

Drag reduction in surfactant-contaminated superhydrophobic channels at high Péclet numbers

Samuel D. Tomlinson¹†, Frédéric Gibou², Paolo Luzzatto-Fegiz²,
Fernando Temprano-Colet^{3,4}, Oliver E. Jensen¹ and Julien R.
Landel^{1,5}

¹Department of Mathematics, University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester, M13 9PL, UK

²Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106, USA

³Andlinger Center for Energy and the Environment, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA

⁴Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA

⁵Universite Claude Bernard Lyon 1, Laboratoire de Mecanique des Fluides et d'Acoustique (LMFA), UMR5509, CNRS, Ecole Centrale de Lyon, INSA Lyon, 69622 Villeurbanne, France

(Received xx; revised xx; accepted xx)

Motivated by microfluidic applications, we investigate drag reduction in laminar pressure-driven flows in channels with streamwise-periodic superhydrophobic surfaces (SHSs) that are contaminated with soluble surfactant. We develop a model in the long-wave and weak-diffusion limit, where the streamwise SHS period is large compared to the channel height and the Péclet number is large. Employing asymptotic and numerical techniques, we determine the drag due to surfactant in terms of the relative strength of diffusion, Marangoni effects and bulk–surface exchange. In scenarios with strong bulk–surface exchange, the drag reduction exhibits a complex dependence on the thickness of the bulk-concentration boundary layer and surfactant strength. Strong Marangoni effects immobilise the interface through a linear surfactant distribution, whereas weak Marangoni effects yield a quasi-stagnant cap with an intricate asymptotic structure that is mediated by weak bulk diffusion. As bulk–surface exchange weakens, the bulk and interface decouple: the surfactant distribution is linear when the surfactant is strong and forms a classical stagnant cap when the surfactant is weak. The asymptotic solutions offer closed-form predictions of drag reduction across much of parameter space, providing practical utility and enhancing understanding of surfactant dynamics in flows over SHSs.

Key words: Marangoni convection, drag reduction, microfluidics

1. Introduction

Superhydrophobic surfaces (SHSs) offer a promising avenue for decreasing drag in laminar and turbulent flows (Lee *et al.* 2016; Park *et al.* 2021). Hydrophobic chemistry and microscopic topography on the SHSs entrap gas bubbles that lubricate

† Email address for correspondence: samuel.tomlinson@manchester.ac.uk

the flow and decrease the wall-average shear stress compared to solid walls. This design presents numerous opportunities for industrial and environmental applications, including enhanced cooling (Lam *et al.* 2015) and reduced emissions (Xu *et al.* 2020). Consequently, SHSs have gathered significant attention in the academic literature (Schönecker *et al.* 2014; Park *et al.* 2014; Türk *et al.* 2014; Cheng *et al.* 2015; Seo & Mani 2018; Rastegari & Akhavan 2019; Kirk *et al.* 2020; Landel *et al.* 2020; Tomlinson *et al.* 2023b). However, recent investigations have highlighted potential challenges. Interfacial displacement and deflection (Ng & Wang 2009; Teo & Khoo 2010), gas-phase flow dynamics (Game *et al.* 2017) and heat- and surfactant-induced Marangoni stresses (Peaudecerf *et al.* 2017; Kirk *et al.* 2020) have been shown to impede the anticipated drag reduction. Consequently, in certain applications, SHSs may not outperform solid walls. In this study, we assess the drag reduction in a surfactant-contaminated flow, confined between a SHS and a solid wall, in the practically important (but computationally challenging) singular limit in which molecular diffusion is weak.

Surfactants have been measured in both artificial (Hourlier-Fargette *et al.* 2018; Temprano-Coleto *et al.* 2023) and natural (Pereira *et al.* 2018; Frossard *et al.* 2019) environments. When a liquid flow becomes contaminated with soluble surfactant, these chemical compounds are transported throughout the flow, adsorbing onto interfaces and desorbing into the bulk. The surfactant distribution within the bulk is regulated by the bulk Péclet number (Pe), forming concentration boundary layers when Pe is large. As the flow carries surfactant towards the downstream stagnation point of an interface, it accumulates, forming a concentration gradient. Depending on factors such as the flow properties, surfactant characteristics and geometry, the resulting adverse Marangoni force can cause the theoretically shear-free interface to behave like a no-slip wall (Peaudecerf *et al.* 2017). Experimental support for this mechanism can be found in studies by Kim & Hidrovo (2012), Bolognesi *et al.* (2014), Schäffel *et al.* (2016), Peaudecerf *et al.* (2017), Song *et al.* (2018) and Temprano-Coleto *et al.* (2023).

Peaudecerf *et al.* (2017) and Landel *et al.* (2020) conducted numerical simulations of a two-dimensional (2D) channel flow featuring streamwise-periodic SHSs using COMSOL, employing surfactant properties that are characteristic of sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS). Temprano-Coleto *et al.* (2023) extended this methodology to encompass a three-dimensional (3D) channel flow featuring streamwise and spanwise-periodic SHSs. Sundin & Bagheri (2022) investigated 2D channel flow over streamwise-periodic liquid-infused surfaces (LISs). In all of the configurations considered above, simulations of the Navier–Stokes equations and advection–diffusion equations for bulk and interfacial surfactant incurred substantial computational costs, particularly in the high-Péclet-number regime, where bulk-concentration boundary layers are thin. In contrast, we introduce below a numerical method based on long-wave theory, offering simplicity and a reduced computational demand compared to full simulations. We supplement the numerics with asymptotic approximations exploiting the boundary-layer structure of high-Péclet-number flows. This combined approach allows for a detailed exploration of the parameter space.

Scaling theories have been developed to analyse the slip length over SHSs and LISs with streamwise-periodic gratings (Landel *et al.* 2020; Sundin & Bagheri 2022) and SHSs with streamwise and spanwise-periodic gratings (Temprano-Coleto *et al.* 2023). These theories typically assume small surfactant concentrations and uniform shear stresses at the interface. At high Péclet numbers, Landel *et al.* (2020) established a relationship between the slip length and surfactant parameters, grating length and boundary-layer thickness. For common surfactants like SDS, Temprano-Coleto *et al.* (2023) demonstrated a significant slip length when the grating length exceeds a modified depletion length and a mobilization

length. The modified depletion length depends on the bulk-concentration boundary-layer thickness and interfacial Péclet numbers, while the mobilisation length depends on the normalised surfactant concentration and Marangoni number. Landel *et al.* (2020), Temprano-Coleto *et al.* (2023) and Sundin & Bagheri (2022) used numerical simulations to calibrate the empirical coefficients linked to the bulk-concentration boundary-layer thickness. Unlike these prior studies, we bypass the need for empirical coefficient fitting and expensive numerical simulations. This allows us to re-assess the slip-length scalings outlined by Landel *et al.* (2020) and Temprano-Coleto *et al.* (2023).

Tomlinson *et al.* (2023*a*) developed an asymptotic theory for laminar channel flow featuring streamwise and spanwise-periodic grooves and then investigated the impact of spatio-temporal fluctuations in surfactant concentration over the SHS (Tomlinson *et al.* 2024). Their theory assumed that the channel is long and bulk diffusion is strong enough to eliminate cross-channel concentration gradients. This 1D long-wave model accommodated non-uniform shear stresses at the interface and enabled an analysis of the soluble stagnant-cap regime at low bulk Péclet numbers. Similar stagnant-cap scenarios, where there is no adsorption at the upstream end of the interface, were studied by Baier & Hardt (2021) and Mayer & Crowdy (2022) in the context of insoluble surfactant-contaminated SHSs, with a linear and nonlinear equation of state, respectively. These studies were extended to include protrusion at the liquid-gas interface, where Baier & Hardt (2022) found recirculating interfacial flows, which Rodriguez-Broadbent & Crowdy (2023) showed lead to an immobilised effective slip length. The amount of surfactant at the interface must be prescribed for insoluble surfactants, whereas for soluble surfactants it is mediated by bulk diffusion, which allows the cap to come into equilibrium with the bulk concentration. The numerical simulations performed at moderate bulk Péclet number in Sundin & Bagheri (2022) show adsorption at the upstream end of the partial stagnant cap, but they did not offer a scaling theory for this regime. Crowdy *et al.* (2023) investigated a linear extensional flow between two fluids. Assuming that Pe is zero, they showed that solubility and strong exchange with the bulk can reduce the length of the stagnant cap and make the interface less immobile. We will show below how similar “remobilisation” due to strong bulk-surface exchange arises when Pe is large. We employ long-wave and boundary-layer theory in this study to describe surfactant-contaminated SHSs at high bulk Péclet numbers, revealing the coupling between the bulk concentration boundary layer and the underlying interface, which is particularly intricate when Marangoni effects are weak.

Tomlinson *et al.* (2023*a*) delineated an asymptotic description of the parameter space, identifying three key regions: one dominated by Marangoni effects, with minimal drag reduction, and others dominated by advection and diffusion, with significant drag reduction. They also identified when their 1D long-wave model first breaks down due to 2D effects. In this paper, we employ a combination of asymptotic and numerical methods to investigate the impact of soluble surfactant on a laminar pressure-driven channel flow confined between a streamwise-periodic SHS and a solid wall. We assume that the period of the SHS is significantly longer than the height of the channel and that the bulk and surface Péclet numbers are large. The 2D long-wave model encompasses a weak-diffusion regime, where thin surfactant boundary layers can cause numerical difficulties. However, the resolution of these boundary layers is crucial for precise drag-reduction predictions. To address these challenges and accurately predict drag reduction in the high-Péclet-number limit, we develop asymptotic solutions for the bulk-concentration boundary layer under conditions of weak diffusion. These asymptotic solutions have an intricate boundary-layer structure and may offer valuable insights into a broader spectrum of surfactant-contaminated flows (e.g., drops and bubbles, as discussed in §5). Additionally,

the numerical methodology provides a cost-effective alternative to expensive numerical simulations of the Navier–Stokes and advection–diffusion equations. We construct a set of simple asymptotic expressions for the key quantities of interest in practical applications, such as the slip length and drag reduction, spanning the entire parameter space and not necessitating fitting empirical coefficients. These asymptotic expressions not only aid in understanding the physics of surfactant-contaminated flows over SHSs but also facilitate the prediction of the slip length and drag reduction in experiments. In some experiments, the numerical methodology presented in this study and numerical simulations of the Navier–Stokes and advection–diffusion equations may be prohibitively expensive.

In §2, we formulate the 2D problem. We non-dimensionalise the fluid and surfactant equations in the long-wave limit and derive 1D and 2D long-wave models for bulk and interfacial surfactant behaviour. In §3, we present our main numerical findings. We analyse the drag reduction and compare the flow and surfactant fields with results obtained from COMSOL simulations. In §4, we derive our asymptotic results. We find analytical solutions for the surfactant distribution and drag reduction in both high-slip and low-slip regimes. In §5, we illustrate the uses of our study. We discuss the key asymptotic results and utilise experimental studies in the literature to illustrate how our model predictions can be used in practical laboratory testing of SHSs.

2. Formulation

2.1. Governing equations of the 2D model

We explore a steady 2D laminar pressure-driven channel flow contaminated with soluble surfactant, confined between a streamwise-periodic SHS and a solid wall (see figure 1). The streamwise and wall-normal directions are represented by \hat{x} - and \hat{y} -coordinates respectively, where hats indicate dimensional quantities. Assuming the fluid to be incompressible and Newtonian, we define the velocity field $\hat{\mathbf{u}} = (\hat{u}(\hat{x}, \hat{y}), \hat{v}(\hat{x}, \hat{y}))$, pressure field $\hat{p} = \hat{p}(\hat{x}, \hat{y})$, bulk surfactant concentration $\hat{c} = \hat{c}(\hat{x}, \hat{y})$ and interfacial surfactant concentration $\hat{\Gamma} = \hat{\Gamma}(\hat{x})$. Due to the periodicity of the SHS in the streamwise direction, our analysis focuses on a single periodic cell with dimensions $2\hat{P}$ in length and $2\hat{H}$ in height. At $\hat{y} = 0$, there is a solid ridge of length $2(1-\phi)\hat{P}$ and a liquid-gas interface, or plastron, of length $2\phi\hat{P}$, where ϕ is the gas fraction. The interface is assumed to be flat. There is a solid boundary at $\hat{y} = 2\hat{H}$. The periodic domain is partitioned into two subdomains,

$$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_1 = \{\hat{x} \in [-\phi\hat{P}, \phi\hat{P}]\} \times \{\hat{y} \in [0, 2\hat{H}]\}, \quad (2.1a)$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_2 = \{\hat{x} \in [\phi\hat{P}, (2-\phi)\hat{P}]\} \times \{\hat{y} \in [0, 2\hat{H}]\}, \quad (2.1b)$$

as illustrated in figure 1.

A comprehensive discussion of the equations governing fluid and surfactant behaviour in a 3D geometry featuring streamwise- and spanwise-periodic SHSs was presented in Tomlinson *et al.* (2023a). Here, we provide a succinct overview of the model for a streamwise-periodic SHS in 2D. Within domains $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_1$ and $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_2$, we have Stokes equations with an advection–diffusion equation for bulk surfactant

$$\hat{\nabla} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{u}} = 0, \quad \hat{\mu} \hat{\nabla}^2 \hat{\mathbf{u}} - \hat{\nabla} \hat{p} = \mathbf{0}, \quad \hat{D} \hat{\nabla}^2 \hat{c} - \hat{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \hat{\nabla} \hat{c} = 0, \quad (2.2a-c)$$

where $\hat{\mu}$ is the dynamic viscosity and \hat{D} is the bulk diffusivity. Linearising the equation of state, we assume $\hat{\sigma}_{\hat{x}} = -\hat{A}\hat{\Gamma}_{\hat{x}}$, where $\hat{\sigma}$ is the surface tension and \hat{A} is the surface activity. For $\hat{x} \in [-\phi\hat{P}, \phi\hat{P}]$ and $\hat{y} = 0$, we impose the tangential stress balance, no-penetration, linear adsorption-desorption kinetics and an advection–diffusion equation for interfacial




FIGURE 1. A 2D laminar pressure-driven channel flow transporting soluble surfactant confined between a streamwise-periodic SHS and solid wall. We position the origin of the Cartesian coordinate system, (\hat{x}, \hat{y}) , at the centre of the liquid–gas interface. Each periodic cell has channel height $2\hat{H}$ and period length $2\hat{P}$. The SHS, characterised by gas fraction ϕ , has an interface region of length $2\phi\hat{P}$ and a solid region of length $2(1-\phi)\hat{P}$; the area above these regions defines subdomains \hat{D}_1 and \hat{D}_2 respectively, as specified in (2.1).

surfactant

$$\hat{\mu}\hat{u}_{\hat{y}} - \hat{A}\hat{\Gamma}_{\hat{x}} = 0, \quad \hat{v} = 0, \quad \hat{D}\hat{c}_{\hat{y}} - \hat{K}_a\hat{c} + \hat{K}_d\hat{\Gamma} = 0, \\ \hat{D}_I\hat{\Gamma}_{\hat{x}\hat{x}} + \hat{K}_a\hat{c} - \hat{K}_d\hat{\Gamma} - (\hat{u}\hat{\Gamma})_{\hat{x}} = 0, \quad (2.3a-d)$$

where \hat{D}_I is the interfacial diffusivity, \hat{K}_a is the adsorption rate and \hat{K}_d is the desorption rate. At $\hat{x} = \pm\phi\hat{P}$ and $\hat{y} = 0$, there is no flux of surfactant,

$$\hat{u}\hat{\Gamma} - \hat{D}_I\hat{\Gamma}_{\hat{x}} = 0. \quad (2.4)$$

For $\hat{x} \in [\phi\hat{P}, (2-\phi)\hat{P}]$ and $\hat{y} = 0$, and likewise for $\hat{x} \in [-\phi\hat{P}, (2-\phi)\hat{P}]$ and $\hat{y} = 2\hat{H}$, we impose no slip, no penetration and no flux of surfactant

$$\hat{u} = 0, \quad \hat{v} = 0, \quad \hat{c}_{\hat{y}} = 0. \quad (2.5a-c)$$

For $\hat{\mathbf{q}} \equiv (\hat{u}, \hat{p}_{\hat{x}}, \hat{c})$, continuity and periodicity conditions on bulk quantities are given by

$$\hat{\mathbf{q}}((\phi\hat{P})^-, \hat{y}) = \hat{\mathbf{q}}((\phi\hat{P})^+, \hat{y}), \quad \hat{\mathbf{q}}(-\phi\hat{P}, \hat{y}) = \hat{\mathbf{q}}((2-\phi)\hat{P}, \hat{y}), \quad (2.6)$$

where the superscript $-$ ($+$) indicates evaluation in \hat{D}_1 (\hat{D}_2). Within \hat{D}_1 , the bulk surfactant equations and boundary conditions (2.2c, 2.3c, 2.5c) can be combined to give

$$\frac{d}{d\hat{x}} \int_0^{2\hat{H}} (\hat{u}\hat{c} - \hat{D}\hat{c}_{\hat{x}}) d\hat{y} - (\hat{K}_d\hat{\Gamma} - \hat{K}_a\hat{c}) = 0, \quad (2.7)$$

which, combined with the interfacial surfactant equation (2.3d) leads to an expression for the total flux of surfactant, \hat{K} , which must be uniform

$$\int_0^{2\hat{H}} (\hat{u}\hat{c} - \hat{D}\hat{c}_{\hat{x}}) d\hat{y} + (\hat{u}\hat{\Gamma} - \hat{D}_I\hat{\Gamma}_{\hat{x}}) = \hat{K}. \quad (2.8)$$

Integrating the interfacial surfactant equation (2.3d) over the plastron and utilizing the no-flux condition (2.4) yields a constraint on net adsorption and desorption

$$\int_{-\phi\hat{P}}^{\phi\hat{P}} (\hat{K}_d\hat{\Gamma} - \hat{K}_a\hat{c}) d\hat{x} = 0. \quad (2.9)$$

Similarly, within $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_2$, (2.3c, 2.5c) can be combined to give

$$\int_0^{2\hat{H}} (\hat{u}\hat{c} - \hat{D}\hat{c}_{\hat{x}}) d\hat{y} = \hat{K}. \quad (2.10)$$

The volume flux of fluid in $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_1$ and $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_2$, \hat{Q} , is also uniform, where

$$\hat{Q} = \int_0^{2\hat{H}} \hat{u} d\hat{y}. \quad (2.11)$$

The fluxes \hat{Q} and \hat{K} are prescribed in this model.

The flow is driven in the streamwise direction by a cross-channel-averaged pressure drop per period, $\Delta\hat{p} \equiv \langle \hat{p} \rangle(-\phi\hat{P}) - \langle \hat{p} \rangle((2-\phi)\hat{P}) > 0$, where $\langle \cdot \rangle \equiv \int_0^{2\hat{H}} \cdot d\hat{y} / (2\hat{H})$. We define the normalised drag reduction

$$DR = \frac{\Delta\hat{p}_I - \Delta\hat{p}}{\Delta\hat{p}_I - \Delta\hat{p}_U}, \quad (2.12)$$

where $\Delta\hat{p} = \Delta\hat{p}_I$ when the interface is immobilised due to surfactant ($DR = 0$) and $\Delta\hat{p} = \Delta\hat{p}_U$ when the interface is unaffected by surfactant ($DR = 1$). We aim to determine the dependence of DR on the dimensional parameters of the problem (ϕ , \hat{P} , \hat{H} , $\hat{\mu}$, \hat{D} , \hat{A} , \hat{D}_I , \hat{K}_a , \hat{K}_d , \hat{K} and \hat{Q}) in the high-Péclet-number regime.

2.2. Non-dimensionalisation

We non-dimensionalise the governing equations (2.1)–(2.12) using \hat{Q}/\hat{H} for the velocity scale, \hat{K}/\hat{Q} for the bulk concentration scale and $\hat{K}_a\hat{K}/(\hat{K}_d\hat{Q})$ for the interfacial concentration scale. We write

$$x = \frac{\hat{x}}{\hat{P}}, \quad y = \frac{\hat{y}}{\epsilon\hat{P}}, \quad u = \frac{\hat{u}}{\hat{Q}/\hat{H}}, \quad v = \frac{\hat{v}}{\epsilon\hat{Q}/\hat{H}},$$

$$p = \frac{\hat{p}}{\hat{\mu}\hat{Q}/(\epsilon\hat{H}^2)}, \quad c = \frac{\hat{c}}{\hat{K}/\hat{Q}}, \quad \Gamma = \frac{\hat{\Gamma}}{\hat{K}_a\hat{K}/(\hat{K}_d\hat{Q})}, \quad (2.13a-g)$$

where $\epsilon \equiv \hat{H}/\hat{P}$ is the slenderness parameter. For $\epsilon \ll 1$, this non-dimensionalisation results in a long-wave theory in the streamwise direction with a dominant streamwise flow. The subdomains (2.1) become

$$\mathcal{D}_1 = \{x \in [-\phi, \phi]\} \times \{y \in [0, 2]\}, \quad (2.14a)$$

$$\mathcal{D}_2 = \{x \in [\phi, 2-\phi]\} \times \{y \in [0, 2]\}. \quad (2.14b)$$

In \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 , the bulk equations (2.2) become

$$u_x + v_y = 0, \quad \epsilon^2 u_{xx} + u_{yy} - p_x = 0,$$

$$\epsilon^4 v_{xx} + \epsilon^2 v_{yy} - p_y = 0, \quad (\epsilon^2 c_{xx} + c_{yy})/Pe - \epsilon u c_x - \epsilon v c_y = 0, \quad (2.15a-d)$$

with $Pe = \hat{Q}/\hat{D}$ the bulk Péclet number. For $x \in [-\phi, \phi]$ and $y = 0$, the interface conditions (2.3) give

$$u_y - \epsilon Ma \Gamma_x = 0, \quad v = 0, \quad c_y - Da(c - \Gamma) = 0,$$

$$\epsilon^2 \Gamma_{xx}/Pe_I + Bi(c - \Gamma) - \epsilon(u\Gamma)_x = 0, \quad (2.16a-d)$$

with $Ma = \hat{A}\hat{K}_a\hat{K}\hat{H}/(\hat{\mu}\hat{K}_d\hat{Q}^2)$ the Marangoni number, $Da = \hat{K}_a\hat{H}/\hat{D}$ the Damköhler number, $Pe_I = \hat{Q}/\hat{D}_I$ the interfacial Péclet number and $Bi = \hat{K}_d\hat{H}^2/\hat{Q}$ the Biot number.

At $x = \pm\phi$ and $y = 0$, the no-flux condition (2.4) becomes

$$u\Gamma - \epsilon\Gamma_x/Pe_I = 0. \quad (2.17)$$

For $x \in [\phi, 2 - \phi]$ and $y = 0$ (and for $x \in [-\phi, 2 - \phi]$ and $y = 2$), the solid boundary conditions (2.5) give

$$u = 0, \quad v = 0, \quad c_y = 0. \quad (2.18a-d)$$

For $\mathbf{q} = (\mathbf{u}, p_x, c)$, the matching conditions (2.6) become

$$\mathbf{q}(\phi^-, y) = \mathbf{q}(\phi^+, y), \quad \mathbf{q}(-\phi, y) = \mathbf{q}(2 - \phi, y). \quad (2.19a, b)$$

For $x \in [-\phi, 2 - \phi]$, the surfactant-flux conditions (2.7)–(2.10) yield

$$\frac{d}{dx} \int_0^2 \left(uc - \frac{\epsilon c_x}{Pe} \right) dy - \frac{Da}{\epsilon Pe} (\Gamma - c) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_1, \quad (2.20a)$$

$$\int_0^2 \left(uc - \frac{\epsilon c_x}{Pe} \right) dy + \frac{Da}{Bi Pe} \left(u\Gamma - \frac{\epsilon\Gamma_x}{Pe_I} \right) = 1 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_1, \quad (2.20b)$$

$$\int_{-\phi}^{\phi} (\Gamma - c) dx = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_1, \quad (2.20c)$$

$$\int_0^2 \left(uc - \frac{\epsilon c_x}{Pe} \right) dy = 1 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_2, \quad (2.20d)$$

and in \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 , the volume-flux condition (2.11) gives

$$\int_0^2 u dy = 1. \quad (2.21)$$

Finally, the drag reduction (2.12) becomes

$$DR = \frac{\Delta p_I - \Delta p}{\Delta p_I - \Delta p_U}, \quad (2.22)$$

where $\Delta p \equiv \langle p \rangle(-\phi) - \langle p \rangle(2 - \phi)$ and $\langle \cdot \rangle \equiv \int_0^2 \cdot dy/2$.

In the limit $\epsilon \ll 1$, we proceed to solve the leading-order boundary-value problem and flux constraints defined in (2.15)–(2.21) for u, v, p, c and Γ using asymptotic and numerical methods. Subsequently, we evaluate the drag reduction (2.22) and investigate its dependence on the seven dimensionless groups ($\epsilon, Pe, Ma, Pe_I, Bi, Da$ and ϕ) that characterise the geometry, flow, liquid and surfactant. Moreover, full solutions of (2.15)–(2.21) obtained as COMSOL simulations are presented in §3 below.

2.3. The long-wave limit of the 2D model at high Péclet numbers

We investigate distinguished limits of (2.15)–(2.21) to uncover different physical balances. We assume that $1/Pe = O(\epsilon)$, $1/Pe_I = O(\epsilon)$, $Bi = O(\epsilon)$, $Da = O(1)$ and $Ma = O(1/\epsilon)$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, denoting this as the “2D long-wave model” in which streamwise and cross-channel concentration gradients are comparable at leading order. We rescale $1/Pe = \epsilon/\mathcal{P}$, $1/Pe_I = \epsilon/\mathcal{P}_I$, $Bi = \epsilon\mathcal{B}$ and $Ma = \mathcal{M}/\epsilon$, assuming that $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{P}_I, \mathcal{B}$ and \mathcal{M} remain $O(1)$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. We substitute the expansions

$$(u, v, p, c, \Gamma) = (u_0, v_0, p_0, c_0, \Gamma_0) + \epsilon^2(u_1, v_1, p_1, c_1, \Gamma_1) + \dots, \quad (2.23)$$

into the governing equations (2.15)–(2.22) and take the leading-order approximation.

In \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 , the streamwise flow is driven by the pressure gradient, and wall-normal

diffusion is comparable to advection. The bulk equations (2.15) become

$$u_{0x} + v_{0y} = 0, \quad u_{0yy} - p_{0x} = 0, \quad p_{0y} = 0, \quad c_{0yy}/\mathcal{P} - u_0 c_{0x} + v_0 c_{0y} = 0. \quad (2.24a-d)$$

For $x \in [-\phi, \phi]$ and $y = 0$, the interfacial flow is inhibited by the surfactant gradient and exchange is comparable to advection. The interface conditions (2.16) yield

$$u_{0y} - \mathcal{M}\Gamma_{0x} = 0, \quad v_0 = 0, \quad c_{0y} - Da(c_0 - \Gamma_0) = 0, \\ \mathcal{B}(c_0 - \Gamma_0) - (u_0\Gamma_0)_x = 0. \quad (2.25a-d)$$

For $x \in [\phi, 2 - \phi]$ and $y = 0$ (and for $x \in [-\phi, 2 - \phi]$ and $y = 2$), the solid wall boundary conditions (2.18) become

$$u_0 = 0, \quad v_0 = 0, \quad c_{0y} = 0. \quad (2.26a-c)$$

Short 2D Stokes-flow regions arise at the junctions between \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 . In the present long-wave theory, in which surface diffusion appears at the next order, we impose the no-flux condition (2.17) at $x = \pm\phi$ and $y = 0$,

$$u_0\Gamma_0 = 0. \quad (2.27)$$

Continuity of bulk concentration (2.19) between \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 requires

$$c_0(\phi^-, y) = c_0(\phi^+, y), \quad c_0(-\phi, y) = c_0(2 - \phi, y). \quad (2.28a, b)$$

In §3, comparison with COMSOL simulations will allow us to investigate the effect of these Stokes-flow regions. Streamwise surfactant transport in the bulk and interface is dominated by advection and exchange, so (2.20) becomes

$$\frac{d}{dx} \int_0^2 u_0 c_0 dy - \frac{Da}{\mathcal{P}} (\Gamma_0 - c_0) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_1, \quad (2.29a)$$

$$\int_0^2 u_0 c_0 dy + \frac{Da}{\mathcal{B}\mathcal{P}} (u_0\Gamma_0) = 1 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_1, \quad (2.29b)$$

$$\int_{-\phi}^{\phi} (\Gamma_0 - c_0) dx = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_1, \quad (2.29c)$$

$$\int_0^2 u_0 c_0 dy = 1 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_2. \quad (2.29d)$$

In \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 , the volume-flux condition (2.21) gives

$$\int_0^2 u_0 dy = 1. \quad (2.30)$$

The leading-order drag reduction (2.22) is given by

$$DR_0 = \frac{\Delta p_I - \Delta p_0}{\Delta p_I - \Delta p_U}. \quad (2.31)$$

The leading-order pressure field simplifies to $p_0 = p_0(x)$ using the wall-normal equation (2.24c). The streamwise velocity field is driven by the pressure gradient p_{0x} and is inhibited by the surfactant gradient Γ_{0x} . Using linear superposition, we can write

$$u_0 = \tilde{U}p_{0x} + \mathcal{M}\bar{U}\Gamma_{0x} \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_1, \quad u_0 = \check{U}p_{0x} \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_2, \quad (2.32a, b)$$

where $\tilde{U} \equiv y^2/2 - 2$, $\bar{U} \equiv y - 2$ and $\check{U} \equiv y^2/2 - y$ are velocity contributions that are found by solving the following boundary-value problems:

$$\tilde{U}_{yy} = 1, \quad \text{subject to } \tilde{U}_y(0) = 0, \quad \tilde{U}(2) = 0, \quad (2.33a-c)$$

Coefficient	Name	Definition	Physical interpretation
α	Bulk diffusion coefficient	$\frac{1}{\epsilon Pe} \equiv \frac{\hat{D}\hat{P}}{\hat{Q}\hat{H}}$	$\frac{\text{Bulk diffusion}}{\text{Bulk advection}}$
β	Partition coefficient	$\frac{Da}{BiPe} \equiv \frac{\hat{K}_a}{\hat{H}\hat{K}_d}$	$\frac{\text{Adsorption}}{\text{Desorption}}$
γ	Surfactant strength	$\frac{\epsilon Ma Da}{BiPe} \equiv \frac{\hat{A}\hat{H}\hat{K}\hat{K}_a^2}{\hat{\mu}\hat{K}_d^2\hat{P}\hat{Q}^2}$	$\frac{\text{Marangoni effects}}{\text{Interfacial advection}}$
δ	Interfacial diffusion coefficient	$\frac{Da}{\epsilon BiPePe_I} \equiv \frac{\hat{D}_I\hat{K}_a\hat{P}}{\hat{H}^2\hat{K}_d\hat{Q}}$	$\frac{\text{Interfacial diffusion}}{\text{Interfacial advection}}$
ν	Exchange strength	$\frac{Da}{\epsilon Pe} \equiv \frac{\hat{K}_a\hat{P}}{\hat{Q}}$	$\frac{\text{Adsorption}}{\text{Bulk advection}}$

TABLE 1. A summary of the transport coefficients in the 2D long-wave model, (2.38)–(2.42), with their definition and physical interpretation. The transport coefficients α , β , γ , δ and ν are written in terms of Pe , Da , Bi , Ma , Pe_I and ϵ defined in §2.2. Compared to the 3D transport coefficients in Tomlinson *et al.* (2023a), $\alpha_{3D} \propto \epsilon^2\alpha$, $\beta_{3D} \propto \beta$, $\gamma_{3D} \propto \gamma$, $\delta_{3D} \propto \epsilon^2\delta$ and $\nu_{3D} \propto \epsilon^2\nu$.

$$\bar{U}_{yy} = 0, \quad \text{subject to} \quad \bar{U}_y(0) = 1, \quad \bar{U}(2) = 0, \quad (2.34a-c)$$

$$\check{U}_{yy} = 1, \quad \text{subject to} \quad \check{U}(0) = 0, \quad \check{U}(2) = 0. \quad (2.35a-c)$$

Substituting (2.32) into (2.30), we obtain

$$\tilde{Q}p_{0x} + \mathcal{M}\bar{Q}\Gamma_{0x} = 1 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_1, \quad \check{Q}p_{0x} = 1 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_2, \quad (2.36a, b)$$

where $\tilde{Q} \equiv -8/3$, $\bar{Q} \equiv -2$ and $\check{Q} \equiv -2/3$. Using the continuity equation (2.24a), the wall-normal velocity field is forced by p_{0xx} and Γ_{0xx} , with velocity contributions that complement those given in (2.32)–(2.34),

$$v_0 = \tilde{V}p_{0xx} + \mathcal{M}\bar{V}\Gamma_{0xx} \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_1, \quad v_0 = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_2, \quad (2.37a, b)$$

where $\tilde{V} \equiv -y^3/6 + 2y$ and $\bar{V} \equiv -y^2/2 + 2y$ (so that $\tilde{V}_y = -\tilde{U}$, $\tilde{V}(0) = 0$, $\bar{V}_y = -\bar{U}$, $\bar{V}(0) = 0$). The no-penetration condition (2.26b) is satisfied, as $v_0(2) = \tilde{V}(2)p_{0xx} + \mathcal{M}\bar{V}(2)\Gamma_{0xx} = -\check{Q}p_{0xx} - \mathcal{M}\check{Q}\Gamma_{0xx} = 0$, using the velocity-flux condition (2.36a).

We substitute (2.32, 2.37) into the bulk and interfacial surfactant equations (2.24)–(2.29) to derive the 2D long-wave model. To facilitate the numerical computation of the 2D long-wave model, we retain $O(\epsilon^2)$ bulk and interfacial streamwise diffusion operators to make the problem more elliptic, simplifying the continuity conditions and smoothing the flow between \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 , later seeking the limit in which these effects are weak. The bulk surfactant equation (2.24c) gives

$$\alpha(\epsilon^2 c_{0xx} + c_{0yy}) - \left(\frac{3}{4} - \frac{3y^2}{16}\right)c_{0x} - \frac{\gamma}{\beta} \left(-\frac{1}{2} + y - \frac{3y^2}{8}\right)\Gamma_{0x}c_{0x} - \frac{\gamma}{\beta} \left(\frac{y}{2} - \frac{y^2}{2} + \frac{y^3}{8}\right)\Gamma_{0xx}c_{0y} = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_1, \quad (2.38a)$$

$$\alpha(\epsilon^2 c_{0xx} + c_{0yy}) - \left(\frac{3y}{2} - \frac{3y^2}{4}\right)c_{0x} = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_2, \quad (2.38b)$$

where α , β and γ are given in table 1. This table defines the five primary parameter

combinations that we use below and gives their physical interpretation. For $x \in [-\phi, \phi]$ and $y = 0$, the continuity of surfactant flux boundary condition and the interfacial surfactant equation (2.25c, d) become

$$c_{0y} - \frac{\nu}{\alpha}(c_0 - \Gamma_0) = 0, \quad \nu(c_0 - \Gamma_0) - \frac{3}{4}\beta\Gamma_{0x} + \frac{1}{2}\gamma(\Gamma_{0x}\Gamma_0)_x + \epsilon^2\delta\Gamma_{0xx} = 0, \quad (2.39a, b)$$

where ν and δ are given in table 1. At $x = \pm\phi$ and $y = 0$, no flux of interfacial surfactant (2.27) gives

$$\frac{3}{4}\beta\Gamma_0 - \frac{1}{2}\gamma\Gamma_{0x}\Gamma_0 - \epsilon^2\delta\Gamma_{0x} = 0. \quad (2.40)$$

For $x \in [\phi, 2-\phi]$ and $y = 0$ (and for $x \in [-\phi, 2-\phi]$ and $y = 2$), no flux of bulk surfactant (2.26c) becomes

$$c_{0y} = 0. \quad (2.41)$$

The surfactant-flux conditions (2.29a, b, d) become

$$\frac{d}{dx} \int_0^2 \left(\left(\frac{3}{4} - \frac{3y^2}{16} \right) c_0 + \frac{\gamma}{\beta} \left(-\frac{1}{2} + y - \frac{3y^2}{8} \right) \Gamma_{0x} c_0 - \epsilon^2 \alpha c_{0x} \right) dy - \nu(\Gamma_0 - c_0) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_1, \quad (2.42a)$$

$$\int_0^2 \left(\left(\frac{3}{4} - \frac{3y^2}{16} \right) c_0 + \frac{\gamma}{\beta} \left(-\frac{1}{2} + y - \frac{3y^2}{8} \right) \Gamma_{0x} c_0 - \epsilon^2 \alpha c_{0x} \right) dy + \frac{3}{4}\beta\Gamma_0 - \frac{1}{2}\gamma\Gamma_{0x}\Gamma_0 - \epsilon^2\delta\Gamma_{0x} = 1 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_1, \quad (2.42b)$$

$$\int_0^2 \left(\left(\frac{3y}{2} - \frac{3y^2}{4} \right) c_0 - \epsilon^2 \alpha c_{0x} \right) dy = 1 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_2, \quad (2.42c)$$

and in $\mathcal{D}_1 \cup \mathcal{D}_2$, the volume-flux condition (2.30) becomes

$$\tilde{Q}p_{0x} + (\gamma/\beta)\tilde{Q}\Gamma_{0x} = 1 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_1, \quad \tilde{Q}p_{0x} = 1 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_2. \quad (2.43a, b)$$

The reduction of the problem from a seven-parameter Stokes-flow system (2.15)–(2.21) for five variables, to the seven-parameter long-wave system (2.38)–(2.42) for two variables, to the five-parameter system for two variables (neglecting streamwise diffusion), simplifies the problem's solution. The numerical solution of (2.38)–(2.42) (Appendix A) is generally less expensive (in terms of memory and runtime) than COMSOL simulations. The numerical method iteratively solves linearised bulk- and interfacial-concentration problems until convergence is achieved. Convergence in the nonlinear problem can be slow, necessitating small tolerances. Accurate resolution of singularities at $x = \pm\phi$ is essential to achieving convergence; accordingly, we employ domain decomposition and Chebyshev collocation techniques that cluster nodes around $y = 0, 2$ and $x = -\phi, \phi, 2-\phi$. Once c_0 and Γ_0 are determined, u_0 and v_0 can be calculated using (2.32) and (2.37) respectively.

Following Tomlinson *et al.* (2023a), we can express the leading-order drag reduction (DR_0) in terms of the transport parameters and geometry (β , γ and ϕ) as follows. When the interface is unaffected by surfactant, $\Delta p_U = -2\phi/\tilde{Q} - 2(1-\phi)/\tilde{Q}$. When the interface is immobilised by surfactant, $\Delta p_I = -2/\tilde{Q}$. Between these two limits, $\Delta p_0 = -2\phi/\tilde{Q} - 2(1-\phi)/\tilde{Q} + \gamma\tilde{Q}\Delta\Gamma_0/(\beta\tilde{Q})$, where $\Delta\Gamma_0 = \Gamma_0(\phi) - \Gamma_0(-\phi)$. Substituting these expressions into the leading-order drag reduction (2.31), gives

$$DR_0 = 1 - \frac{\gamma\Delta\Gamma_0}{3\phi\beta}. \quad (2.44)$$

An alternative measure used commonly in the SHS literature is the effective slip length,

λ_0 , which can be evaluated from DR_0 using (Tomlinson *et al.* 2023a)

$$\lambda_0 = \frac{DR_0(\Delta p_I - \Delta p_U)}{\Delta p_I[\Delta p_U DR_0 + \Delta p_I(1 - DR_0)]}. \quad (2.45)$$

Before presenting the results of the 2D long-wave model, it is helpful to recall key features of the problem at low Péclet numbers, when a 1D description applies.

2.4. The 1D long-wave model

In the strong-cross-channel-diffusion limit, for which $\alpha \gg 1$ (with $\epsilon^2\alpha = O(1)$ and $\epsilon^2\delta = O(1)$), cross-channel concentration gradients are small. Expanding the bulk and interfacial concentration field

$$c_0 = \bar{c}_0(x) + \bar{c}_1(x, y)/\alpha + \dots, \quad \Gamma_0 = \bar{\Gamma}_0(x) + \bar{\Gamma}_1(x)/\alpha + \dots, \quad (2.46)$$

(2.42)–(2.43) reduce to the “1D long-wave model”, given by

$$\bar{c}_{0x} - 2\epsilon^2\alpha\bar{c}_{0xx} - \nu(\bar{\Gamma}_0 - \bar{c}_0) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_1, \quad (2.47a)$$

$$\frac{3}{4}\beta\bar{\Gamma}_{0x} - \frac{1}{2}\gamma(\bar{\Gamma}_{0x}\bar{\Gamma}_0)_x - \epsilon^2\delta\bar{\Gamma}_{0xx} + \nu(\bar{\Gamma}_0 - \bar{c}_0) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_1, \quad (2.47b)$$

$$\bar{c}_0 - 2\epsilon^2\alpha\bar{c}_{0x} + \frac{3}{4}\beta\bar{\Gamma}_0 - \frac{1}{2}\gamma\bar{\Gamma}_{0x}\bar{\Gamma}_0 - \epsilon^2\delta\bar{\Gamma}_{0x} = 1 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_1, \quad (2.47c)$$

$$\bar{c}_0 - 2\epsilon^2\alpha\bar{c}_{0x} = 1 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_2, \quad (2.47d)$$

which is the 2D-SHS version of the 3D-SHS equations introduced in Tomlinson *et al.* (2023a). The system in (2.47) is solved subject to continuity of bulk surfactant, continuity of bulk-surfactant flux and no-flux of interfacial surfactant

$$\bar{c}_0(\phi^-) = \bar{c}_0(\phi^+), \quad (2.48a)$$

$$\bar{c}_0(-\phi) = \bar{c}_0(2 - \phi), \quad (2.48b)$$

$$\bar{c}_0(\phi^-) - 2\epsilon^2\alpha\bar{c}_{0x}(\phi^-) = \bar{c}_0(\phi^+) - 2\epsilon^2\alpha\bar{c}_{0x}(\phi^+), \quad (2.48c)$$

$$\bar{c}_0(-\phi) - 2\epsilon^2\alpha\bar{c}_{0x}(-\phi) = \bar{c}_0(2 - \phi) - 2\epsilon^2\alpha\bar{c}_{0x}(2 - \phi), \quad (2.48d)$$

$$\frac{3}{4}\beta\bar{\Gamma}_0(\pm\phi) - \frac{1}{2}\gamma\bar{\Gamma}_0(\pm\phi)\bar{\Gamma}_{0x}(\pm\phi) - \epsilon^2\delta\bar{\Gamma}_{0x}(\pm\phi) = 0. \quad (2.48e)$$

The system of ODEs in (2.47)–(2.48) can be solved numerically using the method outlined in Appendix A of Tomlinson *et al.* (2023). For a given set of coefficients (α , β , γ , δ , ϵ , ν and ϕ), the drag reduction can be evaluated using (2.44). As illustrated in figure 2, the 1D long-wave model (2.47)–(2.48) exhibits multiple asymptotic regimes. For later reference, we review the strong- ($\bar{c}_0 \approx \bar{\Gamma}_0$, large ν) and weak-exchange ($\bar{c}_0 \neq \bar{\Gamma}_0$, small ν) problems separately below, discussing the key asymptotic results derived in Tomlinson *et al.* (2023a).

For strong exchange, with $\alpha \gg 1$ and $\gamma \gg \max(1, \epsilon^2\alpha)$, a region dominated by Marangoni effects (M^{1D} , figure 2a) is characterised by the immobilisation of the liquid–gas interface. The surfactant distribution and drag reduction are given by

$$\bar{c}_0 \approx \bar{\Gamma}_0 \approx 1 + \frac{3\beta}{2\gamma} \left(x - \frac{\phi(E+1)}{(E-1)} \right), \quad DR_0 \approx \frac{2}{\gamma} \left(\epsilon^2(2\alpha + \delta) + \frac{\phi(E+1)}{(E-1)} \right), \quad (2.49a, b)$$

where $E \equiv \exp((1 - \phi)/(\epsilon^2\alpha))$. Thus, $DR_0 \approx 2\phi/\gamma$ for $1 \ll \alpha \ll 1/\epsilon^2$ and $DR_0 \approx 2\epsilon^2(2\alpha + \delta)/\gamma$ for $\alpha \gg 1/\epsilon^2$. Region M^{1D} transitions into a diffusion-dominated region (D^{1D} , figure 2a) when $\alpha \gg 1/\epsilon^2$ and $\gamma \sim \epsilon^2\alpha$ and an advection-dominated region (A^{1D} , figure 2a) when $1 \ll \alpha \ll 1/\epsilon^2$ and $\gamma \sim 1$. For $\gamma \ll \epsilon^2\alpha$ and $\alpha \gg 1/\epsilon^2$ in region D^{1D} ,

$$\bar{c}_0 \approx \bar{\Gamma}_0 \approx \frac{4\alpha + 2\delta(1 - \phi)}{\alpha(4 + 3\beta\phi) + 2\delta(1 - \phi)}, \quad DR_0 \approx 1 - \frac{\gamma(1 - \phi)}{\epsilon^2(\alpha(4 + 3\beta\phi) + 2\delta(1 - \phi))}, \quad (2.50a, b)$$

(a)

(b)




FIGURE 2. Summary of the asymptotic predictions derived in §4 and Tomlinson *et al.* (2023a) for the leading-order drag reduction (DR_0) in the 2D and 1D long-wave models for (a) strong exchange and (b) weak exchange. The Marangoni-dominated region (M) incorporates sub-regions M^{1D} ($\alpha \gg 1$), M_E^{1D} ($\delta \gg 1$), M^{2D} ($\alpha \ll 1$) and M_E^{2D} ($\delta \ll 1$) where $DR_0 \ll 1$; the advection-dominated region (A) incorporates sub-regions A^{1D} ($1 \ll \alpha \ll 1/\epsilon^2$), A_E^{1D} ($1 \ll \delta \ll 1/\epsilon^2$), A^{2D} ($\alpha \ll 1$) and A_E^{2D} ($\delta \ll 1$) where $1 - DR_0 \ll 1$; and the diffusion-dominated region (D) incorporates sub-regions D^{1D} ($\alpha \gg 1/\epsilon^2$) and D_E^{1D} ($\delta \gg 1/\epsilon^2$) where $1 - DR_0 \ll 1$. DR_0 is expressed in terms of the transport coefficients $\alpha \sim \delta$, $\beta \sim 1$, γ , ϵ and ν given in table 1.

and for $\gamma \ll 1$ and $1 \ll \alpha \ll 1/\epsilon^2$ in region A^{1D} ,

$$\bar{c}_0 \approx \bar{\Gamma}_0 \approx \frac{4}{3\beta + 4} + \frac{3\beta}{3\beta + 4} \exp\left(\frac{(4 + 3\beta)(x - \phi)}{4\epsilon^2(2\alpha + \delta)}\right), \quad DR_0 \approx 1 - \frac{\gamma}{\phi(3\beta + 4)}. \quad (2.51a, b)$$

The onset of 2D effects in the 1D long-wave model was estimated in Tomlinson *et al.* (2023a) to arise via the emergence of shear dispersion, where $\alpha \sim 1$ and $\gamma \ll 1$ or $\alpha \sim 1/\gamma$ and $\gamma \gg 1$. We refine such estimates below by solving the 2D long-wave model, which will reveal regions M^{2D} and A^{2D} shown in figure 2(a).

A similar picture emerges when bulk–surface exchange is weak. A region dominated by Marangoni effects (M_E^{1D} , figure 2b) arises for $\alpha \gg 1$ and $\gamma \gg \max(1, \epsilon^2\alpha)$. Here, \bar{c}_0 decouples from $\bar{\Gamma}_0$ and is approximately equal to its background value (i.e. $\bar{c}_0 \approx 1$). Consequently, $\bar{\Gamma}_0$ is larger to fulfil the net adsorption–desorption condition, (2.29), decreasing the drag reduction compared to the strong-exchange problem

$$\bar{c}_0 \approx 1, \quad \bar{\Gamma}_0 \approx 1 + \frac{3\beta x}{2\gamma}, \quad DR_0 \approx \frac{2\epsilon^2\delta}{\gamma}. \quad (2.52a-c)$$

M_E^{1D} transitions to a diffusion-dominated region (D_E^{1D} , figure 2b) when $\gamma \sim \epsilon^2\delta$ and $\delta \gg 1/\epsilon^2$ and an advection-dominated region (A_E^{1D} , figure 2b) when $\gamma \sim 1$ and $\delta \ll 1/\epsilon^2$. For $\gamma \ll \epsilon^2\delta$ and $\delta \gg 1/\epsilon^2$ in region D_E^{1D} ,

$$\bar{c}_0 \approx 1, \quad \bar{\Gamma}_0 \approx 1 + \frac{3\beta x}{4\epsilon^2\delta}, \quad DR_0 \approx 1 - \frac{\gamma}{2\epsilon^2\delta}, \quad (2.53a-c)$$

and for $\gamma \ll 1$ and $\delta \gg 1/\epsilon^2$ in region A_E^{1D} ,

$$\bar{c}_0 \approx 1, \quad \bar{\Gamma}_0 \approx \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } x \in [-\phi, x_0], \\ \frac{3\beta}{2\gamma}(x - x_0) & \text{for } x \in [x_0, \phi], \end{cases} \quad DR_0 \approx 1 - \left(\frac{2\gamma}{3\phi\beta}\right)^{1/2}, \quad (2.54a-c)$$

where $x_0 = \phi - (8\phi\gamma/(3\beta))^{1/2}$ gives the length of the stagnant cap. Below, we explore the emergence of 2D effects in regions M_E^{2D} and A_E^{2D} .

3. Results

In §3.1, we investigate the leading-order drag reduction (DR_0), interfacial and bulk surfactant concentration (Γ_0 and c_0), as well as the streamwise and wall-normal velocity (u_0 and v_0), with strong bulk–surface exchange ($\nu = 100$). We vary the bulk diffusion (α) and surfactant strength (γ), exploring both strong- and weak-cross-channel-diffusion regimes by solving the 2D long-wave model (2.38)–(2.42). For simplicity, we constrain the partition coefficient (β) and interfacial diffusion (δ), assuming that $\epsilon^2\alpha = \epsilon^2\delta$, $\beta = 1$ and $\phi = 0.5$ throughout. However, asymptotic solutions are derived in §4 for variable α , β , δ and ϕ , which we use to validate numerical simulations and identify dominant physical mechanisms. In §3.2, we consider the weak-exchange limit ($\nu = 0.01$). As illustrated in figure 2, in both strong- and weak-exchange limits, we identify regions of parameter space dominated by Marangoni effects (M), advection (A) and diffusion (D). Additionally, we compare numerical solutions of the 2D long-wave model (2.38–2.42) with numerical solutions of the Stokes and advection–diffusion equations (2.15–2.21) in the weak-cross-channel-diffusion limit.

3.1. Strong exchange

Figure 3 summarises the surfactant-concentration profiles and drag reduction in the strong-exchange limit, computed using the 2D long-wave model, (2.38)–(2.42), with $\nu = 100$. For large values of γ , the interface is almost immobilised (figure 3*a–d*), the Γ_0 profile is almost linear, and the bulk surfactant transitions from a 1D to a 2D distribution as α decreases. Surfactant adsorbs onto the interface across the upper half of the plastron and desorbs from it in the lower half. For small γ and weaker Marangoni effects, interfacial surfactant accumulates near the downstream end of the plastron, lengthening the adsorption region and compressing the desorption region (figure 3*h–i*).

Figure 3(*e, f, g*) illustrates the variation of DR_0 with α and γ . In the present strong-exchange limit, drag reduction decreases as α decreases and the bulk concentration becomes more 2D. Reduced bulk diffusion promotes the formation of bulk-concentration boundary layers, while slowing fluxes between the bulk and interface. We characterise this transition by comparing the established large- α asymptotes (in regions M^{1D} and D^{1D} of the (α, γ) -plane, see (2.49, 2.50)) with new small- α limits (derived below) in regions M^{2D} and A^{2D} . We use these limits to characterise the immobilisation of the interface as γ increases, highlighting in particular the transition from region A^{2D} to region M^{2D} for small α . We now discuss these new regions, starting with M^{2D} .

Region M^{2D} (figures 2*a* and 3*a, b*) emerges when $\alpha \ll 1$ and γ is large. In this region, Marangoni effects dominate, with weak bulk diffusion resulting in a bulk-concentration boundary layer near $y = 0$. We provide a scaling argument for DR_0 as follows, with a detailed derivation given in §4.1. At the interface, Γ_0 is in equilibrium with c_0 , and the interface is nearly immobile, exhibiting a linear surfactant distribution with a slope of size $1/\gamma$. The bulk concentration is close to unity, and $\Gamma_0 < 1$ ($\Gamma_0 > 1$) in the upstream (downstream) half of the plastron, leading to adsorption (desorption). Perturbations to the bulk-concentration boundary layer are driven by the linear surface concentration distribution, giving the boundary layer a self-similar structure. The thickness of the boundary layer is $\alpha^{1/3} \ll 1$ (characteristic of a shear flow), resulting in fluxes of size $\alpha c_{0y} \sim \alpha^{2/3}$ onto and off the interface. Adsorption and desorption are accommodated by weak stretching and compression of the interface, generating smaller contributions to Γ_0




FIGURE 3. The leading-order drag reduction (DR_0), bulk (c_0) and interfacial (Γ_0) surfactant concentration field for $\beta = 1$, $\epsilon = 0.1$, $\nu = 100$ and $\phi = 0.5$, computed using (2.38)–(2.42). In the Marangoni-dominated (M) region, the SHS is no-slip ($DR_0 = 0$), and in the advection- (A) and diffusion-dominated (D) regions, the interface is shear-free ($DR_0 = 1$). Plot of c_0 , Γ_0 , $\langle c_0 \rangle$ and $c_0(x, 0)$ for (a, b) $(\alpha, \gamma) = (0.1, 1)$ and (c, d) $(\alpha, \gamma) = (10, 10)$, where (a) is compared to (3.1a) in M^{2D} . (e) Contours of DR_0 , (f) plots of DR_0 at $\gamma = 0.01, 0.1, 1$ and 10 and (g) plots of DR_0 at $\alpha = 0.1, 1, 10$ and 100, where (e, f, g) are compared to (2.49b) in M^{1D} , (2.50b) in D^{1D} , (4.21b) in M^{2D} and (3.2b) in A^{2D} . Plot of c_0 , Γ_0 , $\langle c_0 \rangle$ and $c_0(x, 0)$ for (h, i) $(\alpha, \gamma) = (0.1, 0.1)$ and (j, k) $(\alpha, \gamma) = (10, 1)$, where (h) is compared to (3.2a) in A^{2D} .

of size $\alpha^{2/3}/\gamma^2$ and to DR_0 of size $\alpha^{2/3}/\gamma$, using (2.44). The constraint $\alpha \ll 1$ ensures that the boundary layer is thin and we require $\gamma \gg 1$ and $\alpha^{2/3} \ll \gamma$ for the correction to Γ_0 to be small (although a more precise condition will emerge below). The leading-order surfactant distribution and drag reduction are given by

$$c_0(x, 0) \approx \Gamma_0 \approx 1 + \frac{3\beta}{2\gamma} \left(x - \frac{\phi}{5} \right), \quad DR_0 \approx \frac{m_1 \alpha^{2/3} \phi^{5/3}}{\gamma}, \quad (3.1a, b)$$

where the coefficient $m_1 \approx 0.79$ is given explicitly in §4.1. The range of validity of the leading-order solution in (3.1) is extended from $\gamma \gg 1$ to $\gamma \sim 1$ in (4.21), although the extension must be evaluated numerically. Therefore, we give the simpler formula above, but compare (4.21) with numerical results from the 2D long-wave model at small α in figure 3(e, f, g), which capture numerical results successfully. In particular, decreasing γ leads to a steepening of the interfacial surfactant gradient until Γ_0 approaches zero at the upstream contact line. This transition provides a lower bound on region M^{2D} , namely $\Gamma_0(-\phi) = 0$ when $\gamma = 9\phi\beta/5$. Hence, we plot solutions up to this limit in figure 3(g).

When $\alpha \ll 1$ and γ is sufficiently small, we transition into region A^{2D} (figures 2a and

3*h, i*), where advection dominates Marangoni effects at the interface, while interacting with a strongly coupled bulk-concentration boundary layer. We distinguish a slip region, $x \in [-\phi, x_0]$ (for some x_0), at the upstream end of the interface, where Marangoni effects are weak and surfactant adsorbs from the bulk, from a quasi-stagnant region, $x \in [x_0, \phi]$, at the downstream end of the interface, where surfactant gradients are large enough for Marangoni effects to decelerate the interface while desorbing the accumulated surfactant. We now provide a scaling argument for DR_0 that is supported by a detailed derivation in §4.2 below. In the slip region, of length $x_0 + \phi = O(1)$, c_0 varies by $O(1)$ across a boundary-layer thickness $y \sim \alpha^{1/2}$, yielding a flux per unit length of size $\alpha c_{0y} \sim \alpha^{1/2}$ onto the interface. This allows Γ_0 to grow to $O(\alpha^{1/2})$. Although c_0 is effectively zero at the interface at leading order, it is coupled to Γ_0 through an $O(\alpha^{1/2})$ correction. The slip region therefore delivers an interfacial flux of size $O(\alpha^{1/2})$ at $x = x_0$, which is carried through short regions across which the interface decelerates rapidly at the leading edge of the quasi-stagnant region. Across the quasi-stagnant region, of length $L = \phi - x_0$ (to be determined), Γ_0 is approximately linear with a slope of size $1/\gamma$, setting c_0 and Γ_0 to be of size L/γ . In the bulk, diffusion balances shear over a vertical length $y \sim (\alpha L)^{1/3}$ and therefore $\alpha c_{0y} \sim (\alpha L)^{2/3}/\gamma$. Integrated over L , this accommodates the $O(\alpha^{1/2})$ interfacial flux, resulting in $L \sim \gamma^{3/5}/\alpha^{1/10}$. Consequently, the drag reduction arising from the surfactant adsorbed and desorbed in the slip and quasi-stagnant regions is proportional to $DR_0 \sim \gamma \Delta \Gamma \sim L$. In §4.2, we show that

$$c_0(x, 0) \approx \Gamma_0 \approx \begin{cases} \frac{4(\alpha(x + \phi))^{1/2}}{\sqrt{3\pi}\beta} & \text{for } x \in [-\phi, x_0], \\ \frac{3\beta}{2\gamma}(x - x_0) & \text{for } x \in [x_0, \phi], \end{cases} \quad DR_0 = 1 - \frac{a_1 \gamma^{3/5}}{\alpha^{1/10}}, \quad (3.2a, b)$$

where the coefficient $a_1 = (-5\lambda/(6C'(0)))^{3/5}/(2\phi)$, with $\lambda = (16(x_0 + \phi)/(3\pi\beta^2))^{1/2}$; $C'(0) \approx -0.92$ is given explicitly in §4.2 and $\phi - x_0 = 2\phi a_1 \gamma^{3/5}/\alpha^{1/10}$ is the length of the quasi-stagnant cap. Asymptotes for DR_0 , $c_0(x, 0)$ and Γ_0 in figure 3(*e, f, g, h*) are evaluated numerically for a given α and γ and capture the behaviour exhibited by the numerical simulations of the 2D long-wave model. This confirms the central role of interfacial stretching and compression in the slip and quasi-stagnant regions to accommodate adsorption and desorption. In particular, increasing γ from low values causes lengthening of the quasi-stagnant region, pushing x_0 towards the upstream contact line and reducing DR_0 . Figure 3(*g*) shows how (3.2) applies almost until x_0 approaches $-\phi$. For small α , $c_0(-\phi, 0) \approx \Gamma_0(-\phi) \approx 0$ for $\gamma \ll 1$, causing the c_0 field to develop a singular first derivative at the upstream contact point. This concentration-gradient singularity significantly impacts the numerical solution (both in terms of the required resolution and run time) of the 2D long-wave model and COMSOL simulations (below). Increasing diffusion recovers a 1D bulk concentration profile and eliminates the quasi-stagnant cap (figure 3*j, k*).

Further insight into the M^{2D} and A^{2D} solutions is provided by figure 4, which compares u_0 , c_0 and Γ_0 computed using the 2D long-wave model, (2.38)–(2.42), to the Stokes and advection-diffusion equations in COMSOL, for the examples shown in figure 3(*a, b, h, i*). For the region- M^{2D} solution shown in figure 4(*a, c*), symbols and lines show how u_0 exhibits a slight deviation from no-slip at the liquid–gas interface, generating a weak vertical flow. The concentration profiles in the two simulations match well, with the drag reduction predicted from the 2D long-wave model, $DR_0 = 0.106$, in close agreement with the COMSOL simulations, $DR_{NS} = 0.109$. In the region- A^{2D} solution depicted in figure 4(*b, d*), the liquid–gas interface is nearly shear-free and $u_0 \approx 3/4$ in the slip region, where the interfacial surfactant concentration is low, before falling towards zero across




FIGURE 4. The leading-order streamwise velocity field (u_0) and surfactant concentration field (c_0 and Γ_0) for $\beta = 1$, $\nu = 100$, $\epsilon = 0.1$ and $\phi = 0.5$ evaluated using (2.38)–(2.42) (lines) and COMSOL simulations (symbols). (a, c) Plots of c_0 and u_0 , respectively, for $\alpha = 0.1$ and $\gamma = 1$, such that the flow is in the Marangoni-dominated region with weak cross-channel diffusion (M^{2D}). (b, d) Plots of c_0 and u_0 , respectively, for $\alpha = 0.1$ and $\gamma = 0.1$, such that the flow is in the advection-dominated region with weak cross-channel diffusion (A^{2D}), where $u_0(x, 0)$ in (d) is compared to (4.35, 4.51).

the quasi-stagnant region, where the gradient of Γ_0 is large. The asymptotic predictions in (4.35, 4.51) capture the slip velocity decrease in the deceleration region and then the fall towards zero across the quasi-stagnant region, as we will discuss further below. This figure illustrates the distinction between the classical stagnant cap of a strictly insoluble surfactant, for which u_0 would be zero where Γ_0 has a large gradient, and the present quasi-stagnant structure, that is mediated by bulk diffusion enabling desorption into the boundary layer. The agreement between the 2D long-wave model and numerical simulations in COMSOL for the surfactant concentration field and drag reduction is good, with $DR_0 = 0.745$ and $DR_{NS} = 0.747$. Both methods capture weak interfacial stretching (allowing adsorption) in the slip region ($u_{0x} > 0$) and strong compression (allowing desorption) in the quasi-stagnant region ($u_{0x} < 0$). There is disagreement in u_0 at the upstream contact line (where the 2D long-wave theory fails to resolve the Stokes-flow region where u_0 transitions from zero to the slip velocity), and at the downstream contact line (where, additionally, the retention of weak surface diffusion leads to a small non-zero value of u_0 to ensure zero surfactant flux). However, these regions are of secondary importance in the drag-reduction calculation. Further features of the surface velocity profile are discussed in §4.2 below.

3.2. Weak exchange

Figure 5 shows that, while 2D effects are again prevalent in bulk concentration profiles at small α when bulk-surface exchange is weak ($\nu = 0.01$), the impact of bulk boundary layers on drag reduction is more modest than in the strong-exchange limit. Solutions at large γ again have approximately linear interfacial surfactant profiles that immobilise the interface (figure 5a–d). These profiles are almost decoupled from the bulk, so act as a sink/source combination driving adsorption/desorption. Solutions for small γ (figure 5h–




FIGURE 5. The leading-order drag reduction (DR_0), bulk (c_0) and interfacial (Γ_0) surfactant concentration field for $\beta = 1$, $\epsilon = 0.1$, $\nu = 0.01$ and $\phi = 0.5$, computed using (2.38)–(2.42). In the Marangoni-dominated (M_E) region, the SHS is no-slip ($DR_0 = 0$), and in the advection- (A_E) and diffusion-dominated (D_E) regions, the interface is shear-free ($DR_0 = 1$). Plot of c_0 , Γ_0 , $\langle c_0 \rangle$ and $c_0(x, 0)$ for (a, b) $(\alpha, \gamma) = (0.1, 1)$ and (c, d) $(\alpha, \gamma) = (10, 1)$, where (a) is compared to (2.52a) in M_E^{2D} . (e) Contours of DR_0 , (f) plots of DR_0 at $\gamma = 0.01, 0.1, 1$ and 10 and (g) plots of DR_0 at $\alpha = 0.1, 1, 10$ and 100, where (e, f, g) are compared to (2.52b) in M_E^{1D} , (2.53b) in D_E^{1D} , (2.52b) in M_E^{2D} and (3.3b) in A_E^{2D} . Plot of c_0 , Γ_0 , $\langle c_0 \rangle$ and $c_0(x, 0)$ for (h, i) $(\alpha, \gamma) = (0.1, 0.1)$ and (j, k) $(\alpha, \gamma) = (10, 0.1)$, where (h) is compared to (3.3a) in A_E^{2D} .

k), show the formation of a more traditional stagnant cap at small α , which is smoothed by streamwise diffusion as α (and δ) increase.

Figure 5(e–g) illustrates the dependency of DR_0 on α and γ , evaluated against existing limits M_E^{1D} and D_E^{1D} (see (2.52, 2.53)) for large α and introducing new limits M_E^{2D} and A_E^{2D} at small α . Importantly, weak coupling between the bulk and the interface suppresses the dependence of DR_0 on α in the limit of very small bulk diffusivity, making the drag-reduction contours horizontal in figure 5(e).

The following scaling argument applies to region A_E^{2D} (figure 2b and 5h, i), where Marangoni effects and bulk diffusion are weak. Here, the interfacial concentration is approximated by the classical distribution for nearly insoluble surfactant, being close to zero along the interface except at the downstream end where it forms a stagnant cap of length L and slope $1/\gamma$. Thus, Γ_0 is of magnitude L/γ , and its integral over the whole interface is $O(L^2/\gamma)$, while the bulk concentration remains close to unity. The constraint (2.29), which matches net absorption to net desorption, therefore requires $L^2/\gamma = O(1)$, implying that Γ_0 is $O(\gamma^{-1/2})$ and DR_0 is $O(\gamma^{1/2})$. This argument, which mirrors the 1D

case, is made more precise in §4.3 below, yielding

$$c_0 \approx 1, \quad \Gamma_0 \approx \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } x \in [-\phi, x_0], \\ \frac{3\beta}{2\gamma}(x - x_0) & \text{for } x \in [x_0, \phi], \end{cases} \quad DR_0 \approx 1 - \left(\frac{2\gamma}{3\phi\beta}\right)^{1/2}, \quad (3.3a-c)$$

where $\phi - x_0 = (8\phi\gamma/(3\beta))^{1/2}$ is the length of the stagnant cap. Bulk diffusion has a higher-order effect, influencing exchange via adsorption and desorption, and hence weak stretching and compression of the interface. In figure 5(*e, f, g, h*), dashed black asymptotes for c_0 , Γ_0 and DR_0 match those results from the 2D long-wave model, almost up to $\gamma = 3\beta\phi/2$ in figure 5(*g*), where the stagnant cap reaches $x = -\phi$. The same boundary is recovered if we approach from region M_E^{2D} , using (2.52*b*).

A comparison between the solutions evaluated using the 2D long-wave model, (2.38)–(2.42), and COMSOL simulations is given in figure 6, focussing on the examples discussed in figure 5(*a, b, h, i*). In figure 6(*a, c*), the solutions for c_0 , Γ_0 and u_0 are presented in region M_E^{2D} . The slip velocity is approximately zero for both symbols and lines, as the interfacial surfactant gradient effectively immobilises the interface. The 2D long-wave model predicts $DR_0 = 0.027$, while the numerical simulations yield $DR_{NS} = 0.056$ (reflecting the 4% difference in $\Delta\Gamma_0$ evident in figure 6*a*). Figure 6(*b, d*) depicts the solutions in region A_E^{2D} . In the stagnant-cap regime, the upstream end of the liquid–gas interface is shear-free, resulting in a slip velocity $u_0 = 3/4$, while the downstream end of the liquid–gas interface does not exhibit slip, leading to a near-zero streamwise velocity at the downstream stagnation point. The transitional and downstream regions induce a strong wall-normal flow that drives bulk surfactant into the core of the channel. We calculate $DR_0 = 0.650$ and $DR_{NS} = 0.662$, demonstrating good agreement between the predictions of the 2D long-wave model and COMSOL simulations, validating the model’s accuracy under a wide range of conditions.

4. Asymptotic solutions for weak cross-channel diffusion

We now derive asymptotic solutions to the 2D long-wave model, (2.38)–(2.43), when diffusive effects are confined to a boundary layer along $y = 0$. First, we consider the strong-exchange regime, where Marangoni effects (§4.1) and advection (§4.2) dominate. Second, we consider the weak-exchange regime (§4.3).

Assuming that $c_0 \approx 1$ in the core of the channel, we anticipate that the flow and transport equations (2.38) involve a diffusive boundary layer near $y = 0$ of the form

$$\alpha c_{0yy} - \left(\frac{3}{4} + \frac{\gamma}{\beta} \left(-\frac{1}{2} + y\right) \Gamma_{0x}\right) c_{0x} - \frac{\gamma}{\beta} \left(\frac{y}{2} - \frac{y^2}{2}\right) \Gamma_{0xx} c_{0y} = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_1, \quad (4.1a)$$

$$\alpha c_{0yy} - 3y c_{0x}/2 = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_2. \quad (4.1b)$$

For $x \in [-\phi, \phi]$ and $y = 0$, the interface conditions (2.39) are given by

$$\alpha c_{0y} = \nu(c_0 - \Gamma_0) = \beta \left[\left(\frac{3}{4} - \frac{\gamma}{2\beta} \Gamma_{0x}\right) \Gamma_0 \right]_x. \quad (4.2)$$

At $x = \pm\phi$ and $y = 0$, the conditions at the stagnation points (2.40) become

$$\left(\frac{3}{4} - \frac{\gamma}{2\beta} \Gamma_{0x}\right) \Gamma_0 = 0. \quad (4.3)$$

For $x \in [\phi, 2 - \phi]$ and $y = 0$, the solid-wall conditions (2.41) are given by

$$c_{0y} = 0. \quad (4.4)$$




FIGURE 6. The leading-order streamwise velocity field (u_0) and surfactant concentration field (c_0 and Γ_0) for $\beta = 1$, $\nu = 0.01$, $\epsilon = 0.1$ and $\phi = 0.5$ evaluated using (2.38)–(2.42) (lines) and COMSOL simulations (symbols). (a, c) Plots of c_0 and u_0 , respectively, for $\alpha = 0.1$ and $\gamma = 1$, such that the flow is in the Marangoni-dominated region with weak cross-channel diffusion (M_E^{2D}). (b, d) Plots of c_0 and u_0 , respectively, for $\alpha = 0.1$ and $\gamma = 0.1$, such that the flow is in the advection-dominated region with weak cross-channel diffusion (A_E^{2D}).

For $x \in [-\phi, 2 - \phi]$ and $y \rightarrow \infty$ (shorthand for y entering the core of the channel, far outside the boundary layer), the core condition is

$$c_0 \rightarrow 1. \quad (4.5)$$

The boundary-layer equations (4.1)–(4.5) can be integrated across the boundary layer to derive excess-surfactant-flux conditions. The total flux (2.43) is satisfied at leading order in the core of the channel, implying that

$$\beta \left(\frac{3}{4} - \frac{\gamma}{2\beta} \Gamma_{0x} \right) \Gamma_0 + \int_0^\infty \left(\frac{3}{4} + \frac{\gamma}{\beta} \left(-\frac{1}{2} + y \right) \Gamma_{0x} \right) (c_0 - 1) dy = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_1, \quad (4.6a)$$

$$\int_{-\phi}^\phi c_{0y} dx = \int_{-\phi}^\phi (c_0 - \Gamma_0) dx = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_1, \quad (4.6b)$$

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{3}{2} y (c_0 - 1) dy = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_2, \quad (4.6c)$$

provided $c_0 \rightarrow 1$ sufficiently quickly where the boundary layer meets the core flow. The condition in (4.6a) indicates that the surfactant flux carried by the flow at the interface balances the flux deficit in the boundary layer (where $c_0 \leq 1$). The condition in (4.6b) specifies that the total amounts of surfactant adsorbed and desorbed must match. Motivated by the simulations and scaling arguments provided in §3.1, we propose the asymptotic structures for regions M^{2D} and A^{2D} outlined in figure 7 and derive asymptotic solutions in the following subsections.

4.1. Strong Marangoni effect and strong bulk-surface exchange: region M^{2D}

We consider the boundary-layer equations, (4.1)–(4.6), in the limit where bulk diffusion is weak and bulk-surface exchange is strong, i.e. $\gamma = O(1)$ and $\alpha \ll 1$. Suppose the in-

The excess-surfactant-flux conditions (4.6) reduce to

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{3Y}{2} (C-1) dY + \frac{G_x}{2} \left(\frac{3\beta x}{2} + \gamma M_1 \right) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_1, \quad (4.13a)$$

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{3Y}{2} (C-1) dY = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_2. \quad (4.13b)$$

We construct a similarity solution to (4.8)–(4.13), assuming that the length of the interface is long compared to the boundary-layer thickness, and that there is no interaction between adjacent plastrons. The bulk concentration is split into two contributions that grow from the leading edge of the plastron,

$$C = 1 - \left(1 - M_1 + \frac{3\beta\phi}{2\gamma} \right) F(\eta) + \frac{3\beta}{2\gamma} (x + \phi) H(\eta) \quad (4.14)$$

for some functions F and H depending on the similarity variable $\eta = Y/(x + \phi)^{1/3}$. F captures the response of the bulk field to the sudden drop in concentration along $Y = 0$ at $x = -\phi$; H captures the response to the linear profile of Γ_0 in $x > -\phi$. Substituting (4.14) into (4.8)–(4.12) leads to the boundary-value problems

$$F_{\eta\eta} + \eta^2 F_\eta / 2 = 0, \quad F(0) = 1, \quad F(\infty) = 0, \quad (4.15a-c)$$

$$H_{\eta\eta} + \eta^2 H_\eta / 2 - 3\eta H / 2 = 0, \quad H(0) = 1, \quad H(\infty) = 0, \quad (4.16a-c)$$

which have solutions

$$F = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{1}{3}, \eta^3/6)}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{3})}, \quad H = \frac{(4 + \eta^3)\Gamma(\frac{1}{3}, \eta^3/6) - 6^{2/3}\eta \exp(-\eta^3/6)}{4\Gamma(\frac{1}{3})}. \quad (4.17a, b)$$

Here $\Gamma(z)$ is the gamma function and $\Gamma(s, z)$ is the incomplete gamma function. We then use the surfactant-flux conditions (4.13) to calculate the response of the interfacial concentration field to the bulk field (4.14),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\gamma G_x}{2} \left(\frac{3\beta x}{2\gamma} + M_1 \right) &= \frac{3}{2} (x + \phi)^{2/3} \left(1 - M_1 + \frac{3\beta\phi}{2\gamma} \right) \int_0^\infty \eta F d\eta \\ &\quad - \frac{9\beta}{4\gamma} (x + \phi)^{5/3} \int_0^\infty \eta H d\eta. \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

The total flux of surfactant must be continuous between domains. The no-flux condition (4.10) at $x = \phi$ requires that

$$M_1 = 1 + \frac{3\beta\phi}{2\gamma} \left(\int_0^\infty \eta F d\eta - 2 \int_0^\infty \eta H d\eta \right) / \int_0^\infty \eta F d\eta = 1 - \frac{3\beta\phi}{10\gamma}. \quad (4.19)$$

Integrating the total-flux condition (4.18) across the plastron reveals that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta G &= \int_{-\phi}^\phi \left(\frac{27\beta\phi}{10\gamma} (x + \phi)^{2/3} \int_0^\infty \eta F d\eta \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{9\beta}{4\gamma} (x + \phi)^{5/3} \int_0^\infty \eta H d\eta \right) / \left(\frac{\gamma}{2} \left(1 + \frac{3\beta}{2\gamma} \left(x - \frac{\phi}{5} \right) \right) \right) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

Hence, in region M^{2D} , substituting (4.7) into (2.44), the leading-order interfacial concentration and drag reduction are given by

$$\Gamma_0 = 1 + \frac{3\beta}{2\gamma} \left(x - \frac{\phi}{5} \right) + \dots, \quad DR_0 = \frac{\gamma\alpha^{2/3}\Delta G}{3\phi\beta}. \quad (4.21a, b)$$

This approximation requires $\Gamma_0 > 0$ at $x = -\phi$, so that $\gamma > 9\beta\phi/5$. For $\gamma \gg 1$, (4.21) reduces to

$$\Delta G = \frac{81\beta(2\phi)^{8/3}}{50\gamma^2} \int_0^\infty \eta F \, d\eta - \frac{27\beta(2\phi)^{8/3}}{16\gamma^2} \int_0^\infty \eta H \, d\eta \equiv \frac{\Delta J}{\gamma^2}, \quad (4.22)$$

$$\Gamma_0 = 1 + \frac{3\beta}{2\gamma} \left(x - \frac{\phi}{5} \right) + \dots, \quad DR_0 = \frac{\alpha^{2/3} \Delta J(\beta, \phi)}{3\phi\beta\gamma} \equiv \frac{m_1 \alpha^{2/3} \phi^{5/3}}{\gamma}, \quad (4.23a, b)$$

where $m_1 = 81(3/2)^{2/3}/(50\Gamma(\frac{1}{3})) \approx 0.79$, as in (3.1). This expression for the leading-order drag reduction (4.23b) assumes strong Marangoni effects ($\gamma \gg 1$), weak diffusion ($\alpha \ll 1$) and strong bulk–surface exchange, and shows how drag reduction in this limit arises from differences between the two self-similar components F and H of the bulk concentration field.

4.2. Weak Marangoni effect and strong bulk–surface exchange: region A^{2D}

We now consider the boundary-layer equations when $\gamma \ll 1$ and $\alpha \ll 1$. Weak Marangoni effects imply that the interface cannot support any stress over most of its length. Consequently, there exists a slip flow along most of the plastron, characterised by a slip velocity in (4.1a) close to $3/4$. A short transition region, mediated by surface diffusion, exists between a no-slip and a slip flow at the upstream contact line, but this is disregarded here. Surfactant adsorbs onto the interface in the slip region (in $-\phi < x < x_0$, say) and accumulates (and desorbs) in a region at the downstream end of the plastron (in $x_0 < x < \phi$). Across this “quasi-stagnant” region, the surface velocity smoothly decreases to zero at the downstream contact line. Motivated by simulations and the scaling arguments given in §3.1, we propose the asymptotic structure illustrated in figure 7(b), in which “deceleration” and “transition” regions are nested at the tip of the quasi-stagnant region over lengthscales indicated. The formal requirement that the deceleration, transition and quasi-stagnant layers are nested ($\gamma\alpha^{1/2} \ll \gamma^{3/4}\alpha^{1/8} \ll \gamma^{3/5}/\alpha^{1/10} \lesssim 1$) is $\gamma \lesssim \alpha^{-3/2}$; this analysis does not therefore extend up to the limit $\gamma = O(1)$ where region M^{2D} begins. We now discuss these regions in turn.

4.2.1. The slip region ($-\phi < x < x_0$)

In the slip region, surfactant adsorbs onto the interface, causing the interface to carry a spatially growing component of the overall flux. Consequently, the bulk advective flux falls with x . Here, we set

$$\Gamma_0 = \alpha^{1/2} G(x), \quad c_0 = C(x, Y), \quad (4.24a, b)$$

where $y = \alpha^{1/2} Y$ balances advection and diffusion in the bulk-transport equation (4.1). When we substitute (4.24) into (4.1)–(4.6), the bulk-transport equation (4.1) in \mathcal{D}_1 becomes

$$C_{YY} - 3C_x/4 = 0. \quad (4.25)$$

At the interface $\alpha^{1/2} G(x) = C(x, 0)$ in the strong-exchange limit and the flux condition (4.2) reduces to

$$C_Y(x, 0) = 3\beta G_x/4. \quad (4.26)$$

The no-flux condition at the upstream stagnation point (4.3) is

$$G(-\phi) = 0. \quad (4.27)$$

For $x \in [-\phi, x_0]$ and $Y \rightarrow \infty$, the core condition (4.5) is

$$C \rightarrow 1. \quad (4.28)$$

We construct a similarity solution to (4.25)–(4.28) by expanding the surfactant fields for $\alpha \ll 1$ as

$$C(x, Y) = C_0(\eta) + (\alpha(x + \phi))^{1/2} C_1(\eta) + \dots, \quad G(x) = (x + \phi)^{1/2} C_1(0), \quad (4.29a, b)$$

with the similarity variable given by $\eta = Y/(\phi + x)^{1/2}$. Substituting (4.29) into (4.25)–(4.28) yields the boundary-value problems

$$C_0'' + 3\eta C_0'/8 = 0, \quad C_0(0) = 0, \quad C_0(\infty) = 1, \quad (4.30a-c)$$

$$C_1'' + 3\eta C_1'/8 - 3C_1/8 = 0, \quad 3\beta C_1(0) = 8C_0'(0), \quad C_1(\infty) = 0. \quad (4.31a-c)$$

These are solved by

$$C_0 = \operatorname{erf}(\sqrt{3}\eta/4), \quad C_1 = 4\operatorname{ierfc}(\sqrt{3}\eta/4)/(\sqrt{3}\beta), \quad (4.32a, b)$$

where $\operatorname{erf}(z)$ is the error function, $\operatorname{erfc}(z)$ is the complementary error function and $\operatorname{ierfc}(z) \equiv e^{-z^2}/\sqrt{\pi} - z\operatorname{erfc}(z)$ is the integrated complementary error function. Therefore the interfacial concentration field in the slip region is given by

$$\Gamma_0 = \frac{4}{\beta} \left(\frac{\alpha(x + \phi)}{3\pi} \right)^{1/2} + \dots, \quad (4.33)$$

contributing to (3.2). There is a large vertical concentration gradient across the boundary layer. Adsorption of surfactant onto the interface is accommodated by the horizontal gradient of the advective flux $3\beta\Gamma_0/4$. Marangoni effects remain subdominant, so the slip flow is uniform to this order, but the concentration rises with x to accommodate the adsorbed material. The total flux adsorbed across the slip region, up to the location $x = x_0$ (to be determined), is given by

$$\int_{-\phi}^{x_0} c_{0y}(x, 0) dx = \left(\frac{9\alpha(x_0 + \phi)}{3\pi} \right)^{1/2} + \dots, \quad (4.34)$$

which is subdominant to the flux in the core. The slip region terminates abruptly, meeting a very short deceleration region near $x = x_0$ nested at the start of the quasi-stagnant region (figure 7b).

4.2.2. Deceleration region ($x - x_0 = O(\gamma\alpha^{1/2})$)

In the deceleration region, $u_0(x, 0)$ varies by $O(1)$ over a short horizontal scale Δx and $\Gamma_0 \sim \alpha^{1/2}$ (where \sim denotes ‘scales like’). Thus, $\Delta x \sim \gamma\alpha^{1/2}$ for $u_0(x, 0)$ to balance $\gamma\Gamma_{0x}$. Diffusion balances advection by u_0 over a vertical lengthscale $y \sim (\alpha\Delta x)^{1/2} \sim \gamma^{1/2}\alpha^{3/4}$. Diffusion therefore influences the concentration field near the interface, while advection dominates transport in the upper part of the boundary layer. At the downstream limit of this region, u_0 falls towards zero, with $\Gamma_{0x} \approx 3\beta/(2\gamma)$. The deceleration region is too short for there to be appreciable desorption so flux conservation requires that $u_0 \sim \alpha^{1/2}/\Gamma_0 \sim \alpha^{1/2}\gamma/(x - x_0) \ll 1$ at the region’s outlet. We write the interfacial flux as

$$u_0(x, 0)\Gamma_0 = \frac{3}{\beta} \left(\frac{\alpha(x_0 + \phi)}{3\pi} \right)^{1/2} \equiv \frac{3\alpha^{1/2}}{4}\lambda, \quad \text{where} \quad \lambda = \frac{4}{\beta} \left(\frac{x_0 + \phi}{3\pi} \right)^{1/2}. \quad (4.35a, b)$$

We then rescale, using

$$x = x_0 + \gamma\alpha^{1/2}X, \quad y = \gamma^{1/2}\alpha^{3/4}Y, \quad \Gamma_0 = \alpha^{1/2}\lambda G(X), \quad c_0 = \alpha^{1/2}\lambda C(X, Y). \quad (4.36a-d)$$

Substituting (4.36) into (4.1)–(4.6), the bulk-surfactant equation (4.1) in \mathcal{D}_1 is given by

$$C_{YY} - \left(\frac{3}{4} - \frac{\lambda}{2\beta} G_X \right) C_X - \frac{\lambda Y}{2\beta} G_{XX} C_Y = 0. \quad (4.37)$$

We have $G(X) = C(X, 0)$ in the strong-exchange limit and the interfacial-surfactant equation (4.2) simplifies to

$$\left[G \left(\frac{3}{4} - \frac{\lambda}{2\beta} G_X \right) \right]_X = 0. \quad (4.38)$$

Integrating (4.38) and matching it to the slip region, where $G \rightarrow 1$ for $X \rightarrow -\infty$, gives

$$\frac{3}{4}G - \frac{\lambda}{2\beta}GG_X = \frac{3}{4}, \quad (4.39)$$

which can be solved directly to give $G + \log(G - 1) = (3\beta/(2\lambda))(X - X_0)$ for some X_0 (as in Jensen & Halpern (1998), for example). Substituting G into (4.35a), we compare $u_0(x, 0)$ with the COMSOL simulations in figure 4(d). The core condition (4.5) becomes

$$C \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as} \quad Y \rightarrow \infty \quad (4.40)$$

Equations (4.37)–(4.40) constitute a nonlinear boundary-layer problem that describes the abrupt ejection of bulk concentration towards the core of the channel in figure 3(i). However, we need only consider its limits here. The upstream condition on C is provided from the near-wall component of the concentration in the slip region, which grows in amplitude with Y . The downstream limit has self-similar form

$$G \approx \frac{3\beta}{2\lambda}(X - X_0) + \dots, \quad C \approx \frac{3\beta}{2\lambda}(X - X_0)\hat{C}(\eta) + \dots \quad (4.41a, b)$$

where the similarity variable is given by $\eta = Y/(X - X_0)$ for some X_0 and \hat{C} satisfies $\hat{C}_{\eta\eta} = (\lambda/2\beta)\hat{C}$, which has solutions $\exp[\pm\sqrt{\lambda/2\beta}\eta]$. Concentration contours are constant along lines $Y = \sqrt{2\beta/\lambda}(X - X_0)$, representing ejection of desorbed surfactant away from the wall. Expressed in terms of the original variables using (4.36), the downstream limit (4.41) of this region has

$$\Gamma_0 \approx \frac{3\beta}{2\gamma}(x - x_0) \quad u_0(x, 0) \approx \frac{\lambda\alpha^{1/2}\gamma}{2\beta(x - x_0)} \quad \text{for} \quad \gamma\alpha^{1/2} \ll x - x_0 \ll \gamma^{3/4}\alpha^{1/8}, \quad (4.42a, b)$$

which delivers an interfacial flux $3\lambda\alpha^{1/2}/4$ into a very short transition region near $x = x_0$. Surface diffusion is a subdominant effect in this region provided $\epsilon^2 \ll \gamma/\alpha^{1/2}$. Equation (4.42a) contributes to (3.2a, 4.42b) and explains the steep fall in surface velocity in figure 4(d) at the end of the slip region; the incident boundary layer of thickness $\alpha^{1/2}$ is thickened to $\alpha^{1/2}/u_0$ as u_0 diminishes (figure 3i).

4.2.3. Transition region ($x - x_0 = O(\gamma^{3/4}\alpha^{1/8})$)

In the transition region, there is a balance in the bulk between vertical diffusion, advection by u_0 (which is now $o(1)$) and advection by shear so that, over a horizontal lengthscale Δx , $\alpha/y^2 \sim u_0/\Delta x \sim y/\Delta x$; thus $y \sim u_0 \sim (\alpha\Delta x)^{1/3}$. Matching u_0 to the deceleration region requires $u_0 \sim \alpha^{1/2}\gamma/\Delta x$, implying $\Delta x \sim \gamma^{3/4}\alpha^{1/8}$ and $y \sim u_0 \sim \gamma^{1/4}\alpha^{3/8}$. The interfacial concentration is linear at leading order ($\Gamma_0 \approx 3\beta(x - x_0)/(2\gamma)$) with a correction of size $u_0\Delta x/\gamma \sim \alpha^{1/2}$. The bulk concentration is set by the dominant interfacial concentration and is $O(\Delta x/\gamma) \sim \alpha^{1/8}/\gamma^{1/4}$. The region is again too short for there to be appreciable desorption, so the interfacial flux is still $O(\alpha^{1/2})$. To provide a bridge between the deceleration region and the quasi-stagnant region further downstream,

we reintroduce shear $3Y/2$ to the bulk transport equation, using the scaling

$$x = x_0 + \alpha^{1/8}\gamma^{3/4}X, \quad y = \alpha^{3/8}\gamma^{1/4}Y, \\ \Gamma_0 = \frac{3\beta}{2\gamma}(x - x_0) + \alpha^{1/2}G(X), \quad c_0 = \frac{\alpha^{1/8}}{\gamma^{1/4}}C(X, Y). \quad (4.43a-d)$$

Substituting (4.43) into (4.1)–(4.6), the bulk transport equation (4.1) in \mathcal{D}_1 simplifies to

$$C_{YY} + \left(\frac{G_X}{2\beta} - \frac{3Y}{2} \right) C_X - \frac{G_{XX}}{2\beta} Y C_Y = 0. \quad (4.44)$$

Again $C(X, 0) = G(X)$ and the interfacial transport equation (4.2) becomes

$$- \left[\frac{3\beta X}{4} G_X \right]_X = 0. \quad (4.45)$$

Using (4.45), there is no exchange of surfactant with the bulk to leading order. Integrating (4.45) in X and matching to the deceleration region, $XG_X \rightarrow \lambda$ as $X \rightarrow -\infty$. This can be integrated in X to give $G = -\lambda \log X + A_1$ for some constant A_1 , which we substitute into (4.44), to obtain

$$C_{YY} - \frac{\lambda}{2\beta} \left(\frac{1}{X} C_X - \frac{Y C_Y}{X^2} \right) - \frac{3}{2} Y C_X = 0. \quad (4.46)$$

This linear boundary-layer problem bridges the scalings $Y \sim X$ for $X \ll 1$ and $Y \sim X^{1/3}$ for $X \gg 1$. Expressed in terms of original variables using (4.43), the downstream limit of the transition region demonstrates that

$$\Gamma_0 \approx \frac{3\beta(x - x_0)}{2\gamma}, \quad u_0(x, 0) \approx \frac{\lambda\alpha^{1/2}\gamma}{2\beta(x - x_0)} \quad \text{for} \quad \gamma^{3/4}\alpha^{1/8} \ll x - x_0 \ll 1. \quad (4.47a, b)$$

This delivers an interfacial flux $3\lambda\alpha^{1/2}/4$ into the quasi-stagnant region in $x_0 < x < \phi$, where the drag reduction is to be determined.

4.2.4. The quasi-stagnant region ($x_0 < x < \phi$)

In the quasi-stagnant region, compression of the almost-immobile interface promotes desorption, returning surfactant to the bulk. Therefore, the interfacial flux of surfactant decreases and the bulk flux increases with x . Following the scaling arguments and numerical simulations outlined in §3.1, we write

$$\Gamma_0 = \frac{3\beta}{2\gamma}(x - x_0) + G(x), \quad c_0 = \frac{3\beta}{2\gamma}(x - x_0)C(\eta), \quad (4.48a, b)$$

where the similarity variable $\eta = y/(\alpha(x - x_0))^{1/3}$ balances advection and diffusion in the bulk-transport equation (4.1). Substituting (4.48) into (4.1)–(4.6), the bulk-surfactant equation (4.1) in \mathcal{D}_1 simplifies to

$$C_{\eta\eta} + \eta^2 C_\eta / 2 - 3\eta C / 2 = 0, \quad C(0) = 1, \quad C(\infty) = 0. \quad (4.49a-c)$$

At the interface $x \in [x_0, \phi]$ and $Y = 0$, the interfacial-surfactant equation (4.2) becomes

$$\beta [u_0(x, 0)(x - x_0)]_x = (\alpha(x - x_0))^{2/3} C'(0). \quad (4.50)$$

Integrating (4.50) and applying the no-flux condition $u_0(\phi, 0) = 0$, gives

$$\beta u_0(x, 0) = - \frac{3\alpha^{2/3} C'(0)}{5} \left(\frac{(\phi - x_0)^{5/3}}{x - x_0} - (x - x_0)^{2/3} \right), \quad (4.51)$$

where $C'(0) = -3^{5/3}/(2^{4/3}\Gamma(\frac{1}{3})) \approx -0.92$. This profile successfully captures the COMSOL prediction in figure 4(d). In figure 4(d), the small discrepancy between the asymptotic results (4.35, 4.51) and the 2D long-wave model arises from the retention of surface diffusion in its numerical approximation. Matching (4.51) to the surface velocity in the transition region (4.47) yields

$$5\lambda\gamma = -6\alpha^{1/6}C'(0)(\phi - x_0)^{5/3}. \quad (4.52)$$

Thus, in the quasi-stagnant region of A^{2D} , the interfacial concentration is given by

$$\Gamma_0 = \frac{3\beta}{2\gamma} \left(x - \phi + \left(\frac{-5\lambda\gamma}{6\alpha^{1/6}C'(0)} \right)^{3/5} \right). \quad (4.53)$$

Substituting (4.53) into (2.44), the leading-order drag reduction in region A^{2D} is given by

$$DR_0 = 1 - \frac{1}{2\phi} \left(\frac{-5\lambda}{6C'(0)} \right)^{3/5} \frac{\gamma^{6/10}}{\alpha^{1/10}} \equiv 1 - \frac{a_1\gamma^{6/10}}{\alpha^{1/10}}, \quad (4.54)$$

as in (3.2b). This result emphasises how bulk diffusion influences the interfacial surfactant profile to determine DR_0 . Using expression for $u_0(x, 0)$ and λ in the quasi-stagnant and slip regions respectively, (4.51) and (4.35), the surfactant desorbed across the quasi-stagnant region is given by

$$\int_{x_0}^{\phi} c_{0y}(x, 0) dx = - \left(\frac{9\alpha^{1/2}(x_0 + \phi)}{3\pi} \right)^{1/2} + \dots \quad (4.55)$$

This matches the surfactant adsorbed in the slip region in (4.34).

4.3. Weak Marangoni effect and weak bulk-surface exchange: region A_E^{2D}

Finally, we simplify the boundary-layer equations (4.1)–(4.6) in region A_E^{2D} , where bulk diffusion and bulk-surface exchange are weak compared to Marangoni effects and advection, i.e. $\alpha \ll 1$. In this regime, the bulk and interfacial dynamics decouple, leading to $c_0 \approx 1$ and the interfacial surfactant distribution is in the classical stagnant-cap regime (He *et al.* 1991). Here, the surfactant gradient generated by the flow renders the downstream end of the interface no slip and the upstream end of the interface shear-free. We expand the surfactant field as follows

$$c_0 = 1 + \alpha C_1(x, y) + \dots, \quad \Gamma_0 = G_0(x) + \alpha G_1(x) + \dots, \quad (4.56a, b)$$

and substitute (4.56) into (4.1)–(4.6). In the interfacial surfactant equation (4.2), there is no flux of bulk surfactant onto the interface. For $x \in [-\phi, \phi]$ and $y = 0$, we have

$$3\beta G_0/4 - \gamma G_{0x} G_0/2 = 0, \quad (4.57)$$

using the no-flux of interfacial surfactant condition (4.3). The surfactant flux condition (4.3b) in \mathcal{D}_1 reduces to

$$\int_{-\phi}^{\phi} G_0 dx = 2\phi. \quad (4.58)$$

A piecewise solution to (4.57) exists for $2\phi > 4\gamma/3\beta$, such that in A_E^{2D} the interfacial-surfactant distribution is given by

$$G_0 = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } -\phi < x < x_0, \\ \frac{3\beta}{2\gamma}(x - x_0) & \text{for } x_0 < x < \phi. \end{cases} \quad (4.59)$$

	M^{2D} ($\alpha \ll 1$)	M^{1D} ($1 \ll \alpha \ll \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}$)	M^{1D} and M_E^{1D} ($\alpha \gg \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}$)
Drag reduction scaling	$\frac{\phi^{5/3} \alpha^{2/3}}{\gamma} = \frac{\hat{H}^2}{\hat{L}_m^2}$	$\frac{\phi}{\gamma} = \frac{\phi \hat{P} \hat{H} \hat{Q}}{\hat{L}_m^2 \hat{D}}$	$\frac{\epsilon^2 \alpha}{\gamma} = \frac{\phi^{5/3} \hat{P}^{5/3} \hat{H}^{1/3} \hat{Q}^{1/3}}{\hat{L}_m^2 \hat{D}^{1/3}}$
Slip length scaling	$\frac{b^{1/3} (\phi P)^{8/3}}{L_m^2}$	$\frac{b(\phi P)^2}{L_m^2}$	$\frac{\phi P}{L_m^2}$

TABLE 2. Summary of the leading-order drag reduction (DR_0) scaling in regions M^{2D} , M^{1D} and M_E^{1D} and the corresponding leading-order slip length (λ_e) scaling using the non-dimensionalisation in Temprano-Coleto *et al.* (2023), in terms of the mobilisation length L_m . The drag reduction is converted to the slip length using (2.45) for $DR_0 \ll 1$ and $\lambda_e \sim P\lambda_0$, where $\hat{L}_m^2 = (\hat{n}\hat{R}\hat{T}\hat{H}^2\hat{K}_a^2\hat{c}_0)/(\hat{D}\hat{\mu}\hat{K}_d^2)$, $P = \hat{P}/\hat{H}$, $L_m = \hat{L}_m/\hat{H}$ and $b = \hat{Q}/\hat{D}$.

We evaluate x_0 using the no-net-flux condition (4.58), such that $x_0 = \phi - (8\phi\gamma/(3\beta))^{1/2}$. Hence, for $2\phi > 4\gamma/3\beta$, the leading-order drag reduction calculated by substituting (4.59) into (2.44) is given by

$$DR_0 = 1 - \left(\frac{2\gamma}{3\phi\beta} \right)^{1/2}. \quad (4.60)$$

This solution is equivalent to that in region A_E^{1D} in the strong cross-channel diffusion problem (Tomlinson *et al.* 2023a).

5. Discussion

In this study, we develop a long-wave theory to analyse the behaviour of a 2D laminar pressure-driven channel flow contaminated with soluble surfactant. The channel is bounded by a SHS with streamwise-periodic grooves and a solid wall. We linearise the equation of state and adsorption-desorption kinetics, solving Stokes and advection–diffusion equations for surfactant in the long-wave limit. Our investigation focuses on regimes where concentration gradients in the streamwise and cross-channel directions are comparable. By numerically solving the 2D long-wave model, we delineate asymptotic regions within the parameter space. Under conditions of strong cross-channel diffusion, our findings align with the 1D results in Tomlinson *et al.* (2023a). Conversely, when cross-channel diffusion is weak, we unveil novel regions of parameter space, where the drag reduction exhibits a non-trivial dependence on the thickness of the bulk-concentration boundary layer and surfactant strength. We derive asymptotic solutions for the boundary-layer problem, validating them against both the numerical solution of the 2D long-wave model (2.38)–(2.42) and the Stokes and advection–diffusion equations in COMSOL. These complementary methodologies, ranging from asymptotic solutions to long-wave numerical simulations, offer a hierarchy of solutions catering to diverse applications, particularly when numerical simulations are computationally prohibitive.

We have explored how the interfacial concentration (Γ_0), bulk concentration (c_0) and leading-order drag reduction (DR_0) are influenced by bulk diffusion (α), surface advection (β), surfactant strength (γ), interfacial diffusion (δ) and bulk–surface exchange (ν) (figures 3 and 5). In cases where cross-channel diffusion dominates, we recover the Marangoni-dominated (M^{1D} and M_E^{1D}), advection-dominated (A^{1D} and A_E^{1D}) and

diffusion-dominated (D^{1D} and D_E^{1D}) regions identified in Tomlinson *et al.* (2023a). However, under weak cross-channel diffusion and strong exchange, we unveil new subregions dominated by Marangoni effects (M^{2D} and M_E^{2D}) and advection (A^{2D} and A_E^{2D}). In these regions, a bulk concentration boundary layer forms, influencing the drag reduction when bulk–surface exchange is strong. When Marangoni effects dominate, the interface is immobilised and the surfactant distribution is approximately linear. The asymptotic solutions for DR_0 are summarised in figure 2 and converted to slip lengths (λ_e) using the non-dimensionalisation in Temprano-Coletto *et al.* (2023) in table 2. Temprano-Coletto *et al.* (2023) proposed that for microchannel applications, $\lambda_e \sim (\phi P)^2/L_m^2$, where $\phi P = \phi \hat{P}/\hat{H}$ is the grating length and $L_m^2 = (\hat{n}\hat{R}\hat{T}\hat{K}_a^2\hat{c}_0)/(\hat{D}\hat{\mu}\hat{K}_d^2)$ is the squared mobilisation length. The slip-length formulae in Landel *et al.* (2020) and Sundin & Bagheri (2022) have the same dependencies in this limit. We find that the slip length always shares the same dependence on $1/L_m^2$, and the quadratic dependence on ϕP when $1 \ll \alpha \ll \epsilon^2$. However, when $\alpha \ll 1$, we find that λ_e has a stronger (8/3 power) dependence on ϕP , and when $\alpha \gg \epsilon^2$, we find a weaker (linear) dependence. The rest of the asymptotic solutions for DR_0 are summarised in figure 2. When $1 - DR_0 \ll 1$, the slip length simplifies to $\lambda_e = (\Delta p_I - \Delta p_U)/(\epsilon \Delta p_I \Delta p_U)$. Hence, outside of the specific applications considered in Temprano-Coletto *et al.* (2023), we have found new parameters that can be used to predict surfactant impairment of superhydrophobic drag reduction.

When both bulk diffusion and Marangoni effects are weak, part of the interface is shear-free and the surfactant distribution forms either a quasi-stagnant cap (when exchange is strong) or a classical stagnant cap (when exchange is weak). The former case has a particularly intricate structure, illustrated in figure 7(b). Surface stretching and compression accommodate weak adsorption from, and desorption to, the bulk across thin concentration boundary layers, ‘remobilising’ the interface (similar to a mechanism described by Crowdy *et al.* (2023) at low Pe). The upstream ‘slip’ region has a boundary layer of thickness $O(\alpha^{1/2})$, which is expected above an almost fully mobile interface. Weak stretching draws surfactant from the bulk to the interface via diffusive adsorption. The slip region transitions abruptly to a quasi-stagnant region, which grows to a thickness $O(\gamma^{1/5}\alpha^{3/10})$. This differs from a classical stagnant cap (of a fully insoluble surfactant) in having weak surface compression at a rate that balances diffusive desorption. The transition from the mobile to the almost immobile interface takes place across two nested regions at the tip of the quasi-stagnant cap: a short deceleration region, where the surface velocity falls abruptly, displacing the bulk boundary layer upwards towards the core; and a slightly longer transition region, across which shear in the boundary layer balances weakening surface advection. Shear then dominates in the boundary layer along the quasi-stagnant region. It is likely that the physical balances arising in these regions may emerge in other flow configurations involving soluble surfactant transport near confined interfaces at high Péclet numbers, such as the cap forming at the rear of a rising drop or bubble. For example, computations by Oguz & Sadhal (1988) and Tasoglu *et al.* (2008) revealed quasi-stagnant caps at large but finite Pe . Interfacial flux balances between diffusion-limited adsorption (slip) and desorption (stagnant region) were given by Harper (2004) and Palaparthi *et al.* (2006), treating the size of the cap as a parameter. Here, we determine its size by solving the bulk concentration boundary layer, which leads (for example) to the maximum interfacial surfactant concentration being of size $\beta/(\gamma^{2/5}\alpha^{1/10})$ in the A^{2D} regime.

For the laboratory experimental studies documented in the literature, we use our 2D long-wave model to forecast surfactant effects via the drag reduction, employing parameters typical of microchannel applications in laminar flows. Our estimates for these parameters, based on the surfactant SDS and experimental data from Temprano-Coletto *et al.*

(2023), are as follows: $\hat{D} \approx \hat{D}_I \approx 7 \times 10^{-10} \text{m}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$, $\hat{n} \approx 2$, $\hat{R} \approx 8.3 \text{J mol}^{-1} \text{K}^{-1}$, $\hat{T} \approx 296 \text{K}$, $\hat{\mu} \approx 8.9 \times 10^{-4} \text{kg m}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}$, $\hat{I}_m \approx 3.9 \times 10^{-6} \text{mol m}^{-1}$, $4 \times 10^{-6} \text{mol m}^{-2} \lesssim \hat{c}_0 \lesssim 1 \times 10^{-3} \text{mol m}^{-2}$ and $7.1 \times 10^1 \text{m}^2 \text{mol}^{-1} \lesssim \hat{\kappa}_a / \hat{\kappa}_d \lesssim 1.8 \times 10^3 \text{m}^2 \text{mol}^{-1}$. The remaining parameters \hat{P} , \hat{Q} , \hat{H} and \hat{K} vary across experiments. Specifically, for Song *et al.* (2018): $\alpha \approx 5 \times 10^{-3}$ and $1 \times 10^{-1} \lesssim \gamma \lesssim 6.8 \times 10^1$ (AM boundary, figure 2); Peaudecerf *et al.* (2017): $\alpha \approx 1$ and $4.7 \times 10^1 \lesssim \gamma \lesssim 2.9 \times 10^4$ (region *M*, figure 2); and Temprano-Coletto *et al.* (2023): $\alpha \approx 3$ and $1 \times 10^{-1} \lesssim \gamma \lesssim 3.7 \times 10^2$ (AM boundary, figure 2). Qualitatively, all of these studies report surfactant effects, which is consistent with their location in parameter space. All of these studies operate within the strong-exchange regime when $\hat{\kappa}_a = 8.95 \times 10^1 \text{m}^3 \text{mol}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}$ and $\hat{\kappa}_d = 7.5 \times 10^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}$ (Temprano-Coletto *et al.* 2023). However, as $\hat{\kappa}_a$ and $\hat{\kappa}_d$ are merely estimations based on fitting to microchannel experiments, we note that weak exchange could be achieved, for instance, when $\hat{\kappa}_a = 8.95 \times 10^{-3} \text{m}^3 \text{mol}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}$ and $\hat{\kappa}_d = 7.5 \times 10^{-5} \text{s}^{-1}$.

In summary, our study compares asymptotic and numerical solutions for a 2D laminar pressure-driven channel flow, confined by a streamwise-periodic SHS and a solid wall, and contaminated with soluble surfactant. While numerical solutions demand significant computational resources, our asymptotic solutions provide a cost-effective alternative. These asymptotic solutions offer accurate predictions devoid of empirical coefficient fitting and provide physical insights into the mechanisms governing drag reduction.

Acknowledgements

We acknowledge support from CBET–EPSRC (EPSRC Ref. EP/T030739/1, NSF #2054894), as well as partial support from ARO MURI W911NF-17-1-0306. For the purpose of open access, the authors have applied a Creative Commons Attribution (CCBY) licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising.

Declaration of interests

The authors report no conflict of interest.

Appendix A. Numerical solutions for weak cross-channel diffusion

The numerical solution to (2.38)–(2.43) can be divided into two subroutines, employing Chebyshev collocation techniques as outlined by Trefethen (2000). First, given a Γ_0^{old} , we evaluate c_0^{new} in \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 . The subdomains of the periodic cell are mapped to the 2D canonical Chebyshev collocation domain, $\mathcal{D}_n = \{\xi \in [-1, 1]\} \times \{\eta \in [-1, 1]\}$, using the transformations

$$(\xi_1, \xi_2, \eta) = ((x + \phi)/\phi - 1, (x - \phi)/(2 - 2\phi) - 1, y - 1). \quad (\text{A } 1)$$

We then discretise using $N = (N_\xi + 1) \times (N_\eta + 1)$ nodes in each subdomain, at points

$$(\xi_i, \eta_j) = (\cos(i\pi/N_\xi), \cos(j\pi/N_\eta)), \quad (\text{A } 2)$$

where $i = 0, 1, \dots, N_\xi$ and $j = 0, 1, \dots, N_\eta$. Horizontal boundary conditions (2.28) are enforced at $i = 0$ and N_ξ , which enforce continuity of bulk surfactant and continuity of bulk surfactant flux between subdomains

$$c_{0,1}^{\text{new}} = c_{0,2}^{\text{new}}, \quad \frac{\partial c_{0,1}^{\text{new}}}{\partial x_1} = \frac{\partial c_{0,2}^{\text{new}}}{\partial x_2}. \quad (\text{A } 3a, b)$$

Vertical boundary conditions (2.39)–(2.41) are enforced at $j = 0$ and N_η , ensuring continuity of surfactant flux at the liquid-gas interface, no-flux of surfactant at the solid wall in \mathcal{D}_1 and no-flux of surfactant at the solid walls in \mathcal{D}_2 . Discretising the bulk surfactant equation (2.38) in their conservative form \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 and incorporating the discretised matching conditions (represented by \mathbf{M}_{12} and \mathbf{M}_{21}), we have that

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A}_1 & \mathbf{M}_{12} \\ \mathbf{M}_{21} & \mathbf{A}_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{c}_{0,1}^{\text{new}} \\ \mathbf{c}_{0,2}^{\text{new}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{f}_1 \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A } 4)$$

where \mathbf{f}_1 is the forcing due to the interfacial surfactant concentration Γ_0^{old} in (2.39a).

Second, given a $\mathbf{c}_0^{\text{new}}$, we evaluate Γ_0^{new} for $x \in [-\phi, \phi]$ and $y = 0$. The liquid-gas interface is mapped to the 1D canonical Chebyshev collocation domain, $\mathcal{D}_n = \{\xi \in [-1, 1]\}$, using ξ_1 in (A 1), discretised using $N_\xi + 1$ nodes at points ξ_i in (A 2). Discretising the interfacial surfactant equation (2.39b) for $x \in [-\phi, \phi]$ and $y = 0$ and incorporating the discretised no-flux conditions (2.40), results in

$$\mathbf{B}(\Gamma_0^{\text{old}})\Gamma_0^{\text{new}} = \mathbf{g}, \quad (\text{A } 5)$$

where \mathbf{g} is the forcing due to the bulk surfactant concentration $\mathbf{c}_0^{\text{new}}$ in (2.39b).

Therefore, to evaluate DR_0 for a given $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \nu$ and ϕ , we choose an initial guess based on the 1D long-wave model discussed in §2.4. The initial guess can be substituted into the forcing \mathbf{f}_1 in the bulk concentration subroutine and the linear system inverted to calculate $\mathbf{c}_0^{\text{new}}$. The bulk concentration can then be substituted into the forcing \mathbf{g} in the interfacial concentration subroutine and the linear system inverted to calculate Γ_0^{new} . We then set $\Gamma_0^{\text{old}} = \Gamma_0^{\text{new}}$ and repeat the above steps. This procedure of updating \mathbf{c}_0 and Γ_0 is then continued until convergence is achieved for both the bulk and interfacial concentration fields.

REFERENCES

- BAIER, T. & HARDT, S. 2021 Influence of insoluble surfactants on shear flow over a surface in Cassie state at large Péclet numbers. *J. Fluid Mech.* **907**, A3.
- BAIER, T. & HARDT, S. 2022 Shear flow over a surface containing a groove covered by an incompressible surfactant phase. *J. Fluid Mech.* **949**, A34.
- BOLOGNESI, G., COTTIN-BIZONNE, C. & PIRAT, C. 2014 Evidence of slippage breakdown for a superhydrophobic microchannel. *Phys. Fluids* **26**, 082004.
- CHENG, Y., XU, J. & SUI, Y. 2015 Numerical study on drag reduction and heat transfer enhancement in microchannels with superhydrophobic surfaces for electronic cooling. *Appl. Therm. Eng.* **88**, 71–81.
- CROWDY, D.G., CURRAN, A.E. & PAPAGEORGIOU, D.T. 2023 Fast reaction of soluble surfactant can remobilize a stagnant cap. *J. Fluid Mech.* **969**, A8.
- FROSSARD, A.A., GÉRARD, V., DUPLESSIS, P., KINSEY, J.D., LU, X., ZHU, Y., BISGROVE, J., MABEN, J.R., LONG, M.S., CHANG, R.Y. & OTHERS 2019 Properties of seawater surfactants associated with primary marine aerosol particles produced by bursting bubbles at a model air–sea interface. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **53** (16), 9407–9417.
- GAME, S.E., HODES, M., KEAVENY, E.E. & PAPAGEORGIOU, D.T. 2017 Physical mechanisms relevant to flow resistance in textured microchannels. *Phys. Rev. Fluids* **2**, 094102.
- HARPER, J.F. 2004 Stagnant-cap bubbles with both diffusion and adsorption rate-determining. *J. Fluid Mech.* **521**, 115–123.
- HE, Z., MALDARELLI, C. & DAGAN, Z. 1991 The size of stagnant caps of bulk soluble surfactant on the interfaces of translating fluid droplets. *J. Colloid Interface Sci.* **146**, 442–451.
- HOURLIER-FARGETTE, A., DERVAUX, J., ANTKOWIAK, A. & NEUKIRCH, S. 2018 Extraction of silicone uncrosslinked chains at air–water–polydimethylsiloxane triple lines. *Langmuir* **34**, 12244–12250.

- JENSEN, O.E. & HALPERN, D. 1998 The stress singularity in surfactant-driven thin-film flows. part 1. viscous effects. *J. Fluid Mech.* **372**, 273–300.
- KIM, T.J. & HIDROVO, C. 2012 Pressure and partial wetting effects on superhydrophobic friction reduction in microchannel flow. *Phys. Fluids* **24**, 112003.
- KIRK, T.L., KARAMANIS, G., CROWDY, D.G. & HODES, M. 2020 Thermocapillary stress and meniscus curvature effects on slip lengths in ridged microchannels. *J. Fluid Mech.* **894**, A15.
- LAM, L.S., HODES, M. & ENRIGHT, R. 2015 Analysis of galinstan-based microgap cooling enhancement using structured surfaces. *J. Heat Transf.* **137**, 091003.
- LANDEL, J.R., PEAUDECERF, F.J., TEMPRANO-COLETO, F., GIBOU, F., GOLDSTEIN, R.E. & LUZZATTO-FEGIZ, P. 2020 A theory for the slip and drag of superhydrophobic surfaces with surfactant. *J. Fluid Mech.* **883**, A18.
- LEE, C., CHOI, C.H. & KIM, C.J. 2016 Superhydrophobic drag reduction in laminar flows: a critical review. *Exp. Fluids* **57**, 1–20.
- MAYER, M.D. & CROWDY, D.G. 2022 Superhydrophobic surface immobilisation by insoluble surfactant. *J. of Fluid Mech.* **949**, A18.
- NG, C.O. & WANG, C.Y. 2009 Stokes shear flow over a grating: implications for superhydrophobic slip. *Phys. Fluids* **21**, 087105.
- OGUZ, H.N. & SADHAL, S.S. 1988 Effects of soluble and insoluble surfactants on the motion of drops. *J. Fluid Mech.* **194**, 563–579.
- PALAPARTHI, R., PAPAGEORGIOU, D.T. & MALDARELLI, C. 2006 Theory and experiments on the stagnant cap regime in the motion of spherical surfactant-laden bubbles. *J. Fluid Mech.* **559**, 1–44.
- PARK, H., CHOI, C.H. & KIM, C.J. 2021 Superhydrophobic drag reduction in turbulent flows: a critical review. *Exp. Fluids* **62**, 1–29.
- PARK, H., SUN, G. & KIM, C.J. 2014 Superhydrophobic turbulent drag reduction as a function of surface grating parameters. *J. Fluid Mech.* **747**, 722–734.
- PEAUDECERF, F.J., LANDEL, J.R., GOLDSTEIN, R.E. & LUZZATTO-FEGIZ, P. 2017 Traces of surfactants can severely limit the drag reduction of superhydrophobic surfaces. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **114**, 7254–7259.
- PEREIRA, R., ASHTON, I., SABBAGHZADEH, B., SHUTLER, J.D. & UPSTILL-GODDARD, R.C. 2018 Reduced air–sea CO₂ exchange in the atlantic ocean due to biological surfactants. *Nat. Geosci.* **11**, 492–496.
- RASTEGARI, A. & AKHAVAN, R. 2019 On drag reduction scaling and sustainability bounds of superhydrophobic surfaces in high reynolds number turbulent flows. *J. Fluid Mech.* **864**, 327–347.
- RODRIGUEZ-BROADBENT, H. & CROWDY, D.G. 2023 Superhydrophobic surfaces with recirculating interfacial flow due to surfactants are ‘effectively’ immobilized. *J. Fluid Mech.* **956**, R3.
- SCHÄFFEL, D., KOYNOV, K., VOLLMER, D., BUTT, H.J. & SCHÖNECKER, C. 2016 Local flow field and slip length of superhydrophobic surfaces. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 134501.
- SCHÖNECKER, C., BAIER, T. & HARDT, S. 2014 Influence of the enclosed fluid on the flow over a microstructured surface in the Cassie state. *J. Fluid Mech.* **740**, 168–195.
- SEO, J. & MANI, A. 2018 Effect of texture randomization on the slip and interfacial robustness in turbulent flows over superhydrophobic surfaces. *Phys. Rev. Fluids* **3**, 044601.
- SONG, D., SONG, B., HU, H., DU, X., DU, P., CHOI, C.H. & ROTHSTEIN, J.P. 2018 Effect of a surface tension gradient on the slip flow along a superhydrophobic air–water interface. *Phys. Rev. Fluids* **3**, 033303.
- SUNDIN, J. & BAGHERI, S. 2022 Slip of submerged two-dimensional liquid-infused surfaces in the presence of surfactants. *J. Fluid Mech.* **950**, A35.
- TASOGLU, S., DEMIRCI, U. & MURADOGLU, M. 2008 The effect of soluble surfactant on the transient motion of a buoyancy-driven bubble. *Phys. Fluids* **20** (4).
- TEMPRANO-COLETO, F., SMITH, S.M., PEAUDECERF, F.J., LANDEL, J.R., GIBOU, F. & LUZZATTO-FEGIZ, P. 2023 A single parameter can predict surfactant impairment of superhydrophobic drag reduction. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **120** (3), e2211092120.
- TEO, C.J. & KHOO, B.C. 2010 Flow past superhydrophobic surfaces containing longitudinal grooves: effects of interface curvature. *Microfluid. Nanofluidics* **9** (2), 499–511.

- TOMLINSON, S.D., GIBOU, F., LUZZATTO-FEGIZ, P., TEMPRANO-COLETO, F., JENSEN, O.E. & LANDEL, J.R. 2023a Laminar drag reduction in surfactant-contaminated superhydrophobic channels. *J. Fluid Mech.* **963**, A10.
- TOMLINSON, S.D., GIBOU, F., LUZZATTO-FEGIZ, P., TEMPRANO-COLETO, F., JENSEN, O.E. & LANDEL, J.R. 2024 Unsteady evolution of slip and drag in surfactant-contaminated superhydrophobic channels. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.18184* .
- TOMLINSON, S.D., PEAUDECERF, F.J., TEMPRANO-COLETO, F., GIBOU, F., LUZZATTO-FEGIZ, P., JENSEN, O.E. & LANDEL, J.R. 2023b A model for slip and drag in turbulent flows over superhydrophobic surfaces with surfactant. *Int. J. Heat Fluid Flow* **103**, 109171.
- TREFETHEN, L.N. 2000 *Spectral methods in MATLAB*. SIAM.
- TÜRK, S., DASCHIEL, G., STROH, A., HASEGAWA, Y. & FROHNAPFEL, B. 2014 Turbulent flow over superhydrophobic surfaces with streamwise grooves. *J. Fluid Mech.* **747**, 186–217.
- XU, M., GRABOWSKI, A., YU, N., KEREZYTE, G., LEE, J., PFEIFER, B.R. & KIM, C. 2020 Superhydrophobic drag reduction for turbulent flows in open water. *Phys. Rev. Appl.* **13** (3), 034056.