

# Generalized transport coefficients for inelastic Maxwell mixtures under shear flow

Vicente Garzó\*

*Departamento de Física, Universidad de Extremadura, E-06071 Badajoz, Spain*

Emmanuel Trizac†

*Laboratoire de Physique Théorique et Modèles Statistiques (CNRS UMR 8626),  
Bâtiment 100, Université Paris-Sud, 91405 Orsay cedex, France*

(Dated: June 12, 2019)

The Boltzmann equation framework for inelastic Maxwell models is considered to determine the transport coefficients associated with the mass, momentum and heat fluxes of a granular binary mixture in spatially inhomogeneous states close to the simple shear flow. The Boltzmann equation is solved by means of a Chapman-Enskog-like expansion around the (local) shear flow distributions  $f_r^{(0)}$  for each species that retains all the hydrodynamic orders in the shear rate. Due to the anisotropy induced by the shear flow, tensorial quantities are required to describe the transport processes instead of the conventional scalar coefficients. These tensors are given in terms of the solutions of a set of coupled equations, which can be *exactly* solved as functions of the shear rate  $a$ , the coefficients of restitution  $\alpha_{rs}$  and the parameters of the mixture (masses, diameters and composition). Since the reference distribution functions  $f_r^{(0)}$  apply for arbitrary values of the shear rate and are not restricted to weak dissipation, the corresponding generalized coefficients turn out to be nonlinear functions of both  $a$  and  $\alpha_{rs}$ . The dependence of the relevant elements of the three diffusion tensors on both the shear rate and dissipation is illustrated in the tracer limit case, the results showing that the deviation of the generalized transport coefficients from their forms for vanishing shear rates is in general significant. A comparison with the previous results obtained analytically for inelastic hard spheres by using Grad's moment method is carried out showing a good agreement over a wide range of values for the coefficients of restitution. Finally, as an application of the theoretical expressions derived here for the transport coefficients, thermal diffusion segregation of an intruder immersed in a granular gas is also studied.

PACS numbers: 05.20.Dd, 45.70.Mg, 51.10.+y

## I. INTRODUCTION

Granular media under rapid flow conditions are amenable to a fruitful modelization through a gas of inelastic hard spheres (IHS) [1]. In the simplest model, the grains are assumed to be smooth so that the inelasticity is characterized through a constant (positive) coefficient of normal restitution  $\alpha \leq 1$  that only affects the translational degrees of freedom of the grains. The case  $\alpha = 1$  corresponds to elastic collisions. Due to the kinetic-energy dissipation in collisions, energy must be externally injected to the granular gas in order to maintain it in rapid flow regime (fluid-like description). In some cases, the system is driven into the flow through a (linear) shear field (simple or uniform shear flow, USF) where a steady state is achieved when the energy dissipated by collisions is balanced by the energy supplied by shearing work. The study of the rheological properties in the steady USF has received consequential attention in the past years [2, 3], especially in the case of monodisperse granular gases.

The USF state is defined by a constant density  $n$ , a uniform granular temperature  $T$ , and a linear velocity profile  $u_x = ay$ , where  $a$  is the constant shear rate. In the steady state, the system admits a non-Newtonian description [4, 5] characterized by shear-rate dependent viscosity and normal stress differences. An interesting problem is the analysis of momentum and heat transport in spatially inhomogeneous states close to the USF. The physical situation is such that the granular gas is in a strongly sheared state that deviates from the USF conditions by *small* spatial gradients. The response of the system to these perturbations gives rise to additional contributions to the momentum and heat fluxes, which can be characterized by generalized shear-rate dependent transport coefficients. Due to the mathematical difficulties met in obtaining those coefficients from the Boltzmann collision operator for IHS [1], the inelastic version of the BGK model [6] was considered to determine the above generalized transport coefficients [7, 8]. On the other hand, explicit expressions for these coefficients were obtained by assuming particular perturbations where the steady state conditions of the USF apply [7, 8]. This allowed us to perform a linear stability analysis of the hydrodynamic equations with respect to the USF state [8] to get the conditions for instability at long wavelengths. The results derived for IHS from the BGK model has been then revisited by considering a mean field version of the hard sphere system where randomly chosen pairs

---

\*Electronic address: vicenteg@unex.es; URL: <http://www.unex.es/eweb/fisteor/vicente/>

†Electronic address: trizac@lptms.u-psud.fr; URL: <http://www.lptms.u-psud.fr/membres/trizac/>

of particles collide with a random impact direction. This assumption, which yields a Boltzmann collision operator with a collision rate *independent* of the relative velocity of the two colliding particles, opens the possibility of obtaining exact results for granular gases in the context of the Boltzmann kinetic equation. The above interaction model is referred to as the inelastic Maxwell model (IMM) [9–16] and it has been widely considered by physicists and mathematicians alike in the past few years to unveil in a clean way the role of dissipation in granular flows. In particular, the use of IMM allows us to *exactly* determine the set of generalized transport coefficients around the USF state for general unsteady conditions [17].

All the above results refer to monocomponent granular gases. However, a real granular system is generally characterized by some degree of polydispersity in density and size (granular mixtures). Needless to say, the difficulties for obtaining explicit results of transport in states close to USF increase considerably when one considers multicomponent systems since not only the number of transport coefficients is larger than for a single gas but they are also functions of more parameters such as composition, masses, sizes and different coefficients of restitution. As in the case of monocomponent granular gases [17], a possible way to get exact results in the above problem retaining the explicit form of the Boltzmann collision operator is to consider IMM. The use of this interaction model allows in principle to determine the transport properties in a strongly sheared granular mixture without introducing additional and sometimes uncontrolled approximations. In addition, as has been mentioned in previous papers, the results derived for inhomogeneous states from IMM compare well (especially in the case of low order moments) with those obtained from IHS [18–21], showing the reliability of IMM as a toy model to characterize the effect of collisional dissipation on the dynamic properties of granular flows. Apart from its academic interest, it is also notable that some experiments [22] for magnetic grains with dipolar interactions have been well described by IMM.

We are interested here in studying mass, momentum and heat transport in a strongly sheared binary mixture. In this case and taking the USF state as the reference one, the set of Boltzmann kinetic equations for the mixture is solved by means of a Chapman-Enskog-like expansion [7] around the distributions  $f_r^{(0)}$  of each species. Since the above distributions hold for arbitrary values of the shear rate [23], the different approximations in the Chapman-Enskog method retain all the hydrodynamic orders in  $a$ . Thus, the non-equilibrium problem analyzed here accounts for two kinds of spatial gradients: *small* gradients due to the (slight) perturbations to the USF and arbitrarily *large* shear rates due to the reference shear flow state. In this paper, we will restrict our calculations to first order (Navier-Stokes-like hydrodynamic order) in the spatial gradients of concentration, temperature and flow velocity. The hydrodynamic Burnett equations (sec-

ond order in the spatial gradients) for a single granular gas of IMM have been recently derived [24].

In the first order of the expansion, the mass flux is characterized by the second-rank tensors  $D_{ij}$  (diffusion tensor),  $D_{p,ij}$  (pressure diffusion tensor) and  $D_{T,ij}$  (thermal diffusion tensor), the pressure tensor is defined in terms of the fourth-rank viscosity tensor  $\eta_{ijkl}$  while the heat flux is given in terms of the second-rank tensors  $D''_{ij}$  (Dufour tensor),  $L_{ij}$  (pressure energy tensor) and  $\lambda_{ij}$  (thermal conductivity tensor). The set of the above generalized transport coefficients are nonlinear functions of the shear rate and the parameters of the mixture (masses, sizes, composition and coefficients of restitution). The determination of these coefficients for IMM is the main goal of the present contribution.

As in previous papers pertaining to IMM [21, 23, 25], the velocity moments of the Boltzmann collision operator are given in terms of a collision frequency  $\nu_0$ . This parameter can be seen as a free parameter of the model that can be chosen to optimize the agreement with the properties of interest of the original Boltzmann equation for IHS. Thus, in order to correctly describe the velocity dependence of the original IHS collision rate, one usually assumes that the IMM collision rate is proportional to  $T^q$  with  $q = 1/2$ . Here, we take  $q$  as a generalized exponent so that different values of  $q$  can be used to mimic different interaction potentials. We assume that  $\nu_0 \propto nT^q$ , with  $q \geq 0$ . In the case  $q = 0$ ,  $\nu_0$  is independent of temperature (model A) while when  $q \neq 0$ ,  $\nu_0$  is a monotonically increasing function of temperature (model B). Model A is closer to the original model of Maxwell gases for elastic collisions [26, 27] while model B with  $q = 1/2$  is closer to IHS. The possibility of having a general temperature dependence of  $\nu_0(T)$  for inelastic repulsive models has been also introduced in the granular literature [13, 14]. One of the main features of model A is that the reduced shear rate  $a^* = a/\nu_0$  (which is the relevant parameter measuring the departure from the homogeneous cooling state) does not change in time and so, a non-Newtonian hydrodynamic regime (where  $a^*$  and the coefficients of restitution  $\alpha_{rs}$  are independent parameters) is achieved for long times. In this regime, the combined effect of both control parameters on the (scaled) transport coefficients can be studied analytically for model A. This is a bonus feature of this model that contrasts with the results derived for model B where only analytical results can be obtained in the steady state limit (namely, when viscous heating and energy lost by collisions cancel each other).

Finally, as an interesting application of the general results, a segregation criterion based on the thermal diffusion factor is derived in the tracer limit (namely, a binary mixture where the concentration of one of the species is negligible). This criterion shows the transition between two different regions (upwards and downwards segregation) by varying the different parameters of the system. This study complements a previous analysis [28] carried out for IHS by using Grad's moment method [29]. Our results show that the form of the phase diagrams of seg-

regation is quite similar to those obtained before for IHS.

The plan of the paper is as follows. In section II, the Boltzmann equation for inelastic Maxwell mixtures is introduced and the USF problem is defined. The Chapman-Enskog-like expansion around the USF state is described in section III. Section IV deals with the evaluation of the generalized transport coefficients associated with the mass, momentum and heat fluxes. In general, those coefficients are given in terms of the solutions of a set coupled nonlinear differential equations that must be solved with the appropriate boundary conditions to obtain their hydrodynamic forms. On the other hand, in the case of model A ( $q = 0$ ), the above set of equations becomes a set of coupled algebraic equations that can be analytically solved. Technical details on the calculations are displayed along several appendices. To illustrate the dependence of the (scaled) transport coefficients on the reduced shear rate and the coefficients of restitution, the simple tracer limit is considered in section V. In this limiting case, the diffusion coefficients are the relevant transport coefficients of the mixture. The dependence of the coefficients  $D_{ij}$ ,  $D_{p,ij}$  and  $D_{T,ij}$  on both  $a^*$  and  $\alpha_{rs}$  is analyzed for model A for general unsteady conditions while steady state conditions are assumed to get the forms of the above coefficients for model B ( $q \neq 0$ ). In this latter case, a comparison with previous results derived for IHS [30, 31] is carried out for the coefficients  $D_{ij}$ , showing in general a good agreement even for strong dissipation. Thermal diffusion segregation is studied in Sec. VI while a brief discussion of the results reported in this paper is provided in Sec. VII.

## II. INELASTIC MAXWELL MIXTURES UNDER SHEAR FLOW

### A. Inelastic Maxwell mixtures

We consider a granular binary mixture modeled as an IMM. In the absence of external forces, the set of nonlinear Boltzmann equations for the one-particle distribution function  $f_r(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}, t)$  of species  $r$  ( $r = 1, 2$ ) reads

$$\left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \right) f_r(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}; t) = \sum_{s=1}^2 J_{rs}[\mathbf{v}|f_r(t), f_s(t)] , \quad (1)$$

where the Boltzmann collision operator  $J_{rs}[\mathbf{v}|f_r, f_s]$  for IMM describing the scattering of pairs of particles is

$$J_{rs}[\mathbf{v}|f_r, f_s] = \frac{\omega_{rs}}{n_s \Omega_d} \int d\mathbf{v}_2 \int d\hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} [\alpha_{rs}^{-1} f_r(\mathbf{v}'_1) f_s(\mathbf{v}'_2) - f_r(\mathbf{v}_1) f_s(\mathbf{v}_2)] . \quad (2)$$

Here,

$$n_r = \int d\mathbf{v} f_r(\mathbf{v}) \quad (3)$$

is the number density of species  $r$ ,  $\omega_{rs}$  is an effective collision frequency for collisions of type  $r$ - $s$ ,  $\Omega_d =$

$2\pi^{d/2}/\Gamma(d/2)$  is the total solid angle in  $d$  dimensions, and  $\alpha_{rs} \leq 1$  refers to the constant coefficient of restitution for collisions between particles of species  $r$  with  $s$ . In addition, the primes on the velocities denote the initial values  $\{\mathbf{v}'_1, \mathbf{v}'_2\}$  that lead to  $\{\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2\}$  following a binary collision:

$$\mathbf{v}'_1 = \mathbf{v}_1 - \mu_{sr} (1 + \alpha_{rs}^{-1}) (\hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \cdot \mathbf{g}_{12}) \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}, \quad (4a)$$

$$\mathbf{v}'_2 = \mathbf{v}_2 + \mu_{rs} (1 + \alpha_{rs}^{-1}) (\hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \cdot \mathbf{g}_{12}) \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}, \quad (4b)$$

where  $\mathbf{g}_{12} = \mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{v}_2$  is the relative velocity of the colliding pair,  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$  is a unit vector directed along the centers of the two colliding spheres, and  $\mu_{rs} = m_r/(m_r + m_s)$  where  $m_r$  is the mass of a particle of species  $r$ .

Apart from  $n_r$ , the relevant quantities in a binary mixture at a hydrodynamic level are the flow velocity  $\mathbf{u}$  and the granular temperature  $T$ . They are defined, respectively, as

$$\mathbf{u} = \frac{1}{\rho} \sum_{s=1}^2 \rho_s \mathbf{u}_s = \sum_{s=1}^2 \int d\mathbf{v} m_s \mathbf{v} f_s(\mathbf{v}), \quad (5)$$

$$nT = \sum_{s=1}^2 n_s T_s = \sum_{s=1}^2 \int d\mathbf{v} \frac{m_s}{d} V^2 f_s(\mathbf{v}). \quad (6)$$

In Eqs. (5) and (6),  $\rho_r = m_r n_r$  is the mass density of species  $r$ ,  $n = n_1 + n_2$  is the total number density,  $\rho = \rho_1 + \rho_2$  is the total mass density, and  $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}$  is the peculiar velocity. Equations (5) and (6) also define the (mean) flow velocity  $\mathbf{u}_r$  and the partial temperature  $T_r$  of species  $r$ . The partial temperature  $T_r$  measures the mean kinetic energy of species  $r$ . As confirmed by computer simulations [32], experiments [33] and kinetic theory calculations [34] the global granular temperature  $T$  is in general different from the partial temperatures  $T_r$  (non-equipartition of energy).

Furthermore, the mass flux for species  $r$  is defined as

$$\mathbf{j}_r = m_r \int d\mathbf{v} \mathbf{V} f_r(\mathbf{v}), \quad (7)$$

the total pressure tensor is given by

$$\mathbf{P} = \sum_{s=1}^2 \int d\mathbf{v} m_s \mathbf{V} \mathbf{V} f_s(\mathbf{v}), \quad (8)$$

and the total heat flux is

$$\mathbf{q} = \sum_{s=1}^2 \int d\mathbf{v} \frac{1}{2} m_s V^2 \mathbf{V} f_s(\mathbf{v}). \quad (9)$$

In addition, the rate of energy dissipated due to collisions among all the species defines the cooling rate  $\zeta$  as

$$\zeta = -\frac{1}{dnT} \sum_{r,s} \int d\mathbf{v} m_r V^2 J_{rs}[\mathbf{v}|f_r, f_s]. \quad (10)$$

At a kinetic level, it is also convenient to introduce the partial cooling rates  $\zeta_r$ , measuring the rate of energy lost by species  $r$ . They are defined as

$$\zeta_r = \sum_s \zeta_{rs} = -\frac{1}{dn_r T_r} \sum_s \int d\mathbf{v} m_r V^2 J_{rs}[f_r, f_s], \quad (11)$$

where the second identity defines the quantities  $\zeta_{rs}$ . The total cooling rate  $\zeta$  is given by

$$\zeta = \sum_{s=1}^2 x_s \gamma_s \zeta_s, \quad (12)$$

where  $x_r \equiv n_r/n$  is the concentration (or mole fraction) of species  $r$  and  $\gamma_r \equiv T_r/T$ .

One of the main advantages of considering Maxwell models (both elastic and inelastic) is that the moments of the Boltzmann collision operator  $J_{rs}[f_r, f_s]$  defined by Eq. (2) can be exactly evaluated in terms of the distributions  $f_r$  and  $f_s$  without the explicit knowledge of both distributions [26]. This property has been exploited to determine the second-, third- and fourth-degree collisional moments for a monodisperse granular gas [35]. In the case of mixtures, only the first-, second-degree and third-degree collisional moments [20] have been obtained. Their explicit forms can be found in the above papers.

The results obtained before apply regardless the specific form of the effective collision frequencies  $\omega_{rs}$ . These frequencies are independent of velocity but depend on space and time through its dependence on density and temperature. On physical grounds,  $\omega_{rs} \propto n_s$ . As in previous works on IMM [17, 23, 25], we will assume that  $\omega_{rs} \propto n_s T^q$ , with  $q \geq 0$ . The case  $q = 0$  (a collision frequency independent of temperature) will be referred as model A while the case  $q \neq 0$  will be called model B. The collision frequencies  $\omega_{rs}$  can be seen as free parameters in the model to optimize the agreement with some property of interest of IHS. Here,  $\omega_{rs}$  is chosen to get the same partial cooling rate  $\zeta_{rs}$  as for IHS (evaluated in the local equilibrium approximation). With this choice,  $\omega_{rs}$  can be written as [19, 20]

$$\omega_{rs} = x_s \left( \frac{\sigma_{rs}}{\sigma_{12}} \right)^{d-1} \left( \frac{\theta_r + \theta_s}{\theta_r \theta_s} \right)^{1/2} \nu_0, \quad \nu_0 = A(q)nT^q, \quad (13)$$

where the value of the quantity  $A$  will be defined later (see subsection V B). In Eq. (13),  $\sigma_{rs} = (\sigma_r + \sigma_s)/2$ , and

$$\theta_r = \frac{m_r}{\gamma_r} \sum_{s=1}^2 m_s^{-1}. \quad (14)$$

## B. Uniform shear flow

We assume that the mixture is under USF. This state is macroscopically characterized by constant partial densities, a uniform temperature, and a linear velocity profile

$$\mathbf{u}(y) = \mathbf{u}_1(y) = \mathbf{u}_2(y) = ay\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \quad (15)$$

where  $a$  is the *constant* shear rate. This linear velocity profile assumes no boundary layer near the walls and is generated by the Lees-Edwards boundary conditions [36], which are simply periodic boundary conditions in the local Lagrange frame moving with the flow velocity [37]. Since  $n_r$  and  $T$  are here uniform, then the mass and heat fluxes vanish and the transport of momentum (measured by the pressure tensor) is the relevant phenomenon. At a microscopic level, the USF is characterized by a velocity distribution function that becomes *uniform* in the local Lagrangian frame moving with the flow velocity  $\mathbf{u}$ , i.e.,  $f_s(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}, t) = f_s(\mathbf{V}, t)$ . In that case, Eq. (1) becomes [27]

$$\frac{\partial f_1}{\partial t} - aV_y \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial V_x} = J_{11}[f_1, f_1] + J_{12}[f_1, f_2] \quad (16)$$

and a similar relation for  $f_2$ . The relevant balance equation in the USF state is the balance equation for the temperature. It can be obtained from Eq. (16) and its counterpart for species 2; it is given by

$$\nu_0^{-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \ln T = -\zeta^* - \frac{2a^*}{d} P_{xy}^*, \quad (17)$$

where  $\zeta^* \equiv \zeta/\nu_0$ ,  $a^* \equiv a/\nu_0$ ,  $P_{xy}^* \equiv P_{xy}/p$ ,  $p = nT$  being the hydrostatic pressure. Equation (15) shows that the temperature changes in time due to the competition of two opposite mechanisms: viscous heating (shearing work) and energy dissipation in collisions. It is apparent that, except for model A ( $q = 0$ ), the collision frequency  $\nu_0(T) \propto T^q$  is an increasing function of temperature, and so  $a^*(t) \propto T(t)^{-q}$  is a function of time. Consequently, the (reduced) pressure tensor  $P_{xy}^*$  depends on time in the hydrodynamic regime only through its dependence on  $a^*(t)$  [27]. Therefore, for  $q \neq 0$ , after a transient regime a steady state is achieved in the long time limit when both viscous heating and collisional cooling cancel each other and the mixture autonomously seeks the temperature at which the above balance occurs. In this steady state, the reduced shear rate and the coefficients of restitution are not independent parameters since they are related through the steady state condition

$$a^* P_{xy}^* = -\frac{d}{2} \zeta^*. \quad (18)$$

On the other hand, when  $q = 0$ ,  $\partial_t a^* = 0$  so that the reduced shear rate remains in its initial value regardless of the values of the coefficients of restitution  $\alpha_{rs}$ . As a consequence, there is no steady state (unless  $a^*$  takes the specific value given by the condition (18)) and  $a^*$  and  $\alpha_{rs}$  are *independent* parameters in the USF problem. Moreover, it must be also noted that the results obtained in the steady simple shear flow state are *universal* in the sense that they apply both for model A and model B, regardless of the specific dependence of  $\nu_0$  on  $T$ . The rheological properties for a granular binary mixture of IMM in the steady state were obtained in Ref. [19], while a more detailed study on the rheological properties for model A has been carried out in Ref. [23].

### III. CHAPMAN-ENSKOG-LIKE EXPANSION AROUND USF

Let us now perturb the USF by small spatial gradients. The response of the system to those perturbations gives rise to contributions to the mass, momentum and heat fluxes that can be characterized by generalized transport coefficients. Our objective is to determine the shear-rate dependence of these coefficients for inelastic Maxwell mixtures.

In order to analyze this problem we have to start from the set of Boltzmann equations (1) with a general time and space dependence. Let  $\mathbf{u}_0 = \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{r}$  be the flow velocity of the *undisturbed* USF state, where the elements of the tensor  $\mathbf{a}$  are  $a_{ij} = a\delta_{ix}\delta_{jy}$ . As expected [17, 27], in the *disturbed* state the true velocity  $\mathbf{u}$  is in general different from  $\mathbf{u}_0$ , and hence  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_0 + \delta\mathbf{u}$ ,  $\delta\mathbf{u}$  being a small perturbation to  $\mathbf{u}_0$ . As a consequence, the true peculiar velocity is now  $\mathbf{c} \equiv \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{V} - \delta\mathbf{u}$ , where  $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}_0$ . In the Lagrangian frame moving with  $\mathbf{u}_0$ , the Boltzmann equations (1) can be written as

$$\frac{\partial f_1}{\partial t} - aV_y \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial V_x} + (\mathbf{V} + \mathbf{u}_0) \cdot \nabla f_1 = J_{11}[f_1, f_1] + J_{12}[f_1, f_2], \quad (19a)$$

$$\frac{\partial f_2}{\partial t} - aV_y \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial V_x} + (\mathbf{V} + \mathbf{u}_0) \cdot \nabla f_2 = J_{22}[f_2, f_2] + J_{21}[f_2, f_1], \quad (19b)$$

where here the derivative  $\nabla f_r$  is taken at constant  $\mathbf{V}$ . The macroscopic balance equations for the densities of mass, momentum and energy associated with this disturbed USF state are obtained from Eqs. (19a) and (19b) with the result

$$\partial_t n_r + \mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \nabla n_r + \nabla \cdot (n_r \delta\mathbf{u}) = -\frac{\nabla \cdot \mathbf{j}_r}{m_r}, \quad (20)$$

$$\partial_t \delta u_i + a_{ij} \delta u_j + (\mathbf{u}_0 + \delta\mathbf{u}) \cdot \nabla \delta u_i = -\rho^{-1} \nabla_j P_{ij}, \quad (21)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{2} n \partial_t T + \frac{d}{2} n (\mathbf{u}_0 + \delta\mathbf{u}) \cdot \nabla T = -a P_{xy} \\ - \frac{d}{2} T \sum_{s=1}^2 \frac{\nabla \cdot \mathbf{j}_s}{m_s} - \left( \nabla \cdot \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{P} : \nabla \delta\mathbf{u} + \frac{d}{2} p \zeta \right), \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where the mass flux  $\mathbf{j}_r$ , the pressure tensor  $\mathbf{P}$ , the heat flux  $\mathbf{q}$ , and the cooling rate are defined by Eqs. (7), (8), (9), and (10), respectively, with the replacement  $\mathbf{V} \rightarrow \mathbf{c}$ .

We assume that the deviations from the USF state are small. This means that the spatial gradients of the hydrodynamic fields are small. For elastic gases, the specific set of gradients contributing to each flux is restricted by fluid symmetry, Onsager relations, and the form of entropy production [38]. However, for granular gases, only fluid symmetry applies and so there is more flexibility in the representation of the heat and mass fluxes since they

can be defined in a variety of equivalent ways depending on the choice of hydrodynamic gradients used. Some care is thus required in comparing transport coefficients in different representations using different independent gradients for the driving forces. Here, the concentration  $x_1$ , the pressure  $p$ , the temperature  $T$ , and the local flow velocity  $\delta\mathbf{u}$  are chosen as hydrodynamic fields.

Since the system is strongly sheared, a solution to the set of Boltzmann equations (19a) and (19b) can be obtained by means of a generalization of the conventional Chapman-Enskog method [39] in which the velocity distribution function of each species is expanded around the *local* version of the shear flow distribution (reference state). This type of Chapman-Enskog-like expansion has been already considered in the case of *mono-component* granular gases to get the set of shear-rate dependent transport coefficients of IHS [7, 8] and IMM [17]. More technical details on this method can be found in the above references.

In the context of the Chapman-Enskog method [39], we look for a *normal* solution of the form

$$f_s(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{V}, t) \equiv f_s[A(\mathbf{r}, t), \mathbf{V}], \quad (23)$$

where

$$A(\mathbf{r}, t) \equiv \{x_1(\mathbf{r}, t), p(\mathbf{r}, t), T(\mathbf{r}, t), \delta\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r}, t)\}. \quad (24)$$

This special solution expresses the fact that the space dependence of the reference shear flow is completely absorbed in the relative velocity  $\mathbf{V}$  and all other space and time dependence occurs entirely through a *functional* dependence on the fields  $A(\mathbf{r}, t)$ . The functional dependence (23) can be made local by an expansion of the distribution functions  $f_s$  in powers of the hydrodynamic gradients:

$$f_s[A(\mathbf{r}, t), \mathbf{V}] = f_s^{(0)}(\mathbf{V}) + f_s^{(1)}(\mathbf{V}) + \dots, \quad (25)$$

where the reference zeroth-order distribution function corresponds to the USF distribution function but taking into account the local dependence of the concentration, pressure and temperature and the change  $\mathbf{V} \rightarrow \mathbf{V} - \delta\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r}, t) = \mathbf{c}$ . The successive approximations  $f_s^{(k)}$  are of order  $k$  in the gradients of  $x_1$ ,  $p$ ,  $T$ , and  $\delta\mathbf{u}$  but retain all the orders in the shear rate  $a$ . Here, only the first-order approximation will be analyzed.

When the expansion (25) is substituted into the definitions (7)–(10), one gets the corresponding expansions for the fluxes and the cooling rate:

$$\mathbf{j}_s = \mathbf{j}_s^{(0)} + \mathbf{j}_s^{(1)} + \dots, \quad \mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}^{(0)} + \mathbf{P}^{(1)} + \dots, \quad (26a)$$

$$\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{q}^{(0)} + \mathbf{q}^{(1)} + \dots, \quad \zeta = \zeta^{(0)} + \zeta^{(1)} + \dots. \quad (26b)$$

Finally, as in the usual Chapman-Enskog method, the time derivative is also expanded as

$$\partial_t = \partial_t^{(0)} + \partial_t^{(1)} + \partial_t^{(2)} + \dots, \quad (27)$$

where the action of each operator  $\partial_t^{(k)}$  is obtained from the hydrodynamic equations (20)–(22). These results provide the basis for generating the Chapman-Enskog solution to the Boltzmann equations (19a) and (19b).

### A. Zeroth-order approximation

Substituting the expansions (25)–(27) into Eq. (19a), the kinetic equation for  $f_1^{(0)}$  is given by

$$\partial_t^{(0)} f_1^{(0)} - aV_y \frac{\partial f_1^{(0)}}{\partial V_x} = J_{11}[f_1^{(0)}, f_1^{(0)}] + J_{12}[f_1^{(0)}, f_2^{(0)}]. \quad (28)$$

To lowest order in the expansion the conservation laws yield

$$\partial_t^{(0)} x_1 = 0, \quad T^{-1} \partial_t^{(0)} T = p^{-1} \partial_t^{(0)} p = -\frac{2}{dp} aP_{xy}^{(0)} - \zeta^{(0)}, \quad (29)$$

$$\partial_t^{(0)} \delta u_i + a_{ij} \delta u_j = 0. \quad (30)$$

Since  $f_1^{(0)}$  is a normal solution, the time derivative in Eq. (28) can be represented more usefully as

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t^{(0)} f_1^{(0)} &= \frac{\partial f_1^{(0)}}{\partial x_1} \partial_t^{(0)} x_1 + \frac{\partial f_1^{(0)}}{\partial p} \partial_t^{(0)} p + \frac{\partial f_1^{(0)}}{\partial T} \partial_t^{(0)} T \\ &\quad + \frac{\partial f_1^{(0)}}{\partial \delta u_i} \partial_t^{(0)} \delta u_i \\ &= -\left( \frac{2}{dp} aP_{xy}^{(0)} + T\zeta^{(0)} \right) \left( p \frac{\partial f_1^{(0)}}{\partial p} + T \frac{\partial f_1^{(0)}}{\partial T} \right) \\ &\quad + a \delta u_y \frac{\partial f_1^{(0)}}{\partial c_x}, \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where in the last step we have taken into account that  $f_1^{(0)}$  depends on  $\delta \mathbf{u}$  only through the peculiar velocity  $\mathbf{c}$ . Substituting Eq. (31) into Eq. (28) yields the following kinetic equation for  $f_1^{(0)}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & -\left( \frac{2}{dp} aP_{xy}^{(0)} + T\zeta^{(0)} \right) \left( p \frac{\partial f_1^{(0)}}{\partial p} + T \frac{\partial f_1^{(0)}}{\partial T} \right) - ac_y \frac{\partial f_1^{(0)}}{\partial c_x} \\ &= J_{11}[f_1^{(0)}, f_1^{(0)}] + J_{12}[f_1^{(0)}, f_2^{(0)}]. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

A similar equation holds for  $f_2^{(0)}$ . The zeroth-order solution leads to  $\mathbf{j}_r^{(0)} = \mathbf{q}^{(0)} = \mathbf{0}$ . The partial pressure tensors  $\mathbf{P}_1^{(0)}$  and  $\mathbf{P}_2^{(0)}$  can be obtained from Eq. (32) and its counterpart for  $f_2^{(0)}$  when one multiplies both equations by  $m_r \mathbf{c}\mathbf{c}$  and integrate over  $\mathbf{c}$ . In the case of model A, their explicit expressions have been obtained [23] in terms of  $a^*$ ,  $\alpha_{rs}$  and the parameters of the system. In the case of model B ( $q \neq 0$ ), except for the steady state, one has to solve numerically the set of equations for  $\mathbf{P}_1^{(0)}$  and  $\mathbf{P}_2^{(0)}$  to get the dependence of the latter on the reduced shear rate.

### B. First-order approximation

The analysis to first order in the gradients is worked out in Appendix A. Only the final results are presented here. The distribution function  $f_1^{(1)}$  is of the form

$$f_1^{(1)} = \mathbf{A}_1 \cdot \nabla x_1 + \mathbf{B}_1 \cdot \nabla p + \mathbf{C}_1 \cdot \nabla T + \mathcal{D}_1 : \nabla \delta \mathbf{u}, \quad (33)$$

where the vectors  $\{\mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{B}_1, \mathbf{C}_1\}$ , and the tensor  $\mathcal{D}_1$  are functions of the true peculiar velocity  $\mathbf{c}$ . They are the solutions of the following set of linear integral equations:

$$\begin{aligned} & -\left( \frac{2}{dp} aP_{xy}^{(0)} + \zeta^{(0)} \right) (p\partial_p + T\partial_T) \mathbf{A}_1 - ac_y \frac{\partial \mathbf{A}_1}{\partial c_x} + \mathcal{L}_1 \mathbf{A}_1 + \mathcal{M}_1 \mathbf{A}_2 = \mathbf{A}_1 \\ & \quad + \left( \frac{2a}{d} \frac{\partial P_{xy}^{(0)}}{\partial x_1} + p \frac{\partial \zeta^{(0)}}{\partial x_1} \right) \mathbf{B}_1 + \left( \frac{2aT}{dp} \frac{\partial P_{xy}^{(0)}}{\partial x_1} + T \frac{\partial \zeta^{(0)}}{\partial x_1} \right) \mathbf{C}_1, \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & -\left( \frac{2}{dp} aP_{xy}^{(0)} + \zeta^{(0)} \right) (p\partial_p + T\partial_T) \mathbf{B}_1 - \left( \frac{2a}{d} \frac{\partial P_{xy}^{(0)}}{\partial p} + \zeta^{(0)} + p \frac{\partial \zeta^{(0)}}{\partial p} \right) \mathbf{B}_1 - ac_y \frac{\partial \mathbf{B}_1}{\partial c_x} + \mathcal{L}_1 \mathbf{B}_1 + \mathcal{M}_1 \mathbf{B}_2 \\ &= \mathbf{B}_1 - \left[ \frac{2aT}{dp^2} \left( P_{xy}^{(0)} - p \frac{\partial P_{xy}^{(0)}}{\partial p} \right) - \frac{T}{p} \frac{\partial \zeta^{(0)}}{\partial p} \right] \mathbf{C}_1, \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & -\left( \frac{2}{dp} aP_{xy}^{(0)} + \zeta^{(0)} \right) (p\partial_p + T\partial_T) \mathbf{C}_1 - \left( \frac{2a}{dp} P_{xy}^{(0)} + \zeta^{(0)} + \frac{2aT}{dp} \frac{\partial P_{xy}^{(0)}}{\partial T} + T \frac{\partial \zeta^{(0)}}{\partial T} \right) \mathbf{C}_1 - ac_y \frac{\partial \mathbf{C}_1}{\partial c_x} \\ & \quad + \mathcal{L}_1 \mathbf{C}_1 + \mathcal{M}_1 \mathbf{C}_2 = \mathbf{C}_1 + \left( \frac{2a}{d} \frac{\partial P_{xy}^{(0)}}{\partial T} + p \frac{\partial \zeta^{(0)}}{\partial T} \right) \mathbf{B}_1, \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

$$- \left( \frac{2}{dp} a P_{xy}^{(0)} + \zeta^{(0)} \right) (p \partial_p + T \partial_T) \mathcal{D}_{1,kl} - a c_y \frac{\partial \mathcal{D}_{1,kl}}{\partial c_x} - a \delta_{ky} \mathcal{D}_{1,xl} + \mathcal{L}_1 \mathcal{D}_{1,kl} + \mathcal{M}_1 \mathcal{D}_{2,kl} = D_{1,kl}. \quad (37)$$

Here,  $\mathbf{A}_1$ ,  $\mathbf{B}_1$ ,  $\mathbf{C}_1$  and  $D_{1,kl}$  are defined by Eqs. (A3)–(A6), respectively. Moreover,  $\mathcal{L}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_1$  are the linearized Boltzmann collision operators around the reference USF state:

$$\mathcal{L}_1 X = - \left( J_{11}[f_1^{(0)}, X] + J_{11}[X, f_1^{(0)}] + J_{12}[X, f_2^{(0)}] \right), \quad (38a)$$

$$\mathcal{M}_1 X = -J_{12}[f_2^{(0)}, X]. \quad (38b)$$

A similar equation for  $f_2^{(1)}$  applies by setting  $1 \leftrightarrow 2$ . It is important to note that for  $q = \frac{1}{2}$ , Eqs. (34)–(37) are expected to have the same structure as that of the Boltzmann equation for IHS, except for the explicit form of the operators  $\mathcal{L}_s$  and  $\mathcal{M}_s$ .

Once the form of the distributions  $f_r^{(1)}$  is known, the first-order corrections to the mass flux  $j_{1,i}^{(1)}$ , the pressure tensor  $P_{ij}^{(1)}$  and the heat flux  $q_i^{(1)}$  can be obtained. They are given by

$$j_{1,i}^{(1)} = - \frac{m_1 m_2 n}{\rho} D_{ij} \frac{\partial x_1}{\partial r_j} - \frac{\rho}{p} D_{p,ij} \frac{\partial p}{\partial r_j} - \frac{\rho}{T} D_{T,ij} \frac{\partial T}{\partial r_j}, \quad (39)$$

$$P_{ij}^{(1)} = - \eta_{ijkl} \frac{\partial \delta u_\ell}{\partial r_k}, \quad (40)$$

$$q_i^{(1)} = -T^2 D''_{ij} \frac{\partial x_1}{\partial r_j} - L_{ij} \frac{\partial p}{\partial r_j} - \lambda_{ij} \frac{\partial T}{\partial r_j}, \quad (41)$$

where

$$D_{ij} = - \frac{\rho}{n m_2} \int d\mathbf{c} c_i \mathcal{A}_{1,j}(\mathbf{c}), \quad (42)$$

$$D_{p,ij} = - \frac{p m_1}{\rho} \int d\mathbf{c} c_i \mathcal{B}_{1,j}(\mathbf{c}), \quad (43)$$

$$D_{T,ij} = - \frac{T m_1}{\rho} \int d\mathbf{c} c_i \mathcal{C}_{1,j}(\mathbf{c}), \quad (44)$$

$$\eta_{ijkl} = \sum_{s=1}^2 \eta_{s,ijkl}, \quad \eta_{s,ijkl} = -m_s \int d\mathbf{c} c_i c_j \mathcal{D}_{s,kl}(\mathbf{c}), \quad (45)$$

$$D''_{ij} = \sum_{s=1}^2 D''_{s,ij}, \quad D''_{s,ij} = - \frac{m_s}{2T^2} \int d\mathbf{c} c^2 c_i \mathcal{A}_{s,j}(\mathbf{c}), \quad (46)$$

$$L_{ij} = \sum_{s=1}^2 L_{s,ij}, \quad L_{s,ij} = - \frac{m_s}{2} \int d\mathbf{c} c^2 c_i \mathcal{B}_{s,j}(\mathbf{c}), \quad (47)$$

$$\lambda_{ij} = \sum_{s=1}^2 \lambda_{s,ij}, \quad \lambda_{s,ij} = - \frac{m_s}{2} \int d\mathbf{c} c^2 c_i \mathcal{C}_{s,j}(\mathbf{c}). \quad (48)$$

Upon writing Eqs. (39)–(48) use has been made of the symmetry properties of  $\mathcal{A}_r$ ,  $\mathcal{B}_r$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_r$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{r,kl}$ . In general, the set of *generalized* transport coefficients defined above are nonlinear functions of the shear rate, the coefficients of restitution and the parameters of the mixture (masses, sizes and concentration).

#### IV. GENERALIZED TRANSPORT COEFFICIENTS

This Section is devoted to the evaluation of the generalized transport coefficients associated to the mass, momentum and heat fluxes. We consider each flux separately.

##### A. Mass flux

The constitutive form for the mass flux to first order in spatial gradients is given by Eq. (39). To illustrate with some detail the evaluation of the transport coefficients of the mass flux, let us consider the diffusion coefficients  $D_{ij}$ , defined by Eq. (42). These coefficients can be obtained by multiplying both sides of Eq. (34) by  $m_1 c_j$  and integrating over  $\mathbf{c}$ . After some algebra, one arrives at

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \frac{2a}{dp} P_{xy}^{(0)} + \zeta^{(0)} \right) (p \partial_p + T \partial_T) D_{ij} - \nu_D D_{ij} - a_{ik} D_{kj} \\ &= \frac{\rho_1}{\rho} \frac{\partial P_{ij}^{(0)}}{\partial x_1} - \frac{\partial P_{1,ij}^{(0)}}{\partial x_1} - \left( \frac{2a}{d} \frac{\partial P_{xy}^{(0)}}{\partial x_1} + p \frac{\partial \zeta^{(0)}}{\partial x_1} \right) \\ & \times \frac{\rho^2 D_{p,ij}}{m_1 m_2 n p} - \left( \frac{2aT}{dp} \frac{\partial P_{xy}^{(0)}}{\partial x_1} + T \frac{\partial \zeta^{(0)}}{\partial x_1} \right) \frac{\rho^2 D_{T,ij}}{m_1 m_2 n T}. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

In Eq. (49) use has been made of the results [20]

$$\int d\mathbf{c} m_1 c_i (\mathcal{L}_1 \mathcal{A}_{1,j} + \mathcal{M}_1 \mathcal{A}_{2,j}) = - \frac{m_1 m_2 n}{\rho} \nu_D D_{ij}, \quad (50)$$

$$\int d\mathbf{c} m_1 c_i \mathcal{A}_{1,j} = \frac{\rho_1}{\rho} \frac{\partial P_{ij}^{(0)}}{\partial x_1} - \frac{\partial P_{1,ij}^{(0)}}{\partial x_1}, \quad (51)$$

where

$$\nu_D = \frac{\rho \omega_{12}}{d \rho_2} \mu_{21} (1 + \alpha_{12}). \quad (52)$$

In the hydrodynamic regime, the diffusion tensor can be written as  $D_{ij} = D_0 D_{ij}^*$  where  $D_0 = (\rho\Gamma/m_1 m_2 \nu_0)$  and  $D_{ij}^*$  is a dimensionless function of the reduced shear rate  $a^*$ , the coefficients of restitution  $\alpha_{rs}$ , the mass ratio  $\mu \equiv m_1/m_2$ , the ratio of diameters  $\sigma_1/\sigma_2$  and the mole fraction  $x_1$ . The dependence of  $D_{ij}^*$  on the pressure and temperature is through the reduced shear rate  $a^* \propto T^{1-q}/p$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} (p\partial_p + T\partial_T) D_{ij} &= (p\partial_p + T\partial_T) D_0 D_{ij}^* \\ &= (1-q)D_{ij} - qD_0 a^* \frac{\partial D_{ij}^*}{\partial a^*}. \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

Consequently, in dimensionless form, Eq. (49) yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\frac{2a^*}{d}P_{xy} + \zeta^*\right) \left[(1-q)D_{ij}^* - qa^* \frac{\partial D_{ij}^*}{\partial a^*}\right] - \nu_D^* D_{ij}^* \\ &- a_{ik}^* D_{kj}^* = \frac{\rho_1}{\rho} \frac{\partial P_{ij}^*}{\partial x_1} - \frac{\partial P_{1,ij}^*}{\partial x_1} - \left(\frac{2a^*}{d} \frac{\partial P_{xy}^*}{\partial x_1} + \frac{\partial \zeta^*}{\partial x_1}\right) \\ &\times D_{p,ij}^* - \left(\frac{2a^*}{d} \frac{\partial P_{xy}^*}{\partial x_1} + \frac{\partial \zeta^*}{\partial x_1}\right) D_{T,ij}^*. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

Here,  $\zeta^* \equiv \zeta^{(0)}/\nu_0$ ,  $P_{r,ij}^* \equiv P_{r,ij}^{(0)}/p$ ,  $\nu_D^* \equiv \nu_D/\nu_0$ ,  $a_{ij}^* \equiv a_{ij}/\nu_0$ ,  $D_{p,ij}^* \equiv D_{p,ij}/D_{p0}$ , and  $D_{T,ij}^* \equiv D_{T,ij}/D_{T0}$  where  $D_{p0} = (p/\rho\nu_0)$  and we recall that  $a_{ij} = a\delta_{ix}\delta_{jy}$ . It must be noted that  $P_{r,ij}^*$  and  $\zeta^*$  depend also on  $x_1$  and  $a^*$  through their dependence on the temperature ratio  $\gamma \equiv T_1/T_2$ .

The equations defining the (scaled) tensors  $D_{p,ij}^*$  and  $D_{T,ij}^*$  can be obtained by following similar steps as those made before for  $D_{ij}^*$ . After some algebra, the results are

$$\begin{aligned} &q \left(\frac{2a^*}{d}P_{xy} + \zeta^*\right) \left(D_{p,ij}^* + a^* \frac{\partial D_{p,ij}^*}{\partial a^*}\right) \\ &- \left[\frac{2a^*}{d} \left(P_{xy}^* - a^* \frac{\partial P_{xy}^*}{\partial a^*}\right) + 2\zeta^* - a^* \frac{\partial \zeta^*}{\partial a^*}\right] D_{p,ij}^* \\ &+ \nu_D^* D_{p,ij}^* + a_{ik}^* D_{p,kj}^* = - \left(\frac{\rho_1}{\rho} P_{ij}^* - P_{1,ij}^*\right) \\ &+ a^* \left(\frac{\rho_1}{\rho} \frac{\partial P_{ij}^*}{\partial a^*} - \frac{\partial P_{1,ij}^*}{\partial a^*}\right) \\ &- \left(\frac{2}{d} a^{*2} \frac{\partial P_{xy}^*}{\partial a^*} - \zeta^* + a^* \frac{\partial \zeta^*}{\partial a^*}\right) D_{T,ij}^*, \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &q \left(\frac{2a^*}{d}P_{xy} + \zeta^*\right) \left(D_{T,ij}^* + a^* \frac{\partial D_{T,ij}^*}{\partial a^*}\right) - \left[\frac{2a^*}{d} \right. \\ &\times \left. \left(P_{xy}^* + (1-q)a^* \frac{\partial P_{xy}^*}{\partial a^*}\right) + q\zeta^* + (1-q)a^* \frac{\partial \zeta^*}{\partial a^*}\right] \\ &\times D_{T,ij}^* + \nu_D^* D_{T,ij}^* + a_{ik}^* D_{T,kj}^* = -(1-q)a^* \left(\frac{\rho_1}{\rho} \frac{\partial P_{ij}^*}{\partial a^*} \right. \\ &\left. - \frac{\partial P_{1,ij}^*}{\partial a^*}\right) + (1-q) \left(\frac{2}{d} a^{*2} \frac{\partial P_{xy}^*}{\partial a^*} - \zeta^* + a^* \frac{\partial \zeta^*}{\partial a^*}\right) D_{p,ij}^*. \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

Upon writing Eqs. (55) and (56) use has been made of the identities

$$p\partial_p P_{ij}^{(0)} = p(P_{ij}^* - a^* \partial_{a^*} P_{ij}^*), \quad (57a)$$

$$T\partial_T P_{ij}^{(0)} = p(1-q)a^* \partial_{a^*} P_{ij}^*, \quad (57b)$$

$$p\partial_p \zeta^{(0)} = \zeta^{(0)} - \nu_0 a^* \partial_{a^*} \zeta^*, \quad (58a)$$

$$T\partial_T \zeta^{(0)} = (q-1)\zeta^{(0)} + (1-q)\nu_0 a^* \partial_{a^*} \zeta^*. \quad (58b)$$

In the absence of shear field ( $a^* = 0$ ),  $P_{ij}^* = \delta_{ij}$ ,  $P_{r,ij}^* = x_r \gamma_r \delta_{ij}$ , and Eqs. (54)–(56) have the solutions  $D_{ij}^* = D^* \delta_{ij}$ ,  $D_{p,ij}^* = D_p^* \delta_{ij}$  and  $D_{T,ij}^* = D_T^* \delta_{ij}$  where

$$D^* = (\nu_D^* - (1-q)\zeta^*)^{-1} \left[ \gamma_1 + x_1 \frac{\partial \gamma_1}{\partial x_1} + \frac{\partial \zeta^*}{\partial x_1} (D_p^* + D_T^*) \right], \quad (59)$$

$$D_p^* = x_1 \gamma_1 \left(1 - \frac{pm_1}{\rho T_1}\right) \left(\nu_D^* + (q-2)\zeta^* - (q-1) \frac{\zeta^{*2}}{\nu_D^*}\right)^{-1}, \quad (60)$$

$$D_T^* = (q-1) \frac{\zeta^*}{\nu_D^*} D_p^*. \quad (61)$$

Equations (59)–(61) agree with the expressions derived for IMM (model B with  $q = \frac{1}{2}$ ) in the Navier-Stokes hydrodynamic order [20]. Beyond the Navier-Stokes domain (vanishing shear rates), in general Eqs. (54)–(56) are nonlinear differential equations that must be solved with the appropriate boundary conditions. However, in the case of model A ( $q = 0$ ), Eqs. (54)–(56) become a set of coupled algebraic equations that can be readily solved.

## B. Pressure tensor

The pressure tensor is defined by Eq. (40) in terms of the coefficients  $\eta_{s,ijkl}$ , Eq. (45). These coefficients can be obtained from the integral equation (37) after multiplying it by  $m_r c_i c_j$  and integrating over velocity. The result is



$$\begin{aligned}
& \left( \frac{2a}{dp} P_{xy}^{(0)} + \zeta^{(0)} \right) (p\partial_p + T\partial_T) \eta_{1,ijkl} - (a_{ip}\eta_{1,jpkl} + a_{jp}\eta_{1,ipkl} - a_{pk}\eta_{1,ijpl}) - (\tau_{11}\eta_{1,ijkl} + \tau_{12}\eta_{2,ijkl}) \\
& = p \frac{\partial P_{1,ij}^{(0)}}{\partial p} \delta_{kl} - \left( \delta_{ik} P_{1,jl}^{(0)} + \delta_{jk} P_{1,il}^{(0)} \right) + \frac{2}{dp} \left( P_{kl}^{(0)} - a\eta_{xykl} \right) \left( p \frac{\partial P_{1,ij}^{(0)}}{\partial p} + T \frac{\partial P_{1,ij}^{(0)}}{\partial T} \right). \tag{62}
\end{aligned}$$

The corresponding equation for  $\eta_{2,ijkl}$  can be obtained from Eq. (62) by changing  $1 \leftrightarrow 2$ . Upon writing (62) use has been made of the result [20]

$$\int d\mathbf{c} m_1 c_i c_j (\mathcal{L}_1 \mathcal{D}_{1,kl} + \mathcal{M}_1 \mathcal{D}_{2,kl}) = -\tau_{11} \eta_{1,ijkl} - \tau_{12} \eta_{2,ijkl}, \tag{63}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau_{11} &= \frac{\omega_{11}}{d(d+2)} (1 + \alpha_{11})(d + 1 - \alpha_{11}) \\
&+ 2 \frac{\omega_{12}}{d} \mu_{21} (1 + \alpha_{12}) \left[ 1 - \frac{\mu_{21}(1 + \alpha_{12})}{d + 2} \right], \tag{64}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\tau_{12} = -2 \frac{\omega_{12}}{d(d+2)} \frac{\rho_1}{\rho_2} \mu_{21}^2 (1 + \alpha_{12})^2. \tag{65}$$

The coefficients  $\eta_{r,ijkl}$  can be written as  $\eta_{r,ijkl} = (p/\nu_0) \eta_{r,ijkl}^*$ . The dependence of  $\eta_{r,ijkl}^*$  on  $p$  and  $T$  is through  $a^*$  so that

$$\begin{aligned}
(p\partial_p + T\partial_T) \eta_{r,ijkl} &= (p\partial_p + T\partial_T) \frac{p}{\nu_0} \eta_{r,ijkl}^* \\
&= (1 - q) \eta_{r,ijkl} - \frac{qp}{\nu_0} a^* \frac{\partial \eta_{r,ijkl}^*}{\partial a^*}. \tag{66}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, in dimensionless form, Eq. (62) can be finally written as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left( \frac{2}{d} a^* P_{xy}^* + \zeta^* \right) \left[ (1 - q) \eta_{1,ijkl}^* - q a^* \frac{\partial \eta_{1,ijkl}^*}{\partial a^*} \right] - (a_{ip}^* \eta_{1,jpkl}^* + a_{jp}^* \eta_{1,ipkl}^* - a_{pk}^* \eta_{1,ijpl}^*) - (\tau_{11}^* \eta_{1,ijkl}^* + \tau_{12}^* \eta_{2,ijkl}^*) \\
& = -a^* \frac{\partial P_{1,ij}^*}{\partial a^*} \delta_{kl} - (\delta_{ik} P_{1,jl}^* + \delta_{jk} P_{1,il}^*) + \frac{2}{d} (P_{kl}^* - a^* \eta_{xykl}^*) \left( P_{1,ij}^* - q a^* \frac{\partial P_{1,ij}^*}{\partial a^*} \right), \tag{67}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\tau_{ij}^* \equiv \tau_{ij}/\nu_0$ .

In the case of mechanically equivalent particles ( $m_1 = m_2$ ,  $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$ ,  $\alpha_{11} = \alpha_{22} = \alpha_{12} \equiv \alpha$ ),  $P_{1,ij}^*/x_1 = P_{2,ij}^*/x_2 = P_{ij}^*$ ,  $\eta_{1,ijkl}^*/x_1 = \eta_{2,ijkl}^*/x_2 = \eta_{ijkl}^*$ , where  $\eta_{ijkl}^*$  verifies the differential equation

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left( \frac{2}{d} a^* P_{xy}^* + \zeta^* \right) \left[ (1 - q) \eta_{ijkl}^* - q a^* \frac{\partial \eta_{ijkl}^*}{\partial a^*} \right] \\
& - (a_{ip}^* \eta_{jpk}^* + a_{jp}^* \eta_{ipk}^* - a_{pk}^* \eta_{ijp}^*) - \nu_\eta^* \eta_{ijkl}^* \\
& = -a^* \frac{\partial P_{ij}^*}{\partial a^*} \delta_{kl} - (\delta_{ik} P_{jl}^* + \delta_{jk} P_{il}^*) \\
& + \frac{2}{d} (P_{kl}^* - a^* \eta_{xykl}^*) \left( P_{ij}^* - q a^* \frac{\partial P_{ij}^*}{\partial a^*} \right), \tag{68}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\nu_\eta^* = \frac{(1 + \alpha)(d + 1 - \alpha)}{d(d + 2)}. \tag{69}$$

Equation (68) agrees with the results derived in Ref. [17] for a sheared monocomponent granular gas of IMM. In

the limit of vanishing shear rates ( $a^* = 0$ ), the solution to Eq. (67) can be written as

$$\eta_{ijkl}^* = (\eta_1^* + \eta_2^*) \Delta_{ijkl}, \quad \Delta_{ijkl} = \delta_{ik} \delta_{jl} + \delta_{jk} \delta_{il} - \frac{2}{d} \delta_{ij} \delta_{kl}, \tag{70}$$

where

$$\eta_1^* = \frac{x_1 \gamma_1 [\tau_{22}^* - (1 - q) \zeta^*] - x_2 \gamma_2 \tau_{12}}{[\tau_{11} - (1 - q) \zeta^*][\tau_{22} - (1 - q) \zeta^*] - \tau_{12} \tau_{21}}, \tag{71}$$

$$\eta_2^* = \frac{x_2 \gamma_2 [\tau_{11}^* - (1 - q) \zeta^*] - x_1 \gamma_1 \tau_{21}}{[\tau_{11} - (1 - q) \zeta^*][\tau_{22} - (1 - q) \zeta^*] - \tau_{12} \tau_{21}}. \tag{72}$$

For model B with  $q = 1/2$ , Eqs. (70)–(72) are consistent with those previously obtained for the Navier-Stokes shear viscosity of an inelastic binary Maxwell mixture [20]. On the other hand, except in the above two limit cases, Eq. (67) for  $\eta_{1,ijkl}^*$  and its counterpart for  $\eta_{2,ijkl}^*$  can be only solved analytically for model A ( $q = 0$ ).

The evaluation of the transport coefficients associated with the heat flux is more involved than the one carried

out before for the mass and momentum fluxes. For the sake of brevity, only the final expressions of the differential equations defining the coefficients  $D''_{ij}$ ,  $L_{ij}$  and  $\lambda_{ij}$  are provided (see Appendix B).

## V. TRACER LIMIT: DIFFUSION COEFFICIENTS

The results obtained in the preceding Section give all the relevant information on the influence of shear flow on the mass, momentum and heat transport of a granular binary mixture. According to these results, the set of generalized (dimensionless) transport coefficients  $\{D_{ij}^*, D_{p,ij}^*, D_{T,ij}^*, n_{ijk\ell}^*, \dots\}$  present a complex dependence on the (reduced) shear rate and the parameters of the mixture (masses, sizes, composition and coefficients of restitution) without any restriction on their values. In addition, although in the case of model A the equations defining the above coefficients are algebraic, their solutions still involve quite a tedious algebra. This is due essentially to the intricate dependence of the partial pressure tensors  $P_{r,ij}^{(0)}$  and the temperature ratio  $\gamma$  on both the mole fraction  $x_1$  and the (reduced) shear rate  $a^*$ . Thus, in order to illustrate the dependence of transport coefficients on the parameter space, we will consider here the tracer limit, namely a binary mixture where the concentration of one of the components (the tracer or the intruder) is very small compared to that of the other (solvent or excess) component. In this limit case ( $x_1 \rightarrow 0$ ), the mass flux is the relevant flux since the momentum and heat fluxes of the system (intruder plus gas particles) are the same as those previously obtained [17] for a monocomponent granular gas of IMM.

It must be remarked that a non-equilibrium phase transition has been recently [40] identified in the tracer limit for a granular binary mixture of IMM. This transition refers to the existence of a region (coined as the ordered phase) where the contribution of tracer particles to the total kinetic energy of the system is *finite*. However, the above (surprising) behavior has been only analytically found when the collision frequency  $\omega_{rs}$  is assumed to be independent of the temperature ratio (“plain vanilla Maxwell model”) and hence, it does not seem to exist for the more realistic version of the IMM considered here. The effects of the above transition on the Navier-Stokes transport coefficients of a granular binary mixture has been recently studied [41].

### A. Model A

In the tracer limit,  $P^{(0)} \simeq P_2^{(0)}$  and the relevant elements of the partial pressure tensor  $P_1^{(0)}$  admit simplified forms (see the Appendix C). In particular, in the tracer limit,  $\partial_{x_1} P_{ij}^{(0)} = \partial_{x_1} \gamma = \partial_{x_1} \zeta^* = \partial_{a^*} \zeta^* = 0$  and  $\partial_{x_1} P_{1,ij}^{(0)} = P_{1,ij}^{(0)}/x_1$ . Taking into account these simplifi-

cations, and for model A ( $q = 0$ ), Eqs. (55)–(57a) become

$$\left(\frac{2a^*}{d}P_{2,xy}^* + \zeta^*\right) D_{ij}^* - \nu_D^* D_{ij}^* - a_{ik}^* D_{kj}^* = -x_1^{-1} P_{1,ij}^*, \quad (73)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\frac{2a^*}{d} \left(P_{2,xy}^* - a^* \frac{\partial P_{2,xy}^*}{\partial a^*}\right) + 2\zeta^*\right] D_{p,ij}^* - \nu_D^* D_{p,ij}^* \\ & - a_{ik}^* D_{p,kj}^* = x_1 \mu P_{2,ij}^* - P_{1,ij}^* - x_1 \mu a^* \frac{\partial P_{2,ij}^*}{\partial a^*} \\ & + a^* \frac{\partial P_{1,ij}^*}{\partial a^*} + \left(\frac{2a^{*2}}{d} \frac{\partial P_{2,xy}^*}{\partial a^*} - \zeta^*\right) D_{T,ij}^*, \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{2a^*}{d} \left(P_{2,xy}^* + a^* \frac{\partial P_{2,xy}^*}{\partial a^*}\right) D_{T,ij}^* - \nu_D^* D_{T,ij}^* - a_{ik}^* D_{T,kj}^* \\ & = x_1 \mu a^* \frac{\partial P_{2,ij}^*}{\partial a^*} - a^* \frac{\partial P_{1,ij}^*}{\partial a^*} - \left(\frac{2a^{*2}}{d} \frac{\partial P_{2,xy}^*}{\partial a^*} - \zeta^*\right) D_{p,ij}^*. \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

Here,  $\zeta^* = (1 - \alpha_{22}^2)/2d$  and  $\nu_D^* = (\omega_{12}^* \mu_{21} (1 + \alpha_{12}))/d$  where  $\omega_{12}^* \equiv \omega_{12}/\nu_0$ . Upon deriving Eq. (73) we have neglected the contributions coming from the tensors  $D_{p,ij}^*$  and  $D_{T,ij}^*$  since both tensors are proportional to  $x_1$  (and hence, they vanish in the tracer limit) while  $D_{ij}^*$  is independent of  $x_1$ . In addition, the derivatives  $\partial_{a^*} P_{2,ij}^*$  and  $\partial_{a^*} P_{1,ij}^*$  appearing in Eqs. (73)–(75) are obtained in Appendix D.

As in the case of IHS [31], the coefficients  $D_{ij}$  decouple from the other ones and hence, they can be obtained straightforwardly. Their expressions are

$$D_{ij}^* = \frac{x_1^{-1}}{\nu_D^* - \frac{2a^*}{d} P_{2,xy}^* - \zeta^*} \left( P_{1,ij}^* - \frac{a_{ik}^* P_{1,kj}^*}{\nu_D^* - \frac{2a^*}{d} P_{2,xy}^* - \zeta^*} \right). \quad (76)$$

The remaining coefficients  $D_{p,ij}^*$  and  $D_{T,ij}^*$  are coupled and they obey the set of simple algebraic equations (74)–(75). As alluded to above, they are proportional to the concentration  $x_1$  and thus vanish in the tracer limit. Yet, it is of interest to normalize them by their vanishing shear rate counterparts (which are also proportional to  $x_1$ ), to study their dependence on parameters other than  $x_1$ . In order to illustrate the shear-rate dependence of the set of transport coefficients  $\Delta_{ij} \equiv \{D_{ij}^*, D_{p,ij}^*, D_{T,ij}^*\}$ , we consider a three-dimensional ( $d = 3$ ) granular mixture. Also, to reduce the number of independent parameters, the simplest case of a common coefficient of restitution ( $\alpha \equiv \alpha_{22} = \alpha_{12}$ ) is studied. Thus, the parameter space is reduced to four quantities  $\{\sigma_1/\sigma_2, m_1/m_2, \alpha, a^*\}$ .

According to Eqs. (73)–(75), we have that  $\Delta_{zx} = \Delta_{zx} = \Delta_{yz} = \Delta_{zy} = 0$  in agreement with the symmetry of the linear shear flow (15). Thus, there are five nonzero elements of the tensors  $\Delta_{ij}$ : the three diagonal ( $\Delta_{xx}$ ,  $\Delta_{yy}$ , and  $\Delta_{zz}$ ) and the two off-diagonal elements ( $\Delta_{xy}$  and  $\Delta_{yx}$ ). The algebraic equations (73)–(75) also show that the anisotropy induced by the shear flow yields the properties  $\Delta_{xx} \neq \Delta_{yy} = \Delta_{zz}$  and  $\Delta_{xy} \neq \Delta_{yx}$ .




FIG. 1: (Color online) Top panel: Shear-rate dependence of the (dimensionless) coefficients  $D_{xx}^*/D_0^*$  and  $D_{xy}^*/D_0^*$  for  $d = 3$ ,  $\sigma_1/\sigma_2 = 1$ ,  $m_1/m_2 = 2$  and three different values of the (common) coefficient of restitution  $\alpha$ :  $\alpha = 1$  (solid line),  $\alpha = 0.8$  (dashed red line) and  $\alpha = 0.6$  (dash-dotted blue line). Bottom panel: Shear-rate dependence of the (dimensionless) coefficients  $D_{yy}^*/D_0^*$  and  $D_{yx}^*/D_0^*$  for the same parameter values. These results pertain to model A.

The equality  $P_{1,yy}^* = P_{1,zz}^*$  implies  $\Delta_{yy} = \Delta_{zz}$ . This is a consequence of the interaction model considered since  $\Delta_{yy} \neq \Delta_{zz}$  for IHS [31].

The shear-rate dependence of the relevant elements of the diffusion tensors  $D_{ij}^*$ ,  $D_{p,ij}^*$  and  $D_{T,ij}^*$  has been plotted in Figs. 1 and 2 for  $d = 3$ ,  $\sigma_1/\sigma_2 = 1$ ,  $m_1/m_2 = 2$  and three different values of the (common) coefficient of restitution. Here, the tensors have been reduced with respect to their values at zero shear rate, namely,  $D_{ij}^*/D_0^*$ ,  $D_{p,ij}^*/D_{p,0}^*$  and  $D_{T,ij}^*/D_{T,0}^*$  where

$$D_0^* = \frac{\gamma}{\nu_D^* - \zeta^*}, \quad D_{T0}^* = -\frac{\zeta^*}{\nu_D^*} D_{p0}^*, \quad (77)$$

$$D_{p0}^* = x_1 \gamma \left(1 - \frac{\mu}{\gamma}\right) \left(\nu_D^* - 2\zeta^* + \frac{\zeta^{*2}}{\nu_D^*}\right)^{-1}. \quad (78)$$

It can be seen that the influence of the shear flow on the diffusion coefficients is in general quite important. We also observe that the anisotropy of the system, as measured by the difference  $D_{xx}^* - D_{yy}^*$  grows with both the




FIG. 2: (Color online) Same as Fig. 1 for  $D_{p,yy}^*/D_{p,0}^*$  and  $D_{p,xy}^*/D_{p,0}^*$  (upper panel),  $D_{T,yy}^*/D_{T,0}^*$  and  $D_{T,xy}^*/D_{T,0}^*$  (bottom panel).

shear rate and collisional dissipation. As expected, the shear field induces cross effects in the diffusion of particles. This is measured by the off-diagonal elements  $D_{xy}^*$  ( $D_{yx}^*$ ),  $D_{p,xy}^*$  ( $D_{p,yx}^*$ ) and  $D_{T,xy}^*$  ( $D_{T,yx}^*$ ). These coefficients give the mass transport along the  $x$  ( $y$ ) axis due to spatial gradients parallel to  $y$  ( $x$ ) axis. All these coefficients are negative in the region of parameter space explored. We see that, regardless of the value of  $\alpha$ , the shapes of the off-diagonal elements are quite similar: there is a region of values of  $a^*$  for which their magnitude increase with increasing shear rate, while the opposite happens for larger shear rates. With respect to the diagonal elements, they are monotonically decreasing functions of the shear rate (shear-thinning effect), except in the region of small shear rates. In addition, Figs. 1 and 2 also show that, at a given value of  $a^*$ , their values decrease with dissipation.

## B. Model B: steady state conditions

In model B the collision frequency  $\nu_0(T)$  is an increasing function of temperature and hence, the (reduced) shear rate  $a^*(T) = a/\nu_0(T)$  depends on time. Thus, in order to determine the diffusion coefficients one would have to solve numerically Eqs. (54)–(56) in the tracer




FIG. 3: (Color online) Plot of the diagonal (dimensionless) coefficients  $D_{xx}^*/D_0^*$  (top panel) and  $D_{yy}^*/D_0^*$  (bottom panel) as functions of the (common) coefficient of restitution  $\alpha$  for  $d = 3$  in the cases  $\sigma_1/\sigma_2 = 1$  and  $m_1/m_2 = 2$  (a) and  $\sigma_1/\sigma_2 = 2$  and  $m_1/m_2 = 4$  (b). The solid lines correspond to the results derived here for IMM while the dashed lines are the results derived for IHS [30, 31]. These results are for model B.




FIG. 4: (Color online) Same as Fig. 3 for  $D_{xy}^*/D_0^*$  (top panel) and  $D_{yx}^*/D_0^*$  (bottom panel).

limit, discard the kinetic stage of the evolution and eliminate time in favor of  $a^*(t)$  [4, 25]. An additional technical difficulty in the case of granular mixtures is that the diffusion coefficients depend also on the temperature ratio, that is itself time dependent through its dependence on  $a^*(t)$ . The integration of Eqs. (54)–(56) is therefore a significantly more complex problem than for the monodisperse system. On the other hand, given that the results derived for the rheological properties in a single granular gas under USF [35] indicate that the influence of the temperature dependence on  $\nu_0$  on rheology is quite small, one can consider the steady-state solution for model B, which is at any rate of interest in its own right. In this case, the condition (18) applies and the solution to Eqs. (54)–(56) can be obtained analytically in the tracer limit. Here, we focus our attention on the tracer diffusion tensor  $D_{ij}^*$ , whose expression in the steady state is *universal* since it applies for both models A and B, regardless the specific dependence of  $\nu_0$  on  $T$ . Moreover, we can compare the predictions of IMM for  $D_{ij}^*$  with those previously derived for IHS [30, 31] by using Grad’s moment method [29].

As in previous works on IMM [19–21] and in order to compare the results between IMM and IHS, the parameter  $A$  appearing in the definition of  $\nu_0$  (see Eq. (13)) is chosen as

$$A = \frac{\Omega_d}{\sqrt{\pi}} \sigma_{12}^{d-1} \sqrt{\frac{2(m_1 + m_2)}{m_1 m_2}}. \quad (79)$$

With this choice, the partial cooling rates  $\zeta_r$  (associated with the partial temperatures  $T_r$ ) of IMM (with  $q = 1/2$ ) are the same as those obtained for IHS (as evaluated in the Maxwellian approximation) [34]. The dependence of the set of tracer diffusion coefficients  $\{D_{xx}^*, D_{yy}^*, D_{xy}^*, D_{yx}^*\}$  on the (common) coefficient of restitution  $\alpha$  is illustrated in Figs. 3 and 4 for two different systems. We observe in general a good agreement between IMM and IHS, especially in the case of the coefficients  $D_{xx}^*$  and  $D_{xy}^*$ . These coefficients measure mass transport in the flow direction ( $x$  axis). It must be pointed out that the discrepancies between both interaction models turn out to be more significant as the disparity of masses or sizes increases.

## VI. AN APPLICATION: SEGREGATION OF AN INTRUDER BY THERMAL DIFFUSION

As an application of the previous results, this section is devoted to the study of thermal diffusion segregation of an intruder in a sheared granular dilute gas. Segregation and mixing of dissimilar grains is one of the most interesting problems in granular mixtures, not only from a fundamental point of view but also from a more practical perspective. This problem has spawned a number of important experimental, computational, and theoretical works in the field of granular media, especially when the system is fluidized by vibrating walls [42]. In the

case of sheared systems, some computational and experimental works in annular Couette cells [43] have shown that granular materials segregate by particle size when subjected to shear. On the other hand, in spite of the relevance of the problem, much less is known on the theoretical description of segregation in sheared granular systems. Previous theoretical studies [44] on the subject for dense systems have been based on a Chapman-Enskog expansion around Maxwellian distributions with the same temperature for each species. As mentioned before, the assumption of energy equipartition can be only justified for nearly elastic gases which means small shear rates in the *steady* USF state.

Thermal diffusion is caused by the relative motion of the components of a mixture due to the presence of a temperature gradient. As a result of this motion, a steady state is finally reached in which the separating effect arising from thermal diffusion is balanced by the remixing effect of ordinary diffusion [45]. The new feature of our study is to assess the impact of shear flow on segregation. Under these conditions, the so-called thermal diffusion factor  $\Lambda$  characterizes the amount of segregation parallel to the temperature gradient. However, due to the anisotropy induced by the shear field, a tensor  $\mathbf{\Lambda}$  rather than a scalar  $\Lambda$  is needed to characterize segregation in the different directions. Here, for the sake of simplicity, we consider a situation where the temperature gradient is orthogonal to the shear flow plane (i.e.,  $\partial_x T = \partial_y T = 0, \partial_z T \neq 0$  and  $\partial_x u_y = a \equiv \text{const.}$ ). In this case, the amount of segregation parallel to the thermal gradient is measured by the diffusion factor  $\Lambda_z$  defined by the relation

$$\Lambda_z \frac{\partial \ln T}{\partial z} = -\frac{\partial \ln x_1}{\partial z}. \quad (80)$$

If we assume that the bottom plate is hotter than the top plate ( $\partial_z T < 0$ ), then the intruder rises with respect to the gas particles if  $\Lambda_z > 0$  (i.e.,  $\partial_z \ln x_1 > 0$ ) while the intruder falls with respect to the gas particles if  $\Lambda_z < 0$  (i.e.,  $\partial_z \ln x_1 < 0$ ).

Our goal here is to determine  $\Lambda_z$  in a steady state with  $\delta \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$  and  $x_1 \rightarrow 0$  (tracer limit) where the spatial gradients of  $T$ ,  $p$  and  $x_1$  point in the  $z$ -direction. Under these conditions, the balance equation (20) yields  $j_{1,z}^{(1)} = 0$  where  $j_{1,z}^{(1)}$  is given by

$$j_{1,z}^{(1)} = -m_1 D_{zz} \frac{\partial x_1}{\partial z} - \frac{m_2}{T} D_{p,zz} \frac{\partial p}{\partial z} - \frac{m_2 n_2}{T} D_{T,z} \frac{\partial T}{\partial z}. \quad (81)$$

According to Eq. (81), the condition  $j_{1,z}^{(1)} = 0$  leads to

$$\frac{\partial x_1}{\partial z} = -\frac{m_2}{m_1 T} \frac{D_{p,zz}}{D_{zz}} \frac{\partial p}{\partial z} - \frac{m_2 n_2}{m_1 T} \frac{D_{T,z}}{D_{zz}} \frac{\partial T}{\partial z}. \quad (82)$$

In the steady state, the momentum balance equation (21) reduces simply to  $\partial_z P_{zz} = 0$ . The pressure tensor has the form  $P_{zz} = p P_{zz}^*(a^*)$  and hence, the identity  $\partial_z P_{zz} = 0$




FIG. 5: (Color online) Phase diagram for segregation for a three-dimensional system ( $d = 3$ ) and three different values of the (common) coefficient of restitution  $\alpha \equiv \alpha_{22} = \alpha_{12}$ :  $\alpha = 0.9$  (solid line),  $\alpha = 0.8$  (dashed line) and  $\alpha = 0.7$  (dotted line).




FIG. 6: (Color online) Phase diagram for segregation for a three-dimensional system ( $d = 3$ ) with  $\alpha_{22} = 0.9$  and  $\alpha = 0.7$ . The solid line corresponds to the theoretical prediction obtained from Eq. (86) while the symbols refer to computer simulations carried out in Ref. [46] for IHS for Couette flows with uniform heat flux (the so-called LTu flows).

allows to express  $\partial_z p$  in terms of  $\partial_z T$ . The result is

$$\frac{\partial \ln p}{\partial z} = -\frac{(1-q)a^*(\partial_{a^*} P_{zz}^*)}{P_{zz}^* - a^*(\partial_{a^*} P_{zz}^*)} \frac{\partial \ln T}{\partial z}. \quad (83)$$

Finally, the balance equation (22) for the granular temperature yields

$$a P_{xy}^{(0)} = -\frac{d}{2} p \zeta^{(0)}. \quad (84)$$

Upon deriving (84) we have neglected the term  $\partial_z q_z$  since it is of second order in the gradients of  $x_1$ ,  $p$  and  $T$ . As said in section II, Eq. (84) establishes a relation between the (reduced) shear rate  $a^*$  and the coefficients of restitution  $\alpha_{22}$  and  $\alpha_{12}$ .

Use of Eq. (83) into Eq. (82) and substitution of Eq.

(82) into Eq. (80) finally leads to

$$\Lambda_z = \frac{\overline{D}_{T,zz} - (1-q)a^*(P_{zz}^* - a^*(\partial_{a^*}P_{zz}^*))^{-1}\overline{D}_{p,zz}(\partial_{a^*}P_{zz}^*)}{D_{zz}^*} \quad (85)$$

where  $\overline{D}_{p,zz} \equiv x_1^{-1}D_{p,zz}^*$  and  $\overline{D}_{T,zz} \equiv x_1^{-1}D_{T,zz}^*$ . Equation (85) provides the thermal diffusion factor  $\Lambda_z$  in terms of the diffusion coefficients  $D_{zz}^*$ ,  $D_{p,zz}^*$  and  $D_{T,zz}^*$ , the (reduced) pressure tensor  $P_{zz}^*$  and the derivative  $\partial_{a^*}P_{zz}^*$ . To evaluate those quantities, we consider the model A ( $q = 0$ ) where  $P_{zz}^*$  and  $\partial_{a^*}P_{zz}^*$  are given by Eqs. (C1) and (D1), respectively. In addition, the explicit forms of the diffusion coefficients can be found by solving the set of algebraic equations (73)–(75) for  $i = j = z$ . The results clearly show that, while  $D_{zz}^* > 0$ , the coefficients  $D_{p,zz}^*$  and  $D_{T,zz}^*$  do not have a definite sign.

The condition  $\Lambda_z = 0$  provides the segregation criterion for the upwards/downwards segregation transition. Thus, according Eq. (85) and given that  $D_{zz}^* > 0$ , the marginal segregation curve ( $\Lambda_z = 0$ ) separating segregation towards the cold wall ( $\Lambda_z > 0$ ) from segregation towards the hot wall ( $\Lambda_z < 0$ ) is given by the condition

$$(P_{zz}^* - a^*(\partial_{a^*}P_{zz}^*))D_{T,zz}^* = a^*(\partial_{a^*}P_{zz}^*)D_{p,zz}^*. \quad (86)$$

Before analyzing the dependence of the parameter space on the form of the phase diagrams for segregation ( $\Lambda_z = 0$ ), it is instructive to consider some limit situations. When the intruder and the particles of the gas are mechanically equivalent ( $m_1 = m_2$ ,  $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$  and  $\alpha_{22} = \alpha_{12}$ ), the two species do not segregate. This is consistent with Eq. (86) since then  $D_{p,zz}^* = D_{T,zz}^* = 0$  so that  $\Lambda_z = 0$  for any value of the (common) coefficient of restitution. Another interesting situation is the elastic limit ( $\alpha_{22} = \alpha_{12} = 1$ , which implies  $a^* = 0$  in the steady state condition (84)). In this case,  $P_{zz}^* = 1$  and  $D_{T,zz}^* = 0$  so that, Eq. (86) holds trivially for any value of the ratios  $m_1/m_2$  and  $\sigma_1/\sigma_2$  (the intruder does not segregate). Beyond the above two limiting cases, the criterion (86) is rather complicated since it involves all the parameter space of the problem ( $m_1/m_2$ ,  $\sigma_1/\sigma_2$ ,  $\alpha_{22}$ ).

Figure 5 shows the phase diagram in the  $\{m_1/m_2, \sigma_1/\sigma_2\}$  plane for  $d = 3$  and three different values of the (common) coefficient of restitution  $\alpha_{22} = \alpha_{12}$ . All zero contours of  $\Lambda_z$  pass through the point (1, 1) since when  $m_1 = m_2$  and  $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$  all the species are indistinguishable for this system. We observe that when the intruder is smaller than the gas particles ( $\sigma_1 < \sigma_2$ ), the main effect of collisional dissipation (or equivalently the dimensionless shear rate  $a^*$ ) is to reduce the size of the down segregation region while the opposite happens when  $\sigma_1 > \sigma_2$ . On the other hand, the impact of dissipation on the latter case is smaller than in the former case (when  $\sigma_1 < \sigma_2$ ) and the curves tend to collapse into a common one for sufficiently large values of the diameter ratio. It is also quite apparent that in general large intruders tend to move towards colder regions since the upwards segregation is dominant and

occupies most of the parameter space. This conclusions contrasts with the results obtained for vibrated dense systems since intruders tend to move towards hotter regions as they get larger [47]. It is also important to remark that the conclusions drawn here for IMM agrees quite well with those obtained before for IHS (see Fig. 5 of Ref. [28]), showing again the reliability of IMM to capture the main trends observed for hard spheres.

As a complement of Fig. 5, Fig. 6 shows a phase diagram for  $\alpha_{22} \neq \alpha_{12}$  ( $\alpha_{22} = 0.9$  and  $\alpha_{12} = 0.9$ ). The theoretical results derived for IMM are compared here against recent computer simulations performed in Ref. [46] in the so-called LTu state, namely, a steady state where the inelastic cooling is exactly balanced by viscous heating (as in the steady USF state) resulting in a *uniform* heat flux [48]. In the simulations, segregation is induced by a thermal gradient parallel to the  $y$ -direction ( $\partial_x T = \partial_z T = 0$  but  $\partial_y T \neq 0$ ) so that, the physical situation slightly differs from the one studied here theoretically. Nevertheless, when  $\sigma_1 \approx \sigma_2$  the agreement with theory is good. More significant discrepancies appear when the intruder is larger than the gas particles since in this case the theory predicts that intruders only move towards hotter regions (upwards segregation). This contrasts with simulation data since they still show a small region of downwards segregation.

## VII. CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, we have investigated the mass, momentum, and heat fluxes for a binary mixture of inelastic grains. The system is driven out of equilibrium by an imposed shear flow, which injects energy while dissipative collisions between the grains act as an energy sink. A kinetic theory description was proposed, where the intractable Boltzmann equation is simplified in a Maxwell model fashion. Such models are in some cases simple enough to be amenable to a full analytical solution, while remaining true to the key physical phenomena under scrutiny. In this respect, our model is not the simplest possible of the Maxwell family (the “plain vanilla” approach), since the collision frequencies  $\omega_{rs}$  are taken to be the same as those found for inelastic hard spheres, see Eq. (13). In this equation, a free parameter  $q$  is introduced. While  $q = 1/2$  is the natural choice to reproduce inelastic hard sphere phenomenology, it also leads to a complex interplay between shear and dissipation in the steady state. On the other hand, it is convenient to decouple these effects, which is possible when  $q = 0$ . We thus discriminate two sub-models, referred to as model A and model B, having respectively  $q = 0$  and  $q \neq 0$ . Model A enjoys a larger parameter space than model B, which is at the root of the greater analytical tractability of the approach. When restricted to the steady state, the results derived with model A coincide with those of model B.

Perturbing the uniform shear flow, we analyzed the re-

sponse of the fluid mixture, from which generalized transport coefficient can be defined. Due to the anisotropy induced by the shear, these quantities appear in tensorial, rather than scalar form. A Chapman-Enskog treatment allows to derive explicit results, which unveil the dependence on the key parameters (shear, dissipation, concentration, size and mass ratio). To reduce the complexity of the problem, we focussed on the limit where species 1 has a much smaller concentration than species 2, the so-called tracer limit ( $x_1 \rightarrow 0$ ). In doing so, mass transport becomes the relevant phenomenon to address, since momentum and heat fluxes coincide with their mono-component (inelastic) expressions. There are then in general 15 different diffusion transport coefficients, that couple the mass flux to the gradients of density, pressure and temperature. The simplified model worked out here reduces this number to 12 (two diagonal and two off-diagonal elements for each diffusion matrix). Our results hold for arbitrary values of the shear rate, and are not restricted to small dissipation. They show that shear driving notably affects mass transport. In addition, good agreement is reported between our Maxwell treatment and previously derived inelastic hard sphere results (here, the relevant view is that of model B, where in the steady state, dissipation selects a unique reduced shear rate). Finally, we analyzed the segregation phenomenon of an intruder by thermal diffusion within our framework, which deciphers how shear impinges on the separating effect of a thermal gradient, opposed by the remixing action of diffusion. Our predictions are in fair agreement with inelastic hard sphere simulations for Couette flows sustaining a uniform heat flux.

At the expense of a further simplification of the Maxwell model (addressing thus the aforementioned plain vanilla treatment [40]), it is of interest to study the impact on transport of a recently evidenced transition taking place in the intruder limit, where the minority species rather unexpectedly carries a finite fraction of the total system's energy. Work along these lines is underway.

### Acknowledgments

We acknowledge support of the Spanish Government through Grant No. FIS2013-42840-P and of the Junta de Extremadura (Spain) through Grant No. GR15104, both partially financed by FEDER funds. We also acknowledge funding by the Investissement d'Avenir LabEx PALM program (grant number ANR-10-LABX-0039-PALM).

### Appendix A: Chapman-Enskog-like expansion

In this Appendix, some technical details on the determination of the first-order approximation  $f_1^{(1)}$  by means

of the Chapman-Enskog-like expansion are provided. Inserting the expansions (25)–(27) into Eq. (19a), one gets the kinetic equation for  $f_1^{(1)}$ :

$$\partial_t^{(0)} f_1^{(1)} - aV_y \frac{\partial f_1^{(1)}}{\partial V_x} + \mathcal{L}_1 f_1^{(1)} + \mathcal{M}_1 f_2^{(1)} = - \left[ \partial_t^{(1)} + (\mathbf{V} + \mathbf{u}_0) \cdot \nabla \right] f_1^{(0)}. \quad (\text{A1})$$

The velocity dependence on the right-hand side of Eq. (A1) can be obtained from the macroscopic balance equations (20)–(22) to first order in the gradients. Using these balance equations in Eq. (A1), one gets

$$\partial_t^{(0)} f_1^{(1)} - aV_y \frac{\partial f_1^{(1)}}{\partial V_x} + \mathcal{L}_1 f_1^{(1)} + \mathcal{M}_1 f_2^{(1)} = \mathbf{A}_1 \cdot \nabla x_1 + \mathbf{B}_1 \cdot \nabla p + \mathbf{C}_1 \cdot \nabla T + \mathcal{D}_1 : \nabla \delta \mathbf{u}, \quad (\text{A2})$$

where

$$A_{1,i}(\mathbf{c}) = - \frac{\partial f_1^{(0)}}{\partial x_1} c_i - \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial f_1^{(0)}}{\partial c_j} \frac{\partial P_{ij}^{(0)}}{\partial x_1}, \quad (\text{A3})$$

$$B_{1,i}(\mathbf{c}) = - \frac{\partial f_1^{(0)}}{\partial p} c_i - \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial f_1^{(0)}}{\partial c_j} \frac{\partial P_{ij}^{(0)}}{\partial p}, \quad (\text{A4})$$

$$C_{1,i}(\mathbf{c}) = - \frac{\partial f_1^{(0)}}{\partial T} c_i - \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial f_1^{(0)}}{\partial c_j} \frac{\partial P_{ij}^{(0)}}{\partial T}, \quad (\text{A5})$$

$$D_{1,ij}(\mathbf{c}) = p \frac{\partial f_1^{(0)}}{\partial p} \delta_{ij} + c_j \frac{\partial f_1^{(0)}}{\partial c_i} + \frac{2}{dp} \left( P_{ij}^{(0)} - a\eta_{xyij} \right) \times \left( p \frac{\partial f_1^{(0)}}{\partial p} + T \frac{\partial f_1^{(0)}}{\partial T} \right). \quad (\text{A6})$$

Upon writing Eq. (A6) use has been made of the identity  $\zeta^{(1)} = 0$  and the expression of the total pressure tensor  $P_{ij}^{(1)}$  of the mixture

$$P_{ij}^{(1)} = -\eta_{ijkl} \frac{\partial \delta u_k}{\partial r_\ell}, \quad (\text{A7})$$

where  $\eta_{ijkl}$  is the viscosity tensor.

The solution to Eq. (A2) has the form given by Eq. (33), where the coefficients  $\mathcal{A}_1$ ,  $\mathcal{B}_1$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_1$ , and  $\mathcal{D}_1$  are functions of the peculiar velocity and the hydrodynamic fields  $x_1$ ,  $p$ ,  $T$ , and  $\delta \mathbf{u}$ . The time derivative acting on these quantities can be evaluated with the replacement

$$\partial_t^{(0)} \rightarrow - \left( \frac{2}{dp} a P_{xy}^{(0)} + \zeta^{(0)} \right) (p \partial_p + T \partial_T). \quad (\text{A8})$$

Moreover, there are contributions from  $\partial_t^{(0)}$  acting on the

pressure, temperature, and velocity gradients given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t^{(0)} \nabla p &= -\nabla \left( \frac{2}{d} a P_{xy}^{(0)} + p \zeta^{(0)} \right) \\
&= -\left( \frac{2a}{d} \frac{\partial P_{xy}^{(0)}}{\partial x_1} + p \frac{\partial \zeta^{(0)}}{\partial x_1} \right) \nabla x_1 \\
&\quad - \left( \frac{2a}{d} \frac{\partial P_{xy}^{(0)}}{\partial p} + \zeta^{(0)} + \frac{\partial \zeta^{(0)}}{\partial p} \right) \nabla p \\
&\quad - \left( \frac{2a}{d} \frac{\partial P_{xy}^{(0)}}{\partial T} + p \frac{\partial \zeta^{(0)}}{\partial T} \right) \nabla T, \quad (\text{A9})
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t^{(0)} \nabla T &= -\nabla \left( \frac{2T}{dp} a P_{xy}^{(0)} + T \zeta^{(0)} \right) \\
&= -\left( \frac{2aT}{dp} \frac{\partial P_{xy}^{(0)}}{\partial x_1} + T \frac{\partial \zeta^{(0)}}{\partial x_1} \right) \nabla x_1 \\
&\quad + \left( \frac{2aT}{dp^2} P_{xy}^{(0)} - \frac{2aT}{dp} \frac{\partial P_{xy}^{(0)}}{\partial p} - T \frac{\partial \zeta^{(0)}}{\partial p} \right) \nabla p \\
&\quad - \left( \frac{2a}{dp} P_{xy}^{(0)} + \frac{2aT}{dp} \frac{\partial P_{xy}^{(0)}}{\partial T} + \zeta^{(0)} + T \frac{\partial \zeta^{(0)}}{\partial T} \right) \nabla T, \quad (\text{A10})
\end{aligned}$$

$$\partial_t^{(0)} \nabla_i \delta u_j = \nabla_i \partial_t^{(0)} \delta u_j = -a_{jk} \nabla_i \delta u_k. \quad (\text{A11})$$

The corresponding integral equations (34)–(36) can be obtained when one identifies coefficients of independent gradients in Eq. (A2) and takes into account Eqs. (A9)–(A11) and the mathematical property

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t^{(0)} X &= \frac{\partial X}{\partial p} \partial_t^{(0)} p + \frac{\partial X}{\partial T} \partial_t^{(0)} T + \frac{\partial X}{\partial \delta u_i} \partial_t^{(0)} \delta u_i \\
&= -\left( \frac{2}{dp} a P_{xy}^{(0)} + \zeta^{(0)} \right) \left( p \frac{\partial X}{\partial p} + T \frac{\partial X}{\partial T} \right) \\
&\quad + a_{ij} \delta u_j \frac{\partial X}{\partial c_i}, \quad (\text{A12})
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last step it has been taken into account that  $X$  depends on  $\delta \mathbf{u}$  through  $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{V} - \delta \mathbf{u}$ .

## Appendix B: Heat flux transport coefficients

The heat flux is defined by Eq. (41) in terms of the coefficients  $D''_{ij}$  (Eq. (46)),  $L_{ij}$  (Eq. (47)) and  $\lambda_{ij}$  (Eq. (48)). In order to determine them, we introduce the quantities

$$D''_{r,ijkl} = -\frac{m_r}{2T^2} \int d\mathbf{c} c_i c_j c_k \mathcal{A}_{r,\ell}(\mathbf{c}), \quad (\text{B1})$$

$$L_{r,ijkl} = -\frac{m_r}{2} \int d\mathbf{c} c_i c_j c_k \mathcal{B}_{r,\ell}(\mathbf{c}), \quad (\text{B2})$$

$$\lambda_{r,ijkl} = -\frac{m_r}{2} \int d\mathbf{c} c_i c_j c_k \mathcal{C}_{r,\ell}(\mathbf{c}). \quad (\text{B3})$$

The generalized transport coefficients  $D''_{ij}$ ,  $L_{ij}$  and  $\lambda_{ij}$  are defined as

$$D''_{ij} = \sum_{s=1}^2 D''_{s,kkij}, \quad L_{ij} = \sum_{s=1}^2 L_{s,kkij}, \quad \lambda_{ij} = \sum_{s=1}^2 \lambda_{s,kkij}. \quad (\text{B4})$$

The differential equations verifying the (scaled) coefficients  $D^*_{r,ijkl} \equiv D''_{r,ijkl}(m_1 + m_2)\nu_0/n$ ,  $L^*_{r,ijkl} = L_{r,ijkl}(m_1 + m_2)\nu_0/T$  and  $\lambda^*_{r,ijkl} = \lambda_{r,ijkl}(m_1 + m_2)\nu_0/p$  can be obtained by following similar mathematical steps as those made for the other transport coefficients. The final results can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left( \frac{2a^*}{d} P_{xy}^* + \zeta^* \right) [2 - q(1 + a^* \partial_{a^*}) D^*_{1,ijkl} - A D^*_{1,ijkl} - B \left[ D^*_{2,ijkl} - \frac{1}{2} (\delta_{kj} D^*_{2,i\ell} + \delta_{ij} D^*_{2,k\ell} + \delta_{ik} D^*_{2,j\ell}) \right] \\
&- C (\delta_{kj} D^*_{1,i\ell} + \delta_{ij} D^*_{1,k\ell} + \delta_{ik} D^*_{1,j\ell}) - E (\delta_{kj} D^*_{i\ell} + \delta_{ij} D^*_{k\ell} + \delta_{ik} D^*_{j\ell}) \\
&- a^* (\delta_{ix} D^*_{1,jky\ell} + \delta_{jx} D^*_{1,iky\ell} + \delta_{kx} D^*_{1,ijy\ell}) = - (L^*_{1,ijkl} + \lambda^*_{1,ijkl}) \left( \frac{2a^*}{d} \partial_{x_1} P_{xy}^* + \partial_{x_1} \zeta^* \right) \\
&- \frac{1}{T^2 \nu_0 D''_0} \partial_{x_1} N^{(0)}_{1,ijkl} + \frac{n(m_1 + m_2)}{\rho} (P^*_{1,kj} \partial_{x_1} P^*_{i\ell} + P^*_{1,ik} \partial_{x_1} P^*_{j\ell} + P^*_{1,ij} \partial_{x_1} P^*_{k\ell}), \quad (\text{B5})
\end{aligned}$$



$$\begin{aligned}
& \left( \frac{2a^*}{d} P_{xy}^* + \zeta^* \right) [1 - q(1 + a^* \partial_{a^*})] L_{1,ijkl}^* - AL_{1,ijkl}^* - B \left[ L_{2,ijkl}^* - \frac{1}{2} (\delta_{kj} L_{2,il}^* + \delta_{ij} L_{2,kl}^* + \delta_{ik} L_{2,jl}^*) \right] \\
& - C (\delta_{kj} L_{1,il}^* + \delta_{ij} L_{1,kl}^* + \delta_{ik} L_{1,jl}^*) - E (\delta_{kj} D_{p,il}^* + \delta_{ij} D_{p,kl}^* + \delta_{ik} D_{p,jl}^*) \\
& - a^* (\delta_{ix} L_{1,jky\ell}^* + \delta_{jx} L_{1,iky\ell}^* + \delta_{kx} L_{1,ijy\ell}^*) + L_{1,ijkl}^* \left[ \frac{2a^*}{d} (1 - a^* \partial_{a^*}) P_{xy}^* + (2 - a^* \partial_{a^*}) \zeta^* \right] \\
= & - \frac{1}{\nu_0 L_0} \partial_p N_{1,ijkl}^{(0)} + \frac{n(m_1 + m_2)}{2\rho} [P_{1,kj}^* (1 - a^* \partial_{a^*}) P_{il}^* + P_{1,ik}^* (1 - a^* \partial_{a^*}) P_{j\ell}^* + P_{1,ij}^* (1 - a^* \partial_{a^*}) P_{k\ell}^*] \\
& + \lambda_{1,ijkl}^* \left[ \frac{2a^{*2}}{d} \partial_{a^*} P_{xy}^* - (1 - a^* \partial_{a^*}) \zeta^* \right], \tag{B6}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left( \frac{2a^*}{d} P_{xy}^* + \zeta^* \right) [1 - q(1 + a^* \partial_{a^*})] \lambda_{1,ijkl}^* - A \lambda_{1,ijkl}^* - B \left[ \lambda_{2,ijkl}^* - \frac{1}{2} (\delta_{kj} \lambda_{2,il}^* + \delta_{ij} \lambda_{2,kl}^* + \delta_{ik} \lambda_{2,jl}^*) \right] \\
& - C (\delta_{kj} \lambda_{1,il}^* + \delta_{ij} \lambda_{1,kl}^* + \delta_{ik} \lambda_{1,jl}^*) - E (\delta_{kj} D_{T,il}^* + \delta_{ij} D_{T,kl}^* + \delta_{ik} D_{T,jl}^*) \\
& - a^* (\delta_{ix} \lambda_{1,jky\ell}^* + \delta_{jx} \lambda_{1,iky\ell}^* + \delta_{kx} \lambda_{1,ijy\ell}^*) + \lambda_{1,ijkl}^* \left[ \frac{2a^*}{d} (1 + (1 - q)a^* \partial_{a^*}) P_{xy}^* + (q + (1 - q)a^* \partial_{a^*}) \zeta^* \right] \\
= & - \frac{1}{\nu_0 \lambda_0} \partial_T N_{1,ijkl}^{(0)} + \frac{n(m_1 + m_2)}{2\rho} (1 - q)a^* [P_{1,kj}^* \partial_{a^*} P_{il}^* + P_{1,ik}^* \partial_{a^*} P_{j\ell}^* + P_{1,ij}^* \partial_{a^*} P_{k\ell}^*] \\
& - L_{1,ijkl}^* \left[ \frac{2a^{*2}}{d} (1 - q) \partial_{a^*} P_{xy}^* + (q - 1)(1 - a^* \partial_{a^*}) \zeta^* \right]. \tag{B7}
\end{aligned}$$

In Eqs. (B5)–(B7), we have introduced the fourth-degree velocity moments of the zeroth-order distribution  $f_r^{(0)}$ ,

$$N_{r,ijkl}^{(0)} = \frac{m_r}{2} \int d\mathbf{c} c_i c_j c_k c_\ell f_r^{(0)}(\mathbf{c}), \tag{B8}$$

and the (dimensionless) quantities

$$\begin{aligned}
A = & \frac{3}{2} \omega_{11}^* (1 + \alpha_{11}) \frac{1 + d - \alpha_{11}}{d(d + 2)} + \frac{3}{d} \omega_{12}^* \mu_{21} (1 + \alpha_{12}) \\
& \times \left[ 1 - \frac{2\mu_{21}(1 + \alpha_{12})}{d + 2} \left( 1 - \frac{\mu_{21}(1 + \alpha_{12})}{d + 4} \right) \right], \tag{B9}
\end{aligned}$$

$$B = -6 \frac{\rho_1}{\rho_2} \omega_{12}^* \frac{\mu_{21}^3 (1 + \alpha_{12})^3}{d(d + 2)(d + 4)}, \tag{B10}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
C = & - \frac{13 + 4d - 3\alpha_{11}}{8d(d + 2)(d + 4)} \omega_{11}^* (1 + \alpha_{11})^2 + 2 \frac{\omega_{12}^*}{d(d + 2)(d + 4)} \\
& \times \mu_{21}^2 (1 + \alpha_{12})^2 [3\mu_{21}(1 + \alpha_{12}) - (d + 4)], \tag{B11}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
E = & \omega_{11}^* \frac{(1 - \alpha_{11}^2)}{8d(d + 2)} \frac{\gamma_1}{\mu_{12}} (3\alpha_{11} - d + 1) - \frac{\omega_{12}^*}{2d(d + 2)} \\
& \times \frac{x_1 \gamma_1}{x_2 \mu_{21}} [d + 2 + 3\mu_{21}(1 + \alpha_{12}) (\mu_{21}(1 + \alpha_{12}) - 2) \\
& + \frac{x_2 \gamma_2}{x_1 \gamma_1} \mu_{21}(1 + \alpha_{12}) (3\mu_{21}(1 + \alpha_{12}) - d - 2)]. \tag{B12}
\end{aligned}$$

In Eqs. (B9)–(B12),  $\omega_{rs}^* \equiv \omega_{rs}/\nu_0$ . The differential equations for the coefficients  $D_{2,ijkl}^*$ ,  $L_{2,ijkl}^*$  and  $\lambda_{2,ijkl}^*$  can be obtained from Eqs. (B5)–(B7) by changing  $1 \leftrightarrow 2$ . As in the case of the previous transport coefficients, Eqs. (B5)–(B7) become algebraic for model A ( $q = 0$ ). Even for this model, the solution to the above equations requires the knowledge of the fourth degree moments  $N_{r,ijkl}^{(0)}$  whose expressions are only known for a monodisperse granular gas of IMM [25].

### Appendix C: Rheological properties in the USF. Tracer limit

The explicit forms of the (reduced) pressure tensors  $P_{2,ij}^* \equiv P_{2,ij}/n_2 T_2$  and  $P_{1,ij}^* \equiv P_{1,ij}/n_2 T_2$  of the solvent (excess) and the solute (tracer) components, respectively, of a granular binary mixture (in the tracer limit  $x_1 \rightarrow 0$ ) of IMM under USF are provided in this Appendix. We consider here model A ( $q = 0$ ) where the coefficients of restitution  $\alpha_{rs}$  and the (reduced) shear rate  $a^*$  are decoupled.

The non-zero elements of  $P_{2,ij}^*$  are given by [17]

$$P_{2,yy}^* = P_{2,zz}^* = \frac{1}{1 + 2\beta(\tilde{a})}, \quad P_{2,xx}^* = \frac{1 + 2d\beta(\tilde{a})}{1 + 2\beta(\tilde{a})}, \tag{C1}$$

$$P_{2,xy}^* = - \frac{\tilde{a}}{[1 + 2\beta(\tilde{a})]^2}, \tag{C2}$$

where

$$\tilde{a} = \frac{2(d+2)}{(1+\alpha_{22})^2} \frac{a^*}{\omega_{22}^*}, \quad (\text{C3})$$

$$\omega_{22}^* \equiv \frac{\omega_{22}}{\nu_0} = \sqrt{2\mu_{12}} \left( \frac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_{12}} \right)^{d-1}, \quad (\text{C4})$$

and  $\beta(\tilde{a})$  is the real root of the cubic equation

$$\beta(1+2\beta)^2 = \frac{\tilde{a}^2}{d}, \quad (\text{C5})$$

namely

$$\beta(\tilde{a}) = \frac{2}{3} \sinh^2 \left[ \frac{1}{6} \cosh^{-1} \left( 1 + \frac{27}{d} \tilde{a}^2 \right) \right]. \quad (\text{C6})$$

In addition, the long-time behavior of the granular temperature  $T(t) \simeq T_2(t)$  is  $T_2(t) = T_2(0)e^{\lambda\omega_{22}^*t}$  where

$$\lambda = -\frac{2}{d} \frac{P_{2,xy}^* a^*}{\omega_{22}^*} - \frac{\zeta^*}{\omega_{22}^*} = \frac{(1+\alpha_{22})^2}{d+2} \beta - \frac{1-\alpha_{22}^2}{2d\omega_{22}^*}. \quad (\text{C7})$$

Upon obtaining the second identity in (C7) use has been made of Eq. (C2) and the result  $\zeta^* = (1-\alpha_{22}^2)/2d$ .

In the case of tracer particles, the relevant elements of  $P_{1,ij}^*$  can be written as [23]

$$P_{1,yy}^* = P_{1,zz}^* = x_1 \frac{F + HP_{2,yy}^*}{\lambda\omega_{22}^* + G}, \quad (\text{C8})$$

$$P_{1,xy}^* = x_1 \frac{HP_{2,xy}^* - a^* x_1^{-1} P_{1,yy}^*}{\lambda\omega_{22}^* + G}, \quad (\text{C9})$$

$$P_{1,xx}^* = x_1 \frac{F + HP_{2,xx}^* - 2a^* x_1^{-1} P_{1,xy}^*}{\lambda\omega_{22}^* + G}, \quad (\text{C10})$$

where

$$F = \frac{\omega_{12}^*}{d+2} \mu_{21} (\mu_{12} + \mu_{21}\gamma) (1 + \alpha_{12})^2, \quad (\text{C11})$$

$$G = \frac{2\omega_{12}^*}{d(d+2)} \mu_{21} (1 + \alpha_{12}) [d + 2 - \mu_{21} (1 + \alpha_{12})], \quad (\text{C12})$$

$$H = \frac{2\omega_{12}^*}{d(d+2)} \mu_{21} \mu_{12} (1 + \alpha_{12})^2. \quad (\text{C13})$$

Here,

$$\omega_{12}^* \equiv \frac{\omega_{12}}{\nu_0} = \sqrt{\mu_{12} + \mu_{21}\gamma}, \quad (\text{C14})$$

where  $\gamma \equiv T_1/T_2$  is the temperature ratio. The temperature ratio is determined from the constraint

$$x_1 \gamma = \frac{P_{1,xx}^* + (d-1)P_{1,yy}^*}{d}. \quad (\text{C15})$$

Since the collision frequency  $\omega_{12}^*$  is a nonlinear function of  $\gamma$ , one then has to numerically solve Eq. (C15) to obtain the shear-rate dependence of the temperature ratio.

#### Appendix D: Evaluation of the derivatives of the pressure tensors with respect to the shear rate. Tracer limit

This Appendix addresses the evaluation of the derivatives  $\partial_{a^*} P_{2,ij}^*$  and  $\partial_{a^*} P_{1,ij}^*$  for model A ( $q = 0$ ) needed to determine the tracer diffusion coefficients  $D_{ij}$ ,  $D_{p,ij}$  and  $D_{T,ij}$  in the tracer limit. In the case of the excess component, according to Eqs. (C1) and (C2), one has [17]

$$a^* \frac{\partial P_{2,yy}^*}{\partial a^*} = -\frac{4\beta}{(1+2\beta)(1+6\beta)}, \quad (\text{D1})$$

$$a^* \frac{\partial P_{2,xx}^*}{\partial a^*} = \frac{4(d-1)\beta}{(1+2\beta)(1+6\beta)}, \quad (\text{D2})$$

$$a^* \frac{\partial P_{2,xy}^*}{\partial a^*} = -\frac{1-2\beta}{(1+2\beta)^2(1+6\beta)} \tilde{a}, \quad (\text{D3})$$

where use has been made of

$$a^* \frac{\partial \beta}{\partial a^*} = 2\beta \frac{1+2\beta}{1+6\beta}. \quad (\text{D4})$$

The calculations for the tracer particles are more intricate. First, we derive both sides of Eq. (C8) with respect to  $a^*$  to obtain the result

$$\frac{\partial P_{1,yy}^*}{\partial a^*} = \Delta_{yy}^{(0)} + \Delta_{yy}^{(1)} \frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial a^*}, \quad (\text{D5})$$

where

$$\Delta_{yy}^{(0)} = \frac{x_1 H (\partial_{a^*} P_{2,yy}^*) - P_{1,yy}^* \omega_{22}^* (\partial_{a^*} \lambda)}{\lambda\omega_{22}^* + G}, \quad (\text{D6})$$

$$\Delta_{yy}^{(1)} = \frac{x_1}{\lambda\omega_{22}^* + G} (\overline{F} + \overline{H} P_{2,yy}^* - \overline{G} x_1^{-1} P_{1,yy}^*). \quad (\text{D7})$$

In Eqs. (D6) and (D7),  $\partial_{a^*} \lambda = \frac{1+\alpha^2}{d+2} (\partial_{a^*} \beta)$  and we have introduced the quantities

$$\overline{F} \equiv \frac{\mu_{21}}{2\omega_{12}^{*2}} F + \omega_{12}^* \frac{\mu_{21}^2 (1 + \alpha_{12})^2}{d+2}, \quad (\text{D8})$$

$$\overline{G} \equiv \frac{\mu_{21}}{2\omega_{12}^{*2}} G, \quad \overline{H} \equiv \frac{\mu_{21}}{2\omega_{12}^{*2}} H. \quad (\text{D9})$$

The derivatives  $\partial_{a^*} P_{1,xy}^*$  and  $\partial_{a^*} P_{1,xx}^*$  can be also obtained from Eqs. (C9) and (C10). Their final forms can be written as

$$\frac{\partial P_{1,xy}^*}{\partial a^*} = \Delta_{xy}^{(0)} + \Delta_{xy}^{(1)} \frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial a^*}, \quad (\text{D10})$$

$$\frac{\partial P_{1,xx}^*}{\partial a^*} = \Delta_{xx}^{(0)} + \Delta_{xx}^{(1)} \frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial a^*}, \quad (\text{D11})$$

where

$$\Delta_{xy}^{(0)} = \frac{x_1 H(\partial_{a^*} P_{2,xy}^*) - P_{1,yy}^* - a^* \Delta_{yy}^{(0)} - P_{1,xy}^* \omega_{22}^* (\partial_{a^*} \lambda)}{\lambda \omega_{22}^* + G}, \quad (\text{D12})$$

$$\Delta_{xy}^{(1)} = \frac{x_1}{\lambda \omega_{22}^* + G} \left( \overline{H} P_{2,xy}^* - a^* x_1^{-1} \Delta_{yy}^{(1)} - \overline{G} x_1^{-1} P_{1,xy}^* \right), \quad (\text{D13})$$

$$\Delta_{xx}^{(0)} = \frac{x_1 H(\partial_{a^*} P_{2,xx}^*) - 2P_{1,xy}^* - 2a^* \Delta_{xy}^{(0)} - P_{1,xx}^* \omega_{22}^* (\partial_{a^*} \lambda)}{\lambda \omega_{22}^* + G}, \quad (\text{D14})$$

$$\Delta_{xx}^{(1)} = \frac{x_1}{\lambda \omega_{22}^* + G} \left( \overline{F} + \overline{H} P_{2,xx}^* - 2a^* x_1^{-1} \Delta_{xy}^{(1)} - \overline{G} x_1^{-1} P_{1,xx}^* \right). \quad (\text{D15})$$

To close the problem, it still remains to get the quantity  $\partial_{a^*} \gamma$ , which can be determined from the relation (C15) by taking the derivative with respect to  $a^*$  in both sides of this identity. The result can be written as

$$\frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial a^*} = x_1^{-1} \frac{\Delta_{xx}^{(0)} + (d-1) \Delta_{yy}^{(0)}}{d - x_1^{-1} \Delta_{xx}^{(1)} - (d-1) x_1^{-1} \Delta_{yy}^{(1)}}. \quad (\text{D16})$$

- 
- [1] N. Brilliantov and T. Pöschel, *Kinetic Theory of Granular Gases* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 2004)
- [2] C. S. Campbell, *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.* **22**, 57 (1990).
- [3] I. Goldhirsch, *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.* **35**, 267 (2003).
- [4] A. Santos, V. Garzó and J. W. Dufty, *Phys. Rev. E* **69**, 061303 (2004).
- [5] A. Astillero and A. Santos, *Europhys. Lett.* **78**, 24002 (2007).
- [6] J. J. Brey, J. W. Dufty and A. Santos, *J. Stat. Phys.* **97**, 281 (1999).
- [7] J. F. Lutsko, *Phys. Rev. E* **73**, 021302 (2006).
- [8] V. Garzó, *Phys. Rev. E* **73**, 021304 (2006).
- [9] A. V. Bobylev, J. A. Carrillo and I. M. Gamba, *J. Stat. Phys.* **98**, 743 (2000).
- [10] J. A. Carrillo, C. Cercignani and I. M. Gamba, *Phys. Rev. E* **62**, 7700 (2000).
- [11] M. H. Ernst and R. Brito, *Europhys. Lett.* **58**, 182 (2002); *J. Stat. Phys.* **109**, 407 (2002); *Phys. Rev. E* **65**, 040301 (2002).
- [12] E. Ben-Naim and P. L. Krapivsky, in *Granular Gas Dynamics*, edited by T. Pöschel and S. Luding, *Lecture Notes in Physics*, Vol. **624** (Springer, Berlin, 2003), pp. 65-94.
- [13] M.H. Ernst, E. Trizac and A. Barrat, *J. Stat. Phys.* **124**, 549 (2006); *Europhys. Lett.* **76**, 56 (2006).
- [14] A. Barrat, E. Trizac and M. H. Ernst, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **40**, 4057 (2007).
- [15] E. Trizac and P. L. Krapivsky, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 218302 (2003).
- [16] V. Garzó and A. Santos, *Math. Model. Nat. Phenom.* **6**, 37 (2011).
- [17] V. Garzó, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **40**, 10729 (2007).
- [18] A. Santos, *Physica A* **321**, 442 (2003).
- [19] V. Garzó, *J. Stat. Phys.* **112**, 657 (2003).
- [20] V. Garzó and A. Astillero, *J. Stat. Phys.* **118**, 935 (2005).
- [21] M. G. Chamorro, V. Garzó and F. Vega Reyes, *J. Stat. Mech.* P06008 (2014).
- [22] K. Kohlstedt, A. Snezhko, M. V. Sapozhnikov, I. S. Aranson, J. S. Olafsen and E. Ben-Naim, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 068001 (2005).
- [23] V. Garzó and E. Trizac, *J. Non-Newtonian Fluid Mech.* **165**, 932 (2010).
- [24] N. Khalil, V. Garzó and A. Santos, *Phys. Rev. E* **89**, 052201 (2014).
- [25] A. Santos and V. Garzó, *J. Stat. Mech.* P08021 (2007).
- [26] C. Truesdell and R. G. Muncaster, *Fundamentals of Maxwell's Kinetic Theory of a Simple Monatomic Gas* (New York, Academic Press, 1980).
- [27] V. Garzó and A. Santos, *Kinetic Theory of Gases in Shear Flows. Nonlinear Transport* (Dordrecht, Kluwer-Academic, 2003).
- [28] V. Garzó and F. Vega Reyes, *J. Stat. Mech.* P07024 (2010).
- [29] H. Grad, *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.* **2**, 331 (1949).
- [30] V. Garzó, *Phys. Rev. E* **66**, 021308 (2002).
- [31] V. Garzó, *J. Stat. Mech.* P02012 (2007).
- [32] See for instance, J. M. Montanero and V. Garzó, *Gran. Matt.* **4**, 17 (2002); A. Barrat and E. Trizac, *Gran. Matt.* **4**, 57 (2002); *Phys. Rev. E* **66**, 051303 (2002); S. R. Dahl, C. M. Hrenya, V. Garzó, and J. W. Dufty, *Phys. Rev. E* **66**, 041301 (2002); R. Pagnani, U. M. B. Marconi and A. Puglisi, *Phys. Rev. E* **66**, 051304 (2002); R. Clelland

- and C. M. Hrenya, Phys. Rev. E **65**, 031301 (2002); P. E. Krouskop and J. Talbot, Phys. Rev. E **68**, 021304 (2003); H. Q. Wang, G. J. Jin and Y. Q. Ma, Phys. Rev. E **68**, 031301 (2003); J. J. Brey, M. J. Ruiz-Montero and F. Moreno, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 098001 (2005); Phys. Rev. E **73**, 031301 (2006); M. Schröter, S. Ulrich, J. Kreft, J. B. Swift and H. L. Swinney, Phys. Rev. E **74**, 011307 (2006).
- [33] R. D. Wildman and D. J. Parker, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 064301 (2002); K. Feitosa and N. Menon, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 198301 (2002).
- [34] V. Garzó and J. W. Dufty, Phys. Rev. E **60**, 5706 (1999).
- [35] V. Garzó and A. Santos, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **40**, 14927 (2007).
- [36] A. W. Lees and S. F. Edwards, J. Phys. C **5**, 1921 (1972).
- [37] J. W. Dufty, A. Santos, J. J. Brey and R. F. Rodríguez, Phys. Rev. A **33**, 459 (1986).
- [38] S. R. de Groot and P. Mazur, *Nonequilibrium Thermodynamics* (Dover, New York, 1984).
- [39] S. Chapman and T. G. Cowling, *The Mathematical Theory of Nonuniform Gases* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1970).
- [40] V. Garzó and E. Trizac, Europhys. Lett. **94**, 50009 (2011); Phys. Rev. E **85**, 011302 (2012).
- [41] V. Garzó, N. Khalil and E. Trizac, Eur. Phys. J. E **38**, 16 (2015).
- [42] See for instance the special issue *Focus on granular segregation*, published in New J. Phys. (2013); editorial by K. E. Daniels and M. Schröter, New. J. Phys. **15**, 035017 (2013).
- [43] See for instance, S. Sarkar and D. V. Khakhar, Europhys. Lett. **83**, 54004 (2008); L. A. Golick and K. E. Daniels, Phys. Rev. E **80**, 042301 (2009); L. B. H. May, L.A. Golick, K. C. Phillips, M. Shearer, and K. E. Daniels, Phys. Rev. E **81**, 051301 (2010); L. B. H. May, M. Shearer and K. E. Daniels, J. Nonlinear Sci. **20**, 689 (2010); K. M. Hill and D. S. Tan, J. Fluid Mech. **756**, 54 (2014).
- [44] B. Arnarson and J. T. Jenkins, Phys. Fluids **16**, 4543 (2004).
- [45] J. Kincaid, E. G. D. Cohen, and M. López de Haro, J. Chem. Phys. **86**, 963 (1987).
- [46] F. Vega Reyes, V. Garzó and N. Khalil, Phys. Rev. E **89**, 052206 (2014).
- [47] V. Garzó, Phys. Rev. E **78**, 020301(R) (2008); Eur. Phys. J. E **29**, 261 (2009); V. Garzó and F. Vega Reyes, Phys. Rev. E **85**, 021308 (2012).
- [48] F. Vega Reyes, A. Santos and V. Garzó, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 028001 (2010).