

A variational front-tracking method for multiphase flow with triple junctions

Harald Garcke*

Robert Nürnberg[†]Quan Zhao[‡]

Abstract

We present and analyze a variational front-tracking method for a sharp-interface model of multiphase flow. The fluid interfaces between different phases are represented by curve networks in two space dimensions (2d) or surface clusters in three space dimensions (3d) with triple junctions where three interfaces meet, and boundary points/lines where an interface meets a fixed planar boundary. The model is described by the incompressible Navier–Stokes equations in the bulk domains, with classical interface conditions on the fluid interfaces, and appropriate boundary conditions at the triple junctions and boundary points/lines. We propose a weak formulation for the model, which combines a parametric formulation for the evolving interfaces and an Eulerian formulation for the bulk equations. We employ an unfitted discretization of the coupled formulation to obtain a fully discrete finite element method, where the existence and uniqueness of solutions can be shown under weak assumptions. The constructed method admits an unconditional stability result in terms of the discrete energy. Furthermore, we adapt the introduced method so that an exact volume preservation for each phase can be achieved for the discrete solutions. Numerical examples for three-phase flow and four-phase flow are presented to show the robustness and accuracy of the introduced methods.

Key words. multiphase flow, Navier–Stokes, surface tension, triple junctions, parametric finite element method, unconditional stability, volume preservation.

AMS subject classification. 76M10, 76T30, 76D05

1 Introduction

Multiphase flows are a widely observed phenomena in nature, and have also found a wide range of applications in industrial engineering and scientific experiments, such as oil and natural gas extraction, ink-jet printing and microfluids. In recent decades, significant mathematical efforts have been devoted to the study of multiphase flow and its applications.

*Fakultät für Mathematik, Universität Regensburg, 93053 Regensburg, Germany, (harald.garcke@ur.de)

[†]Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Trento, 38123 Trento, Italy, (robert.nurnberg@unitn.it)

[‡]School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Science and Technology of China, 230026 Hefei, China (quanzhao@ustc.edu.cn)

There exist a large body of numerical methods for two-phase flows in the literature [37, 38, 49]. These include volume of fluid methods [40, 47, 53, 55], diffuse-interface methods [1, 4, 5, 25, 33, 39, 46, 58, 62], level set methods [31, 50, 51, 57, 63] and front-tracking methods [3, 6, 7, 16, 17, 27, 32, 34–36, 52, 54, 64, 66]. Of course, two-phase flow is a special case of multiphase flow. In this paper, from now on, we will use the term *multiphase* flow exclusively for the situation where at least three different phases are present in the model. Generalizations of the level set approach to multiphase flow can be found in [48, 60, 61, 68]. The diffuse interface approach for multiphase flow was analyzed in [19, 21, 26, 28, 44, 59, 67], and a thin film approach for multiphase flow was discussed in [42]. To the best of our knowledge, there are far fewer works on front-tracking methods for multiphase flow. This can be explained by the fact that in addition to the well-known challenges of two-phase flow, a suitable numerical framework for dealing with the representation and the evolution of the triple junctions has to be found. These well-known challenges include the accurate approximation of discontinuous quantities, the prevention of mesh distortions and spurious velocities, as well as ensuring energy dissipation and conservation of mass. We refer to previous work by the authors in [16, 17, 35] for details on these issues in the context of both Eulerian and arbitrary Lagrangian–Eulerian (ALE) formulations. When more than two phases are present in the flow, triple junctions may appear, where three different interfaces meet. An ALE method for three-phase flow in two space dimensions has been considered in [45]. The author employs an iterative algorithm to continuously update the velocity field at the triple junctions, thus ensuring a good approximation of the angle condition. However, this treatment may lead to numerical instabilities, and a generalization to three space dimensions remains open.

In this paper, we consider front-tracking approximations for multiphase flow in both 2d and 3d in a unified framework. The fluid interfaces are represented by curve networks in 2d and surface clusters in 3d, with triple junction points/lines where three interfaces meet. We also account for the moving boundary points/lines when an interface meets a fixed external planar boundary. The model is then governed by the incompressible Navier–Stokes equations in the bulk phases and appropriate interface equations on the interfaces, together with boundary conditions at the triple junctions and boundary points/lines. The precise mathematical formulation will be introduced in Section 2. In fact, the front-tracking approximations we consider will be based upon a variational formulation which combines an Eulerian weak formulation for the bulk equations and a parametric formulation for the evolving interfaces, see (3.5). Using suitable discretizations of the two formulations, it is the aim of this work to devise a variational method that can preserve the inherent structures of the considered flow, i.e., the energy stability and volume conservation.

A crucial aspect of our introduced methods is a variational formulation for the motion of curve networks with triple junctions that was originally introduced by Barrett, Garcke and Nürnberg (BGN) [11]. The BGN approach relies on a novel parametric formulation of geometric evolution equations that allows for freedom in the tangential velocity of the parameterizations that describe the evolving interfaces. This is necessary to allow movement of the triple junctions and thus leads to a well-posed formulation. Here we recall that due to force balances that have to hold at triple junctions, parameterizations without tangential velocities would keep triple junctions stationary for all times. The innovative BGN idea was initially considered for mean curvature flow and surface diffusion of curve networks [10–12, 15], and was then generalized to the evolution of surface clusters [13, 14]. Another benefit of the tangential freedom in the BGN approach is that suitable discretizations lead to asymptotically equidistributed curves in 2d, and in general good quality meshes in 3d. We refer to the recent review article [18] for further details, including on the extension of the idea to other geometric evolution equations as well as to free

boundary problems in fluid mechanics and materials science. In particular, the BGN approach has been successfully applied to two-phase flow. In the unfitted mesh approach, unconditionally stable approximations were introduced in [16, 17, 36], while numerical approximations on moving fitted meshes were considered in [2, 3, 27, 34, 35].

In this work, we would like to combine the ideas of the BGN methods for two-phase flow in [17] with the BGN framework for the evolution of curve networks and surface clusters in [11, 14] to propose a novel variational formulation for multiphase flow with triple junctions. In particular, we will enforce the boundary conditions at the triple junctions either weakly through the variational formulation, or strongly in the chosen function spaces. We employ an unfitted finite element approximation for the Navier–Stokes equations in the bulk. Overall, this leads to a linear fully discrete approximation that is unconditionally stable. Moreover, we will also consider a structure-preserving variant of our fully discrete scheme, in the sense that it is not only energy stable, but also mass conserving. To this end, we adapt an idea from [9, 43] that uses time-averaged discrete interface normals to ensure that the discrete enclosed volume of each phase is exactly preserved. The obtained fully-discrete scheme is mildly nonlinear. In the context of the evolution of surface clusters this techniques has been successfully applied in [8], while for two-phase flow it was considered in [35].

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce a sharp-interface model for multiphase flow with triple junctions and boundary points/lines. Subsequently, a variational formulation is proposed for the considered flow in Section 3. Based on this formulation, we then explore unfitted finite element approximations in Section 4. Several numerical examples are presented in Section 5 to show the robustness of our introduced methods. Finally, we draw some conclusions in Section 6.

2 The sharp-interface model

Throughout this section we make use of the notation from [8] to describe the fluid interfaces. We assume that the fluid interfaces are represented by a cluster consisting of I_S hypersurfaces in \mathbb{R}^d , with $d \in \{2, 3\}$, and I_T triple junctions, which are denoted, respectively, by

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma(t) &:= (\Gamma_1(t), \dots, \Gamma_{I_S}(t)), & I_S \in \mathbb{N}, & I_S \geq 1, \\ \mathcal{T}(t) &:= (\mathcal{T}_1(t), \dots, \mathcal{T}_{I_T}(t)), & I_T \in \mathbb{N}, & I_T \geq 0.\end{aligned}$$

We consider multiphase flow in a fixed bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, and the cluster $\Gamma(t)$ separates Ω into I_R phases or bulk regions, which we enumerate as

$$\mathcal{R}[\Gamma(t)] := (\mathcal{R}_1[\Gamma(t)], \dots, \mathcal{R}_{I_R}[\Gamma(t)]), \quad I_R \in \mathbb{N}, \quad I_R \geq 2.$$

This means that $\Omega = \left(\cup_{\ell=1}^{I_R} \mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma(t)]\right) \cup \left(\cup_{i=1}^{I_S} \Gamma_i(t)\right) \cup \left(\cup_{k=1}^{I_T} \mathcal{T}_k(t)\right)$. The cluster may have contact with the boundary $\partial\Omega$ and thus generates boundary points/lines, which we denote by

$$\mathcal{B}(t) := (\mathcal{B}_1(t), \dots, \mathcal{B}_{I_B}(t)), \quad I_B \in \mathbb{N}, \quad I_B \geq 0.$$

In the bulk domains: For $\ell = 1, \dots, I_R$, we assume that the bulk region $\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma(t)]$ is occupied by a fluid of density $\rho_\ell \geq 0$ and viscosity $\eta_\ell > 0$. Let $\vec{u}(\vec{x}, t) : \Omega \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be the fluid velocity and let $p(\vec{x}, t) : \Omega \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the thermodynamic pressure. Then the dynamic

system is governed by the incompressible Navier–Stokes equations in the bulk as

$$\rho_\ell(\partial_t \vec{u} + \vec{u} \cdot \nabla \vec{u}) = \nabla \cdot \underline{\underline{\sigma}} + \rho_\ell \vec{g} \quad \text{in } \mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma(t)], \quad \ell = 1, \dots, I_R, \quad (2.1a)$$

$$\nabla \cdot \vec{u} = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma(t)], \quad \ell = 1, \dots, I_R, \quad (2.1b)$$

where $\vec{g} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the body acceleration, $\underline{\underline{\sigma}}$ is the stress tensor

$$\underline{\underline{\sigma}} = 2\eta_\ell \underline{\underline{\mathbb{D}}}(\vec{u}) - p \underline{\underline{Id}} \quad \text{with} \quad \underline{\underline{\mathbb{D}}}(\vec{u}) = \frac{1}{2} (\nabla \vec{u} + (\nabla \vec{u})^T) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma(t)].$$

Here $\underline{\underline{\mathbb{D}}}(\vec{u})$ is the rate-of-deformation tensor, and $\underline{\underline{Id}} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is the identity matrix. In order to formulate the boundary conditions, let $\partial\Omega = \partial_1\Omega \cup \partial_2\Omega$ be a partitioning of the boundary of Ω , and let \vec{n} be the outward unit normal to $\partial\Omega$. Then we prescribe either a no-slip condition or a free-slip condition such that

$$\vec{u} = \vec{0} \quad \text{on } \partial_1\Omega, \quad (2.2a)$$

$$\vec{u} \cdot \vec{n} = 0, \quad (\underline{\underline{\sigma}} \vec{n}) \cdot \vec{t} = 0 \quad \forall \vec{t} \in \{\vec{n}\}^\perp \quad \text{on } \partial_2\Omega, \quad (2.2b)$$

where $\{\vec{n}\}^\perp := \{\vec{t} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \vec{t} \cdot \vec{n} = 0\}$. For simplicity we assume that $\partial_1\Omega$ has positive measure. Observe that by allowing the case $\rho_\ell = 0$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, I_R$ in our model, we can consider Stokes flow in the bulk.

On the fluid interfaces: We introduce parameterizations of $\Gamma(t)$ as

$$\vec{x} = (\vec{x}_1, \dots, \vec{x}_{I_S}), \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{x}_i : \Upsilon_i \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \quad \text{with} \quad \Gamma_i(t) = \vec{x}_i(\Upsilon_i, t), \quad i = 1, \dots, I_S, \quad (2.3)$$

where $\Upsilon = (\Upsilon_1, \dots, \Upsilon_{I_S})$ is a collection of reference domains. The velocity induced by the parameterization is then given by $\vec{\mathcal{V}} = (\vec{\mathcal{V}}_1, \dots, \vec{\mathcal{V}}_{I_S})$ with

$$\vec{\mathcal{V}}_i(\vec{x}_i(\vec{q}, t), t) = \partial_t \vec{x}_i(\vec{q}, t) \quad \forall (\vec{q}, t) \in \Upsilon_i \times (0, T], \quad i = 1, \dots, I_S.$$

Let $\vec{\nu}_i$ be a continuous unit normal field on $\Gamma_i(t)$. We further introduce the index pair

$$b_i^+ \in \{1, \dots, I_R\}, \quad b_i^- \in \{1, \dots, I_R\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, I_S,$$

to denote the two subdomains $\mathcal{R}_{b_i^+}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{b_i^-}$ that lie on the two sides of the interface $\Gamma_i(t)$. In particular, the unit normal $\vec{\nu}_i$ of $\Gamma_i(t)$ points into the region $\mathcal{R}_{b_i^+}$.

On the fluid interfaces, we have the interface conditions

$$[\vec{u}]_{b_i^-}^{b_i^+} = \vec{0} \quad \text{on } \Gamma_i(t), \quad i = 1, \dots, I_S, \quad (2.4a)$$

$$[\underline{\underline{\sigma}} \vec{\nu}_i]_{b_i^-}^{b_i^+} = -\gamma_i \varkappa_i \vec{\nu}_i \quad \text{on } \Gamma_i(t), \quad i = 1, \dots, I_S, \quad (2.4b)$$

$$\vec{\mathcal{V}}_i \cdot \vec{\nu}_i = \vec{u} \cdot \vec{\nu}_i \quad \text{on } \Gamma_i(t), \quad i = 1, \dots, I_S. \quad (2.4c)$$

In the above expressions, $[\cdot]_{b_i^-}^{b_i^+}$ denotes the jump value from $\mathcal{R}_{b_i^-}(t)$ to $\mathcal{R}_{b_i^+}(t)$, and γ_i is a positive constant representing the surface tension of $\Gamma_i(t)$. In addition, \varkappa_i is the mean curvature of $\Gamma_i(t)$, that is

$$\varkappa_i \vec{\nu}_i = \Delta_s \vec{\text{id}} \quad \text{on } \Gamma_i(t), \quad i = 1, \dots, I_S, \quad (2.5)$$




Figure 1: Sketch of the local orientation of $(\Gamma_{s_1^k}, \Gamma_{s_2^k}, \Gamma_{s_3^k})$ at the triple junction line \mathcal{T}_k (blue). Depicted above is a plane that is perpendicular to \mathcal{T}_k . Left panel: the orientation $o^k := (o_1^k, o_2^k, o_3^k)$ can be chosen as $(1, 1, 1)$. Right panel: o^k can be chosen as $(1, 1, -1)$.

where id is the identity function in \mathbb{R}^d , and Δ_s is the Laplace–Beltrami operator [29]. Here (2.4a) implies the continuity of the fluid velocity across the fluid interfaces, (2.4b) is the balance between the jump in normal stress and the capillary force, and (2.4c) is the kinematic equation for the fluid interfaces.

At the triple junctions: By (2.3), we denote a partition of the boundary of the reference domain Υ_i as

$$\partial\Upsilon_i = \bigcup_{j=1}^{I_P^i} \partial_j \Upsilon_i, \quad I_P^i \in \mathbb{N}, \quad I_P^i \geq 1, \quad i = 1, \dots, I_S.$$

For each triple junction line \mathcal{T}_k , we set

$$\mathcal{T}_k(t) := \vec{x}_{s_1^k}(\partial_{p_1^k} \Upsilon_{s_1^k}, t) = \vec{x}_{s_2^k}(\partial_{p_2^k} \Upsilon_{s_2^k}, t) = \vec{x}_{s_3^k}(\partial_{p_3^k} \Upsilon_{s_3^k}, t), \quad k = 1, \dots, I_T, \quad (2.6a)$$

where $1 \leq s_1^k < s_2^k < s_3^k \leq I_S$ and $1 \leq p_j^k \leq I_P^{s_j^k}$, $j = 1, 2, 3$. The triple junction \mathcal{T}_k can thus be defined via the three pairs $((s_j^k, p_j^k))_{j=1}^3$, $k = 1, \dots, I_T$. At the triple junction, we have the force balance condition

$$\sum_{j=1}^3 \gamma_{s_j^k} \vec{\mu}_{s_j^k} = \vec{0} \quad \text{on } \mathcal{T}_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, I_T, \quad (2.6b)$$

where $\vec{\mu}_i$ denotes the conormal of $\Gamma_i(t)$, i.e., it is the outward unit normal to $\partial\Gamma_i(t)$ that lies within the tangent plane of $\Gamma_i(t)$. We also introduce the orientation $o^k = (o_1^k, o_2^k, o_3^k)$ with $o_j^k \in \{-1, 1\}$ representing the orientation at the triple junction \mathcal{T}_k such that $(o_j^k \vec{v}_{s_j^k}, \vec{\mu}_{s_j^k})$, $1 \leq j \leq 3$ have the same orientation in the plane orthogonal to \mathcal{T}_k at that point of interest, as shown in Fig. 1.

On the boundaries: We allow more than one of the phases to be in contact with the external boundary $\partial\Omega$, which means that the cluster $\Gamma(t)$ may intersect $\partial\Omega$. For simplicity, we assume that no triple junction $\mathcal{T}_k(t)$ is in contact with $\partial\Omega$. For each boundary point/line \mathcal{B}_k we set

$$\mathcal{B}_k(t) := \vec{x}_{s_k}(\partial_{p_k} \Upsilon_{s_k}, t) \subset \partial\Omega, \quad k = 1, \dots, I_B, \quad 1 \leq s_k \leq I_S, \quad 1 \leq p_k \leq I_P^{s_k}, \quad (2.7a)$$

which means that the boundary point/line \mathcal{B}_k is defined via the pair (s_k, p_k) . Then we have the following conditions at the boundary points/lines

$$\vec{n} \cdot \vec{v}_{s_k} = 0 \quad \text{on } \mathcal{B}_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, I_B, \quad (2.7b)$$

$$\vec{n} \cdot \vec{v}_{s_k} = 0 \quad \text{on } \mathcal{B}_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, I_B. \quad (2.7c)$$

Here (2.7b) can be interpreted as an attachment condition, which implies (2.7a) directly with the initial condition $\vec{x}_{s_k}(\partial_{p_k} \Upsilon_{s_k}, 0) \subset \partial\Omega$, while (2.7c) is a 90° contact angle condition between Γ_{s_k} and the boundary $\partial\Omega$. For simplicity we assume that the boundary points/lines always lie on the free slip part of $\partial\Omega$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{B}_k(t) \subset \partial_2\Omega \quad k = 1, \dots, I_B,$$

in order to be consistent with the conditions (2.7), see [69]. Nevertheless, the case $\mathcal{B}_k(t) \subset \partial_1\Omega$ can easily be included in our model, on requiring the conditions (2.7b) and (2.7c) only on $\mathcal{B}_k(t) \subset \partial_2\Omega$, while on $\mathcal{B}_k(t) \subset \partial_1\Omega$ the pinned contact point/line conditions $\vec{\nu}_{s_k} = \vec{0}$ need to hold. In particular, in this specific case no contact angle condition is prescribed on $\partial_1\Omega$. Recall that combining a no-slip condition with a moving contact line leads to a non-integrable shear-stress singularity [41], and this situation is not considered in this paper.

With the initial conditions for the fluid velocity $\vec{u}_0 = \vec{u}(\cdot, 0)$ and the surface cluster $\Gamma_0 = \Gamma(0)$, which also satisfies (2.6a) and (2.7a), our complete sharp-interface model for multiphase flow with triple junctions is given by the bulk equations (2.1), (2.2), the interface conditions (2.4) and the boundary conditions (2.6), (2.7). We introduce the density and viscosity functions

$$\rho(\cdot, t) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{I_R} \rho_\ell \mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma(t)]}, \quad \eta(\cdot, t) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{I_R} \eta_\ell \mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma(t)]}, \quad (2.8)$$

where \mathcal{X}_E is the characteristic function of the set E . The total free energy of the system is given by the kinetic energy of the fluids and the interfacial energy of the cluster,

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho, \vec{u}, \Gamma(t)) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \rho |\vec{u}|^2 d\mathcal{L}^d + \sum_{i=1}^{I_s} \int_{\Gamma_i(t)} \gamma_i d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \rho |\vec{u}|^2 d\mathcal{L}^d + \sum_{i=1}^{I_s} \gamma_i |\Gamma_i(t)|, \quad (2.9)$$

where \mathcal{L}^d represents the Lebesgue measure in \mathbb{R}^d , \mathcal{H}^{d-1} represents the $(d-1)$ -Hausdorff measure in \mathbb{R}^d , and $|\Gamma_i(t)|$ denotes the surface area of $\Gamma_i(t)$. We then have the following dissipation law for the free energy.

Theorem 2.1 (energy law for the strong solution). *The dynamic system obeys the following energy dissipation law*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{E}(\rho, \vec{u}, \Gamma(t)) = - \int_{\Omega} 2\eta \underline{\mathbb{D}}(\vec{u}) : \underline{\mathbb{D}}(\vec{u}) d\mathcal{L}^d + \int_{\Omega} \rho \vec{u} \cdot \vec{g} d\mathcal{L}^d. \quad (2.10)$$

Proof. It follows from the transport theorem [18, Theorem 33], the incompressibility condition (2.1b) and (2.1a) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \rho |\vec{u}|^2 d\mathcal{L}^d \right) \\ &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{I_R} \int_{\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma(t)]} \rho_\ell \vec{u} \cdot (\partial_t \vec{u} + \vec{u} \cdot \nabla \vec{u}) d\mathcal{L}^d = \sum_{\ell=1}^{I_R} \int_{\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma(t)]} \vec{u} \cdot (\nabla \cdot \underline{\underline{\sigma}} + \rho_\ell \vec{g}) d\mathcal{L}^d \\ &= - \sum_{\ell=1}^{I_R} \int_{\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma(t)]} 2\eta_\ell \underline{\mathbb{D}}(\vec{u}) : \underline{\mathbb{D}}(\vec{u}) d\mathcal{L}^d - \sum_{i=1}^{I_s} \int_{\Gamma_i(t)} \vec{u} \cdot [\underline{\underline{\sigma}} \vec{\nu}_i]_{b_i^-}^{b_i^+} d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} + \int_{\Omega} \rho \vec{u} \cdot \vec{g} d\mathcal{L}^d \\ &= - \int_{\Omega} 2\eta \underline{\mathbb{D}}(\vec{u}) : \underline{\mathbb{D}}(\vec{u}) d\mathcal{L}^d + \sum_{i=1}^{I_s} \int_{\Gamma_i(t)} \gamma_i \kappa_i \vec{u} \cdot \vec{\nu}_i d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} + \int_{\Omega} \rho \vec{u} \cdot \vec{g} d\mathcal{L}^d, \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

where in the last two equalities we have used integration by parts, on recalling the boundary conditions (2.2), the interface conditions (2.4a), as well as (2.8). Moreover, using the transport theorem [18, Theorem 32] and noting the kinematic condition (2.4c), the triple junction conditions (2.6), and the boundary conditions (2.7), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt} (\gamma_i |\Gamma_i(t)|) &= - \sum_{i=1}^{I_S} \int_{\Gamma_i(t)} \gamma_i \varkappa_i \vec{\mathcal{V}}_i \cdot \vec{\nu}_i d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{I_S} \gamma_i \int_{\partial\Gamma_i(t)} \vec{\mathcal{V}}_i \cdot \vec{\mu}_i d\mathcal{H}^{d-2} \\
&= - \sum_{i=1}^{I_S} \int_{\Gamma_i(t)} \gamma_i \varkappa_i \vec{u} \cdot \vec{\nu}_i d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} + \sum_{k=1}^{I_T} \int_{\mathcal{T}_k(t)} \vec{\mathcal{V}}_{s_1^k} \cdot \left(\sum_{j=1}^3 \gamma_{s_j^k} \vec{\mu}_{s_j^k} \right) d\mathcal{H}^{d-2} \\
&= - \sum_{i=1}^{I_S} \int_{\Gamma_i(t)} \gamma_i \varkappa_i \vec{u} \cdot \vec{\nu}_i d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}. \tag{2.12}
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (2.11) and (2.12), and recalling (2.9), yields the desired result (2.10). \square

For later use, we introduce the following index sets and orientations of the bulk regions

$$\mathcal{I}_\Gamma^\ell \subset \{1, \dots, I_S\}, \quad o^{\mathcal{R}_\ell} \in \{-1, 1\}^{I_S}, \quad \ell = 1, \dots, I_R, \quad I_R \in \mathbb{N}, \quad I_R \geq 2, \tag{2.13}$$

such that $\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma(t)]$ is the region enclosed by the surfaces $\{\Gamma_i(t)\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\Gamma^\ell}$ and possibly an additional part of the fixed boundary $\partial\Omega$ to create a finite volume. Here the orientations are chosen such that $o_i^{\mathcal{R}_\ell} \vec{\nu}_i$ is the outer normal to $\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma(t)]$ on $\Gamma_i(t)$. Then we have the following volume conservation law for each bulk region.

Theorem 2.2 (volume preservation for the strong solution). *The dynamic system obeys the volume conservation law*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \text{vol}(\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma(t)]) = 0 \quad \text{for } \ell = 1, \dots, I_R. \tag{2.14}$$

Proof. Using the Reynolds transport theorem [18, Theorem 33], it holds for any $\ell = 1, \dots, I_R$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt} \text{vol}(\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma(t)]) &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\Gamma^\ell} \int_{\Gamma_i(t)} o_i^{\mathcal{R}_\ell} \vec{\mathcal{V}}_i \cdot \vec{\nu}_i d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\Gamma^\ell} \int_{\Gamma_i(t)} o_i^{\mathcal{R}_\ell} \vec{u} \cdot \vec{\nu}_i d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \\
&= \int_{\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma(t)]} \nabla \cdot \vec{u} d\mathcal{L}^d = 0, \tag{2.15}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have invoked the kinematic condition (2.4c) and the incompressibility condition (2.1b). \square

The main aim of this paper is to devise a variational front-tracking method for the introduced sharp-interface model such that discrete analogues of (2.10) and (2.14), the two fundamental structures of the considered flow, are satisfied also on the fully discrete level.

Remark 2.3 (steady state solutions). *It is not difficult to verify that any stationary solution of the sharp interface model (2.1), (2.2), (2.4), (2.6), (2.7) with body acceleration $\vec{g} = \vec{0}$ must satisfy $\vec{u} = \vec{0}$, $\vec{\mathcal{V}}_i = \vec{0}$, $i = 1, \dots, I_S$, $\varkappa_i = \bar{\varkappa}_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, \dots, I_S$, and $p = \sum_{\ell=1}^{I_R} \bar{p}_\ell \mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma(t)]}$ with $\bar{p}_\ell \in \mathbb{R}$, $\ell = 1, \dots, I_R$, satisfying*

$$\bar{p}_{b_i^-} - \bar{p}_{b_i^+} = -\gamma_i \bar{\varkappa}_i \quad \text{on } \Gamma_i(t), \quad i = 1, \dots, I_S. \tag{2.16}$$

We now investigate what (2.16) implies at the triple junction \mathcal{T}_k . To this end, we would like to sum this equality for the interfaces $\Gamma_{s_1^k}$, $\Gamma_{s_2^k}$ and $\Gamma_{s_3^k}$ in such a way, that we obtain zero on the left hand side. Firstly we observe that exactly three different phases meet at \mathcal{T}_k , i.e., $\text{Card}(\{b_{s_1^k}^-, b_{s_1^k}^+, b_{s_2^k}^-, b_{s_2^k}^+, b_{s_3^k}^-, b_{s_3^k}^+\}) = 3$, where the function $\text{Card}(\cdot)$ represents the cardinality of a set. Secondly, we note that a phase's pressure in (2.16) is multiplied by $+1$ or -1 , depending on the sign of \vec{v}_i . Hence, if we want to ensure that each of the three phase pressures is added exactly once with a positive sign, and exactly once with a negative sign, we need to make use of the local orientation $o^k = (o_1^k, o_2^k, o_3^k)$ of the interfaces meeting at \mathcal{T}_k , as shown in Fig. 1. Overall we obtain

$$0 = \sum_{j=1}^3 o_j^k (\bar{p}_{b_{s_j^k}^-} - \bar{p}_{b_{s_j^k}^+}) = \sum_{j=1}^3 o_j^k \gamma_{s_j^k} \bar{\chi}_{s_j^k}. \quad (2.17)$$

The condition (2.17) will motivate a delicate treatment of the curvatures at the triple junctions on the discrete level in order to ensure a well-posed approximation that conserves the enclosed volumes.

3 Weak formulation

On recalling (2.3) and (2.6a), we define the function space for the parameterization of Γ as $V(\Upsilon) := \{(\vec{\chi}_1, \dots, \vec{\chi}_{I_S}) \in \times_{i=1}^{I_S} [H^1(\Upsilon_i)]^d : \vec{\chi}_{s_1^k}(\partial_{p_1^k} \Upsilon_{s_1^k}) = \vec{\chi}_{s_2^k}(\partial_{p_2^k} \Upsilon_{s_2^k}) = \vec{\chi}_{s_3^k}(\partial_{p_3^k} \Upsilon_{s_3^k}), k = 1, \dots, I_T\}$. For any $\vec{x} \in V(\Upsilon)$, this gives a parameterization of a cluster $\Gamma = \vec{x}(\Upsilon)$. We then introduce the following function spaces on Γ

$$\begin{aligned} W(\Gamma) &:= \{(\chi_1, \dots, \chi_{I_S}) \in \times_{i=1}^{I_S} L^2(\Gamma_i)\}, \\ V(\Gamma) &:= \{(\vec{\chi}_1, \dots, \vec{\chi}_{I_S}) \in \times_{i=1}^{I_S} [H^1(\Gamma_i)]^d : \vec{\chi}_{s_1^k} = \vec{\chi}_{s_2^k} = \vec{\chi}_{s_3^k} \text{ on } \mathcal{T}_k, k = 1, \dots, I_T\}, \\ V_{\partial}(\Gamma) &:= \{(\vec{\chi}_1, \dots, \vec{\chi}_{I_S}) \in V(\Gamma) : \vec{\chi}_{s_k} \cdot \vec{n} = 0 \text{ on } \mathcal{B}_k, k = 1, \dots, I_B\}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

and the L^2 -inner product over $\Gamma := (\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_{I_S})$ as

$$\langle u, v \rangle_{\Gamma} := \sum_{i=1}^{I_S} \int_{\Gamma_i} u_i \cdot v_i \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \quad \forall u, v \in W(\Gamma),$$

where we also allow u and v to be vector or tensor valued functions.

Next we denote by (\cdot, \cdot) the L^2 -inner product over Ω and introduce the following function spaces for the bulk quantities, i.e., the velocity and pressure

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{U} &:= \{\vec{\chi} \in [H^1(\Omega)]^d : \vec{\chi} = \vec{0} \text{ on } \partial_1 \Omega, \vec{\chi} \cdot \vec{n} = 0 \text{ on } \partial_2 \Omega\}, \\ \mathbb{P} &:= \{\eta \in L^2(\Omega) : (\eta, 1) = 0\}, \quad \mathbb{V} := H^1(0, T; [L^2(\Omega)]^d) \cap L^2(0, T; \mathbb{U}). \end{aligned}$$

In a similar manner to the simpler situation of two-phase flow [17], it can be shown that

$$(\rho [\partial_t \vec{u} + (\vec{u} \cdot \nabla) \vec{u}], \vec{\chi}) = \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{d}{dt} (\rho \vec{u}, \vec{\chi}) + (\rho \partial_t \vec{u}, \vec{\chi}) - (\rho \vec{u}, \partial_t \vec{\chi}) \right] + \mathcal{A}(\rho, \vec{u}; \vec{u}, \vec{\chi}), \quad (3.2)$$

holds $\forall \vec{\chi} \in \mathbb{V}$, where we introduced the antisymmetric term

$$\mathcal{A}(\rho, \vec{v}; \vec{u}, \vec{\chi}) := \frac{1}{2} [(\rho (\vec{v} \cdot \nabla) \vec{u}, \vec{\chi}) - (\rho (\vec{v} \cdot \nabla) \vec{\chi}, \vec{u})].$$

The rigorous derivation of (3.2) is presented in Appendix A.

For the pressure and viscous term in (2.1a), we take the inner product with $\vec{\chi} \in \mathbb{V}$ and integrate over Ω to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(\nabla \cdot \underline{\sigma}, \vec{\chi}) &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{I_R} \int_{\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma(t)]} (\nabla \cdot \underline{\sigma}) \cdot \vec{\chi} \, d\mathcal{L}^d \\
&= \sum_{\ell=1}^{I_R} \int_{\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma(t)]} \left(p \nabla \cdot \vec{\chi} \, d\mathcal{L}^d - 2\eta_\ell \underline{\mathbb{D}}(\vec{u}) : \underline{\mathbb{D}}(\vec{\chi}) \right) \, d\mathcal{L}^d - \sum_{i=1}^{I_S} \int_{\Gamma_i(t)} [\underline{\sigma} \vec{v}_i]_{b_i^-}^{b_i^+} \cdot \vec{\chi} \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \\
&= (p, \nabla \cdot \vec{\chi}) - 2(\eta \underline{\mathbb{D}}(\vec{u}), \underline{\mathbb{D}}(\vec{\chi})) + \sum_{i=1}^{I_S} \int_{\Gamma_i(t)} \gamma_i \varkappa_i \vec{v}_i \cdot \vec{\chi} \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \\
&= (p, \nabla \cdot \vec{\chi}) - 2(\eta \underline{\mathbb{D}}(\vec{u}), \underline{\mathbb{D}}(\vec{\chi})) + \langle \varkappa_\gamma \vec{v}, \vec{\chi} \rangle_{\Gamma(t)}, \tag{3.3}
\end{aligned}$$

where we introduced the weighted mean curvature $\varkappa_\gamma := (\gamma_1 \varkappa_1, \gamma_2 \varkappa_2, \dots, \gamma_{I_S} \varkappa_{I_S})$ such that

$$(\varkappa_\gamma)_i \vec{v}_i = \gamma_i \Delta_s \vec{\text{id}} \quad \text{on } \Gamma_i(t), \quad i = 1, \dots, I_S, \tag{3.4}$$

recall (2.5).

Now we propose the following weak formulation for the dynamic system. Let $\vec{x}(\cdot, 0) \in V(\Upsilon)$ with $\vec{x}_{s_k}(\partial_{p_k} \Upsilon_{s_k}, 0) \subset \partial\Omega$ for $k = 1, \dots, I_B$ and $\vec{u}(\cdot, 0) \in \mathbb{U}$. We then find $\vec{x}(\Upsilon, t) \in V(\Upsilon)$ for $\Gamma(t) = \vec{x}(\Upsilon, t)$ with $\vec{v} \in V_\partial(\Gamma(t))$, $\vec{u} \in \mathbb{V}$, $p \in L^2(0, T; \mathbb{P})$ and $\varkappa_\gamma \in W(\Gamma(t))$ such that for all $t \in (0, T]$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{d}{dt} (\rho \vec{u}, \vec{\chi}) + (\rho \partial_t \vec{u}, \vec{\chi}) - (\rho \vec{u}, \partial_t \vec{\chi}) \right] + \mathcal{A}(\rho, \vec{u}; \vec{u}, \vec{\chi}) \\
+ 2(\eta \underline{\mathbb{D}}(\vec{u}), \underline{\mathbb{D}}(\vec{\chi})) - (p, \nabla \cdot \vec{\chi}) - \langle \varkappa_\gamma \vec{v}, \vec{\chi} \rangle_{\Gamma(t)} = (\rho \vec{g}, \vec{\chi}) \quad \forall \vec{\chi} \in \mathbb{V}, \tag{3.5a}
\end{aligned}$$

$$(\nabla \cdot \vec{u}, q) = 0 \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{P}, \tag{3.5b}$$

$$\langle [\vec{v} - \vec{u}] \cdot \vec{v}, \varphi \rangle_{\Gamma(t)} = 0 \quad \forall \varphi \in W(\Gamma(t)), \tag{3.5c}$$

$$\langle \varkappa_\gamma \vec{v}, \vec{\zeta} \rangle_{\Gamma(t)} + \langle \gamma \nabla_s \vec{\text{id}}, \nabla_s \vec{\zeta} \rangle_{\Gamma(t)} = 0 \quad \forall \vec{\zeta} \in V_\partial(\Gamma(t)). \tag{3.5d}$$

Here (3.5a) is straightforward on recalling (3.2) and (3.3), and (3.5b) is the incompressibility condition (2.1b). Equation (3.5c) is obtained by multiplying the kinematic condition (2.4c) with $\varphi \in W(\Gamma(t))$. In addition, taking the inner product of (3.4) on $\Gamma(t)$ with the test function $\vec{\zeta} \in V_\partial(\Gamma(t))$ and using the boundary conditions (2.7b) and (2.6b), we obtain (3.5d).

4 Finite element approximations

We consider the approximation of the weak formulation (3.5) for \vec{u} , p in the bulk domain Ω and \vec{v} , \varkappa_γ on the surface cluster $\Gamma(t)$, respectively. A uniform partition of the time interval is employed as $[0, T] = \bigcup_{m=1}^M [t_{m-1}, t_m]$ with $t_m = m\Delta t$ and $\Delta t = \frac{T}{M}$.

Interface discretization: To approximate the reference domains $\{\Upsilon_i\}_{i=1}^{I_S}$, we consider the following triangulations

$$\overline{\Upsilon}_i^h = \cup_{j=1}^{J_i} \overline{\sigma}_j^i \quad \text{with} \quad Q_{\Upsilon_i}^h := \{\vec{q}_k^i, k = 1, \dots, K_i\} \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, \dots, I_S,$$

where $\{\sigma_j^i\}_{j=1}^{J_i}$ are mutually disjoint open $(d-1)$ -simplices, and $Q_{\Upsilon_i}^h$ is a collection of the vertices in the triangulation of Υ_i . At the boundaries, we assume the approximation of $\partial_j \Upsilon_i$, which we denote by $\partial_j \Upsilon_i^h$, coincide with $\partial_j \Upsilon_i$ for each $j = 1, \dots, I_P^i$ and $i = 1, \dots, I_S$. This means that the triangulations match up at their boundaries such that for each triple junction, we have

$$Z_k := \#\{\{\bar{q}_l^{s_1^k}\}_{l=1}^{K_{s_1^k}} \cap \partial_{p_1^k} \Upsilon_{s_1^k}^h\} = \#\{\{\bar{q}_l^{s_2^k}\}_{l=1}^{K_{s_2^k}} \cap \partial_{p_2^k} \Upsilon_{s_2^k}^h\} = \#\{\{\bar{q}_l^{s_3^k}\}_{l=1}^{K_{s_3^k}} \cap \partial_{p_3^k} \Upsilon_{s_3^k}^h\}, \quad k = 1, \dots, I_T.$$

We also define the following bijective map

$$\bar{\varrho}_j^k : \{1, \dots, Z_k\} \mapsto \left\{ \{\bar{q}_l^{s_j^k}\}_{l=1}^{K_{s_j^k}} \cap \partial_{p_j^k} \Upsilon_{s_j^k}^h \right\}, \quad j = 1, 2, 3, \quad k = 1, \dots, I_T, \quad (4.1)$$

such that $(\bar{\varrho}_j^k(1), \dots, \bar{\varrho}_j^k(Z_k))$ is an ordered sequence of vertices. Moreover, a discrete finite element space of $V(\Upsilon)$ is defined as follows

$$V^h(\Upsilon^h) = \left\{ (\bar{\chi}_1, \dots, \bar{\chi}_{I_S}) \in \prod_{i=1}^{I_S} [C^0(\bar{\Upsilon}_i^h)]^d : \bar{\chi}_i|_{\sigma_j^i} \text{ is linear } \forall j = 1, \dots, J_i, i = 1, \dots, I_S; \right. \\ \left. \bar{\chi}_{s_1^k}(\bar{\varrho}_1^k(l)) = \bar{\chi}_{s_2^k}(\bar{\varrho}_2^k(l)) = \bar{\chi}_{s_3^k}(\bar{\varrho}_3^k(l)), l = 1, \dots, Z_k, k = 1, \dots, I_T \right\}.$$

We now introduce a sequence of polyhedral surfaces $\bar{\mathcal{X}}^m \in V^h(\Upsilon^h)$, for $m = 1, \dots, M$, and denote by $\Gamma^m := \bar{\mathcal{X}}^m(\Upsilon^h)$ the numerical approximation of the cluster $\Gamma(t)$ with $\Gamma_i^m = \bar{\mathcal{X}}_i^m(\Upsilon_i^h)$ for $i = 1, \dots, I_S$, meaning that

$$\Gamma_i^m = \cup_{j=1}^{J_i} \bar{\sigma}_j^{m,i} = \cup_{j=1}^{J_i} \bar{\mathcal{X}}_i^m(\bar{\sigma}_j^i) \quad \text{with} \quad Q_{\Gamma_i^m}^m := \bar{\mathcal{X}}_i^m(Q_{\Upsilon_i}^h) = \{\bar{q}_k^{m,i} = \bar{\mathcal{X}}_i^m(\bar{q}_k^i) : k = 1, \dots, K_i\}, \quad (4.2)$$

where $\{\bar{\sigma}_j^{m,i}\}_{j=1}^{J_i}$ are mutually disjoint open $(d-1)$ -simplices with a collection of vertices $Q_{\Gamma_i^m}^m$. By (4.1), the triple junctions of $\Gamma(t_m)$ are then approximated by the ordered sequences of vertices

$$\mathcal{T}_k^m := (\bar{\mathcal{X}}_{s_1^k}^m(\bar{\varrho}_1^k(1)), \dots, \bar{\mathcal{X}}_{s_1^k}^m(\bar{\varrho}_1^k(Z_k))), \quad k = 1, \dots, I_T.$$

Similarly, the discrete analogue of the boundaries \mathcal{B}_k^m are given by an appropriately defined ordering of the vertices $\{\bar{\mathcal{X}}^m(\bar{q}) : \bar{q} \in \{\bar{q}_l^{s_k^k}\}_{k=1}^{K_{s_k^k}} \cap \partial_{p_k} \Upsilon_{s_k}^h\}$.

On the polyhedral surface Γ_i^m defined via (4.2) with $i = 1, \dots, I_S$, we define the finite element space

$$Y^h(\Gamma_i^m) := \{\chi \in C^0(\Gamma_i^m) : \chi|_{\bar{\sigma}_j^{m,i}} \text{ is linear } \forall j = 1, \dots, J_i\}.$$

We then introduce the discrete analogues of $W(\Gamma)$, $V(\Gamma)$ and $V_\partial(\Gamma)$ as

$$W^h(\Gamma^m) := \left\{ (\chi_1, \dots, \chi_{I_S}) \in \prod_{i=1}^{I_S} Y^h(\Gamma_i^m) : \sum_{j=1}^3 o_j^k \chi_{s_j^k} = 0 \text{ on } \mathcal{T}_k^m, k = 1, \dots, I_T \right\}, \\ V^h(\Gamma^m) := \left\{ (\bar{\chi}_1, \dots, \bar{\chi}_{I_S}) \in \prod_{i=1}^{I_S} [Y^h(\Gamma_i^m)]^d : \bar{\chi}_{s_1^k} = \bar{\chi}_{s_2^k} = \bar{\chi}_{s_3^k} \text{ on } \mathcal{T}_k^m, k = 1, \dots, I_T \right\}, \\ V_\partial^h(\Gamma^m) := \left\{ (\bar{\chi}_1, \dots, \bar{\chi}_{I_S}) \in V^h(\Gamma^m) : \bar{n} \cdot \bar{\chi}_{s_k}(\bar{q}) = 0 \quad \forall \bar{q} \in \mathcal{B}_k^m, k = 1, \dots, I_B \right\}.$$

On recalling (3.1), we note that in $W^h(\Gamma^m)$ we have imposed an extra condition at the triple junctions:

$$\sum_{j=1}^3 o_j^k \chi_{s_j^k} = 0,$$

compare with (2.17). This additional condition will allow us to prove the existence of a unique solution to the linear scheme (4.8), see Theorem 4.1. It represents a mild condition for the discrete analogue of \varkappa_γ at the triple junctions that is motivated by (2.17) and by a similar approach for the volume preserving fourth order geometric flows in [11, 14].

In addition, let $\{\vec{q}_{j_k}^{m,i}\}_{k=0}^{d-1}$ be the vertices of $\sigma_j^{m,i}$, and ordered with the same orientation for all $\sigma_j^{m,i}$, $j = 1, \dots, J_i$. Then the unit normal $\vec{\nu}_i^m$ to Γ_i^m is given by

$$\vec{\nu}_{i,j}^m := \vec{\nu}_i^m |_{\sigma_j^{m,i}} = \frac{\vec{A}\{\sigma_j^{m,i}\}}{|\vec{A}\{\sigma_j^{m,i}\}|} \quad \text{with} \quad \vec{A}\{\sigma_j^{m,i}\} = (\vec{q}_{j_1}^{m,i} - \vec{q}_{j_0}^{m,i}) \wedge \dots \wedge (\vec{q}_{j_{d-1}}^{m,i} - \vec{q}_{j_0}^{m,i}), \quad (4.3)$$

where \wedge is the wedge product and $\vec{A}\{\sigma_j^{m,i}\}$ is the orientation vector of $\sigma_j^{m,i}$. To approximate the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\Gamma(t_m)}$, we introduce the inner products $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\Gamma^m}$ and the mass lumped approximation $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\Gamma^m}^h$ over the current polyhedral surface cluster Γ^m via

$$\langle u, v \rangle_{\Gamma^m} := \sum_{i=1}^{I_S} \langle u_i, v_i \rangle_{\Gamma_i^m} = \sum_{i=1}^{I_S} \int_{\Gamma_i^m} u_i \cdot v_i \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}, \quad (4.4a)$$

$$\langle u, v \rangle_{\Gamma^m}^h := \sum_{i=1}^{I_S} \langle u_i, v_i \rangle_{\Gamma_i^m}^h = \sum_{i=1}^{I_S} \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^{J_i} |\sigma_j^{m,i}| \sum_{k=0}^{d-1} \lim_{\sigma_j^{m,i} \ni \vec{q} \rightarrow \vec{q}_{j_k}^{m,i}} (u_i \cdot v_i)(\vec{q}), \quad (4.4b)$$

where u, v are piecewise continuous, with possible jumps across the edges of $\{\sigma_j^{m,i}\}_{j=1}^{J_i}$, $i = 1, \dots, I_S$, $\{\vec{q}_{j_k}^{m,i}\}_{k=0}^{d-1}$ are the vertices of $\sigma_j^{m,i}$, and $|\sigma_j^{m,i}| = \frac{1}{(d-1)!} |\vec{A}\{\sigma_j^{m,i}\}|$ is the measure of $\sigma_j^{m,i}$.

In our parametric approximations, given the cluster Γ^m we aim to seek $\vec{X}^{m+1} \in V^h(\Gamma^m)$, which then defines the new cluster $\Gamma^{m+1} = \vec{X}^{m+1}(\Gamma^m)$. This can be done repeatedly as the interface quantities and the new interfaces are defined over the current polygonal surfaces.

Bulk discretization: At time t_m , we consider a regular partition of the bulk domain Ω as

$$\bar{\Omega} = \cup_{e \in \mathcal{T}^m} \bar{e} \quad \text{with} \quad \mathcal{T}^m := \{e_j^m, j = 1, \dots, J_\Omega^m\}, \quad Q_\Omega^m := \{\vec{a}_k^m, k = 1, \dots, K_\Omega^m\},$$

where \mathcal{T}^m is the set of mutually disjoint open d -simplices in \mathbb{R}^d , and Q_Ω^m is a collection of the vertices of \mathcal{T}^m . We introduce the finite element spaces associated with \mathcal{T}^m

$$S_k^m := \left\{ \chi \in C(\bar{\mathcal{R}}) : \chi|_{e_j^m} \in \mathcal{P}_k(e_j^m), \forall j = 1, \dots, J_\Omega^m \right\}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad k \geq 1, \\ S_0^m := \{ \chi \in L^2(\Omega) : \chi|_{e_j^m} \text{ is constant}, \forall j = 1, \dots, J_\Omega^m \},$$

where $\mathcal{P}_k(e_j^m)$ denotes the space of polynomials of degree at most k on e_j^m . For the discrete velocity and pressure spaces, it is natural to consider the lowest order Taylor–Hood elements [17] such that

$$\text{P2-P1} : \quad (\mathbb{U}^m, \mathbb{P}^m) = ([S_2^m]^d \cap \mathbb{U}, S_1^m \cap \mathbb{P}), \quad (4.5)$$

which guarantees the LBB inf-sup stability condition,

$$\inf_{q^h \in \mathbb{P}^m} \sup_{\vec{0} \neq \vec{\chi}^h \in \mathbb{U}^m} \frac{(q^h, \nabla \cdot \vec{\chi}^h)}{\|q^h\|_0 \|\vec{\chi}^h\|_1} \geq c > 0, \quad (4.6)$$

see [22, p. 252] for $d = 2$ and [20] for $d = 3$.

We consider an unfitted approximation so that the interface discretization need not to be fitted to the bulk discretization. This allows the approximating interface to cut through the elements of the bulk mesh \mathcal{T}^m . At time t_m , we introduce a collection of the index of the bulk regions for each element $e \in \mathcal{T}^m$ such that

$$\mathcal{I}^m(e) \subset \{1, \dots, I_R\}, \quad m = 0, \dots, M-1,$$

that is, $\ell \in \mathcal{I}^m(e)$ if and only if $e \cap \mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma^m] \neq \emptyset$. We then employ an average approximation of ρ and η at time t_m . Namely, we introduce $\rho^m \in S_0^m$ and $\eta^m \in S_0^m$ such that

$$\rho^m|_e := \frac{1}{\text{Card}(\mathcal{I}^m(e))} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{I}^m(e)} \rho_\ell, \quad \eta^m|_e := \frac{1}{\text{Card}(\mathcal{I}^m(e))} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{I}^m(e)} \eta_\ell, \quad \text{for } e \in \mathcal{T}^m.$$

In a similar manner to the numerical work for two-phase flow in [16, 17], we also consider an enrichment procedure for (4.5) as follows

$$\text{P2-P1 with XFEM: } (\mathbb{U}^m, \mathbb{P}^m) = ([S_2^m]^d \cap \mathbb{U}, \text{span}(S_1^m \cup \bigcup_{\ell=1}^{I_R} \{\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma^m]}\}) \cap \mathbb{P}). \quad (4.7)$$

This will help to achieve a better volume preservation, see [17, Section 4.1]. In the vicinity of the interface, we employ a bulk mesh adaption strategy as described in [17]. We further introduce the standard interpolation operator $I_k^m : C(\bar{\Omega}) \rightarrow [S_k^m]^d$ for $k \geq 1$, and the standard projection operator $I_0^m : L^1(\Omega) \rightarrow S_0^m$ with $(I_0^m \zeta)|_e = \frac{1}{|e|} \int_e \zeta \, d\mathcal{L}^d$ for $e \in \mathcal{T}^m$. We also introduce $\|\cdot\|_0$ and $\|\cdot\|_1$ as the L^2 - and H^1 -norm on Ω , respectively.

4.1 A linear and unconditionally stable approximation

We now present a finite element approximation of the weak formulation (3.5) as follows. Let $\vec{X}^0 \in V^h(\Upsilon^h)$ and given the initial $\vec{U}^0 \in \mathbb{U}$, we set $\rho^{-1} = \rho^0$. For $m \geq 0$ we then find $\vec{U}^{m+1} \in \mathbb{U}^m$, $P^{m+1} \in \mathbb{P}^m$, $\delta \vec{X}^{m+1} \in V_\delta^h(\Gamma^m)$ and $\kappa_\gamma^{m+1} \in W^h(\Gamma^m)$ with $\vec{X}^{m+1} = \text{id}|_{\Gamma^m} + \delta \vec{X}^{m+1}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \left[\left(\frac{\rho^m \vec{U}^{m+1} - I_0^m \rho^{m-1} I_2^m \vec{U}^m}{\Delta t} + I_0^m \rho^{m-1} \frac{\vec{U}^{m+1} - I_2^m \vec{U}^m}{\Delta t}, \vec{\chi}^h \right) \right] \\ & + \mathcal{A}(\rho^m, I_2^m \vec{U}^m; \vec{U}^{m+1}, \vec{\chi}^h) + 2(\eta^m \underline{\mathbb{D}}(\vec{U}^{m+1}), \underline{\mathbb{D}}(\vec{\chi}^h)) - (P^{m+1}, \nabla \cdot \vec{\chi}^h) \\ & - \langle \kappa_\gamma^{m+1} \vec{\nu}^m, \vec{\chi}^h \rangle_{\Gamma^m} = (\rho^m \vec{g}, \vec{\chi}^h) \quad \forall \vec{\chi}^h \in \mathbb{U}^m, \end{aligned} \quad (4.8a)$$

$$(\nabla \cdot \vec{U}^{m+1}, q^h) = 0 \quad \forall q^h \in \mathbb{P}^m, \quad (4.8b)$$

$$\left\langle \frac{\vec{X}^{m+1} - \text{id}}{\Delta t} \cdot \vec{\nu}^m, \varphi^h \right\rangle_{\Gamma^m}^h - \langle \vec{U}^{m+1} \cdot \vec{\nu}^m, \varphi^h \rangle_{\Gamma^m} = 0 \quad \forall \varphi^h \in W^h(\Gamma^m), \quad (4.8c)$$

$$\langle \kappa_\gamma^{m+1} \vec{\nu}^m, \vec{\zeta}^h \rangle_{\Gamma^m}^h + \langle \gamma \nabla_s \vec{X}^{m+1}, \nabla_s \vec{\zeta}^h \rangle_{\Gamma^m} = 0 \quad \forall \vec{\zeta}^h \in V_\delta^h(\Gamma^m). \quad (4.8d)$$

In the above discretization, we employed a lagged approximation of the density and viscosity functions, and thus (4.8) leads to a linear system of equations. We mention that it is possible to prove that a semidiscrete continuous-in-time variant of (4.8) conserves the enclosed volumes and leads to well distributed discrete interfaces. In particular, in two space dimensions a (weak) equidistribution property can be shown. We refer to [8, 11, 14, 17] for the necessary details.

In the following we aim to show that (4.8) admits a unique solution, and that the solution satisfies an unconditional stability estimate. We follow the work in [13, 14] and introduce the vertex normal vector $\vec{\omega}^m = (\omega_1^m, \omega_2^m, \dots, \omega_{I_S}^m) \in V^h(\Gamma^m)$. For each $m \geq 0$, and $i = 1, \dots, I_S$, we set

$$\vec{\omega}_i^m(\vec{q}) = \frac{1}{|\Lambda_i^m(\vec{q})|} \sum_{\sigma_j^{m,i} \in \Lambda_i^m(\vec{q})} |\sigma_j^{m,i}| \vec{\nu}_{i,j}^m \quad \text{for } \vec{q} \in Q_{\Gamma_i}^m, \quad (4.9)$$

where we introduce $\Lambda_i^m(\vec{q})$ to represent a collection of the $(d-1)$ -simplices of Γ_i^m that contain the vertex \vec{q} :

$$\Lambda_i^m(\vec{q}) := \{\sigma \in \{\sigma_j^{m,i}\}_{j=1}^{J_i} : \vec{q} \in \bar{\sigma}\}, \quad |\Lambda_i^m(\vec{q})| = \sum_{\sigma_j^{m,i} \in \Lambda_i^m(\vec{q})} |\sigma_j^{m,i}| > 0.$$

In fact, one can interpret $\vec{\omega}_i^m \in Y^h(\Gamma_i^m)$ as a spatially weighted normal of (4.3), which is the mass-lumped L^2 -projection of $\vec{\nu}_i^m$ onto $[Y^h(\Gamma_i^m)]^d$, i.e.,

$$\langle \vec{\omega}_i^m, \vec{\zeta}^h \rangle_{\Gamma_i^m}^h = \langle \vec{\nu}_i^m, \vec{\zeta}^h \rangle_{\Gamma_i^m}^h = \langle \vec{\nu}_i^m, \vec{\zeta}^h \rangle_{\Gamma_i^m} \quad \forall \vec{\zeta}^h \in [Y^h(\Gamma_i^m)]^d, \quad (4.10)$$

on recalling (4.4). Moreover it is not difficult to show that the following identity holds

$$\langle \chi \vec{\omega}_i^m, \vec{\zeta}^h \rangle_{\Gamma_i^m}^h = \langle \chi \vec{\nu}_i^m, \vec{\zeta}^h \rangle_{\Gamma_i^m}^h \quad \forall \chi \in Y^h(\Gamma_i^m), \quad \vec{\zeta} \in [Y^h(\Gamma_i^m)]^d.$$

On recalling (4.2), we denote by

$$Q_{\Gamma_i^\circ}^m := \left\{ \vec{q} \in Q_{\Gamma_i}^m : \vec{q} \notin \cup_{k=1}^{I_T} \mathcal{T}_k^m; \quad \vec{q} \notin \cup_{k=1}^{I_B} \mathcal{B}_k^m \right\} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, I_S,$$

a collection of the interior vertices of Γ_i . We further introduce the vectors

$$\vec{W}_{s_\ell^k}^m(\vec{q}) = o_\ell^k |\Lambda_{s_\ell^k}^m(\vec{q})| \vec{\omega}_{s_\ell^k}^m(\vec{q}), \quad \ell = 1, 2, 3, \quad \vec{q} \in \mathcal{T}_k^m. \quad (4.11)$$

We then have the following theorem for the scheme (4.8) under mild assumptions on the discrete vertex normals in (4.9). Here we assume for simplicity that Γ^m has a single connected component.

Theorem 4.1 (existence and uniqueness). *For $m \geq 0$, let the following assumptions hold*

(A1) (4.6) is satisfied;

$$(A2) \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \vec{\omega}_i^m(\vec{q}) \neq \vec{0} & \text{if } \vec{q} \in Q_{\Gamma_i^\circ}^m, \quad i = 1, \dots, I_S, \\ \vec{\omega}_{s_k}^m(\vec{q}) - (\vec{\omega}_{s_k}^m(\vec{q}) \cdot \vec{n}(\vec{q})) \vec{n}(\vec{q}) \neq \vec{0} & \text{if } \vec{q} \in \mathcal{B}_k^m, \quad k = 1, \dots, I_B, \\ \dim \text{span} \left\{ \vec{W}_{s_1^k}^m(\vec{q}) - \vec{W}_{s_3^k}^m(\vec{q}), \vec{W}_{s_2^k}^m(\vec{q}) - \vec{W}_{s_3^k}^m(\vec{q}) \right\} = 2 & \text{if } \vec{q} \in \mathcal{T}_k^m, \quad k = 1, \dots, I_T; \end{array} \right.$$

$$(A3) \dim \text{span} \left(\left\{ \left\{ \vec{\omega}_i^m(\vec{q}) \right\}_{\vec{q} \in Q_{\Gamma_i^\circ}^m} \right\}_{i=1}^{I_S} \cup \left\{ \left\{ \vec{n}(\vec{q}) \right\}_{\vec{q} \in \mathcal{B}_k^m} \right\}_{k=1}^{I_B} \right) = d.$$

Then there exists a unique solution $(\vec{U}^{m+1}, P^{m+1}, \delta \vec{X}^{m+1}, \kappa_\gamma^{m+1}) \in \mathbb{U}^m \times \mathbb{P}^m \times V_\partial^h(\Gamma^m) \times W^h(\Gamma^m)$ to the system (4.8).

Proof. Since (4.8) is a linear system where the number of unknowns equals the number of equations, it suffices to show that the corresponding homogeneous system has only the zero solution. We hence consider the following homogeneous system for $(\vec{U}, P, \delta\vec{X}, \kappa) \in \mathbb{U}^m \times \mathbb{P}^m \times V_\partial^h(\Gamma^m) \times W^h(\Gamma^m)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \left[\left(\frac{\rho^m \vec{U} + I_0^m \rho^{m-1} \vec{U}}{\Delta t}, \vec{\chi}^h \right) \right] + \mathcal{A}(\rho^m, I_2^m \vec{U}^m; \vec{U}, \vec{\chi}^h) + 2(\eta^m \underline{\mathbb{D}}(\vec{U}), \underline{\mathbb{D}}(\vec{\chi}^h)) \\ - (P, \nabla \cdot \vec{\chi}^h) - \langle \kappa \vec{\nu}^m, \vec{\chi}^h \rangle_{\Gamma^m} = 0 \quad \forall \vec{\chi}^h \in \mathbb{U}^m, \end{aligned} \quad (4.12a)$$

$$(\nabla \cdot \vec{U}, q^h) = 0 \quad \forall q^h \in \mathbb{P}^m, \quad (4.12b)$$

$$\left\langle \frac{\delta\vec{X}}{\Delta t} \cdot \vec{\nu}^m, \varphi^h \right\rangle_{\Gamma^m}^h - \langle \vec{U} \cdot \vec{\nu}^m, \varphi^h \rangle_{\Gamma^m} = 0 \quad \forall \varphi^h \in W^h(\Gamma^m), \quad (4.12c)$$

$$\langle \kappa \vec{\nu}^m, \vec{\zeta}^h \rangle_{\Gamma^m}^h + \langle \gamma \nabla_s(\delta\vec{X}), \nabla_s \vec{\zeta}^h \rangle_{\Gamma^m} = 0 \quad \forall \vec{\zeta}^h \in V_\partial^h(\Gamma^m). \quad (4.12d)$$

Now choosing $\vec{\chi}^h = \Delta t \vec{U}$ in (4.12a), $q^h = P$ in (4.12b), $\varphi^h = \Delta t \kappa$ in (4.12c) and $\vec{\zeta}^h = \delta\vec{X}$ in (4.12d), and combining these equations yields that

$$\left(\frac{\rho^m + I_0^m \rho^{m-1}}{2} \vec{U}, \vec{U} \right) + 2\Delta t (\eta^m \underline{\mathbb{D}}(\vec{U}), \underline{\mathbb{D}}(\vec{U})) + \langle \gamma \nabla_s(\delta\vec{X}), \nabla_s(\delta\vec{X}) \rangle_{\Gamma^m} = 0. \quad (4.13)$$

By Korn's inequality, it immediately follows from (4.13) and $|\partial_1 \Omega| > 0$ that $\vec{U} = \vec{0}$. Moreover, it holds that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{I_S} \int_{\Gamma_i^m} \gamma_i \nabla_s(\delta\vec{X}_i) : \nabla_s(\delta\vec{X}_i) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} = \langle \gamma \nabla_s(\delta\vec{X}), \nabla_s(\delta\vec{X}) \rangle_{\Gamma^m} = 0, \quad (4.14)$$

which means that $\delta\vec{X}_i = \delta\vec{X}_i^c$ is a constant for $i = 1, \dots, I_S$. Substituting $\vec{U} = \vec{0}$ and $\delta\vec{X}^c = (\delta\vec{X}_1^c, \dots, \delta\vec{X}_{I_S}^c)$ into (4.12c) and (4.12d), we thus obtain

$$\langle \delta\vec{X}^c \cdot \vec{\nu}^m, \varphi^h \rangle_{\Gamma^m}^h = 0 \quad \forall \varphi^h \in W^h(\Gamma^m), \quad (4.15a)$$

$$\langle \kappa \vec{\nu}^m, \vec{\zeta}^h \rangle_{\Gamma^m}^h = 0 \quad \forall \vec{\zeta}^h \in V_\partial^h(\Gamma^m). \quad (4.15b)$$

It follows from (4.15a) and (4.10) that

$$\langle \delta\vec{X}^c \cdot \vec{\nu}^m, \varphi^h \rangle_{\Gamma^m}^h = \langle \delta\vec{X}^c \cdot \vec{\omega}^m, \varphi^h \rangle_{\Gamma^m}^h = 0 \quad \forall \varphi^h \in W^h(\Gamma^m),$$

which implies that for each $i = 1, \dots, I_S$

$$\delta\vec{X}_i^c \cdot \vec{\omega}_i^m(\vec{q}) = 0 \quad \forall \vec{q} \in Q_{\Gamma_i^c}^m. \quad (4.16)$$

Now, since Γ^m is connected and since $\delta\vec{X}^c \in V^h(\Gamma^m)$, we have that $\delta\vec{X}_1^c = \delta\vec{X}_2^c = \dots = \delta\vec{X}_{I_S}^c$. Moreover, (4.16) together with $\delta\vec{X}^c \in V_\partial^h(\Gamma^m)$ and assumption **(A3)** implies that $\delta\vec{X}_1^c = \vec{0}$, and hence $\delta\vec{X}^c = \vec{0}$.

Next we prove that $\kappa = 0$. To this end, in (4.15b) we use the test function $\vec{\zeta}^h \in V_\partial^h(\Gamma^m)$ defined by

$$\vec{\zeta}^h(\vec{q}) = \begin{cases} \kappa_i(\vec{q}) \vec{\omega}_i^m(\vec{q}) & \text{if } \vec{q} \in Q_{\Gamma_i^c}^m \text{ for some } 1 \leq i \leq I_S, \\ \kappa_{s_k}(\vec{q}) (\vec{\omega}_{s_k}^m(\vec{q}) - (\vec{\omega}_{s_k}^m \cdot \vec{n}(\vec{q})) \vec{n}(\vec{q})) & \text{if } \vec{q} \in \mathcal{B}_k^m \text{ for some } 1 \leq k \leq I_B, \\ \vec{0} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then it follows, on noting (4.4b) and (4.9), that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \langle \kappa \vec{\nu}^m, \zeta^h \rangle_{\Gamma^m}^h = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^{I_S} \sum_{j=1}^{J_i} |\sigma_j^{m,i}| \sum_{k=1}^{d-1} \kappa_i(\vec{q}_{j_k}^{m,i}) \vec{\nu}_{i,j}^m \cdot \vec{\zeta}^h(\vec{q}_{j_k}^{m,i}) \\ &= \frac{1}{d} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{I_S} \sum_{\vec{q} \in Q_{\Gamma_i^m}^m} |\kappa_i(\vec{q}) \vec{\omega}_i^m(\vec{q})|^2 |\Lambda_i^m(\vec{q})| + \sum_{k=1}^{I_B} \sum_{\vec{q} \in \mathcal{B}_k^m} |\kappa_{s_k}(\vec{q}) (\vec{\omega}_{s_k}^m(\vec{q}) - (\vec{\omega}_{s_k}^m(\vec{q}) \cdot \vec{n}(\vec{q})) \vec{n}(\vec{q}))|^2 |\Lambda_{s_k}^m(\vec{q})| \right), \end{aligned}$$

which then implies that $\kappa_i(\vec{q}) = 0$ for both $\vec{q} \in Q_{\Gamma_i^m}^m$ and $\vec{q} \in \mathcal{B}_k^m$ on recalling the assumptions in (A2). Now for an arbitrary vertex $\vec{q}_T = \vec{q}_{j_1}^{m,s_1^k} = \vec{q}_{j_2}^{m,s_2^k} = \vec{q}_{j_3}^{m,s_3^k} \in \mathcal{T}_k^m$, in (4.15b) we set $\vec{\zeta}^h \in V_{\partial}^h(\Gamma^m)$ such that

$$\vec{\zeta}^h(\vec{q}) = \begin{cases} \vec{\zeta}^c & \text{if } \vec{q} = \vec{q}_T, \\ \vec{0} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $\vec{\zeta}^c$ is a constant vector. We thus obtain that

$$0 = \langle \kappa \vec{\nu}^m, \zeta^h \rangle_{\Gamma^m}^h = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{\ell=1}^3 \kappa_{s_\ell^k}(\vec{q}_T) |\Lambda_{s_\ell^k}^m(\vec{q}_T)| \vec{\omega}_{s_\ell^k}^m(\vec{q}_T) \cdot \vec{\zeta}^c,$$

which gives rise to

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^3 o_\ell^k \kappa_{s_\ell^k}(\vec{q}_T) \vec{W}_{s_\ell^k}^m(\vec{q}_T) = \vec{0} \quad \text{with} \quad \vec{W}_{s_\ell^k}^m(\vec{q}_T) = o_\ell^k |\Lambda_{s_\ell^k}^m(\vec{q}_T)| \vec{\omega}_{s_\ell^k}^m(\vec{q}_T), \quad (4.17)$$

since $\vec{\zeta}^c$ is an arbitrary constant. We also have that $\sum_{\ell=1}^3 o_\ell^k \kappa_{s_\ell^k}(\vec{q}_T) = 0$ as $\kappa \in W^h(\Gamma^m)$. Then we could recast (4.17) as

$$o_1^k \kappa_{s_1^k}(\vec{q}_T) (\vec{W}_{s_1^k}^m(\vec{q}_T) - \vec{W}_{s_3^k}^m(\vec{q}_T)) + o_2^k \kappa_{s_2^k}(\vec{q}_T) (\vec{W}_{s_2^k}^m(\vec{q}_T) - \vec{W}_{s_3^k}^m(\vec{q}_T)) = \vec{0},$$

which implies that

$$\kappa_{s_1^k}(\vec{q}_T) = \kappa_{s_2^k}(\vec{q}_T) = \kappa_{s_3^k}(\vec{q}_T) = 0,$$

on recalling the linear independence of $\{\vec{W}_{s_1^k}^m(\vec{q}_T) - \vec{W}_{s_3^k}^m(\vec{q}_T), \vec{W}_{s_2^k}^m(\vec{q}_T) - \vec{W}_{s_3^k}^m(\vec{q}_T)\}$ in assumption (A2). Therefore we obtain $\kappa \equiv 0$.

Finally, we substitute $\vec{U} = \vec{0}$ and $\kappa = 0$ into (4.12a) and obtain

$$(P, \nabla \cdot \vec{\chi}^h) = 0 \quad \forall \vec{\chi}^h \in \mathbb{U}^m.$$

This yields that $P = 0$ as a consequence of the assumption in (A1). Combining these results we have shown that the homogeneous system (4.12) has only the zero solution. Thus (4.8) admits a unique solution. \square

Remark 4.2. We give some interpretation for the assumptions in Theorem 4.1. Assumption (A3) means that the discrete vertex normals $\vec{\omega}_i^m(\vec{q})$ of Γ^m , recall (4.9), together with the normals of the external boundary on the boundary points/lines, span the whole space \mathbb{R}^d , and so is very mild, see also [13, Assumption A]. Assumption (A2) gives additional local conditions for the discrete vertex normals $\vec{\omega}_i^m(\vec{q})$. For the interior points $\vec{q} \in Q_{\Gamma_i^m}^m$, we require $\vec{\omega}_i^m(\vec{q})$ to be

nonzero. For vertices on the external boundary $\partial\Omega$, the second condition in Assumption (A2) means that the numerical contact angle should not be 0 or π . Seeing that the weakly approximated contact angle in the sharp-interface model is $\frac{\pi}{2}$, this is once again a very mild constraint. For vertices at a triple junction \mathcal{T}_k^m , the third condition in (A2) means that the differences of the scalar multiples of the discrete vertex normals defined in (4.11) must not be colinear. Given that the discrete vertex normals approximate the force balance condition (2.6b), also this condition will almost never be violated and so is very mild.

Remark 4.3. In the proof of Theorem 4.1, for simplicity we assume that Γ^m is made up of a single connected component. The proof can easily be extended to the more general case of several connected components. In that case, the Assumption (A3) must hold individually on each connected component, which then allows to deduce from (4.14) and (4.16) that $\delta\vec{X} = \vec{0}$ as before.

Next we show that the scheme (4.8) satisfies a stability bound, that mimics the energy dissipation law (2.10) on the discrete level.

Theorem 4.4 (unconditional stability). *Let $(\vec{U}^{m+1}, P^{m+1}, \vec{X}^{m+1}, \kappa_\gamma^{m+1})$ be a solution to (4.8) for $m = 0, 1, \dots, M-1$. Then it holds that*

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho^m, \vec{U}^{m+1}, \Gamma^{m+1}) + 2\Delta t \|\sqrt{\eta^m} \underline{\mathbb{D}}(\vec{U}^{m+1})\|_0^2 \leq \mathcal{E}(I_0^m \rho^{m-1}, I_2^m \vec{U}^m, \Gamma^m) + \Delta t (\rho^m \vec{g}, \vec{U}^{m+1}), \quad (4.18)$$

where $\mathcal{E}(\rho, \vec{u}, \Gamma(t))$ is the energy function in (2.9).

Proof. We choose $\vec{\chi}^h = \Delta t \vec{U}^{m+1}$ in (4.8a), $q^h = P^{m+1}$ in (4.8b), $\varphi^h = \Delta t \kappa_\gamma^{m+1}$ in (4.8c) and $\vec{\zeta}^h = (\vec{X}^{m+1} - \text{id})|_{\Gamma^m}$ in (4.8d). Combining these four equations then leads to

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} (\rho^m \vec{U}^{m+1} - I_0^m \rho^{m-1} I_2^m \vec{U}^m + I_0^m \rho^{m-1} [\vec{U}^{m+1} - I_2^m \vec{U}^m], \vec{U}^{m+1}) + 2\Delta t (\eta^m \underline{\mathbb{D}}(\vec{U}^{m+1}), \underline{\mathbb{D}}(\vec{U}^{m+1})) \\ & + \langle \gamma \nabla_s \vec{X}^{m+1}, \nabla_s (\vec{X}^{m+1} - \text{id}) \rangle_{\Gamma^m} = \Delta t (\rho^m \vec{g}, \vec{U}^{m+1}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

It is easy to show that

$$\begin{aligned} & (\rho^m \vec{U}^{m+1} - I_0^m \rho^{m-1} I_2^m \vec{U}^m + I_0^m \rho^{m-1} (\vec{U}^{m+1} - I_2^m \vec{U}^m), \vec{U}^{m+1}) \\ & = (\rho^m \vec{U}^{m+1}, \vec{U}^{m+1}) - (I_0^m \rho^{m-1} I_2^m \vec{U}^m, I_2^m \vec{U}^m) + (I_0^m \rho^{m-1} [\vec{U}^{m+1} - I_2^m \vec{U}^m], [\vec{U}^{m+1} - I_2^m \vec{U}^m]) \\ & \geq (\rho^m \vec{U}^{m+1}, \vec{U}^{m+1}) - (I_0^m \rho^{m-1} I_2^m \vec{U}^m, I_2^m \vec{U}^m). \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

Moreover, it holds that (see [18, Lemma 57])

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \gamma \nabla_s \vec{X}^{m+1}, \nabla_s (\vec{X}^{m+1} - \text{id}) \rangle_{\Gamma^m} & = \sum_{i=1}^{I_S} \gamma_i \int_{\Gamma_i^m} \nabla_s \vec{X}_i^{m+1} : \nabla_s (\vec{X}_i^{m+1} - \text{id}) \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \\ & \geq \sum_{i=1}^{I_S} \gamma_i (|\Gamma_i^{m+1}| - |\Gamma_i^m|). \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

Using (4.20) and (4.21) in (4.19), we immediately obtain (4.18). \square

4.2 A structure-preserving method

Following similar techniques in [8, 35], and based on the original idea from [9, 43], we now adapt the scheme (4.8) in such a way, that it satisfies an exact volume preservation property. The approach hinges on carefully chosen time-weighted discrete surface normals. Precisely, we first introduce a family of polyhedral surfaces via a linear interpolation between Γ^m and Γ^{m+1} as

$$\Gamma_i^h(t) = \frac{t_{m+1} - t}{\Delta t} \Gamma_i^m + \frac{t - t_m}{\Delta t} \Gamma_i^{m+1}, \quad t \in [t_m, t_{m+1}], \quad i = 1, \dots, I_S.$$

Denote by $\Gamma_i^h(t) = \bigcup_{j=1}^{J_i} \overline{\sigma_j^{h,i}(t)}$ the polyhedral surfaces, where $\{\sigma_j^{h,i}(t)\}_{j=1}^{J_i}$ are the mutually disjoint $(d-1)$ -simplices with vertices $\{\bar{q}_k^{h,i}(t)\}_{k=1}^{K_i}$, and

$$\bar{q}_k^{h,i}(t) = \frac{t_{m+1} - t}{\Delta t} \bar{q}_k^{m,i} + \frac{t - t_m}{\Delta t} \bar{q}_k^{m+1,i}, \quad t \in [t_m, t_{m+1}], \quad k = 1, \dots, K_i.$$

We then define the time-weighted approximation $\bar{\nu}^{m+\frac{1}{2}} \in \times_{i=1}^{I_S} [L^\infty(\Gamma_i^m)]^d$ such that

$$\bar{\nu}_i^{m+\frac{1}{2}}|_{\sigma_j^{m,i}} = \bar{\nu}_{i,j}^{m+\frac{1}{2}} := \frac{1}{\Delta t |\bar{A}\{\sigma_j^{m,i}\}|} \int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \bar{A}\{\sigma_j^{h,i}(t)\} dt, \quad j = 1, \dots, J_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, I_S. \quad (4.22)$$

As a consequence, we have the following lemma, and its proof was given in [8, Lemma 3.1].

Lemma 4.5. *Let $\bar{X}^{m+1} \in V^h(\Gamma^m)$ with $\bar{X}^{m+1} - \text{id}|_{\Gamma^m} \in V_\partial^h(\Gamma^m)$. Then it holds*

$$\text{vol}(\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma^{m+1}]) - \text{vol}(\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma^m]) = \langle (\bar{X}^{m+1} - \text{id}) \cdot \bar{\nu}^{m+\frac{1}{2}}, \chi \rangle_{\Gamma^m}^h, \quad \ell = 1, \dots, I_R, \quad (4.23)$$

where $\chi = (\chi_1, \dots, \chi_{I_S})$ is given by

$$\chi_i = \begin{cases} o_i^{\mathcal{R}_\ell} & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{I}_\Gamma^\ell, \\ 0 & \text{if } i \notin \mathcal{I}_\Gamma^\ell, \end{cases} \quad (4.24)$$

with $o^{\mathcal{R}_\ell}$ defined as in (2.13).

We are now in a position to adapt (4.8) to obtain a volume-preserving approximation. Let $\bar{X}^0 \in V^h(\Upsilon^h)$ and given the initial $\bar{U}^0 \in \mathbb{U}$, we set $\rho^{-1} = \rho^0$. For $m \geq 0$ we then find $\bar{U}^{m+1} \in \mathbb{U}^m$, $P^{m+1} \in \mathbb{P}^m$, $\delta \bar{X}^{m+1} \in V_\partial^h(\Gamma^m)$ and $\kappa_\gamma^{m+1} \in W^h(\Gamma^m)$ with $\bar{X}^{m+1} = \text{id}|_{\Gamma^m} + \delta \bar{X}^{m+1}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \left[\left(\frac{\rho^m \bar{U}^{m+1} - I_0^m \rho^{m-1} I_2^m \bar{U}^m}{\Delta t} + I_0^m \rho^{m-1} \frac{\bar{U}^{m+1} - I_2^m \bar{U}^m}{\Delta t}, \bar{\chi}^h \right) \right] \\ & + \mathcal{A}(\rho^m, I_2^m \bar{U}^m; \bar{U}^{m+1}, \bar{\chi}^h) + 2(\eta^m \mathbb{D}(\bar{U}^{m+1}), \mathbb{D}(\bar{\chi}^h)) - (P^{m+1}, \nabla \cdot \bar{\chi}^h) \\ & - \langle \kappa_\gamma^{m+1} \bar{\nu}^m, \bar{\chi}^h \rangle_{\Gamma^m} = (\rho^m \bar{g}, \bar{\chi}^h) \quad \forall \bar{\chi}^h \in \mathbb{U}^m, \end{aligned} \quad (4.25a)$$

$$(\nabla \cdot \bar{U}^{m+1}, q^h) = 0 \quad \forall q^h \in \mathbb{P}^m, \quad (4.25b)$$

$$\left\langle \frac{\bar{X}^{m+1} - \text{id}}{\Delta t} \cdot \bar{\nu}^{m+\frac{1}{2}}, \varphi^h \right\rangle_{\Gamma^m}^h - \langle \bar{U}^{m+1} \cdot \bar{\nu}^m, \varphi^h \rangle_{\Gamma^m} = 0 \quad \forall \varphi^h \in W^h(\Gamma^m), \quad (4.25c)$$

$$\langle \kappa_\gamma^{m+1} \bar{\nu}^{m+\frac{1}{2}}, \zeta^h \rangle_{\Gamma^m}^h + \langle \gamma \nabla_s \bar{X}^{m+1}, \nabla_s \zeta^h \rangle_{\Gamma^m} = 0 \quad \forall \zeta^h \in V_\partial^h(\Gamma^m). \quad (4.25d)$$

Note that the only difference between (4.8) and (4.25) is that the first terms in (4.25c) and (4.25d) contain the time-weighted normals $\vec{\nu}^{m+\frac{1}{2}}$ rather than $\vec{\nu}^m$. This means that the scheme (4.25) no longer leads to a system of linear equations.

We have the following theorem for the adapted scheme.

Theorem 4.6 (structure-preserving property). *Let $(\vec{U}^{m+1}, P^{m+1}, \vec{X}^{m+1}, \kappa_\gamma^{m+1})$ be a solution to (4.25) for $m = 0, 1, \dots, M-1$. Then it holds that*

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho^m, \vec{U}^{m+1}, \Gamma^{m+1}) + 2\Delta t \|\sqrt{\eta^m} \underline{\mathbb{D}}(\vec{U}^{m+1})\|_0^2 \leq \mathcal{E}(I_0^m \rho^{m-1}, I_2^m \vec{U}^m, \Gamma^m) + \Delta t \left(\rho^m \vec{g}, \vec{U}^{m+1} \right). \quad (4.26)$$

Moreover, if the discrete pressure space is chosen as (4.7), then it holds that

$$\text{vol}(\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma^{m+1}]) = \text{vol}(\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma^m]) \quad \ell = 1, \dots, I_R, \quad m = 0, \dots, M-1. \quad (4.27)$$

Proof. The proof of the stability estimate (4.26) is similar to that of Theorem 4.4, thus we omit it here. To show the volume preservation of the ℓ -th bulk domain, we choose suitable test functions in (4.25b) and (4.25c), respectively. Precisely in (4.25c) we set $\varphi^h = \chi = (\chi_1, \dots, \chi_{I_S})$ with χ_i satisfying (4.24). This gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\Delta t} \langle (\vec{X}^{m+1} - \text{id}) \cdot \vec{\nu}^{m+\frac{1}{2}}, \chi \rangle_{\Gamma^m}^h &= \langle \vec{U}^{m+1} \cdot \vec{\nu}^m, \chi \rangle_{\Gamma^m} \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\Gamma^\ell} \int_{\Gamma_i^m} \vec{U}^{m+1} \cdot (o_i^{\mathcal{R}_\ell} \vec{\nu}^m) \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} = \int_{\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma^m]} \nabla \cdot \vec{U}^{m+1} \, d\mathcal{L}^d. \end{aligned} \quad (4.28)$$

We next choose $q^h = \mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma^m]} - c_\ell^m$ with $c_\ell^m = \frac{\text{vol}(\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma^m])}{\text{vol}(\Omega)}$ in (4.25b) and obtain

$$0 = (\nabla \cdot \vec{U}^{m+1}, q^h) = (\nabla \cdot \vec{U}^{m+1}, \mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma^m]}) = \int_{\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma^m]} \nabla \cdot \vec{U}^{m+1} \, d\mathcal{L}^d. \quad (4.29)$$

Combining (4.28) and (4.29) and recalling (4.23), we obtain the desired volume preservation in (4.27).

What remains to show is that the chosen test functions are in the corresponding finite element spaces. It is straightforward to show that $q^h = \mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma^m]} - c_\ell^m \in \mathbb{P}^m$ will be guaranteed if the discrete pressure space (4.7) is used. As for $\varphi^h = \chi$, we consider an arbitrary triple junction \mathcal{T}_k^m . If $\mathcal{T}_k^m \cap \mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma^m] = \emptyset$, it is trivial since $\chi_{s_1^k} = \chi_{s_2^k} = \chi_{s_3^k} = 0$. Otherwise, we assume that $\{s_2^k, s_3^k\} \in \mathcal{I}_\Gamma^\ell$ and $s_1^k \notin \mathcal{I}_\Gamma^\ell$, recall (2.13), which implies that we have $\chi_{s_1^k} = 0$. For $\chi_{s_2^k}$ and $\chi_{s_3^k}$ we consider two possible cases as shown in Fig. 1. On the left panel of the figure, we need to choose $\chi_{s_2^k} = o_{s_2^k}^{\mathcal{R}_\ell} = -1$ and $\chi_{s_3^k} = o_{s_3^k}^{\mathcal{R}_\ell} = 1$, while on right we require $\chi_{s_2^k} = o_{s_2^k}^{\mathcal{R}_\ell} = -1$ and $\chi_{s_3^k} = o_{s_3^k}^{\mathcal{R}_\ell} = -1$. In both cases we are able to show that $\sum_{i=1}^3 o_j^k \chi_{s_j^k} = 0$, and thus $\chi \in W^h(\Gamma^m)$. \square

Due to the presence of the time-weighted normals in (4.25c) and (4.25d), the introduced method (4.25) results in a system of polynomial nonlinear equations. The nonlinear system can be solved via a lagged Picard-type iteration. Precisely, at time step t_m we set $\vec{X}^{m+1,0} = \vec{X}^m$. Then for each $\ell \geq 0$, we find $\vec{U}^{m+1,\ell+1} \in \mathbb{U}^m$, $P^{m+1,\ell+1} \in \mathbb{P}^m$, $\kappa_\gamma^{m+1,\ell+1} \in W^h(\Gamma^m)$ and $\delta \vec{X}^{m+1,\ell+1} \in V_\partial^h(\Gamma^m)$ with $\vec{X}^{m+1,\ell+1} = \delta \vec{X}^{m+1,\ell+1} + \text{id}|_{\Gamma^m}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \left[\left(\frac{\rho^m \vec{U}^{m+1, \ell+1} - I_0^m \rho^{m-1} I_2^m \vec{U}^m}{\Delta t} + I_0^m \rho^{m-1} \frac{\vec{U}^{m+1, \ell+1} - I_2^m \vec{U}^m}{\Delta t}, \vec{\chi}^h \right) \right] \\ & + \mathcal{A}(\rho^m, I_2^m \vec{U}^m; \vec{U}^{m+1, \ell+1}, \vec{\chi}^h) + 2(\eta^m \underline{\mathbb{D}}(\vec{U}^{m+1, \ell+1}), \underline{\mathbb{D}}(\vec{\chi}^h)) - (P^{m+1, \ell+1}, \nabla \cdot \vec{\chi}^h) \\ & - \langle \kappa_\gamma^{m+1, \ell+1} \vec{\nu}^m, \vec{\chi}^h \rangle_{\Gamma^m} = (\rho^m \vec{g}, \vec{\chi}^h) \quad \forall \vec{\chi}^h \in \mathbb{U}^m, \end{aligned} \quad (4.30a)$$

$$(\nabla \cdot \vec{U}^{m+1, \ell+1}, q^h) = 0 \quad \forall q^h \in \mathbb{P}^m, \quad (4.30b)$$

$$\left\langle \frac{\vec{X}^{m+1, \ell+1} - \text{id}}{\Delta t} \cdot \vec{\nu}^{m+\frac{1}{2}, \ell}, \varphi^h \right\rangle_{\Gamma^m}^h - \langle \vec{U}^{m+1, \ell+1} \cdot \vec{\nu}^m, \varphi^h \rangle_{\Gamma^m} = 0 \quad \forall \varphi^h \in W^h(\Gamma^m), \quad (4.30c)$$

$$\langle \kappa_\gamma^{m+1, \ell+1} \vec{\nu}^{m+\frac{1}{2}, \ell}, \vec{\zeta}^h \rangle_{\Gamma^m}^h + \langle \gamma \nabla_s \vec{X}^{m+1, \ell+1}, \nabla_s \vec{\zeta}^h \rangle_{\Gamma^m} = 0 \quad \forall \vec{\zeta}^h \in V_\delta^h(\Gamma^m), \quad (4.30d)$$

where $\vec{\nu}^{m+\frac{1}{2}, \ell}$ is a lagged approximation which follows (4.22) except that \vec{X}^{m+1} is replaced with $\vec{X}^{m+1, \ell}$. We then repeat the above iteration until the following condition holds

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq I_S} \max_{\vec{q} \in Q_{\Gamma_i}^m} |\vec{X}_i^{m+1, \ell+1}(\vec{q}) - \vec{X}_i^{m+1, \ell}(\vec{q})| \leq \text{tol},$$

where tol is a chosen tolerance. The well-posedness of the linear system (4.30) can be shown similarly to Theorem 4.1.

5 Numerical results

In this section, we will present numerical results in both 2d and 3d. We implemented the fully discrete finite element approximations (4.8) and (4.25) within the finite element toolbox ALBERTA, see [56]. The linear systems of equations arising from (4.8) and (4.30), respectively, are solved with a GMRES iterative solver applied to a Schur complement approach, similarly to the procedure in the two-phase flow context in [17]. When applied to (4.8), the Schur complement eliminates κ_γ^{m+1} from (4.8a), to yield a linear saddle-point problem for \vec{U}^{m+1} and P^{m+1} that is very similar to discretizations arising from one-phase Navier–Stokes equations. For the treatment of the non-standard finite element spaces $W^h(\Gamma^m)$ and $V_\delta^h(\Gamma^m)$ we use the techniques in [11, 14], see also [30]. In particular, rather than working with the trial and test spaces $W^h(\Gamma^m)$ and $V_\delta^h(\Gamma^m)$ directly, we employ standard finite element spaces and then use suitable projection operators to enforce the conditions that need to hold at triple junctions and boundary points/lines. This technique is similar to a common numerical treatment of periodic boundary conditions for PDEs. The GMRES solver is dependent on efficient preconditioners, both for the solution of the outer saddle-point problem, as well as for the solution of the inner Schur complement. For these preconditioners we employ the sparse factorization packages UMFPAK and SPQR, see [23, 24]. For more details in the two-phase situation, we refer to [17].

As we use an unfitted finite element approximation, the discretizations of the fluid interfaces are completely independent of the bulk mesh. For the communication between bulk and surface meshes we extended the approach from [17] from closed surfaces to surface clusters with triple junctions. In particular, we use an adaptive bulk mesh procedure that leads to a refined mesh close to the interfaces. We stress that for the interface meshes, no adaptation, mesh smoothing or remeshing is necessary in practice, since our variational method will automatically move the vertices tangentially to keep a good mesh quality. Hence all the numerical results presented

in this section are the exact results of our scheme (4.25), without any heuristic changes to the interfacial meshes. For the bulk mesh adaptation strategy we use the same notation “ n adapt $_{k,l}$ ” from [17] to denote $\Delta t = 10^{-3}/n$, $N_f = 2^k$ and $N_c = 2^l$.

5.1 Numerical results in 2d

Example 1: For our first set of experiments, we check for the absence of spurious velocities by considering an example for three-phase Stokes flow in $\Omega = (-1, 1)^2$ with no-slip condition on all of $\partial\Omega$, i.e., $\partial_1\Omega = \partial\Omega$. For the initial data of the interfaces we choose a symmetric standard double bubble with radii 0.3, as shown in Fig. 2. This setup represents a steady state solution for the continuous problem, and so nonzero discrete velocities are often called spurious, compare with [16]. We also set the physical parameters

$$\rho = 0, \quad \eta = 1, \quad \gamma = 1, \quad \vec{g} = \vec{0}.$$

As can be seen in Fig. 2, the pressure jump can be captured exactly when XFEM is used. As a consequence, the scheme does not exhibit any spurious velocities. The time history of the energy is shown as well. Here we observe a significant decrease in energy for the scheme without XFEM. This is due to the shrinking of the bubble, since the scheme no longer preserves the volume exactly, while being still energy stable.

We repeat the experiment for four-phase Stokes flow, where as initial data for the interfaces we use a symmetric standard triple bubble with each bubble having area $\frac{3\pi}{25}$. See Fig. 2 for the results, which confirm once again that our scheme (4.25) can capture this discrete steady state solution exactly.

We further repeat the two previous experiments with a different choice of surface tensions. For the double bubble, we select $\gamma = (1.5, 2, 1)$, where the inter-bubble interface has unit surface tension. For the triple bubble, we select $\gamma = (1.4, 1.6, 1.8, 1, 1, 1)$, where the inter-bubble interfaces have unit surface tension. The numerical results are presented in Fig. 3, which again confirm that our scheme with XFEM can exactly capture the pressure jump across the interfaces.

Example 2: In this example, we consider an initial setup similar to [10, Fig. 28] in $\Omega = (0, 2) \times (0, 1)$, with $\partial_1\Omega = [0, 2] \times \{0, 1\}$ and $\partial_2\Omega = \{0, 2\} \times [0, 1]$. As shown in Fig. 4, initially the fluid interfaces consist of three curves meeting at a triple junction. The two straight curves have lengths 0.25 and 1.75, while the curved interface is made up of a quarter of a circle with radius 0.25 and a straight line of length 1.5. The physical parameters are chosen as

$$\rho = \eta = \gamma = 1, \quad \vec{g} = (0, -0.98)^T.$$

We observe that the triple junction moves slowly towards the right, as shown in Fig. 4. This movement, which is driven by the desire of the system to decrease the total interfacial energy, is similar to what is observed in Marangoni-type flows, where the fluid moves towards a direction with higher surface tension. We also find that the total energy is decreasing in time. The computational mesh and the pressure and fluid velocity at the final time are visualized as well in Fig. 4.

In the following 2d examples, we always consider the computational domain $\Omega = (0, 1) \times (0, 2)$ with $\partial_1\Omega = [0, 1] \times \{0, 2\}$ and $\partial_2\Omega = \{0, 1\} \times [0, 2]$.

Example 3: In this experiment, we consider a rising bubble that is trapped between two fluids. Initially, the bubble is given by a circle of radius $\frac{3}{16}$ at the centre of the domain, as shown in




Figure 2: (adapt_{5,5}) Upper panel: pressure plots for the standard double bubble using P2-P1 without or with XFEM. Lower left panel: the time history of the energy for the standard double bubble. Lower right panel: pressure plot for the standard triple bubble using P2-P1 with XFEM.




Figure 3: (adapt_{5,5}) The fluid interfaces and corresponding pressure plots for the nonsymmetric double bubble (upper panel) and triple bubble (lower panel).




Figure 4: (adapt_{9,4}) Evolution of the triple junction. On top we show the fluid interfaces at times $t = 0, 5, 10, 20, 30, 40$, together with a visualization of the computational mesh at time $T = 40$. Below are the time history of the total energy as well as a plot of the pressure and of some streamlines of the velocity at time $T = 40$.

Fig. 5. We set $\gamma = 5$, and use $\rho = 1000, \eta = 0.1$ for the upper fluid, $\rho = 1200, \eta = 0.15$ for the lower fluid and $\rho = 1, \eta = 10^{-4}$ for the bubble. The gravitational force is chosen as usual with $\vec{g} = (0, -0.98)^T$. Here we observe that the bubble lifts the heavier liquid and eventually leads to a striking shape at time $T = 3$. In fact, the final geometric shape of the interfaces is consistent with experimental results for bubbles rising through an oil/water interface, see, e.g., [65, Fig. 2].




Figure 5: (2adapt_{9,4}) Snapshots of the fluid interfaces at times $t = 0, 0.5, \dots, 3$, together with a visualization of the computational mesh at time $T = 3$. On the right is plot of the pressure and of some streamlines of the velocity at time $t = 3$. Compare also with [65, Fig. 2].

Example 4: In this experiment, we consider the rise of a gas-liquid double bubble. We investigate the case when a lighter bubble pulls up a bubble that is heavier than the surrounding liquid. The initial double bubble is made up of a semi-disk and a semi-ellipse, where the radius of the disk is 0.15 and the major semi-axis of the ellipse is 0.45. The interface between the two bubbles is aligned with the y -axis at a height of 0.7. We set $\gamma = 24.5$ and choose $\rho = 1, \eta = 0.1$

for the lighter(gas) bubble, $\rho = 1100, \eta = 10$ for the heavier(liquid) bubble, $\rho = 1000, \eta = 10$ for the surrounding liquid, and $\vec{g} = (0, -0.98)^T$ as usual. Snapshots of the rising double bubble are shown in Fig. 6 at different times, where we observe a similar geometric shape to [45, Fig. 17].

To further investigate the dynamics of the double bubble, we introduce the benchmark quantities for each bubble as

$$V_c|_{t_m} = \frac{\int_{\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma^m]} (\vec{U}^m \cdot \vec{e}_d) d\mathcal{L}^d}{\text{vol}(\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma^m])}, \quad y_c = \frac{\int_{\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma^m]} (\text{id} \cdot \vec{e}_d) d\mathcal{L}^d}{\text{vol}(\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma^m])}, \quad v_\Delta = \frac{\text{vol}(\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma^m]) - \text{vol}(\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma^0])}{\text{vol}(\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma^0])},$$

for some $\ell \in \{1, \dots, I_R\}$. Here V_c is the bubble's rise velocity, y_c is the bubble's centre of mass in the vertical direction, and v_Δ is the relative volume loss. The time history plots of the benchmark quantities for the gas bubble and the liquid bubble are shown in Fig. 7. We observe that in the early stages the gas bubble rises much faster than the liquid bubble, but it is then dragged down by the heavier bubble. Eventually, the two bubbles rise with the same speed. Moreover, exact volume preservation (up to solver tolerances) is observed for both bubbles.




Figure 6: (2adapt_{9,4}) Snapshots of the rising double bubble at different times.




Figure 7: The time history plots of the rise velocity, the centre of mass and the relative volume loss of the two bubbles, and the total energy of the system.

Example 5: In this experiment, we consider the rise of a standard triple bubble. The initial interfaces are given by a symmetric standard triple bubble with each bubble having area $\frac{3}{400}\pi$.

We set $\gamma = 24.5$ as before and choose $\rho = 100, \eta = 1$ for the three bubbles and $\rho = 1000, \eta = 1$ for the surrounding fluid. The numerical results are visualised in Fig. 8 and Fig. 9. We can see that the triple bubble deforms slightly, and it wobbles a bit from left to right, as it rises in the container. We next repeat the experiment but choose $\gamma = 1.96$, as well as $\rho = 1, \eta = 0.1$ inside the bubbles, and $\rho = 1000, \eta = 10$ in the surrounding fluid. The numerical results are shown in Fig. 10 and Fig. 11. where we now observe a much stronger deformation of the triple bubble. In particular, the leading bubble(s) are now much thinner, due to the smaller surface tension and the larger density contrast.




Figure 8: (2adapt_{9,4}) Snapshots of the rising triple bubble at different times.




Figure 9: The time history plots of the rise velocity, the centre of mass and the relative volume loss of the three bubbles, and the total energy of the system.

5.2 Numerical results in 3d

For the 3d examples, we fix the computational domain $\Omega = (0, 1) \times (0, 1) \times (0, 2)$ with $\partial_1\Omega = [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \times \{0, 2\}$ and $\partial_2\Omega = \partial\Omega \setminus \partial_1\Omega$.

Example 6: We consider the dynamics of a lens that is trapped between two fluids. We set $\gamma = 24.5 (1.2, 1, 0.5)$, where Γ_1 separates the bubble from the upper liquid, Γ_2 separates the bubble from the lower liquid, and Γ_3 is the initially flat interface between the two surrounding




Figure 10: Snapshots of the rising triple bubble at different times.




Figure 11: The time history plots of the rise velocity, the centre of mass and the relative volume loss of the three bubbles, and the total energy of the system.

liquids. The initial profile of the fluid interfaces is chosen as (an approximation to) the surface energy minimizer for this choice of surface tensions. Hence this would be a steady state for Stokes flow, or for Navier–Stokes flow in the absence of gravity. For the shown simulation, we choose $\rho = 1, \eta = 0.1$ for the bubble, $\rho = 100, \eta = 1$ for the upper fluid and $\rho = 1000, \eta = 10$ for the lower fluid. The gravitational force is chosen as usual $\vec{g} = (0, 0, -0.98)^T$. The fluid interfaces are shown at time $t = 0$ and $T = 3$ in Fig. 12. We can see that due to the gravitational forces the drop becomes rounder and raises slightly, leading to a curved interface between the two surrounding fluids.




Figure 12: (adapt_{4,1}) Snapshots of the trapped bubble at $t = 0$ and $T = 3$. Lower panel: view from the front.

Example 7: In our last experiment, we use the same physical parameters as in **Example 4**, and consider a rising double bubble in 3d. In particular, the initial double bubble is made up of a half-ball and a semi-ellipsoid, where the radius of the ball is 0.15 and the major semi-axis of the ellipsoid is 0.45. The interface between the two bubbles is aligned with the z -axis at a height of 0.7. The evolution of the standard double bubble at times $t = 0$ and $T = 8$ is visualized in Fig. 13. The time history plots of the benchmark quantities are shown in Fig. 14. As in the 2d experiment in **Example 4** we can see that the lighter bubble lifts the heavier bubble, despite it being heavier than the surrounding fluid.

6 Conclusions

We have presented a variational front-tracking method for multiphase Navier–Stokes flow that can naturally deal with triple junctions, and with an arbitrary number of phases in two and three space dimensions. The numerical method couples a parametric finite element approximation of the interfaces with a standard finite element approximation of the Navier–Stokes equations




Figure 13: (adapt_{5,2}) Snapshots of the rising double bubble at $t = 0$ and $T = 8$.




Figure 14: The time history plots of the rise velocity, the centre of mass and the relative volume loss of the two bubbles, and the total energy of the system.

in the bulk. Here we use an unfitted approach, so that the interface meshes are completely independent of the bulk mesh. With the help of a simple XFEM enrichment procedure our scheme is guaranteed to conserve the volumes of the phases. Moreover, our introduced finite element method can be shown to be unconditionally stable.

An important feature of our numerical method is the excellent mesh quality of the interface approximations. This is induced by an inherent discrete tangential motion of the vertices that make up the discrete interfaces. In particular, no mesh smoothing for the discrete interfaces is necessary in practice.

Acknowledgement

The last author Quan Zhao would like to acknowledge the support from the Alexander von Humboldt Foundations during his stay at University of Regensburg.

Appendix A Derivation of (3.2)

In this appendix, we generalize the calculations for the simpler situation of two-phase flow in [17] to the multiphase case. In particular, it is not difficult to show that the following identity holds

$$\begin{aligned} (\rho [\vec{u} \cdot \nabla] \vec{u}, \vec{\chi}) &= \frac{1}{2} [(\rho (\vec{u} \cdot \nabla) \vec{u}, \vec{\chi}) - (\rho (\vec{u} \cdot \nabla) \vec{\chi}, \vec{u})] + \frac{1}{2} (\rho, \vec{u} \cdot \nabla [\vec{u} \cdot \vec{\chi}]) \\ &= \mathcal{A}(\rho, \vec{u}; \vec{u}, \vec{\chi}) + \frac{1}{2} (\rho, \vec{u} \cdot \nabla [\vec{u} \cdot \vec{\chi}]), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

for any $\vec{\chi} \in \mathbb{V}$. For the last term in (A.1), we apply integration by parts to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} (\rho, \vec{u} \cdot \nabla [\vec{u} \cdot \vec{\chi}]) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\ell=1}^{I_R} \int_{\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma(t)]} \rho_\ell \vec{u} \cdot \nabla (\vec{u} \cdot \vec{\chi}) \, d\mathcal{L}^d \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\ell=1}^{I_R} \int_{\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma(t)]} \rho_\ell (\vec{u} \cdot \vec{\chi}) \nabla \cdot \vec{u} \, d\mathcal{L}^d - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{I_S} \int_{\Gamma_i(t)} [\rho]_{b_i^-}^{b_i^+} (\vec{u} \cdot \vec{v}_i) (\vec{u} \cdot \vec{\chi}) \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{I_S} \int_{\Gamma_i(t)} [\rho]_{b_i^-}^{b_i^+} (\vec{u} \cdot \vec{v}_i) (\vec{u} \cdot \vec{\chi}) \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where we recall the boundary conditions (2.2) and the divergence free condition (2.1b). On the other hand, using (2.1b), (2.4c) and the Reynolds transport theorem yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} (\rho \vec{u}, \vec{\chi}) &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{I_R} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma(t)]} \rho_\ell \vec{u} \cdot \vec{\chi} \, d\mathcal{L}^d \\ &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{I_R} \int_{\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma(t)]} \rho_\ell (\partial_t \vec{u} \cdot \vec{\chi} + \vec{u} \cdot \partial_t \vec{\chi}) \, d\mathcal{L}^d + \sum_{\ell=1}^{I_R} \int_{\mathcal{R}_\ell[\Gamma(t)]} \rho_\ell \vec{u} \cdot \nabla (\vec{u} \cdot \vec{\chi}) \, d\mathcal{L}^d \\ &= (\rho \partial_t \vec{u}, \vec{\chi}) + (\rho \vec{u}, \partial_t \vec{\chi}) - \sum_{i=1}^{I_S} \int_{\Gamma_i(t)} [\rho]_{b_i^-}^{b_i^+} (\vec{u} \cdot \vec{v}_i) (\vec{u} \cdot \vec{\chi}) \, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where the last equality is due to integration by parts and the boundary conditions (2.2). It immediately follows from (A.3) that

$$(\rho \partial_t \vec{u}, \vec{\chi}) = \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{d}{dt} (\rho \vec{u}, \vec{\chi}) + (\rho \partial_t \vec{u}, \vec{\chi}) - (\rho \vec{u}, \partial_t \vec{\chi}) + \sum_{i=1}^{I_S} \int_{\Gamma_i(t)} [\rho]_{b_i}^{b_i^+} (\vec{u} \cdot \vec{\nu}_i) (\vec{u} \cdot \vec{\chi}) d\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \right],$$

which on combining with (A.1) and (A.2) yields the desired result (3.2).

References

- [1] H. Abels, H. Garcke, and G. Grün. Thermodynamically consistent, frame indifferent diffuse interface models for incompressible two-phase flows with different densities. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 22(03):1150013, 2012.
- [2] M. Agnese and R. Nürnberg. Fitted finite element discretization of two-phase Stokes flow. *Inter. J. Numer. Methods Fluids*, 82(11):709–729, 2016.
- [3] M. Agnese and R. Nürnberg. Fitted front tracking methods for two-phase incompressible Navier–Stokes flow: Eulerian and ALE finite element discretizations. *Int. J. Numer. Anal. Mod.*, 17:613–642, 2020.
- [4] S. Aland and A. Voigt. Benchmark computations of diffuse interface models for two-dimensional bubble dynamics. *Int. J. Numer. Methods Fluids*, 69(3):747–761, 2012.
- [5] D. M. Anderson, G. B. McFadden, and A. A. Wheeler. Diffuse-interface methods in fluid mechanics. *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.*, 30(1):139–165, 1998.
- [6] G. Anjos, N. Mangiavacchi, N. Borhani, and J. R. Thome. 3D ALE finite-element method for two-phase flows with phase change. *Heat Transf. Engrg.*, 35(5):537–547, 2014.
- [7] E. Bänsch. Finite element discretization of the Navier–Stokes equations with a free capillary surface. *Numer. Math.*, 88(2):203–235, 2001.
- [8] W. Bao, H. Garcke, R. Nürnberg, and Q. Zhao. A structure-preserving finite element approximation of surface diffusion for curve networks and surface clusters. *Numer. Methods Partial Diff. Equ.*, 39(1):759–794, 2023.
- [9] W. Bao and Q. Zhao. A structure-preserving parametric finite element method for surface diffusion. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 59(5):2775–2799, 2021.
- [10] J. W. Barrett, H. Garcke, and R. Nürnberg. On the variational approximation of combined second and fourth order geometric evolution equations. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 29(3):1006–1041, 2007.
- [11] J. W. Barrett, H. Garcke, and R. Nürnberg. A parametric finite element method for fourth order geometric evolution equations. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 222(1):441–467, 2007.
- [12] J. W. Barrett, H. Garcke, and R. Nürnberg. Numerical approximation of anisotropic geometric evolution equations in the plane. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 28(2):292–330, 2008.
- [13] J. W. Barrett, H. Garcke, and R. Nürnberg. Finite-element approximation of coupled surface and grain boundary motion with applications to thermal grooving and sintering. *Euro. J. Appl. Math.*, 21(6):519–556, 2010.
- [14] J. W. Barrett, H. Garcke, and R. Nürnberg. Parametric approximation of surface clusters driven by isotropic and anisotropic surface energies. *Interfaces Free Bound.*, 12(2):187–234, 2010.
- [15] J. W. Barrett, H. Garcke, and R. Nürnberg. The approximation of planar curve evolutions by stable fully implicit finite element schemes that equidistribute. *Numer. Methods Partial Differ. Equ.*, 27(1):1–30, 2011.
- [16] J. W. Barrett, H. Garcke, and R. Nürnberg. Eliminating spurious velocities with a stable approximation of viscous incompressible two-phase Stokes flow. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 267:511–530, 2013.
- [17] J. W. Barrett, H. Garcke, and R. Nürnberg. A stable parametric finite element discretization of two-phase Navier–Stokes flow. *J. Sci. Comput.*, 63(1):78–117, 2015.
- [18] J. W. Barrett, H. Garcke, and R. Nürnberg. Parametric finite element approximations of curvature driven interface evolutions. *Handb. Numer. Anal. (Andrea Bonito and Ricardo H. Nochetto, eds.)*, 21:275–423, 2020.
- [19] L. Bañas and R. Nürnberg. Numerical approximation of a non-smooth phase-field model for multicomponent incompressible flow. *ESAIM: Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, 51(3):1089–1117, 2017.

- [20] D. Boffi. Three-dimensional finite element methods for the Stokes problem. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 34(2):664–670, 1997.
- [21] F. Boyer, C. Lapuerta, S. Minjeaud, B. Piar, and M. Quintard. Cahn–Hilliard/Navier–Stokes model for the simulation of three-phase flows. *Transp. Porous Media*, 82:463–483, 2010.
- [22] F. Brezzi and M. Fortin. *Mixed and Hybrid Finite Element Methods*, volume 15 of *Springer Series in Computational Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991.
- [23] T. A. Davis. Algorithm 832: UMFPACK V4.3—an unsymmetric-pattern multifrontal method. *ACM Trans. Math. Software*, 30(2):196–199, 2004.
- [24] T. A. Davis. Algorithm 915, SuiteSparseQR: Multifrontal multithreaded rank-revealing sparse QR factorization. *ACM Trans. Math. Software*, 38(1):1–22, 2011.
- [25] H. Ding, P. D. Spelt, and C. Shu. Diffuse interface model for incompressible two-phase flows with large density ratios. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 226(2):2078–2095, 2007.
- [26] S. Dong. An efficient algorithm for incompressible N-phase flows. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 276:691–728, 2014.
- [27] B. Duan, B. Li, and Z. Yang. An energy diminishing arbitrary Lagrangian–Eulerian finite element method for two-phase Navier–Stokes flow. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 461:111215, 2022.
- [28] O. R. Dunbar, K. F. Lam, and B. Stinner. Phase field modelling of surfactants in multi-phase flow. *Interfaces Free Bound.*, 21(4):495–547, 2019.
- [29] G. Dziuk. An algorithm for evolutionary surfaces. *Numer. Math.*, 58(6):603–611, 1991.
- [30] T. Eto, H. Garcke, and R. Nürnberg. A structure-preserving finite element method for the multi-phase Mullins–Sekerka problem with triple junctions. *Numer. Math.*, 2024. (to appear).
- [31] T. Frachon and S. Zahedi. A cut finite element method for incompressible two-phase Navier–Stokes flows. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 384:77–98, 2019.
- [32] S. Ganesan, G. Matthies, and L. Tobiska. On spurious velocities in incompressible flow problems with interfaces. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 196(7):1193–1202, 2007.
- [33] H. Garcke, M. Hinze, and C. Kahle. A stable and linear time discretization for a thermodynamically consistent model for two-phase incompressible flow. *Appl. Numer. Math.*, 99:151–171, 2016.
- [34] H. Garcke, R. Nürnberg, and Q. Zhao. Arbitrary Lagrangian-Eulerian finite element approximations for axisymmetric two-phase flow. *Comput. Math. Appl.*, 155:209–223, 2024.
- [35] H. Garcke, R. Nürnberg, and Q. Zhao. Structure-preserving discretizations of two-phase Navier-Stokes flow using fitted and unfitted approaches. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 489:112276, 2023.
- [36] H. Garcke, R. Nürnberg, and Q. Zhao. Unfitted finite element approximations of the axisymmetric two-phase flow. *J. Sci. Comput.*, 97(1):14, 2023.
- [37] F. Gibou, R. Fedkiw, and S. Osher. A review of level-set methods and some recent applications. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 353:82–109, 2018.
- [38] S. Gross and A. Reusken. *Numerical methods for two-phase incompressible flows*, volume 40. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2011.
- [39] G. Grün and F. Klingbeil. Two-phase flow with mass density contrast: stable schemes for a thermodynamic consistent and frame-indifferent diffuse-interface model. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 257:708–725, 2014.
- [40] C. W. Hirt and B. D. Nichols. Volume of fluid (vof) method for the dynamics of free boundaries. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 39(1):201–225, 1981.
- [41] C. Huh and L. E. Scriven. Hydrodynamic model of steady movement of a solid/liquid/fluid contact line. *J. Colloid Interface Sci.*, 35(1):85–101, 1971.
- [42] S. Jachalski, D. Peschka, S. Bommer, R. Seemann, and B. Wagner. Structure formation in thin liquid-liquid films. In *Transport processes at fluidic interfaces*, Adv. Math. Fluid Mech., pages 531–574. Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2017.
- [43] W. Jiang and B. Li. A perimeter-decreasing and area-conserving algorithm for surface diffusion flow of curves. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 443:110531, 2021.
- [44] J. Kim and J. Lowengrub. Phase field modeling and simulation of three-phase flows. *Interfaces Free Bound.*, 7(4):435–466, 2005.
- [45] J. Li. An arbitrary Lagrangian Eulerian method for three-phase flows with triple junction points. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 251:1–16, 2013.

- [46] J. Lowengrub and L. Truskinovsky. Quasi-incompressible Cahn–Hilliard fluids and topological transitions. *R. Soc. Lond. Proc. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.*, 454(1978):2617–2654, 1998.
- [47] C. Ma and D. Bothe. Direct numerical simulation of thermocapillary flow based on the volume of fluid method. *Int. J. Multiph. Flow*, 37(9):1045–1058, 2011.
- [48] B. Merriman, J. K. Bence, and S. J. Osher. Motion of multiple junctions: A level set approach. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 112(2):334–363, 1994.
- [49] S. Mirjalili, S. S. Jain, and M. Dodd. Interface-capturing methods for two-phase flows: An overview and recent developments. *CTR Ann. Res. Briefs*, 2017(117-135):13, 2017.
- [50] E. Olsson, G. Kreiss, and S. Zahedi. A conservative level set method for two phase flow II. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 225(1):785–807, 2007.
- [51] S. Osher and R. Fedkiw. *Level Set Methods and Dynamic Implicit Surfaces*, volume 153. Springer Science & Business Media, 2002.
- [52] B. Perot and R. Nallapati. A moving unstructured staggered mesh method for the simulation of incompressible free-surface flows. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 184(1):192–214, 2003.
- [53] S. Popinet. An accurate adaptive solver for surface-tension-driven interfacial flows. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 228(16):5838–5866, 2009.
- [54] S. Quan and D. P. Schmidt. A moving mesh interface tracking method for 3D incompressible two-phase flows. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 221(2):761–780, 2007.
- [55] Y. Renardy and M. Renardy. PROST: a parabolic reconstruction of surface tension for the volume-of-fluid method. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 183(2):400–421, 2002.
- [56] A. Schmidt and K. G. Siebert. *Design of Adaptive Finite Element Software: The Finite Element Toolbox ALBERTA*, volume 42 of *Lecture Notes in Computational Science and Engineering*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005.
- [57] J. A. Sethian. *Level set methods and fast marching methods: evolving interfaces in computational geometry, fluid mechanics, computer vision, and materials science*, volume 3. Cambridge university press, 1999.
- [58] J. Shen and X. Yang. A phase-field model and its numerical approximation for two-phase incompressible flows with different densities and viscosities. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 32(3):1159–1179, 2010.
- [59] M. Shen and B. Q. Li. Bubble rising and interaction in ternary fluid flow: a phase field study. *RSC Adv.*, 13(6):3561–3574, 2023.
- [60] K. A. Smith, F. J. Solis, and D. Chopp. A projection method for motion of triple junctions by level sets. *Interfaces Free Bound.*, 4(3):263–276, 2002.
- [61] D. P. Starinshak, S. Karni, and P. L. Roe. A new level set model for multimaterial flows. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 262:1–16, 2014.
- [62] V. Styles, D. Kay, and R. Welford. Finite element approximation of a Cahn–Hilliard–Navier–Stokes system. *Interfaces Free Bound.*, 10(1):15–43, 2008.
- [63] M. Sussman, P. Smereka, and S. Osher. A level set approach for computing solutions to incompressible two-phase flow. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 114(1):146–159, 1994.
- [64] G. Tryggvason, B. Bunner, A. Esmaeeli, D. Juric, N. Al-Rawahi, W. Tauber, J. Han, S. Nas, and Y.-J. Jan. A front-tracking method for the computations of multiphase flow. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 169(2):708–759, 2001.
- [65] T. Uemura, Y. Ueda, and M. Iguchi. Ripples on a rising bubble through an immiscible two-liquid interface generate numerous micro droplets. *Europhys. Lett.*, 92(3):34004, 2010.
- [66] S. O. Unverdi and G. Tryggvason. A front-tracking method for viscous, incompressible multi-fluid flows. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 100(1):25–37, 1992.
- [67] Q. Zhang and X.-P. Wang. Phase field modeling and simulation of three-phase flow on solid surfaces. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 319:79–107, 2016.
- [68] H.-K. Zhao, T. Chan, B. Merriman, and S. Osher. A variational level set approach to multiphase motion. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 127(1):179–195, 1996.
- [69] Q. Zhao and W. Ren. An energy-stable finite element method for the simulation of moving contact lines in two-phase flows. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 417:109582, 2020.