History and motivation

2024-06-14

Very much like Unix in the late 1960s and C in the early 1970s, FeenoX is a third-system effect: I wrote a first hack that seemed to work better than I had expected. Then I tried to add a lot of features and complexities which I felt the code needed. After ten years of actual usage, I then realized

- 1. what was worth keeping,
- 2. what needed to be rewritten and
- 3. what had to be discarded.

The first version was called wasora, the second was "The wasora suite" (i.e. a generic framework plus a bunch of "plugins", including a thermo-mechanical one named Fino) and then finally FeenoX. The story that follows explains why I wrote the first hack to begin with.

It was at the movies when I first heard about dynamical systems, non-linear equations and chaos theory. The year was 1993, I was ten years old and the movie was Jurassic Park. Dr. Ian Malcolm (the character portrayed by Jeff Goldblum) explained sensitivity to initial conditions in a memorable scene, which is worth watching again and again. Since then, the fact that tiny variations may lead to unexpected results has always fascinated me. During high school I attended a very interesting course on fractals and chaos that made me think further about complexity and its mathematical description. Nevertheless, it was not not until college that I was able to really model and solve the differential equations that give rise to chaotic behavior.



Figure 1: Dr. Ian Malcolm (Jeff Goldblum) explains sensitivity to initial conditions.

In fact, initial-value ordinary differential equations arise in a great variety of subjects in science and engineering. Classical mechanics, chemical kinetics, structural dynamics, heat transfer analysis and dynamical systems, among other disciplines, heavily rely on equations of the form

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = F(\mathbf{x}, t)$$

During my years of undergraduate student (circa 2004–2007), whenever I had to solve these kind of equations I had to choose one of the following three options:

- 1. to program an *ad-hoc* numerical method such as Euler or Runge-Kutta, matching the requirements of the system of equations to solve, or
- 2. to use a standard numerical library such as the GNU Scientific Library and code the equations to solve into a C program (or maybe in Python), or
- 3. to use a high-level system such as Octave, Maxima, or some non-free (and worse, see below) programs.

Of course, each option had its pros and its cons. But none provided the combination of advantages I was looking for, namely flexibility (option one), efficiency (option two) and reduced input work (partially given by option three). Back in those days I ended up wandering between options one and two, depending on the type of problem I had to solve. However, even though one can, with some effort, make the code read some parameters from a text file, any other drastic change usually requires a modification in the source code—some times involving a substantial amount of work—and a further recompilation of the code. This was what I most disliked about this way of working, but I could nevertheless live with it.

Regardless of this situation, during my last year of Nuclear Engineering, the tipping point came along. Here's a slightly-fictionalized of a dialog between myself and the teacher at the computer lab (Dr E.), as it might have happened (or not):

- (Prof.) Open MATLAB.™
- (Me) It's not installed here. I type mathlab and it does not work.
- $-\ (Prof.)$ It's spelled matlab.
- (Me) Ok, working. (A screen with blocks and lines connecting them appears)
- (Me) What's this?
- (Prof.) The point reactor equations.
- (Me) It's not. These are the point reactor equations:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\phi}(t) = \frac{\rho(t) - \beta}{\Lambda} \cdot \phi(t) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \lambda_i \cdot c_i \\ \dot{c}_i(t) = \frac{\beta_i}{\Lambda} \cdot \phi(t) - \lambda_i \cdot c_i \end{cases}$$

- (Me) And in any case, I'd write them like this in a computer:

phi_dot = (rho-Beta)/Lambda * phi + sum(lambda[i], c[i], i, 1, N)
c_dot[i] = beta[i]/Lambda * phi - lambda[i]*c[i]

This conversation forced me to re-think the ODE-solving issue. I could not (and still cannot) understand why somebody would prefer to solve a very simple set of differential equations by drawing blocks and

History and motivation

connecting them with a mouse with no mathematical sense whatsoever. Fast forward fifteen years, and what I wrote above is essentially how one would solve the point kinetics equations with FeenoX.