cell average but modify the slope of the piecewise linear solutions in order to make the function non - negative.
Regarding $I$, the conditions for its positivity are derived below.

$$
\begin{aligned}
I= & \bar{f}_{i k m}^{n}+\frac{\Gamma_{T}}{\alpha}=\frac{\int_{\Omega_{i k m}} f_{h} p^{2} d p d \mu d x}{V_{i k m}} \\
& -\frac{\Delta t^{n}}{\alpha V_{i k m}}\left[\left.\int_{\partial_{x} \Omega_{k m}} \widehat{H^{(x)}} f_{h}\right|_{x_{i+}} p^{2} d p d \mu-\left.\int_{\partial_{x} \Omega_{k m}} \widehat{H^{(x)}} f_{h}\right|_{x_{i-}} p^{2} d p d \mu\right. \\
& +\left.p_{k^{+}}^{2} \int_{\partial_{p} \Omega_{i m}} \widehat{H^{(p)}} f_{h}\right|_{p_{k+}} d \mu d x-\left.p_{k^{-}}^{2} \int_{\partial_{p} \Omega_{i m}} \widehat{H^{(p)}} f_{h}\right|_{p_{k-}} d \mu d x \\
& \left.+\left.\left(1-\mu_{m+}^{2}\right) \int_{\partial_{\mu} \Omega_{i k}} \widehat{H^{(\mu)}} f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m+}} p d p d x-\left.\left(1-\mu_{m-}^{2}\right) \int_{\partial_{\mu} \Omega_{i k}} \widehat{H^{(\mu)}} f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m-}} p d p d x\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

We will split the cell average using 3 convex parameters $s_{l} \geq 0, l=1,2,3$ s.t. $s_{1}+s_{2}+s_{3}=1$. We have then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& I=\frac{1}{V_{i k m}}\left[\left(s_{1}+s_{2}+s_{3}\right) \int_{\Omega_{i k m}} f_{h} p^{2} d p d \mu d x\right. \\
& -\frac{\Delta t^{n}}{\alpha}\left(\left.\int_{\partial_{x} \Omega_{k m}} \widehat{H^{(x)}} f_{h}\right|_{x_{i}+} p^{2} d p d \mu-\left.\int_{\partial_{x} \Omega_{k m}} \widehat{H^{(x)}} f_{h}\right|_{x_{i-}} p^{2} d p d \mu\right. \\
& +\left.p_{k^{+}}^{2} \int_{\partial_{p} \Omega_{i m}} \widehat{H^{(p)}} f_{h}\right|_{p_{k+}} d \mu d x-\left.p_{k^{-}}^{2} \int_{\partial_{p} \Omega_{i m}} \widehat{H^{(p)}} f_{h}\right|_{p_{k-}} d \mu d x \\
& \left.\left.+\left.\left(1-\mu_{m+}^{2}\right) \int_{\partial_{\mu} \Omega_{i k}} \widehat{H^{(\mu)}} f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m+}} p d p d x-\left.\left(1-\mu_{m-}^{2}\right) \int_{\partial_{\mu} \Omega_{i k}} \widehat{H^{(\mu)}} f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m-}} p d p d x\right)\right] \\
& =\frac{1}{V_{i k m}}\left[s_{1} \int_{x_{i-}}^{x_{i+}} \int_{\partial_{x} \Omega_{k m}} f_{h} p^{2} d p d \mu d x-\frac{\Delta t^{n}}{\alpha}\left(\left.\int_{\partial_{x} \Omega_{k m}} \widehat{H^{(x)}} f_{h}\right|_{x_{i+}} p^{2} d p d \mu-\left.\int_{\partial_{x} \Omega_{k m}} \widehat{H^{(x)}} f_{h}\right|_{x_{i-}} p^{2} d p d \mu\right)\right. \\
& +s_{2} \int_{p_{k-}}^{p_{k+}} \int_{\partial_{p} \Omega_{i m}} f_{h} p^{2} d p d \mu d x-\frac{\Delta t^{n}}{\alpha}\left(\left.p_{k^{+}}^{2} \int_{\partial_{p} \Omega_{i m}} \widehat{H^{(p)}} f_{h}\right|_{p_{k+}} d \mu d x-\left.p_{k^{-}}^{2} \int_{\partial_{p} \Omega_{i m}} \widehat{H^{(p)}} f_{h}\right|_{p_{k-}} d \mu d x\right) \\
& +s_{3} \int_{\mu_{m-}}^{\mu_{m+}} \int_{\partial_{\mu} \Omega_{i k}} f_{h} p^{2} d p d \mu d x \\
& \left.-\frac{\Delta t^{n}}{\alpha}\left(\left.\left(1-\mu_{m+}^{2}\right) \int_{\partial_{\mu} \Omega_{i k}} \widehat{H^{(\mu)}} f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m+}} p d p d x-\left.\left(1-\mu_{m-}^{2}\right) \int_{\partial_{\mu} \Omega_{i k}} \widehat{H^{(\mu)}} f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m-}} p d p d x\right)\right] \\
& =\frac{1}{V_{i k m}}\left[\int_{\partial_{x} \Omega_{k m}}\left\{s_{1} \int_{x_{i-}}^{x_{i+}} f_{h} p^{2} d x-\frac{\Delta t^{n}}{\alpha}\left(\widehat{H^{(x)}} f_{h}\left|x_{i+} p^{2}-\widehat{H^{(x)}} f_{h}\right| x_{i-} p^{2}\right)\right\} d p d \mu\right. \\
& +\int_{\partial_{p} \Omega_{i m}}\left\{s_{2} \int_{p_{k-}}^{p_{k+}} f_{h} p^{2} d p-\frac{\Delta t^{n}}{\alpha}\left(\left.p_{k^{+}}^{2} \widehat{H^{(p)}} f_{h}\right|_{p_{k+}}-\left.p_{k^{-}}^{2} \widehat{H^{(p)}} f_{h}\right|_{p_{k-}}\right)\right\} d \mu d x \\
& \left.+\int_{\partial_{\mu} \Omega_{i k}}\left\{s_{3} \int_{\mu_{m-}}^{\mu_{m+}} f_{h} p^{2} d \mu-\frac{\Delta t^{n}}{\alpha}\left[\left.\left(1-\mu_{m+}^{2}\right) \widehat{H^{(\mu)}} f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m+}} p-\left.\left(1-\mu_{m-}^{2}\right) \widehat{H^{(\mu)}} f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m-}} p\right]\right\} d p d x\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

All the functions to be integrated are polynomials inside a given interval, rectangle or element. Therefore, we can integrate them exactly using a quadrature rule of enough degree, which could be either the usual Gaussian quadrature or the Gauss-Lobatto, which involves the end-points of the interval. We use Gauss-Lobatto quadratures for the integrals of $f_{h} p^{2}$ over intervals, so that
the values at the endpoints can balance the flux terms of boundary integrals, obtaining then CFL conditions.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& I=\frac{1}{V_{i k m}}\left[\int_{\partial_{x} \Omega_{k m}}\left\{\left.s_{1} \sum_{\hat{q}=1}^{N} \hat{w}_{\hat{q}} f_{h}\right|_{x_{\hat{q}}} p^{2} \Delta x_{i}-\frac{\Delta t^{n}}{\alpha}\left(\left.\widehat{H^{(x)}} f_{h}\right|_{x_{i+}} p^{2}-\left.\widehat{H^{(x)}} f_{h}\right|_{x_{i-}} p^{2}\right)\right\} d p d \mu\right. \\
& +\int_{\partial_{p} \Omega_{i m}}\left\{\left.s_{2} \sum_{\hat{r}=1}^{N} \hat{w}_{\hat{r}} f_{h}\right|_{p_{\hat{r}}} p_{\hat{r}}^{2} \Delta p_{k}-\frac{\Delta t^{n}}{\alpha}\left(\left.p_{k^{+}}^{2} \widehat{H^{(p)}} f_{h}\right|_{p_{k+}}-\left.p_{k^{-}}^{2} \widehat{H^{(p)}} f_{h}\right|_{p_{k-}}\right)\right\} d \mu d x \\
& \left.+\int_{\partial_{\mu} \Omega_{i k}}\left\{\left.s_{3} \sum_{\hat{s}=1}^{N} \hat{w}_{\hat{s}} f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{s}} p^{2} \Delta \mu_{m}-\frac{\Delta t^{n}}{\alpha}\left[\left.\left(1-\mu_{m+}^{2}\right) \widehat{H(\mu)} f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m+}} p-\left.\left(1-\mu_{m-}^{2}\right) \widehat{H(\mu)} f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m-}} p\right]\right\} d p d x\right] \\
& =\left[\int_{\partial_{x} \Omega_{k m}}\left\{s_{1} \Delta x_{i}\left(\left.\hat{w}_{1} f_{h}\right|_{x_{i-}} ^{+}+\left.\hat{w}_{N} f_{h}\right|_{x_{i+}} ^{-}+\left.\sum_{\hat{q}=2}^{N-1} \hat{w}_{\hat{q}} f_{h}\right|_{x_{\hat{q}}}\right)-\frac{\Delta t^{n}}{\alpha}\left(\left.\widehat{H^{(x)}} f_{h}\right|_{x_{i+}}-\left.\widehat{H^{(x)}} f_{h}\right|_{x_{i-}}\right)\right\} p^{2} d p d \mu\right. \\
& +\int_{\partial_{p} \Omega_{i m}}\left\{s_{2}\left(\left.\hat{w}_{1} f_{h}\right|_{p_{k-}} ^{+} p_{k-}^{2}+\left.\hat{w}_{N} f_{h}\right|_{p_{k+}} ^{-} p_{k+}^{2}+\left.\sum_{\hat{r}=2}^{N-1} \hat{w}_{\hat{r}} f_{h}\right|_{p_{\hat{r}}} p_{\hat{r}}^{2}\right) \Delta p_{k}\right. \\
& \left.-\frac{\Delta t^{n}}{\alpha}\left(\left.p_{k^{+}}^{2} \widehat{H^{(p)}} f_{h}\right|_{p_{k+}}-\left.p_{k^{-}}^{2} \widehat{H^{(p)}} f_{h}\right|_{p_{k-}}\right)\right\} d \mu d x \\
& +\int_{\partial_{\mu} \Omega_{i k}}\left\{s_{3}\left(\left.\hat{w}_{1} f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m-}} ^{+}+\left.\hat{w}_{N} f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m+}}+\left.\sum_{\hat{s}=2}^{N-1} \hat{w}_{\hat{s}} f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{s}}\right) p^{2} \Delta \mu_{m}\right. \\
& \left.\left.-\frac{\Delta t^{n}}{\alpha}\left[\left.\left(1-\mu_{m+}^{2}\right) \widehat{H^{(\mu)}} f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m+}}-\left.\left(1-\mu_{m-}^{2}\right) \widehat{H^{(\mu)}} f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m-}}\right] p\right\} d p d x\right] \frac{1}{V_{i k m}} \\
& =\left[\int_{\partial_{x} \Omega_{k m}} s_{1} \Delta x_{i}\left\{\left.\sum_{\hat{q}=2}^{N-1} \hat{w}_{\hat{q}} f_{h}\right|_{x_{\hat{q}}}+\left(\left.\hat{w}_{1} f_{h}\right|_{x_{i-}} ^{+}+\left.\hat{w}_{N} f_{h}\right|_{x_{i+}} ^{-}\right)-\frac{\Delta t^{n}}{\alpha s_{1} \Delta x_{i}}\left(\left.\widehat{H^{(x)}} f_{h}\right|_{x_{i+}}-\widehat{H^{(x)}} f_{h} \mid x_{i-}\right)\right\} p^{2} d p d \mu\right. \\
& +\int_{\partial_{p} \Omega_{i m}} s_{2} \Delta p_{k}\left\{\left(\left.\hat{w}_{1} f_{h}\right|_{p_{k-}} ^{+} p_{k-}^{2}+\left.\hat{w}_{N} f_{h}\right|_{p_{k+}} ^{-} p_{k+}^{2}\right)+\left.\sum_{\hat{r}=2}^{N-1} \hat{w}_{\hat{r}} f_{h}\right|_{p_{\hat{r}}} p_{\hat{r}}^{2}\right. \\
& \left.-\frac{\Delta t^{n}}{\alpha s_{2} \Delta p_{k}}\left(\left.p_{k^{+}}^{2} \widehat{H^{(p)}} f_{h}\right|_{p_{k+}}-\left.p_{k^{-}}^{2} \widehat{H^{(p)}} f_{h}\right|_{p_{k-}}\right)\right\} d \mu d x \\
& +\int_{\partial_{\mu} \Omega_{i k}} s_{3} p^{2} \Delta \mu_{m}\left\{\left(\left.\hat{w}_{1} f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m-}} ^{+}+\left.\hat{w}_{N} f_{h}\right|_{\bar{\mu}_{m+}} ^{-}\right)+\left.\sum_{\hat{s}=2}^{N-1} \hat{w}_{\hat{s}} f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{s}}\right. \\
& \left.\left.-\frac{\Delta t^{n}}{\alpha s_{3} p \Delta \mu_{m}}\left[\left.\left(1-\mu_{m+}^{2}\right) \widehat{H(\mu)} f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m+}}-\left.\left(1-\mu_{m-}^{2}\right) \widehat{H(\mu)} f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m-}}\right]\right\} d p d x\right] \frac{1}{V_{i k m}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

We reorganize the terms involving the endpoints, which are in parenthesis. So

$$
\begin{aligned}
I= & \frac{1}{V_{i k m}}\left[\int _ { \partial _ { x } \Omega _ { k m } } s _ { 1 } \Delta x _ { i } \left\{\left(\left.\hat{w}_{1} f_{h}\right|_{x_{i-}} ^{+}+\left.\frac{\Delta t^{n}}{\alpha s_{1} \Delta x_{i}} \widehat{H^{(x)}} f_{h}\right|_{x_{i-}}\right)+\left(\left.\hat{w}_{N} f_{h}\right|_{x_{i+}} ^{-}-\left.\frac{\Delta t^{n}}{\alpha s_{1} \Delta x_{i}} \widehat{H^{(x)}} f_{h}\right|_{x_{i+}}\right)\right.\right. \\
& \left.+\left.\sum_{\hat{q}=2}^{N-1} \hat{w}_{\hat{q}} f_{h}\right|_{x_{\hat{q}}}\right\} p^{2} d p d \mu+\int_{\partial_{p} \Omega_{i m}} s_{2} \Delta p_{k}\left\{\left.\sum_{\hat{r}=2}^{N-1} \hat{w}_{\hat{r}} f_{h}\right|_{p_{\hat{r}}} p_{\hat{r}}^{2}+\right. \\
& \left.\quad+p_{k^{-}}^{2}\left(\left.\hat{w}_{1} f_{h}\right|_{p_{k-}} ^{+}+\left.\frac{\Delta t^{n}}{\alpha s_{2} \Delta p_{k}} \widehat{H(p)} f_{h}\right|_{p_{k-}}\right)+p_{k+}^{2}\left(\left.\hat{w}_{N} f_{h}\right|_{p_{k+}} ^{-}-\left.\frac{\Delta t^{n}}{\alpha s_{2} \Delta p_{k}} \widehat{H(p)} f_{h}\right|_{p_{k+}}\right)\right\} d \mu d x \\
& +\int_{\partial_{\mu} \Omega_{i k}} d x d p p^{2} s_{3} \Delta \mu_{m}\left\{\left.\sum_{\hat{s}=2}^{N-1} \hat{w}_{\hat{s}} f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{\hat{s}}}+\right. \\
& \left.\left.+\left(\left.\hat{w}_{1} f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m-}} ^{+}+\left.\frac{\Delta t^{n}\left(1-\mu_{m-}^{2}\right)}{\alpha s_{3} p \Delta \mu_{m}} \widehat{H(\mu)} f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m-}}\right)+\left(\left.\hat{w}_{N} f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m+}} ^{-}-\left.\frac{\Delta t^{n}\left(1-\mu_{m+}^{2}\right)}{\alpha s_{3} p \Delta \mu_{m}} \widehat{H^{(\mu)}} f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m+}}\right)\right\}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

To guarantee the positivity of $I$, assuming that the terms $\left.f_{h}\right|_{x_{\hat{q}}},\left.f_{h}\right|_{p_{\hat{r}}},\left.f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{\hat{s}}}$ are positive at time $t^{n}$, we only need that the terms in parenthesis related to interval endpoints are positive. Since $\hat{w}_{1}=\hat{w}_{N}$ for Gauss-Lobatto Quadrature, we want the non-negativity of the terms

$$
\begin{align*}
0 & \leq\left(\left.\left.\hat{w}_{N} f_{h}\right|_{x_{i \pm}} ^{\mp} \mp \frac{\Delta t^{n}}{\alpha s_{1} \Delta x_{i}} \widehat{H^{(x)}} f_{h}\right|_{x_{i \pm}}\right) \\
0 & \leq\left(\left.\left.\hat{w}_{N} f_{h}\right|_{p_{k \pm}} ^{\mp} \mp \frac{\Delta t^{n}}{\alpha s_{2} \Delta p_{k}} \widehat{H^{(p)}} f_{h}\right|_{p_{k \pm}}\right)  \tag{77}\\
0 & \leq\left(\left.\left.\hat{w}_{N} f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m \pm}} ^{\mp} \mp \frac{\Delta t^{n}\left(1-\mu_{m \pm}^{2}\right)}{\alpha s_{3} p \Delta \mu_{m}} \widehat{H^{(\mu)}} f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m \pm}}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

We remember that we have used the following notation for the numerical flux terms, given by the upwind rule

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left.\widehat{H^{(x)}} f\right|_{x_{i \pm}} & =\left.\partial_{p} \varepsilon \widehat{f_{h} \mu}\right|_{x_{i \pm}}=\partial_{p} \varepsilon\left[\left.\left(\frac{\mu+|\mu|}{2}\right) f_{h}\right|_{x_{i \pm}} ^{-}+\left.\left(\frac{\mu-|\mu|}{2}\right) f_{h}\right|_{x_{i \pm}} ^{+}\right] \\
\left.\widehat{H^{(p)}} f\right|_{p_{k \pm}} & =-\left.q \widehat{E f_{h}} \mu\right|_{p_{k \pm}}=q\left[\left.\left(\frac{-E(x, t) \mu+|E(x, t) \mu|}{2}\right) f_{h}\right|_{p_{k \pm}} ^{-}+\left.\left(\frac{-E(x, t) \mu-|E(x, t) \mu|}{2}\right) f_{h}\right|_{p_{k \pm}} ^{+}\right] \\
\left.\widehat{H^{(\mu)}} f\right|_{\mu_{m \pm}} & =-\left.q \widehat{E f_{h}}\right|_{\mu_{m \pm}}=q\left[\left.\left(\frac{-E(x, t)+|E(x, t)|}{2}\right) f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m \pm}} ^{-}+\left.\left(\frac{-E(x, t)-|E(x, t)|}{2}\right) f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m \pm}} ^{+}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

We have assumed that the positivity of the pdf evaluated at Gauss-Lobatto points, which include endpoints, so we know $\left.f_{h}\right|_{x_{i \pm}} ^{\mp},\left.f_{h}\right|_{p_{k \pm}} ^{\mp},\left.f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m \pm}} ^{\mp}$ are positive. The worst case scenario for positivity is having negative flux terms. In that case,

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 & \leq\left.\hat{w}_{N} f_{h}\right|_{x_{i \pm}} ^{\mp}-\left.\frac{\Delta t^{n}}{\alpha s_{1} \Delta x_{i}} \partial_{p} \varepsilon|\mu| f_{h}\right|_{x_{i \pm}} ^{\mp}=\left.f_{h}\right|_{x_{i \pm}} ^{\mp}\left(\hat{w}_{N}-\frac{\Delta t^{n}}{\alpha s_{1} \Delta x_{i}} \partial_{p} \varepsilon|\mu|\right) \\
0 & \leq\left.\hat{w}_{N} f_{h}\right|_{p_{k \pm}} ^{\mp}-\left.\frac{\Delta t^{n}}{\alpha s_{2} \Delta p_{k}} q|E(x, t) \mu| f_{h}\right|_{p_{k \pm}} ^{\mp}=\left.f_{h}\right|_{p_{k \pm}} ^{\mp}\left(\hat{w}_{N}-\frac{\Delta t^{n}}{\alpha s_{2} \Delta p_{k}} q|E(x, t) \mu|\right) \\
0 & \leq\left.\hat{w}_{N} f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m \pm}} ^{\mp}-\left.\frac{\Delta t^{n}\left(1-\mu_{m \pm}^{2}\right)}{\alpha s_{3} p \Delta \mu_{m}} q|E(x, t)| f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m \pm}} ^{\mp}=\left.f_{h}\right|_{\mu_{m \pm}} ^{\mp}\left(\hat{w}_{N}-\frac{\Delta t^{n}\left(1-\mu_{m \pm}^{2}\right)}{\alpha s_{3} p \Delta \mu_{m}} q|E(x, t)|\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

We need then for the worst case scenario that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\hat{w}_{N} & \geq \frac{\Delta t^{n}}{\alpha s_{1} \Delta x_{i}} \partial_{p} \varepsilon|\mu| \\
\hat{w}_{N} & \geq \frac{\Delta t^{n}}{\alpha s_{2} \Delta p_{k}} q|E(x, t) \mu| \\
\hat{w}_{N} & \geq \frac{\Delta t^{n}\left(1-\mu_{m \pm}^{2}\right)}{\alpha s_{3} p \Delta \mu_{m}} q|E(x, t)|
\end{aligned}
$$

or equivalently,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\hat{w}_{N} \frac{\alpha s_{1} \Delta x_{i}}{\partial_{p} \varepsilon|\mu|} & \geq \Delta t^{n} \\
\hat{w}_{N} \frac{\alpha s_{2} \Delta p_{k}}{q|E(x, t) \mu|} & \geq \Delta t^{n} \\
\hat{w}_{N} \frac{\alpha s_{3} \Delta \mu_{m} p}{q|E(x, t)|\left(1-\mu_{m \pm}^{2}\right)} & \geq \Delta t^{n} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore the CFL conditions imposed to satisfy the positivity of the transport term $I$ are

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\alpha s_{1} \hat{w}_{N} \Delta x_{i}}{\max _{\hat{r}} \partial_{p} \varepsilon\left(p_{\hat{r}}\right) \cdot \max _{ \pm}\left|\mu_{m \pm}\right|} & \geq \Delta t^{n} \\
\frac{\alpha s_{2} \hat{w}_{N} \Delta p_{k}}{q \max _{\hat{q}}\left|E\left(x_{\hat{q}}, t\right)\right| \cdot \max _{ \pm}\left|\mu_{m \pm}\right|} & \geq \Delta t^{n} \\
\frac{\alpha s_{3} \hat{w}_{N} \Delta \mu_{m} \cdot p_{k-}}{q \max _{\hat{q}}\left|E\left(x_{\hat{q}}, t\right)\right| \cdot \max _{ \pm}\left(1-\mu_{m \pm}^{2}\right)} & \geq \Delta t^{n} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Regarding $I I$, there are several ways to guarantee its positivity.
One possible way to guarantee its positive is given below, by separating the gain and the loss part, combining the cell average with the loss term and deriving a CFL condition related to the collision frequency, and imposing a positivity condition on the points where the gain term is evaluated, which differs for inelastic scatterings from the previous Gauss-Lobatto points because of the addition or subtraction of the phonon energy $\hbar \omega$. We would need an additional set of points in which to impose positivity in order to guarantee positivity of $I I$ as a whole, since

$$
\begin{aligned}
& I I=\bar{f}_{i k m}^{n}+\frac{\Gamma_{C}}{1-\alpha}= \\
& \bar{f}_{i k m}^{n}+\left[2 \pi \int_{\Omega_{i k m}}\left(\left.\sum_{j=-1}^{+1} c_{j} \chi(\varepsilon(p)+j \hbar \omega) \int_{-1}^{+1} d \mu^{\prime}\left[f_{h}\left(x, p\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right), \mu^{\prime}\right) p^{2}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) \frac{d p^{\prime}}{d \varepsilon^{\prime}}\right]\right|_{\varepsilon^{\prime}=\varepsilon(p)+j \hbar \omega}\right) p^{2} d p d \mu d x\right. \\
& -4 \pi \int_{\Omega_{i k m}} f_{h}(x, p, \mu, t) \underbrace{\left(\left.\sum_{j=-1}^{+1} c_{j} \chi(\varepsilon(p)-j \hbar \omega)\left[p^{2}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) \frac{d p^{\prime}}{d \varepsilon^{\prime}}\right]\right|_{\varepsilon^{\prime}=\varepsilon(p)-j \hbar \omega}\right)}_{=\nu(p)>0, \quad \text { since } \quad \partial_{p} \varepsilon>0, \quad c_{j}>0, \quad \chi \geq 0} p^{2} d p d \mu d x] \frac{\Delta t^{n}}{V_{i k m}(1-\alpha)}= \\
& {\left[\frac{2 \pi \Delta t^{n}}{(1-\alpha)} \int_{\Omega_{i k m}}\left(\left.\sum_{j=-1}^{+1} c_{j} \chi(\varepsilon(p)+j \hbar \omega) \int_{-1}^{+1} d \mu^{\prime}\left[f_{h}\left(x, p\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right), \mu^{\prime}\right) p^{2}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) \frac{d p^{\prime}}{d \varepsilon^{\prime}}\right]\right|_{\varepsilon^{\prime}=\varepsilon(p)+j \hbar \omega}\right) p^{2} d p d \mu d x+\right.} \\
& \left.\int_{\Omega_{i k m}} f_{h} d V-\frac{4 \pi \Delta t^{n}}{(1-\alpha)} \int_{\Omega_{i k m}} f_{h}\left(\left.\sum_{j=-1}^{+1} c_{j} \chi(\varepsilon(p)-j \hbar \omega)\left[p^{2}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) \frac{d p^{\prime}}{d \varepsilon^{\prime}}\right]\right|_{\varepsilon^{\prime}=\varepsilon(p)-j \hbar \omega}\right) p^{2} d p d \mu d x\right] \frac{1}{V_{i k m}}= \\
& {\left[\left.\frac{2 \pi \Delta t^{n}}{(1-\alpha)} \sum_{j=-1}^{+1} c_{j} \int_{\Omega_{i k m}} \int_{-1}^{+1} d \mu^{\prime}\left[f_{h}\left(x, p\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right), \mu^{\prime}\right) p^{2}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) \frac{d p^{\prime}}{d \varepsilon^{\prime}}\right]\right|_{\varepsilon^{\prime}=\varepsilon(p)+j \hbar \omega} \chi(\varepsilon(p)+j \hbar \omega) p^{2} d p d \mu d x+\right.} \\
& \left.\int_{\Omega_{i k m}} f_{h}(x, p, \mu, t)\left(1-\left.\frac{4 \pi \Delta t^{n}}{(1-\alpha)} \sum_{j=-1}^{+1} c_{j} \chi(\varepsilon(p)-j \hbar \omega)\left[p^{2}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) \frac{d p^{\prime}}{d \varepsilon^{\prime}}\right]\right|_{\varepsilon^{\prime}=\varepsilon(p)-j \hbar \omega}\right) p^{2} d p d \mu d x\right] \frac{1}{V_{i k m}}= \\
& {\left[\begin{array}{l}
\frac{2 \pi \Delta t^{n}}{(1-\alpha)} \sum_{j=-1}^{+1} c_{j}\left|\Omega_{i k m}\right| \underbrace{\sum_{s, r, q} w_{s, r, q} f_{h}\left(x_{s}, p^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon\left(p_{r}\right)+j \hbar \omega\right), \mu_{q}^{\prime}\right)\left[p^{\prime 2}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) \frac{d p^{\prime}}{d \varepsilon^{\prime}} \chi\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\right]\left\{\varepsilon\left(p_{r}\right)+j \hbar \omega\right\} p_{r}^{2}}_{>0}
\end{array}\right.} \\
& +\int_{\Omega_{i k m}} f_{h}(x, p, \mu, t) \underbrace{\left(1-\left.\frac{4 \pi \Delta t^{n}}{(1-\alpha)} \sum_{j=-1}^{+1} c_{j} \chi(\varepsilon(p)-j \hbar \omega)\left[p^{2}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) \frac{d p^{\prime}}{d \varepsilon^{\prime}}\right]\right|_{\varepsilon^{\prime}=\varepsilon(p)-j \hbar \omega}\right)}_{>0 \rightarrow(1-\alpha)\left(\left.\max _{G Q p} \sum_{j=-1}^{+1} c_{j} \chi(\varepsilon(p)-j \hbar \omega)\left[p^{2}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) \frac{d p^{\prime}}{d \varepsilon^{\prime}}\right]\right|_{\varepsilon^{\prime}=\varepsilon(p)-j \hbar \omega}\right)^{-1}>\Delta t} p^{2} d p d \mu d x]_{V_{i k m}}
\end{aligned}
$$

where the notation for the measure of the elements is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\Omega_{i k m}\right|=\Delta x_{i} \Delta p_{k} \Delta \mu_{m} \tag{78}
\end{equation*}
$$

Another possible way to guarantee positivity for $I I$ is by considering the collision term as a whole. The difference between the gain minus the loss integrals will give us a smaller source term overall, and therefore a more relaxed CFL condition for $\Delta t^{n}$. We have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& I I=\bar{f}_{i k m}^{n}+\frac{\Gamma_{C}}{1-\alpha}=\frac{\int_{\Omega_{i k m}} f_{h} d V}{V_{i k m}}+\frac{\Delta t^{n} \int_{\Omega_{i k m}} Q\left(f_{h}\right) d V}{(1-\alpha) V_{i k m}}=\frac{\int_{\Omega_{i k m}} f_{h} d V}{V_{i k m}}+ \\
& +\left[2 \pi \int_{\Omega_{i k m}}\left(\left.\sum_{j=-1}^{+1} c_{j} \chi(\varepsilon(p)+j \hbar \omega) \int_{-1}^{+1} d \mu^{\prime}\left[f_{h}\left(x, p\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right), \mu^{\prime}\right) p^{2}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) \frac{d p^{\prime}}{d \varepsilon^{\prime}}\right]\right|_{\varepsilon^{\prime}=\varepsilon(p)+j \hbar \omega}\right) p^{2} d p d \mu d x\right. \\
& -4 \pi \int_{\Omega_{i k m}} f_{h}(x, p, \mu, t) \underbrace{\left(\left.\sum_{j=-1}^{+1} c_{j} \chi(\varepsilon(p)-j \hbar \omega)\left[p^{2}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) \frac{d p^{\prime}}{d \varepsilon^{\prime}}\right]\right|_{\varepsilon^{\prime}=\varepsilon(p)-j \hbar \omega}\right)}_{=\nu(p)>0, \quad \text { since } \quad \partial_{p} \varepsilon>0, \quad c_{j}>0, \quad \chi \geq 0} p^{2} d p d \mu d x] \frac{\Delta t^{n}}{V_{i k m}(1-\alpha)}= \\
& {\left[\frac { 2 \pi \Delta t ^ { n } } { ( 1 - \alpha ) } \left\{\int_{\Omega_{i k m}}\left(\left.\sum_{j=-1}^{+1} c_{j} \chi(\varepsilon(p)+j \hbar \omega) \int_{-1}^{+1} d \mu^{\prime}\left[f_{h}\left(x, p\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right), \mu^{\prime}\right) p^{2}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) \frac{d p^{\prime}}{d \varepsilon^{\prime}}\right]\right|_{\varepsilon^{\prime}=\varepsilon(p)+j \hbar \omega}\right) p^{2} d p d \mu d x+\right.\right.} \\
& \left.\left.-2 \int_{\Omega_{i k m}} f_{h}\left(\left.\sum_{j=-1}^{+1} c_{j} \chi(\varepsilon(p)-j \hbar \omega)\left[p^{2}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) \frac{d p^{\prime}}{d \varepsilon^{\prime}}\right]\right|_{\varepsilon^{\prime}=\varepsilon(p)-j \hbar \omega}\right) p^{2} d p d \mu d x\right\}+\int_{\Omega_{i k m}} f_{h} d V\right] \frac{1}{V_{i k m}}= \\
& {[\frac{\Delta t^{n}}{(1-\alpha)} \int_{\Omega_{i k m}} \underbrace{\left(\left.2 \pi \sum_{j=-1}^{+1} c_{j} \int_{-1}^{+1} d \mu^{\prime}\left[f_{h}\left(x, p\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right), \mu^{\prime}\right) p^{2}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) \frac{d p^{\prime}}{d \varepsilon^{\prime}} \chi\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\right]\right|_{\varepsilon^{\prime}=\varepsilon(p)+j \hbar \omega}-f_{h} \nu(p)\right)}_{Q\left(f_{h}\right)} p^{2} d p d \mu d x} \\
& \left.+\int_{\Omega_{i k m}} f_{h} d V\right] \frac{1}{V_{i k m}}, \quad \nu(p)=\left.4 \pi \sum_{j=-1}^{+1} c_{j}\left[p^{2}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) \frac{d p^{\prime}}{d \varepsilon^{\prime}} \chi\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\right]\right|_{\varepsilon^{\prime}=\varepsilon(p)-j \hbar \omega}=\nu(\varepsilon(p)) .
\end{aligned}
$$

We will treat then the cell average of the collision term, the gain minus loss term, as a whole, considering it a source term, and we will apply the same techniques for positivity preserving DG schemes for transport equations with source terms. We have then that

$$
\begin{align*}
I I & =\bar{f}_{i k m}^{n}+\frac{\Gamma_{C}}{1-\alpha}=\frac{\int_{\Omega_{i k m}} f_{h} d V}{V_{i k m}}+\frac{\Delta t^{n} \int_{\Omega_{i k m}} Q\left(f_{h}\right) d V}{(1-\alpha) V_{i k m}}= \\
& =\frac{1}{V_{i k m}}\left[\int_{\Omega_{i k m}} f_{h} p^{2} d p d \mu d x+\frac{\Delta t^{n}}{(1-\alpha)} \int_{\Omega_{i k m}} Q\left(f_{h}\right) p^{2} d p d \mu d x\right], \\
Q\left(f_{h}\right) & =\left.2 \pi \sum_{j=-1}^{+1} c_{j} \int_{-1}^{+1} d \mu^{\prime} f_{h}\left(x, p\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right), \mu^{\prime}\right) p^{2}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) \frac{d p^{\prime}}{d \varepsilon^{\prime}} \chi\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\right|_{\varepsilon^{\prime}=\varepsilon(p)+j \hbar \omega}-f_{h} \nu(p), \\
\nu(p) & =\left.4 \pi \sum_{j=-1}^{+1} c_{j}\left[p^{2}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) \frac{d p^{\prime}}{d \varepsilon^{\prime}} \chi\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\right]\right|_{\varepsilon^{\prime}=\varepsilon(p)-j \hbar \omega}=\nu(\varepsilon(p)) . \tag{79}
\end{align*}
$$

We want $I I$ to be positive. If the collision operator part was negative, we choose the time step $\Delta t^{n}$ such that $I I$ is positive on total. We will get this way our CFL condition in order to guarantee the positivity of $I I$. We want that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& I I=\frac{1}{V_{i k m}} \int_{\Omega_{i k m}}\left[f_{h}(x, p, \mu, t)+\frac{\Delta t^{n}}{(1-\alpha)} Q\left(f_{h}\right)(x, p, \mu, t)\right] p^{2} d p d \mu d x \geq 0 \\
& I I=\frac{\left|\Omega_{i k m}\right|}{V_{i k m}} \sum_{q, r, s} w_{q} w_{r} w_{s}\left[f_{h}\left(x_{q}, p_{r}, \mu_{s}, t\right)+\frac{\Delta t^{n}}{(1-\alpha)} Q\left(f_{h}\right)\left(x_{q}, p_{r}, \mu_{s}, t\right)\right] p_{r}^{2} \geq 0
\end{aligned}
$$

If $0>Q\left(f_{h}\right)$ for any of the points $\left(x_{q}, p_{r}, \mu_{s}\right)$ at time $t=t^{n}$, then choose $\Delta t^{n}$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 & \leq f_{h}\left(x_{q}, p_{r}, \mu_{s}, t\right)+\frac{\Delta t^{n}}{(1-\alpha)} Q\left(f_{h}\right)\left(x_{q}, p_{r}, \mu_{s}, t\right) \\
0 & \leq f_{h}\left(x_{q}, p_{r}, \mu_{s}, t\right)-\frac{\Delta t^{n}}{(1-\alpha)}\left|Q\left(f_{h}\right)\right|\left(x_{q}, p_{r}, \mu_{s}, t\right) \\
\Delta t^{n} & \leq \frac{(1-\alpha) f_{h}\left(x_{q}, p_{r}, \mu_{s}, t\right)}{\left|Q\left(f_{h}\right)\right|\left(x_{q}, p_{r}, \mu_{s}, t\right)}
\end{aligned}
$$

Our CFL condition in this case would be then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta t^{n} \leq(1-\alpha) \min _{Q\left(f_{h}\right)\left(x_{q}, p_{r}, \mu_{s}, t^{n}\right)<0}\left\{\frac{f_{h}\left(x_{q}, p_{r}, \mu_{s}, t^{n}\right)}{\left|Q\left(f_{h}\right)\right|\left(x_{q}, p_{r}, \mu_{s}, t^{n}\right)}\right\} \tag{80}
\end{equation*}
$$

The minimum for the CFL condition is taken over the subset of Gaussian Quadrature points $\left(x_{q}, p_{r}, \mu_{s}\right)$ inside the cell $\Omega_{i k m}$ (whichever the chosen quadrature rule was) over which

$$
Q\left(f_{h}\right)\left(x_{q}, p_{r}, \mu_{s}, t^{n}\right)<0
$$

This subset of points might be different for each time $t^{n}$ then.

We have figured out the respective CFL conditions for the transport and collision parts. Finally, we only need to choose the optimal parameter $\alpha$ that gives us the most relaxed CFL condition for $\Delta t^{n}$ such that positivity is preserved for the cell average at the next time, $\bar{f}_{i k m}^{n+1}$. The positivity of the whole numerical solution to the pdf, not just its cell average, can be guaranteed by applying the limiters in [15, 16], which preserve the cell average but modify the slope of the piecewise linear solutions in order to make the function non - negative in case it was negative before.

## 4 Conclusions

The work presented here relates to the development of entropy stable and positivity preserving DG schemes for BP models of collisional electron transport in semiconductors. Due to the physics of energy transitions given by Planck's law, and to reduce the dimension of the associated collision operator, given its mathematical form, we pose the Boltzmann Equation for electron transport in curvilinear coordinates for the momentum. This is a more general form that includes two previous BP models in different coordinate systems used in in [4] and [12] as particular cases. We consider first the 1D diode problem with azimuthal symmetry assumptions, which give us a 3D plus time problem. We choose for this problem the spherical coordinate system $\vec{p}(p, \mu, \varphi)$, slightly different to choices in previous works, because its DG formulation gives simpler integrals involving just piecewise polynomial functions for both transport and collision terms, which is convenient for Gaussian quadrature. We have been able to prove the full stability of the semi-discrete DG scheme formulated under an entropy norm and the decay of this norm over time for a 3D plus time problem (1D in position and 2D in momentum), assuming periodic boundary conditions for simplicity. This highlights the importance of the dissipative properties of our collisional operator given by its entropy inequalities. The entropy norm depends on the full time dependent Hamiltonian rather than just the Maxwellian associated solely to the kinetic energy. We prove another stability result for a 5 D plus time problem (2D in position, 3 D in momentum) considering in this case not only periodic but also specular reflection boundary conditions, where the integral associated to each reflecting boundary vanishes by itself due to specularity. Regarding positivity preserving DG schemes, using the strategy in [15], [16], [5], we treat the collision operator as a source term, and find convex combinations of the transport and collision terms which guarantee the preservation of positivity of the cell average of our numerical probability density function at the next time step.

The positivity of the numerical solution to the pdf in the whole domain can be guaranteed just by applying the limiters in [15, 16] that preserve the cell average but modify the slope of the piecewise linear solutions in order to make the function non - negative.
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