

# Multispecies BGK models and the Onsager reciprocal relations

E. S. Benilov\*

*Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Limerick, Limerick V94 T9PX, Ireland*

It is shown that most of the existing versions of the Bhatnagar–Gross–Krook model – those whose coefficient are independent of the molecular velocity – do not satisfy the Onsager relations. This casts doubt on their qualitative relevance and definitely rules them out as a quantitative predictive tool.

## I. INTRODUCTION

In their seminal 1954 paper [1], Bhatnagar, Gross and Krook (BGK) proposed a phenomenological model describing kinetic processes in a pure gas, and two years later, Gross and Krook extended this result to gas mixtures [2]. Even though neither of these models follows from the first principles, they are believed to provide a qualitatively correct approximation of the Boltzmann kinetic equation, and a lot of work has been done to generalize and extend the BGK approach. In application to mixtures, the effort has mostly gone into making the BGK model more adaptable, so that it would be able to describe a wide range of real fluids (e.g., Refs. [3–15]).

Note, however, that the multispecies BGK model has never been tested for compliance with the Onsager reciprocal relations, which impose certain constraints on the transport coefficients. Models derived from the first principles satisfy them automatically, whereas phenomenological models may or may not do so. An example of a non-compliant model can be viewed in the Enskog theory of dense fluids [16], and an example of a compliant one, in the modified Enskog theory [17, 18]. The noncompliance with the Onsager relations casts doubt on the model’s physical relevance, and it is no coincidence that the modified Enskog theory has eventually been shown to follow from the first principles [19, 20].

As demonstrated in the present paper, the most common version of the BGK model does not comply with the Onsager reciprocal relations. According to one of those, the coefficient of the temperature gradient in the mass flux should be inter-linked in a certain way with the coefficient of the density gradient in the heat flux. According to the BGK model, however, the former is zero, whereas the latter is proportional to the coefficient of the density gradient in the mass flux – hence, *cannot* be zero. Not only does this undermine the physical relevance of the model, this also makes the BGK model impossible to calibrate – i.e., choose the values of the parameters involved to ensure that the transport properties of the fluid under consideration are described correctly.

In Sec. II of this paper, the most common BGK model will be formulated, and in Sec. III, it will be shown to

not comply with the Onsager relations. Other BGK-type models are briefly discussed in Sec. IV.

## II. FORMULATION: THE BGK MODEL FOR BINARY MIXTURES

Consider a mixture of two monatomic fluids, described by the distribution functions  $f_k(t, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v})$ , where  $k$  is the species number,  $t$  is the time,  $\mathbf{r}$  is the position vector, and  $\mathbf{v}$  is the molecular velocity. The macroscopic number density  $n_k$ , velocity  $\mathbf{V}_k$ , and temperature  $T_k$  of the  $k$ -th species are given by

$$n_k = \int f_k d^3\mathbf{v}, \quad (1)$$

$$n_k \mathbf{V}_k = \int \mathbf{v} f_k d^3\mathbf{v}, \quad (2)$$

$$3n_k T_k = \int m_k |\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{V}_k|^2 f_k d^3\mathbf{v}, \quad (3)$$

where  $m_k$  is the molecular mass, and  $T_k$  is measured in energy units (so that the Boltzmann constant equals unity).

The most general form of the multispecies BGK model (e.g., [15, 21]) consists in

$$\frac{\partial f_1}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla f_1 = \nu_{11} (M_1 - f_1) + \nu_{12} (M_{12} - f_1), \quad (4)$$

$$\frac{\partial f_2}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla f_2 = \nu_{22} (M_2 - f_2) + \nu_{21} (M_{21} - f_2), \quad (5)$$

where  $\nu_{ki}$  are the frequencies of collisions between the molecules of  $k$ -th and  $i$ -th species,

$$M_k = n_k \left( \frac{m_k}{2\pi T_k} \right)^{3/2} \exp \left( -\frac{m_k |\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{V}_k|^2}{2T_k} \right), \quad (6)$$

$$M_{12} = \left( \frac{m_1}{2\pi T_{12}} \right)^{3/2} n_1 \exp \left( -\frac{m_1 |\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{V}_{12}|^2}{2T_{12}} \right), \quad (7)$$

$$M_{21} = \left( \frac{m_2}{2\pi T_{21}} \right)^{3/2} n_2 \exp \left( -\frac{m_2 |\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{V}_{21}|^2}{2T_{21}} \right), \quad (8)$$

\* Email address: Eugene.Benilov@ul.ie;  
Homepage: <https://eugene.benilov.com/>

are various Maxwellian distributions, and

$$\mathbf{V}_{12} = \mathbf{V}_1 + \beta_1 (\mathbf{V}_2 - \mathbf{V}_1), \quad (9)$$

$$\mathbf{V}_{21} = \mathbf{V}_2 + \beta_2 (\mathbf{V}_1 - \mathbf{V}_2), \quad (10)$$

$$T_{12} = T_1 + \alpha_1 (T_2 - T_1) + \gamma_1 |\mathbf{V}_1 - \mathbf{V}_2|^2, \quad (11)$$

$$T_{21} = T_2 + \alpha_2 (T_1 - T_2) + \gamma_2 |\mathbf{V}_2 - \mathbf{V}_1|^2. \quad (12)$$

Note that the parameters  $\nu_{ki}$ ,  $\alpha_k$ ,  $\beta_k$ , and  $\gamma_k$  may depend on the fluid's macroscopic characteristics  $n_1$ ,  $n_2$ ,  $\mathbf{V}_1$ ,  $\mathbf{V}_2$ , etc. – hence, may vary with  $t$  and  $\mathbf{r}$ , but not with  $\mathbf{v}$ . Various particular cases of model (1)–(12) have been examined in Refs. [2, 3, 5–9, 12].

Eqs. (1)–(12) form a closed set for  $f_1(t, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v})$  and  $f_2(t, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v})$ . One can readily show that they conserve mass – i.e., satisfy

$$\frac{\partial n_1}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (n_1 \mathbf{V}_1) = 0, \quad \frac{\partial n_2}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (n_2 \mathbf{V}_2) = 0. \quad (13)$$

As for the momentum and energy, Eqs. (1)–(12) do not conserve them automatically, but only subject to the following restrictions:

$$\alpha_1 = \frac{\alpha}{\nu_{12}}, \quad \alpha_2 = \frac{\alpha}{\nu_{21}}, \quad (14)$$

$$\beta_1 = \frac{\beta}{\nu_{12} m_1}, \quad \beta_2 = \frac{\beta}{\nu_{21} m_2}, \quad (15)$$

$$\gamma_1 = \frac{1}{3\nu_{12}} \left( \beta - \frac{\beta^2}{\nu_{12} m_1} + 3\gamma \right), \quad (16)$$

$$\gamma_2 = \frac{1}{3\nu_{21}} \left( \beta - \frac{\beta^2}{\nu_{21} m_2} - 3\gamma \right), \quad (17)$$

where the coefficients  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ , and  $\gamma$  may depend on  $\mathbf{r}$  and  $t$ . The above restrictions are equivalent to those derived in Refs. [15, 21], albeit presented in a slightly different form.

Given restrictions (14)–(17), Eqs. (1)–(12) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial (m_1 n_1 \mathbf{V}_1 + m_2 n_2 \mathbf{V}_2)}{\partial t} \\ & + \nabla \cdot \int \mathbf{v} \otimes \mathbf{v} (m_1 f_1 + m_2 f_2) d^3 \mathbf{v} = 0, \quad (18) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( \frac{3}{2} n_1 T_1 + \frac{m_1 |\mathbf{V}_1|^2}{2} + \frac{3}{2} n_2 T_2 + \frac{m_2 |\mathbf{V}_2|^2}{2} \right) \\ & + \nabla \cdot \int \frac{|\mathbf{v}|^2}{2} \mathbf{v} (m_1 f_1 + m_2 f_2) d^3 \mathbf{v} = 0, \quad (19) \end{aligned}$$

which reflect the momentum and energy conservation, respectively.

### III. TRANSPORT FLUXES UNDER THE DIFFUSION APPROXIMATION

#### A. The standard hydrodynamics

Within the framework of the Enskog–Chapman approach (e.g., Ref. [22], chapter 6), the mass and heat fluxes are given by

$$\mathbf{J}_k = -m_k n_k \left( \sum_i D_{ki} \mathbf{d}_i + B_k \frac{\nabla T}{T} \right), \quad (20)$$

$$\mathbf{Q} = - \sum_k C_k \mathbf{d}_k - \kappa \nabla T, \quad (21)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{d}_i &= \nabla \frac{n_i}{n_1 + n_2} \\ &+ \left( \frac{n_i}{n_1 + n_2} - \frac{\rho_i}{m_1 n_1 + m_2 n_2} \right) \frac{\nabla p}{p}, \quad (22) \end{aligned}$$

is the “diffusion driving force” of the  $k$ -th species, and the pressure is

$$p = (n_1 + n_2) T. \quad (23)$$

$D_{ki}$ ,  $B_k$ ,  $\kappa$ , and  $C_k$  are the transport coefficients:  $D_{ki}$  is the diffusivity,  $B_k$  is the thermodiffusivity,  $\kappa$  is the thermal conductivity, and  $C_k$  does not have a name as it is linked to  $B_k$  via one of the Onsager reciprocal relations,

$$C_k = p B_k.$$

The other Onsager relation guarantees the symmetry of the diffusivity matrix,

$$D_{ki} = D_{ik}.$$

The coefficients  $D_{ki}$  and  $B_k$  should also satisfy

$$\sum_k D_{ki} = 0, \quad \sum_k B_k = 0$$

(see Ref. [22]). Thus, for a binary mixture, one can express  $D_{ki}$ ,  $B_k$ , and  $C_k$  through only two coefficients – say,  $D$  and  $B$ :

$$D_{11} = -\frac{\rho_2}{\rho_1} D, \quad D_{22} = -\frac{\rho_1}{\rho_2} D, \quad (24)$$

$$D_{21} = D_{12} = D, \quad (25)$$

$$B_1 = \frac{B}{m_1 n_1}, \quad B_2 = -\frac{B}{m_2 n_2}, \quad (26)$$

$$C_1 = \frac{(n_1 + n_2) T}{m_2 n_2} B, \quad C_2 = -\frac{(n_1 + n_2) T}{m_1 n_1} B. \quad (27)$$

In this paper, expressions (20)–(27) will be used under the diffusion approximation – which includes the isobaricity assumption (more details given later), i.e.,

$$p \approx \text{const}.$$

Then, expressions (20)–(27) yield

$$\mathbf{J}_1 \approx D \frac{(m_1 n_1 + m_2 n_2) (n_2 \nabla n_1 - n_1 \nabla n_2)}{(n_1 + n_2)^2} + B \frac{\nabla n_1 + \nabla n_2}{n_1 + n_2}, \quad (28)$$

$$\mathbf{J}_2 \approx D \frac{(m_1 n_1 + m_2 n_2) (n_1 \nabla n_2 - n_2 \nabla n_1)}{(n_1 + n_2)^2} - B \frac{\nabla n_1 + \nabla n_2}{n_1 + n_2}, \quad (29)$$

$$\mathbf{Q} \approx -B \frac{T (n_1 \nabla n_2 - n_2 \nabla n_1)}{m_1 n_1 m_2 n_2 (n_1 + n_2)^2} - \kappa \frac{\nabla n_1 + \nabla n_2}{(n_1 + n_2)^2}. \quad (30)$$

In the next subsection, these expressions will be compared to their BGK counterparts. This is, generally, how the latter could be calibrated – i.e., its coefficients related to the measured values of  $D$ ,  $B$ , and  $\kappa$  of the fluid under consideration.

## B. The multispecies BGK model

To derive the hydrodynamic approximation of a kinetic model, one should assume that the spatial scale of the solution exceeds the length  $l$  of the free path, and the solution's temporal scale exceeds  $l/v$  where  $v$  is the mean velocity. Mathematically, this assumption amounts to ‘stretching’ the coordinates and time – i.e., replacing

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \rightarrow \varepsilon \frac{\partial}{\partial t}, \quad \nabla \rightarrow \varepsilon \nabla, \quad (31)$$

where  $\varepsilon$  is a small parameter. One should then assume that the distribution function is nearly Maxwellian, with the velocity  $\mathbf{V}$  and temperature  $T$  being the same for all the species, i.e.,

$$f_k = n_k \left( \frac{m_k}{2\pi T} \right)^{3/2} \exp \left( -\frac{m_k |\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{V}|^2}{2T} \right) + \varepsilon f_k^{(1)} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2). \quad (32)$$

In application to a BGK-type model, the hydrodynamic approximation was considered in Ref. [10], who also let

$$\mathbf{V}_k = \mathbf{V} + \varepsilon \mathbf{V}_k^{(1)} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2), \quad (33)$$

$$T_k = T + \varepsilon T_k^{(1)} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2), \quad (34)$$

while leaving  $n_k$  nonexpanded. Substituting (32)–(34) into the rescaled versions of Eqs. (4)–(5), one can find  $f_k^{(1)}$  and then use Eqs. (2)–(3) to find  $\mathbf{V}_k^{(1)}$  and  $T_k^{(1)}$ , while Eq. (1) for  $n_k$  does not seem to be needed. Such a non-straightforward procedure was chosen in Ref. [10] because of the highly-nonlinear structure of the BGK model, making the straightforward calculation of higher-order corrections, such as the transport fluxes, cumbersome.

In the present paper, a slightly different approach is employed, where the transport coefficients are calculated under the *diffusion* approximation instead of the *hydrodynamic* one. The difference between the two approximations is two-fold. Firstly, the diffusion flow is slow, so that scaling (31) should be replaced with

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \rightarrow \varepsilon^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial t}, \quad \nabla \rightarrow \varepsilon \nabla. \quad (35)$$

Secondly, the diffusion flow is weak – so that expansions (32)–(33) should be replaced with

$$f_k = n_k^{(0)} \left( \frac{m_k}{2\pi T} \right)^{3/2} \exp \left( -\frac{m_k |\mathbf{v}|^2}{2T} \right) + \varepsilon f_k^{(1)} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2). \quad (36)$$

$$\mathbf{V}_k = \varepsilon \mathbf{V}_k^{(1)} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2), \quad T_k = T + \varepsilon T_k^{(1)} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2), \quad (37)$$

and the density should also be expanded,

$$n_k = n_k^{(0)} + \varepsilon n_k^{(1)} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2). \quad (38)$$

Under such an approximation, the transport fluxes emerge from the *leading* order of the expansion.

Having rescaled the BGK equations (4)–(5) according to (35), one should substitute into them expansions (36)–(38).  $\mathbf{V}_{ki}$  and  $T_{ki}$  should also be expanded [similarly to how  $\mathbf{V}_k$  and  $T_k$  are expanded in (37)], as well as the coefficients,

$$\nu_{ki} = \nu_{ki}^{(0)} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon), \quad \alpha_k = \alpha_k^{(0)} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon), \quad \beta_k = \beta_k^{(0)} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon), \quad \gamma_k = \gamma_k^{(0)} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon).$$

Eqs. (4)–(5) are linear algebraic equations, so that one can readily deduce that

$$f_1^{(1)} = \left[ \frac{n_1^{(1)}}{n_1^{(0)}} + \frac{m_1 |\mathbf{v}|^2 - 3T \nu_{11}^{(0)} T_1^{(1)} + \nu_{12}^{(0)} T_{12}^{(1)}}{2T} + m_1 \mathbf{v} \cdot \frac{\nu_{11}^{(0)} \mathbf{V}_1^{(1)} + \nu_{12}^{(0)} \mathbf{V}_{12}^{(1)}}{(\nu_{11}^{(0)} + \nu_{12}^{(0)}) T} \right] M_1^{(0)} \\ - \frac{\mathbf{v}}{\nu_{11}^{(0)} + \nu_{12}^{(0)}} \cdot \left( \frac{\nabla n_1^{(0)}}{n_1^{(0)}} + \frac{m_1 |\mathbf{v}|^2 - 3T \nabla T}{2T T} \right) M_1^{(0)},$$

$$f_2^{(1)} = \left[ \frac{n_2^{(1)}}{n_2^{(0)}} + \frac{m_2 |\mathbf{v}|^2 - 3T \nu_{22}^{(0)} T_2^{(1)} + \nu_{21}^{(0)} T_{21}^{(1)}}{2T} + m_2 \mathbf{v} \cdot \frac{\nu_{22}^{(0)} \mathbf{V}_2^{(1)} + \nu_{21}^{(0)} \mathbf{V}_{21}^{(1)}}{(\nu_{22}^{(0)} + \nu_{21}^{(0)}) T} \right] M_2^{(0)} \\ - \frac{\mathbf{v}}{\nu_{22}^{(0)} + \nu_{21}^{(0)}} \cdot \left( \frac{\nabla n_2^{(0)}}{n_2^{(0)}} + \frac{m_2 |\mathbf{v}|^2 - 3T \nabla T}{2T T} \right) M_2^{(0)},$$

where

$$M_k^{(0)} = n_k^{(0)} \left( \frac{m_k}{2\pi T} \right)^{3/2} \exp \left( -\frac{m_k |\mathbf{v}|^2}{2T} \right).$$

Substituting these expressions into the leading-order equations (1)–(3), one can verify that (1) is satisfied identically, while (2)–(3) and the leading-order expansions of Eqs. (9)–(12) yield

$$\nabla \left( n_1^{(0)} T^{(0)} + n_2^{(0)} T^{(0)} \right) = 0, \quad (39)$$

$$\mathbf{V}_1^{(1)} = \mathbf{V}^{(1)} - \frac{\nabla \left( n_1^{(0)} T^{(0)} \right)}{2\beta^{(0)} n_1^{(0)} n_2^{(0)}}, \quad (40)$$

$$\mathbf{V}_2^{(1)} = \mathbf{V}^{(1)} - \frac{\nabla \left( n_2^{(0)} T^{(0)} \right)}{2\beta^{(0)} n_1^{(0)} n_2^{(0)}}, \quad (41)$$

$$T_{12}^{(1)} = T_1^{(1)} = T_{21}^{(1)} = T_2^{(1)} = T^{(1)},$$

where  $\mathbf{V}^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}, t)$  and  $T^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}, t)$  are undetermined functions (neither will appear in the final expressions for the

fluxes). Note that  $\beta_1^{(0)}$  and  $\beta_2^{(0)}$  (appearing in Eqs. (9)–(10) of the original set) have been expressed through  $\beta^{(0)}$  using (15).

Physically, Eq. (39) reflects the isobaric nature of diffusion and heat conduction, just as this should be in all good models. Introducing the leading-order pressure  $p^{(0)}$  (which may depend only on  $t$ ), one can rewrite (39) in the form

$$T^{(0)} = \frac{p^{(0)}}{n_1^{(0)} + n_2^{(0)}}. \quad (42)$$

Next, introduce the mass-averaged velocity,

$$\bar{\mathbf{V}} = \frac{m_1 n_1 \mathbf{V}_1 + m_2 n_2 \mathbf{V}_2}{m_1 n_1 + m_2 n_2},$$

and the diffusion flux of the  $k$ -th species,

$$\mathbf{J}_k = m_k n_k (\mathbf{V}_k - \bar{\mathbf{V}}).$$

Using (40)–(41), one can calculate  $\mathbf{J}_k$  and then use (42) to eventually obtain

$$\mathbf{J}_1 = -\varepsilon \frac{T^{(0)} m_1 m_2 \left( n_2^{(0)} \nabla n_1^{(0)} - n_1^{(0)} \nabla n_2^{(0)} \right)}{\beta^{(0)} \left( m_1 n_1^{(0)} + m_2 n_2^{(0)} \right) \left( n_1^{(0)} + n_2^{(0)} \right)} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2), \quad \mathbf{J}_2 = -\varepsilon \frac{T^{(0)} m_1 m_2 \left( n_1^{(0)} \nabla n_2^{(0)} - n_2^{(0)} \nabla n_1^{(0)} \right)}{2\beta^{(0)} \left( m_1 n_1^{(0)} + m_2 n_2^{(0)} \right) \left( n_1^{(0)} + n_2^{(0)} \right)} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2).$$

Comparing these expressions to their ‘correct’ counterparts (28)–(29), one can see that a choice of  $\beta$  exists such that the two results coincide only if  $B = 0$  (no thermodiffusivity). One might think that the BGK model may still work for fluids whose thermodiffusivity is indeed small – e.g., water (see the estimates in Refs. [23, 24]) – but, unfortunately, a further problem arises even in this case. To illustrate it, consider the heat flux,

$$\mathbf{Q} = \int \frac{|\mathbf{v}|^2}{2} \mathbf{v} (m_1 f_1 + m_2 f_2) d^3 \mathbf{v} - 5 (n_1 T_1 + n_2 T_2) \bar{\mathbf{V}},$$

which, to leading order, is

$$\mathbf{Q} = -\varepsilon \frac{5T^{(0)2} (m_2 - m_1) \left( n_2^{(0)} \nabla n_1^{(0)} - n_1^{(0)} \nabla n_2^{(0)} \right)}{\beta^{(0)} \left( m_1 n_1^{(0)} + m_2 n_2^{(0)} \right) \left( n_1^{(0)} + n_2^{(0)} \right)} + \varepsilon \left[ \frac{n_1^{(0)}}{m_1 \left( \nu_{11}^{(0)} + \nu_{12}^{(0)} \right)} + \frac{n_2^{(0)}}{m_2 \left( \nu_{22}^{(0)} + \nu_{21}^{(0)} \right)} \right] \frac{5T^{(0)2} \left( \nabla n_1^{(0)} + \nabla n_2^{(0)} \right)}{n_1^{(0)} + n_2^{(0)}} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2).$$

Comparing this expression to its ‘correct’ counterpart (30) with  $B = 0$ , one can see that the two results can coincide only in the limit  $\beta^{(0)} \rightarrow \infty$  – which makes *the whole* diffusive flux equal zero, not only its thermodiffusive part.

One way or another, no such value of the parameter  $\beta$  exists that makes the BGK transport fluxes satisfy the Onsager reciprocal relation – neither for the general case nor for a fluid with zero thermodiffusivity.

#### IV. CONCLUDING REMARKS

It should be emphasized that the results of the present paper apply to some, but not all, of the existing BGK-

type models. Apart from the model examined above, they apply to that of Refs. [10, 11], which consists of Eqs. (1)–(10) of this paper, but with Eqs. (11)–(12) replaced with

$$T_{12} = T_1 + \alpha_1 (T_2 - T_1) + \gamma_1 \left( |\mathbf{V}_1|^2 - |\mathbf{V}_2|^2 \right),$$

$$T_{21} = T_2 + \alpha_2 (T_1 - T_2) + \gamma_2 \left( |\mathbf{V}_2|^2 - |\mathbf{V}_1|^2 \right).$$

As for models where the coefficients depend on the molecular velocity (e.g., [13, 14]), they need to be tested separately – which is yet to be done.

One should hope that, one way or another, a good version of the multispecies BGK model would be available as an alternative to the (far more complicated) Boltzmann equation.

- 
- [1] P. L. Bhatnagar, E. P. Gross, and M. Krook, A model for collision processes in gases. I. Small amplitude processes in charged and neutral one-component systems, *Phys. Rev.* **94**, 511 (1954).
  - [2] E. P. Gross and M. Krook, Model for collision processes in gases: Small-amplitude oscillations of charged two-component systems, *Phys. Rev.* **102**, 593 (1956).
  - [3] B. B. Hamel, Kinetic model for binary gas mixtures, *Phys. Fluids* **8**, 418 (1965).
  - [4] B. B. Hamel, Two-fluid hydrodynamic equations for a neutral, disparate-mass, binary mixture, *Phys. Fluids* **9**, 12 (1966).
  - [5] J. M. Greene, Improved Bhatnagar-Gross-Krook model of electron-ion collisions, *Phys. Fluids* **16**, 2022 (1973).
  - [6] C. Cercignani, *The Boltzmann equation and its applications* (Springer, New York, 1988).
  - [7] V. Garzó, A. Santos, and J. J. Brey, A kinetic model for a multicomponent gas, *Phys. Fluids A* **1**, 380 (1989).
  - [8] V. Sofonea and R. F. Sekerka, BGK models for diffusion in isothermal binary fluid systems, *Physica A* **299**, 494 (2001).
  - [9] P. Asinari, Asymptotic analysis of multiple-relaxation-time lattice boltzmann schemes for mixture modeling, *Comput. Math. Appl.* **55**, 1392 (2008).
  - [10] J. R. Haack, C. D. Hauck, and M. S. Murillo, A conservative, entropic multispecies BGK model, *J. Stat. Phys.* **168**, 826 (2017).
  - [11] J. R. Haack, C. D. Hauck, and M. S. Murillo, Interfacial mixing in high-energy-density matter with a multiphysics kinetic model, *Phys. Rev. E* **96**, 063310 (2017).
  - [12] A. V. Bobylev, M. Bisi, M. Groppi, G. Spiga, and I. F. Potapenko, A general consistent BGK model for gas mixtures, *Kinet. Relat. Mod.* **11**, 1377 (2018).
  - [13] J. Haack, C. Hauck, C. Klingenberg, N. Pirner, and S. Warnecke, A consistent BGK model with velocity-dependent collision frequency for gas mixtures, *J. Stat. Phys.* **184**, 31 (2021).
  - [14] J. Haack, C. D. Hauck, C. F. Klingenberg, M. Pirner, and S. Warnecke, Numerical schemes for a multi-species BGK model with velocity-dependent collision frequency, *J. Comput. Phys.* **473**, 111729 (2023).
  - [15] M. Pirner and S. Warnecke, A review on a general multi-species BGK model: Modelling, theory and numerics, in *From Kinetic Theory to Turbulence Modeling*, Springer INdAM Series, Vol. 51, edited by P. Barbante, F. D. Belgiorio, S. Lorenzani, and L. Valdettaro (Springer Nature, Singapore, 2022) pp. 217–231.
  - [16] D. Enskog, Kinetische theorie der wärmeleitung, reibung und selbstdiffusion in gewissen verdichteten gasen und flüssigkeiten., *Kungl. Svenska Vetenskaps Akad. Handl.* **63**, 1 (1922).
  - [17] H. van Beijeren and M. H. Ernst, The modified Enskog equation, *Physica* **68**, 437 (1973).
  - [18] H. van Beijeren and M. H. Ernst, The modified enskog equation for mixtures, *Physica* **70**, 225 (1973).
  - [19] P. Résibois and M. Leener, *Classical kinetic theory of*

- fluids* (Wiley, New York NY, 1977).
- [20] J. R. Dorfman and H. van Beijeren, The kinetic theory of gases, in *Modern Theoretical Chemistry*, Statistical Mechanics B, Vol. 6, edited by B. J. Berne (Plenum, New York, 1977).
- [21] C. Klingenberg, M. Pirner, and G. Puppo, A consistent kinetic model for a two-component mixture with an application to plasma, *Kinet. Relat. Mod.* **10**, 445 (2017).
- [22] J. H. Ferziger and H. G. Kaper, *Mathematical theory of transport processes in gases* (Elsevier, New York, 1972).
- [23] P. Lidon, E. Perrot, and A. D. Stroock, Nonisothermal effects on water potential measurement in a simple geometry, *Phys. Rev. Fluids* **6**, 023801 (2021).
- [24] E. S. Benilov, The multicomponent diffuse-interface model and its application to water/air interfaces, *J. Fluid. Mech.* **954**, A41 (2023).