

Nonequilibrium model for compressible two-phase two-pressure flows with surface tension

Ilya Peshkov¹ Evgeniy Romenski² Michal Pavelka³

December 18, 2023

In continuum thermodynamics, models of two-phase mixtures typically obey the condition of pressure equilibrium across interfaces between the phases. We propose a new non-equilibrium model beyond that condition, allowing for microinertia of the interfaces, surface tension, and different phase pressures. The model is formulated within the framework of Symmetric Hyperbolic Thermodynamically Compatible equations, and it possesses variational and Hamiltonian structures. Finally, via formal asymptotic analysis, we show how the pressure equilibrium is restored when fast degrees of freedom relax to their equilibrium values.

1. Introduction

When dealing with multi-fluid flows of several immiscible fluids (gas-liquid or liquid-liquid mixtures), one needs to take into account the effect of surface tension, for instance in dispersed flows, bubbly fluid, sprays droplets, or (super-)fluids undergoing phase transitions [24, 57]. The interface between the mixture constituents can be either well-resolved or under-resolved. In the former, surface tension defines the shape of the macroscopic interface, while in the latter, it introduces microinertia due to the bubbles/droplets oscillations. In this paper, we propose a continuum mechanics model for multi-phase flows with macroscopically resolved or continuously distributed interfaces that adheres to both the principles of thermodynamics and Hamiltonian mechanics.

In continuum mechanics, there are two alternative approaches to address the effect of surface tension: the sharp interface and diffuse interface approaches, e.g. see [43, 55]. The sharp interface approach treats an interface as a true hypersurface of zero thickness separating pure phases. This is a pure geometrical approach, and any extra physics (e.g. phase transition, mass transfer, etc.) must be introduced as a boundary effect on the interface. On the other hand, in diffuse-interface-type approaches, a new state variable is introduced as a continuous field representing the interface as a narrow mixing zone in which all constituents coexist. In contrast to the sharp interface approaches, extra physics must be added via coupling of the interface field with other physical fields both at the governing-equation level and through the constitutive relations. Modeling surface tension with a diffuse interface approach represents the subject of this paper.

In turn, inside of the diffuse interface community, the multi-fluid system can be considered from the two different perspectives. According to the first viewpoint, the mixture is treated as a single continuous medium (single-fluid approach) without distinguishing the individual constituents. The famous examples of such theories are

¹Department of Civil, Environmental and Mechanical Engineering, University of Trento, Via Mesiano 77, Trento 38123, Italy ilya.peshkov@unitn.it

²Sobolev Institute of Mathematics, 4 Acad. Koptyug avenue, Novosibirsk, Russia, evrom@math.nsc.ru

³Mathematical Institute, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University, Sokolovská 83, Prague 186 75, Czech Republic, pavelka@karlin.mff.cuni.cz

the Korteweg type models and phase field models, e.g. [17, 5, 8], with a single double-well potential serving as the equation of state of the whole multifluid system. On the other hand, according to the second viewpoint, the multifluid system is considered as a mixture with well defined species governed by their individual parameters (velocities, pressures, temperatures, etc.), and most importantly, individual equations of state. It is, therefore, more realistic and thus has a bigger potential than the single-fluid approach because it contains physically motivated extra degrees of freedom missing in the latter. Moreover, the single-fluid approach is restricted to liquid-liquid or gas-liquid systems, while the mixture approach can be potentially also applied to the solid-fluid interfaces or dispersed multi-phase flows in porous elastic media [50], in particular in the setting of the unified model of continuum mechanics [41, 12, 39, 29].

In a truly non-equilibrium mixture model, all corresponding phase parameters (pressures, velocities, etc.) are independent and distinct within a mixture element. Phase parameters may relax to common values only in the vicinity of thermodynamic equilibrium. In such instances, various reduced models can be derived, such as single-pressure models and single-velocity models, as described in [6, 26]. Notably, the single-pressure approximation is widely employed in diffuse interface surface tension models, as exemplified in [4, 38, 56, 9]. This raises a fundamental question: how can surface tension be incorporated into a two-fluid diffuse interface model without invoking the pressure-equilibrium assumption? This paper addresses this question within the framework of the Symmetric Hyperbolic Thermodynamically Compatible (SHTC) class of equations.

The SHTC formulation for two-phase flows was first proposed in [51, 52], and later it was developed in a series of papers [47, 46, 45]. In particular, it was generalized to an arbitrary number of phases in [49] and its variational and Hamiltonian formulation via Poisson brackets were discussed in [40].

Other mixture formulations for multifluid systems without surface tension exist. In the community of compressible multiphase flows, perhaps the most popular is the Baer-Nunziato (BN) model [3]. The relation between the BN model and the SHTC mixture model was discussed for example in [47, 46]. In particular, in contrast to the SHTC model, the BN model has the known issue of closure relations for interfacial quantities (interfacial velocity and pressure), which is linked to the lack of variational formulation for the BN model. Variational formulations for binary mixtures were also proposed in [18, 22]. The model proposed by Ruggeri in [53, 22] only applies to homogeneous mixtures (no volume fraction) and the interactions between phases reduced to interfacial friction only (no pressure relaxation, no temperature relaxation) and therefore a direct comparison between the SHTC formulation and [53] is impossible at the moment.

On the other hand, the model proposed by Gavrilyuk and Saurel in [18] was directly designed to address the micro-capillarity and microinertia effects in bubbly liquids. Thus, it contains the volume fraction as a state variable and describes, like the BN model, a two-fluid mixture as a medium with two pressures and two velocities. The SHTC model for surface tension discussed in this paper is very close, in principle, to the one in [18]. By this we mean that the time and space gradients of the volume fraction are introduced in our model as new state variables to account for the microinertia and mixture heterogeneity in the vicinity of the interface. However, the different choice of the time gradient of the volume fraction results in overall different governing equations in the two approaches. It is likely that model [18] can also be applied not only to modeling of the microinertia effect in bubbly fluids, but also to describe macroscopic diffuse interfaces between immiscible fluids as in this paper, but this option has not yet been tested for [18].

Finally, we would like to emphasize the variational nature of the SHTC equations in general, and the SHTC formulation for mixtures in particular. When dealing with multiphysics problems it is important that the coupling of various physics in the system of governing equations is done in a compatible way. Human intuition can not serve as a reliable tool in the derivation of governing equations, but one should use first-principle-based approaches. The SHTC equations discussed in this paper, can be derived by two first-principle-type means. The first is the variational principle which is discussed in Sec. A. We also demonstrate that the governing equations can be derived

from the Hamiltonian formulation of non-equilibrium thermodynamics known as GENERIC (General Equations for Non-Equilibrium Reversible-Irreversible Coupling) [23, 34, 35, 36]. Thus, the discussed SHTC equations for surface tension admits a variational and Hamiltonian formulation via non-canonical Poisson brackets.

The paper is organized as follows. First, in Sec. 2 we briefly recall the SHTC model for binary heterogeneous mixtures. Then, in Sec. 3, we discuss how it can be generalized to include the surface tension effect so that the generalization still stays in the class of thermodynamically consistent systems of first-order hyperbolic equations. The variational and Hamiltonian formulations of the SHTC surface tension model are discussed in Sec. A and B. The closure problem is discussed in Sec. 4, and hyperbolicity of the governing equations is partially discussed in Sec. 5. We then derive the relaxation limit of the governing equation in Sec. 6, and demonstrate that the stationary bubble solution is compatible with the Young-Laplace law in Sec. 7. Finally, we analyze the dispersion relation of the model in Sec. 8.

2. SHTC master system for two-phase compressible flows

The governing equations of the discussed later continuous surface tension model generalize the SHTC equations of compressible two-phase flows [46]. Like all SHTC models, the two-phase flow model with surface tension can be obtained from a master SHTC system of balance equations [19, 20, 52] using generalized internal energy as thermodynamic potential. In turn, the master SHTC system can be derived from a variational principle and thus consists of a set of Euler-Lagrange equations coupled with trivial differential constraints. It describes transport of abstract scalar, vector, and tensor fields.

Let us first remind the SHTC two-phase flow model and then we demonstrate how it can be to account for the effect of surface tension.

2.1. Two-phase flow master system

The master SHTC system for the mixture of two ideal fluids can be found in [46, 45] and reads as

$$\frac{\partial \rho \alpha}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \rho \alpha v_k}{\partial x_k} = -\frac{1}{\lambda} \rho E_\alpha, \quad (1a)$$

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \rho v_k}{\partial x_k} = 0, \quad (1b)$$

$$\frac{\partial \rho v_i}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial (\rho v_i v_k + \rho^2 E_\rho \delta_{ik} + \rho w_l E_{w_k})}{\partial x_k} = 0, \quad (1c)$$

$$\frac{\partial \rho c}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial (\rho c v_k + \rho E_{w_k})}{\partial x_k} = 0, \quad (1d)$$

$$\frac{\partial w_k}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial (v_l w_l + E_c)}{\partial x_k} + v_l \left(\frac{\partial w_k}{\partial x_l} - \frac{\partial w_l}{\partial x_k} \right) = -\frac{1}{\chi} E_{w_k}, \quad (1e)$$

$$\frac{\partial \rho S}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \rho S v_k}{\partial x_k} = \frac{\rho}{E_S} \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} E_\alpha E_\alpha + \frac{1}{\chi} E_{w_k} E_{w_k} \right) \geq 0. \quad (1f)$$

This system describes a mixture whose infinitesimal element of volume $V = V_1 + V_2$ and mass $M = M_1 + M_2$ is characterized by the following state variables. Here, $V_a, M_a, a = 1, 2$ are the volume and mass of the constituents of the mixture in the volume V . The mass density of the mixture is defined as $\rho = M/V$, while the apparent densities of the constituents in the volume V are $\rho_a = M_a/V, a = 1, 2$, so that $\rho = \rho_1 + \rho_2$. Also, the non-dimensional mixture parameters are the mass $c_a = M_a/M = \rho_a/\rho$ and volume $\alpha_a = V_a/V$ fractions. Note that from these definitions it follows that $c_1 + c_2 = 1$ and $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = 1$ and hence one needs to know only the mass and volume fraction of one of the components. Thus, in the above equations, we use the notations $c = c_1$ and $\alpha = \alpha_1$.

Furthermore, one needs the so-called actual densities $\rho_a = M_a/V_a$ of the phases to define the individual equations of state (internal energies) $e_a(\rho_a, s_a)$ of the constituents, where s_a , $a = 1, 2$ are the specific entropies of the constituents, and $\rho S = \varrho_1 s_1 + \varrho_2 s_2$ is the mixture entropy density. One can observe the relation $\varrho_a = \alpha_a \rho_a$, $a = 1, 2$. Despite the original SHTC two-fluid model [46, 45] is a two-temperature model, in this paper we ignore some thermal properties of such mixtures, and a single entropy-approximation $s_1 = s_2 = S$ is adopted for the sake of simplicity.

To describe the kinematics of the mixture element we define the mixture momentum, which is the sum of the constituents' momenta (due to the momentum conservation principle) $\rho \mathbf{v} = \varrho_1 \mathbf{v}_1 + \varrho_2 \mathbf{v}_2$ with $\mathbf{v}_a = v_{a,k}$, $a = 1, 2$, $k = 1, 2, 3$ being the velocity of the a -th component. Note that the velocity of the mixture element is thus defined as

$$\mathbf{v} = \frac{\varrho_1}{\rho} \mathbf{v}_1 + \frac{\varrho_2}{\rho} \mathbf{v}_2 = c_1 \mathbf{v}_1 + c_2 \mathbf{v}_2. \quad (2)$$

Additionally, we introduce the relative velocity $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{v}_2$ which is defined with respect to the second phase but not with respect to the mixture velocity \mathbf{v} as traditionally done, see for example [54]. This is required by the structure of the SHTC equations and eventually by the variational scheme we use [40].

One can notice that the fluxes and sources of the governing equations are defined in terms of the partial derivatives of the mixture total energy $E = E(\rho, S, \alpha, c, \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v})$ with respect to the state variables, e.g. $E_\rho = \frac{\partial E}{\partial \rho}$, $E_\alpha = \frac{\partial E}{\partial \alpha}$, $E_{w_k} = \frac{\partial E}{\partial w_k}$, the so-called thermodynamic forces.

2.2. First law of thermodynamics

Thermodynamic consistency of the SHTC equations means that the first and second laws of thermodynamics are satisfied by constructions. Indeed, it can be shown that on the solution to (1) an additional conservation law

$$\frac{\partial \rho E}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} (\rho v_k E + v_i (\rho^2 E_\rho \delta_{ki} + \rho w_i E_{w_k}) + \rho E_c E_{w_k}) = 0, \quad (3)$$

is satisfied. It can be obtained by multiplying equations of (1) by corresponding multipliers and summing all them up, see [51, 52, 40]. Here, $\rho E = \rho E(\rho, S, \alpha, c, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w})$ is the total energy density of the mixture which, due to the energy conservation principle, is nothing else but the sum $\rho E = \varrho_1 E_1 + \varrho_2 E_2$ of the total energies $E_a = e_a(\rho_a, S) + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{v}_a^2$, $a = 1, 2$ of the constituents. After a certain term rearrangements, the specific mixture energy $E = c_1 E_1 + c_2 E_2$ can be written in terms of the SHTC state variables

$$E = c_1 e_1(\rho_1, S) + c_2 e_2(\rho_2, S) + c_1 c_2 \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{w}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{v}^2. \quad (4)$$

The presence of an additional conservation law like (3) makes it possible to reformulate (1) in terms of the so-called generating thermodynamic potential and new variables (thermodynamically dual to the original ones) and to transform the equations to a symmetric form, e.g. see [40]. If the potential ρE is convex in terms of the state variables, then the system is symmetric hyperbolic and that is why the name (SHTC) of the equations.

To close system (1), one needs to provide the so-called closure, which for the SHTC equations is always the energy potential ρE . In the case of mixtures of ideal fluids, in (3), we need only to specify the internal energies $e_a(\rho_a, S)$ of the constituents. Note that the actual densities ρ_a do not belong to the set of SHTC state variables but

must be expressed as $\rho_a = \rho c_a / \alpha_a$. This can be used to compute all the partial derivatives E_ρ, E_α, E_c , etc. in (1)

$$\frac{\partial E}{\partial \rho} = \frac{\alpha_1 p_1 + \alpha_2 p_2}{\rho^2} = \frac{\alpha p_1 + (1 - \alpha) p_2}{\rho^2}, \quad (5a)$$

$$\frac{\partial E}{\partial c} = \mu_1 - \mu_2 + (1 - 2c) \frac{w^2}{2}, \quad (5b)$$

$$\frac{\partial E}{\partial \alpha} = -\frac{p_1 - p_2}{\rho}, \quad (5c)$$

$$\frac{\partial E}{\partial w_k} = c_1 c_2 w_k = c(1 - c) w_k, \quad (5d)$$

where $p_a = \rho_a^2 \frac{\partial e_a}{\partial \rho_a}$, $a = 1, 2$ are the phase pressures, and $\mu_a = e_a + \frac{p_a}{\rho_a} - s_a T_a = e_a - \alpha_a \frac{\partial e_a}{\partial \alpha_a} - s_a \frac{\partial e_a}{\partial s_a}$ is the chemical potential of the a -th constituent.

Finally note, that the mixture thermodynamic pressure is defined as

$$p = \rho^2 E_\rho = \alpha_1 p_1 + \alpha_2 p_2. \quad (6)$$

2.3. Second law of thermodynamics and irreversibility

For the sake of simplicity, we ignore the various dissipative processes such as heat conduction, viscous dissipation, phase transformation, etc., but we keep only two dissipative process in this consideration which are related to the main subject of the paper that is how to introduce surface tension in the SHTC two-phase flow model.

The first dissipative process is the relaxation of the phase velocities to a common value, which is described by a relaxation-type source term $\chi^{-1} E_{w_k} = \chi^{-1} c(1 - c) w_k$ in the relative velocity equation (1d) with χ being a relaxation parameter with the dimension of time. The second and the most important relaxation process in the context of surface tension is the pressure relaxation towards a common pressure which is modeled by the relaxation source term $\lambda^{-1} \rho E_\alpha = \lambda^{-1} (p_1 - p_2)$ with λ being usually a small parameter that controls the rate of relaxation.

As it is seen from these two examples of dissipative processes, the dissipative terms in the SHTC equations (including other SHTC models for heat conduction or viscous dissipation [41, 12, 13, 40]) are algebraic relaxation-type terms that have the form of the so-called gradient dynamics [40, 36], i.e. they are proportional to the anti gradients (in the space of state variables) of the total energy (thermodynamic forces) with positive factors that control the rate of dissipation. Thus, in the state space, the dissipation is directed towards diminishing the thermodynamic forces E_α, E_{w_k} , etc.

Modeling the dissipation via the gradient dynamics, we automatically guarantee the consistency with the first and second law of thermodynamics. Indeed, the presence of dissipative sources on the right-hand side does not violate the conservation of the total energy, i.e. the energy conservation law has a zero on the right hand-side. Of course this is achieved by the proper choice of the entropy production term in the entropy equation (1f) which is canceled out with the rest of the dissipative source terms and simultaneously is staying always non-zero by construction, see more details in [46, 45, 40].

3. Nonequilibrium SHTC formulation of surface tension

System (1) allows for resolution of macroscopic interfaces between the phases in a diffuse interface manner [1, 55] using the volume fraction α as the so-called color function. Yet, such interfaces are only passively advected by the flow and do not carry any energy content (zero surface energy). In other words, the surface tension effects can not be modeled with the two-phase flow model (1).

In the diffuse interface setting, there several approaches exist that allow inclusion of the surface tension. All of them require computation of the gradient $\nabla\alpha = \left\{ \frac{\partial\alpha}{\partial x_k} \right\}$ of the volume fraction or another smooth scalar field ϕ generally called a *color function*. Roughly speaking, we can divide these diffuse interface approaches to surface tension into two categories: equilibrium models and nonequilibrium ones. In an equilibrium model, the continuous equivalent of the Young-Laplace law

$$[p] = \sigma\kappa, \quad \kappa := \nabla \cdot \left(\frac{\nabla\phi}{\|\nabla\phi\|} \right) \quad (7)$$

is directly used as the constitutive relation for the stress tensor. In (7), σ is the surface tension coefficient, and square brackets $[\bullet]$ denote the jump of a quantity across the interface, in particular the jump of the pressure p in (7). This law is known to be a good approximation for interfaces not far from mechanical and/or thermodynamic equilibrium. Representatives of the equilibrium approach are the models that for example can be found in [4, 38, 56, 9].

On the other hand, in a non-equilibrium surface tension model, the Young-Laplace law is not directly prescribed as a constitutive function but is recovered if the flow is not far from the mechanical and thermodynamic equilibrium (typically, in the limit when a small parameter (capillarity coefficient) goes to 0). Representatives of the nonequilibrium approach are the phase field models, for example, the *Korteweg-type*¹ models [8, 11, 27], to which *Cahn-Hilliard-type* models are closely related [7, 28, 17]. However, as was mentioned in the introduction, such models belong to the so-called single-fluid-type models and thus has intrinsic limitations for modeling mixtures far from thermodynamic equilibrium when the mixture constituents are having different state parameters, e.g. pressures, temperatures, velocities, etc.

The SHTC formulation of the surface tension we shall discuss in what follows belongs to the non-equilibrium type models, yet it of course has some conceptual differences from the Korteweg-type formulations as being a multi-fluid-type formulation. We also remark, that the presence of gradients of the state variables in the constitutive relations, like in (7), is not allowed in the SHTC theory which includes only first-order hyperbolic equations. Therefore, any space or time gradients of the fields must be lifted to the role of new independent state variables with their own time evolution equations.

The key state variable in representing the interfaces between the phases is the volume fraction α . In a mixture element, the volume fraction can change both due to changes in the thermodynamic state of the constituents (e.g. thermal expansion) and when a phase flows in and out of the mixture element. The later is taken into account in (1a) via simply the advection terms on the left-hand side, while the former is taken into account via the dissipative pressures relaxation source term. For the further discussion it is convenient to rewrite the balance law (1a) in the following equivalent form

$$\frac{\partial\alpha}{\partial t} + v_j \frac{\partial\alpha}{\partial x_j} = -\frac{1}{\lambda} E_\alpha. \quad (8)$$

Obviously, at the mechanical equilibrium ($\partial/\partial t = 0$ and $\mathbf{v} = 0$), or sufficiently close to the thermodynamic equilibrium, i.e. if the time scale t_λ associated with the relaxation parameter λ is significantly smaller $t_\lambda/t_0 \ll 1$ than the flow time scale t_0 , the pressure relaxation term $\lambda^{-1} E_\alpha = (p_2 - p_1)/(\rho\lambda)$ drives the mixture element to a state with the vanishingly small pressure difference $[p] = p_1 - p_2 \approx 0$. This fact is, of course, not compatible with the Young-Laplace law (7). Therefore, the volume fraction evolution equation must be subjected to some modifications.

Let us consider the balance equation for the volume fraction in a more general than (8) form

$$\frac{\partial\alpha}{\partial t} + v_j \frac{\partial\alpha}{\partial x_j} = -\mathcal{F}, \quad (9)$$

¹First idea was proposed by van der Waals in [58].

where the algebraic source term \mathcal{F} has to be defined. From (9) one immediately can obtain an equation for the new vector field $\mathbf{b} := \nabla\alpha$ by differentiating (9) with respect to x_k :

$$\frac{\partial b_k}{\partial t} + v_j \frac{\partial b_k}{\partial x_j} + b_j \frac{\partial v_j}{\partial x_k} + \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial x_k} = 0, \quad (10)$$

or in an equivalent form

$$\frac{\partial b_k}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial (b_j v_j + \mathcal{F})}{\partial x_k} + v_j \left(\frac{\partial b_k}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial b_j}{\partial x_k} \right) = 0, \quad (11)$$

where the source term \mathcal{F} from (9) has become the constitutive flux in (11).

Note that, due to its definition, \mathbf{b} must satisfy the stationary differential curl-constraint

$$\frac{\partial b_k}{\partial x_i} - \frac{\partial b_i}{\partial x_k} = 0, \quad (12)$$

that if holds for the initial data must remain so for all later times. This also should hold at the discrete level when solving (11) numerically. One may expect, however, that condition (12) could be dropped in the supercritical case, when the difference between liquid and gas phases disappears.

Let us remark that in the traditional approach to continuous surface tension modeling [4], see also [38, 56, 9], the hypothesis of equal phase pressures $p_1 = p_2$, or $E_\alpha = 0$, (single pressure approximation) is employed from the very beginning. In other words, the curvature $\kappa = \nabla \cdot \left(\frac{\nabla \phi}{\|\nabla \phi\|} \right)$ of the interface is computed from the color function ϕ governed by the pure transport equation

$$\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} + v_j \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_k} = 0 \quad (13)$$

which is equivalent to the homogeneous equation (9) with $\mathcal{F} = 0$. However, far from thermodynamic equilibrium, the phase pressures are different $p_1 \neq p_2$, and so are the gradients of the color function $\nabla \phi$ and of the volume fraction $\nabla \alpha$ computed from (13) and (9), accordingly.

Thus, equation (11) is the starting point for formulating the SHTC governing equations for surface tension. In accordance with the SHTC formalism, the governing equations have a pair structure, or a *Hamiltonian structure* [20, 40, 37], that is the governing equations are split into pairs and in each pair, one equation is an Euler-Lagrange equation and the second equation is a differential identity (differential constraint), see Section A. Equation (11) is apparently a differential identity for $\nabla \alpha$, and thus it must have a complementary Euler-Lagrange equation for a new scalar field, say d . This can be demonstrated more rigorously by the variational scheme employed in the SHTC formalism given in Appendix A, see also details in [40, 37].

Thus, rewriting equations (74) from Appendix A in the Eulerian frame of reference, we obtain the following system of governing equations on the unknowns $\{\alpha, d, b_k\}$

$$\frac{\partial \rho \alpha}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \rho \alpha v_k}{\partial x_k} = -\rho E_d, \quad (14a)$$

$$\frac{\partial \rho d}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial (\rho d v_k + \rho E_{b_k})}{\partial x_k} = \rho E_\alpha - \lambda \rho E_d, \quad (14b)$$

$$\frac{\partial b_k}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial (b_j v_j + E_d)}{\partial x_k} + v_j \left(\frac{\partial b_k}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial b_j}{\partial x_k} \right) = 0, \quad (14c)$$

where the relaxation parameter λ is exactly the same as in (8). Moreover, the source term $\lambda \rho E_d$ is of dissipative nature [37], and is thus missing in the variational formulation in (74a) but it is added afterwards in full consistency with the second law of thermodynamics (it contributes to the entropy production) [40]. We shall comment further on this after the full SHTC equations will be presented, see (17).

In particular, by comparing (11) and (14c), or (9) and (14a), we identify $\mathcal{F} = E_d = \partial E / \partial d$ as the thermodynamic force associated with the new scalar field d . As it is clear from its definition, see (68) and (73), the field d is closely associated with the time derivative $\frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial t} + v_k \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial x_k}$ of the volume fraction α , and hence it carries information about the microinertia of the interface field α .

For practical use of equations (14), it is convenient to use the following re-scaled state variables

$$B_k := \delta b_k, \quad D := \delta^{-1} d, \quad (15a)$$

$$E_{B_k} = \delta^{-1} E_{b_k}, \quad E_D = \delta E_d, \quad (15b)$$

with δ being a scaling parameter with the units of length

$$\delta \sim \text{Length}, \quad (16)$$

which, for example, can be associated with the width of the diffuse interface.

The resulting SHTC system for two-phase compressible flows with surface tension combines (1) and (14) and reads

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \rho v_k}{\partial x_k} = 0, \quad (17a)$$

$$\frac{\partial \rho v_i}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial (\rho v_i v_k + \rho^2 E_\rho \delta_{ki} + \rho w_i E_{w_k} + \rho B_i E_{B_k})}{\partial x_k} = 0, \quad (17b)$$

$$\frac{\partial \rho c}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial (\rho c v_k + \rho E_{w_k})}{\partial x_k} = 0, \quad (17c)$$

$$\frac{\partial w_k}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial (v_l w_l + E_c)}{\partial x_k} + v_l \left(\frac{\partial w_k}{\partial x_l} - \frac{\partial w_l}{\partial x_k} \right) = -\frac{1}{\chi} E_{w_k}, \quad (17d)$$

$$\frac{\partial \rho \alpha}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \rho \alpha v_k}{\partial x_k} = -\frac{1}{\delta} \rho E_D, \quad (17e)$$

$$\frac{\partial \rho D}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial (\rho D v_k + \rho E_{B_k})}{\partial x_k} = \frac{1}{\delta} \rho E_\alpha - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \rho E_D, \quad (17f)$$

$$\frac{\partial B_k}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial (B_l v_l + E_D)}{\partial x_k} + v_l \left(\frac{\partial B_k}{\partial x_l} - \frac{\partial B_l}{\partial x_k} \right) = 0, \quad (17g)$$

$$\frac{\partial \rho S}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \rho S v_k}{\partial x_k} = \frac{\rho}{E_S} \left(\frac{1}{\chi} E_{w_k} E_{w_k} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} E_D E_D \right) \geq 0, \quad (17h)$$

where, for convenience, we introduced a new relaxation parameter

$$\varepsilon := \lambda^{-1} \delta^2 \sim \text{Time}. \quad (18)$$

Also, one can see that the interface vector field B_k contributes to the stress tensor via the term $\rho B_i E_{B_k}$ which, however, was not added by hands, but it emerges automatically in the variational and Hamiltonian formulations as shown in [40].

We note that the solutions to (17) also satisfy an extra conservation law

$$\frac{\partial \rho E}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \left(\rho E v_k + v_i (\rho^2 E_\rho \delta_{ki} + \rho w_i E_{w_k} + \rho B_i E_{B_k}) + \rho E_c E_{w_k} + \rho E_D E_{B_k} \right) = 0, \quad (19)$$

that is the energy conservation law. It can be shown, e.g. see [19, 51, 52, 40], that (19) can be obtained by summing up all the equations with the corresponding coefficients:

$$(19) = \mathcal{E}_\rho \cdot (17a) + \mathcal{E}_{\rho v_i} \cdot (17b) + \mathcal{E}_{\rho c} \cdot (17c) + \mathcal{E}_{w_k} \cdot (17d) + \mathcal{E}_{\rho \alpha} \cdot (17e) + \mathcal{E}_{\rho D} \cdot (17f) + \mathcal{E}_{B_k} \cdot (17g) + \mathcal{E}_{\rho S} \cdot (17h), \quad (20)$$

where $\mathcal{E} = \rho E$.

System (17) has two types of algebraic source terms. The relaxation source terms $\varepsilon^{-1} \rho E_D$ and $\chi^{-1} E_{w_k}$ are of dissipative nature because they rise the entropy, which is reflected in the entropy production term. On the other hand, the source terms $\delta^{-1} \rho E_D$ in (17e) and $\delta^{-1} \rho E_\alpha$ in (17f) do not contribute to the entropy production and thus, are of non-dissipative (or reversible) nature. They have the opposite signs in front of them and simply cancel each other out in the summation (20). A similar ‘‘antisymmetric’’ structure of the reversible source terms can be observed in other SHTC models [48, 42]. We shall refer to this type of source terms as *dispersive* because they are responsible for non-trivial dispersive properties of the equations as discussed in Sec. 8, see also [48].

Note that in the compressible multi-phase flow systems, one of the important processes that results in the change of volume fraction is the phase pressure relaxation [55]. In the original two-phase SHTC model, it is encoded in (1) in the relaxation source term $-\lambda^{-1} \rho E_\alpha = -\lambda^{-1} (p_2 - p_1)$. However, it may look like we lost this important feature in the modified volume fraction equation (17e). In fact, under a proper choice of relaxation parameters, the pressure relaxation process still drives the evolution of volume fraction implicitly. Indeed, using definition (18), the evolution equation for the new field ρD can be rewritten as

$$\frac{\partial \rho D}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial (\rho D v_k + \rho E_{B_k})}{\partial x_k} = \frac{\lambda}{\delta^2} \left(\frac{\delta}{\lambda} \rho E_\alpha - \rho E_D \right). \quad (21)$$

From this form of the source term, it is clear that if the relaxation parameters λ and δ are chosen consistently such that $\varepsilon = \lambda^{-1} \delta^2$ is a small parameter, then during the time evolution

$$\frac{1}{\delta} \rho E_D \approx \frac{1}{\lambda} \rho E_\alpha \quad (22)$$

and (17e) tends to (1a). Also, see a more detailed asymptotic analysis in Sec. 6.

4. Closure: equation of state

As it is clear from system (17), the fluxes and sources are defined in terms of the thermodynamic forces E_α , E_D , E_c , etc., therefore, in order to close the system of equations, it is necessary to define the dependence of the total energy E on the state variables $\{\alpha, \rho, c, w_k, D, B_k, S\}$.

Below, we discuss a simple option for E that reads

$$E = c_1 e_1(\rho_1, S) + c_2 e_2(\rho_2, S) + c_1 c_2 \frac{1}{2} w_k w_k + \frac{\beta^2}{2} D^2 + \frac{\Sigma^2}{2\rho^2} B_k B_k \quad (23)$$

where two additional terms, in comparison with (4), are added. The quadratic term $\frac{\Sigma^2}{2\rho^2} B_k B_k$ represents the surface energy with Σ being the so-called *capillarity modulus*, and β being a modulus characterizing the microinertial effects. In general, Σ could be a second-order tensor, but here we stay constrained to the isotropic case.

The explicit expression of the stress tensor in (17)

$$T_{ik} = \rho^2 E_\rho \delta_{ki} + \rho w_i E_{w_k} + \rho B_i E_{B_k} \quad (24)$$

becomes

$$T_{ik} = (\alpha_1 p_1 + \alpha_2 p_2) \delta_{ik} - \frac{\Sigma^2}{\rho} (B_j B_j \delta_{ik} - B_i B_k) + \rho c_1 c_2 w_i w_k. \quad (25)$$

After comparing its surface tension part with the conventional capillary stress tensor [4, 38, 56, 9]

$$\mathbf{T} = p\mathbf{I} - \sigma \left(\|\nabla\alpha\|\mathbf{I} - \frac{\nabla\alpha \otimes \nabla\alpha}{\|\nabla\alpha\|} \right), \quad (26)$$

and recalling definition (15), one may conclude that to recover (26) from (25), one needs to define Σ from

$$\sigma = \frac{1}{\rho} \Sigma^2 \delta, \quad \delta = \|\nabla\alpha\|^{-1}. \quad (27)$$

Here, σ is the surface tension coefficient from (7).

The thermodynamic forces E_α , E_c , E_{w_k} , E_D , E_ρ and E_{B_k} corresponding to the energy (23) can be explicitly expressed as

$$\frac{\partial E}{\partial \rho} = \frac{\alpha_1 p_1 + \alpha_2 p_2}{\rho^2} - \frac{\Sigma^2}{\rho^3} B_k B_k, \quad (28a)$$

$$\frac{\partial E}{\partial \alpha} = \frac{p_2 - p_1}{\rho}, \quad (28b)$$

$$\frac{\partial E}{\partial c} = \mu_1 - \mu_2 + (1 - 2c) \frac{w_k w_k}{2}, \quad (28c)$$

$$\frac{\partial E}{\partial w_k} = c(1 - c) w_k, \quad (28d)$$

$$\frac{\partial E}{\partial D} = \beta^2 D, \quad (28e)$$

$$\frac{\partial E}{\partial B_k} = \frac{\Sigma^2}{\rho^2} B_k, \quad (28f)$$

where the phase pressures p_a and chemical potentials μ_a are defined in the same way as in (5).

We note that the specification of the energy potential in the form (23) together with the scaling (15) fixes the physical units of the new quantities as

$$[D] \sim \frac{\text{m}}{\text{s}}, \quad [\beta] \sim [-], \quad [B_k] \sim [-], \quad [\Sigma] \sim \frac{\text{kg}}{\text{m}^2 \text{s}}, \quad [\delta] \sim \text{m}, \quad [\varepsilon] \sim \text{s}. \quad (29)$$

We also note that in the SHTC class of equations [19, 51, 52, 40], the total energy can be arbitrary physically motivated potential that however should additionally provide hyperbolicity or symmetric hyperbolicity (convex potential) of the governing equations to have a well-posed initial value problem for the model.

For example, alternatively to the quadratic surface energy (23), one could consider a different surface energy in the form

$$\frac{\Sigma^2}{\rho} \sqrt{B_k B_k} \quad (30)$$

as in the single-pressure surface tension models [38, 56, 9]. However, in the presented non-equilibrium framework, this form of surface energy cannot be used because, from the non-equilibrium thermodynamic standpoint, the thermodynamic forces, e.g. E_{B_k} , must be non-constant that can be guaranteed by energy potential at least quadratic in the corresponding state variable B_k . In particular, our consideration of the surface energy in the form (30) showed that the corresponding thermodynamic force $\rho E_{B_k} = \Sigma^2 B_k / \sqrt{B_l B_l}$ is constant for spherically symmetric interfaces. Hence, the use of (30) would result in the vanishing space gradient in the radial direction and subsequently in $E_\alpha = 0$, see (56b). The latter means that the phase pressures are equal, $p_1 = p_2$ that contradicts the intentions of our paper.

5. Hyperbolicity and Eigenstructure

The hyperbolicity analysis of the three-dimensional equations (17) is a non-trivial task. Unfortunately, the analytical expressions of the eigenvalues and eigenvectors are not available in the general case. Note that because of the rotational invariance of the SHTC equations [19], the eigenstructure analysis can be done in the direction $x = x_1$.

Another unfortunate finding of our research is that the energy potential (4) for two-phase mixture is not convex in the SHTC state variables (the conserved variables in (1)), at least for a two-phase mixture with ideal gas and stiffened-gas equations of state, e.g. see (61). The energy potential (23) for the two-phase mixture with surface tension inherits the lack of convexity from potential (4). Therefore, despite being symmetrizable, system (17) can not benefit from the full structure of SHTC class of equations, i.e. it is not symmetric hyperbolic. In particular, the root of the problem of non-convexity is in the internal energy part $\varrho_1 e_1(\varrho_1, \phi_1) + \varrho_2 e_2(\varrho_2, \phi_2)$ of the total energy potential (4), where $\varrho_a = \rho c_a$ and $\phi_a = \rho \alpha_a$, $a = 1, 2$. Thus, it can be shown that for a mixture of two ideal gas, or two stiffened-gas (or their combinations) equations of state, the determinant of the Hessian of the internal energy is proportional to the phase pressure difference $p_1 - p_2$, and therefore, it is singular in the pressure equilibrium and may have negative eigenvalues which indicates that the internal energy is not convex. It is likely that this is also true for other equations of state. Despite the loss of symmetric hyperbolicity (at least in the standard SHTC scheme [40]), one could still investigate whether system (17) is just hyperbolic, which is a weaker condition.

Not to replace a rigorous proof of hyperbolicity but only to give some preliminary evidences in favor of that system (17) is likely hyperbolic, at least in some intervals of state variables and material parameters, we report here about a numerical study of hyperbolicity of (17).

This analysis suggests that, similar to the two-phase SHTC system (1), whose eigenstructure was studied in particular in [44], equations (17) are only weakly hyperbolic (two eigenvectors are missing) in the form as they are presented in (17). However, for smooth solutions, system (17) is equivalent to its symmetrizable form, i.e. when the curls

$$\rho E_{w_j} \left(\frac{\partial w_j}{\partial x_i} - \frac{\partial w_i}{\partial x_j} \right) = 0, \quad \rho E_{B_j} \left(\frac{\partial B_j}{\partial x_i} - \frac{\partial B_i}{\partial x_j} \right) = 0, \quad (31)$$

of the relative velocity \mathbf{w} and the vector field \mathbf{B} are added to the mixture momentum equation, e.g. see [51, 40], and this later form usually possesses a full basis of eigenvectors. This operation does not alter the eigenvalues but only allow to recover the missing eigenvectors.

Note that for $\chi = c(1 - c)\chi_0$, $\chi_0 = \text{const} > 0$, $\nabla \times \mathbf{w} = 0$ for all positive times $t > 0$ if it was so at $t = 0$, see [19, 51, 40], while $\nabla \times \mathbf{B} = 0$ for $\delta = \text{const}$ by its definition. Despite δ is defined not as a constant in (27), we shall show that in practical computations δ can be chosen *a priori* as a constant. Therefore, we are interested in that case of $\delta = \text{const}$, and hence we assume that $\nabla \mathbf{B} = 0$. Note that adding (31) to the momentum equation, does not change the eigenvalues but only allows to recover the missing eigenvectors.

We rewrite the homogeneous system (17) in an equivalent (on smooth solutions) form by adding (31) to the mixture momentum equation, and then rewriting the resulting system in a quasilinear form in the $x = x_1$ -direction

$$\mathbf{P}_t + \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{P})\mathbf{P}_x = 0, \quad (32)$$

where \mathbf{P} is the vector of primitive variables with the components

$$\mathbf{P} = \{v_{1,1}, v_{1,2}, v_{1,3}, v_{2,1}, v_{2,2}, v_{2,3}, B_1, B_2, B_3, D, \alpha, \rho_1, \rho_2\}, \quad (33)$$

while the matrix $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{P})$ reads

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} v_{1,1} & c_2 w_2 & c_2 w_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{2B_2 \Sigma^2}{\rho^2} & -\frac{2B_3 \Sigma^2}{\rho^2} & 0 & \frac{(B_2^2 + B_3^2) \rho_{1,2} \Sigma^2}{\rho^3} + \frac{p_{1,2}}{\rho} & \frac{(B_2^2 + B_3^2) c_1 \Sigma^2}{\rho^2 \rho_1} + \frac{C_1^2}{\rho_1} & \frac{(B_2^2 + B_3^2) c_2 \Sigma^2}{\rho^2 \rho_2} \\ 0 & v_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{B_2 \Sigma^2}{\rho^2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{B_1 B_2 \rho_{1,2} \Sigma^2}{\rho^3} & -\frac{B_1 B_2 c_1 \Sigma^2}{\rho^2 \rho_1} & -\frac{B_1 B_2 c_2 \Sigma^2}{\rho^2 \rho_2} \\ 0 & 0 & v_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{B_3 \Sigma^2}{\rho^2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{B_1 B_3 \rho_{1,2} \Sigma^2}{\rho^3} & -\frac{B_1 B_3 c_1 \Sigma^2}{\rho^2 \rho_1} & -\frac{B_1 B_3 c_2 \Sigma^2}{\rho^2 \rho_2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & v_{2,1} & -c_1 w_2 & -c_1 w_3 & 0 & -\frac{2B_2 \Sigma^2}{\rho^2} & -\frac{2B_3 \Sigma^2}{\rho^2} & 0 & \frac{(B_2^2 + B_3^2) \rho_{1,2} \Sigma^2}{\rho^3} + \frac{p_{1,2}}{\rho} & \frac{(B_2^2 + B_3^2) c_1 \Sigma^2}{\rho^2 \rho_1} & \frac{(B_2^2 + B_3^2) c_2 \Sigma^2}{\rho^2 \rho_2} + \frac{C_2^2}{\rho_2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & v_1 & 0 & \frac{B_2 \Sigma^2}{\rho^2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{B_1 B_2 (\rho_2 - \rho_1) \Sigma^2}{\rho^3} & -\frac{B_1 B_2 c_1 \Sigma^2}{\rho^2 \rho_1} & -\frac{B_1 B_2 c_2 \Sigma^2}{\rho^2 \rho_2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & v_1 & \frac{B_3 \Sigma^2}{\rho^2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{B_1 B_3 \rho_{1,2} \Sigma^2}{\rho^3} & -\frac{B_1 B_3 c_1 \Sigma^2}{\rho^2 \rho_1} & -\frac{B_1 B_3 c_2 \Sigma^2}{\rho^2 \rho_2} \\ B_1 c_1 & B_2 c_1 & B_3 c_1 & B_1 c_2 & B_2 c_2 & B_3 c_2 & v_1 & 0 & 0 & \beta^2 & \frac{\rho_1 \rho_2 \mathbf{B} \cdot \mathbf{w}}{\rho^2} & \frac{c_1 c_2 \mathbf{B} \cdot \mathbf{w}}{\rho_1} & -\frac{c_1 c_2 \mathbf{B} \cdot \mathbf{w}}{\rho_2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & v_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & v_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\Sigma^2}{\rho^2} & 0 & 0 & v_1 & -\frac{B_1 \rho_{1,2} \Sigma^2}{\rho^3} & -\frac{B_1 c_1 \Sigma^2}{\rho^2 \rho_1} & -\frac{B_1 c_2 \Sigma^2}{\rho^2 \rho_2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & v_1 & 0 & 0 \\ \rho_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{c_2 \rho_1^2 w_1}{c_1 \rho} & v_{1,1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{c_1 \rho_2^2 w_1}{c_2 \rho} & 0 & v_{2,1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Here, $\rho_{1,2} = \rho_1 - \rho_2$, $p_{1,2} = p_1 - p_2$, $C_a^2 = \frac{\partial p_a}{\partial \rho_a}$, $a = 1, 2$.

To prove that system (32) is hyperbolic, one needs to demonstrate that all eigenvalues of matrix $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{P})$ are real and right eigenvectors form a basis. Because an analytical expression of eigenvectors and eigenvalues are not available for general state vector \mathbf{P} , to get at least some evidences in favor of hyperbolicity of (32), we performed a numerical study of the eigenvalue decomposition of $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{P})$ in a domain of the state space near the mechanical and thermodynamical equilibrium. Thus, we generated sample vectors \mathbf{P} with randomly distributed components in the following intervals: $\alpha \in [0.001, 0.999]$, $\rho_a \in [0.9 \cdot \rho_{a0}, 1.1 \cdot \rho_{a0}]$, $v_{a,k} \in [-10, 10]$, $B_k \in [-1, 1]$. Other material parameters such as the reference mass densities ρ_{a0} , the reference sound speeds c_{a0} , the capillarity modulus $\Sigma = 100$, the microinertia modulus $\beta = 1$, and the equations of state were taken as in Section 7. We then computed the eigenvalues and the matrix of right eigenvectors $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{P})$ of $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{P})$ numerically using the Matlab software [25] and the `eig` function with the options `eig(A, I, 'qz')`, where \mathbf{I} is the identity matrix of the same size as \mathbf{A} . We then checked if the matrix $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{P})$ is singular by computing its singular value decomposition. Fig. 1 shows the smallest singular value $\sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{R})$ (red dots) for 10^6 sample state vectors \mathbf{P} . As it can be seen the smallest singular value is well separated (blue area) from 0 indicating that the matrix \mathbf{R} is non-singular for the tested sample vectors \mathbf{P} . During this and other checks the numerically computed eigenvalues were always real.

Finally, remark that the analytical expressions of the eigenvalues and vectors are available for the case of stationary medium $\mathbf{v}_1 = \mathbf{v}_2 = 0$. The eigenvalues are completely decoupled and read

$$\lambda_{1,2} = \pm C_1^2, \quad \lambda_{3,4} = \pm C_2^2, \quad \lambda_{5,6} = \pm \frac{\Sigma}{\rho} \sqrt{\|\mathbf{B}\|^2 - B_1^2 + \beta^2}, \quad \lambda_{7,\dots,13} = 0, \quad (34)$$

while the eigenvectors are linearly independent in this case.

6. Relaxation limit system via formal asymptotic analysis

System (17) contains a set of dissipative relaxation source terms with corresponding relaxation parameters. For some types of two-phase flows, such as dispersed flows (bubbly fluids, two-phase flows in porous media), a simplified model can be considered when assuming very fast (instantaneous) relaxation of the thermodynamic forces to the equilibrium. For example, the assumption of instantaneous pressure relaxation seems reasonable from a




Figure 1: The smallest singular value (red dots) of the matrix $R(\mathbf{P})$ of right eigenvectors of $A(\mathbf{P})$.

physical point of view, since the transition of the medium to an equilibrium state is determined by a few passages of fast pressure waves at the scale of dispersed inclusions. In many ways, the narrow mixing zone of a diffuse interface separating two fluids can be also considered as a dispersed zone, and therefore the above argument also applies.

In this section, we present a derivation of the so-called relaxation limit of equations (17) assuming instantaneous relaxation of all dissipative processes, namely relaxation of the microinertia thermodynamic force E_D , pressure E_α , and relative velocity E_{w_k} .

First, considering $\varepsilon = \delta^2/\lambda \ll 1$ as a small parameter, we derive a relaxation limit for (17) assuming instantaneous relaxation of the thermodynamic force E_D in Sec. 6.1. By these means, it will be demonstrated that in leading-orders in ε , the Young-Laplace law is fulfilled locally, in the mixture elements. Then, in Sec. 6.2, we consider relaxation of the remaining thermodynamic forces E_α and E_{w_k} , and derive the final isentropic single-velocity approximation of (17).

6.1. Relaxation limit of (17)

For our purposes, it is enough to consider only two equations for α and D :

$$\rho \frac{d\alpha}{dt} = -\frac{1}{\delta} \rho E_D, \quad (35a)$$

$$\rho \frac{dD}{dt} + \frac{\partial(\rho E_{B_k})}{\partial x_k} = \frac{1}{\delta} \rho E_\alpha - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \rho E_D, \quad (35b)$$

where we have used the material time derivative $d/dt = \partial/\partial t + v_k \partial/\partial x_k$ to rewrite the equations in a more compact form.

We then expand D and the thermodynamic force E_D

$$D = D_0 + \varepsilon D_1 + \varepsilon^2 D_2 + \dots, \quad (36a)$$

$$E_D = E_{D,0} + \varepsilon E_{D,1} + \varepsilon^2 E_{D,2} + \dots, \quad (36b)$$

in powers of the small non-dimensional parameter $\epsilon = \varepsilon/\varepsilon_0$, where ε_0 is a time scale. Then, plugging this into (35b)

$$\rho \frac{d}{dt} (D_0 + \epsilon D_1 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)) + \frac{\partial(\rho E_{B_k})}{\partial x_k} = \frac{1}{\delta} \rho E_\alpha - \frac{1}{\varepsilon_0 \epsilon} \rho (E_{D,0} + \epsilon E_{D,1} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)), \quad (37)$$

we obtain that

$$E_{D,0} = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon). \quad (38)$$

Hence, assuming $E_{D,0} = 0$ and $D_0 = E_{D,0}/\beta^2 = 0$, we obtain the following approximate equation on $E_{D,1}$

$$\rho \frac{d}{dt} (\epsilon D_1 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)) + \frac{\partial(\rho E_{B_k})}{\partial x_k} = \frac{1}{\delta} \rho E_\alpha - \frac{1}{\varepsilon_0 \epsilon} \rho (\epsilon E_{D,1} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)), \quad (39)$$

from which, we deduce that

$$E_{D,1} = \varepsilon_0 \frac{1}{\delta} E_\alpha - \varepsilon_0 \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} (\rho E_{B_k}) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon). \quad (40)$$

On the other hand, the equation for α can be approximated as

$$\delta \rho \frac{d\alpha}{dt} = -\rho \epsilon E_{D,1} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2), \quad (41)$$

and then, using the expression of $E_{D,1}$, the relaxation limit equation for volume fraction reads

$$\rho \frac{d\alpha}{dt} = -\frac{1}{\lambda} \rho E_\alpha + \frac{1}{\lambda} \delta \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} (\rho E_{B_k}) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2). \quad (42)$$

From this equation, we can conclude that, in contrast to the master system (1), the time evolution of the volume fraction is governed not only by the pressure relaxation $\lambda^{-1} \rho E_\alpha = \lambda^{-1} (p_2 - p_1)$, but also by the curvature of the diffuse interface. To see the latter, one needs to use the explicit expression of $E_{B_k} = \Sigma^2 B_k / \rho^2$, the definition $B_k = \delta \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial x_k}$, and the assumption that the surface tension coefficient $\sigma = \delta \Sigma^2 / \rho$ is constant, $\sigma = \text{const}$. After this, equation (42) becomes (we omit the terms $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$)

$$\rho \frac{d\alpha}{dt} = -\frac{1}{\lambda} \rho E_\alpha + \frac{1}{\lambda} \delta \sigma \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \left(\frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial x_k} \right), \quad (43)$$

where we used definition (27) of the surface tension coefficient σ .

In particular, for stationary flows ($\frac{d\alpha}{dt} = 0$), the later equation reduces to

$$\delta \sigma \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \left(\frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial x_k} \right) = p_2 - p_1. \quad (44)$$

To obtain the Young-Laplace law

$$\sigma \nabla \cdot \left(\frac{\nabla \alpha}{\|\nabla \alpha\|} \right) = p_2 - p_1, \quad (45)$$

from (44), the parameter $\delta = \|\nabla \alpha\|^{-1}$ must appear under the outer derivative $\partial/\partial x_k$, but δ is not constant and this cannot be done without altering (44). However, we shall show in Sec. 7, that in practical computations, δ can be replaced by an a priori computed constant (see (60)), so that in fact (44) approximates the Young-Laplace law (45).

Finally, we note that the relaxation limit of (17) for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ is system (17) without equation for D and in which the equations for α and B_k are replaced by the following:

$$\rho \frac{d\alpha}{dt} - \frac{\delta}{\lambda} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} (\rho E_{B_k}) = -\frac{1}{\lambda} \rho E_\alpha, \quad (46a)$$

$$\frac{dB_k}{dt} + B_j \frac{\partial v_j}{\partial x_k} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \left(\frac{\delta}{\lambda} E_\alpha \right) - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \left(\frac{\delta^2}{\lambda \rho} \frac{\partial \rho E_{B_j}}{\partial x_j} \right) = 0, \quad (46b)$$

where the equation for B_k is a second order parabolic equation, that can be obtained by the same means as (42).

One could note the antisymmetric structure (opposite signs) of the constitutive fluxes in (46) involving the thermodynamic forces E_α and E_{B_k} . This usually results in complex eigenvalues, and subsequently in the loss of hyperbolicity of the first-order differential operator (without dissipative parabolic term in the second equation of (46)). Therefore, in the next section we consider another relaxation limit of (17), in which we couple the result of this section with the single velocity approximation ($\mathbf{v}_1 = \mathbf{v}_2$).

6.2. Relaxation limit of the single velocity isentropic model

In this section, on top of the previous result, we derive reduced single-velocity isentropic equations obtained as a relaxation limit of (17) when E_α and E_{w_k} are instantaneously set to their equilibrium values. The latter can be obtained by simply assuming the relative velocity to be zero $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{v}_2 = 0$, since $E_w = c(1-c)\mathbf{w}$. Thus, the single-velocity approximation system is a consequence of (17) under the assumption $w_k = 0$, that can be written in the following form

$$\frac{\partial \rho_1 \alpha_1}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \rho_1 \alpha_1 v_k}{\partial x_k} = 0, \quad (47a)$$

$$\frac{\partial \rho_2 \alpha_2}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \rho_2 \alpha_2 v_k}{\partial x_k} = 0, \quad (47b)$$

$$\frac{\partial \rho v_i}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial (\rho v_i v_k + \rho^2 E_\rho \delta_{ki} + \rho B_i E_{B_k})}{\partial x_k} = 0, \quad (47c)$$

$$\frac{\partial \rho \alpha}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \rho \alpha v_k}{\partial x_k} = -\frac{1}{\delta} \rho E_D, \quad (47d)$$

$$\frac{\partial \rho D}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial (\rho D v_k + \rho E_{B_k})}{\partial x_k} = \frac{1}{\delta} \rho E_\alpha - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \rho E_D, \quad (47e)$$

$$\frac{\partial B_k}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial (B_l v_l + E_D)}{\partial x_k} + v_l \left(\frac{\partial B_k}{\partial x_l} - \frac{\partial B_l}{\partial x_k} \right) = 0. \quad (47f)$$

In the previous section, we derived the asymptotic equation (42) for the volume fraction assuming small relaxation time for the microinertia field D . In turn, further assuming that the relaxation parameter λ is sufficiently small so that the time variation of the volume fraction is small in comparison with the relaxation rate λ^{-1} , equation (42) can be approximated as

$$p_2(\rho_2) - p_1(\rho_1) = \delta \frac{\partial \rho E_{B_k}}{\partial x_k}. \quad (48)$$

From (48), we immediately obtain two relations for derivatives of phase mass densities

$$C_2^2 \frac{\partial \rho_2}{\partial t} - C_1^2 \frac{\partial \rho_1}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left(\delta \frac{\partial \rho E_{B_k}}{\partial x_k} \right), \quad C_2^2 \frac{\partial \rho_2}{\partial x_j} - C_1^2 \frac{\partial \rho_1}{\partial x_j} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \left(\delta \frac{\partial \rho E_{B_k}}{\partial x_k} \right), \quad (49)$$

where $C_a^2 = \partial p_a / \partial \rho_a$, $a = 1, 2$ are the phase adiabatic sound speeds.

Now, using relations (49) and phase mass conservation equations (47a), (47b), one can obtain the following equation for α_1 :

$$\frac{d\alpha_1}{dt} + \frac{\alpha_1 \alpha_2 (K_1 - K_2)}{\alpha_2 K_1 + \alpha_1 K_2} \frac{\partial v_k}{\partial x_k} - \frac{\alpha_1 \alpha_2}{\alpha_2 K_1 + \alpha_1 K_2} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\delta \frac{\partial \rho E_{B_k}}{\partial x_k} \right) = 0, \quad (50)$$

where $K_a = \rho_a C_a^2$ are the phase bulk moduli.

If we recall the definition $B_k = \delta \partial \alpha_1 / \partial x_k$, then it is clear that (50) is a third-order partial differential equation for $\alpha = \alpha_1$. Finally, we can also formulate a closed relaxation limit system of the single velocity isentropic approximation of (17) for the variables α_1 , ρ_1 , ρ_2 , and v_k :

$$\frac{\partial \alpha_1}{\partial t} + v_k \frac{\partial \alpha_1}{\partial x_k} + \frac{\alpha_1 \alpha_2 (K_1 - K_2)}{\alpha_2 K_1 + \alpha_1 K_2} \frac{\partial v_k}{\partial x_k} - \frac{\alpha_1 \alpha_2}{\alpha_2 K_1 + \alpha_1 K_2} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\delta \sigma \frac{\partial^2 \alpha_1}{\partial x_k \partial x_k} \right) = 0, \quad (51a)$$

$$\frac{\partial \rho_1 \alpha_1}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \rho_1 \alpha_1 v_k}{\partial x_k} = 0, \quad (51b)$$

$$\frac{\partial \rho_2 \alpha_2}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \rho_2 \alpha_2 v_k}{\partial x_k} = 0, \quad (51c)$$

$$\frac{\partial \rho v_i}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \left(\rho v_i v_k + \left(p_1 + \alpha_2 \left(\delta \sigma \frac{\partial^2 \alpha_1}{\partial x_j \partial x_j} \right) \right) \delta_{ki} + \hat{T}_{ki} \right) = 0, \quad (51d)$$

where $\hat{T}_{ki} = -\frac{\Sigma^2}{\rho} (B_j B_j \delta_{ki} - B_k B_i)$ is the surface tension stress tensor which should also be expressed in terms of the gradients $\partial \alpha_1 / \partial x_k$ using the definition of B_k .

Note that if surface tension is neglected, then terms with higher derivatives of α_1 and the tensor \hat{T}_{ki} should be excluded from (51). In this case, (51) transforms to the well-known five-equation two-phase model of Kapila [33].

The presence of third-order derivatives in (51) and the corresponding dispersion effects of the model can lead to non-standard behavior of waves and this will be the subject of further research.

7. Stationary solution of a spherical bubble

In the previous section, we demonstrated that in the limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$ and $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, in the leading-order terms, the pressure difference inside a mixture element fulfills the relation (44), that in turn resembles the Young-Laplace law (45). The formal obstacle to identify the two relations (44) and (45) is the parameter $\delta = \|\nabla \alpha\|^{-1}$ that appears outside of the divergence operator. In what follows, we shall demonstrate that, in fact, δ can be chosen as a constant so that the Young-Laplace law holds on macroscopic diffuse interfaces between two immiscible fluids in an approximation sense.

We shall search for a spherically symmetric stationary solution to system (17) representing a bubble or droplet of a radius R . Thus, we assume that $\mathbf{v} = 0$ and $\mathbf{w} = 0$. We also assume that the temperature variations are negligible, that means that we can exclude the entropy from consideration. All unknown scalar functions can be parameterized as

$$\alpha(t, \mathbf{x}) = \tilde{\alpha}(r), \quad \rho(t, \mathbf{x}) = \tilde{\rho}(r), \quad D(t, \mathbf{x}) = \tilde{D}(r), \quad r = \|\mathbf{x}\| \quad (52)$$

and vector fields as

$$B_k(t, \mathbf{x}) = \tilde{B}(r) \frac{x_k}{r}. \quad (53)$$

Moreover, we prescribe the distribution of $\tilde{\alpha}$ in the diffuse interface between the fluids in the form

$$\tilde{\alpha}(r) = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \tanh \left(\frac{\pi(r - R)}{h} \right) \right), \quad (54)$$

where h is the thickness of the diffuse interface, and we will look for a solution that satisfy (54). This also fixes $\tilde{B}(r)$ as

$$\tilde{B}(r) = \delta \tilde{\alpha}'(r) \quad (55)$$

due to the definition (15) of the vector field B_k . In the following, we shall omit the tilde sign “~” above the unknowns for simplicity of notations. The reader should keep in mind that all the state variables are functions of the single variable r .

It is sufficient to consider the momentum equations and equation on D that, for a steady state, reduce to

$$\frac{\partial(\rho^2 E_\rho \delta_{ki} + \rho B_i E_{B_k})}{\partial x_k} = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \quad (56a)$$

$$\frac{\partial(\rho E_{B_k})}{\partial x_k} = \frac{1}{\delta} \rho E_\alpha. \quad (56b)$$

After using the spherical symmetry assumptions (53), definition of $B(r)$ (55), and the relation $\sigma = \delta \Sigma^2 / \rho$ (27), these two equations reduce to an ordinary differential equation and an algebraic equation (because $\alpha(r)$ is given by (54))

$$p'(r) = -\frac{2\sigma\delta(r)\alpha'(r)^2}{r} \equiv F(r), \quad (57a)$$

$$p_2(r) - p_1(r) = \sigma\delta(r) \left(\frac{d-1}{r} \alpha'(r) + \alpha''(r) \right) \equiv G(r), \quad (57b)$$

where d is the space dimension ($d = 3$ in this example).

The first equation can be integrated to get the mixture pressure $p(r) = \alpha(r)p_1(r) + (1 - \alpha(r))p_2(r)$

$$p(r) = p_{\text{atm}} - \int_r^\infty F(\zeta) d\zeta, \quad p_{\text{atm}} = p(\infty), \quad (58)$$

after which, the phase pressures can be found as

$$p_1(r) = p(r) - (1 - \alpha(r))G(r), \quad p_2(r) = p(r) + \alpha(r)G(r). \quad (59)$$

In Section 4, we concluded that to recover the conventional capillary stress tensor (26), one should take $\delta(r) = \|\nabla\alpha\|^{-1}$. This, however, is not convenient from the computational view point, because $\nabla\alpha$ is not a state variable of the system (17) and cannot be easily evaluated. Therefore, a practical procedure has to be invented in order to provide a reasonable estimate of δ *a priori*. In this paper, we suggest replacing $\delta(r)$ by the following constant $\delta_0 = \text{const}$

$$\delta_0(h) = \int_{R-h}^{R+h} r^{-1} \alpha'(r) dr \cdot \left(\int_{R-h}^{R+h} r^{-1} \alpha'(r)^2 dr \right)^{-1}, \quad (60)$$

which is choosing in such a way to obtain the Young-Laplace formula $\Delta p = -2\sigma/R$ in (57a). Exactly this δ_0 is used instead of $\delta = \|\nabla\alpha\|^{-1}$ in the numerical results below.

Typical solutions to (58) for $R = 0.01$, $\sigma = 0.0728$, and various interface widths h are depicted in Fig. 2. In particular, one can see that as long as $h \rightarrow 0$ the pressure jump across the interface converges to the theoretical one $\Delta p_{\text{theor}} = (d-1)\sigma/R = 14.56$ given by the Young-Laplace law. One should bear in mind that for every curve in Fig. 2, $\delta_0(h)$ is different since it depends on h .

Fig. 3 depicts the phase pressure $p_a(r)$ and partial pressure $\hat{p}_a(r) = \alpha_a(r)p_a(r)$ variations across the interface. It demonstrates the main feature of our model, that is, the pressures p_1 and p_2 of the mixture constituents can be different, and that the presence of the interface curvature prevent p_1 and p_2 from relaxing to a common value as it is assumed in the single-pressure models, e.g. [4, 38, 56, 9].

For this particular solution, one does not need to specify the fluid equations of state $e_a(\rho_a, S)$ in (23), however, it would be interesting to take some particular internal energies $e_a(\rho_a, S)$ and to look at the density variation across




Figure 2: Diffuse interface profile for the stationary bubble of radius $R = 0.01$, $\sigma = 0.0728$ for which the theoretical pressure jump $\Delta p_{\text{theor}} = (d-1)\sigma/R = 14.56$. Left: volume fraction for various interface width h . Right: mixture pressure $p(r) = \alpha p_1 + (1-\alpha)p_2$




Figure 3: Mixture pressure $p(r)$ (left), phase pressures $p_a(r)$ (middle), and partial pressures $\hat{p}_a(r) = \alpha_a p_a$ (right), for a stationary bubble with $R = 0.01$, $\sigma = 0.0728$, and $h = 0.005$.

the interface. Thus, we shall assume that the fluid with index $a = 1$ (in the center of the domain, left from the interface in the figures) is an ideal gas given by the ideal gas equation of state, while the fluid $a = 2$ is a liquid parameterized by the stiffened-gas equation of state

$$e_1(\rho_1, S) = \frac{c_{10}^2}{\gamma_1(\gamma_1 - 1)} \left(\frac{\rho_1}{\rho_{10}} \right)^{\gamma_1 - 1} e^{S/c_{v,1}}, \quad e_2(\rho_2, S) = \frac{c_{20}^2}{\gamma_2(\gamma_2 - 1)} \left(\frac{\rho_2}{\rho_{20}} \right)^{\gamma_2 - 1} e^{S/c_{v,2}} + \frac{\rho_{20}c_{20}^2 - \gamma_2 p_{20}}{\gamma_2 \rho_2}, \quad (61)$$

where $c_{V,a}$, $a = 1, 2$ are the specific heats at constant volume, γ_a are the ratio of the specific heats, c_{a0} are the reference sound speeds, ρ_{a0} are the reference phase mass densities, and p_{20} is the reference pressure of the liquid phase.

Fig. 4 shows typical density profiles recovered from the pressure profiles using equations of state (61). The following values were used for the gas phase $\gamma_1 = 1.4$, $c_{10} = 343.03$, $c_{V,1} = 717.2$, $S = 0$ that gives the equilibrium density of the gas $\rho_{10} = 1.205$. The liquid parameters were taken as follows $\gamma_2 = 1.949437$, $c_{V,2} = 4150$, $p_{20} = p_{\text{atm}} = 101325$, $c_{20} = 1500$, $\rho_{20} = 1000$. Computing the phase pressures as $p_a = \rho_a^2 \frac{\partial e_a}{\partial \rho_a}$ and inverting it with respect to ρ_a , we can plot the density profiles as depicted in Fig. 4. Note that the liquid density $\rho_2(r)$ is not exactly constant as it may seem from Fig. 4 (middle) but its perturbations are of the order 10^{-8} .




Figure 4: Mixture mass density $\rho(r) = \alpha\rho_1 + (1 - \alpha)\rho_2$ (left), phase mass densities $\rho_a(r)$ (middle), and apparent densities $\varrho_a(r) = \alpha_a\rho_a$ (right), for a stationary bubble with $R = 0.01$, $\sigma = 0.0728$, and $h = 0.005$. The ideal gas and stiffened-gas equations of state were used to obtain fluid densities ρ_a from pressures p_a .

8. Dispersion relations

In this section, we perform a linear stability analysis of (17) by considering a particular solution in the form of a plane wave

$$\mathbf{Q}(t, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{Q}_0 e^{i(\omega t - \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x})}, \quad (62)$$

where $i = \sqrt{-1}$ is the imaginary unit, $\omega = 2\pi f$ is the real angular frequency, f is the frequency, \mathbf{k} is the complex wave vector. It is sufficient to restrict the analysis to the 1D case, i.e. $\mathbf{x} = (x, 0, 0)$, and $\mathbf{k} = (k, 0, 0)$, and moreover to the genuinely 1D case, i.e. we set $(v_{a,1}, v_{a,2}, v_{a,3}) = (v_a, 0, 0)$, $(B_1, B_2, B_3) = (B, 0, 0)$.

To derive the required PDE system it is necessary to use relations between mixture and individual phases variables of state. Then, after a cumbersome but standard procedure, one can derive equations for the state variables of the phases and linearize these equations near the equilibrium state $v_a = 0 + v'_a$, $\rho_a = \rho_{a,0} + \rho'_a$, $\alpha = \alpha_0 + \alpha'$, $D = 0 + D'$, $B = B_0 + B'$.

The equations for perturbations $\mathbf{Q}' = (v'_1, v'_2, B', D', \alpha', \rho'_1, \rho'_2)$ reads (we omit the prime symbol “'” for the sake of brevity)

$$\frac{\partial v_1}{\partial t} + \frac{p_{1,0} - p_{2,0}}{\rho_0} \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial x} + \frac{C_1^2}{\rho_{1,0}} \frac{\partial \rho_1}{\partial x} = -\frac{c_{1,0} c_{2,0}^2}{\chi} (v_1 - v_2), \quad (63a)$$

$$\frac{\partial v_2}{\partial t} + \frac{p_{1,0} - p_{2,0}}{\rho_0} \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial x} + \frac{C_2^2}{\rho_{2,0}} \frac{\partial \rho_2}{\partial x} = +\frac{c_{1,0}^2 c_{2,0}}{\chi} (v_1 - v_2), \quad (63b)$$

$$\frac{\partial B}{\partial t} + B_0 c_{1,0} \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial x} + B_0 c_{2,0} \frac{\partial v_2}{\partial x} + \beta^2 \frac{\partial D}{\partial x} = 0, \quad (63c)$$

$$\frac{\partial D}{\partial t} + \frac{\Sigma^2}{\rho_0^2} \frac{\partial B}{\partial x} - \frac{B_0 \Sigma^2 (\rho_{1,0} - \rho_{2,0})}{\rho_0^3} \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial x} - \frac{\alpha_0 B_0 \Sigma^2}{\rho_0^3} \frac{\partial \rho_1}{\partial x} - \frac{(1 - \alpha_0) B_0 \Sigma^2}{\rho_0^3} \frac{\partial \rho_2}{\partial x} = -\frac{\rho_1 C_{1,0}^2 - \rho_2 C_{2,0}^2}{\delta \rho_0} - \frac{\beta^2 \lambda}{\delta^2} D, \quad (63d)$$

$$\frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial t} = -\frac{\beta^2}{\delta} D, \quad (63e)$$

$$\frac{\partial \rho_1}{\partial t} + \rho_1 \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial x} = \frac{\beta^2 \rho_{1,0}}{\alpha_0 \delta} D, \quad (63f)$$

$$\frac{\partial \rho_2}{\partial t} + \rho_2 \frac{\partial v_2}{\partial x} = -\frac{\beta^2 \rho_{2,0}}{(1 - \alpha_0) \delta} D, \quad (63g)$$

where $C_a^2 = \frac{\partial p_a}{\partial \rho_a}$, $a = 1, 2$

If linear system (63) is written in the matrix notations as

$$\mathbf{Q}_t + \mathbf{A}\mathbf{Q}_x = \mathbf{S}\mathbf{Q} \quad (64)$$

then the dispersion relations $k(\omega)$ of (63) are given as the roots of the polynomial (e.g. see [32])

$$\det\left(\mathbf{I} - \frac{k}{\omega}\mathbf{A} + \frac{i}{\omega}\mathbf{S}\right) = 0, \quad (65)$$

with \mathbf{I} being the identity matrix.

The phase $V_{\text{ph}}(\omega)$ and group $V_{\text{g}}(\omega)$ velocities and the attenuation factor $A(\omega)$ can be computed as

$$V_{\text{ph}} = \frac{\omega}{\text{Re}(k)}, \quad V_{\text{g}} = \left(\frac{\partial \text{Re}(k)}{\partial \omega}\right)^{-1}, \quad A(\omega) = -\text{Im}(k). \quad (66)$$

The polynomial (65) is a cubic polynomial on $k(\omega)^2$, and its roots correspond to three modes: the pressure modes of the two phases, and the capillarity mode associated with the surface tension. All three modes are stable as can be seen from the attenuation factors plotted in Fig. 5–7 and which are positive.

Figures 5–7 show typical dispersion curves for the thermodynamic parameters extracted from the stationary bubble solution corresponding to $\alpha = 0.999$ (almost pure gas), $\alpha = 0.519$ (mixed state), $\alpha = 0.002$ (almost pure liquid). The curves are plotted along side with the phase characteristic velocities $C_a^2 = \frac{\partial p_a}{\partial \rho_a}$, the so-called equilibrium sound speed C_e and Wood's sound speed C_W (dashed lines) given by [18]

$$C_e^2 = \left(\rho \left(\frac{\alpha_1}{\rho_1 C_1^2} + \frac{\alpha_2}{\rho_2 C_2^2}\right)\right)^{-1}, \quad C_W^2 = C_1^2 C_2^2 \left(\frac{\rho_1}{\alpha_1} + \frac{\rho_2}{\alpha_2}\right) \left(\frac{\rho_1 C_1^2}{\alpha_1} + \frac{\rho_2 C_2^2}{\alpha_2}\right)^{-1}. \quad (67)$$

From these figures, one can note that Wood's speed C_W serves as a low frequency limit for the sound speed of the gaseous phase $a = 1$ (the light one), and the equilibrium speed C_e is the high-frequency limit of the gaseous phase.

On the other hand, the liquid phase (the heavy one), has C_2 as the high-frequency limit, while its low-frequency limit is undetermined in general.

The most interesting behavior of the sound waves can be seen in Fig. 7 corresponding to $\alpha = 0.00206$ that can be considered as if a gaseous phase $\rho_1 = 1.205$ is dispersed in a heavy liquid phase $\rho_2 = 1000$. Thus, the velocity of the sound mode corresponding to the light phase may change from $C_W = 258.7$ at $\omega \rightarrow 0$ to $C_1 = 343.1$ at $\omega \rightarrow \infty$ through $C_e = 425.3$ at moderate frequencies.

9. Conclusion

We have presented a new nonequilibrium *two-pressure* diffuse interface model for two-fluid systems with surface tension. The model represents an extension of the SHTC two-fluid mixture model [51, 52, 46, 45] in which the time and space gradients of the volume fraction are lifted to the level of state variables to account for spatial heterogeneities and microinertial effect in the vicinity of the diffuse interface. The resulting model belongs to the class of thermodynamically compatible hyperbolic equations for which both laws of thermodynamics hold.

The main difference from the existing diffuse interface approaches to surface tension such as [4, 38, 56, 9] is that the pressure equilibrium condition $p_1 = p_2$ is not assumed in our model. The pressure non-equilibrium is actually a fundamental assumption for introduction of the surface tension into the two-fluid SHTC model in order to gain the full SHTC structure of the governing equations. In particular, it is important for the variational and Hamiltonian formulations of the governing equations discussed in Sec. A and B.




Figure 5: Phase velocities (left), group velocities (middle), and attenuation factor (right) versus the angular frequency $\omega = 2\pi f$, where f is the frequency. The dashed lines shows the pure gas $C_1 = \sqrt{\partial p_1(\rho_1, S)/\partial \rho_1}$ and liquid $C_2 = \sqrt{\partial p_2(\rho_2, S)/\partial \rho_2}$ characteristic velocities, equilibrium characteristic speed C_e , and Wood's sound speed C_W . The mixture parameters are $\alpha = 0.999$, $\beta = 1$, $\delta = 0.0025$, $\delta/\lambda = 10^{-8}$. The phase pressures parameters are extracted from the stationary bubble solution at the corresponding value of α : $p_1 = p_2 = 1.013395 \cdot 10^5$, while other thermodynamic parameters were computed from the equations of state.




Figure 6: Phase velocities (left), group velocities (middle), and attenuation factor (right) versus the angular frequency $\omega = 2\pi f$, where f is the frequency. The dashed lines shows the pure gas $C_1 = \sqrt{\partial p_1(\rho_1, S)/\partial \rho_1}$ and liquid $C_2 = \sqrt{\partial p_2(\rho_2, S)/\partial \rho_2}$ characteristic velocities, equilibrium characteristic speed C_e , and Wood's sound speed C_W . The mixture parameters are $\alpha = 0.519$, $\beta = 1$, $\delta = 0.0025$, $\delta/\lambda = 10^{-8}$. The phase pressures parameters are extracted from the stationary bubble solution at the corresponding value of α : $p_1 = 1.013531 \cdot 10^5$, $p_2 = 1.013103 \cdot 10^5$, while other thermodynamic parameters were computed from the equations of state.




Figure 7: Phase velocities (left), group velocities (middle), and attenuation factor (right) versus the angular frequency $\omega = 2\pi f$, where f is the frequency. The dashed lines shows the pure gas $C_1 = \sqrt{\partial p_1(\rho_1, S)/\partial \rho_1}$ and liquid $C_2 = \sqrt{\partial p_2(\rho_2, S)/\partial \rho_2}$ characteristic velocities, equilibrium characteristic speed C_e , and Wood's sound speed C_W . The mixture parameters are $\alpha = 0.00206$, $\beta = 1$, $\delta = 0.0025$, $\delta/\lambda = 10^{-8}$. The phase pressures parameters are extracted from the stationary bubble solution at the corresponding value of α : $p_1 = 1.0132276 \cdot 10^5$, $p_2 = 1.0132500 \cdot 10^5$, while other other thermodynamic parameters were computed from the equations of state.

We presented two reduced relaxation limits of the model. In Sec. 6.1, the relaxation limit of the equations when the microinertia relaxation rate is very fast. In Sec. 6.2, the relaxation limit for very fast pressure and velocity relaxation rates was derived that can be called single-velocity pressure-equilibrium model. These reduced models can be used for better understanding of the solution properties of the full system. In particular, we demonstrated that the Young-Laplace law is approximately holds in a mixture element as long as the gradient of the volume fraction is not equal to zero. Furthermore, the single-velocity pressure-equilibrium reduced model is a system of third-order partial differential equations which can be used to connect our model to some classical dispersive models. The dispersion relation of the full model can be obtained numerically and was studied in Sec. 8. The full model has three modes: two pressure modes of the constituents and the third mode, related to the microinertia of the interface. The analysis revealed non trivial dependencies of the phase velocities on frequency.

Although we could not conduct the hyperbolicity analysis of the full system completely, our preliminary study suggests that the full two-fluid model with surface tension is hyperbolic at least in the vicinity of equilibrium. Also, during this research, we found out that the energy potential is not strictly convex and thus formally the model does not have all properties of the SHTC class of equations. We shall address this issue in more detail in future.

Finally, we studied the stationary bubble solution, and demonstrated that the Young-Laplace law holds as a sharp interface limit for macroscopic interfaces. Although the new parameter δ is not a constant, from the theoretical viewpoint, and must be chosen as $\delta = \|\nabla \alpha\|^{-1}$, we demonstrated that in practical computations it can be taken as a precomputed constant, see (60).

In future, we shall extend the model so that it applies also to complex fluids and solids, such as superfluid helium-4 or non-Newtonian fluids.

Acknowledgment

The work of I.P. was financially supported via the Departments of Excellence Initiative 2018–2027 attributed to DICAM of the University of Trento (grant L. 232/2016). Also, I.P. is a member of the INdAM GNCS group in Italy. E.R. is supported by the Mathematical Center in Akademgorodok under the agreement No. 075-15-2022-281 with the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Russian Federation. M.P. was supported by Czech Science Foundation, project 23-05736S. M.P. is a member of the Nečas center for Mathematical Modelling.

A. Variational formulation

Here we briefly recall the variational scheme that underlies every SHTC equations, see [40]. The variational principle is formulated in the Lagrangian coordinates $\mathbf{X} = \{X^K\}$, $K = 1, 2, 3$. For simplicity, we only consider the surface tension part.

Thus, we consider a general Lagrangian density $\Lambda = \Lambda(\alpha, \phi, \beta_K)$ which is a function of the volume fraction and their space and time gradients

$$\phi := d_t \alpha, \quad \beta_K := \partial_K \alpha, \quad (68)$$

where $d_t = d/dt$ is the material time derivative and $\partial_K = \partial/\partial X^K$. Hence, varying the action integral

$$\mathcal{A} = \int \Lambda(\alpha, d_t \alpha, \partial_K \alpha) dt d\mathbf{X} \quad (69)$$

with respect to $\delta \alpha$, one immediately obtains the Euler-Lagrange equation

$$\frac{d\Lambda_\phi}{dt} + \frac{\partial \Lambda_{\beta_K}}{\partial X^K} = \Lambda_\alpha, \quad (70)$$

where $\Lambda_\alpha = \frac{\partial \Lambda}{\partial \alpha}$, $\Lambda_\phi = \frac{\partial \Lambda}{\partial \phi}$, and $\Lambda_{\beta_K} = \frac{\partial \Lambda}{\partial \beta_K}$. The Euler-Lagrange equation is formally a second-order PDE for α . To obtain an extended first-order system for $\{\alpha, \phi, \beta_K\}$ as required by the SHTC theory, we need to provide an evolution equations for the vector β_K and α which is in fact not a difficult task because these equations are trivial consequences of the definitions of β_K and ϕ . Indeed, the required system of first-order PDEs reads

$$\frac{d\Lambda_\phi}{dt} + \frac{\partial \Lambda_{\beta_K}}{\partial X^K} = \Lambda_\alpha, \quad (71a)$$

$$\frac{d\beta_K}{dt} - \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial X^K} = 0, \quad (71b)$$

$$\frac{d\alpha}{dt} = \phi. \quad (71c)$$

By introducing new potential as a partial Legendre transform of Λ

$$U(\alpha, d, b_K) := \phi \Lambda_\phi - \Lambda, \quad (72)$$

and new variables

$$d := \Lambda_\phi, \quad b_K := -\beta_K, \quad (73)$$

system (71) can be rewritten as

$$\frac{dd}{dt} + \frac{\partial U_{b_K}}{\partial X^K} = -U_\alpha, \quad (74a)$$

$$\frac{db_K}{dt} + \frac{\partial U_d}{\partial X^K} = 0, \quad (74b)$$

$$\frac{d\alpha}{dt} = U_d, \quad (74c)$$

where we have used the standard properties of the Legendre transform

$$U_\alpha = -\Lambda_\alpha, \quad \phi = U_d. \quad (75)$$

Finally, performing the Lagrange-to-Euler transformation of the energy potential, state variables, and time and space derivatives

$$A_i^K := \frac{\partial X^K}{\partial x^i}, \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} = A_i^K \frac{\partial}{\partial X^K}, \quad \frac{d}{dt} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + v^k \frac{\partial}{\partial x^k}, \quad (76a)$$

$$E := \det(\mathbf{A})U, \quad d := \det(\mathbf{A})d, \quad b_i := A_i^K b_k, \quad (76b)$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} A_i^K + A_j^K \frac{\partial v^j}{\partial x^i} = 0 \quad (76c)$$

as detailed in [40], equations (74) become (14). Note that, in (74a), an equivalent of the source term $\lambda\rho E_d$ in (14b) is missing because it is a dissipative term and cannot be included into the variational scheme but must be added afterwards in correspondence with the second law of thermodynamics [40].

B. Hamiltonian formulation

Equations (17) consist of a reversible part and an irreversible part (the two source terms with the rates χ^{-1} and ε^{-1}). The purpose of this Section is to show that the reversible part has a Hamiltonian structure, meaning that it is generated by a Poisson bracket. This underlines the internal consistency of the equations and provides to them an alternative geometric interpretation [36].

Poisson brackets are a cornerstone of analytical mechanics [21], where they typically come out of variation of action. Then, they come in the so-called canonical form for the pairs of coordinates and their respective momenta. But in continuum mechanics, which is the case here, Poisson brackets are typically non-canonical, they are degenerate, and do not need to have state variables in the form of pairs of coordinates and momenta [10, 2, 14, 36].

In general, Poisson brackets are bilinear operators from a space of functionals of some state variables \mathbf{q} to the same space. Moreover, they are skew-symmetric, $\{F, G\} = -\{G, F\}$, for each two functionals $F(\mathbf{q})$ and $G(\mathbf{q})$, and they satisfy the Leibniz rule and Jacobi identity. The state variables can be for instance positions and momenta, which is the usual case in analytical mechanics, but also fields as density, momentum density, and others. The Leibniz rule, $\{F, GH\} = \{F, G\}H + G\{F, H\}$ means that Poisson brackets behave as derivatives, which in particular means that the resulting evolution equations do not depend on constant shifts of energy. Finally, Jacobi identity, $\{F, \{G, H\}\} + \{G, \{H, F\}\} + \{H, \{F, G\}\} = 0$, expresses self-consistency of Hamiltonian mechanics [16, 37]. Once the Poisson bracket for a state variable vector \mathbf{q} is determined, Hamiltonian evolution of \mathbf{q} is given by

$$\dot{\mathbf{q}} = \{\mathbf{q}, \mathcal{E}\}, \quad (77)$$

where $\mathcal{E} = \int e(\mathbf{q}) d\mathbf{x}$ is the total energy of the system and $e(\mathbf{q})$ the volumetric energy density.

Now, we approach the Hamiltonian structure of Equations (17), which can be seen as evolution equations for state variables ρ (mass density), \mathbf{m} (momentum density), $\rho = \rho c$ (density of a mixture component), \mathbf{w} (relative velocity), α (volume fraction), $\mathcal{D} = \rho D$ (volume fraction rate density), \mathbf{B} (interface gradient), and $s = \rho S$ (entropy density per volume). Fields ρ , \mathbf{m} , and s , which describe fluid mechanics, are known to have Hamiltonian evolution generated by Poisson bracket

$$\{F, G\}^{(FM)} = \int \rho (\partial_i F_\rho G_{m_i} - \partial_i G_\rho F_{m_i}) d\mathbf{x} + \int m_i (\partial_j F_{m_i} G_{m_j} - \partial_j G_{m_i} F_{m_j}) d\mathbf{x} + \int s (\partial_i F_s G_{m_i} - \partial_i G_s F_{m_i}) d\mathbf{x}, \quad (78)$$

where FM stands for fluid mechanics [2, 36]. Note that in this section the subscripts stand for functional derivatives, not partial derivatives as in the preceding sections. From the geometric point of view, this bracket expresses that the velocity field $\mathbf{v} = \frac{\partial e}{\partial \mathbf{m}}$ advects itself as well as two scalar densities, ρ and s . From the algebraic point of view, the bracket expresses dynamics on the Lie algebra dual of a semidirect product [31, 15].

Another part of Equations (17) consists of the equations for fields ρ and \mathbf{w} (density of a species and its relative velocity with respect to the other species). These fields form a cotangent bundle and the whole cotangent bundle is then advected by the overall velocity \mathbf{v} , which gives the mixture part of the overall bracket

$$\{F, G\}^{(\text{mixture})} = \{F, G\}^{(FM)} + \int \rho (\partial_i F_\rho G_{m_i} - \partial_i G_\rho F_{m_i}) d\mathbf{x} \quad (79)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &+ \int (\partial_i F_\rho G_{w_i} - \partial_i G_\rho F_{w_i}) d\mathbf{x} \\ &- \int \partial_i w_j (F_{w_j} G_{m_i} - G_{w_j} F_{m_i}) d\mathbf{x} \\ &+ \int w_i (\partial_j F_{m_i} G_{w_j} - \partial_j G_{m_i} F_{w_j}) d\mathbf{x}, \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

see [40] for more details.

Then, the pair of fields $\{\mathbf{B}, \mathcal{D}\}$ have analogical dynamics as the pair $\{\mathbf{w}, \rho\}$, which leads to an analogical part of the Poisson bracket. However, density \mathcal{D} is also part of another cotangent bundle, this time with function α , resulting in their canonical coupling,

$$\{F, G\}^{(\delta)} = \frac{1}{\delta} \int (F_\mathcal{D} G_\alpha - G_\mathcal{D} F_\alpha) d\mathbf{x}, \quad (81)$$

where $\delta(\alpha)$ is an adjustable functional of α . Note that in order to keep validity of the Jacobi identity, δ can not depend on other state variables than α . Since α is a function, not a density (as opposed to for instance ρ), it is advected by terms

$$\int (\partial_i F_\alpha G_{m_i} - \partial_i G_\alpha F_{m_i}) d\mathbf{x} \quad (82)$$

in the resulting Poisson bracket.

The overall Poisson bracket for state variables in Equations (17) is then

$$\begin{aligned}
\{F, G\}^{(\text{surface tension})} &= \{F, G\}^{(\text{mixture})} + \{F, G\}^{(\delta)} + \int (\partial_i F_\alpha G_{m_i} - \partial_i G_\alpha F_{m_i}) d\mathbf{x} \\
&+ \int \mathcal{D} (\partial_i F_{\mathcal{D}} G_{m_i} - \partial_i G_{\mathcal{D}} F_{m_i}) d\mathbf{x} \\
&+ \int (\partial_i F_{\mathcal{D}} G_{B_i} - \partial_i G_{\mathcal{D}} F_{B_i}) d\mathbf{x} \\
&- \int \partial_i B_j (F_{B_j} G_{m_i} - G_{B_j} F_{m_i}) d\mathbf{x} \\
&+ \int B_i (\partial_j F_{m_i} G_{B_j} - \partial_j G_{m_i} F_{B_j}) d\mathbf{x}, \tag{83}
\end{aligned}$$

where validity of Jacobi identity was checked by program [30]. From the geometric point of view, this Poisson bracket expresses evolution three-forms $\rho(t, \mathbf{x})\boldsymbol{\omega}$ and $s(t, \mathbf{x})\boldsymbol{\omega}$, where $\boldsymbol{\omega} = dx \wedge dy \wedge dz$ is the volume three-form [16], advected by the overall velocity that also advects the momentum density $m_i(t, \mathbf{x})dx^i \otimes \boldsymbol{\omega}$. Moreover, three-form $\rho(t, \mathbf{x})c(t, \mathbf{x})\boldsymbol{\omega}$ is coupled with one-form $w_i(t, \mathbf{x})dx^i$ (differential of the dual function to that three-form), and both are advected by the velocity. Finally, the three-form $\rho(t, \mathbf{x})D(t, \mathbf{x})\boldsymbol{\omega}$ with its canonically coupled dual element, zero-form or function $\alpha(t, \mathbf{x})$, are advected by the velocity. Three-form $\rho(t, \mathbf{x})D(t, \mathbf{x})\boldsymbol{\omega}$ is, moreover, coupled with one-form $B_i(t, \mathbf{x})dx^i$, which is constructed as the differential of the dual to that three-form, and both are advected (Lie-dragged) by the velocity field.

Once energy of the system is determined, Hamiltonian evolution (77) with Poisson bracket (83) leads to the reversible (non-dissipative) part of Equations (17).

References

- [1] D. M. Anderson, G. B. McFadden, and M. F. Wheeler. “Diffuse-Interface Methods in Fluid Mechanics”. *Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics* 30.1 (1998), pp. 139–165. DOI: [10.1146/annurev.fluid.30.1.139](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.fluid.30.1.139) (Cited on p. 5).
- [2] V. Arnold. “Sur la géométrie différentielle des groupes de Lie de dimension infini et ses applications dans l’hydrodynamique des fluides parfaits”. *Annales de l’institut Fourier* 16.1 (1966), pp. 319–361 (Cited on pp. 24, 25).
- [3] M. Baer and J. Nunziato. “A two-phase mixture theory for the deflagration-to-detonation transition (ddt) in reactive granular materials”. *International Journal of Multiphase Flow* 12.6 (1986), pp. 861–889. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0301-9322\(86\)90033-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0301-9322(86)90033-9) (Cited on p. 2).
- [4] J. Brackbill, D. Kothe, and C Zemach. “A continuum method for modeling surface tension”. *Journal of Computational Physics* 100.2 (1992), pp. 335–354. DOI: [10.1016/0021-9991\(92\)90240-Y](https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9991(92)90240-Y) (Cited on pp. 2, 6, 7, 10, 17, 20).
- [5] D. Bresch, M. Gisclon, and I. Lacroix-Violet. “On Navier–Stokes–Korteweg and Euler–Korteweg Systems: Application to Quantum Fluids Models”. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis* 233.3 (2019), pp. 975–1025. DOI: [10.1007/s00205-019-01373-w](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00205-019-01373-w) (Cited on p. 2).
- [6] H. Bruce Stewart and B. Wendroff. “Two-phase flow: Models and methods”. *Journal of Computational Physics* 56.3 (1984), pp. 363–409. DOI: [10.1016/0021-9991\(84\)90103-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9991(84)90103-7) (Cited on p. 2).
- [7] J. W. Cahn and J. E. Hilliard. “Free Energy of a Nonuniform System. I. Interfacial Free Energy”. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 28.2 (1958), pp. 258–267. DOI: [10.1063/1.1744102](https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1744102) (Cited on p. 6).
- [8] P Casal and H Gouin. “A representation of liquid-vapor interfaces by using fluids of second grade”. *Annales de Physique* 13.2 (1988), pp. 3–12 (Cited on pp. 2, 6).
- [9] S. Chiocchetti, I. Peshkov, S. Gavrilyuk, and M. Dumbser. “High order ADER schemes and GLM curl cleaning for a first order hyperbolic formulation of compressible flow with surface tension”. *Journal of Computational Physics* 426 (2021), p. 109898. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2020.109898> (Cited on pp. 2, 6, 7, 10, 17, 20).
- [10] A. Clebsch. “Über die Integration der Hydrodynamische Gleichungen”. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik* 56 (1895), pp. 1–10 (Cited on p. 24).

- [11] F. Dhaouadi and M. Dumbser. “A first order hyperbolic reformulation of the Navier-Stokes-Korteweg system based on the GPR model and an augmented Lagrangian approach”. *Journal of Computational Physics* 470 (2022), p. 111544. DOI: [10.1016/j.jcp.2022.111544](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2022.111544) (Cited on p. 6).
- [12] M. Dumbser, I. Peshkov, E. Romenski, and O. Zanotti. “High order ADER schemes for a unified first order hyperbolic formulation of continuum mechanics: Viscous heat-conducting fluids and elastic solids”. *Journal of Computational Physics* 314 (2016), pp. 824–862. DOI: [10.1016/j.jcp.2016.02.015](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2016.02.015) (Cited on pp. 2, 5).
- [13] M. Dumbser, I. Peshkov, E. Romenski, and O. Zanotti. “High order ADER schemes for a unified first order hyperbolic formulation of Newtonian continuum mechanics coupled with electro-dynamics”. *Journal of Computational Physics* 348 (2017), pp. 298–342. DOI: [10.1016/j.jcp.2017.07.020](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2017.07.020) (Cited on p. 5).
- [14] I. E. Dzyaloshinskii and G. E. Volovick. “Poisson brackets in condense matter physics”. *Annals of Physics* 125.1 (1980), pp. 67–97 (Cited on p. 24).
- [15] O. Esen and H. Gümral. “Geometry of Plasma Dynamics II: Lie Algebra of Hamiltonian Vector Fields”. *Journal of Geometric Mechanics* 4.3 (2012) (Cited on p. 25).
- [16] M. Fecko. *Differential Geometry and Lie Groups for Physicists*. Cambridge University Press, 2006 (Cited on pp. 24, 26).
- [17] H. Freistühler and M. Kotschote. “Phase-Field and Korteweg-Type Models for the Time-Dependent Flow of Compressible Two-Phase Fluids”. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis* 224.1 (2017), pp. 1–20. DOI: [10.1007/s00205-016-1065-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00205-016-1065-0) (Cited on pp. 2, 6).
- [18] S. Gavriluk and R. Saurel. “Mathematical and Numerical Modeling of Two-Phase Compressible Flows with Micro-Inertia”. *Journal of Computational Physics* 175.1 (2002), pp. 326–360. DOI: [10.1006/jcph.2001.6951](https://doi.org/10.1006/jcph.2001.6951) (Cited on pp. 2, 20).
- [19] S. K. Godunov, T. Y. Mikhaïlova, and E. I. Romenskii. “Systems of thermodynamically coordinated laws of conservation invariant under rotations”. *Siberian Mathematical Journal* 37.4 (1996), pp. 690–705. DOI: [10.1007/BF02104662](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02104662) (Cited on pp. 3, 9, 10, 11).
- [20] S. K. Godunov and E. I. Romenskii. *Elements of mechanics of continuous media and conservation laws*. Novosibirsk: Nauchnaya kniga, 1998 (Cited on pp. 3, 7).
- [21] H. Goldstein. *Classical Mechanics*. Pearson Education, 2002 (Cited on p. 24).
- [22] H. Gouin and T. Ruggeri. “Hamiltonian principle in the binary mixtures of Euler fluids with applications to the second sound phenomena”. *Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Classe di Scienze Fisiche, Matematiche e Naturali. Rendiconti Lincei. Matematica e Applicazioni* 14 (2003), pp. 69–83 (Cited on p. 2).
- [23] M. Grmela and H. C. Öttinger. “Dynamics and thermodynamics of complex fluids. I. Development of a general formalism”. *Phys. Rev. E* 56 (6 1997), pp. 6620–6632. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevE.56.6620](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.56.6620) (Cited on p. 3).
- [24] M. Hirschler, G. Oger, U. Nieken, and D. Le Touzé. “Modeling of droplet collisions using Smoothed Particle Hydrodynamics”. *International Journal of Multiphase Flow* 95 (2017), pp. 175–187. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmultiphaseflow.2017.06.002> (Cited on p. 1).
- [25] T. M. Inc. *MATLAB version: 9.13.0 (R2022b)*. Natick, Massachusetts, United States, 2022 (Cited on p. 12).
- [26] A. K. Kapila, R. Menikoff, J. B. Bdzil, S. F. Son, and D. S. Stewart. “Two-phase modeling of deflagration-to-detonation transition in granular materials: Reduced equations”. *Physics of Fluids* 13.10 (2001), pp. 3002–3024. DOI: [10.1063/1.1398042](https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1398042) (Cited on p. 2).
- [27] J. Keim, C.-D. Munz, and C. Rohde. “A relaxation model for the non-isothermal Navier-Stokes-Korteweg equations in confined domains”. *Journal of Computational Physics* 474 (2023), p. 111830. DOI: [10.1016/j.jcp.2022.111830](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2022.111830) (Cited on p. 6).
- [28] J. Kim and J. Lowengrub. “Phase field modeling and simulation of three-phase flows”. *Interfaces and Free Boundaries* 7 (2005), pp. 435–466. DOI: [10.4171/IFB/132](https://doi.org/10.4171/IFB/132) (Cited on p. 6).
- [29] O. Kincl, I. Peshkov, M. Pavelka, and V. Klika. “Unified description of fluids and solids in Smoothed Particle Hydrodynamics”. *Applied Mathematics and Computation* 439 (2023), p. 127579. DOI: [10.1016/j.amc.2022.127579](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amc.2022.127579) (Cited on p. 2).
- [30] M. Kroegeer and M. Huetter. “Automated symbolic calculations in nonequilibrium thermodynamics”. *Comput. Phys. Commun.* 181 (2010), 2149–2157 (Cited on p. 26).
- [31] J. Marsden and A. Weinstein. “Coadjoint orbits, vortices, and Clebsch variables for incompressible fluids”. *PHYSICA D* 7.1-3 (1983), 305–323. DOI: [10.1016/0167-2789\(83\)90134-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-2789(83)90134-3) (Cited on p. 25).
- [32] A. Muracchini, T. Ruggeri, and L. Seccia. “Dispersion relation in the high frequency limit and non linear wave stability for hyperbolic dissipative systems”. *Wave Motion* 15.2 (1992), pp. 143–158 (Cited on p. 20).
- [33] A. Murrone and H. Guillard. “A five equation reduced model for compressible two phase flow problems”. *Journal of Computational Physics* 202.2 (2005), pp. 664–698. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2004.07.019> (Cited on p. 16).

- [34] H. C. Öttinger and M. Grmela. “Dynamics and thermodynamics of complex fluids. II. Illustrations of a general formalism”. *Phys. Rev. E* 56 (6 1997), pp. 6633–6655. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevE.56.6633](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.56.6633) (Cited on p. 3).
- [35] H. Öttinger. *Beyond Equilibrium Thermodynamics*. New York: Wiley, 2005 (Cited on p. 3).
- [36] M. Pavelka, V. Klika, and M. Grmela. *Multiscale Thermo-Dynamics*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 2018. DOI: [10.1515/9783110350951](https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110350951) (Cited on pp. 3, 5, 24, 25).
- [37] M. Pavelka, I. Peshkov, and V. Klika. “On Hamiltonian continuum mechanics”. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena* 408 (2020), p. 132510. DOI: [10.1016/j.physd.2020.132510](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physd.2020.132510) (Cited on pp. 7, 24).
- [38] G. Perigaud and R. Saurel. “A compressible flow model with capillary effects”. *Journal of Computational Physics* 209.1 (2005), pp. 139–178. DOI: [10.1016/j.jcp.2005.03.018](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2005.03.018) (Cited on pp. 2, 6, 7, 10, 17, 20).
- [39] I. Peshkov, M. Dumbser, W. Boscheri, E. Romenski, S. Chiochetti, and M. Ioriatti. “Simulation of non-Newtonian viscoplastic flows with a unified first order hyperbolic model and a structure-preserving semi-implicit scheme”. *Computers & Fluids* 224 (2021), p. 104963. DOI: [10.1016/j.compfluid.2021.104963](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compfluid.2021.104963) (Cited on p. 2).
- [40] I. Peshkov, M. Pavelka, E. Romenski, and M. Grmela. “Continuum mechanics and thermodynamics in the Hamilton and the Godunov-type formulations”. *Continuum Mechanics and Thermodynamics* 30.6 (2018), pp. 1343–1378. DOI: [10.1007/s00161-018-0621-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00161-018-0621-2) (Cited on pp. 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 23, 24, 25).
- [41] I. Peshkov and E. Romenski. “A hyperbolic model for viscous Newtonian flows”. *Continuum Mechanics and Thermodynamics* 28.1-2 (2016), pp. 85–104. DOI: [10.1007/s00161-014-0401-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00161-014-0401-6) (Cited on pp. 2, 5).
- [42] I. Peshkov, E. Romenski, and M. Dumbser. “Continuum mechanics with torsion”. *Continuum Mechanics and Thermodynamics* (2019). DOI: [10.1007/s00161-019-00770-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00161-019-00770-6) (Cited on p. 9).
- [43] S. Popinet. “Numerical Models of Surface Tension”. *Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics* 50.1 (2018), pp. 49–75. DOI: [10.1146/annurev-fluid-122316-045034](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-fluid-122316-045034) (Cited on p. 1).
- [44] L. Río-Martín and M. Dumbser. “High-order ADER Discontinuous Galerkin schemes for a symmetric hyperbolic model of compressible barotropic two-fluid flows” (2023) (Cited on p. 11).
- [45] E. Romenski, D. Drikakis, and E. Toro. “Conservative Models and Numerical Methods for Compressible Two-Phase Flow”. *Journal of Scientific Computing* 42(1) (2010), pp. 68–95 (Cited on pp. 2, 3, 4, 5, 20).
- [46] E. Romenski, A. D. Resnyansky, and E. F. Toro. “Conservative hyperbolic formulation for compressible two-phase flow with different phase pressures and temperatures”. *Quarterly of Applied Mathematics* 65.2 (2007), pp. 259–279. DOI: [10.1090/S0033-569X-07-01051-2](https://doi.org/10.1090/S0033-569X-07-01051-2) (Cited on pp. 2, 3, 4, 5, 20).
- [47] E. Romenski and E. F. Toro. “Compressible two-phase flows: Two-pressure models and numerical methods”. *Comput. Fluid Dyn.* 13.April (2004), pp. 1–30 (Cited on p. 2).
- [48] E. I. Romenski and A. D. Sadykov. “On modeling the frequency transformation effect in elastic waves”. *Journal of Applied and Industrial Mathematics* 5.2 (2011), pp. 282–289. DOI: [10.1134/S1990478911020153](https://doi.org/10.1134/S1990478911020153) (Cited on p. 9).
- [49] E. Romenski, A. A. Belozarov, and I. M. Peshkov. “Conservative formulation for compressible multiphase flows”. *Quarterly of Applied Mathematics* 74 (2016), pp. 113–136. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1090/qam/1409> (Cited on p. 2).
- [50] E. Romenski, G. Reshetova, and I. Peshkov. “Two-phase hyperbolic model for porous media saturated with a viscous fluid and its application to wavefields simulation”. *Applied Mathematical Modelling* 106 (2022), pp. 567–600. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apm.2022.02.021> (Cited on p. 2).
- [51] E. I. Romenski. “Hyperbolic systems of thermodynamically compatible conservation laws in continuum mechanics”. *Mathematical and computer modelling* 28.10 (1998), pp. 115–130. DOI: [10.1016/S0895-7177\(98\)00159-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0895-7177(98)00159-9) (Cited on pp. 2, 4, 9, 10, 11, 20).
- [52] E. I. Romenski. “Thermodynamics and Hyperbolic Systems of Balance Laws in Continuum Mechanics”. In: *Godunov Methods*. Ed. by E. F. Toro. New York, NY: Springer US, 2001, pp. 745–761. DOI: [10.1007/978-1-4615-0663-8_75](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-0663-8_75) (Cited on pp. 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 20).
- [53] T. Ruggeri. “The Binary Mixtures of Euler Fluids: A Unified Theory of Second Sound Phenomena”. In: *Continuum Mechanics and Applications in Geophysics and the Environment*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2001, pp. 79–91. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-662-04439-1_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-04439-1_5) (Cited on p. 2).
- [54] T. Ruggeri and M. Sugiyama. *Rational Extended Thermodynamics beyond the Monatomic Gas*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2015, pp. 1–376. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-319-13341-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-13341-6) (Cited on p. 4).
- [55] R. Saurel and C. Pantano. “Diffuse-Interface Capturing Methods for Compressible Two-Phase Flows”. *Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics* 50.1 (2018), pp. 105–130. DOI: [10.1146/annurev-fluid-122316-050109](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-fluid-122316-050109) (Cited on pp. 1, 5, 9).

- [56] K. Schmidmayer, F. Petitpas, E. Daniel, N. Favrie, and S. Gavriluk. “A model and numerical method for compressible flows with capillary effects”. *Journal of Computational Physics* 334 (2017), pp. 468–496. DOI: [10.1016/j.jcp.2017.01.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2017.01.001) (Cited on pp. 2, 6, 7, 10, 17, 20).
- [57] A. Vitrano and B. Baudouy. “Double phase transition numerical modeling of superfluid helium for fixed non-uniform grids”. *Computer Physics Communications* 273 (2022), p. 108275. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpc.2021.108275> (Cited on p. 1).
- [58] J. D. van der Waals. “The thermodynamic theory of capillarity under the hypothesis of a continuous variation of density”. *Journal of Statistical Physics* 20.2 (1979), pp. 200–244. DOI: [10.1007/BF01011514](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01011514) (Cited on p. 6).