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ABSTRACT

The dynamics and rheology of an emulsion of viscous drops in shear flow is investigated computationally. The simulations are performed using a three-dimensional front tracking method. An emulsion gives rise to an effective non-Newtonian rheology with finite normal stress differences and shear-dependent viscosity.

Previous estimates about the bulk properties of emulsions were limited to Stokes conditions under which a positive first normal stress difference and a negative second normal stress difference are predicted. However, the introduction of finite inertia significantly modifies the behaviour of emulsions. The normal stress differences change sign and the emulsion shows a shear-thickening behaviour with inertia. Computed rheological properties (effective shear viscosity and first and second normal stress differences) in conditions close to Stokes limit match well with the existing theoretical and simulated results. The first component of the rheology arising from the interfacial stresses at the drop surface is investigated as functions of particle Reynolds number, capillary number and volume fraction. The sign change is caused by the increase in drop inclination in presence of inertia, which in turn directly affects interfacial stresses due to drops. Increasing volume fraction or capillary numbers increases the critical Reynolds numbers for sign reversals due to increasing alignment of the drops with the flow directions. The Reynolds stresses which form the second component of the stress formulation are also considered in detail. The primary components of the Reynolds stress showed a simple scaling with Reynolds number for moderate values of inertia. They showed a non-linear increase at larger values of Reynolds number. A comparison of the estimated effective viscosity with an established empirical relation is also presented.
Presence of finite surface tension results in a characteristic stress relaxation time scale for emulsions. This is investigated for both dilute and concentrated systems and the results are verified against the standard theoretical expressions. Finally, to enhance the capabilities of the current computational method to handle extremely low Reynolds number flows, a parallel version of the Alternate Direction Implicit method is implemented.
Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Emulsions which are a mixture of two or more immiscible liquids are ubiquitous in our day to day life. They find numerous applications in different mechanical and chemical engineering industries such as in the oil extraction process, food processing, pharmaceutical manufacturing, etc. The properties of emulsions are determined by their constituting phases as well as their internal arrangement. The small scale arrangement of the constituting phases is termed as the microstructure [1]. Emulsions of desirable mechanical properties can be obtained by manipulating their small scale morphology [2]. Consequently it is of significant importance to establish the close connection between the bulk properties of emulsions and their microstructure.

(a) Milk (commons.wikimedia.org)  (b) Mayonnaise (commons.wikimedia.org)

Figure 1.1: Common examples of emulsions
The following section outlines some of the research attempts that have been made to predict the effective properties of emulsions by understanding the above mentioned link. The subsequent section provides a motivation and the main objectives of the present work.

1.1 Emulsion Rheology

It is of great practical importance to understand the behaviour a complex liquid like emulsion under different geometries and flow conditions. The solution to the velocity and pressure fields (which essentially describe the behaviour of the liquid) under a particular fluid flow would require a general stress-strain rate relationship. This is well established for a simple Newtonian liquid like water phenomenologically, where a single viscosity coefficient is sufficient to describe the relationship. A similar constitutive equation for emulsions is very difficult to determine phenomenologically. So a possible approach is to derive them from first principles by resolving the small scales as well. Derivation of the constitutive equations from first principles under general flow conditions can be a very complicated problem. However valuable insights into the behaviour of emulsions can be obtained by studying the constitutive relations under simple flow conditions such as steady shear flow, extensional flow and oscillatory flow. Steady shearing type of flows impose a constant shearing condition at the macroscale and its impact on the microscale is calculated. Extensional flow imposes a vorticity free condition and oscillatory flow imposes a time varying condition. Among these flow fields, steady shear flow conditions can be achieved in experiments easily (e.g. cone and plate rheometer). Consequently a significant amount of research efforts have been focussed on the development of constitutive equations (by resolving the smaller scales) under steady shearing conditions.

The earliest work relating the effective properties of emulsion to its internal micro-structure dates back to the seminal work of Taylor [3] in which he derived the effective viscosity of a dilute emulsion under small deformation conditions. This was an extension for the Einstein’s viscosity [4] expression for a rigid particle suspension.
Using perturbative methods and assuming a Stokes flow condition Taylor predicted the following expression for effective viscosity:

$$\mu^{eff} = \mu \left[ 1 + 2.5\phi \left( \frac{\lambda + \frac{2}{\phi}}{\lambda + 1} \right) \right]$$

This was a zeroth order result and assumed spherical shapes of the drops. Consequently it did not predict the presence of normal stress differences. Oldroyd [5] considered the elastic properties of the emulsion and assumed a linear stress-strain relation which involved their time derivatives as well. Using perturbation techniques he obtained the Taylor’s viscosity expression (this was also a zeroth order solution) and also found the relaxation and retardation times. These time scales are another characteristic behaviour of non-Newtonian fluids. Schowalter et al. [6] obtained expressions for the normal stress differences by solving the first order perturbative solutions. They took into consideration the deviations in the spherical shape of the drop. Using perturbation
techniques Frankel et al. [7] developed the general expressions of the stress tensor of an emulsion in a time dependent shearing flow. From the general expressions, they matched with the existing published results as special cases. Choi and Schowalter [8] extended the results for a semi-dilute system. They used a cell model approach to account for the inter-drop interactions and gave an order $\phi^2$ expression for the shear stress and the normal stress differences.

The approach adopted by the previous papers was essentially a perturbative one and the results were mostly valid under their assumed asymptotic conditions. Certain semi-phenomenological approach which involve some modelling at the small scales have achieved success in the prediction of the behaviour of emulsions under more general conditions. These methods are based on the modelling of the time evolution of tensorial quantities which capture the geometry of the dispersed drops. Doi and Ohta [9] developed such a model for bi-continuous blend with a 50% volume fraction. They divided the time dependence of the geometric tensors as additive contributions from drop relaxation (surface tension) and drop deformation (external flow deformation). Since the formulation was for bi-continuous blend, the model lacked an intrinsic length/time scale. Using their model they obtained a linear relationship between stresses and velocity gradient. Following this work, various modifications were made to the Doi-Ohta model and a review of those is avoided here. Maffettone and Minale [10] developed a similar phenomenological model assuming an ellipsoidal shape for the drop. They compared the prediction of their model with experiments for the drop deformation and orientation in shear flow for a range of Capillary numbers. Almusallam and coworkers [11] proposed a phenomenological model where the volume of the drops were conserved and so their model had an intrinsic length/time scale. They obtained good agreement of the drop shape evolution with experiments.

Numerical simulations offer a good alternative approach where most of the assumptions of the theoretical models can be relaxed. Computational techniques like Stokesian dynamics [13] have been successful in the prediction of rheology of rigid particle suspensions and have provided a deep insight into the internal structure of
suspensions. Stokesian dynamics has been employed for understanding the behaviour and dynamics of Brownian as well as non-colloidal suspensions of hard spheres under Stokes flow condition. They predict a range of non-Newtonian behaviour which arise due to the break down of the reversibility of Stokes flow. A suspension of hard spheres under low Peclet condition (which is a measure of the relative strengths of hydrodynamics and Brownian forces) exhibit shear thinning and a positive first normal stress difference and a negative second normal stress difference. Increasing Peclet number modifies the behaviour of the system. As the relative strength of the hydrodynamic forces increase the suspension exhibits shear thickening and the first normal stress difference becomes negative. The shear thickening occurs because of the formation of the hydrodynamic clusters [14]. There also have been some recent experimental confirmation of the existence of finite normal stress differences in the case of non-colloidal suspensions [15].

In case of deformable particle suspensions, numerical simulations have been fewer as they are computationally more intensive. Secondly, numerical simulations
generally do not take into account the complicated phenomena like the drops coalescence and breakup. Therefore it gets difficult to match up these results with realistic experiments. Zhou and Pozrikidis [16] studied the dynamics of two-dimensional periodic and random suspensions in closed channels using numerical simulations. Lowenberg and Hinch [2] did boundary integral simulations of concentrated emulsions. They provided deep insight into the connection between the small scale morphology and the bulk properties. They predicted a shear thinning behaviour and a positive first normal stress difference and a negative second normal stress difference. In case of the drops (i.e. deformable particles) the deformation in the shape produces anisotropy in the flow field and the non-Newtonian behaviour can be explained by considering simple parameters like orientations and deformations. Zinchenko and Davis [17] did boundary integral simulations of highly concentrated emulsions and discussed in detail about selecting the correct parameters for accurately predicting the rheology. They computed the dependence of the normal stress differences and shear stress on capillary number for very high volume fractions and noticed that most of the shear thinning at very high concentrations occur at small deformation conditions.

Investigation of the dynamics and rheology of emulsions and suspensions in presence of finite inertia has been quite limited. Lin and Scholwater [18] accounted for the effect of finite fluid inertia on the rheology of rigid particle suspensions (dilute system). They assumed a condition of zero forces and torques on the particles and using asymptotic techniques they found that the effect of inertia was to produce a negative first normal stress difference. Patankar et al. [19], performed two dimensional simulations for a similar system where they included finite forces on the particle. They also predicted a negative first normal stress difference and a shear thickening behaviour. Using a volume of fluid method, Renardy et al. [20] studied the effect of inertia on the geometry and break of a single drop under shear flow condition. Li and Sarkar [21] investigated the influence of increasing inertia on the rheology of a dilute emulsion (i.e. a single drop) using front tracking simulations. They predicted the reversal of the signs of normals stress differences with increasing Reynolds number. A similar study
was also pursued by Raja et al. [22] analytically and they found qualitatively similar results. Singh and Sarkar [23] found out that the normal stress differences change their signs with Reynolds number only for a range of capillary numbers. These studies have however been limited to a dilute system i.e. a single drop problem.

Numerical simulations of the dynamics of emulsions is essentially a two phase (or multiphase if generalized more) flow problem. Currently a number of sophisticated techniques are available for the simulations of such a problem. Some of the popular methods among them are the volume of fluid method [24], level set [25], a coupled level set and volume of fluid method [26] and front tracking method [27]. Front tracking though computationally more expensive than the other methods provides a very accurate tracking of the drop’s motion and prevents the artificial diffusion of the interfaces between the separate phases. Consequently it has been extensively used for studying multiphase flow problems [28–37]. Recently Lattice Boltzmann method [38] has also made significant advances on the simulation of deformable particle suspensions [39].

1.2 Motivation and Scope

The objective of the present work is to study the behaviour and effective properties of a concentrated emulsion in steady shear. The focus of the research is to understand the effects of inertia and concentration on the effective rheology of emulsions. It is a simple system, consisting of mono-dispersed Newtonian drops in a Newtonian matrix. The bulk properties of the emulsion are estimated by volume averaging the microscopic quantities as proposed by the Batchelor stress formulation [40]. The formulation assumes that the scale of the macroscopic flow is larger than the size of the droplets. This means that we can find an averaging volume element smaller than the macroscopic flow scales and much larger than the droplet size. The coalescence and breakup have not been considered. Nevertheless, the simple system provides valuable insights about emulsions and exhibits a number of non-Newtonian properties such as shear thinning and presence of non-zero normal stress differences. It captures the effects of increasing concentration and demonstrates that presence of small amount of
inertia can qualitatively change the rheological behaviours such as a change of the signs of normal stress differences.

Chapters 2 and 3 provide the details of the mathematical modelling of the problem and the numerical method used for its solution. Chapter 4 presents the background required for understanding the idea of rheology and finally chapter 5 presents the results of this study. Chapter 6 discusses about the implementation of a parallel version of the Alternate Direction Implicit method which will enhance the capability of the code to deal with extremely low Reynolds number flows. Some of the possible future works are provided in chapter 7.
Chapter 2

MATHEMATICAL MODELLING OF THE SYSTEM

The emulsion is modelled as a mixture of spherical droplets dispersed in a matrix fluid. The drops are mono-dispersed i.e. every drop has identical shape, size and property. The matrix liquid and the droplets are considered as Newtonian fluid. This essentially is a two phase system (see fig 2.1). This problem can be approached by solving separate sets of Navier Stokes equations for the matrix fluid and the droplets and connecting them via appropriate boundary conditions at the drops’ interface. An alternate to this approach is to pose this problem as a single fluid formulation. This can be done by including the surface tension force as a body force term in the momentum equation. This body force term involves a dirac delta function which ensures that the boundary conditions are felt only at the interface of the drops.

2.1 Governing Equations for the One Liquid Formulation

The derivation of the one liquid formulation is avoided here. The key idea behind this approach is the use of dirac delta functions to convert surface integrals to volume integrals. The formulation consists of the following set of equations:

**Continuity equation**

\[ \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.1)

**Momentum equation**

\[
\frac{\partial (\rho \mathbf{u})}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}) = -\nabla p + \nabla \left[ \mu \left\{ \nabla \mathbf{u} + (\nabla \mathbf{u})^T \right\} \right] - \int_{\partial B} \kappa \mathbf{n} \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}') dS(\mathbf{x}') \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.2)
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State equation

\[
\frac{D\rho}{Dt} = 0 \quad \text{(2.3)}
\]
\[
\frac{D\mu}{Dt} = 0 \quad \text{(2.4)}
\]

For the above set of equations \( u \) is the fluid velocity, \( \rho \) and \( \mu \) are the density and viscosity respectively which take appropriate values for the matrix liquid and the droplets, \( \Gamma \) is surface tension and \( \kappa \) is the local curvature of the droplets. The first equation specifies that both the liquids are incompressible. The momentum equation has a surface tension force as an area integral (integrated over the surface of drops). It is this term which captures the two fluid system in a single equation. The last two equations specify that the density and viscosity for each liquid is constant.

2.2 Non-Dimensional Parameters

The dynamics of this two phase system is governed by a number of non-dimensional parameters. The analysis that will be presented in the later sections is reported in terms of these parameters. The non-dimensional parameters are:

Reynolds number: The velocity scale is formed using the imposed shear rate and the drop’s radius. The length scale is taken as the drop’s radius itself.

\[
\text{Reynolds number (Re)} = \frac{\rho_0 \dot{\gamma} a^2}{\mu_0}
\]

Capillary number: The capillary number indicates the strength of the deforming viscous stresses acting on the drops relative to the restoring surface tension force.

\[
\text{Capillary number (Ca)} = \frac{\mu_0 \dot{\gamma} a}{\Gamma}
\]
Figure 2.1: Two-phase system.

**Volume fraction:** This is the fraction of the volume constituted by the dispersed droplets.

\[
\text{Volume fraction}(\phi) = \frac{4\pi a^3 N}{3V}
\]  

(2.5)

**Density ratio:** This is the ratio of the drop and matrix liquid density. This parameter will be fixed at unity for the entire study.

\[
\text{Density ratio}(\lambda_p) = \frac{\rho_1}{\rho_0}
\]
**Viscosity ratio**: It is the ratio of the drop and matrix liquid viscosity. This parameter is also fixed at unity for the entire study.

\[
\text{Viscosity ratio}(\lambda) = \frac{\mu_1}{\mu_0}
\]
Chapter 3

COMPUTATIONAL METHOD: FRONT TRACKING

As mentioned before the emulsion is modelled by dispersing spherical drops in a matrix liquid and the objective is to study the bulk properties of the system under shearing condition. This is achieved via numerical simulations and the problem set up is shown in the figure below. Figure 3.1 below shows the three dimensional domain in which spherical drops are suspended in an ambient fluid. The domain is periodic in x-direction and z-direction. It is subjected to wall boundary conditions along the y-direction. The top and bottom walls move with a constant speed $U$ in opposite directions. This imposes a shearing condition, the flow condition under which we are interested in investigating the effective properties of the emulsion. The system is mathematically modelled using the single fluid formulation outlined in the previous chapter.

![Problem set-up](image)

Figure 3.1: Problem set-up
Commonly used methods for solving the single fluid formulation such as the volume of fluid method involves an extra scalar for distinguishing the two liquids. This extra scalar satisfies an advection equation. Using this approach the entire set of equations is solved on a single fixed mesh. The computational method used presently is a front tracking method and it does not use an extra scalar for distinguishing the two liquids. It involves a second moving mesh for explicitly tracking the motion of the drops. The front tracking method is outlined in detail in the following sections.

3.1 Front Tracking Method

This computational method uses two separate mesh for simulating the flow. The first is a fixed cartesian mesh on which the set of Navier stokes equations are solved. The second mesh is a moving mesh that explicitly tracks the motion of the drops. This is a surface mesh and is composed of triangular elements. Figures 3.2 and 3.3 below show the two meshes.

![Figure 3.2: Fixed mesh](image1.png) ![Figure 3.3: Moving mesh](image2.png)

3.2 Surface Tension Calculation

Along with tracking the motion of the drops, the surface mesh is also used for calculating the surface tension force. This force is calculated as a surface force term
on the moving mesh. Figure 3.4 shows a typical triangular element along with its adjoining neighbours. The surface tension force on an element $a$ is given by the surface integral:

\[
\partial F_a = \Gamma \int \kappa n dA = \Gamma \oint_S (t \times n) dS
\]

Here $\Gamma$ is the surface tension coefficient, $\kappa$ is the curvature, $t$ is the tangential vector (shown in the figure) and $n$ is the normal to the surface. The surface integral is a well known result and it has been converted into a line integral using Stokes theorem. The surface tension force is calculated using the line integral. The tangential vector $t$ is calculated easily by finding the unit vectors aligned along the edges of the element. The calculation of the normal vector involves a quadratic surface fitting. A quadratic surface of the form shown below is fitted through the nodal points of the element $a$ and the nodal point of the three adjoining elements.

Quadratic surface

\[
z = ax + by + cxy + dx^2 + ey^2
\]
Once the quadratic fitting is completed the gradient of the surface gives the normal vector which is then plugged in the previous expression for the surface tension force. This completes the evaluation of the surface tension force on every such element \( a \).

### 3.3 Moving Mesh to Fixed Mesh Interpolation

The surface tension force calculated on the moving mesh is a surface force and the one fluid formulation requires this force as a body force term on the fixed mesh. This necessitates the interpolation of the surface tension force from the moving mesh to the fixed mesh. The key idea behind this is that the total strength of the interpolated quantity should remain conserved, which in turn provides the relation for the interpolated body force term on the fixed mesh.

\[
\int_S \phi_f(x')dS' = \int_V \phi_g(x)dV \implies \phi_g = \int_S \phi_f(x')\delta(x - x')dS'
\]

Here \( \phi_f \) is the surface force calculated on the moving mesh and \( \phi_g \) is the interpolated body force term on the fixed mesh.

The Dirac delta function \( \delta(x - x') \) occurring in the previous relation is approximated by a function \( D(x - x') \) which has a finite support i.e. having a finite width. This is done by using the Peskin Cosine \([41]\) function which has a width of four grid spacing in each direction.

\[
\delta(x - x') \approx D(x - x') = \prod_{i=1}^{3} D^i(x - x')
\]

\[
D^i(x_i - x_i') = \begin{cases} 
\frac{1}{4h_i}(1 + \cos \frac{x_i - x_i'}{2h_i}) & |(x_i - x_i')| < 2h \\
0 & |(x_i - x_i')| > 2h
\end{cases}
\]
3.4 Density and Viscosity Field

The densities and the viscosities of the matrix liquid and the drops can be different in general. So from a given location of the fronts, these scalar fields need to be created. The scalar fields will be required in the solution of Navier-Stokes equations. The scalar fields (of density and viscosity) are generated by determining their gradients by the following relation:

$$\nabla \phi(x) = \int_S \Delta \phi(x - x') n dS'$$

Here $\phi$ can represent either density or viscosity. This equation can be integrated directly to obtain the appropriate scalar field. In the present code, divergence of the above equation is calculated, which results in a Poisson’s equation. The resulting Poisson’s equation is solved with a multigrid subroutine.

3.5 Navier Stokes Equation Solver

Once the density and viscosity field have been generated from the location of the fronts and the interpolated surface tension force has been estimated, all the components necessary for setting up the Navier Stokes equations are present. The set of Navier Stokes equations are solved explicitly on the fixed mesh using a projection method. In the first step of the projection method an intermediate velocity field is generated using the values of the previous time step.

$$\frac{\rho^{n+1}u^* - \rho u^n}{\delta t} = -\nabla \cdot (\rho uu^n) + \nabla \cdot \tau^n + f^n$$

Here the spatial derivatives are discretised using a second order central differencing scheme. $f^n$ is the interpolated surface tension force. The intermediate velocity field is used to create the pressure Poisson’s equation which guarantees that the continuity
The Poisson’s equation arising in the previous step is solved using a geometric multigrid solver. Since this is an explicit scheme it suffers from different stability criteria. The convective restriction i.e. $\delta t < \frac{2.0 \mu}{\rho U_{max}}$ and the CFL criteria of $\delta t < \frac{\delta x}{U_{max}}$ do not affect the simulations as the Reynolds numbers for the simulations are quite low. The viscous stability criteria: $\delta t < \frac{0.125 \rho \delta x^2}{\mu}$ dictates the time stepping limit. This can be alleviated to some extent by including some of the viscous terms implicitly and this approach is called the Alternate Direction Implicit (ADI) method. The development of the parallel subroutines for ADI was a separate part of the research and will be discussed in a later chapter. The results for the emulsion rheology do not include the ADI subroutines.

The solution of the set of Navier-Stokes equations gives the updated velocity field on the fixed mesh. The advection of the front requires this time an interpolation from the fixed mesh to moving mesh and this is discussed in the following section.

3.6 Advection of the Fronts

Once the updated velocity field have been calculated it has to be interpolated on the moving mesh to advect the fronts. This is achieved by the use of the following equation is satisfied.

$$\nabla \cdot \left( \frac{1}{\rho^{n+1}} \nabla p^{n+1} \right) = \frac{1}{\delta t} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^*$$

The newly constructed field is then used for projecting the intermediate velocity field onto a divergence free velocity field, which is the new velocity field.

$$\frac{u^{n+1} - u^*}{\delta t} = -\frac{1}{\rho^{n+1}} \nabla p^{n+1}$$
The delta function is again numerically approximated by using the Peskin Cosine function. The advection of fronts may lead to a decrease or increase in the size of the front elements. This may result in “poor front quality” and this is prevented in the code by employing an adaptive regridding. Certain threshold limits are placed below or above which the sizes of the elements cannot decrease or increase respectively. The details of this are avoided here and the reader is directed to the paper by Trygvasson et al. [27].

3.7 Parallelization

The front tracking code that is used for the simulations has been parallelized using MPI libraries. A domain decomposition methodology is used for the fixed mesh on which the set of Navier Stokes equations are solved. The entire domain is subdivided into a number of smaller sub-domains and a processor is attached to each sub-domain. Since the Navier Stokes equations are solved explicitly the parallelization of the Navier Stokes solver on the fixed mesh is relatively easy.

The calculation of the front quantities such as the surface tension force uses a different methodology. It uses a Master-Slave approach where each front has associated with it a master processor. The master processor does all the calculation for its associated front and then it passes this information to the remaining slave processors associated with the front. The master processor is determined by finding out the sub-domain on the fixed mesh which has the maximum number of nodal points of a front. The processor associated with that sub-domain becomes the master processor of that front. The processors of the remaining sub-domains which share some of the nodal points of the given front become the slave processors. The master processor does all the calculation associated with the given front and then it passes this information to
the slave processors. The slave processor uses this information for the interpolation between the moving and fixed mesh. The reader is directed to the following reference [42] for the details of this procedure and the scalability of the code.
Chapter 4
RHEOLOGY

The previous chapters gave a brief description of our problem and the computational method used for simulating the fluid flow. The present chapter will discuss in detail about the physical quantities we are interested in calculating. The procedure used for estimating these quantities will also be discussed.

The main goal of a rheological study is to develop the constitutive equations of a complex liquid. This can be stated as the following question: We have a homogeneous fluid. We take a representative element of the fluid subjected to given strain rates. What are the stresses developed on the faces of this element? This question is well answered for a Newtonian liquid like water phenomenologically. Such a general stress-strain relationship for a complex liquid like emulsion is very hard to formulate. As it was mentioned in the preceding chapters, the constitutive equations are derived from the first principles under simple flow conditions and this gives us a valuable insight into the dynamics of such liquids. Steady shearing condition is one of the most commonly used type of flow for such a study and the present work is also completely focussed on shear rheology.

4.1 Batchelor Stress Formulation

Batchelor [40] gave a mathematical expression for determining the bulk properties of emulsions by establishing a connection between the macroscopic and microscopic quantities. Here macro-scale corresponds to the scale associated with the emulsion fluid flow and the micro-scale is that associated with the drop’s motion. The key idea is to take a statistical approach in determining the bulk quantities. To determine the stress developed on the faces of a representative element of the emulsion subjected to
a given straining condition, an ensemble of such elements needs to be considered. The average of the stresses over all such ensembles gives the required stress which is termed as macroscopic stress. This is a macroscopic property in the sense that the scale over which they vary is governed by the macro-scales associated with the emulsion fluid flow. To evaluate the ensemble average, the property of ergodicity has to be invoked and the ensemble average is converted into an integral of the stresses over the volume of the representative element. This is expressed by the following relation:

\[
\sigma_{\text{ave}} = \int_V (\sigma - \rho u' u') dV
\]  

(4.1)

Here V is the volume of the representative element being sampled. \(\sigma_{\text{ave}}\) is the macroscopic stresses developed and is called the average stress since it is estimated through an averaging process. The term \(\sigma\) inside the integration sign is the stress developed inside the emulsion element (i.e. the stress generated on the microscopic scale). The final term \(\rho u' u'\) under the integration sign captures the additional momentum fluxes due to the disturbances generated by the presence of drops. This stress can be viewed as the Reynolds stress arising in turbulent flows and consequently is also called Reynolds stress. The details of this stress will be explained in the following sections. Equation 4.1 can also be written as a sum of the following terms:

\[
\sigma_{\text{ave}} = P_{\text{ave}} I + \tau_{\text{ave}} + \sigma_{\text{excess}}
\]  

(4.2)

Here the left hand term is the average or macroscopic stress. The first two terms on the right hand side arise due to the macroscopic or bulk shearing. This can be obtained from the stress-strain relationship of the matrix liquid (which is Newtonian). The last term called the excess stress captures the effect of the presence of drops on the macroscopic stress and is a complicated quantity. This has to be calculated from numerical simulations.

Further mathematical manipulations show that the excess stresses can be broken
down into two terms:

\[ \sigma^{\text{excess}} = \frac{-\Gamma}{V} \sum A_d (\mathbf{n} \mathbf{n} - \frac{1}{3}) dA + \frac{-1}{V} \int \rho \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{u} dV \]  

(4.3)

In the above expression the second term of the right hand side is the Reynolds stress which was explained before. It shows up as a part of the excess stress (and this should be as excess stress captures the effects of drops). The first term is called the interfacial stress. Both the above stresses are explained in detail in the section below.

### 4.2 Interfacial Stress

\[ \sigma^{\text{int}} = \frac{-\Gamma}{V} \sum A_d (\mathbf{n} \mathbf{n} - \frac{1}{3}) dA \]  

(4.4)

The interfacial stress defined above is one of the components of the stresses generated by the presence of drops. This is an interesting quantity as it is completely determined by the geometry of the drops. It does not involve any pressure or velocity terms. This quantity gives a measure of how much the drops are deformed and the direction along which they are oriented due to the imposed flow condition.

Figure 4.1 shows a snapshot of a drop inside the emulsion. The integral of the quantity \( \Gamma(\mathbf{n} \mathbf{n} - \frac{1}{3}) \) over the drop’s surface is calculated. This requires the knowledge of the normal vectors over the drop’s interface and this is already calculated as part of the front tracking method. The above quantity is computed for all the drops and the summation of them normalized with the volume of the element (being sampled) gives the interfacial stresses.
4.3 Reynolds Stress

\[ \sigma^{re} = -\frac{1}{V} \int_{V} \rho u' u' dV \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.5)

\[ u' = U - \bar{U} \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.6)

The Reynolds stress captures the disturbances in the velocity field produced by the presence of the drops. In the above equation \( U \) represents the actual velocity field inside the element and \( \bar{U} \) is the bulk velocity. This quantity is similar to the Reynolds stress term arising in turbulent flows. The idea behind including this term is to include the additional momentum fluxes which were lost because of the averaging process.
4.4 Effective Properties

4.4.1 Effective viscosity

While studying the rheology of any complex liquid we are first of all interested in estimating its effective viscosity. The expression of the viscosity can be obtained from the equation 4.2 defined above for the calculation of the average stresses. The following expression gives this relation with the viscosity scaled with that of the matrix fluid.

\[
\frac{\mu^{\text{ave}}}{\mu} = 1 + \frac{\sigma^{\text{excess}}}{\dot{\gamma} \mu}
\] (4.7)

4.4.2 Normal stress differences

Along with the effective viscosity we are interested in calculating the normal stress differences as defined below. Note that we are interested only in their differences and not the normal stresses themselves as both the liquids involved here are incompressible and the normal stresses can be determined only up-to a constant value for incompressible liquids.

\[
N_1 = \sigma_{xx}^{\text{ave}} - \sigma_{yy}^{\text{ave}}
\]

\[
\frac{N_1}{\mu \dot{\gamma}} = \frac{\sigma_{xx}^{\text{excess}} - \sigma_{yy}^{\text{excess}}}{\mu \dot{\gamma}}
\]

\[
N_2 = \sigma_{yy}^{\text{ave}} - \sigma_{zz}^{\text{ave}}
\]

\[
\frac{N_2}{\mu \dot{\gamma}} = \frac{\sigma_{yy}^{\text{excess}} - \sigma_{zz}^{\text{excess}}}{\mu \dot{\gamma}}
\]

From the above expressions it should be noted that the normal stress differences arise only due to the excess stresses (i.e. due to the presence of the drops). The bulk shearing terms do not produce any normal stress differences and this is because of the Newtonian nature of the matrix liquid.

The significance of the shear viscosity is easy to understand, it gives a measure of
the opposing shearing stresses that will be generated when an element of the emulsion is sheared. Presence of normal stress differences under shearing condition is sort of counter-intuitive. However in reality they affect the flow properties of the emulsion in a very perceptible way and they show up in a number of peculiar behaviours of complex liquids. A very good example of this would be the Weissenberg effect popularly referred to as “rod climbing effect”. Figure 4.2 below shows this. A Newtonian liquid when stirred moves away from the stirrer due to the centrifugal forces (left picture). However certain liquids move radially inward and actually climb up the rod (right picture). This is a manifestation of the normal stress differences.

![Figure 4.2: Rod climbing effect](image)

4.5 Previous Rheological Results

This section will present some of the established rheological results and will motivate the focus of this research.

4.5.1 Newtonian liquids

Figure 4.3 below shows a Newtonian liquid subjected to shearing conditions. The shear stress developed will be a linear function of the imposed shear rate. The normal stresses developed will be equal in all directions and equal to the pressure. Therefore normal stress differences will be zero. This is a Newtonian behaviour and the description is complete just with the use of a single viscosity coefficient.
4.5.2 Emulsion: Stokes flow

Figure 4.4 below shows Newtonian drops dispersed in a Newtonian liquid and the system is subjected to shearing conditions. It has been calculated (Choi-Schowalter model) [8] that the system exhibits shear thinning i.e. viscosity decreases with shear rate. The normal stress differences are non-zero with $N_1 > 0$ and $N_2 < 0$. These results are valid under Stokes flow condition i.e. negligible inertia. The normal stress differences arise because of the stretching of the drops (this will be explained in detail in later sections). This behaviour is called viscoelastic: visco due to the presence of viscosity and elastic due to normal stress differences. This description has also been verified by the simulations of Lowenberg and Hinch [2] and Zinchenko and Davis [17].

4.5.3 Rigid particle suspension

Suspensions have been investigated thoroughly using Stokesian dynamics and experiments. A review of some of the results was presented in the chapter 1 and is repeated here. Stokesian dynamics predicts different behaviour under differing conditions. It predicts shear-thinning and $N_1 > 0$ and $N_2 < 0$ for low Peclet numbers. The behaviour changes to shear-thickening and $N_1 < 0$ and $N_2 < 0$ as the strength of the hydrodynamic forces increase [14]. Zarraga et al. [15] experimentally verified
the presence of non-zero normal stress differences for non-colloidal suspensions (under Stokes flow condition) with $N_1 < 0$ and $N_2 < 0$. The presence of non-zero normal stress differences for rigid particle suspensions is explained by the asymmetry in the micro-structure by the use of pair-distribution function.

4.5.4 Dilute emulsion: Finite inertia

Li and Sarkar [21] using numerical simulations showed that increasing inertia results in the reversal of the signs of normal stress differences. The study was for a dilute emulsion using a single drop. This qualitative behaviour was also verified by the subsequent pertubative analysis of Raja et al. [22].

The current research investigates finite inertia effects in a concentrated emulsion consisting of multiple drops.
Chapter 5
STEADY SHEAR RHEOLOGICAL RESULTS

The previous few chapters served to describe the problem and the different ideas used for studying the rheology of a complex liquid like emulsion. This chapter will present the main results of this thesis. After showing the validation of the code and tuning the parameters for an accurate prediction of rheology, the main results will be discussed. A physical insight into the behaviour of the emulsion under shearing condition will also be provided as an explanation of the results. The problem set-up is recapitulated and is shown in figure 5.1. The shear flow velocity direction is demarcated as the X-axis, the velocity gradient as the Y-axis and the vorticity as the Z-axis. The top and the bottom Y walls (parallel to x-z plane) move with a +U and -U velocity, respectively, so as to a create uniform velocity gradient of $\dot{\gamma}$. The boundary

Figure 5.1: Schematic diagram showing the computational domain
conditions at these Y walls are that of no slip condition and at the X and Z walls are of periodic nature. Inside this domain multiple drops are positioned randomly with an initial velocity distribution of uniform steady shear. Using the simulations from the front tracking code, effective properties are calculated by employing the rheological concepts that were outlined in the previous chapter.

5.1 Validation

The code was first validated by considering a dilute emulsion of volume fraction of 0.25% and comparing the results with the predictions of Choi-Schowalter (C-S) model [8]. As this is a Stokes flow model, the Reynolds number for the simulations was kept at a low value of 0.1. The dilute emulsion consists of four drops initially positioned at random locations. The size of the domain was fixed as $l \times 2l \times l$ ($l/a = 15$) and the grid resolution is $128 \times 256 \times 128$. These parameters were adjusted to get a good match with the theoretical values. Figure 5.2 shows the comparison of the normal stress differences and the inset of the figure compares the shear stress. The stresses have been scaled by $\mu \dot{\gamma} \phi$. The normal stress differences match is quite good and the shear stress match well at the low capillary numbers. At higher Ca, the curves show deviation and this is expected because the C-S model is valid under small deformation of the drops and at higher Ca the drops deformation violate the assumption of this model. These comparisons confirm the ability of the code to predict the rheology of emulsions.
### Figure 5.2: Comparison of the simulation and C-S model.

The stresses are scaled by $\mu \dot{\gamma} \phi$

#### 5.2 Concentrated Emulsion

We investigated the rheology of emulsions at varying capillary numbers and inertia in the volume fraction range of: 5-27%. Accurate rheological predictions can be made by first studying the sensitivity of the results on the grid resolution, number of drops, their size relative to domain and their initial position. This is discussed in detail in the following section. The data that will be reported in the tables and figures in the later sections invoke time averaging. The curves for the interfacial stresses show a lot of fluctuation as they involve multiple drop interactions, which will continue to occur throughout the simulations. To give a good estimate of the data, the statistical
uncertainties associated with it also needs to be considered. Figures 5.3-5.5 below show the plots for the evolution of the interfacial stresses with the non-dimensional time. The fluctuating behaviour of these data is evident. The method used for determining the mean values for all the simulations is this: First of all, an initial transient part of the simulation is discarded. This is done by looking at the curves and most of the time this developing part is evident. After discarding that portion, the remaining parts of the curves are divided into subdivisions of 30-40 time units. In each of the subdivisions, the average is calculated and the mean of these averages are reported as the time averaged data (or rather ensemble averaged if the system is ergodic). The standard deviation of the different averages are reported as the error bars. This ensures that the separate average values are approximately uncorrelated values. Most of the simulations are run upto 200-300 time units.
Figure 5.3: Time variation of $N_1^{int}$

Figure 5.4: Time variation of $N_2^{int}$

Figure 5.5: Time variation of $\Sigma_{xy}^{int}$
5.3 Grid Resolution

Front Tracking method has two grids. The first mesh is a Cartesian fixed mesh, and the second is a moving surface mesh. The resolution of the fixed mesh affects the calculations of Navier Stokes equations. It also determines how well the drops are resolved to accurately capture their morphology. The surface mesh is composed of triangular elements and its resolution is important to accurately calculate the surface tension forces. The surface mesh involves adaptive regridding and the number of elements it contains keeps on changing as was described briefly in the previous chapter. The initial number of elements that are present on each drop is a squared function of the ratio of drop’s radius and fixed mesh spacing.

Figure 5.6: Grid resolution test for $N_1$
Figure 5.7: Grid resolution test for $\Sigma_{xy}$

Figure 5.6 and 5.7 show the grid resolution tests for volume fractions of $\phi = 20\%$ and $\phi = 0.05\%$ respectively. The simulations were run on grid resolutions of $64 \times 64 \times 64$, $98 \times 98 \times 98$, $128 \times 128 \times 128$ and $192 \times 192 \times 192$. The drop number was fixed at 64, Ca at 0.05 and Re at 1.0. The main plot shows the curves for $\phi = 20\%$ and the insets in the plots are for $\phi = 5\%$. The plots are just a snapshot of the results for the first 10 time units. The entire range of data is avoided for clarity, however the average values (time average) reported in the tables below are obtained by running simulations upto 200-300 strains.

The data in tables 5.1, 5.2, 5.3 are taken by the method outlined before. The results in table 5.1 show that normal stress differences show more sensitivity to the grid
resolution while the shear stresses and deformations are more robust. The normal stress differences at the low Ca of 0.05 are small quantities and therefore are more difficult to capture accurately. For Ca= 0.20 the normal stresses are of larger magnitude and show much less sensitivity to grid resolution as suggested by table 5.2. The lesser volume fraction case of 5% is more difficult because at lower volume fractions the drops sizes are smaller and finer grids are needed to resolve the drops accurately. Along with this the small magnitude of the stresses compounds the difficulty. The above two-volume fraction cover the range in which we want to operate. The grid resolution of $128 \times 128 \times 128$ gives satisfactory convergence especially for the higher volume fraction and is fixed for the entire study considering the accuracy of the results and the time limitations for running the simulations.

Table 5.1: Table showing the grid resolution test for $\phi = 20\%$, Re=1.0 and Ca=0.05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grid resolution</th>
<th>$N_1 (\times 1E - 01)$</th>
<th>$N_2 (\times 1E - 02)$</th>
<th>$\Sigma_{xy} (\times 1E - 01)$</th>
<th>Deformation ($\times 1E - 01$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64x64x64</td>
<td>2.21 ± 0.0547</td>
<td>-6.74 ± 0.4711</td>
<td>6.06 ± 0.00481</td>
<td>1.20 ± 0.0307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96x96x96</td>
<td>1.54 ± 0.103</td>
<td>-4.96 ± 0.706</td>
<td>5.59 ± 0.00358</td>
<td>1.11 ± 0.0099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128x128x128</td>
<td>1.33 ± 0.0433</td>
<td>-3.22 ± 0.851</td>
<td>5.23 ± 0.00702</td>
<td>9.96 ± 0.0262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192X192X192</td>
<td>1.17 ± 0.0916</td>
<td>-3.13 ± 0.502</td>
<td>5.19 ± 0.00223</td>
<td>9.89 ± 0.0205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2: Table showing the grid resolution test for $\phi = 20\%$, Re=1.0 and Ca=0.20 (average values only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grid resolution</th>
<th>$N_1 (\times 1E - 01)$</th>
<th>$N_2 (\times 1E - 02)$</th>
<th>$\Sigma_{xy} (\times 1E - 01)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>128x128x128</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>-1.29</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192x192x192</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3: Table showing the grid resolution study for $\phi = 0.05\%$, Re=1.0 and Ca=0.05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grid resolution</th>
<th>$N_1 (\times 1E - 02)$</th>
<th>$N_2 (\times 1E - 03)$</th>
<th>$\Sigma_{xy} (\times 1E - 01)$</th>
<th>Deformation ($\times 1E - 02$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96x96x96</td>
<td>1.67 ± 0.0654</td>
<td>4.63 ± 0.517</td>
<td>1.21 ± 0.00589</td>
<td>8.32 ± 0.0872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128x128x128</td>
<td>1.07 ± 0.0265</td>
<td>6.04 ± 0.232</td>
<td>1.11 ± 0.00755</td>
<td>7.58 ± 0.0821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192x192X192</td>
<td>0.760 ± 0.0442</td>
<td>7.06 ± 0.442</td>
<td>1.06 ± 0.00336</td>
<td>7.05 ± 0.0807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4 Drop Number Dependence

The number of drops used for simulating the flow can affect the calculated rheology. Zinchenko and Davis [17] studied how the number of drops used for rheology calculation can be a source of both systematic and statistical errors. The statistical errors arise due to finite time averaging and can be decreased by averaging over longer time units so that sufficient non-correlated drops interactions are captured. However, the systematic errors may persist due to finite domain size (periodic boundary conditions) and especially due to the presence of walls.

The presence of a wall creates additional physical complexities. They result in the migration of drops towards the domain centerline and this has been carefully studied and understood theoretically, experimentally and numerically [43, 44]. Silbilo et al. [45] did a careful study of the single drop deformation and breakup in confined domains. They found that confinement enhances drop deformations and stabilizes large deformed drops, which would otherwise break in non-confined flows. Janssen et al. [46] studied the drop deformation and orientation changes with confinement using boundary integral simulations. These studies were however focused on the cases where the drop radius was comparable to the domain size and so completely new physics was observed. The aim of the present study is to predict free shear properties and so wall effects should be minimal.

When sufficient number of drops are considered, the rheological properties should show less variation with further increase in drops. It should also be noted that considering larger number of drops ensures that their size relative to the wall separation is less and thus the wall effects are minimal. Therefore considering large number of drops for predicting the rheology is essential, though it adds to the computational costs. Table 5.4 shows the dependence of the interfacial and Reynolds stresses on the number of drops for a low capillary number of 0.05 and a Reynolds number of 1.0. This table shows that 16 drops =O(10) would predict a significantly higher $N_1$ and lower shear. The mean values of the stresses show less variation as the drops number is increased beyond 32. The ratio of $l/a$ (i.e. wall separation to drop radius) varies between 7-13
(approximately) for the 16-100 drops range. This table suggests that 64 drops should be sufficient.

Table 5.4: Table showing the drop’s number study for $\phi = 20\%$, Re=1.0 and Ca=0.05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drops</th>
<th>$N_1(x1E-01)$</th>
<th>$N_2(x1E-02)$</th>
<th>$\Sigma_{xy}(x1E-01)$</th>
<th>$R_{xx}(x1E-02)$</th>
<th>$R_{yy}(x1E-02)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.57 ± 0.22</td>
<td>-2.74 ± 1.1</td>
<td>4.795 ± 0.068</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.370 ± 0.089</td>
<td>-2.64 ± 0.37</td>
<td>5.097 ± 0.08</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.33 ± 0.0433</td>
<td>-3.22 ± 0.851</td>
<td>5.23 ± 0.00702</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.2564 ± 0.11</td>
<td>-2.997 ± 0.71</td>
<td>5.264 ± 0.099</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using 64 drops gives a $l/a$ ratio of around 11. Fixing the number of drops as 64, the wall separation was doubled to get a higher $l/a$ ratio of 18. This was done to further verify that the wall effects are minimal. The results are presented in table 5.5. Even after doubling the wall separation to get a higher $l/a$ ratio the changes in the stresses are quite less. It is somewhat significant for $N_2$ but this maybe because $N_2$ itself is too small to be accurately computed. Therefore these two tables suggests that 64 drops (giving a $l/a$ ratio of 11) should be adequate for the prediction of the rheology for $\phi = 0.20\%$.

Table 5.5: Table showing relative domain size influence for $\phi = 20\%$, Re=1.0 and Ca=0.05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain size</th>
<th>$N_1(x1E-01)$</th>
<th>$N_2(x1E-02)$</th>
<th>$\Sigma_{xy}(x1E-01)$</th>
<th>$R_{xx}(x1E-02)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1x1x1</td>
<td>1.33 ± 0.0433</td>
<td>-3.22 ± 0.851</td>
<td>5.23 ± 0.00702</td>
<td>6.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1x2x1</td>
<td>1.17 ± 0.0602</td>
<td>-1.87 ± 0.371</td>
<td>5.10 ± 0.00616</td>
<td>6.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally tables 5.6, 5.7 and 5.8 further justify the choice of the number of drops by showing the dependence of the stresses at Ca=0.20 (Re=1.0) and Re=5.0 (Ca=0.05) for $\phi = 0.20\%$ and at Re=1.0 (Ca=0.05) for a lower volume fraction of $\phi = 5\%$ respectively.
Table 5.6: Table showing the drop’s number study for $\phi = 20\%$, $Re=1.0$ and $Ca=0.20$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drops</th>
<th>$N_1(\times 1E-01)$</th>
<th>$N_2(\times 1E-01)$</th>
<th>$\Sigma_{xy}(\times 1E-01)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>5.12 ± 0.0562</td>
<td>−1.29 ± 0.0662</td>
<td>4.11 ± 0.0106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>5.40 ± 0.0405</td>
<td>−1.41 ± 0.0244</td>
<td>4.21 ± 0.0146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.7: Table showing the drop’s number study for $\phi = 20\%$, $Re=5.0$ and $Ca=0.05$ (average values only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drops</th>
<th>$N_1(\times 1E-02)$</th>
<th>$N_2(\times 1E-02)$</th>
<th>$\Sigma_{xy}(\times 1E-01)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>−2.02</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>−2.01</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>6.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.8: Table showing the drop’s number study for $\phi = 0.05\%$, $Re=1.0$ and $Ca=0.05$ (average values only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drops</th>
<th>$N_1(\times 1E-02)$</th>
<th>$N_2(\times 1E-03)$</th>
<th>$\Sigma_{xy}(\times 1E-01)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.9647</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5 Initial Position

The rheology estimated should be independent of their initial positions. However, choosing an initially random positioning of the drops is important to reduce the time it takes for the system to forget about its past history. This was investigated by fixing the volume fraction, Reynolds number and capillary number while varying the initial positions. Figure 5.8 compares the time evolution of the shear stress for two cases. The first case corresponds to an initial ordered positioning of the drops and the second case corresponds to an initial random positioning. It is clear that the ordered system takes a large amount of time to break the structure. During the initial 70 time units the drops move in layers (which is how they are initially distributed) for the
ordered case. The shear stress is considerably low since the drop-drop interactions are minimal. After the structure breaks, inter drop interactions results in shear stresses close to those obtained from the second case. Therefore this illustrates two points: first of all, the stresses are independent of the initial configuration (which is expected). Secondly, the initial positioning of the drops should be random to get good time-averaged quantities in a reasonable number of cycles. So, for all the simulations, the drops are initially randomly positioned.

![Figure 5.8: Influence of the initial drops' positions](image)

5.6 Comparisons with Numerical Results

After fixing the main parameters of the problem, we first compare our results with some of the existing concentrated emulsion results. Using boundary element methods, Lowenberg and Hinch [2] and Zinchenko and Davis [17] estimated the rheology of concentrated emulsion and we aim to compare our results with them. Figure 5.9 shows a comparison of our results with that of Lowenberg and Hinch. This is for a
volume fraction of 20%. The Reynolds number is fixed at 1.0. The stresses have been scaled with $\frac{\sigma}{\alpha \phi}$. Figure 5.10 shows the comparisons of the results with that of Zinchenko and Davis. The volume fraction is 30% and the Reynolds number is kept at 1.0. For this case, the stresses have been scaled with $\mu \dot{\gamma}$. The scaling of the stresses for both the comparisons have been done according to the respective papers.

The comparisons of the viscosity with that of Zinchenko et al. (figure 5.10) is quite good and the differences lie within 5%. For $N_1$ they lie within a range of 10% for all the capillary numbers except 0.20. At that Ca it increases upto 20%. The differences between $N_2$ is not very apparent from the figure but for the lowest Ca of 0.0375 the difference shoots up to 35%. This may be because at this low value of Ca, $N_2$ is too small to capture it accurately. However, the main reason for the differences should be finite inertial effects. The results of both Loewenberg et al. [2] and Zinchenko et al. [17] were at Stokes flow while the present simulations are at a finite Re of 1.0. Running simulations at smaller Reynolds numbers can be very restrictive due to viscous time stepping restrictions. Figure 5.9 shows the comparisons with Lowenberg and Hinch [2]. The differences for the shear stress in this case remains roughly within 10% range. For $N_1$ and $N_2$ they lie within this range for all capillary numbers except 0.20. At this values the $N_1$ predicted from simulations is roughly 20% lower and $N_2$ is 25% higher. This again is largely due to the inertial effects, since it will be seen later that increasing inertia causes $N_1$ to decrease and $N_2$ to increase respectively. Another source of differences may be the relatively smaller number of drops used for simulations by Lowenberg and Hinch.
Figure 5.9: Comparisons of interfacial stress with the simulations of Lowenberg and Hinch ($\phi=20\%$)

Figure 5.10: Comparisons of interfacial stress with the simulations of Zinchenko and Davis ($\phi=30\%$)
5.7 Dependence of the Interfacial Stresses on Reynolds Number

Figure 5.11 - 5.13 show the dependence of the interfacial stresses with Reynolds number for 4 different volume fractions: 5%, 10%, 20%, 27%. The plots also include the dilute emulsion results of Li and Sarkar \[21\] where the sign reversal of the normal stress differences with Reynolds number was first noticed. The stresses have been scaled by $\phi$ to allow comparisons between different volume fractions. The capillary number was fixed at 0.05. Error bars (dashed lines) have also been shown only for interfacial $N_1$ for volume fraction of 20%. These bars correspond to the statistical fluctuations of the data and the purpose of this is to show that the deviations in the results due to finite time averaging is quite less compared to the changes due to inertia and volume fraction. Similar trends are seen for $N_2$ and shear stress, and all the remaining error bars are therefore avoided.

![Graph showing the variation of $N_1^{\text{int}}$ with Re and $\phi$ at Ca=0.05](image.png)

Figure 5.11: Variation of $N_1^{\text{int}}$ with Re and $\phi$ at Ca=0.05
These plots show that the interfacial $N_1$ and $N_2$ decrease and increase with Reynolds number respectively for the entire range of volume fraction considered. The curves for different volume fractions do not overlap as the concentration is increased. This indicates that the effect of increasing $\phi$ is not merely a case of superposition of single drop results. It involves inter-particle interactions which can be pairing, tripling and higher-order interactions (Zhou and Pozrikidis [16]). Increasing volume fraction delays the reversal of the signs of the interfacial normal stress differences. The interfacial shear stress increases with Reynolds number over the volume fraction range considered.

The above observations can be explained by considering the average drops orientations and deformations. Before showing their plots, the connection between the orientation of a drop to the interfacial normal stress differences is explained. This helps
in forming a mental picture as how the orientation of drop changes the interfacial normal stress differences. The expression for the first and second normal stress difference goes as:

\[ N_1 \sim - \int_{\delta A} (n_x^2 - n_y^2) dA \]  \hspace{1cm} (5.1)

\[ N_2 \sim - \int_{\delta A} (n_y^2 - n_z^2) dA \]  \hspace{1cm} (5.2)

Figure 5.14 shows different orientations of a drop relative to the flow direction. If the drop is aligned along the flow direction then the normals will be oriented more along the velocity gradient direction and this means that \( n_x << n_y \). From the expressions
Figure 5.14: Connection between orientation and normal stress differences
of $N_1$ in equation 5.2 it can be inferred that $N_1 > 0$. The second case is that of the drop aligned along the velocity gradient direction and in this case it is easy to see that $N_1 < 0$. The third case is when the drop is aligned along the 45° line i.e. the extensional axis. This should result in $N_1 \approx 0$. These arguments will be exactly true when the drop shape is ellipsoidal with the shape symmetric about the major axis (or major axis plane). This holds for a single drop in a shear flow, but the above arguments will still hold approximately if the shape is not perfectly symmetrical about the major axis plane, which is the case when drops are interacting. So the conclusion that should be drawn is that if a drop is oriented between the extensional axis and the flow direction, $N_1$ should be positive, and negative when it is oriented between the extensional axis and the velocity gradient direction. A similar argument can also be given for $N_2$. As the drop rotates in its shear plane from the flow direction to the velocity gradient direction, $n_y$ decreases but $n_z$ should roughly remain unchanged. Therefore increasing the orientation of the drop should increase $N_2$. It is though more difficult to predict (even approximately) when $N_2$ would change sign. The above facts can also be extended for a multiple particle system since the total interfacial stresses for such a system is just a summation of the interfacial stresses of the individual drops. So a natural way to define the average orientation of the emulsion would be to calculate the orientations of each drop and then take the average over all the drops.

Figure 5.15 shows the variation of the average orientation of the drops with Reynolds number. It should be noted that for a fixed volume fraction, the drops tend to align themselves more along the velocity gradient direction as the inertia is increased. Li and Sarkar [21], and Singh and Sarkar [23] investigated this observation in detail for a single drop problem. The effect of increasing inertia on individual drops is to orient them along the velocity gradient direction by exerting a torque on the drops. As it was explained in the previous paragraph the increase in the orientation of the drop would lead to an increase in $N_2$ and decrease in $N_1$. Another fact that should be noted is that the orientation of the drops decreases with increasing volume fraction. This behaviour was also noted by Lowenberg and Hinch [2]. Therefore the reason for the delay in the
reversal of the signs of the interfacial normal stress differences with increase in volume fraction can be intuitively understood now.

Figure 5.17 shows the average drops’ deformation variation with Reynolds number. The deformation of a single drop is the Taylor deformation parameter shown in figure 5.16 and the average of this value over all the drops gives the deformation of the emulsion. This parameter should be zero when the drops are completely spherical and therefore it is an indicator of the deviation in the shape of drops from the initial spherical geometry. Figure 5.17 show that as the volume fraction is increased the drops are more deformed. The increased deformations are to reduce the obstructions in the trajectory of individual drops.

The explanation of the dependence of shear stress on volume fraction and Re is
\[ D = \frac{L - B}{L + B} \]

Figure 5.16: Taylor deformation parameter

not completely straightforward. The expression for the shear stress goes as:

\[ \Sigma_{xy} \sim - \int_{\delta A} (n_x \ast n_y) dA \]  \hspace{1cm} (5.3)

Referring back to the equation 5.14, it should be noted that if the drop is perfectly aligned along the flow direction or the velocity gradient direction, the shear stress will be very less as its expression involves product of the vectors \( n_x \) and \( n_y \). Apart from this it is hard to conclude the changes in the interfacial shear stress when it is oriented at an intermediate angle. So the explanation of the observed shear thickening property cannot be provided simply by considering orientation effects and the deformation effects also need to be included. The expressions for the interfacial stresses for an ellipsoidal-shaped object involves complex elliptic integrals [11]. To circumvent this, a capsule-shaped drop is considered. This is a crude approximation but it explains the shear-thickening behaviour with increasing inertia very well. The shear stress for such a geometry goes as [2]:
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Figure 5.17: Variation of the average deformation with Re and $\phi$ (Ca=0.05)

$$\Sigma_{xy} \approx \sin(2\theta) \times D$$ (5.4)

Here $D$ is the Taylor deformation parameter and $\theta$ is the orientation of the drop relative to the flow direction. (This approximation is true if the deformation is small, i.e. low capillary number condition.) Due to changes in increasing inertia, orientation and deformation increases. Increasing deformation will increase the shear stress, but increase of the angle beyond 45° should decrease it. So these two effects are opposing in nature. Our average deformation plots show that for an increase of inertia over a range of 1-10, the deformation roughly doubles. The changes in the angle are in the range of a maximum of ±5° relative to 45° which means that the $\sin 2\theta$ will reduce from 1 (at 45°) to $\sim 0.98$. This change is small compared to the two-fold increase in
the deformation. So the increase in shear stress with inertia and volume fraction is dictated by the increase in deformation. Therefore by considering simple parameters like the average orientation and deformation the observations of figures, 5.11 - 5.13 could be explained.

The effects of inertia on micro-structure is to increase the orientations of the drops as well as their deformation. Increasing deformation tends to induce drop break up. So there should be a limit of Reynolds number range in which the drops are able to sustain the enhanced deformations. This was investigated by Singh and Sarkar [23] in detail for a dilute emulsion (i.e. single drop study). They showed that the combined effect of increasing orientation and deformation leads to the reversal of the signs of the normal stress differences within a particular capillary number range only. This was because higher deformation required a larger torque to increase the orientation of the drop and beyond a certain capillary number the enhanced deformation prevented an increase in orientation. So at high Ca the drop breaks up with a slight increase in Re. They suggested an Ohnesorge dependence of the reversal of signs, which captures the ratio of capillary and Reynolds number.

Figure 5.18- 5.20 capture the dependence of the interfacial normal stress differences and shear stress with inertia over a range of capillary numbers at a fixed volume fraction of 20%. Figure 5.18 shows that the sign change of the interfacial first normal stress difference occurs at a lower Reynolds number for Ca=0.02 as compared to Ca=0.05. The decreasing behaviour of the first normal stress differences with inertia is captured well in the Ca range of 0.02 to 0.075. At Ca of 0.125 and 0.20 the first normal stress difference shows a non-monotonic behaviour. This is because of the fact that for a single drop the sign change of the first normal stress difference is dependent on Ohnesorge number i.e. the ratio of Reynolds and capillary number. Some of the drops begin to break beyond Re=5.0 and Re=2.0 for Ca=0.125 and Ca=0.20 respectively. Similar to the first normal stress difference, the second normal stress difference also shows a delay in the reversal of the signs with increasing capillary number. An empirical relation between interfacial $N_1$ and shear stress with Reynolds number for
Figure 5.18: $N_1^{int}$ variation with Re over a range of Ca. ($\phi = 20\%$ fixed)

Ca=0.02 is also calculated using a linear fit. The relations are:

$$N_1 = -0.0501 \times Re + 0.0886$$
$$\Sigma_{xy} = 0.0311 \times Re + 0.5458$$

Figure 5.20 shows that interfacial shear stress increases with Reynolds for the entire range of capillary numbers considered. This is a pure manifestation of the enhanced drop deformation with increasing inertia at all the capillary values. It can also be concluded that the system is exhibit a shear thinning behaviour with increasing capillary number, which is well known for this type of an emulsion. This is considered in the next section.
Figure 5.19: $N_2^{int}$ variation with Re over a range of Ca. ($\phi = 20\%$ fixed)

Figure 5.20: $\Sigma_{xy}^{int}$ variation with Re over a range of Ca. ($\phi = 20\%$ fixed)
5.8 Capillary Number Variation

Figure 5.21 and 5.22 show the dependence of the interfacial stresses and the deformation and orientation parameters on the capillary number. The Reynolds number was fixed at 1.0 and the volume fraction at 0.20%. Increasing capillary number results in a shear thinning behaviour, which is a well know fact. The effect of increasing capillary number is to enhance the drop deformation (fig. 8(b)). This is to be expected because increasing capillary number implies the decrease of surface tension forces relative to straining viscous forces. The inset of fig 8(b) shows that the average orientation of the drops is inclined more towards the velocity direction as capillary number is increased. This is also intuitive because larger straining forces at higher capillary number will decrease their orientations. The decreased orientation of the drops is responsible for the large interfacial first number stress difference and the shearing thinning behaviour. The underlying idea behind this was explained in the previous section by using figure 5.14 and equations 5.2 and 5.3. The shear thinning behaviour and the increase in first normal stress difference was measured experimentally by Han and King [47], and these qualitative behaviours agree with the results of Lowenberg and Hinch [2].
Figure 5.21: Interfacial stresses variation with Ca ($\phi=20\%$, Re=1.0)

Figure 5.22: Average deformations and orientations variations with Ca ($\phi=20\%$, Re=1.0)
5.9 Reynolds Stresses

Figure 5.23 shows the velocity profile of the X-component velocity (flow direction) for $\phi = 20\%$, capillary number of 0.05 and Reynolds number of 10. The velocity has been averaged over x-z plane and over time as well. The velocity has been scaled by the imposed velocity scale and the distance $y$ with the wall separation. There are small perturbations of the averages velocity about the linear velocity field and the velocity remains very close to the linear profile. This type of plot was tried for other range of capillary and Reynolds numbers as well and the resulting velocity distributions were all very similar, just displaying small perturbations about the linear profile. These small disturbances arise from the presence of drops.

Figure 5.24 shows the variation of the drop’s center velocity at different locations along the Y direction. To estimate this quantity the y separation was divided into 100 equal sized bins. The drops were put in the respective bins according to their centres’ y coordinate. The velocity in each bin was obtained by averaging over the velocity of the different drops that occupied the particular bin during the simulation time. This is a good approximation of the drop’s velocity at different positions along the Y direction. Figure 5.24 shows that the drops’ average velocity too remains very close to the linear profile and this means that the drops’ centres move with the local velocity field. The perturbations that are there in the velocity field are captured by the Reynolds stresses present in the stress formulation and has been discussed briefly in the rheology section.

Figure 5.25 shows the variation of the Reynolds stresses with volume fraction. The figure shows the three components $R_{xx}$, $R_{yy}$ and $R_{zz}$. The cross components i.e. $R_{xy}$, $R_{xz}$, $R_{zy}$ are relatively much small quantities and they do not influence the total stresses. They are therefore avoided in the plots. The components $R_{yy}$ and $R_{zz}$ show a roughly linear dependence with volume fraction and if the curves are interpolated they will become zero at diminishing volume fraction. However, $R_{xx}$ shows non linear dependence and this is evident from the fact that the curve has to pass through origin. The figure suggests that it shows a somewhat square root dependence on the volume fraction.
Figure 5.23: Velocity profile $\phi=0.20$, Re10, Ca0.05

Figure 5.24: Average velocity of drops' centers $\phi=0.20$, Re1, Ca0.05

Figure 5.26 and 5.27 show the dependence of the Reynolds stresses with Reynolds number at two different Ca (0.020 and 0.075) at a fixed volume fraction of 20%. For
Figure 5.25: Reynolds stresses dependence on $\phi$ (Ca=0.05 and Re=1.0)

Figure 5.26: Reynolds stresses dependence on Re ($\phi=0.20\%$ and Ca=0.02)

Ca=0.02, the Reynolds stress scale linearly with Reynolds number in the Re range of 1 to 4. For Ca=0.075 the figure indicates that the the $R_{xx}$ component shows a weak
non-linear increase with Re while the remaining components show a linear dependence. Figure 5.28 shows the dependence of the differences of the Reynolds stresses (which we call here perturbation stresses) at Ca=0.05. This too shows that over a higher Re range the $N_{1}^{ptb}$ shows a weak non-linear increase with Re and this was also observed by Li and Sarkar [21] for dilute simulations. As the curves indicate, perturbation stresses should vanish at zero Re.

This linear scaling of the Reynolds stresses with Reynolds number (atleast for the low Reynolds numbers) can be explained using simple arguments. The Reynolds stresses have been scaled with $\mu \dot{\gamma}$. The expression for the Reynolds stress goes as $\sigma^{Re} \sim \int_{V} \rho \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{u}' dV$. In the previous plot of the drop’s centre velocity (figure 5.24) it was shown that they approximately move with the local velocity field. So the correct scale for the perturbation velocity should be $\mathbf{u}' \sim \dot{\gamma} a$. Therefore $\frac{\sigma^{Re}}{\mu \dot{\gamma}} \sim Re \int_{V} \rho \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{u}' dV$. Here the term $\mathbf{u}'$ is the perturbation velocity scaled with $\dot{\gamma} a$.

Figure 5.29 and 5.30 show the time evolution of the Reynolds stresses $R_{xx}$ and $R_{yy}$ for $\phi=20\%$ and Ca=0.05. The stresses have been scaled with Reynolds number.
Figure 5.28: Perturbation stresses dependence on Re ($\phi=0.20\%$ and Ca=0.05)

Figure 5.29: Time evolution of $R_{xx}$ for different Re ($\phi=0.20\%$ and Ca=0.05)

Figure 5.29 shows that the curves for Re=1 and Re=3 are very close and this is a manifestation of the linear scaling of the $R_{xx}$ with Reynolds number. The Re=7 and 10
curves predict higher values which corresponds to the non-linear increase. Figure 5.30 shows that the curves for all the three Reynolds numbers 1, 5 and 10 are close to each other and this shows the linear scaling of the $R_{yy}$ component with Reynolds number even upto higher Re. Few more interesting observations can also be made. Figure 5.29 clearly shows that $R_{xx}$ takes certain amount of time to reach a steady value. This is somewhat surprising because it is a volume average quantity and probably it is suggestive of some sort of configuration time-scale. It should also be noted that the lower Reynolds numbers cases take more time to reach a steady value.

Finally fig. 5.31 shows the variation of the Reynolds stresses with capillary number at a fixed Reynolds number of 1.0 and volume fraction of 0.20. Increasing capillary number increases the magnitude of $R_{xx}$ and decreases the magnitude of $R_{yy}$ and $R_{zz}$. This means that increasing capillary number is increasing the disturbances along the x direction (flow direction). This can be explained by the fact that increasing capillary number orients and deforms the drops more along the x- direction and this increases the disturbances along that axis.
5.10 Excess Stresses

The bulk properties of the emulsion or its constitutive relation is captured by the excess stresses which are a combination of both the interfacial and Reynolds stresses. The previous two sections discussed about these two terms individually. Near the Stokes flow condition, the behaviour of the excess stresses are governed by the interfacial terms only as the Reynolds stresses are negligible. Increasing inertia enhances the influence of the Reynolds stresses on the total quantity. This influence is limited to the normal stress differences only as the Reynolds stresses affecting the excess shear stress remain small for the range of Reynolds numbers considered.

\[ \sigma^{excess} = \sigma^{int} + \sigma^{re} \]

For a volume fraction of 20-27\%, both the stresses influence the excess stress in the Reynolds number range of 2-5 (provided the drops do not break). Beyond that, the behaviour specially for the first normal stress difference is completely dictated by the Reynolds stresses. This occurs from a lower Reynolds number for the lower volume
fractions.

Figure 5.32, 5.33 and 5.34 show the dependence of the excess stresses with Reynolds number. The scaling of the plots are same as that of the interfacial stresses plots. The figures indicate that qualitatively the behaviour of the excess stress plots remain the same as the interfacial stress curves. The addition of the Reynolds stresses make the $N_1$ curves steeper and they remain negative for most of the Reynolds numbers. This negative sign (with increasing inertia) for $N_1$ is now contributed by both the interfacial and Reynolds stresses. The addition of the Reynolds stresses to $N_2$ makes these curves relatively flat. This is because of the opposite behaviour of the interfacial and Reynolds stress component of $N_2$ with increasing Re. As pointed out earlier, the Reynolds stresses have very little effect on the shear stresses.

![Figure 5.32: $N_1^{excess}$ variation with Re (Ca0.05 fixed)](image_url)

The significance of the signs of the normal stress differences show up in the cone and plate rheometer. If the rheometer contains a Newtonian liquid, no forces would be felt on the bottom plate. For an emulsion composed of Newtonain drops dispersed in
Newtonian liquid, if the hydrodynamics conditions are close to Stokes flow, a positive resulting $N_1$ is responsible for a compressive forces on the bottom plate. Now, the
previous figure 5.32 indicates that even a small inertia (at the particle level) in the range of 2-5 is sufficient to develop a negative $N_1$. Therefore in this case, one should expect a tensile force on the bottom plate.

Figure 5.35 shows the dependence of the excess stresses with volume fraction and the empirical relations are also presented by the use of curve fitting. Figure 5.36 shows the comparison of the viscosity v/s volume fraction relation predicted by the simulation with the empirical relations provided by Pal [48]. He derived three empirical models and tested them against a range of experiments [49–56]. The third model in that paper was shown to give the best match with experiments. The current comparisons have also been made with the third model. Figure 5.36 shows that the comparison is quite good and the differences are in the range of 5%.

\begin{align}
N_1 &= 3.87\phi^2 - 0.172\phi - 0.03 \quad \text{(5.5)} \\
N_2 &= -1.59\phi^2 + 0.082\phi \quad \text{(5.6)} \\
N_2 &= -1.59\phi^2 + 0.082\phi \quad \text{(5.7)}
\end{align}
Figure 5.35: Dependence of the stresses on volume fraction (Re=1.0 and Ca=0.05)

Figure 5.36: Dependence of the viscosity on volume fraction (Re=1.0 and Ca=0.05)
5.11 Relaxation Times

Emulsions exhibit non-Newtonian behaviour such as the presence of normal stress differences, shear rate dependent shear viscosity. Due to the interfacial tension, they also have associated with them a stress relaxation time. This means that if an emulsion is sheared and then the shearing is stopped after sometime, the stresses take a finite amount of time to die out even under Stokes flow condition. This is because it takes finite amount of time for the interfacial tension to restore the spherical shape of the droplets. Consequently this is a capillary time scale. Oldroyd [5] derived the expressions for the relaxation time using perturbation analysis. Choi and Schowalter [8] extended the results for relaxation time for a concentrated system. Almusallam et al. [11] performed relaxation experiments and calculated the stress relaxation time. Using this they fixed the unknown parameters in their phenomenological relations.

The current aim is to determine the relaxation times for a concentrated emulsion. To do this we first revisit the dilute emulsion problem containing a single drop and determine the stress relaxation time for this problem. After verifying these predictions, the relaxation time for a concentrated system is calculated. To determine the relaxation time the system is sheared to a steady state and then the shearing is stopped (numerically). Plotting the variation of the logarithm of the interfacial shear stress gives us the time scales for stress relaxation. Table 5.10 shows the variation of the time scale with different capillary numbers. The time scale predicted by Oldroyd i.e. \( \tau_0 = \frac{(3+2\lambda)(16+19\lambda)\eta\mu}{40(\lambda+1)^2} (\lambda = 1) \) is also shown in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>capillary number</th>
<th>( \tau ) relaxation time</th>
<th>( \tau_0 ) (Oldroyd)</th>
<th>( \tau / \tau_0 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.1094</td>
<td>1.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>0.2179</td>
<td>1.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.4796</td>
<td>0.4375</td>
<td>1.096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows that the time scales obtained from the simulations agree well
with those predicted by Oldroyd. The value at Ca=0.05 is a bit higher. At this low capillary number the capillary time scale is very small. The ambient fluid too has associated with it a time scale for the decay of velocity field (viscous time scale) since we are not solving Stokes flow. So if the time scale for decay of the velocity gradient of the ambient fluid becomes close to the capillary time scale of the drops, then shear stresses may not relax according to the capillary time scale. This is what is happening for Ca=0.05.

After verifying the ability of the code to correctly predict the relaxation time for a dilute emulsion, a similar exercise is repeated for a concentrated emulsion at a volume fraction of 20%.

Table 5.10: Table showing relaxation time for $\phi = 20\%$, Re=0.10 fixed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>capillary number</th>
<th>$\tau_0$ (Oldroyd)</th>
<th>$\tau$ relaxation time</th>
<th>$\tau / \tau_0$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.3281</td>
<td>0.5753</td>
<td>1.7535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.4375</td>
<td>0.7475</td>
<td>1.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.5469</td>
<td>0.9043</td>
<td>1.6536</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the case of concentrated emulsion it should be noted that the relaxation time for the shear stress is higher than the Oldroyd’s prediction. They are however closer to the value predicted by Choi-Schowalter model for a concentrated system ($\frac{\tau}{\tau_0} = 1.88$).
Chapter 6

ALTERNATE DIRECTION IMPLICIT METHOD

It was mentioned briefly in the chapter on front tracking method that the simulation time step is restricted by the viscous time limit criteria \( \delta t < \frac{0.125 \rho \delta x^2}{\mu} \). This can be relieved by treating some of the viscous terms implicitly. This idea was followed in the serial version of the front tracking code [57]. A parallel version for this is presented here. This method involves the solution of tridiagonal matrices (including cyclic tridiagonal matrices associated with periodic boundary conditions). A simple algorithm (Thomas algorithm) for solving tridiagonal matrices is inherently serial in nature but even using this algorithm, the additional computational cost is outweighed by the benefits from the relaxed time stepping criteria. The following sections discusses the formulation of the Alternate Direction Implicit method (ADI) and then gives the procedure used for the numerical implementation.

6.1 Formulation

The first step for the projection method involves the following computation:

\[
\frac{\rho^{n+1} u^* - (\rho u)^n}{\delta t} = -\nabla \cdot (\rho uu)^n + \nabla \cdot \tau^n + f^n
\]

Instead of treating all the viscous terms explicitly, only the cross terms are treated so. The remaining terms are considered implicitly. This is shown below:

\[
\nabla \cdot \tau = \{ D_{xx} + D_{yy} + D_{zz} + D_{xy} + D_{xz} + D_{yz} \} u
\]

Here \( D_{xy} + D_{xz} + D_{yz} \) are the mixed terms and are treated explicitly. \( D_{xx} + D_{yy} + D_{zz} \) are considered implicitly. So the first step of the projection method is itself subdivided
into a number of step where some of the viscous terms are treated implicitly one by one:

$$\frac{\rho^{n+1}u^{****} - (\rho u)^n}{\delta t} = -\nabla \cdot (\rho uu)^n + \{D_{xy} + D_{xz} + D_{yz}\}(u)^n + f^n \quad (6.1)$$

$$\frac{\rho^{n+1}(u^{**} - u^{****})}{\delta t} = D_{xx}(u)^{**} \quad (6.2)$$

$$\frac{\rho^{n+1}(u^{*} - u^{**})}{\delta t} = D_{yy}(u)^* \quad (6.3)$$

$$\frac{\rho^{n+1}(u^* - u^{**})}{\delta t} = D_{zz}(u)^* \quad (6.4)$$

The following boundary condition is imposed for the intermediate velocity fields:

$$u^* = u^{**} = u^{***} = u^{****} = u^{n+1} \quad (6.5)$$

Equations 6.2 and 6.4 involve solving cyclic Tridiagonal matrices (due to periodic boundary conditions) and equation 6.3 involves the usual tridiagonal matrix (due to wall boundary condition). The solution procedure is outlined in the next section.

6.2 Procedure

Equation 6.3 which involves a simple tridiagonal system can be solved by the well known Thomas Algorithm. Equations 6.2 and 6.4 which involve cyclic tridiagonal matrices can be solved by the use of Sherman Morrison formula [58]. These are frequently used standard algorithms for the serial computation. A solution to equations 6.2, 6.3 and 6.4 using a parallel algorithm has other sophisticated approaches. Johnsson et al. [59] investigated the performances of different parallel implementations of the method. Van der Wijngaart [60] used the standard Thomas algorithm for the
solution of tridiogonal matrices in a parallel environment but they considered different decomposition strategies.

The domain decomposition of the current code in dictated by its main Navier Stokes solver and the approach taken for the ADI was based on this decomposition. Therefore a simple parallel version of the Thomas algorithm (and the Sherman Morrison variant for periodic boundary conditions) was implemented. Though this involved a number of message passing steps, the use of derived datatypes helped in reducing the number of messages passed to some extent. The validations, computational efficiency and the time stepping benefits are presented below.

### 6.3 Validation

To validate the code with the ADI subroutines included, a simple single drop problem was studied. The domain size was fixed at roughly 10a, grid resolution at $128 \times 128 \times 128$. The capillary number was kept at 0.05. The density (density ratio is unity) was varied to decrease the kinematic viscosity as the viscous time step criteria depends inversely on this parameter. Two cases were considered. The first case (figure 6.1) was for a density value which gave viscous time step criteria of $1E-03$. The plots below show the results for the interfacial stresses (Reynolds stresses were also checked but are avoided here) with and without ADI. The curves overlap which show that the method has been correctly implemented.

A second case (figure 6.2) was considered which gave a time step criteria of $0.38E-04$ and the plots show that the curves are very close. Slight differences are there because the simulation without ADI is run at the time step of $0.38E-04$ while the simulation incorporating the ADI method was still simulated at $1E-03$ (no stability issue) time step. This shows that the method is still stable. Infact the method is stable for a case in which time stepping criteria was as restrictive as $0.38E-05$. Therefore it can be concluded that the inclusion of the ADI subroutines gives at least an order of magnitude time stepping benefit.
Figure 6.1: Validation of the ADI scheme with the first case

Figure 6.2: Validation of the ADI scheme with the second case
6.4 Computational Costs

The table below compares the computational cost of the ADI subroutines for unit cycle of computation. It presents the percentage of the total cost used by the ADI subroutines.

Table 6.1: Table showing the computational cost of the ADI method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Procs</th>
<th>total time (s)</th>
<th>ADI time (s)</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.5 Conclusion

The main conclusion that can be drawn from the above data is that the fraction of the additional computational cost of the ADI method can be reduced if more processors are used. In such case the time stepping benefit completely outweighs the extra computational costs.
Chapter 7
SUMMARY AND FUTURE WORK

7.1 Summary

A computational study of the rheology of concentrated emulsions was undertaken with the use of a finite difference based front tracking method. A simple emulsion system consisting of Newtonian drops dispersed in a Newtonian matrix liquid is considered and even such a simple system exhibits complex non-Newtonian behaviour. The constitutive relations for the emulsion was studied under a shearing condition. The effective properties were determined using Batchelor stress formulation.

The bulk stress was estimated for a range of volume fractions, capillary numbers and Reynolds number. The behaviour of the individual stress components (of the stress formulation): interfacial stresses and Reynolds stresses was studied under different conditions. The interfacial stresses exhibit interesting behaviours under increasing inertial effects. The interfacial first normal stress difference decreased and became negative with increasing Reynolds number. The interfacial second normal stress difference exhibited an opposite trend. Increasing concentration resulted in a larger first normal stress difference and consequently increasing volume fraction delayed the reversal of the signs of the normal stress differences. Interfacial shear stress exhibited a shear thickening behaviour with increasing Reynolds number and it also increased with volume fraction. Since the interfacial stresses are geometric quantities, their behaviour was explained by looking at simple geometric parameters like the average deformation and average orientation. Increasing inertia resulted in drops aligned along the velocity gradient direction and this was responsible for the reversal of the signs of the normal stress differences. Increasing inertia resulted in larger deformation which caused
a shear thickening behaviour. Increasing capillary number resulted in drops aligned toward the flow direction and consequently larger first normal stress difference and small shear stress (i.e. a shear thinning behaviour) was observed.

Reynolds stresses which form the second component of the stress formulation was also considered in detail. These stresses showed a simple scaling with Reynolds number for moderate values of Reynolds number. Beyond that range they showed a non-linear increase. Increasing capillary number increased the disturbances along the x direction and caused the Reynolds stress involving the x-component velocity to increase. It was also observed that the Reynolds stresses showed a time scale for achieving a steady value and this decreased with increasing inertia. The excess stress which is the total contribution to the bulk stresses from the drops presence is composed of both the interfacial and Reynolds stresses. It was noted that for low values of Reynolds number, the excess stress behaviour was dictated by interfacial stresses and beyond a Re of $2 - 5$ the behaviour was completely governed by Reynolds stresses. This range of Re also depended on the volume fraction. The comparisons of the effective viscosity with some established empirical relations was also quite good. Stress relaxation time was also studied and comparisons were made against the standard relaxation time theoretical expressions.

Finally to improve the capabilities of the existing code to deal with extremely low Reynolds number flows a parallel version of the Alternate Direction Implicit method was implemented and tested.

### 7.2 Future Work

In this study a range of different parameters was considered to investigate the emulsion rheology. However there is scope for a number of different studies without major modification in the tools (code as well as theory) used in the current study.
7.2.1 Shear-induced self-diffusion

Brownian forces lead to diffusion of particles. For emulsions, the size of drops are large enough for the Brownian effects to be insignificant. Shearing forces result in a different type of diffusion termed as self diffusion which markedly affects the mixing properties of emulsions [61]. Therefore a rigorous investigation of this property has significant practical applications. Accurate prediction of the shear induced diffusion involves the use of very large number of drops [39] which the current study lacks. However the parallel code should be able to tackle this easily.

7.2.2 Rheology in poiseulle flow

The focus of the current research was to understand the behaviour and the dynamics of emulsions under shearing conditions. A systematic study can also be made for Poiseuille flow. The principle difference between these two is the existence of non-uniform shearing condition in Poiseuille flow. This results in interesting phenomena like shear-induced migration, which has been investigated in detail for rigid particle suspensions [62]. The current code is well suited for this type of problem since the existence of wall boundary conditions will no longer be an issue.
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