

Influence of Langmuir adsorption and viscous fingering on transport in porous media

Chinar Rana,^{1,2} Satyajit Pramanik,^{3,1} Michel Martin,⁴ Anne De Wit,² and Manoranjan Mishra^{1,5}

¹*Department of Mathematics, Indian Institute of Technology Ropar, Rupnagar-140001, Punjab, India*

²*Université Libre de Bruxelles (ULB), Nonlinear Physical Chemistry Unit, 1050 Brussels, Belgium*

³*Nordita, Royal Institute of Technology and Stockholm University, SE 106 91 Stockholm, Sweden*

⁴*PMMH, ESPCI Paris, CNRS, PSL (Paris Sciences et Lettres) University Sorbonne-Université, Université Paris-Diderot, Campus Jussieu, Barre Cassan A Case 18 7 Quai Saint-Bernard, 75252 Paris Cedex 05, France*

⁵*Department of Chemical Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology Ropar, Rupnagar-140001, Punjab, India*

(Dated: April 7, 2022)

We examine the transport in a homogeneous porous medium of a finite slice of a solute which adsorbs on the porous matrix following a Langmuir adsorption isotherm and can influence the dynamic viscosity of the solution. In the absence of any viscosity variation, the Langmuir adsorption induces the formation of a shock layer wave at the frontal interface and of a rarefaction wave at the rear interface of the sample. For a finite width sample, these waves interact to give a triangle-like concentration profile after a given time that varies nonlinearly with the adsorption properties. In the presence of viscosity contrast, when a less viscous fluid displaces a more viscous finite slice, viscous fingers are formed at the rarefaction interface. The fingers propagate through the finite sample to preempt the shock layer at the viscously stable front. However, when the shock layer front features viscous fingering, the fingers are unable to intrude through the rarefaction zone, thus the qualitative property of the expanding wave front is preserved. A non-monotonicity with respect to the Langmuir adsorption parameter b is observed in the onset time of interaction between the nonlinear waves and viscous fingering.

I. INTRODUCTION

Waves are ubiquitous in a wide variety of physical and chemical systems ranging from geophysical fluid dynamics [1, 2], aerodynamics [3], the motion of glaciers and traffic flow [4], separation science [5], quantum mechanics [6], and astrophysics [7], among others. Although nonlinear waves are quite complex, some of them are analytically tractable. *Shock layer* (SL) and *rarefaction* (RF) waves are two such classes of nonlinear waves which have been studied extensively using analytic/semi-analytic methods. A SL is a nonlinear wave with a steep but continuous profile while a RF wave is a nonsharpening wave with a highly diffused profile [8]. Interactions of these nonlinear waves lead to many interesting nonlinear dynamics and pattern formation. A *triangular wave* (or *N wave*) forms when a SL interacts with a RF wave [4]. From the theoretical perspective, the study of triangular waves is of fundamental interest in many physico-chemical systems where the equations of motion possess both shock layer and rarefaction solutions [9, 10]. Here, we investigate analytically and numerically the interaction between SL and RF waves in a porous matrix, e.g., a soil or a chemical reactor, when nonlinear adsorption-desorption processes impact the transport of given solutes [5, 11]. The adsorption *isotherm* describes the partitioning of solutes between the solvent (mobile phase) and the matrix/adsorbent (stationary phase). For a finite slice of a solute undergoing a fluid-solid Langmuir adsorption isotherm [12], the stationary phase concentration (\tilde{c}_s) varies with the concentration (\tilde{c}_m) in the mobile phase as :

$$\tilde{c}_s = \frac{K\tilde{c}_m}{(1 + b\tilde{c}_m)}, \quad (1)$$

where K is the equilibrium constant, while $\bar{b} = K/c_{sat}$ represents the rate at which \tilde{c}_s saturates to c_{sat} when \tilde{c}_m increases. A Langmuir isotherm induces \tilde{c}_m -dependent transport coefficients of the solute, which can lead to the sharpening or spreading of the solute concentration front, depending on the initial profile of \tilde{c}_m . The transport equation of \tilde{c}_m satisfies then wave-like solutions [8, 13, 14, and refs. therein]. If \tilde{c}_m decreases in the direction of the wave motion, a SL wave forms [14] whereas, when \tilde{c}_m increases along the direction of the wave, a RF wave builds up. Thus for a finite solute slice, a Langmuir adsorption induces a SL (RF) formation at the frontal (rear) interface of the solute hence forming a triangle-like profile [11, 15, 16].

Gradients of concentration across such waves can induce a hydrodynamic instability like viscous fingering (VF) for instance [17–19]. VF develops when a less viscous fluid displaces a more viscous one and is of importance in contaminant transport, separation processes, enhanced oil recovery and carbon dioxide capture [5, 20–22]. VF has also been used as a tool to enhance fluid mixing [23]. For a linearly adsorbed solute undergoing VF, experimental [24] and the numerical analysis [25] reveal that the linear adsorption slows down the growth of instability. For a nonlinear langmuir isotherm the theoretical analyses of the displacement of a semi-infinite sample by a semi-infinite displacing




FIG. 1: Schematic of the displacement of a finite slice of miscible fluid in a two-dimensional homogeneous porous media.

liquid reveal an early onset of VF if a SL is formed [14] and a delayed onset of VF if a RF builds up [26]. For a finite width sample a recent experimental work on a system with Langmuir adsorption shows that an additional band broadening effect can be due to VF [27], yet it is not known how the interaction between nonlinear waves (RF and SL) evolves under VF and whether these waves persist or impede after the interaction.

In this context, we analyse here the dynamics resulting from the interaction of RF with SL through mathematical analysis and numerical simulations the displacement of a Langmuir adsorbed solute initially present in a finite width sample. Further, we analyse the influence of additional nonlinearity introduced by VF on the fate of these nonlinear waves.

II. MATHEMATICAL MODEL

We consider a rectangular porous medium of length L_x , width L_y , with a constant permeability κ . A fluid of viscosity μ_1 displaces (at a uniform velocity U along the x -direction) a sample of finite width W of the same fluid containing a solute with initial mobile phase concentration c_0 with viscosity μ_2 (see Fig.1). The solute adsorbs on the porous matrix according to the Langmuir isotherm (Eq. 1). The governing equations for the solute transport, with velocity governed by Darcy's law and solute transport by mass balance equation, are:

$$\tilde{\nabla} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{u}} = 0, \quad (2)$$

$$\tilde{\nabla} p = -\frac{\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{c}_m)}{\kappa} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}, \quad (3)$$

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{c}_m}{\partial t} + F \frac{\partial \tilde{c}_s}{\partial t} + (\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \tilde{\nabla}) \tilde{c}_m = D \tilde{\nabla}^2 \tilde{c}_m, \quad (4)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} = (u, v)$, p is the pressure, $\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{c}_m)$ is the dynamic viscosity of the fluid which depends on the mobile phase concentration \tilde{c}_m , κ is the permeability assumed here to be constant, D is the dispersion coefficient of the solute in the solvent and $F = V_s/V_m$ is the phase ratio volume of the solute in the stationary and mobile phases. Substituting \tilde{c}_s from Eq. (1) into Eq. (4) we get

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left[\left(1 + \frac{k}{1 + b\tilde{c}_m} \right) \tilde{c}_m \right] + \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \tilde{\nabla} \tilde{c}_m = D \tilde{\nabla}^2 \tilde{c}_m, \quad (5)$$

where, $k = FK$ is the retention parameter of the solute. The nonlinear dynamics of the solute concentration and the effect of viscous fingering can be analyzed by solving Eqs. (2)-(3) and Eq. (5), subject to the following boundary and initial conditions,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{u}} = (U, 0), \quad \partial_{\tilde{x}} \tilde{c}_m = 0, \quad \text{as } \tilde{x} \rightarrow \pm\infty, \quad (6a)$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{u}}(\tilde{x}, 0, \tilde{t}) = \tilde{\mathbf{u}}(\tilde{x}, L_y, \tilde{t}), \quad \tilde{c}_m(\tilde{x}, 0, \tilde{t}) = \tilde{c}_m(\tilde{x}, L_y, \tilde{t}), \quad (6b)$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{u}} = (U, 0), \quad (6c)$$

and an initial solute concentration in mobile phase $\tilde{c}_m = c_0$ within the finite slice and $\tilde{c}_m = 0$ outside.

We render the above system of equations dimensionless with the following scaling

$$(x, y) = \frac{(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})}{D/U}, \quad t = \frac{\tilde{t}}{D/U^2}, \quad \mathbf{u} = \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{u}}}{U}, \quad (7a)$$

$$p = \frac{\tilde{p}}{\mu_1 D/\kappa}, \quad \mu = \frac{\tilde{\mu}}{\mu_1}, \quad c_m = \frac{\tilde{c}_m}{c_0}, \quad (7b)$$

from which we obtain, in a reference frame moving with the injection velocity,

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0, \quad (8)$$

$$\nabla p = -\mu(c_m)[\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{e}_x], \quad (9)$$

$$\partial_t c_m + [\mathcal{D}(c_m)\mathbf{u} - \mathcal{U}(c_m)\mathbf{e}_x] \cdot \nabla c_m = \mathcal{D}(c_m)\nabla^2 c_m, \quad (10)$$

wherein

$$\mathcal{U}(c_m) = \frac{k}{k + (1 + bc_m)^2}, \quad \mathcal{D}(c_m) = \frac{(1 + bc_m)^2}{k + (1 + bc_m)^2}.$$

Here, \mathbf{e}_x is the unit vector along the x -axis and $b = \bar{b}c_0$ characterizes the Langmuir adsorption. For $b = 0$, we recover the linear adsorption isotherm while $b \rightarrow \infty$ gives the no adsorption case. The non-dimensional boundary and initial conditions in moving reference frame are:

$$\mathbf{u} = (0, 0), \quad \partial_x c_m = 0 \text{ at } x = 0, A \cdot \text{Pe}, \quad (12)$$

$$\mathbf{u}(x, 0, t) = \mathbf{u}(x, \text{Pe}, t), \quad c_m(x, 0, t) = c_m(x, \text{Pe}, t), \quad (13)$$

$$\mathbf{u}(t = 0) = (0, 0), \quad (14)$$

$$c_m = \begin{cases} 1, & -l/2 \leq x \leq l/2 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad (15)$$

where, $l = \frac{W}{D/U}$ is the non-dimensional width of the finite slice of solute, $\text{Pe} = \frac{UL_y}{D}$ is the Péclet number and $A = \frac{L_x}{L_y}$ is the aspect ratio of the computational domain.

The viscosity of the fluid is assumed to vary as $\mu(c_m) = \exp(Rc_m)$, where $R = \ln(\mu_2/\mu_1)$ is the log-mobility ratio. It is evident that for $R = 0$, we have $\mu_2 = \mu_1$ thus system does not exhibit any viscous fingering instability. Whereas, for $R > 0$ the frontal interface and for $R < 0$ the rear interface of the sample is unstable [19, 28]. In order to analyse the propagation dynamics of the adsorbed solute, the stream-function vorticity form of equations (8) is solved using a Fourier pseudo-spectral method [18] and subsequently modified to account for Langmuir adsorption [14]. The number of spectral modes chosen for a computational domain of size 8192×1024 is 2048×256 . The spatial and time steps are taken as $\Delta x = \Delta y = 4$ and $\Delta t = 0.2$ respectively. Our code has been extensively tested against results from numerical simulations for a wide range of different flows [14, 26, 29].

III. INTERACTION OF SHOCK LAYER AND RAREFACTION WAVE: $R = 0$ CASE

In order to study the interaction between the shock layer (SL) and the rarefaction wave (RF) formed due to Langmuir adsorption in the absence of VF ($R = 0$) we plot the concentration fields at different times for $b = 0$ and $b = 2$ in Fig. 2(a). It is observed that, for $b = 0$, both interfaces of the solute distribution show symmetrically diffusing profiles. However, for $b = 2$ we have a highly diffusing rear interface and a sharpened frontal interface, a characteristic of Langmuir adsorption [5]. In order to investigate the difference in linear and Langmuir adsorption profiles of the solute, we compute the transverse averaged concentration profile defined as [19] :

$$\bar{c}_m(x, t) = \frac{1}{\text{Pe}} \int_0^{\text{Pe}} c_m(x, y, t) dy, \quad (16)$$

plotted in Fig.2(b). The system is shown in a frame moving with injection speed, so the solute is seen to move in the upstream direction. In Fig.2 the concentration profile with $b = 0$ represents the characteristics of the sample undergoing a linear adsorption, as already studied in detail in Mishra et.al.(2007) [25]. For $b = 2$, the Langmuir adsorption leads to the dependence of the migration rate upon the concentration, thus forming a rarefaction wave (RF) at the rear interface and a shock layer (SL) at the frontal interface. The shock-layer interface for $b = 2$ is




FIG. 2: (a) Concentration field $c_m(x, y, t)$ for $R = 0, k = 0.2$ with $b = 0$ and $b = 2$ at times written in the panel. (b) The corresponding transversely averaged concentration profiles for the mobile phase solute concentration $\bar{c}_m(x, t)$ for $R = 0, k = 0.2$ and $b = 0$ (red), $b = 2$ (blue).

less dispersed in comparison to the frontal interface for $b = 0$. On the other hand, the rarefaction wave widens the concentrations in comparison to the rear interface for $b = 0$. The interaction of the rarefaction wave with the shock layer, results in a decrease of the peak height. The concentration profile becomes nearly triangular and band broadening is observed to be enhanced in comparison to linear adsorption (see Fig.2(b)). This kind of concentration profiles is observed in theoretical studies of chromatographic model [16] as well as in contaminant transportation models [30] considering the non-linear adsorption of the solute.

Since, for $R = 0$ there is no instability in the transverse direction, 1D concentration profiles c_m capture all the dynamics of the solute. Thus, to analyze the interaction between SL and RF for $R = 0$, we use a 1D solute transport model for $c_m(x, t)$. In Fig.3(a), we observe that after a given time t_{on} , the SL and RF waves start to interact, the $c_m = 1$ plateau does not exist any longer and a triangle-like profile is obtained. The time of this interaction t_{on} is defined as the time when:

$$\max_x \{c_m(x, t)\} < 1. \quad (17)$$

The time of interaction between the shock layer and rarefaction waves depends on l, k and b . For given values of k and b , the onset time of interaction increases with l , while for a fixed sample width l , t_{on} depends non-trivially on b and k . To show this, we first analyze separately the influence of these parameters on the width of SL and RF before the interaction between them (see Fig. 3(a)).

A. The Shock Layer thickness

Following Rana and Mishra (see Eq. (25) of [14]) we define the *shock layer thickness*, L_{sl} , as the width of the interval for which the concentration $c_m(x, t)$ at the frontal interface lies in the range $c_m^- < c_m(x, t) < c_m^+$:

$$L_{sl} = \frac{(2+b)(1+k+b)}{kb} \ln \left(\frac{c_m^+}{c_m^-} \right), \quad (18)$$

which we rewrite as $L_{sl} = B g(b; k)$, where $g(b; k) = (2+b)(1+k+b)/kb$ and $B = \ln(c_m^+/c_m^-) \approx 6.91$ using $c_m^+ = 0.999$ and $c_m^- = 0.001$. From

$$\frac{dg}{db} = \frac{1}{k} \left[1 - \frac{2}{b^2}(1+k) \right] = 0 \quad (19)$$




FIG. 3: (Color online) (a) 1D concentration profiles of a Langmuir adsorbed solute for $k = 0.2, b = 1$ at time $t = 0$, $t < t_{on}$ showing definition of L_{rf} and L_{sl} (blue), $t = t_{on}$ (time of onset of the interaction between SL and RF, black), $t > t_{on}$ (long time triangle-like profile, red). (b) Interaction times t_{on} (SL with RF), $t_{on,sl}$ (VF with SL) and $t_{on,rf}$ (VF with RF) exhibit non-monotonicity in b for $k = 0.2$. The vertical lines correspond to b^* (dotted) and b^\dagger (dash-dotted).




FIG. 4: Shock Layer thickness L_{sl} as a function of b shows a global minimum at $b^* = \sqrt{2(1+k)}$.

one obtains $b^* = \sqrt{2(1+k)}$ (the negative root of the quadratic equation in b is neglected owing to the fact that b is positive). Further,

$$\left. \frac{d^2 g}{db^2} \right|_{b^*} = \frac{4}{b^{*3}}(1+k) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{1+k}} > 0 \quad (20)$$

ensures that $g(b; k)$ has a global minimum at $b^* = \sqrt{2(1+k)}$, and so does L_{sl} . In Fig. 4 we plot L_{sl} as a function of b , from which it is clearly seen that L_{sl} has a global minimum at $b^* = \sqrt{2(1+k)}$.

B. The Rarefaction thickness

Unlike the shock layer front, the rarefaction wave does not acquire a constant speed and shape [14]. In fact the traveling speed of the solute varies locally with its concentration c_m in the mobile phase. Therefore, a closed form solution of the thickness (spreading length) of the rarefaction wave is not attainable. Here we present a crude approximation of the *rarefaction thickness*. In the absence of viscosity mismatch between the sample solvent and

the displacing solution, the velocity of the solvent is a constant and in the dimensional form it takes the value of the injection velocity U . Therefore, in the moving co-ordinate frame we have $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} = 0$ [c.f., Eqs. (8)-(10)]. In this co-ordinate frame, the transport of c_m is a resultant of two transport properties. One is the downstream advection at a concentration-dependent speed, $\mathcal{U}(c_m)$ caused by the adsorption. The other is dispersion with a concentration-dependent coefficient $\mathcal{D}(c_m)$. Our argument is based on local approximations of the transport equation (10) at the rear interface in the neighborhood of $c_m(x, t) = 1 - \delta$ and $c_m(x, t) = \delta$ as

$$\partial_t c_m - \mathcal{U}_{1-\delta} \partial_x c_m = \mathcal{D}_{1-\delta} \partial_x^2 c_m, \quad (21a)$$

$$\partial_t c_m - \mathcal{U}_\delta \partial_x c_m = \mathcal{D}_\delta \partial_x^2 c_m, \quad (21b)$$

respectively. These are advection-diffusion equations with constant transport coefficients. Denoting the positions of $c_m = 1 - \delta$ and $c_m = \delta$ at time t , as $x_{1-\delta}(t)$ and $x_\delta(t)$ respectively, we compute

$$x_{1-\delta}(t) = x_{1-\delta}(0) - \mathcal{U}_{1-\delta} t + \sqrt{2\mathcal{D}_{1-\delta} t}, \quad (22a)$$

$$x_\delta(t) = x_\delta(0) - \mathcal{U}_\delta t - \sqrt{2\mathcal{D}_\delta t}. \quad (22b)$$

We define the spreading length of the rarefaction wave L_{rf} as the width of the interval for which the concentration $c_m(x, t)$ at the rear interface lies in the range $\delta < c_m(x, t) < 1 - \delta$:

$$L_{rf}(t; b, k) = x_{1-\delta}(t) - x_\delta(t), \quad (23)$$

which, in combination with Eqs. (22a) and (22b) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} L_{rf}(t; b, k) - L_{rf}(0; b, k) &= \left[\frac{(1 + \beta b)}{\sqrt{k + (1 + \beta b)^2}} + \frac{(1 + \alpha b)}{\sqrt{k + (1 + \alpha b)^2}} \right] \sqrt{2t} \\ &\quad + \left[\frac{1}{k + (1 + \alpha b)^2} - \frac{1}{k + (1 + \beta b)^2} \right] kt, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where $\alpha = \delta$ and $\beta = 1 - \delta$. For a fixed $k = k_0$ and $\forall t > 0$, we find $b^\dagger(k_0)$ that maximizes L_{rf} computing

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dL_{rf}}{db} &= \left[\frac{\beta}{[k + (1 + \beta b)^2]^{3/2}} + \frac{\alpha}{[k + (1 + \alpha b)^2]^{3/2}} \right] \sqrt{2tk^2} \\ &\quad + \left[\frac{\beta(1 + \beta b)}{[k + (1 + \beta b)^2]^2} - \frac{\alpha(1 + \alpha b)}{[k + (1 + \alpha b)^2]^2} \right] 2kt, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

which, equating to zero yields $b^\dagger(k_0)$. Further,

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{d^2 L_{rf}}{db^2} \right|_{b^\dagger} &= \left[\frac{-3\beta^2(1 + \beta b^\dagger)}{[k + (1 + \beta b^\dagger)^2]^{5/2}} + \frac{-3\alpha^2(1 + \alpha b^\dagger)}{[k + (1 + \alpha b^\dagger)^2]^{5/2}} \right] \sqrt{2tk^2} \\ &\quad + \left[\frac{\beta^2 [k - 3(1 + \beta b^\dagger)^2]}{[k + (1 + \beta b^\dagger)^2]^3} - \frac{\alpha^2 [k - 3(1 + \alpha b^\dagger)^2]}{[k + (1 + \alpha b^\dagger)^2]^3} \right] 2kt < 0. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

For a given value of k , we obtain $b^\dagger(k)$ such that $L_{rf}[t; b^\dagger, k] > L_{rf}[t; b, k]$, $\forall b \neq b^\dagger$ and $\forall t > 0$. Thus the rarefaction thickness L_{rf} increases with b until the widest RF wave is achieved for a particular b^\dagger depending on k . We compute $b^\dagger(k = 0.1) \approx 19.3116$, $b^\dagger(k = 0.2) \approx 21.4672$, and $b^\dagger(k = 1) \approx 62.2245$. In Fig. 5 the thickness of RF wave front L_{rf} is plotted for $k = 0.2$ and different values of b . Clearly, L_{rf} increases for $0 < b < 20$ and decreases for $b = 30$, justifying the above calculation where $b^\dagger \simeq 21$ for $k = 0.2$.

C. Evolution of interaction time t_{on} with b

The time of interaction between SL and RF, t_{on} , is evaluated as the time at which the relation defined in Eq.17 is satisfied and plotted in Fig.3(b) as a function of b . Clearly, t_{on} is observed to vary non-monotonically with b . For small values of b ($b \leq 1$), t_{on} decreases rapidly and then starts increasing for $b > 1$. To account the occurrence of




FIG. 5: Temporal evolution of rarefaction thickness L_{rf} for different b with $k = 0.2$ shows a decrease in L_{rf} after $b = 20$.

this non-monotonicity in t_{on} , we present the following explanation: For a very large value of b ($b \rightarrow \infty$), we have the saturated case where the solute molecules in the mobile phase migrate nearly without interacting with the stationary phase, so that the SL ceases to exist and the $c_m(x)$ profile approaches an error function. Thus L_{sl} has non-monotonic dependence on b (see Fig.4). For the RF wave, the spreading length is widest for $b = b^\dagger$ thus L_{rf} increases for $b < b^\dagger$. As mentioned above we recover the error function profile in the limit $b \rightarrow \infty$, hence for large b , $L_{\text{rf}} \rightarrow l_d$, the spreading length of a diffusive front ($\propto \sqrt{t}$). Thus, L_{rf} first increases and then decreases as b increases. Also, as studied previously [26], for a given k and at a time t , we obtain $x(c_m = 0.999, t, k; b_i) < x(c_m = 0.999, t, k; b_j)$, $b_i < b_j$ at the RF front. Therefore, an increase in b shortens the distance between the apex of the RF and SL waves. This, in combination with a non-monotonic L_{sl} and L_{rf} , causes a non-monotonic dependence of t_{on} on b . Next we analyze how SL and RF interact with VF.

IV. INTERACTION OF NONLINEAR WAVES WITH VISCOUS FINGERING

A. Interaction between SL and VF for $R > 0$

For $R > 0$, the rear interface of the finite slice of sample becomes unstable and shows viscous fingering. With time, the fingers develop and interact with the stable frontal interface i.e. the SL interface of the Langmuir adsorbed solute. On the interaction between the fingers and the SL interface, the plateau of $\bar{c}_m = 1$ breaks and after the interaction the maximum of \bar{c}_m starts decreasing. Thus to quantify the onset of interaction between viscous fingering and SL, we compute $t_{\text{on,sl}}$ as the time at which $\max_x \{\bar{c}_m(x, t)\} < 1$ and plotted in Fig.3(b). It is known that a linear adsorption ($b = 0$) delays the onset of fingering compared to the saturated case ($b \rightarrow \infty$) [25]. For intermediate values of b ($0 < b < \infty$), the onset time of VF varies non-monotonically with b as shown in Figs. 6(a-d). Accordingly a non-monotonicity is seen in $t_{\text{on,sl}}$ [see Figs. 3(b) and 6(a-d)]. An analysis of the dynamics of c_m after the interaction reveals that a steep stable viscosity contrast at the SL front blunts the forward moving fingers that try to intrude in the SL [Figs. 6(b-c)].

Interestingly, we observe that the VF dynamics are confined within the spread of the solute concentration. Fig. 7(a) shows the transverse averaged concentration, $\bar{c}_m(x)$ at $t = 15000, 20000$ for $k = 0.2$ and $b = b^*(= 1.55)$. It is seen that the viscous fingers do not spread the solute outside the spreading zone of the non-fingered solute. For $k = 1, b = b^*(= 2)$, the effect of viscosity contrast is slaved to the Langmuir adsorption [see Fig. 7(b)]. These findings have important applications in chromatography separation. In typical chromatographic conditions, the viscosity of the sample is larger than that of carrier fluid. For a given solvent and solute, i.e. for a fixed value of the control parameter R , one can fix the nature of the porous matrix to a desired saturation capacity and saturation rate such that either VF does not occur at all in the column or VF induced distorted peaks of the solute are confined within the spread of the triangle-like waves that are formed in the absence of VF. In addition, the solvent injection rate can be controlled in such a manner that the solute travels the entire column length before an interaction of the fingers with the stable shock layer front reorients the former in the upstream direction to enhance the spreading over a larger column length.




FIG. 6: (Color online) Concentration maps for $R = 1, k = 0.2$: (a) $b = 0$, (b) $1.55 (= b^*)$, (c) 10 and (d) 10^3 (the saturated case) at the time written in the panel. The solid contours are $c_m = 0.1$ to 0.9 with step 0.2 . The dashed contour corresponds to $c_m = 0.001$. The concentration maps are shown at the onset of VF (top row), at $t \approx t_{\text{on,sl}}$ (middle row), and at $t > t_{\text{on,sl}}$.




FIG. 7: \bar{c}_m as a function of the dimensionless position x (a) at $t = 15000$ (top) and 20000 (bottom) (b) at $t = 5000$ (top) and 10000 (bottom).




FIG. 8: (Color online) Concentration maps for $R = -1, k = 0.2$: (a) $b = 0$, (b) $1.55 (= b^*)$, (c) 10 and (d) 10^3 (the saturated case) at the time written in the panel. The solid contours are $c_m = 0.1$ to 0.9 with step 0.2 . The dashed contour corresponds to $c_m = 0.001$. The concentration maps are shown at the onset of VF (top row), at $t \approx t_{\text{on,rf}}$ (middle row), and at $t > t_{\text{on,rf}}$.

B. Interaction between RF and VF for $R < 0$

To analyze the interaction of the RF with VF developing at the SL front, we next take $R < 0$ (Figs. 8(a-d)). Fingers originating from the SL front possess both qualitative and quantitative differences compared to the fingers at the RF front. An earlier study explained the self sharpening effect of the SL front with increasing b and its imprint as an early onset of VF [14]. To quantify the onset of interaction between VF and RF, we compute $t_{\text{on,rf}}$ evaluated the same way as $t_{\text{on,sl}}$ and plotted in Fig.3(b). Interaction of fingers originating from the SL front with the RF front occurs earlier [Figs. 8(b-c)] when compared to the linear adsorption case [Fig. 8(a)]. An early interaction of viscous fingers with the RF front is the resultant of—(a) a diminishing separation between the frontal (SL) and rear (RF) interfaces as b increases and (b) an early onset of VF for $b \neq 0$ in comparison to the $b = 0$ case. In combination, these ensure that fingers originating from the SL interface ($b \neq 0$) travel a shorter distance before interacting with the stable interface when compared to the linear adsorption isotherm ($b = 0$). This is in strong contrast with the situation of $R > 0$, for which the interaction of the fingered upstream front with the non-fingered downstream front happens at a later time as b increases within a moderate (and most probably physically relevant) range (see Fig.3(b)). The other striking difference between $R > 0$ and $R < 0$ cases is the post interaction dynamics of the viscous fingers. As explained earlier, for $R > 0$, fingers penetrate through the SL, where a steep stable viscosity contrast prevents the breakthrough to occur. It is compensated by the annihilation of the SL. A RF front caused by the Langmuir adsorption ($b \neq 0, k \neq 0$)—presenting a wider stable zone than the corresponding linearly adsorbed ($b = 0, k \neq 0$) or non-adsorbed front ($k = 0$)—makes it difficult for the backward fingers to reach the upstream end of the stable front [Fig. 8(a-d)]. Thus, a portion of the rarefaction zone preserves its qualitative property of an expanding wavefront. Moreover, as the stable barrier moves closer to the unstable interface with an increasing b , backward fingers reorient




FIG. 9: Temporal evolution of the degree of mixing $\chi(t)$ for $R = 0$, $k = 0.2$ and different values of b .




FIG. 10: (Color online) Temporal evolution of $\dot{\chi}(t)$ for $k = 0.2$ and different values of b : $R =$ (a) 1, (b) -1.

quicker and spread the solute over a larger column length in the downstream direction [compare Figs. 8(c) and 8(d)].

C. Degree of mixing

For a more quantitative measure of interaction between nonlinear waves and viscous fingering, we calculate the degree of mixing of c_m , defined as $\chi(t) = 1 - \sigma^2(t)/\sigma_{\max}^2$, where $\sigma^2(t) = \langle c_m^2 \rangle - \langle c_m \rangle^2$ is the variance of $c_m(x, y, t)$, $\langle \cdot \rangle$ represents spatial average [23]. Here, σ_{\max}^2 corresponds to a perfectly separated state and $\sigma^2 = 0$ corresponds to perfectly a mixed state which gives $\chi(t) = 1$. Fig.9 shows the degree of mixing $\chi(t)$ for different values of b with $R = 0$. We note that $\chi(t; b = 0) \leq \chi(t; b \neq 0)$, $\forall t > 0$ —the equality holds as $b \rightarrow \infty$. Also, $\chi(t)$ maximizes for b close to b^* . Thus mixing increases with an increase in b and it maximizes for $b \simeq b^*$.

Next, we evaluate the rate of mixing defined as $\dot{\chi} = d\chi/dt$, plotted in Fig.10 for $R = 1$ and -1 . The rate of

change, $\dot{\chi}$, is equivalent to the scalar dissipation rate, which corresponds to the homogenization of the fluid due to mixing [23]. A local minimum (maximum) in the $\dot{\chi} - t$ curve corresponds to an increase (decrease) of the interface length between the solute and the displacing fluid [23]. For $R = 1$, $k = 0.1$ we plot $\dot{\chi}$ as a function of dimensionless time t in Fig. 10(a). The scalar dissipation rate increases due to the onset of VF (first local minimum) until the interaction of the fingers with the SL (first local maximum). The wiggles in the $\dot{\chi} - t$ curves at later times are due to splitting and merging of fingers. Contrary to $R > 0$, two local maxima are observed at $t > 0$ in $\dot{\chi} - t$ curves of a less viscous Langmuir adsorbed sample [Fig. 10(b)], the later of which corresponds to $t_{\text{on,rf}}$. Similar to a more viscous sample, the first local minimum demarcates the onset of VF. The first maximum is caused by a competition between an enhanced mixing from VF and a reduction in mixing at the expanding RF front. Before the onset of VF, the dissipation rate steeply declines for $b \neq 0$. Nevertheless, we must remember that there can be an opposite contribution from the SL front for the same b values. From these plots, the non-monotonicity of $t_{\text{on,sl}}$ and $t_{\text{on,rf}}$ with respect to b are corroborated.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Our combined theoretical and computational investigation has focused on the nonlinear dynamics that emerge from the interactions of rarefaction and shock layers and/or viscous fingers that can develop during transport of a finite width sample of solute in a porous medium. On the basis of nonlinear simulations, we demonstrated that VF ruins the triangle-like wave that is the hallmark of a shock layer and a rarefaction wave interaction [13].

The propagation dynamics of the Langmuir adsorbed solute is influenced by the mobile phase concentration-dependent advection and diffusion of the solute. The semi-infinite solute model admits formation of a shock layer (SL) for a decreasing initial concentration profile [14] and a rarefaction (RF) wave for an increasing initial concentration profile [26]. In the present study, the finite size of the sample induces an interaction between these two nonlinear waves of opposite characteristics. The non-monotonic variation of the shock layer and rarefaction wave thicknesses with b implies that the shock layer and the rarefaction wave vanishes in the limit $b \rightarrow \infty$ and an error function profile emerges. Our quantification of the onset time of the interaction between these nonlinear waves further reveals that the interaction between SL and RF has a non-monotonic dependence on the adsorption parameter b . Our results show that in order to obtain the triangle-like solute profiles the nonlinear adsorption parameters can conveniently be used to tune the interaction of a SL with a RF.

We have next studied the influence of viscous fingering (VF) on the propagation dynamics of the non-linearly adsorbed solute of finite width. Our two-dimensional model allows to investigate for the first time the interaction between viscous fingering and nonlinear waves. This study reveals significant differences between the interaction of fingers with the SL and the RF wave. It has been observed that when fingers develop on the RF front, a steep stable viscosity contrast at the SL front blunts these forward moving fingers that try to intrude but the SL annihilates due to this interaction. On the contrary, a portion of the rarefaction zone preserves the qualitative property of an expanding wave front when interacting with the VF of the unstable frontal interface developing on the SL. We have shown that, for a finite $k \neq 0$, all the measurable quantities, e.g., the onset of interaction of SL with RF, interaction time of VF with SL, interaction time of VF with RF, etc., with a Langmuir adsorption isotherm must exhibit a non-monotonic variation with respect to b between the two well-understood extremities—linear adsorption ($b = 0$) [25] and saturated case ($b \rightarrow \infty$) [28].

The study presented in this paper is of vital importance in understanding the role of nonlinear adsorption and viscous fingering in various processes where the motion of species results in the formation of nonlinear waves [31, 32] or when the motion of species is encountered by nonlinear waves [33]. Our inferences could be helpful in understanding the role of adsorption parameters and viscosity ratios in chromatography applications, CO₂ capture, subsurface transport as well as in oil recovery.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CR and A.D acknowledges financial support of the FRS-FNRS PDR CONTROL programme. SP acknowledges the support of the Swedish Research Council Grant no. 638-2013-9243.

-
- [1] John W. Miles. On the generation of surface waves by shear flows. *J. Fluid Mech.*, 3(2):185–204, 1957.
[2] J. Vanneste. Balance and spontaneous wave generation in geophysical flows. *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.*, 45(1):147–172, 2013.

- [3] D G Crighton. Model equations of nonlinear acoustics. *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.*, 11(1):11–33, 1979.
- [4] G.B. Whitham. *Linear and Nonlinear Waves*. Pure and Applied Mathematics: A Wiley Series of Texts, Monographs and Tracts. Wiley, 1999.
- [5] Georges Guiochon, Attila Felinger, Dean G. Shirazi, and A. M. Katti. *Fundamentals of Preparative and Nonlinear Chromatography*. Academic Press, March 2006.
- [6] Willi-Hans Steeb. *Solitons and Quantum Mechanics*, pages 165–170. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, 1998.
- [7] Christopher P. McKee and David J. Hollenbach. Interstellar shock waves. *Annu. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.*, 18(1):219–262, 1980.
- [8] Friedrich G. Helfferich and Peter W. Carr. Non-linear waves in chromatography: I. waves, shocks, and shapes. *J. Chromatography*, 629:97–122, 1993.
- [9] Martha W. Evans, Francis H. Harlow, and Billy D. Meixner. Interaction of shock or rarefaction with a bubble. *Phys. Fluids*, 5(6):651–656, 1962.
- [10] Douglas M. Ruthven. *Principles of adsorption and adsorption processes*. Wiley, 1984.
- [11] Walter J. Weber, Paul M. McGinley, and Lynn E. Katz. Sorption phenomena in subsurface systems: Concepts, models and effects on contaminant fate and transport. *Wat. Res.*, 25(5):499 – 528, 1991.
- [12] Irving Langmuir. The constitution and fundamental properties of solids and liquids. part i. solids. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 38(11):2221–2295, 1916.
- [13] D. De Vault. The theory of chromatography. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 65:532–540, 1943.
- [14] Chinar Rana and Manoranjan Mishra. Interaction between shock layer and viscous fingering in a langmuir adsorbed solute. *Phys. Fluids*, 29(3):032108, 2017.
- [15] S. G. Shirazi and G. Guiochon. Analytical solution for the ideal model of chromatography in the case of a langmuir isotherm. *Anal. Chem.*, 60:2364–2374, 1988.
- [16] B. Lin, T. Yun, G. Zhong, and G. Guiochon. Shock layer analysis for a single-component in preparative elution chromatography. *J. Chromatogr. A*, 708:1–12, 1995.
- [17] G M Homsy. Viscous fingering in porous media. *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.*, 19:271–311, 1987.
- [18] C. T. Tan and G. M. Homsy. Simulation of nonlinear viscous fingering in miscible displacement. *Phys. Fluids*, 31:1330–1338, June 1988.
- [19] A. De Wit, Y. Bertho, and M. Martin. Viscous fingering of miscible slices. *Phys. Fluids*, 17:054114, May 2005.
- [20] J. Russell Boulding and Jon S. Ginn. *Practical Handbook of Soil, Vadose Zone, and Ground-Water Contamination: Assessment, Prevention, and Remediation*. Lewis Publishers, 2004.
- [21] Brian Berkowitz, Ishai Dror, and Bruno Yaron. *Contaminant Geochemistry: Interactions and Transport in Subsurface environment*. Springer-Verlag Berlin, 2008.
- [22] Abdelhamid Sayari and Youssef Belmabkhout. Stabilization of amine-containing co2 adsorbents: Dramatic effect of water vapor. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 132:6312–6314, 2010.
- [23] B. Jha, L. Cueto-Felgueroso, and R. Juanes. Fluid mixing from viscous fingering. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 106:194502, 2011.
- [24] Matthew L. Dickson, T. Tucker Norton, and Erik J. Fernandez. Chemical imaging of multicomponent viscous fingering in chromatography. *AIChE Journal*, 43(2):409–418.
- [25] M. Mishra, M. Martin, and A. De Wit. Miscible viscous fingering with linear adsorption on the porous matrix. *Phys. Fluids*, 19:073101, July 2007.
- [26] Chinar Rana. PhD thesis, Indian Institute of Technology Ropar, 2015.
- [27] Martin Enmark, Dennis Åsberg, Andrew Shalliker, Jorgen Samuelsson, and Torgny Fornstedt. A closer study of peak distortions in supercritical fluid chromatography as generated by the injection. *J. Chromatogr. A*, 1400:131 – 139, 2015.
- [28] M. Mishra, M. Martin, and A. De Wit. Differences in miscible viscous fingering of finite width slices with positive or negative log-mobility ratio. *Phys. Rev. E*, 78:066306, Dec 2008.
- [29] Chinar Rana, Anne De Wit, Michel Martin, and Manoranjan Mishra. Combined influences of viscous fingering and solvent effect on the distribution of adsorbed solutes in porous media. *RSC Adv.*, 4:34369–34381, 2014.
- [30] Mark L. Brusseau. The effect of nonlinear sorption on transformation of contaminants during transport in porous media. *Journal of Contaminant Hydrology*, 17(4):277 – 291, 1995.
- [31] L. M. Abriola. Modelling contaminant transport in subsurface:an interdisciplinary challenge. *Rev. Geophys.*, 25:125–134, 1987.
- [32] A. A. Maslov, S. G. Mironov, A. N. Kudryavtsev, T. V. Poplavskaya, and I. S. Tsyryulnikov. Wave processes in a viscous shock layer and control of fluctuations. *J. Fluid Mech.*, 650:81, may 2010.
- [33] William F. Ballhaus and Maurice Holt. Interaction between the ocean surface and underwater spherical blast waves. *Phys. Fluids*, 17(6):1068–1079, 1974.