



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

**FINITE ELEMENT AND DIFFERENTIAL QUADRATURE METHODS
FOR HEAT DISTRIBUTION IN RECTANGULAR FINS**

MD MOSLEMUDDIN FAKIR

FK 2009 7

**FINITE ELEMENT AND DIFFERENTIAL QUADRATURE METHODS
FOR HEAT DISTRIBUTION IN RECTANGULAR FINS**

By

MD MOSLEMUDDIN FAKIR

**Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra
Malaysia, in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy**

April 2009



DEDICATION

This Thesis is Dedicated to My

Parents

Children:

**Nusrat Jahan Shoumy
Rifatul Bari**

&

Wife:

Sabira Khatun



Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

**FINITE ELEMENT AND DIFFERENTIAL QUADRATURE METHODS
FOR HEAT DISTRIBUTION IN RECTANGULAR FINS**

By

MD. MOSLEMUDDIN FAKIR

April 2009

Chairman: Professor ShahNor Basri, PhD

Faculty: Engineering

Presently there are many numerical solution techniques such as finite element method (FEM), differential quadrature method (DQM), finite difference method (FDM), boundary element method (BEM), Raleigh-Ritz method (RRM), etc. These methods have their respective drawbacks. However, FEM and DQM are important techniques among those.

The conventional FEM (CFEM) provides flexibility to model complex geometries than FDM and conventional DQM (CDQM) do in spite some of its own drawbacks. It has been widely used in solving structural, mechanical, heat transfer, and fluid dynamics problems as well as problems of other disciplines. It has the characteristic that the solution must be calculated with a large number of mesh points (uniformly distributed) in order to obtain moderately accurate results at the points of interest. Consequently, both the computing time and storage required often prohibit the calculation. Therefore, focus is given to optimize the CFEM.



The Optimum FEM (OFEM) has been presented in this thesis to solve heat conduction problems in rectangular thin fins. This method is a simple and direct technique, which can be applied in a large number of cases to circumvent the computational time and complexity. The accuracy of the method depends mainly on the accuracy of the mesh generation (non-uniformly distributed) and stiffness matrix calculation, which is a key of the method. In this thesis, the algorithm for OFEM solution and the optimum mesh generation formula have been developed and presented. The technique has been illustrated with the solution of four heat conduction problems in fins for two types of mesh size distribution (uniformly distributed and non-uniformly distributed). The obtained OFEM results are of good accuracy with the exact solutions. It is also shown that the obtained OFEM results are at least 90% and 7% improved than those of similar published CFEM and ODQM results respectively. This method is a vital alternative to the conventional numerical methods, such as FDM, CFEM and DQM.

On the other hand, DQM is suitable for simple geometry and not suitable for practical large-scale problems or on complex geometries. DQM is used efficiently to solve various one-dimensional heat transfer problems. For two-dimensional case, this technique is so far used to solve Poisson's equation and some fluid flow problems but not the heat conduction problems in fins. Hence, in this thesis, a two-dimensional heat conduction problem in a thin rectangular fin is solved using DQM by means of the accurate discretization (for uniformly distributed (CDQM) and non-uniformly distributed (ODQM) mesh size.

DQM optimum discretization rule and mesh generation formula have been presented. The governing equations have been discretized according to DQM rule.

The technique has been illustrated with the solution of two two-dimensional heat conduction problems in fins. The obtained results show that the DQM results are of good accuracy with the FEM results. Optimum DQM (ODQM) shows better accuracy and stability than CDQM and CFEM. But in some cases, OFEM shows better efficiency than ODQM.

Abstrak tesis dipersembahkan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi syarat keperluan untuk ijazah Doktor Falasafah.

**KAEDAH UNSUR TERHINGGA DAN PEMBEZAAN KUADRATIK
UNTUK PENGAGIHAN HABA DALAM SIRIP SEGIEMPAT TEPAT**

Oleh

MD. MOSLEMUDDIN FAKIR

April 2009

Pengerusi: Profesor ShahNor Basri, PhD

Fakulti: Kejuruteraan

Kini terdapat banyak kaedah penyelesaian berangka iaitu seperti kaedah unsur terhingga (FEM), kaedah pembezaan kuadratik (DQM), kaedah pembezaan terhingga (FDM), kaedah unsur sempadan (BEM), kaedah Raleigh-Ritz (RRM), dll. Kesemua kaedah tersebut mempunyai kelemahan masing-masing. Namun demikian, FDM, FEM dan DQM adalah antara teknik-teknik yang penting.

Kaedah konvensional FEM (CFEM) memberi lebih kelonggaran dalam permodelan geometri yang kompleks berbanding dengan FDM dan konvensional DQM (CDQM) walaupun ianya mempunyai kelemahan tersendiri. Ia telah digunakan dengan meluas dalam menyelesaikan masalah struktur, mekanikal, pemindahan haba dan dinamik bendalir termasuk juga masalah dari disiplin yang lain. Ia mempunyai ciri dimana penyelesaiannya mesti dihitung dengan jumlah titik jaringan yang besar (diagihkan dengan seragam) bagi mendapatkan keputusan yang sederhana tepat pada titik yang dikehendaki. Dengan itu, kedua-dua masa pengiraan dan penyimpanan komputer yang diperlukan biasanya akan menghalang pengiraan. Oleh itu fokus akan diberikan kepada mengoptimumkan CFEM.

Pengoptimuman FEM (OFEM) telah dibentangkan dalam tesis ini untuk menyelesaikan masalah pengaliran haba dalam sirip nipis empat segi tepat. Kaedah ini mudah dan terus dimana ia boleh digunakan dalam kebanyakan kes untuk mengatasi tempoh dan kesukaran pengaturcaraan. Ketepatan kaedah ini terutamanya bergantung kepada ketepatan penjanaan jaringan (agihan tidak seragam) dan pengiraan matrik kekenyalan, dimana ia adalah kunci kepada kaedah ini. Dalam tesis ini, penyelesaian algoritma OFEM dan formula pengoptimuman penjanaan jaringan telah dibangunkan dan dibentangkan. Teknik ini telah diilustrasikan dengan menyelesaikan empat masalah pemindahan haba dalam sirip untuk dua jenis agihan saiz jaringan (agihan seragam dan agihan tidak seragam). Keputusan OFEM yang diperolehi mempunyai ketepatan yang baik berbanding dengan penyelesaian sebenar. Dapat ditunjukkan juga bahawa keputusan OFEM yang diperolehi telah dipertingkatkan sekurang-kurangnya 90% dan 7% berbanding dengan keputusan yang sama yang diterbitkan dengan CFEM dan DQM. Kaedah ini merupakan pilihan penting kepada kaedah berangka konvensional seperti FDM, CFEM dan DQM.

Namun demikian, DQM adalah sesuai untuk geometri mudah dan tidak sesuai untuk masalah praktikal berskala besar serta bergeometri kompleks. DQM digunakan dengan cekap untuk menyelesaikan pelbagai masalah pemindahan haba satu dimensi. Untuk kes dua dimensi, teknik ini masih digunakan untuk menyelesaikan persamaan Poisson dan sedikit masalah aliran bendalir tetapi tidak untuk masalah pengaliran haba dalam sirip. Oleh itu, dalam tesis ini, masalah dua dimensi pengaliran haba untuk sirip nipis empat segi tepat telah diselesaikan menggunakan DQM dengan cara pengagihan tepat (untuk agihan titik jaringan seragam dan agihan titik jaringan tidak seragam).

Hukum pendiskretan optimum DQM dan rumus penjanaan jaringan telah dibentangkan. Persamaan-persamaan menakluk telah didiskretkan mengikut hukum DQM. Teknik ini telah diilustrasikan dengan penyelesaian dua masalah dua-dimensi pengaliran haba dalam sirip. Keputusan yang diperolehi menunjukkan keputusan DQM mempunyai ketepatan yang baik dengan keputusan FEM. DQM optimum (ODQM) menunjukkan ketepatan dan kestabilan yang lebih baik dari CDQM dan CFEM. Tetapi untuk sesetengah kes, OFEM menunjukan kecekapan yang lebih baik berbanding ODQM.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all I would like to express my sincerest appreciation and deepest gratitude to Professor Ir. Dr. ShahNor Basri who initially introduced me to the concept of Finite Element Method in Computational Mechanics. Since then, he has provided me the necessary materials to do research in this field and given me his wise counsel, guidance and valuable help whenever I needed. I am ever grateful to his unflinching guidance, support and encouragement.

I would also like to thank my supervisory committee members Associate Professor Dr. -Ing. Renuganth Varatharajoo and Dr. Abdul Aziz Jaafar for their valuable guidance, comments and suggestions, which were very helpful throughout my research work. I am very grateful for all of these assistance and encouragement.

I am particularly grateful to our senior brother Dr. Azmin for his active help and cooperation in exchange of scientific knowledge whenever I needed. I am truly indebted to his assistance.

Finally, I would like to thank all the staff members in the Department of Aerospace Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, UPM, for their direct and indirect help and co-operation throughout the period of my study.



I certify that an Examination Committee met on 2nd of April 2008 to conduct the final examination of Md. Moslem Uddin Fakir on his Doctor of Philosophy Thesis entitled “Finite Element and Differential Quadrature Methods for Heat Distribution in Rectangular Fins” in accordance with Universiti Pertanian Malaysia (Higher Degree) Act 1980 and Universiti Pertanian Malaysia (Higher Degree) Regulations 1981. The committee recommends that the candidate be awarded the relevant degree. Members of the Examination Committee are as follows:

Abd. Rahim Abu Talib, PhD

Lecturer/ Head of the Department, Aerospace Engineering
Faculty of Engineering
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chairman)

Ir. Mohd. Sapuan Salit, PhD

Professor
Faculty of Engineering
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Internal Examiner)

Rizal Zahari, PhD

Senior Lecturer
Faculty of Engineering
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Internal Examiner)

Ahmad Kamal Ariffin Mohd Ihsan, PhD

Professor
Faculty of Engineering
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia
(External Examiner)

Bujang Kim Huat, PhD

Professor /Deputy Dean
School Of Graduate Studies
University Putra Malaysia

Date:



This thesis submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia has been accepted as fulfillment of the requirement for the degree Doctor of Philosophy.

The members of the Supervisory Committee are as follows:

ShahNor Basri, PhD

Professor
Faculty of Engineering
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chairman)

Renuganth Varatharajoo, PhD, P. Eng.

Associate Professor
Faculty of Engineering
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

Abdul Aziz Jaafar, PhD

Senior Lecturer
Faculty of Engineering
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

HASANAH MOHD GHAZALI, PhD

Professor and Dean
School of Graduate Studies,
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 8 June 2009



DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the thesis is based on my original work except for quotations and citations which have been duly acknowledged. I also declare that it has not been previously or concurrently submitted for any other degree at UPM or other institutions.

(MD. MOSLEMUDDIN FAKIR)

Date:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ABSTRAK	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	ix
APPROVAL	x
DECLARATION	xii
LIST OF TABLES	xviii
LIST OF FIGURES	xx
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xxvii
 CHAPTERS	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Problem Statement and Motivation	2
1.3 Research Aim and Objectives	5
1.4 Contribution of the Thesis	6
1.5 Organization of the Thesis	7
 2. LITERATURE REVIEW	 10
2.1 Background and Fitness of Finite Element Method	10
2.1.1 Computational Mechanics	10
2.1.2 Statics versus Dynamics	12
2.1.3 Linear versus Nonlinear	13
2.1.4 Discretization methods	13
2.1.5 Finite Element Method and Variants	15
2.2 The FEM Analysis Process	16
2.2.1 The Physical FEM	17



2.2.2	The Mathematical FEM	19
2.2.3	Synergy of Physical and Mathematical FEM	21
2.3.	Interpretations of the Finite Element Method	23
2.3.1	Physical Interpretation	23
2.3.2	Mathematical Interpretation	24
2.3.3	Sources of Errors for FEM	25
2.3.4	Using a Computer Program	26
2.4	FEM Working Procedure	26
2.5	Reviews On Some Related Work Done	28
2.5.1	Numerical Prediction of Flow and Heat Transfer in a Rectangular Channel	28
2.5.2	Application of FEM FDM Integrated Approach	28
2.5.3	Finite Element Mesh Generation	29
2.5.4	Effects of the Swinging Amplitude of Fins on Heat Transfer in a Flow	30
2.5.5	Stabilized Finite Element Computations for Heat Conduction	31
2.5.6	Application of Heat Transfer	34
2.5.7	Application of Heat Conduction	37
2.5.8	A Higher Order Finite Element	39
2.6	Application of Differential Quadrature Method (DQM)	39
2.6.1	Formulation for Direct Computing in DQM	40
2.6.2	Mathematical Formulation for DQM	41
2.6.3	Some Recent Researches on Heat Transfer and Mesh Generation Related Problems	52
2.6.4	Some Recent Researches on Various Aspects of DQM	55
2.6.5	Summary on DQM	62
2.7	Closure	63
3.	METHODOLOGY	64
3.1	Introduction	64
3.2	Finite Element Optimal Discretization and Solution Rules	66
3.2.1	Discretization and Solution Rule for 1-D FEM	67
3.2.2	Discretization and Solution Rule for 2-D FEM	72

3.3	Finite Element Mathematical Formulation	79
3.3.1	Finite Element Mathematical Formulation for One Dimension	79
3.3.1.1	FEM Galerkin's Approach for One Dimensional Heat Conduction Problems	81
3.3.1.2	FEM Mathematical Formulation of 1-D Application Problems	87
3.3.2	Finite Element Mathematical Formulation for Two Dimension	90
3.3.2.1	FEM Galerkin's Approach for Two Dimensional Heat Conduction Problems	91
3.3.2.2	Boundary Conditions of 2-D Application Problems	95
3.4	Differential Quadrature Rules	96
3.4.1	Determination of DQM Mesh Points	97
3.4.2	Determination of Weighting Coefficients from Quadrature Rule	98
3.4.3	Two Dimensional discretization for DQM	99
3.4.4	Two Dimensional DQM discretization for Application Problems	100
3.5	Absolute Relative Percent Error Calculation	101
3.6	Summary	102
4.	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF 1-D APPLICATION PROBLEMS	103
4.1	Introduction	103
4.2	Results and Discussions of 1-D Insulated Tip Thin Rectangular Fin	105
4.3	Results and Discussions of 1-D Convection Tip Thin Rectangular Fin	117
4.4	Summary	128



5.	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF 1-D VERSUS 2-D APPLICATION PROBLEMS	129
5.1	Introduction	129
5.2	Comparison of 1-D versus 2-D Insulated Tip Thin Rectangular Fin	131
5.2.1	Comparison of 1-D versus 2-D Insulated Tip Thin Fin for 3 versus 2 Elements and Ambient Temperature 20 ⁰ C	131
5.2.2	Comparison of 1-D versus 2-D Insulated Tip Thin Fin for 10 versus 2 Elements and Ambient Temperature 0 ⁰ C	136
5.2.3	Comparison of 1-D versus 2-D Insulated Tip Fin with Ambient Temperature 20 ⁰ C and Fin-Dimension 5m by 5m	141
5.3	Comparison of 1-D versus 2-D Convection Tip Thin Rectangular Fin	146
5.3.1	Comparison of 1-D versus 2-D Convection Tip Thin Fin for 10 versus 2 Elements and Ambient Temperature 0 ⁰ C	146
5.3.2	Comparison of 1-D versus 2-D Convection Tip Fin with Ambient Temperature 20 ⁰ C and Fin-Dimension 5m by 5m for 10 versus 10 Elements	151
5.4	Summary	157
6.	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF 2-D FEM versus DQM APPLICATION PROBLEMS	159
6.1	Introduction	159
6.2	Comparison of 2-D FEM versus DQM Insulated Tip Thin Rectangular Fin	160
6.2.1	Comparison of 2-D FEM versus DQM Results for Insulated Tip Narrow Rectangular Fin with Ambient Temperature 0 ⁰ C	160
6.2.2	Comparison of 2-D FEM versus DQM Results for a Wide Insulated Tip Rectangular Fin with Ambient Temperature 20 ⁰ C and Fin Dimension 5m by 5m	166
6.3	Convection Tip Thin Rectangular Fin	171
6.3.1	Comparison of 2-D FEM versus DQM Results for Convection Tip Narrow Rectangular Fin with Ambient Temperature 0 ⁰ C	171
6.3.2	Comparison of 2-D FEM versus DQM Results for a Wide Convection Tip Rectangular Fin with Ambient Temperature 20 ⁰ C and Fin Dimension 5m by 5m	177
6.4	FEM Temperature Distribution Behaviour of an Specific Example Fin with Internal Heat Generation	182
6.5	Summary	187



7. CONCLUSION	188
Conclusion	188
Future Research Directions	189
REFERENCES	191
BIODATA OF STUDENT	204



LIST OF TABLES

Tables		Page
4.1	Design Parameters and Assumptions for 1-D Fin	104
4.2(a)	Solution with Conventional Mesh Distributions	106
4.2(b)	Solution with Optimum Mesh Distributions	106
4.3	Convergence and Error Analysis of the DQ Solution for Temperature Distribution in a Insulated tip rectangular fin, $m = 1$	107
4.3 (a)	Solution with Conventional Mesh Distributions	107
4.3 (b)	Solution with Optimum Mesh Distributions	108
4.4	Convergence and Error Analysis of the FEM Solution for Temperature Distribution in a Convection tip rectangular fin, $m = 1$	118
4.4 (a)	Solution with Conventional Mesh Distributions	118
4.4 (b)	Solution with Optimum Mesh Distributions	118
4.5	Convergence and Error Analysis of the DQM Solution for Temperature Distribution in a Convection tip rectangular fin, $m = 1$	119
4.5 (a)	DQM Solution with Conventional Mesh Distributions	119
4.5 (b)	DQM Solution with Optimum Mesh Distributions	120
5.1	Design Parameters and Assumptions for Rectangular Fin (1-D and 2-D)	130
5.2	1-D versus 2-D average % error comparison for insulated-tip fin with 10 elements and $T_{\infty} = 0$	141
5.3	1-D versus 2-D average % error comparison for convection-tip fin with 10 elements and $T_{\infty} = 0$	150
5.4	1-D versus 2-D average % error comparison for a wide convection-tip fin with 10 by 10 elements and $T_{\infty} = 20$	157
6.1	FEM versus DQM average % error comparison for a narrow insulated-tip fin with 33 mesh points and $T_{\infty} = 0$	166



6.2	FEM versus DQM average % error comparison for a 5m by 5m wide insulated-tip fin with 5 versus 5 (50) elements and $T_{\infty} = 0$	171
6.3	FEM versus DQM average % error comparison for convection-tip fin with 10 versus 2 elements and $T_{\infty} = 0$	177
6.4	FEM versus DQM average % error comparison for a wide convection-tip fin with 10 versus 10 (200) elements and $T_{\infty} = 20^{\circ}C$	182



LIST OF FIGURES

Figures		Page
2.1	Two-Dimensional continuum Domain	15
2.2	The Physical FEM	17
2.3	Model updating process in the Physical FEM.	19
2.4	The Mathematical FEM	20
2.5	Combining physical and mathematical modeling through multilevel FEM	22
2.6	A Triangular Fin	41
2.7	A rectangular shaft	45
2.8	A rectangular fin	48
3.1	Methodology block diagram	65
3.2	Optimum discretization and solution rule for 1-D FEM	68
3.3	Example 1-D optimum mesh distribution and element lengths	70
3.4	Example 1-D conventional mesh distribution and element lengths	72
3.5	Optimum discretization and solution rule for 2-D FEM	73
3.6	Example 2-D optimum mesh distribution and element lengths	77
3.7	Example 2-D conventional mesh distribution and element lengths	79
3.8	Finite Element Modeling for One Dimension	79
3.9	Thin rectangular fin	88
3.10	Two dimensional fin with boundary conditions	90
3.11	Two dimensional linear triangular element	92
3.12	Cross sectional view of an insulated tip rectangular fin	95
3.13	Cross sectional view of a convection tip rectangular fin	96

4.1	Comparison of convergence of fin-temperature in terms of maximum % error for conventional versus optimum FEM solution (N = 11-104)	109
4.2	Comparison of convergence of fin-temperature in terms of maximum % error for conventional versus optimum FEM solution (N = 31-104)	110
4.2	Comparison of convergence of fin-temperature in terms of maximum % error for conventional versus optimum FEM solution (N = 31-104)	110
4.4	Comparison of convergence of fin-temperature in terms of maximum % error for conventional FEM versus DQM solution (N = 11-55)	111
4.5	Comparison of convergence of fin-temperature in terms of maximum % error for optimum FEM versus DQM solution (N = 11-104)	111
4.6	Comparison of fin-temperature distribution (exact and numerical) for conventional FEM using uniform mesh points (N = 101)	113
4.7	Comparison of fin-temperature distribution (exact and numerical) for conventional FEM using uniform mesh points (N = 101)	113
4.8	Percent error comparison of optimum versus conventional FEM For 100 elements along the fin-length	114
4.9	Percent error comparison of Optimum versus Conventional FEM for 100 elements in terms of nodal points along the fin-length	114
4.10	Conventional FEM versus conventional DQM % error comparison for N = 40 along the fin-length	116
4.11	Optimum FEM versus optimum DQM % error comparison for N = 100 along the fin-length	116
4.12	Comparison of convergence of convection-tip fin-temperature in terms of maximum % error for conventional versus optimum FEM solution: (a) N = 11-104, (b) N = 31-104, (c) N = 31-45, (d) N = 55-104	121
4.13	Comparison of convergence of convection-tip fin-temperature in terms of maximum % error for FEM versus DQM solution (N = 11-55)	123
4.14	Comparison of convergence of convection-tip fin-temperature in terms of maximum % error for conventional FEM versus DQM solution (N = 11-55)	123



4.15	Comparison of convergence of convection-tip fin-temperature in terms of maximum % error for optimum FEM versus DQM solution ($N = 11-104$)	124
4.16	Comparison of convection-tip fin-temperature distribution (exact and numerical) for conventional FEM using uniform mesh points ($N = 101$)	125
4.17	Comparison of convection-tip fin-temperature distribution (exact and numerical) for optimum FEM using non-uniform mesh points ($N = 101$)	126
4.18	Percent error comparison of optimum versus conventional FEM and DQM for 100 elements along the fin-length	126
4.19	Optimum FEM versus optimum DQM % error comparison for $N = 100$ along the fin-length	127
4.20	Conventional FEM versus conventional DQM % error comparison for $N = 40$ along the fin-length	128
5.1 (a)	Conventional 2-D mesh distribution for 3 by 2 elements	133
5.1 (b)	Optimum 2-D mesh distribution for 3 by 2 elements	133
5.2 (a)	Conventional 2-D mesh with temperature distribution for 3 by 2 elements	134
5.2 (b)	Optimum 2-D mesh with temperature distribution for 3 by 2 elements	134
5.3 (a)	Conventional 1-D versus 2-D (average) temperature comparison for 3 elements along the fin-length	135
5.3 (b)	Optimum 1-D versus 2-D (average) temperature comparison for 3 elements along the fin-length	135
5.4	2-D Conventional versus optimum relative % error (w.r.t. 1-D) comparison for 3 by 2 elements along the fin-length	136
5.5 (a)	Conventional 2-D mesh distribution for 10 by 2 elements with $T_{\infty} = 0$	137
5.5 (b)	Optimum 2-D mesh distribution for 10 by 2 elements with $T_{\infty} = 0$	137
5.6 (a)	Conventional 2-D mesh with temperature distribution for 10 by 2 elements with $T_{\infty} = 0$	138

5.6 (b)	Optimum 2-D mesh with temperature distribution for 10 by 2 elements with $T_{\infty} = 0$	138
5.7	Interpolated 1-D versus 2-D (average) temperature comparison for 10 elements along the fin-length with $T_{\infty} = 0$	140
5.8	1-D versus 2-D absolute % error comparison for 10 elements along the fin-length with $T_{\infty} = 0$	140
5.9 (a)	Conventional 2-D mesh distribution of a wide fin for 5 by 5 elements	142
5.9 (b)	Optimum 2-D mesh distribution of a wide fin for 5 by 5 elements	142
5.10 (a)	Conventional 2-D mesh with temperature distribution for 5 by 5 elements in a wide fin	143
5.10 (b)	Optimum 2-D mesh with temperature distribution for 5 by 5 elements in a wide fin	143
5.10 (c)	Conventional 2-D mesh with temperature Flow for 5 by 5 elements in a wide fin	144
5.10 (d)	Optimum 2-D mesh with temperature flow for 5 by 5 elements in a wide fin	144
5.11 (a)	Conventional 1-D versus 2-D (average) temperature comparison for 5 elements along the fin-length in a wide fin	145
5.11 (b)	Optimum 1-D versus 2-D (average) temperature comparison for 5 elements along the fin-length in a wide fin	145
5.12	2-D Conventional versus optimum relative % error (w.r.t. 1-D) comparison for 5 by 5 elements along the fin-length in a wide fin	146
5.13 (a)	Conventional 2-D mesh distribution for convection-tip fin with 10 by 2 elements and $T_{\infty} = 0$	147
5.13 (b)	Optimum 2-D mesh distribution for convection-tip fin with 10 by 2 elements and $T_{\infty} = 0$	147
5.14 (a)	Conventional 2-D mesh with temperature distribution for convection-tip fin with 10 by 2 elements and $T_{\infty} = 0$	148
5.14 (b)	Optimum 2-D mesh with temperature distribution for convection-tip fin with 10 by 2 elements and $T_{\infty} = 0$	149



5.15	Interpolated 1-D versus 2-D (average) temperature comparison convection-tip fin with 10 by 2 elements and $T_{\infty} = 0$	150
5.16	1-D versus 2-D absolute % error comparison for convection-tip fin with 10 by 2 elements and $T_{\infty} = 0$	150
5.17 (a)	Conventional 2-D mesh distribution for 10 by 10 elements in a wide fin	152
5.17 (b)	Optimum 2-D mesh distribution for 10 by 10 elements in a wide fin	152
5.18 (a)	Conventional 2-D mesh with temperature distribution for 10 by 10 elements in a wide fin	153
5.18 (b)	Optimum 2-D mesh with temperature distribution for 10 by 10 elements in a wide fin	154
5.18 (c)	Conventional 2-D mesh with temperature flow for 10 by 10 elements in a wide fin	155
5.18 (d)	Optimum 2-D mesh with temperature flow for 10 by 10 elements in a wide fin	155
5.19 (a)	Conventional 1-D versus 2-D (average) temperature comparison for 10 elements along the fin-length in a wide fin	156
5.19 (b)	Optimum 1-D versus 2-D (average) temperature comparison for 10 elements along the fin-length in a wide fin	156
5.20	2-D Conventional versus optimum relative % error (w.r.t. 1-D) comparison for 10 by 10 elements along the fin-length in a wide fin	157
6.1 (a)	CFEM surface temperature for a narrow insulated-tip fin with 10by2 elements and $T_{\infty} = 0^{\circ} C$	162
6.1 (b)	OFEM surface temperature for a narrow insulated-tip fin with 10by2 elements and $T_{\infty} = 0^{\circ} C$	162
6.2 (a)	CDQM 2-D mesh and temperature distribution for a narrow insulated-tip fin with 33 mesh points and $T_{\infty} = 0^{\circ} C$	163
6.2 (b)	ODQM 2-D mesh and temperature distribution for a narrow insulated-tip fin with 33 mesh points and $T_{\infty} = 0^{\circ} C$	163
6.3 (a)	CFEM absolute % error for a narrow insulated-tip fin	