

Comment on  
 “Dynamic Wetting by liquids of different viscosity”, by  
 T.D. Blake and Y.D. Shikhmurzaev

Jens Eggers<sup>†</sup> and Robert Evans<sup>‡</sup>

<sup>†</sup> *School of Mathematics,*

*University of Bristol, University Walk,  
 Bristol BS8 1TW, United Kingdom*

<sup>‡</sup> *H.H. Wills Physics Laboratory, University of Bristol  
 Bristol BS8 1TL, United Kingdom*

We comment on a recent theory of dynamic wetting, that is based directly upon a model for interface formation, introduced by Shikhmurzaev. We argue that the treatment of surface tension and its relaxation, inherent in the original model, is physically flawed.

In a recent paper [1], Blake and Shikhmurzaev utilize a model for interface formation, proposed initially by Shikhmurzaev [2, 3], to interpret their measurements of the velocity dependence of the dynamic contact angle at a moving contact line. They determine some of the parameters contained in the model, in particular, their viscosity dependence. In this comment, we point out that the key quantities upon which this model is based have no well-defined physical meaning. More specifically, the treatment of surface tension which underlies the theory does not correspond to any known physical mechanism. As a result, the model leads to consequences which are physically absurd and which are at odds with available experimental data. Furthermore, we show that the values for model parameters, purportedly estimated in [1], depart by many orders of magnitude from what is physically reasonable.

The model in Ref.[1] is based on the fundamental assumption that the surface tension of a *pure liquid* is determined by a ‘surface equation of state’, which fixes its value as function of surface parameters (see also [2], section 2.1). As an approximation, the surface tension  $\sigma$  is assumed to depend on the ‘surface density’  $\rho^s$  alone, cf. equations (1) and (4) of [1]:

$$\sigma = \gamma(\rho_0^s - \rho^s), \quad (1)$$

where  $\gamma$  and  $\rho_0^s$  are phenomenological constants. In [1], Shikhmurzaev’s model is applied to both the free liquid-gas and the liquid-solid interface, but we will focus on the former, so there is no need for an index on  $\sigma$ . Equation (1) makes no physical sense. Firstly, as explained in [4], p. 31 ff, surface density as introduced by Gibbs cannot be an intrinsic property of the surface of a pure liquid. It depends solely on the definition of what Gibbs calls the *dividing surface* between the two phases. Conventionally, for a pure liquid, one defines the dividing surface in such a way that the surface density *vanishes* ([4], p. 31), a choice which is called the *equimolar surface*. Secondly, the surface is not an independent thermodynamic system that would allow relations between its extensive and intensive parameters to be defined, as is done in [1, 2, 3], and as

is implied by (1). As pointed out in [4], p.33, the surface exists only by virtue of the bulk phases that surround it; it does not form an autonomous phase. Hence an expression such as  $\sigma = \sigma(\rho^s)$ , as given in [1], is meaningless as regards surface thermodynamics, no matter how  $\rho^s$  is defined.

We illustrate our criticism further by pointing out two of the consequences of the ansatz (1), which we think are absurd. Equation (13) of [1] states that the surface tension should go to zero with surface thickness  $h$  (assuming  $\rho_e^{s*}$  is constant, as is implied in the text). This is well known not to be the case, see [4] p. 16 ff and p.47, which provides an authoritative critique of treatments based on point-thermodynamics. Of course,  $h$  is not really an independent quantity, rather, it is determined by the conditions of thermodynamic equilibrium at the surface. However by considering, for example, different temperatures, different interface density profiles can effectively be realized. Given the interface profile, the surface tension can be calculated essentially by mechanical arguments [4]. (For a slowly-varying profile, treated in the square-gradient approximation of Rayleigh and van der Waals, the result is equation (1.43) or (3.11) of [4].) If anything, the surface tension will be *larger* for a sharp interface ( $h = 0$ ) than for the real smooth one. The reason is that the real interface shape is one that *minimizes* the total free energy (grand potential) of the inhomogeneous fluid (see [4], p. 54 ff). Indeed, at high temperatures, when the interface becomes more diffuse, surface tension *decreases* (cf. Figs. 1.5, 1.6, and 6.5 [4]).

Next, we consider equation (14) of [1] for the typical time scale  $\tau$ , over which the surface tension reaches its equilibrium value after a fresh surface is created. The time  $\tau$  is claimed to be proportional to the viscosity  $\mu$  of the fluid, and a specific estimate is given for  $\mu = 672mPas$ , for which the value is supposed to lie between  $\tau = 2.5 \times 10^{-6}s$  and  $8.3 \times 10^{-6}s$ . To a first approximation, we in fact believe that the timescale needed to establish a surface tension in a pure fluid is essentially zero: force is transmitted with the speed of light, giving  $\tau \approx 10^{-18}s$  for molecular sizes. The interfacial profile,

and thus the surface tension, subsequently relaxes toward its equilibrium value, but even for this process the author's numbers appear to be a gross over-estimation. The thickness of the liquid-gas interface is typically 2 or 3 molecular diameters near the triple-point ([4], Chs 6 and 7); this gives about  $5 \times 10^{-10}m$ . Dividing this length by the speed of sound in a typical simple liquid, we arrive at  $\tau_s \approx 10^{-12}s$ . In other words,  $\tau$  will be given by a typical collision time in the liquid, which is not related in any simple way to the fluid viscosity.

This estimate is consistent with typical decay times of correlation functions in simple liquids measured by neutron scattering as well as with those found in molecular dynamics simulations [5]. Note also that Brillouin scattering from density fluctuations in bulk liquids, where the wavelengths involved are much larger, of the order of  $5 \times 10^{-7}m$ , is characterized by shifts of frequency of typically  $10^{10}Hz$  and that Brillouin spectra for liquid interfaces correspond to the same range of frequency shifts [6]. We are not aware of any physical mechanism that would give rise to relaxation times in the order of  $10^{-6}s$ .

One might argue that as the authors' estimates are based on their own measurements of a moving contact line, they should provide independent evidence for the consistency of the assumptions of the model. Unfortunately, we do not believe this to be the case. The reason is that the authors' theory refers to what they term the dynamic contact angle  $\theta_d$ , determined solely by a balance of surface tensions, cf. equation (7) of [1]. Viscous forces

and, therefore, interface bending does not enter their description. The *measurement* of the interface angle was however performed at a scale of about a *mm*. It is well known that the interface near a moving contact line is highly curved [7], which is the result of viscous forces which therefore cannot be ignored. This is best appreciated in the case of a perfectly wetting fluid, where the contact line is preceded by a precursor film [7]. Hence no interface formation is taking place, yet on macroscopic scales measured contact angles have a speed dependence consistent with Tanner's law [7]. This implies that in the partially wetting case, considered here, any effects of interface bending would have to be carefully subtracted for a correct interpretation of experimental data.

- 
- [1] T.D. Blake and Y.D. Shikhmurzaev, *J. Coll. Interf. Sci.* **253**, 196 (2002).
  - [2] Y.D. Shikhmurzaev, *Int. J. Multiphase Flow* **19**, 589 (1993).
  - [3] Y.D. Shikhmurzaev, *Fluid Dynamics Research* **13**, 45 (1994).
  - [4] J. S. Rowlinson and B. Widom, *Molecular theory of capillarity*, Oxford, 1982.
  - [5] J.P. Hansen and I.R. McDonald, *Theory of Simple Liquids, 2nd Edition*, Academic Press, 1986.
  - [6] J.G. Dil, *Rep. Progr. Phys.* **45**, 285 (1982).
  - [7] P. G. de Gennes, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **57**, 827 (1985).