Density-driven instabilities in capillary tubes: Influence of a variable diffusion coefficient
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The influence of a variable diffusion coefficient on the gravitational instability at the interface between two variable viscosity fluids in a vertical capillary tube is investigated, based on the three-dimensional Stokes equations. As the viscosity contrast between the fluids grows, the maximum density gradient of the self-similar base concentration profile increases while its location is shifted into the more viscous fluid. Thus the perturbations are forced to grow in a more viscous environment, which can reduce their growth rate by up to 30%. For large viscosity contrasts, intermediate interface thicknesses are seen to give rise to the highest growth rates. For most parameter combinations, the first azimuthal mode is found to be most unstable. However, for large viscosity ratios and small interface thicknesses the axisymmetric mode dominates.


The gravitational instability at the interface separating a heavier fluid above from a lighter fluid below represents a classical problem in fluid mechanics (Batchelor and Nitsche). Vanaparthy et al. analyzed the miscible version of this instability in a vertical capillary tube, based on the three-dimensional Stokes equations, in order to study how its growth is affected by the presence of sidewalls. A comprehensive review of the pertinent literature is provided by those authors. Subsequently, Payr et al. extended this investigation to fluids of different viscosities. They report that the growth rates do not depend on whether the heavier or the lighter fluid is the more viscous one, and that in the presence of large viscosity contrasts thicker interfaces may be more unstable than thinner ones. The first azimuthal mode is generally found to be most unstable, in agreement with the experimental observations of Kuang et al. and the three-dimensional nonlinear simulations of Wilhelm and Meiburg. However, for large viscosity contrasts and thin interfaces, the axisymmetric mode may have a larger growth rate than its azimuthal counterpart. Corresponding findings for Hele-Shaw configurations are reported by Graf and Goyal and Meiburg.

All of the above investigations employed a constant diffusion coefficient. Especially for fluids with widely disparate viscosities, this is known to be a poor approximation of the real situation. For example, the measurements by Petitjeans and Maxworthy clearly show that for water and glycerin the diffusion coefficient varies strongly with the concentration (cf. also the experiments of Rashidnia and Balasubramaniam and the simulations of Chen and Meiburg). Hence, a detailed analysis of the influence of a variable diffusion coefficient is the goal of the present investigation. For this purpose, we utilize the well-established Stokes–Einstein relation (Probstein), according to which the diffusion coefficient is inversely proportional to the fluid viscosity. While this relation does not hold for all fluid mixtures, cf. Zwanzig and Harrison, it is well suited as basis for a first exploration of the effects of a variable diffusion coefficient.

We consider an unstable, miscible interface that separates a lighter fluid from a heavier one placed above it, in a vertically oriented capillary tube of diameter \( d \). The two fluids of different viscosities are assumed to be miscible with each other in all proportions, with a diffusion coefficient \( D(c) \) that depends on the concentration \( c \). Since the flow velocities are small, the fluid motion is governed by the three-dimensional Stokes equations. The density \( \rho = \rho_2 + c(\rho_1 - \rho_2) \) and viscosity \( \mu = \mu_2 e^{Rc} \) are assumed to be linear and exponential functions of the concentration, respectively. Here \( \rho_1 \) and \( \mu_1 \) indicate the density and viscosity of the heavier fluid, while \( \rho_2 \) and \( \mu_2 \) represent their counterparts for the lighter fluid. \( R \) denotes the logarithm of the viscosity contrast, \( R = \ln(\mu_1/\mu_2) \). We assume the variation of the diffusion coefficient with concentration is governed by the generalized Stokes–Einstein relation (cf. Probstein) \( D(c) = \mu(c) = \text{const.} \), so that \( D = D_2 e^{-Rc} \), where \( D_2 \) denotes the diffusion coefficient of an infinitesimally small amount of the heavier fluid in pure fluid 2.

The governing equations are rendered dimensionless by introducing a characteristic length \( L^* = d \), viscosity \( \mu^* = \mu_{\text{min}} \), velocity \( U^* = \Delta pgd^2/\mu_{\text{min}} \), time \( T^* = \mu_{\text{min}}/\Delta pgd \), pressure \( P^* = \Delta pgd \), and density difference \( R^* = \Delta \rho = \rho_1 - \rho_2 \). The diffusion coefficient is referred to its average value \( D^* = \int_0^1 D dc \), so that a meaningful comparison can be made with calculations assuming a constant diffusion coefficient. This implies that with an increasing value of \( R \) the diffusion coefficient varies over a larger range, while its average value remains unchanged.

By using the above relations in the Stokes equations, we obtain the set of dimensionless equations

\[
\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0,
\]
This equation is solved iteratively for the concentration profile, as outlined by Vanaparthy and related equations numerically, we adopt the approach by Vanaparthy et al.\textsuperscript{2} for the region near the axis.

For both of the fluids at rest everywhere, the base concentration profile $\bar{c}$ is a solution of the equation $\partial \bar{c} / \partial t = 1 / \bar{c} \cdot (D \nabla \bar{c})$. By introducing the similarity variable $\eta \equiv z/\sqrt{4D^*t}$, we obtain the nonlinear ordinary differential equation

$$\frac{d\bar{c}}{d\eta} = e^{-R^*} \frac{R}{1 - e^{-R^*}} \left[ \frac{d^2\bar{c}}{d\eta^2} - R \left( \frac{d\bar{c}}{d\eta} \right)^2 \right],$$

(4)

with the boundary conditions $\bar{c}(\eta \to \infty) = 1$ and $\bar{c}(\eta \to -\infty) = 0$. This equation is solved iteratively for $\bar{c}(\eta)$ in the control volume $-10 \leq \eta \leq 10$, using second-order finite differences, until a converged profile is obtained. Test calculations showed this volume to be sufficiently large so that the boundaries have a negligible effect on the solution. As an initial condition for the iteration procedure we employ a linearly varying profile in the computational domain. Since the diffusive fluxes do not vanish exactly at the boundaries, mass conservation needs to be enforced by satisfying the additional integral condition $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} cd\eta = \text{const}$.

Figure 1(a) shows the resulting base concentration profile as a function of the viscosity ratio $R$. For $R=0$, $\bar{c}$ is the symmetric error function profile. With increasing $R$, $\bar{c}$ becomes steeper in the more viscous fluid due to the locally weaker diffusion, and shallower in the less viscous fluid as a result of locally stronger diffusion. The shape of the profiles resembles the experimentally measured curves of Petitjeans and Maxworthy.\textsuperscript{8} We remark that it remains meaningful to refer to $z=0$ as the interface location, as there are equal amounts of fluid 2 above, and fluid 1 below the interface, respectively. The gradient of the base concentration profile is plotted as function of the viscosity ratio in Fig. 1(b). The maximum slope of the concentration profile is seen to grow with $R$. The resulting increase in the local Rayleigh number $Ra_\text{ci}$, formed with the local density gradient rather than the overall density difference, is expected to be destabilizing. From (4) we obtain the location of the maximum gradient, i.e., the location of the inflection point, as

$$\eta_{\text{max}} = e^{-R^*} \frac{R^2}{2(1 - e^{-R^*})} \left( \frac{d\bar{c}}{d\eta} \right)_{\text{max}}.$$

(5)

Since all of the terms on the right-hand side of this equation are positive, $\eta_{\text{max}}$ is positive for all values of $R$. This is confirmed by Fig. 1(c), which quantifies the upward shift of the location of the maximum slope. This shift reaches a maximum for a value of $R$ between 3 and 4, and subsequently decreases for larger $R$ values. Figure 1(d) shows that the concentration, and hence the viscosity, at this location of the maximum slope increases monotonically with $R$. This should have a stabilizing effect, as the perturbation will grow more slowly in a more viscous environment.

We now consider small perturbations to this base state of the form $\tilde{c}(r,z) \cos(\beta \theta) e^{i\omega t}$, where the hatted quantity represents the two-dimensional eigenfunction, and $\beta$ denotes the azimuthal wave number. For the purpose of evaluating the
stability of these perturbations, we assume that the diffusive time scale of the base state is much larger than the characteristic time scale of the instability growth, so that the base state can be held constant. Note that, since the linear stability analysis is conducted in the original (not similarity) variables, the interface thickness denoted by \( \delta \) represents an independent parameter. By substituting the above relations into the dimensionless governing equations, subtracting out the dependent parameter, and for various combinations of base state and linearizing, we obtain an eigenvalue problem.

The growth rates are identical. A simple transformation shows that, if a solution to the linearized perturbation equations is given by \( \sigma, R_e, \hat{c}_R, \hat{c}_R(r,z), \) and \( \hat{u}_{r,R} \), another solution to the same equation with the same value of \( \sigma \) is of the form

\[
\hat{u}_{c,R} \propto \hat{u}_{r,R}. \tag{6}
\]

\[
\hat{c}_{R,z} = 1 - \hat{c}_R(-z), \tag{7}
\]

\[
\hat{c}_{R,z} = \hat{c}_R(r,-z), \tag{8}
\]

\[
\hat{u}_{c,R} \propto \hat{u}_{r,R}. \tag{9}
\]

For this reason, we will limit our discussion to positive values of the viscosity ratio only, in which the upper heavier fluid is the more viscous one.

We carried out corresponding calculations with both constant (CD) and variable (VD) diffusion coefficients, respectively. Figure 2(a) displays the leading eigenvalue as a function of the azimuthal wave number \( \beta \) for the representative case of \( Ra=10^5, \delta=0.5, \) and various \( R \). It should be noted that even though only integral values of \( \beta \) are physically meaningful, the dispersion relations are drawn as continuous curves in order to guide the eye. As expected, an increase in \( R \) has a stabilizing influence, while larger values of \( Ra \) are seen to result in higher growth rates. Moreover, the results show that for all \((Ra,R)\) combinations, the VD growth rates are consistently lower than their CD counterparts, by up to 30% for larger values of \( R \). This result is remarkable, considering that the average diffusion coefficient for VD is equal to the constant diffusion coefficient for CD, so that the overall damping influence of diffusion should be comparable for the two cases.

Dispersion relations for various values of \( R \) and \( \delta \) show that the growth rates generally increase with \( Ra \) until they reach an asymptotic plateau for \( Ra > 10^7 \). For moderate values of \( R \) and \( \delta \), the azimuthal mode \( \beta=1 \) is more unstable than its axisymmetric counterpart. However, Fig. 3 demonstrates that for a thinner interface with \( \delta=0.2 \), a higher viscosity ratio \( R=4 \), and large \( Ra \) the axisymmetric mode can exhibit a higher growth rate than the azimuthal one. Moreover, for \( R=4 \) the highest growth rate occurs for an intermediate value of the interfacial thickness. With CD a similar observation had been made by Payr et al.\(^3\) These authors attribute this behavior to the shift of the eigenfunctions into the less viscous fluid or the region of least damping influence. Visual inspection of the eigenfunctions for VD shows that this shift into the less viscous fluid persists at high \( Ra \) and \( R \), thus allowing the growth rates for thicker interfaces to be higher than those for thinner ones.

The above observations raise the question as to what determines the location of the eigenfunction maximum, along with its growth. For a given value of the interface thickness \( \delta \), the two governing dimensionless parameters are \( R \) and \( Ra \), respectively. It is important to realize that they enter the problem in different ways. The viscosity ratio \( R \), and with it the variability of the diffusion coefficient, determines both the base state and also enters directly into the perturbation equations for the concentration and the three components of momentum, \( Ra \), on the other hand, does not affect the base concentration profile, and enters directly only into the equation for the concentration perturbation. The large \( Ra \) asymptotic regime presents us with an opportunity to analyze the influence of \( R \) in isolation. Towards this
end, we carried out four different sets of calculations for $Ra=10^7$. The largest growth rates are obtained for $CD$, i.e., a constant diffusion coefficient. Indistinguishable from these results are those obtained when the variable diffusion coefficient is accounted for only in the perturbation equation, but not in the base profile ($VDE$). This suggests that at large values of $Ra$ the effect of the variable diffusion coefficient in the perturbation equations is negligible, so that its influence is felt only through the modification of the base profile. This observation is confirmed by the fact that the growth rates computed for a variable diffusion coefficient throughout ($VD$) are identical to those obtained when the diffusion coefficient is kept constant in the perturbation equations ($VDB$), as long as the variable diffusion base profile is accounted for.

For a lower value of $Ra=10^5$, the situation is different. The highest growth rate is again observed for $CD$, but the results for $VDE$ are now significantly lower. This indicates that at lower $Ra$ the variability of the diffusion coefficient in the perturbation equations is important. In agreement with this, the results for $VDB$ are still noticeably higher than those for $VD$, confirming that the base profile effect cannot account for all of the difference between $CD$ and $VD$.

An important quantity with regard to the instability growth is the local Rayleigh number $Ra_l$, formed with the local density gradient $dp/dc$ rather than the global density difference $\Delta \rho$. As a result of invoking the Stokes–Einstein assumption, the denominator of $Ra_l$ is constant throughout the flow field, so that $Ra_l$ depends on the local density gradient only. As we saw above, this density gradient reaches its maximum at a location $z_{max}(R)>0$, which causes the upward shift of the eigenfunction maximum as $R$ increases. The competition of $Ra_l$ and the local viscosity with regard to determining the location of the eigenfunction maximum are summarized in Fig. 4. For $D=const.$, shown in the upper row, the steepest slope and the highest local Rayleigh number occur at $z=0$. The viscosity profile causes the eigenfunction maximum to be shifted downward from the location of the steepest slope, i.e., into the less viscous fluid, where the perturbation can grow faster. The shift is nearly identical for the Rayleigh number of $10^5$ and $10^7$. For $D=D(c)$, on the other hand, shown in the lower row, the steepest slope and the highest value of $Ra_l$ occur at a location $z>0$. Again the eigenfunction maximum is shifted downwards from this location due to the viscosity profile. This shift is more pronounced for the higher Rayleigh number of $10^7$. Here the local value $Ra_l$ is in the asymptotic regime over a much larger section of the interfacial region. Within this section, the growth rate becomes independent of $Ra_l$, and thus mostly is a function of the local viscosity. Hence for $Ra=10^7$ the eigenfunction maximum is able to move into a less viscous environment as compared to the lower value of $Ra=10^5$.

In summary, in the asymptotic large Rayleigh number regime the modification of the base concentration profile dominates, while for lower Rayleigh numbers the effects of the concentration-dependent diffusion coefficient are also felt through the perturbation equations.
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