arXiv:2502.02251v1 [physics.flu-dyn] 4 Feb 2025

Geometric structure of parameter space in immiscible two-phase flow in porous media

Håkon Pedersen and Alex Hansen

PoreLab, Department of Physics, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, NO-7491 Trondheim, Norway

(Dated: February 5, 2025)

In a recent paper, a continuum theory of immiscible and incompressible two-phase flow in porous media based on generalized thermodynamic principles was formulated (Transport in Porous Media, 125, 565 (2018)). In this theory, two immiscible and incompressible fluids flowing in a porous medium are treated as a single effective fluid, substituting the two interacting subsystems for a single system with an effective viscosity and pressure gradient. In assuming Euler homogeneity of the total volumetric flow rate and comparing the resulting first order partial differential equation to the total volumetric flow rate in the porous medium, one can introduce of a novel velocity that relates the two pairs of velocities. This velocity, the co-moving velocity, describes the mutual cocarrying of fluids due to immiscibility effects and interactions between the fluid clusters and the porous medium itself. The theory is based upon general principles of classical thermodynamics, and allows for many relations and analogies to draw upon in analyzing two-phase flow systems in this framework. The goal of this work is to provide additional connections between geometric concepts and the variables appearing in the thermodynamics-like theory of two-phase flow. In this endeavor, we will encounter two interpretations of the velocities of the fluids: as tangent vectors (derivations) acting on functions, or as coordinates on an affine line. The two views are closely related, with the former viewpoint being more useful in relation to the underlying geometrical structure of equilibrium thermodynamics, and the latter being more useful in concrete computations and finding examples of constitutive relations. We apply these relatively straightforward geometric contexts to interpret the relations between velocities, and from this obtain a general form for the co-moving velocity.

I. INTRODUCTION

The formulation of an effective continuum-level theory of immiscible and incompressible two-phase flow in porous media based on rigorous physical principles is a problem of great importance spanning several disciplines within physics and mathematics [1–4]. The behavior of such flows underpins a range of complex phenomena seen in nature, industrial applications and general theoretical models where one can map a problem onto a description where two interacting populations, here being fluids, are exploring a constrained and complex network.

In the continuum limit of these complex systems, which we have to consider in order to understand diverse phenomena such as permeability, wettability properties, capillary pressure and many more [3], the macroscopic behavior depends on the interactions at the pore scale, which in turn depend on those at even smaller scales. Moreover, upon coarse-graining of a system, new behavior might emerge as a result of the interactions between the coarse-grained constituents that make up the system [5]. The choice of how one "abstracts away" the behavior of a system at some scale to yield a new system at a larger length scale depends on the available information about the physical system.

In the continuum limit where it no longer makes sense to regard the system as an immiscible mixture of two fluids moving in a solid matrix, but rather as a single fluid with complex rheological properties, one is interested in what the behavior of this system is as a function of a minimal set of macroscopic variables given that we know the individual properties of the component fluids and the porous medium. This is the same question which is asked in equilibrium thermodynamics [6], where the equilibrium state is assumed to be uniquely defined by a set of macroscopic variables, but reflecting the underlying molecular system through an equation of state.

The notion of a state is important here. In the context of immiscible two-phase flow in porous media, its meaning is that the flow is determined by the current values of the macroscopic variables alone without being dependent on how the system got there [7]. This has been investigated experimentally and computationally [8], leading to the conclusion that indeed steady-state flow is uniquely described by the values of the macroscopic variables. However, there are regions where there is history dependence in the form of hysteresis [9]. This means that there are regions in the space spanned by the control variables where flow is described by functions that are multivalued [10]. This is analogous to thermodynamics where hysteresis e.g., is a typical feature of first order phase transitions.

Two-phase flow in porous media is dissipative on the molecular scale, so it is not in equilibrium in the sense of molecular thermodynamics. However, we are free to define another notion of equilibrium based on properties of the overall flow, for instance based on volumetric flow rates. In doing so, we may map steady-state flow onto an equivalent equilibrium system [11]. Under steady-state conditions, the fluid flow should then be determined by a set of thermodynamics-like variables. With this general approach, one can map theories onto the general framework of thermodynamics and leverage thermodynamic identities to obtain relations between variables. This line of reasoning has been pursued in a series of papers that use statistical mechanics to scale up the immiscible two-phase flow problem from the pore scale to the continuum scale, leading to a thermodynamics-like mathematical structure at the continuum level [7, 11–13]. As a consequence of this approach, immiscible two-phase flow in porous media provides sensible physical analogues of quantities like energy, entropy, temperature etc. and relations like the Maxwell relations and the framework of phase transitions — however in a non-thermal setting.

Thermodynamics is at its core constrained by relations which manifest themselves in *geometric terms*. As long as one has a notion of equilibrium and seeks a minimal set of variables, the problem may be formulated as a problem of geometry [14–17]. The central idea of the present paper is to use the analogue between immiscible two-phase flow in porous media and thermodynamics to use the geometrical apparatus previously implemented for thermodynamics in the context of the immiscible two-phase flow problem.

A. Immiscible two-phase flow in porous media formulated as a thermodynamic problem

In Hansen et al. [12], Euler homogeneity was used to formulate thermodynamic relations for the steady-state seepage velocities v_w and v_n of two immiscible and incompressible fluids (respectively more wetting and less wetting with respect to the solid matrix). Central to this work was to provide a mapping between the two seepage velocities and the average seepage velocity v. By averaging, we would map $(v_w, v_n) \rightarrow v$, but it is not possible to construct a unique inverse mapping, $v \rightarrow (v_w, v_n)$. This led to the introduction of the *co-moving velocity* v_m so that $(v, v_m) \rightarrow (v_w, v_n)$, the inverse mapping. The two mappings are

$$v = S_w v_w + S_n v_n , \qquad (1)$$

$$v_m = S_w \frac{\partial v_w}{\partial S_w} + S_n \frac{\partial v_n}{\partial S_w} , \qquad (2)$$

and

$$v_w = v + S_n \left[\frac{\partial v}{\partial S_w} - v_m \right] , \qquad (3)$$

$$v_n = v - S_w \left[\frac{\partial v}{\partial S_w} - v_m \right] , \qquad (4)$$

respectively. Here S_w and S_n are the wetting and nonwetting saturations respectively, obeying

$$S_w + S_n = 1. (5)$$

We will return to these equations in Section II.

Why would one want to construct this inverse mapping, $(v, v_m) \rightarrow (v_w, v_n)$? It was observed experimentally in 2009 [18, 19] that the average seepage velocity v follows a power-law in the pressure gradient with an exponent considerably larger than one (as would be the case for Darcian flow) over a wide range of capillary numbers. This observation has been followed up in multiple papers since, see e.g., [20–28]. Experimentally, one finds this power-law behavior around a capillary number of the order of 10^{-5} and up. The power law appears when an increase in pressure gradient results in the mobilization of interfaces that would otherwise be held in place by the capillary forces. If we assume that the increase in mobilized interfaces is proportional to the increase in pressure gradient and the increase in effective permeability is proportional to the increase in mobilized interfaces, we end up with an exponent equal to two. The flow rate-pressure gradient reverts to being linear again when all interfaces that may move are moving [23]. Having the mapping from (v, v_m) to (v_w, v_n) , equations (3) and (4), makes it possible to reconstruct the seepage velocity constitutive equations for each fluid from the constitutive equation between v and the pressure gradient.

This brings us to the co-moving velocity v_m , see equation (2). We define the wetting saturation S_w in the following way: We imagine a cut through the porous medium. Part of the cut will go through the matrix and part will go through the pores. The area of the plane cutting through the pores is the pore area A_p . The wetting saturation S_w in that plane is the fraction of the pore area A_p that cut through the wetting fluid. It was shown in $[1\hat{1}]$ that a natural variable describing the comoving velocity is the flow derivative $\mu = v' = dv/dS_w$. Both numerical and experimental data point towards the constitutive equation for v_m being quite simple [4, 7, 29] and Hansen has proposed that the origin of this simplicity may be found in dimensional analysis [30]. The constitutive equation seems to be an affine function of the form

$$v_m = bv' + av_0 \quad , \tag{6}$$

to within the accuracy of the measurements. Here a and b are dependent on the viscosity ratio and pressure gradient [7, 11], and v_0 is a velocity scale.

We will in this paper in the context of geometry examine the two-way mappings

$$(v, v_m) \leftrightarrow (v_w, v_n)$$
 (7)

$$(\hat{v}_w, \hat{v}_n) \leftrightarrow (v_w, v_n)$$
, (8)

where the first mapping we have already described in equations (1) to (4). The second mapping (8) is between the thermodynamic velocities, defined as

$$\hat{v}_w = \left(\frac{\partial Q}{\partial A_w}\right)_{A_n} \,, \tag{9}$$

$$\hat{v}_n = \left(\frac{\partial Q}{\partial A_n}\right)_{A_w} , \qquad (10)$$

and the seepage velocities. We have not explicitly written out the dependence on the pressure gradient in these two expressions. Here Q is the volumetric flow rate through the cut described above, A_w is the area of the cut passing through the wetting fluid and A_n is the area of the cut passing through the non-wetting area. The thermodynamic velocities appear naturally in the thermodynamics-like formalism proposed in [11, 12].

Preliminary steps towards such a geometric interpretation was taken in [31], where different coordinate systems on the space spanned by the first quadrant of (A_w, A_n) were defined and studied. This description was completely linear, in the sense that all quantities had an interpretation as components of vectors with respect to some coordinate system. These vectors are elements of the tangent space to the space of extensive variables, and simple relations in the dual space of cotangent vectors were also considered.

The relation to equilibrium thermodynamics enters through the steady-state flow condition, which is the situation when the macroscopic variables of the system fluctuate around well-defined average values. By a transformation we will discuss in Section II, the flow problem, which is characterized by the production of molecular entropy, can be mapped onto an equivalent equilibrium system by noting that the information entropy associated with the pore-level fluid flow configurations is not being produced [11]. The maximum entropy principle may then be used to formulate a statistical mechanics [32] which in turn leads to an equilibrium thermodynamics-like formalism at the continuum scale.

Our goal is to formulate the two-phase-flow problem in a manner suitable for geometric generalizations (see below). The reason for seeking this connection is to impart validity to the claim that immiscible and incompressible two-phase flow is readily describable using principles of thermodynamics. This ties into the general problem of applying thermodynamic theories to mesoscopic systems as a whole [33, 34]. Our reasoning is that if we are able to embed the thermodynamics-like theory into the geometric framework of thermodynamics in a satisfactory manner, we can use geometric tools to obtain thermodynamic-like relations and possibly investigate thermodynamic-like processes in this system.

In the geometric interpretation of thermodynamics, the usage of mathematical structures called fiber bundles [35, 36] are prevalent. In this article, we will not go into much detail on these structures, and only consider relatively common types of fiber bundles, in particular the tangent vector bundle. While we will introduce these objects and remark where they are applicable, the structure itself will not be the main subject of this work.

More explicitly, when we speak of a "geometric formulation of thermodynamics", we refer to the *contact geometric formulation of thermodynamics* [37, 38]. A symplectic formulation of thermodynamics is also possible by introducing additional gauge variables [39]. The contactand symplectic formulations are closely related [40], but have different purposes. Contact geometry has long been recognized as an appropriate geometric setting for both equilibrium- and non-equilibrium thermodynamics, and has close ties to information theory and statistical mechanics [37]. We will not consider contact geometry in detail in this work other than a short comment in Section V A.

B. Motivation and outline

The core idea of this work is to reframe the theory initially presented in [12] using the basic concepts from two related geometric viewpoints. The first one is the basic differential geometry and (tangent) bundle structure of the configuration space of extensive variables. The second one is a classical geometric view of the velocities as points in an affine space. We will only need basic concepts from both; the difficulty here is not mathematical, but rather lies in the physical interpretation of the results. The geometric relations are motivated by the particular form of the equations to be presented in Section II.

We note that essentially all concepts used in this work are common tools in parts of mathematical physics. Our view is that a thorough introduction to these ideas are needed when put in the context of a pseudothermodynamic theory of two-phase flow in porous media, a field where primarily other techniques have been applied.

The "classical" geometric viewpoint interprets the values of the functions corresponding to the velocities introduced in Section I A as points in an affine space. The formulation in terms of differential geometry describes the velocities in the theory as (tangent) vector fields. We will see how both views, which uses many of the same types of spaces but with different objects defined on them, can aid in our understanding of what the co-moving velocity, equation (2), represents, and how to potentially work with it. Moreover, we will see how this theory relates to a constitutive relation for the co-moving velocity [7, 29, 30].

The tangent-vector formulation can be seen in relation to previous works [31]. The difference here is that the tangent vectors are considered as derivative operators, where the action of the tangent vector fields on functions defined on the space yields the velocities.

The structure of the article is as follows: in Section II, we present the preliminaries of the pseudothermodynamic theory of two-phase flow [12]. In Section III, we introduce the machinery of manifolds, tangentand affine spaces, and bundles constructed from these spaces. These bundles are the natural habitats of the vector fields presented in this work. We will also present the preliminaries of using affine spaces in the classicalgeometric viewpoint. In Section IV, we show how the comoving velocity appears in the two geometric viewpoints presented above, and how it relates to the interpretation of the equations in Section II. This is the main part of this work, with the goal of clearing up what the relations in Section II are seemingly stating in geometric terms, formulate them in terms of geometry, and show how the co-moving velocity obtained in this way relates to already known relations.

Before summing up our results in Section VI, we will in Section V comment shortly on the usage areas of the results of Section IV. Moreover, we comment on two related topics to the concepts introduced in this work, namely how the results are related to contact geometry, and the notion of a connection on a bundle.

II. PRELIMINARIES AND THE EULER HOMOGENEOUS FUNCTION THEOREM

Consider a porous medium sample as shown in Figure 1. We assume the immiscible fluids enter through the bottom and leaving through the top. The side walls are impenetrable. Within the porous medium, the fluids mix by forming clusters. The clusters merge and split, creating a steady-state. We choose a plane orthogonal to the average flow direction far enough from the bottom so that it is in the region where the flow is in a steady-state. In this plane we choose a Representative Elementary Area (REA) which is large enough for the macroscopic variables to have well-defined averages, but not larger. The REA has an area \tilde{A} . We use the tilde to signify that the area \tilde{A} is the area of a single plane. Associated to the REA, there is a time averaged volumetric flow rate Q of fluid passing through \tilde{A} at each instant.

The average value of \tilde{A} over the entire domain, defined as the integral of $\tilde{A} = \tilde{A}(z)$, where z is the coordinate along the flow direction, is denoted by A. We will define all areas in this way, as their averaged values over the domain in the overall direction of Q where the flow is in a steady state. We will in the following refer to the averaged area A as the area of the REA. We will in the following introduce several other kinds of areas. These will in the same way be averages over sets of REAs.



FIG. 1: The porous medium sample with an REA indicated. The pore area A_p can be divided into a wetting area A_w and a non-wetting area A_n so that their sum is A_p .

We define the porosity ϕ of the porous medium as

$$\phi \equiv \frac{A_p}{A} \quad , \tag{11}$$

where A_p is the area of A that cuts through the pores. The solid matrix area A_s is given by $A_s = A(1 - \phi)$. We assume the porous medium to be homogeneous. The pore area A_p is an extensive variable; it scales with a factor λ when we let $A \mapsto \lambda A$, where λ is a real number. The porosity ϕ does not change under under this scaling, i.e., it is an intensive variable.

The pore area of the REA, A_p is split into an area A_w of (more) wetting fluid and an area A_n of (less) non-wetting fluid. The the fluids are taken to be incompressible. We have that

$$A_w + A_n = A_p . (12)$$

We then define the wetting and non-wetting saturations

$$S_w = \frac{A_w}{A_p} , \qquad (13)$$

$$S_n = \frac{A_n}{A_p} , \qquad (14)$$

obeying equation (5).

Since we consider the mutual flow of two fluids, Q can be decomposed as a sum of the volumetric flow rates of the individual fluids, denoted Q_w and Q_n . We then have

$$Q(A_w, A_n) = Q_w (A_w, A_n) + Q_n (A_w, A_n) , \qquad (15)$$

so Q may be seen as a composite thermodynamic-like system consisting of two subsystems. We define the seepage velocities as

$$v = \frac{Q}{A_p} , \qquad (16)$$

$$v_w = \frac{Q_w}{A_w} , \qquad (17)$$

$$v_n = \frac{Q_n}{A_n} . \tag{18}$$

These velocities of the individual fluids passing through the REA are the ones measured in experiments.

The total volumetric flow rate Q is extensive in the variables A_w and A_n , meaning that

$$Q(\lambda A_w, \lambda A_n) = \lambda Q(A_w, A_n) .$$
(19)

We are here assuming A_w and A_n to be the control variables. The pore area A_p is then a dependent variable. This is of course not possible to arrange in the laboratory. However, theoretically it is possible.

By defining Q_w , Q_n in equation (15) as functions of A_w , A_n and not as $Q_w(A_w)$ and $Q_n(A_n)$, we imply that Q is not a sum of simple, non-interacting subsystems [6]; the "subsystem" flow rates Q_w , Q_n include interactions between the two phases of fluids. We could alternatively





write Q as the sum of two non-interacting volumetric flow rates $Q_{w,0}$, $Q_{n,0}$ and an interaction term Q_{int}

$$Q(A_w, A_n) = Q_{w,0}(A_w) + Q_{n,0}(A_n) + Q_{\text{int}}(A_w, A_n) .$$
(20)

However, we will keep to the convention in equation (15), noting that this assumption is a potential point of analysis in itself [41].

Using equations eq. (15) to eq. (18), we find equation (1). Equation (15) can then be rewritten as

$$Q = A_w v_w + A_n v_n . (21)$$

We now use the assumption that Q is degree one Euler homogeneous in the areas [12]. Taking the derivative with respect to λ on both sides of equation (19) and setting $\lambda = 1$, we get

$$Q(A_w, A_n) = A_w \left(\frac{\partial Q}{\partial A_w}\right)_{A_n} + A_n \left(\frac{\partial Q}{\partial A_n}\right)_{A_w} .$$
 (22)

By dividing equation (22) by A_p , we get

$$v = S_w \left(\frac{\partial Q}{\partial A_w}\right)_{A_n} + S_n \left(\frac{\partial Q}{\partial A_n}\right)_{A_w} .$$
 (23)

The partial derivatives acting on Q have units of velocity, so we define the *thermodynamic velocities* equations (9) and (10). We may then write equation (23) as

$$v = S_w \hat{v}_w + S_n \hat{v}_n . aga{24}$$

We will utilize the notation \hat{v}_i for the (set) (\hat{v}_w, \hat{v}_n) , and the same (un-hatted) notation for the set of seepage velocities, $v_i \equiv (v_w, v_n)$.

The thermodynamic velocities \hat{v}_i are not the same as the physical velocities v_w and v_n . Rather, the most general relation between $\{\hat{v}_i\}$ and $\{v_i\}$ that fulfills both equations (1) and (24),

$$v = S_w \hat{v}_w + S_n \hat{v}_n = S_w v_w + S_n v_n \quad , \tag{25}$$

is given by [12]

$$\hat{v}_w = v_w + S_n v_m , \qquad (26)$$

$$\hat{v}_n = v_n - S_w v_m , \qquad (27)$$

which defines the co-moving velocity, denoted v_m . Hence, the co-moving velocity which first appeared in equation (2) is a quantity with units of velocity that relates the thermodynamic and seepage velocities.

It was shown in [12] that

$$v_m + v_w - v_n = \hat{v}_w - \hat{v}_n = v'$$
, (28)

where $v' = dv/dS_w$, which will be used throughout this work.

One can show [12] that \hat{v}_i satisfies an analogue of the Gibbs-Duhem relation,

$$S_w \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\hat{v}_w}{\mathrm{d}S_w}\right) + S_n \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\hat{v}_n}{\mathrm{d}S_w}\right) = 0 \quad . \tag{29}$$

The interpretation is, like in classical thermodynamics, that the intensive thermodynamic velocities are fully dependent. In the same work, it was shown that v_m can also be expressed as equation (2). Equations (1) and (2) constitute the transformation $(v_w, v_n) \rightarrow (v, v_m)$. From the above relations, one can show that

$$\hat{v}_w = v + S_n \frac{dv}{dS_w} , \qquad (30)$$

$$\hat{v}_n = v - S_w \frac{dv}{dS_w} \,. \tag{31}$$

Combining these two equation with equations (26) and (27) leads to equations (3) and (4), constituting the transformation $(v_p, v_m) \rightarrow (v_w, v_n)$.

As already discussed, the constitutive equation for v_m (6) is to within the precision of the measurements an affine function of $v' = dv/dS_w$.

III. SPACES AND MANIFOLDS

We will in this section describe the theory presented in Section II using manifolds and bundle structures.

In [31], a two-dimensional vector space of the extensive area variables (A_w, A_n) was studied, and the terminology of manifolds was left out. The idea here is similar, but we instead define the space of extensive areas to be a twodimensional manifold where (A_w, A_n) is a possible set of coordinates labeling a point on the manifold, see Figure 3. We label this manifold by \mathcal{M} . Since we have from equation (12) that A_p is a dependent variable, we only need two independent extensive variables as coordinates on \mathcal{M} . We choose them to be A_w and A_n .

 \mathcal{M} itself does not have the structure of a vector space. However, the tangent space at each point of the manifold, which is just the space of all tangent vectors that has this point as their initial point or origin, has such a structure, see Figure 4. Since our space of extensive variables is essentially just \mathbb{R}^2 , it might seem unnecessary to separate the manifold from its tangent space. However, we cannot come to any of the conclusions in this work if we do not formally keep them separate.

The motivation for introducing a manifold and its tangent spaces is to be able to formally discern extensive and intensive variables. This is necessary to explain why our theory acts like a thermodynamic theory. As mentioned earlier, the vector spaces in [31] did not separate between the space of extensive variables and that of velocities; areas and velocities were simply elements of the same vector space. In a geometrical approach to physics, one often separates the two by means of a bundle structure, with a base-manifold acting as a configuration space, and some space of objects attached to each point of the configuration space. The geometry of classical mechanics as a whole is based on this structure, and geometric descriptions of thermodynamics use exactly the same framework. For instance, what we call "extensive" and "intensive" variables in thermodynamics are examples of canonical coordinates [40], the coordinates on the "thermodynamic phase space" analogous to the phase space of positions and momenta in Hamiltonian mechanics. Without a clear distinction between the two types of variables, we will not be able to introduce geometric structures that define thermodynamic equilibrium states, so called Legendre-manifolds [40], or talk about metrics on the thermodynamic phase space, which connect thermodynamics to statistical mechanics [42]. Thus, separating the extensive and intensive variables in the same way as in geometrical physics is a natural step in a "geometrization" of the theory in this work.



FIG. 3: The manifold spanned by the extensive areas A_w , A_n is taken to be an open subset of \mathbb{R}^2 .



FIG. 4: The tangent space $T_p\mathcal{M}$ at a point $p \in \mathcal{M}$ can be imagined as a plane (strictly speaking a vector space) attached to \mathcal{M} at the point p. A tangent vector $v \in T_p\mathcal{M}$ can be imagined as a "small arrow" tangent to the manifold. The tangent vector v can be expressed in some basis, for instance $(\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2)$.

A. Tangent space, bundle and frames

We now consider at every point $p \in \mathcal{M}$, the tangent space $T_p\mathcal{M}$ at that point, see Figure 4. The collection of all such tangent spaces of \mathcal{M} along with their points of attachments viewed as a manifold itself is called a tangent bundle [35]¹. We denote the total space of the tangent bundle of \mathcal{M} by $T\mathcal{M}$. An element of the tangent bundle $T\mathcal{M}$ is a pair (p, u), where $p \in \mathcal{M}$ is the point of attachment of the tangent space on \mathcal{M} , together with a tangent vector $u \in T_p\mathcal{M}$. We can express p in coordinates as e.g., $p = (A_w, A_n)$, and u can be expressed via the components (u_1, u_2) of the vector u expressed in some vector space basis of $T_p\mathcal{M}$. With the bundle structure follows the projection $\pi : T\mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M}$. For each (p, u), π is just the projection onto the base point p, i.e., we "forget" about the vector u.

Since $\mathcal{M} \cong \mathbb{R}^2$, we have that for each $p \in \mathcal{M}$ that $T_p\mathcal{M} \cong T_p\mathbb{R}^2 \cong \mathbb{R}^2$, and that $T\mathcal{M} \cong T\mathbb{R}^2 \cong \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2$. This means that dim $(T\mathcal{M}) = 4$.

Consider now a general tangent vector field V on \mathcal{M} , also called a section of the bundle $T\mathcal{M}$. V is a map $V: \mathcal{M} \mapsto T\mathcal{M}$, a choice of a vector $V_p \in T_p\mathcal{M}$ at every point $p \in \mathcal{M}$. We are here assuming that this choice of vector at each point is smooth in the sense that the vector components are smooth functions on the manifold. Let \mathbf{v}_i be a basis of the tangent space $T_p\mathcal{M}$. We will use a bold font on general basis vectors to separate them from their coordinates. We can as usual expand any tangent

 $^{^1}$ This is a fiber bundle with base space, where the fibers are given by the tangent spaces at each point.



FIG. 5: The chart ϕ is a (smooth) map from a neighborhood U of a point p on the general manifold \mathcal{M} (not necessarily a surface) to an open subset of \mathbb{R}^n .

vector $V_p, p \in \mathcal{M}$, in the basis \mathbf{v}_i as

$$V_p = v^i(p) \mathbf{v}_i \quad , \tag{33}$$

where v^i are the coordinates of V_p with respect to \mathbf{v}_i , which are functions of p. We use here and onwards the Einstein summation convention. Similarly, we can expand a vector field V using a set of sections \mathbf{s}_i as

$$V = f^i \mathbf{s}_i , \qquad (34)$$

where f^i are functions on \mathcal{M} .

We adopt the common convention that the basis of tangent vectors at a point $p \in \mathcal{M}$ are directional derivatives acting on smooth functions on the base space at that point [35, 43]. A chart on some open set $U \subset \mathcal{M}$ containing the point p, given e.g., by coordinate (functions) $x^i(p) \equiv (A_w, A_n)$, gives a natural basis for the tangent space $T_p\mathcal{M}$: the partial derivatives with respect to the coordinate functions x^i viewed as "attached" at p.

We introduce the notation

$$\left\{ \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \right|_p \right\}_{i=1}^n \equiv \left\{ \left. \partial_{x^i} \right|_p \right\}_{i=1}^n , \qquad (35)$$

where n is the dimension of the manifold. In the case of $p = (A_w, A_n) \in \mathcal{M}$, we then have that

$$\left\{\frac{\partial}{\partial A_w}, \frac{\partial}{\partial A_n}\right\} \equiv \left\{\partial_w, \partial_n\right\}$$
(36)

is a basis for the tangent space at each point p. The partial derivatives act on smooth functions $f : \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{R}$, which are simply functions that take points on the

 $Q = Q(A_w, A_n)$ is such a function. We can now identify the thermodynamic velocities (9)and (10) as being the basis $\{\partial_w, \partial_n\}$ acting on the function Q; we have "decoupled" the vectors from the functions on which they act. The partial derivatives with respect to A_w and A_n at a point p, denoted by $\partial_w|_p$ and $\partial_n|_p$ respectively, acting on the volumetric flow rate Q define the thermodynamic velocities. We have such a derivation at each point $p \in \mathcal{M}$, so we can view $\{\partial_w, \partial_n\}$ as coordinate vector fields on \mathcal{M} . These correspond to the sections \mathbf{s}_i in equation (34). In the same way, we from now on identify any velocity with some tangent vector acting on Q. For instance, the pore velocity function vcan be identified with a tangent vector field that has components (S_w, S_n) in the basis $\{\partial_w, \partial_n\}$, i.e. $S_w \partial_w + S_n \partial_n$. Upon acting on Q, we get the pore velocity function v.

manifold \mathcal{M} as input. The total volumetric flow rate

In the same way, we view the seepage velocities v_i as being defined by derivations acting on Q. In other words, we say that there exists a basis \mathbf{e}_i of the tangent spaces of \mathcal{M} that yield the seepage velocities upon acting on Q,

$$\mathbf{e}_i\left(Q\right) \equiv v_i , \qquad (37)$$

where i = w, n. The basis \mathbf{e}_i is strictly speaking a frame, which means that the frame elements \mathbf{e}_i could be linearly dependent.

In the following, we will use the notation v, \hat{v}_w , v_n etc. to signify the velocity functions, and use the notation V, ∂_i and \mathbf{e}_i for the vector fields associated with the velocity functions.

Note in particular that equation (22) can be written as the action of a tangent vector field on Q which acts as the identity. We have a vector field Δ acting like

$$\Delta(Q) = A^{i}\partial_{i}(Q) = A_{w}\left(\frac{\partial Q}{\partial A_{w}}\right)_{A_{n}} + A_{n}\left(\frac{\partial Q}{\partial A_{n}}\right)_{A_{w}},$$
(38)

which by equation (22) is equal to Q through the Euler theorem. Strictly speaking, we should be more careful with the notation: A_w and A_n as prefactors to ∂_w and ∂_n are here coordinates on the "fiber", the tangent space. This means that they are just the components of a vector. Meanwhile, A_w , A_n in ∂_w and ∂_n are the coordinate functions on \mathcal{M} . We will not encounter problems by not distinguishing them in this work, so we keep the notation as is for simplicity.

We have in this section shown how the velocities in Section II can be interpreted as objects on a tangent bundle with base space \mathcal{M} . When these tangent vectors act on the function Q, we obtain the ordinary velocity functions, which gives a number for each $p \in \mathcal{M}$. This simple fact is the link to the "classical" geometric viewpoint we alluded to in Section I. In what follows, we will use this relation with ordinary numbers, and motivate the introduction of affine spaces from the definition of the pore velocity v. We will then use the fact that we can relate tangent vectors to points of an affine space (the tangent vector spaces are actually affine spaces over themselves), and show how this is helpful in the geometric interpretation presented in this work.

B. Affine spaces of velocities, displacement- and tangent-vectors

Before analyzing the co-moving velocity v_m in terms of affine maps in Section IV, we review some central points concerning affine spaces, the bundle structure, and the differences between the differential-geometric and the affine descriptions presented in previous sections.

Formally, an affine space [44] is a set \mathcal{A} of points together with a vector space $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$, equipped with a map $\mathcal{A} \times \vec{\mathcal{A}} \to \mathcal{A}$. This map can be said to be the action of a vector $v \in \vec{\mathcal{A}}$ on a point $p \in \mathcal{A}$, acting as a displacement to another point $p' \in \mathcal{A}$. The "difference" between two points $p, p' \in \mathcal{A}$ can be identified with an element $v \in \vec{\mathcal{A}}$, which intuitively just mean that the difference between two points can be identified with the vector between them. We then have a space \mathcal{A} of points, and a space $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ of all displacements between points of \mathcal{A} .

Coordinates on affine spaces entail a choice of an origin (a "zero-vector") and linear basis with respect to this origin. Consider an affine space \mathcal{A} of dimension n, and let $o \in \mathcal{A}$ be a choice of origin. Let $(\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n) \equiv {\mathbf{e}_i}$ be a choice of basis of $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$. Then, any point $p \in \mathcal{A}$ can be written as

$$p = o + (p - o) = o + p^{i} \mathbf{e}_{i}$$
, (39)

where (p - o) is a vector since it is the difference of two points, which we on the second line of equation (39) expanded in the basis \mathbf{e}_i with components $\{p^i\}$. The components $\{p^i\}$ are the affine coordinates of the point p. A new choice of origin o or basis $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$ specifies a new set of affine coordinates. The choice of an origin and a linear basis with respect to this origin is an affine frame or affine basis.

An affine map f is a map between affine spaces that preserves the affine structure. Any such map $f : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$ between affine spaces \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} , with associated vector spaces $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\vec{\mathcal{B}}$ respectively, is defined by the property that for any two points $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$, we have

$$f(a) - f(b) = \lambda (a - b) , \qquad (40)$$

where λ is a linear map. Expressed equivalently, we have

$$f(p+u) = f(p) + \lambda u , \qquad (41)$$

where $p \in \mathcal{A}$ is a point, $u \in \overline{\mathcal{A}}$ is a vector, and λ is a linear map. By fixing points $o_1 \in \mathcal{A}$, and $o_2 \in \mathcal{B}$, a general affine map $f : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$ can be written in the form

$$f(p) = o_2 + (f(o_1) - o_2) + \lambda (p - o_1) , \qquad (42)$$

for $p \in \mathcal{A}$. Here, $(f(o_1) - o_2)$ is a translation of \mathcal{B} which only depends on o_1 and o_2 , and $\lambda(p - o_1)$ is a linear map of the vector $(p - o_1) \in \mathcal{A}$. At any point, we can form a vector space and define some basis with respect to this point. We can for instance take the derivative operators discussed in Section III A as a basis for the vector space at this point. In this work, we can identify it with the tangent space at that point. Thus, the vector $\lambda(p - o_1)$ can be treated as a tangent vector attached at o_1 , obtained in coordinates by specifying affine coordinates for the point p. A very important point is that by equation (42), a translation of the origin is also given by a vector, or equivalently a tangent vector in this case.

A special case of an affine map is an invertible affine map from an affine space \mathcal{A} to itself, $f : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A}$. Such a map is an affine transformation of \mathcal{A} , and satisfies

$$f(p) = o + (f(o) - o) + \lambda (p - o)$$
(43)

with $p \in \mathcal{A}$ and $o \in \mathcal{A}$ is taken as the origin, and (f(o)-o) is a translation.

For an affine combination of points $\{e_i\}$ with coefficients α_i , an affine map f satisfies

$$f\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i e_i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i f\left(e_i\right) \quad . \tag{44}$$

Let the tangent vectors introduced in the previous section act on Q, such that we obtain the ordinary velocity functions. By the map given in equations (26) and (27), we can rewrite the definition of the pore velocity function v, equation (24), as

$$v = S_w \hat{v}_w + S_n \hat{v}_n = v_m + S_w \left(\hat{v}_w - v_m \right) + S_n \left(\hat{v}_n - v_m \right) .$$
(45)

Equation (45) expresses v as an affine combination with v_m singled out as a choice of origin. Thus, we interpret the velocities v, \hat{v}_i , v_i and v_m as points of an affine space \mathcal{A} , with an associated vector space $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ of displacements. We view the space of velocities as affine since v_m determines a "moving origin", $v_m = v_m (S_w)$.

Formally the velocities are points of \mathcal{A} ,

$$v, \hat{v}_i, v_i, v_m \in \mathcal{A} , \qquad (46)$$

whereas the velocity differences $(\hat{v}_i - v_m)$ are *not* vectors in $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$. They are just functions, giving a real number for each value of the saturation S_w .

Consider two pairs of points, for example the thermodynamic velocities (\hat{v}_w, \hat{v}_n) and the seepage velocities (v_w, v_n) in \mathcal{A} . If we have a map $g \in G$ for some group G such that $g(\hat{v}_w, \hat{v}_n) = (v_w, v_n)$, the group G is said to act 2-transitively on \mathcal{A} . A prominent example of such a group is the group consisting of translations and homotheties, or the group of dilations [45]. These are examples of the affine transformations just considered. The map f in equation (51) is exactly such a 2-transitive map. That facts 2-transitively of (\hat{v}_w, \hat{v}_n) means that if we know how one velocity is mapped, the map of the other is known. This is exactly what is described by the relation defined in equations (26) and (27).

We now stress an important point regarding the relation between the "classical" and differential-geometric descriptions: the vector space of displacements $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ and the tangent vector spaces $T_p\mathcal{M}$ at each point $p \in \mathcal{M}$ are formally not the same spaces. However, they are isomorphic in the case of $\mathcal{M} \cong \mathbb{R}^2$. The tangent spaces at each point of \mathcal{M} can, in the case where we regard the underlying space to be just $\mathcal{M} \cong \mathbb{R}^n$, be identified with each other by translations. This is not possible in general; for a general manifold, each tangent space must be viewed as distinct, as the concept of simple displacements needs amending [44]. We note that in the infinitesimal (tangent vector) case, the co-moving velocity v_m is in general an example of a particular type of section of a bundle, see section V B.

In Section III A, we defined the tangent vector spaces $T_p\mathcal{M}, p \in \mathcal{M}$, without endowing \mathcal{M} itself with any particular structure. In fact, we could view \mathcal{M} itself as an affine space. As an example of why this might be useful, consider the case where we have some constant irreducible saturation in the two-phase flow system. If the irreducible saturation is associated with some constant non-vanishing flow rate, we have a constant term in our description of the areas and the velocities that we have to take into account. The problem can then be simplified if one could specify a new convenient origin in \mathcal{M} , for instance one corresponding to the irreducible saturation.

Therefore, we seen that it can be useful to view \mathcal{M} as not having a fixed origin O. The latter was considered in [31]. By specifying some origin O, one obtains a vector space structure. On the other hand, in order to refer to the relation between the choices of origins, one needs the affine structure. It turns out that in the case where we take the base space \mathcal{M} to itself be an affine space, we can identify the tangent spaces at different points of \mathcal{M} by translations of \mathcal{M} : given some vector u, one can consider the translation or displacement $\tau_u : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M}$ of all points of the affine space \mathcal{M} by this vector [45]. Note that this is a translation of all points of the space \mathcal{M} , and does not act as a derivation at a point as in the case of tangent vectors. These translations are elements of the vector space associated to \mathcal{M} viewed as an affine space.

Let this associated vector space to \mathcal{M} be denoted by $\overrightarrow{\mathcal{M}}$. We note that $\overrightarrow{\mathcal{M}}$ can be identified with the "vector space of areas" from earlier work [31]. The vector space $\overrightarrow{\mathcal{M}}$ associated to the affine space \mathcal{M} can be viewed as containing the displacements between points of \mathcal{M} , just as with \mathcal{A} and $\overrightarrow{\mathcal{A}}$ from earlier in this section. A tangent vector $u \in T_p \mathcal{M}$ can be regarded as a tangent vector to a curve (which we take to be just a line) $t \mapsto p + tu$ at the point $p \in \mathcal{M}$ [44]. Any displacement vector $u' \in \overrightarrow{\mathcal{M}}$ with the same direction as u would give the same curve. If we consider the limit where the displacement given by u' goes to zero, we see that we naturally have that we can let $u \in \overrightarrow{\mathcal{M}}$. Thus, we can view the tangent space at

each point $p \in \mathcal{M}$ as a copy of $\overrightarrow{\mathcal{M}}$ attached to p. This identification between vectors of $\overrightarrow{\mathcal{M}}$ and vectors in $T_p\mathcal{M}$ at each $p \in \mathcal{M}$ is only possible due to the affine structure of \mathcal{M} , and it is important to note that this does not hold for general manifolds. This is so because there in general is no natural way of identifying vectors at different points of a manifold without introducing a *connection* on the bundle [43, 46]. Such a connection is extraneous to the manifold itself. Note that the difference between the two is that the elements of $\overrightarrow{\mathcal{M}}$ are, intuitively, "detached" from any point p.

To sum up, we only need a single space \mathcal{M} , whose displacements live in the vector space \mathcal{M} . We can either use the tangent vectors at each point to describe the velocities at each point $p \in \mathcal{M}$, or we can let these tangent vectors act on Q and instead use the (signed) distances between points of \mathcal{M} as representing the displacements. This correspondence is possible due to the identification $\mathcal{M} \cong \mathbb{R}^2$. In the latter case, we essentially do not use the manifold structure of \mathcal{M} , and only treat it as the linear space \mathbb{R}^2 .

C. The saturation as a coordinate and parameter

In the description of velocities as points in an affine space, equation (46), we have an important relation for the space \mathcal{M} of extensive variables: we can use the velocities to identify "directions" in \mathcal{M} . More explicitly, ratios of distances (the "lengths" of the vectors in $\overrightarrow{\mathcal{M}}$) can be identified with points on an affine line $L \subset \mathcal{M}$ through their functional values. We can specify points on this line either by specifying a value of S_w , or by specifying the values of the velocity differences. We will now clarify this point.

The specific coordinates on \mathcal{M} do not really matter [31], so we specify points $p \in \mathcal{M}$ using the extensive areas, $p = (A_w, A_n) \in \mathcal{M}$. However, for practical reasons, it is often convenient to work with the coordinates [12] (S_w, A_p) , defined by

$$A_p \equiv A_w + A_n , \qquad (47)$$

$$S_w \equiv \frac{A_w}{A_w + A_n} = \frac{A_w}{A_p} . \tag{48}$$

If we view A_p as fixed and constant, we only have a single variable S_w . For each constant value $A_p = A_p^*$, S_w parametrizes a line $L \subset \mathcal{M}$ running between $(A_w, A_n) = (0, A_p^*)$ and $(A_p^*, 0)$. In these coordinates (A_w, A_n) , we have the "trivial" parametrization $(S_w A_p^*, (1 - S_w) A_p^*)$.

Since $\mathcal{M} \cong \mathbb{R}^2$, each L (one for each value of A_p^*) can be seen as an affine subspace of \mathcal{M} In terms of manifolds, L is a sub-manifold of \mathcal{M} . The usage of the term "affine subspace" in this case is only due to our identification of \mathcal{M} with the real plane \mathbb{R}^2 , viewed as a vector space itself. S_w is in this context is called an affine coordinate on the line L. Moreover, S_w is a parameter that specifies a point on the line L defined by $A_w + A_n - A_p^* = 0$. The velocity functions are equivalent to onedimensional maps of the parameter S_w , which e.g., sends $S_w \mapsto \hat{v}_w(S_w) \in L$. The relation between S_w and the velocities are obtained by solving equation (25) for S_w , finding

$$S_w = \frac{v - \hat{v}_n}{\hat{v}_w - \hat{v}_n} = \frac{v - v_n}{v_w - v_n}$$
(49)

where the velocity differences are simply the values of the corresponding functions. Thus, S_w give the position of v on the line segment with \hat{v}_w and \hat{v}_n or v_w and v_n as endpoints for v.

The view of S_w as a parameter specifying a point on the line L is quite useful for concrete computations. In fact, instead of letting A_p equal a constant A_p^* , we can consider all relations "modulo" the scale factor A_p , and work with the parameter S_w alone. By this, we mean that transformations in the parameter S_w are related to a (potentially continuous) family of lines $\{L_i\}$ in \mathcal{M} , where each line L_i is given by a linear inhomogeneous equation $aA_w + bA_n = c$, where a, b, c are constants. This serves as the entry point for continued work on the affine-geometric interpretation of the system, and connects the affine relations in this work to projective geometry [45, 47]. In this context, where we can specify points on a line L by using the "dual" intensive quantities to the extensive variables, the velocities $\{v, \hat{v}_w, \hat{v}_n\}$, or equivalently $\{v, v_w, v_n\}$, can be called a type of projective basis or projective frame [47, 48]. A map of the velocities sending $\hat{v}_i \mapsto v_i$ can in this context be said to be a map defined on the dual space of \mathcal{M} . What is meant by "dual" depends on the context, but in this specific case, one is referring to the projective dual of \mathcal{M} , denoted \mathcal{M}^* . This is simply the space where each point $a \in \mathcal{M}^*$ represents a line in \mathcal{M} . The velocities can then be seen as elements of \mathcal{M}^* , since they exactly specify lines in \mathcal{M} . This can be seen by writing equation (25) as

$$A_w (\hat{v}_w - v) + A_n (\hat{v}_n - v) = A_w (v_w - v) + A_n (v_n - v) = 0.$$
 (50)

In equation (50), (A_w, A_n) specifies points of \mathcal{M} , while the (ratio of the) velocities give the slope of the line through the point (A_w, A_n) . In the special case that $\mathcal{M} \cong \mathbb{R}^2$, this duality is trivial, however, this is the formal relation between the extensive and intensive variables in the affine viewpoint. We will not need more specifics about these spaces, and reserve this for future work.

IV. THE CO-MOVING VELOCITY AND AFFINE MAPS

We will now investigate how the co-moving velocity v_m , first presented in equation (2), can be described in terms of the two views of the velocities presented in previous sections. As already mentioned in Section III B, we have a natural identification between the tangent spaces

at each point of \mathcal{M} and the vector space \mathcal{M} of displacements of points of \mathcal{M} . From the discussion in the preceding sections, we can work with either the distances between points given by the differences $(v_i - v_m)$, or with tangent vectors at each point. We will start by using the former description, where it is implicit that we have restricted ourselves to a line $L \subset \mathcal{M}$ such that S_w is a parameter along L, as discussed in the previous section. We will then use the tangent vector description to write the relations in terms of vector components, before simplifying the obtained relations. The result will in the two cases be an expression for a function of $v' = dv/dS_w$ and a vector field corresponding to the co-moving velocity v_m respectively.

A. v_m from affine maps

Let f be an affine map. We now use use the property of affine maps in equation (44). Comparing with equation (25), we see that the mapping $\{\hat{v}_i\} \mapsto \{v_i\}$, which we call f, by definition should satisfy

$$v = f(v) = f(S_w \hat{v}_w + S_n \hat{v}_n)$$

= $S_w f(\hat{v}_w) + S_n f(\hat{v}_n)$
= $S_w v_w + S_n v_n$, (51)

which holds since $S_w + S_n = 1$ at all times. Thus, f can be seen as an affine map $f : \hat{v}_i \mapsto v_i$ leaving the convex combination v invariant.

The details about the map f depends on which interpretation we have for the velocities. As expressed in the discussion around equation (51), f as a map of the velocities is formally a map on \mathcal{M}^* , the space of lines in \mathcal{M} . However, since we can simply view the velocities as functions of S_w only, f is simply a map of the one-dimensional number line \mathbb{R} . It is not important if this number line is embedded in some higher dimensional space. We will call this line l, the image of $S_w \in L$ under the velocity functions. This is what we will take as the meaning of the map f of the velocities: as a map of their functional values on the line l. We will return to the case of f acting on tangent vectors, where the idea is exactly the same but expressed differently.

With the notion of an affine map f, we can revisit the right hand side of equation (45). The velocities $(\hat{v}_n + S_n v_m)$, $(\hat{v}_n + S_w v_m)$ are in this case not velocity differences; they are expressions of a particular affine map called a homothety, see Section IV B. In fact, v itself can be written as a homothety. To see this, we rewrite equation (25) as

$$v = \hat{v}_w + S_n \left(\hat{v}_n - \hat{v}_w \right) = v_w + S_n \left(v_n - v_w \right) , \quad (52)$$

where the middle and third expressions respectively are homotheties of ratio S_n with centers v_w and \hat{v}_w [45].

Consider $\{\hat{v}_i\}$ and $\{v_i\}$ as points in two affine spaces \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} with associated vector spaces $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\vec{\mathcal{B}}$ respectively.

$$f(\hat{v}_w) - f(\hat{v}_n) = v_w - v_n$$
$$= \frac{dv}{dS_w} - v_m .$$
(53)

The velocity difference $(v_w - v_n)$, where $v_i = f(\hat{v}_i)$, is then equivalent to a linear map λ of $(\hat{v}_w - \hat{v}_n)$ according to Section III B. In writing, $(f(\hat{v}_w) - f(\hat{v}_n)) = (v_w - v_n)$, we can specify a choice of origin in \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} . We choose the origins $o \in \mathcal{A}$ and $p \in \mathcal{B}$, and use equation (42) and equation (53) to write

$$f(\hat{v}_w) = f(\hat{v}_n) + \lambda(\hat{v}_w - \hat{v}_n) , \qquad (54)$$

which from Section III B is equivalent to

$$f(o+u) = p + (f(o) - p) + \lambda u$$

= $p + \lambda u$, (55)

for some vector u, and where we let $f(o) \equiv p$. We can then set $f(o+u) = f(\hat{v}_w)$, the new origin $p = f(\hat{v}_n)$, $\lambda u = (v' - v_m)$. The point is that the affine map f also moves the origins of the velocities.

As before, we can associate the vector u with its (Euclidean) length of the distance between points on the line l. Thus, the meaning of equation (55) is simply that a velocity defined by the distance u from some origin o is mapped to a new origin p and a linear map of the distance u. Even if we a priori have no preferred way of defining such an origin or vector u, the map f suggests that the origin should move, and the distance u from the origin is scaled by λ .

We are now ready for a simple yet important result. Comparing equation (53) to the definition in equation (40), we see that we can write

$$f(\hat{v}_w) - f(\hat{v}_n) = \lambda \left(\hat{v}_w - \hat{v}_n\right)$$
$$= \lambda \left(v'\right) = v' - v_m , \qquad (56)$$

where λ is a linear map. In one dimension, the only linear maps are multiplication by a scalar, so λ is just a number. Thus, we have

$$v_m = (1 - \lambda) v' . \tag{57}$$

Comparing equation (57) to equation (6), we see that we can identify $(1 - \lambda) \equiv b$. However, the term av_0 in equation (6) does not appear from considering an affine map f in this way. We will see that we get the same result when treating the velocities as tangent vector fields in section IV C.

B. Homotheties and irreducible capillary flow

Intuitively, equation (52) means that v is the point located at a fraction S_n along the line segment between \hat{v}_w and \hat{v}_n in \mathcal{A} . Thus, if either \hat{v}_w or \hat{v}_n (or both) were to change while v was kept fixed, S_n would also change, and hence also $S_w = 1 - S_n$. Thus, any change in one of the thermodynamic velocities is accompanied by an equal and opposite change in the other thermodynamic velocity. This is the relation between the middle and last expression in equation (52), and also in equation (51). In fact, affine maps are the only maps that "commute" with the saturation S_n in this way, which we see is the defining property which we use to introduce v_m through eqs. (26) and (27).

Let τ_u be a translation of \mathcal{A} by the vector u and let $h_{s,\lambda}$ be a homothety of center s and ratio λ . A composition of τ_u and $h_{s,\lambda}$, since the set of translations and homotheties of an affine space forms a group [45], is again a homothety $\tilde{h}_{\tilde{s},\lambda}$ of center \tilde{s} . Explicitly, if $h_{s,\lambda} : p \mapsto s + \lambda (p - s)$, and $\tau_u : p \mapsto p + u$ with u a vector, we have

$$\tau_u \circ h_{s,\lambda} : p \mapsto s + u + \lambda \left(p - s \right) \ . \tag{58}$$

We can rewrite equation (58) as a new homothety \tilde{h} with respect to a point \tilde{s} and the same ratio λ as

$$\tau_u \circ h_{s,\lambda} : p \mapsto s + \frac{u}{1-\lambda} + \lambda \left(p - \left(s + \frac{u}{1-\lambda} \right) \right) .$$
 (59)

If we define

$$\tilde{s} = s + \frac{u}{1 - \lambda} , \qquad (60)$$

we can define $\tau_u \circ h_{s,\lambda} \equiv \tilde{h}_{\tilde{s},\lambda}$ and write equation (59) as

$$\tilde{h}_{\tilde{s},\lambda}: p \mapsto \tilde{s} + \lambda \left(p - \tilde{s}\right)$$
 (61)

The formalism in terms of homotheties as defined above can be applied directly to the system studied in Section 7.3 of Reference [12]. This system consist of Ncapillary fibers in parallel, of which N_s have smaller cross section a_s and the rest, $N_l = N - N_s$ have a larger cross section a_l . We assume the smaller cross section is so small than only the wetting fluid can enter these capillaries. Each capillary is filled with either wetting or non-wetting only. The wetting pore area is then $A_w = A_s + A_{lw}$ where $A_s = N_s a_s$ and A_{lw} is the area of the large capillaries that are filled with wetting fluid. This means that the system has an irreducible saturation given by $S_{w,i} = A_s/A_p$. Hence, the wetting area is given by $A_w = A_p S_{w,i} + A_p (S_w - S_{w,i})$. The non-wetting saturation is given by $S_n = 1 - S_w$. We denote the velocity of the non-wetting fluid by v_n , and the velocity of the wetting fluid in the small capillaries v_{sw} and in the large capillaries by v_{lw} . The average flow velocities through the capillary fiber bundle is then

$$v = S_{w,i}v_{sw} + (S_w - S_{w,i})v_{lw} + S_nv_n .$$
 (62)

We may now interpret the velocities as points in a space \mathcal{A} . We combine equations (1) and (62) to find

$$S_w v_w = S_{w,i} v_{sw} + (S_w - S_{w,i}) v_{lw} .$$
 (63)

We express v_w by dividing the left hand side of equation (63) by S_w , and insert this into equation (52) to obtain

$$v = v_{w} + S_{n} (v_{n} - v_{w})$$

$$= \left[v_{lw} + \frac{S_{w,i}}{S_{w}} (v_{sw} - v_{lw}) \right]$$

$$+ S_{n} \left[v_{n} - \left(v_{lw} + \frac{S_{w,i}}{S_{w}} (v_{sw} - v_{lw}) \right) \right]$$

$$= v_{lw} + \frac{S_{w,i}}{1 - S_{n}} (v_{sw} - v_{lw})$$

$$+ S_{n} \left[v_{n} - \left(v_{lw} + \frac{S_{w,i}}{1 - S_{n}} (v_{sw} - v_{lw}) \right) \right] . \quad (64)$$

Comparing equation (64) to equations (59) and (60), we see that we have defined a composition of a homothety of ratio S_n of the point v_n with respect to the center v_{lw} and the translation of the point v_{lw} by the constant vector $S_{w,i}(v_{sw} - v_{lw})$. We can thus identify it with a translation of the origin from $S_{w,i}v_{lw}$ to $S_{w,i}v_{sw}$. We may then rewrite equation (64) one last time as

$$v = v_{lw} - v_m + S_n \left(v_n - (v_{lw} - v_m) \right) ,$$
 (65)

where we have identified

$$v_m = \frac{S_{w,i}}{S_w} \left(v_{lw} - v_{sw} \right) \ . \tag{66}$$

Comparing equation (65) to equation (61), we get that $\tilde{s} = v_{lw} - v_m$, meaning it can be viewed as a translation of the homothetic center v_{lw} . v_m is exactly the translation vector of the homothetic center in the space of velocities.

We find from equation (62) that

$$v' = \frac{dv}{dS_w} = v_{lw} - v_n . agenum{67}$$

Hence, v_m in this system is *not* on the form suggested by equation (57). The reason for this is that there is no mechanism in the capillary fiber bundle system to generate an equilibrium thermodynamics as the fibers are non-interacting.

We have in section IV A related v_m to the affine map f, with the result that eq. (57) is linear in v'. Equation (56) means that f acts the same way on both thermodynamic velocities. This restriction is what gives us eq. (57). When the constituent subsystems do not interact with each other as in the capillary fiber bundle example, which in general can happen in sub-regions of the saturation range, we see that we do not have a single map f acting as in eq. (56). However, the velocity v itself can be expressed in terms of a homothety, which is affine. This means that eq. (57) is not correct in this case. Solving eq. (66) for v_{lw} and inserting into eq. (66) gives us

$$v_m = \frac{S_{w,i}}{S_w} v' + \frac{S_{w,i}}{S_w} \left(v_n - v_{sw} \right) , \qquad (68)$$

which contains a linear transformation in v'^2 and a translation term which moves the origin. In section VB, we will see some solutions for describing this geometrically.

C. v_m as a tangent vector field

We now turn to the interpretation of velocities as tangent vectors in the tangent spaces of \mathcal{M} , where \mathcal{M} is again viewed as a manifold. We will exploit the fact that $\mathcal{M} \cong \mathbb{R}^2$ to circumvent a discussion of connections (see Section VB) and mathematical fiber bundles (see). We will simply say that we are able to choose an origin o in each tangent space that may depend on the point $p \in \mathcal{M}$. We regard vectors in the tangent space $T_p \mathcal{M}$ to be attached at the point $o \in T_p \mathcal{M}$. This origin is given by some section s of $T\mathcal{M}$ which we assume to be nonvanishing for the domain in \mathcal{M} we are considering. This means that the vector field itself has no singular points. A section of a bundle exists independently of a representation in terms of coordinates, so there is no intrinsic way of defining coordinates for a section unless more structure is provided.

We can encode an "indeterminate" origin in the tangent spaces of the bundle $T\mathcal{M}$ by letting the origin of the tangent spaces be given by a section s_0 . This gives us an affine bundle [49], where the fibers are now related by affine maps. We cannot use the choice s_0 to define the coordinates of the section s_0 itself; the choice of s_0 is rather a part of the choice of affine frame generalized to the bundle (see section III B), which allows us to define coordinates for vectors ³.

For now, we disregard s_0 , and consider a single tangent space $T_p\mathcal{M}$. Recall that $T_p\mathcal{M}$ is itself an affine space, denoted \mathcal{A}_p with an associated vector space $\vec{\mathcal{A}}_p$. We consider the origin of $\vec{\mathcal{A}}_p$ as a point $\hat{o} \in \mathcal{A}_p$. Let another choice of origin be o. A choice of o in each fiber is determined by a section s. In each tangent space, we can then identify a vector $(o\hat{o})_p = u \in \vec{\mathcal{M}}_p$ between the points $\hat{o}, o \in \mathcal{A}_p$, and this vector can be decomposed into components. We have a choice of such a vector in each tangent space, given by the section s. Thus, we can associate the section s to a vector field that we can describe using vector components. We rename this field from s to V_m , to make the analogy clear. Note that this is exactly what is implied by the right hand side of equation (45).

We use the index $\alpha = w, n$, to label which velocity we are referring to. For each α , a vector is given by two components, because dim $(T_p\mathcal{M}) = 2$. Since we here view each $T_p\mathcal{M}$ as an affine space, every vector is defined with respect to some choice of origin which in general is a

² The map is non-linear in S_w , but appears as a multiplicative factor of v', hence the map of v' is linear.

³ An application of this formalism is seen in mechanics, see [50]. We follow the same reasoning here.

function of the point $p \in \mathcal{M}$. As done before, we use the notation \mathcal{A} for the affine space of points corresponding to $T_p\mathcal{M}$, and $\overrightarrow{\mathcal{M}}$ for the associated vector space.

We label the velocities viewed as points of the affine space \mathcal{A}_p by a left superscript ${}^p(\cdot)$. Thus, the thermodynamic velocities, denoted ${}^p\hat{v}_{\alpha}$, and the seepage velocities, ${}^pv_{\alpha}$, which we stress are not functions but abstract points of $T_p\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{A}$, are then expressed as

$${}^{p}\hat{v}_{\alpha} = \hat{o}_{\alpha} + \hat{v}_{\alpha} , \qquad (69)$$

$${}^{p}v_{\alpha} = o_{\alpha} + \vec{v}_{\alpha} , \qquad (70)$$

where $\hat{o}_{\alpha}, o_{\alpha} \in \mathcal{A}, \ \vec{v}_{\alpha}, \vec{v}_{\alpha} \in \vec{\mathcal{A}}$. We here regard the points and velocities corresponding to the thermodynamic- and seepage velocities to belong to the same affine- and vector space, which simplifies the notation in Section IV.

In the notation introduced above, we can write the relations in equations (26) and (27 as)

$${}^{p}\hat{v}_{\alpha} - {}^{p}v_{\alpha} = (\hat{o}_{\alpha} + \vec{v}_{\alpha}) - (o_{\alpha} + \vec{v}_{\alpha})$$
$$= (\hat{o}_{\alpha} - o_{\alpha}) + (\vec{v}_{\alpha} - \vec{v}_{\alpha})$$
$$= O_{\alpha}^{j}\mathbf{e}_{j,\alpha} + \lambda_{\alpha}^{j}\mathbf{e}_{j,\alpha}$$
$$\equiv v_{\alpha}^{j}\mathbf{e}_{j,\alpha} , \qquad (71)$$

where the index j runs over the dimension of \mathcal{A} , dim $(\mathcal{A}) = 2$, and $v_{\alpha}^{j} = (O_{\alpha}^{j} + \lambda_{\alpha}^{j})$. λ_{α}^{j} are the components of the tangent vectors in $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$. Thus, we see that by introducing a shift in the origin, the new components are linear inhomogeneous functions (in other words affine functions) of the components λ_{α}^{j} .⁴

In equation (71), we expanded $(\hat{o}_{\alpha} - o_{\alpha})$ and $(\vec{v}_{\alpha} - \vec{v}_{\alpha})$ in the same basis \mathbf{e}_{α}^{j} . In particular, the basis is not dependent on which velocity we are referring to, as the basis is the same for all α . Therefore, we have $\mathbf{e}_{j,\alpha} = \mathbf{e}_{j}$, i.e. we drop the index α .

The last line in equation (71) then defines two comoving velocities,

$${}^{p}\hat{v}_{w} - {}^{p}v_{w} = v_{w}^{j}\mathbf{e}_{j} \equiv S_{n}\overline{v_{m}^{w}}, \qquad (72)$$

$$v^{p}\hat{v}_{n} - {}^{p}v_{n} = v^{j}_{n}\mathbf{e}_{j} \equiv -S_{w}\overrightarrow{v^{n}_{m}}.$$
 (73)

The quantities $\overrightarrow{v_m}^{\alpha}$ are written as vectors because they are defined as the difference between two points, hence vectors. In Section II, invariance of v requires that $\overrightarrow{v_m}^{\overrightarrow{w}} = \overrightarrow{v_m}^{\overrightarrow{n}} \equiv \overrightarrow{v_m}$. This places restrictions upon the coefficients v_{α}^{j} .

We now adopt the view in equation (51), namely that the mapping in equation (8) is given by an affine map f, or in this case: an affine transformation. This view presents no new difficulties, and just means that we view the components in equation (71) as being related by the map f. From Section III B, we then have that

$$\vec{v}_{\alpha} = \bar{f}\left(\vec{\hat{v}}_{\alpha}\right) \,, \tag{74}$$

$$o_{\alpha} = f(\hat{o}_{\alpha}) , \qquad (75)$$

where \bar{f} is the linear part of the affine map f. If the components of the linear part \hat{v}_{α} of ${}^{p}\hat{v}_{\alpha}$ (same for the seepage velocities) with respect to the basis \mathbf{e}_{j} are x_{α}^{j} , then the components of \hat{v}_{α} are related to x_{α}^{j} by a linear transformation, $x_{\alpha}^{j} \mapsto x_{\alpha}^{i} \bar{\lambda}_{i,\alpha}^{j}$. Since we in equation (51) only use a single map f, the linear transformation is equal for $\alpha = w, n$, so we can drop the index α on the matrix representation of the linear transformation. The assumption that the mapping in equation (8) is given by a single map f is the simplest choice we can make. If we allowed for a pair of maps, meaning that $f \mapsto f_{\alpha}$, the transformation would not be affine. This would also imply that we have two thermodynamic velocities, meaning $v_{m}^{w} \neq v_{m}^{n}$, which makes us unable to define a single $\overline{v_{m}}$

From the above, we can now rewrite equation (71) as

$$\hat{v}_{\alpha} - v_{\alpha} = (\hat{o}_{\alpha} - o_{\alpha}) + (\vec{v}_{\alpha} - \vec{v}_{\alpha})$$

$$= (\hat{o}_{\alpha} - f(\hat{o})_{\alpha}) + (\vec{v}_{\alpha} - \bar{f}(\vec{v}_{\alpha}))$$

$$= O_{\alpha}^{j} \mathbf{e}_{j} + (x_{\alpha}^{j} - x_{\alpha}^{i} \bar{\lambda}_{i}^{j}) \mathbf{e}_{j}$$

$$= (O_{\alpha}^{j} + x_{\alpha}^{i} (I_{i}^{j} - \bar{\lambda}_{i}^{j})) \mathbf{e}_{j} .$$
(76)

where I_i^j is the identity matrix, x_{α}^j are the components of \vec{v}_{α} in the basis \mathbf{e}_j , and $\bar{\lambda}_i^j$ is the matrix-representation of the linear transformation \bar{f} . Using equation (76) and equations (71) — (73), we can then write the difference $({}^pv_w - {}^pv_n)$ as equations (72 and (73)⁶

$${}^{p}v_{w} - {}^{p}v_{n} = \left(v_{w}^{j} - v_{n}^{j}\right)\mathbf{e}_{j}$$

$$= \left[\left(x_{w}^{j} - x_{n}^{j}\right) + \left(x_{n}^{i}\bar{\lambda}_{i}^{j} - x_{w}^{i}\bar{\lambda}_{i}^{j}\right)\right]\mathbf{e}_{j}$$

$$= \left[\left(x_{w}^{j} - x_{n}^{j}\right) + \left(x_{n}^{i} - x_{w}^{i}\right)\bar{\lambda}_{i}^{j}\right]\mathbf{e}_{j}$$

$$= \left(x_{w}^{i} - x_{n}^{i}\right)\left(I_{i}^{j} - \bar{\lambda}_{i}^{j}\right)\mathbf{e}_{j}$$
(77)

To relate equation (77) to v_m , we need to make some restrictions. We choose coordinates (S_w, A_p) on \mathcal{M} , which induces the coordinate basis $(\partial_{S_w}, \partial_{A_p})$ on the tangent space. In general, both vectors enter into equation (77).

⁴ Affine functions of the components of the vectors is central in the definition of affine bundles, see e.g. [51].

⁵ In eq. (71), this assumption also means that the origins for v_w and v_n are taken to be the same.

⁶ Note that if we had allowed for unequal origins, the matrices in equation (77) would have the index α (i.e. they would be tensors), and there would be an additional term due to potentially different choices of origin for v_w and v_n .

We can now either set $A_p = A_p^*$ where A_p^* is a constant (which essentially means that we restrict to a subspace or "sub-manifold" of \mathcal{M}), or consider the extensive variables on \mathcal{M} up to a common factor of λ , where λ need not be constant (we could here e.g. set $\lambda = A_p$). The two possibilities give us two potential definitions of the saturation, which we could label $S_w^{A_p^*}$ and S_w^{λ} . The former definition is the most straightforward, where all quantities are seen in relation to a "absolute" total area. The latter possibility is related to projective spaces, which is outside the scope of this work. However, no matter which of the two possibilities is invoked, the basis \mathbf{e}_j reduces to a single element, and we label this single element simply by ∂_{S_w} as before. The fourth line in equation (77) is then trivial, and can be simplified to

$${}^{p}v_{w} - {}^{p}v_{n} = \tilde{\gamma}\partial_{S_{w}}$$
$$= (1 - \gamma)\partial_{S_{w}}$$
(78)

equation (78) can, upon acting on the function Q, be identified with $(v' - v_m)$, so that $\gamma \partial_{S_w} \equiv \vec{v}_m$ where γ is a function on \mathcal{M} . Equation (78) has the same content as equation (57), only described in terms of tangent vectors. Moreover, as in equation (57), we cannot explicitly get a term corresponding to the constant av_0 in equation (6). We will return to this and its generalization in section V B.

V. DISCUSSION AND CONNECTION TO FURTHER FORMALISMS

The two ways of viewing the velocities discussed in this work might seem almost equivalent, but the two approaches represent very different views of the base space and the velocities. In viewing the velocities simply as "points on a line" in Section IIIB, the velocities are then examples of homogeneous coordinates [45, 52] on projective spaces. These coordinates can be interpreted as labels for points along the real number line (in our case), which we are free to regard as the function values corresponding to the velocities. The co-moving velocity is in this context simply another point on the number line. This way of viewing the velocities allow for working with concrete numbers. In viewing the velocities as points of an affine space attached to each point of the base space of extensive variables, we loose the "tangibility" of the "classical" method. However, the language of bundles and manifolds underpins investigations into the geometry of thermodynamics.

As a sidenote, we see from the considerations in Section IV that we cannot get an isolated constant term av_0 as in the phenomenological constitutive relation in equation (6) in the framework presented here.⁷ This conclusion

follows from the observation that the map in equation (8) is given by a single affine transformation, the affine map f. The term av_0 was first obtained [12] from fits of experimental data. A physical interpretation of it was then presented in [30]: we have from equations (28) and (6) that

$$av_0 = [v_n - v_m]_{dv/dS_w = 0} , \qquad (79)$$

if the average seepage velocity has a minimum for some saturation S_w . There is, however, no *a priori* reason to believe that this term should follow from an analytical approach based on geometry with only two independent variables. However, the space of extensive variables \mathcal{M} is strictly speaking not complete as is. The statistical mechanics formalism based on Jaynes maximum entropy principle [32] developed by Hansen et al. [11, 53] includes configurational entropy, and it is natural that it is included in \mathcal{M} .

A. A note on contact geometry

As mentioned in Section I, contact geometry [40] is the appropriate setting for for a formalization of classical thermodynamics. The idea is to introduce a thermodynamic phase space M of extensive and intensive quantities in the system, which in classical thermodynamics would be e.g. energy, entropy, volume and particle numbers along with conjugate variables. If there are n + 1 extensive variables, we have n intensive variables, so the total number of variables are 2n + 1. Therefore, dim (M) = 2n + 1. All the thermodynamic variables are initially taken to be independent. One then introduces a contact one-form, which is just the Gibbs one-form from thermodynamics. If we take only energy E, entropy Sand volume V as extensive variables, the contact form Θ looks like

$$\Theta = dE - \gamma_S dS + \gamma_V dV , \qquad (80)$$

The quantities γ_S , γ_V are in equilibrium thermodynamics just the temperature T and pressure P, however, they are not identified as such initially: this is only the case on some sub-manifold $N \subset M$ that characterizes the equilibrium states of the system. In fact, the contact form Θ defines such a sub-manifold as $\Theta = 0$, called a Legendre sub-manifold [40]. More concretely, the contact form Θ defines a distribution \mathcal{D} on M, which is just the selection of a subspace $L_x \subseteq T_x M$ of the tangent space $T_x M$ at each $x \in M$. Given such a distribution \mathcal{D} stemming from the contact form Θ in equation (80), it turns out

⁷ Strictly speaking, it can be done if the factor in front of v' and

 $[\]partial_{S_w}$ in equation (57) and equation (78) contains a term that cancels v' exactly as $v' \to 0$, i.e. a term $\sim (v')^{-1}$. However, such a term would not correspond to any well-defined vector field, or would require knowing the function Q itself.

that the Legendre sub-manifolds $N \subset M$ that has the distribution \mathcal{D} as its tangent space have maximal dimension n. Such sub-manifolds N are more generally called called integral sub-manifolds [44, 52] of the distribution $\mathcal{D}^{.8}$ A curve c = c(t) in M that lies on N can be interpreted as some quasi-static thermodynamic process. The tangent vectors to the curve c(t) are all contained in \mathcal{D} , which means that the curve cannot "leave" the equilibrium manifold N. It turns out that on the integral sub-manifolds N, we have exactly

$$\gamma_S|_N = \frac{\partial E}{\partial S} , \qquad (81)$$

$$-\gamma_V|_N = \frac{\partial E}{\partial V} , \qquad (82)$$

in accordance with equilibrium thermodynamics. The energy E is here expressed as a function E = E(S, V). In N, E is exactly what is called a thermodynamic potential.

The parallel between thermodynamics and the formalism discussed here and in [11, 53] has been developed in References [11, 53]. We discuss contact geometry in this context in the following, however, without including the configurational entropy, and its conjugate, the agiture (a temperature-like variable). We have the extensive variable Q expressed as $Q = Q(A_w, A_n)$. The related contact form is then

$$\Theta = dQ - \gamma_{A_w} dA_w - \gamma_{A_n} dA_n , \qquad (83)$$

where $\gamma_{A_w}, \gamma_{A_n}$ are identified with \hat{v}_w, \hat{v}_n respectively on an equilibrium sub-manifold, which in our case means steady-state flow. v_m enters when the form in equation (83) restricted to the steady-state manifold is rewritten as[31]

$$\Theta = dQ - (v_w + S_n v_m) dA_w - (v_n - S_w v_m) dA_n = 0.$$
(84)

Note that formally, the quantities S_w and S_n must in general be treated as independent of A_w , A_n , see Section V B. It is clear that v_w and v_n in place of the thermodynamic velocities in equation (83) restricted to the steady state manifold would not define a Legendre sub-manifold. v_m is then a correction that brings us back to this equilibrium sub-manifold.

In the above, we have used the assumption of extensivity of Q in the remaining extensive variables. This produces the well-known Gibbs-Duhem relation [12]. In a geometric context, degree-1 homogeneity in the extensive variables reduces the thermodynamic phase space M[54] in the following sense: if the thermodynamic phase space M is decomposed as $M = \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{I} = \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}^n$, where the space \mathcal{E} , dim $(\mathcal{E}) = n+1$, contains the variables we denote as "extensive" and \mathcal{I} , dim $(\mathcal{I}) = n$, contains the variables we denote as "intensive", the homogeneityrequirement on the extensive variables sends $\mathcal{E} = \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ to the quotient space [44] $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$, the projectivization of \mathcal{E} . Thus, projective spaces occur naturally when we introduce homogeneity, and a further study of these types of spaces can be undertaken when working with the velocities as introduced in Section III B.⁹

Contact geometry is, as stated in Section IA, closely related to Hamiltonian mechanics [40], which utilizes Hamiltonian functions (which are smooth functions on phase space), which again defines Hamiltonian vector fields. The integral curves of these vector fields yields equations of motions for the Hamiltonian system. Similar types of relations hold in geometric formulations of thermodynamics [40, 54]. In this work, a choice of Hamiltonian corresponds to a choice of Q. This means that the function Q itself is assumed to contain all the information about the system.

B. Connections and bundle structure

When introducing the description in terms of vector fields in the context of this work, one is faced with the difficulty of making sense of expressions like equation (28). Here, the derivative operator ∂_{S_m} is a vector field. Moreover, we replace the function v by a vector field $V = S_w \partial_w + S_n \partial_n$. We therefore have a situation where we are evaluating the derivative of a section V in the direction of another section, ∂_{S_w} . This "derivative of a section" of the tangent bundle with respect to another section necessitates a way of connecting the tangent spaces at different points of the base manifold \mathcal{M} , since we are asking precisely how a vector field changes if we follow it along another vector field along its integral curves on \mathcal{M} . Thus, we need the general concept of a connection [43, 52, 55] on the tangent bundle. There are many realizations of this concepts, and a thorough treatment is outside the scope of this work. What we will say is that one way of working with a connection is via the covariant derivative [43], which measures the change in the components of a vector field and the frame itself along another vector field.

An important point about the covariant derivative is that it solves the specific problem of differentiating tangent vectors to the tangent bundle $T\mathcal{M}$ as a whole, and not only tangent vectors to the base space \mathcal{M} . To get a tangent vector that actually lies in the tangent space, one needs a way of "projecting" these vectors back to the tangent space. This is often done via the use of a metric

⁸ These sub-manifolds N are also called leaves of the distribution \mathcal{D} .

⁹ Projective spaces are also relevant for the intensive variables: one can introduce an additional "gauge" variable[39, 40] in \mathcal{I} , which is often more convenient to work with. The intensive variables are an example of homogeneous coordinates on \mathcal{I} , which are the standard type of coordinates used when working with projective spaces.

[43]. Note that we have not assumed any type of metric structure on the space of extensive variables or the thermodynamic phase space as a whole. This is a topic of ongoing research (see [14, 16]) which is closely tied to information theory and the Hessian of the entropy (or energy) of the system. However, in our case we have *a priori* no knowledge of a metric, which means that we have no idea of knowing what the contribution from such a structure on the base space \mathcal{M} . We will therefore leave the discussion about metrics here.

In the case of $V = S_w \partial_w + S_n \partial_n$ and ∂_{S_w} , we can form the covariant derivative $\nabla_{\partial_{S_w}} V$, where V is expressed in the coordinate frame (∂_w, ∂_n) . Recall that we associated the general (possibly non-coordinate or anholonomic) frame $(\mathbf{e}_w, \mathbf{e}_n)$ to the seepage velocities. V expressed in this frame is then just $V = S_w \mathbf{e}_w + S_n \mathbf{e}_n$. A general expression for the covariant derivative using an arbitrary frame $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$ and vector fields X, u is [43]

$$\nabla_{u}X = \left(u^{j}\mathbf{e}_{i}\nabla_{\mathbf{e}_{j}}\left(X^{i}\right) + u^{j}X^{i}\nabla_{\mathbf{e}_{j}}\left(\mathbf{e}_{i}\right)\right)$$
$$= \left(u^{j}\mathbf{e}_{j}\left(X^{k}\right) + X^{i}u^{j}\Gamma_{ji}^{k}\right)\mathbf{e}_{k} \quad , \qquad (85)$$

where Γ_{ii}^k are the connection coefficients¹⁰ of the connection with respect to the basis, and the notation $\mathbf{e}_{i}(v^{k})$ (for all indices) denotes the action of the frame element \mathbf{e}_j on the function v^k . If we first set $V = S_w \partial_w + S_n \partial_n$ so that $\{\mathbf{e}_i\} = (\partial_{S_w}, \partial_{S_n}), X^i = V^i = (S_w, S_n),$ and $u = \partial_{S_w} = (A_w + A_n)(\partial_w - \partial_n)$ so that $u^i = (A_w + A_n, -A_w + A_n)$, one can show that the covariant derivative $\nabla_{\partial_{S_w}} V$ reduces to $(\partial_w - \partial_n)$, which applied to Q yields $\hat{v}_w - \hat{v}_n$. However, if if we change the frame from the coordinate frame to the seepage-frame, $(\partial_w, \partial_n) \mapsto (\mathbf{e}_w, \mathbf{e}_n)$, the last term in both lines of equation (85) are not necessarily zero. In fact, the first term of the first line of equation (85) can be written as $v_w - v_n$, and the second term is exactly equation (2). In general, if the frame is a non-coordinate-frame, the connection coefficients Γ_{ji}^k contains contributions from both the metric and the commutation coefficients [43] of the frame, which describes exactly the dependency of the frame elements. Thus, we can connect the co-moving velocity to the existence of a type of metric, the dependency between the frame elements, or both.

We can draw an analogy between equation (2) and the connection-term $u^j X^i \nabla_{\mathbf{e}_j}(\mathbf{e}_i)$ in equation (85). This term contains the derivatives of the frame elements with respect to ∂_{S_w} , which are expanded in the frame itself to yield the connection coefficients. If we instead stick to the first line in equation (85), using the relation $\mathbf{e}_w \sim v_w$, $\mathbf{e}_n \sim v_n$, we see that a term $\partial_{S_w} v_\alpha$ in equation (2) is analogous to the covariant derivative of a single vector in the frame $\{\mathbf{e}_\alpha\}$, so we have $\partial_{S_w} v_\alpha \sim \nabla_{\partial_{S_w}} \mathbf{e}_\alpha$. Thus, the vector field V_m associated to v_m can be written as

$$V_m = S_w \nabla_{\partial_{S_w}} \mathbf{e}_w + S_n \nabla_{\partial_{S_w}} \mathbf{e}_n . \tag{86}$$

This is a well-defined vector field since $\nabla_{\partial_{S_w}} \mathbf{e}_{\alpha}$ produces vector fields, and a linear combination of vector fields is again a vector field. Moreover, since the functions S_w, S_n on \mathcal{M} satisfy $S_w + S_n = 1$, equation (86) is defined on an affine bundle. An affine bundle has no preferred zerosection, and the only expressions that are independent of the choice of zero-section are affine combinations of sections. The situation is therefore analogous to affine combinations which are independent of the choice of origin [56]. The vector fields related to both equation (25) and equation (86) share the property that they are affine combinations of sections, and are therefore independent of any choice of origin in the spaces of velocities. Since they are independent of the zero-section, we could use these vector fields themselves as zero-sections. The defining difference between vector bundles and affine bundles are that vector bundles always has a zero-section, so defining a zero-section of the affine bundle is equivalent to a vector bundle.

The relation between these considerations, eq. (78) and the discussion after eq. (57) can be formulated in terms of the connection. We will only provide an explanation on a conceptual level, as a thorough treatment is outside the scope of this work.

On a one-dimensional manifold, the only possible form of the covariant derivative is $g(x) \partial_x$.¹¹. We have here a single variable S_w , which in reality is a parameter along a line embedded in a higher dimensional space. Let this space be two-dimensional as before, with the same frame elements $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}, i = w, n$ as we have already considered. View V_m as the zero-section of an affine bundle. On the level of bundles, an arbitrary zero-section is handled by a solder form [49] ¹².

On the tangent bundle, a solder form represents a relation between the tangent space at a point and the vertical spaces of the bundle $T\mathcal{M}$. The vertical space at a point p of $T\mathcal{M}$ consist of all tangent vectors to $T\mathcal{M}$ that project to tangent vectors of \mathcal{M} . These spaces form a bundle called the vertical bundle $VT\mathcal{M}$. A solder form τ at a point $x \in \mathcal{M}$ is defined in terms of a distinguished section, here V_m , and is a linear map (not affine)

$$\tau_x : T_x \mathcal{M} \to V_{V_M(x)} T \mathcal{M} .$$
 (87)

Intuitively, τ_x can be seen as relating the tangent vectors at $T_x \mathcal{M}$ with all tangent vectors of the entire bundle $T\mathcal{M}$

¹⁰ These are, given some additional assumptions, just what we call the Christoffel symbols[43].

¹¹ The covariant derivative can be seen as a projection operator that projects the tangent vectors to the tangent bundle $T\mathcal{M}$ itself onto the tangent spaces of \mathcal{M} .

¹² In particular, a connection on an affine bundle is an example of an affine connection, of which the covariant derivative is one manifestation. The connection on the affine bundle is in this case an example of a more general definition of a connection called a Cartan connection [57, 58].

that project to vectors on $T_x \mathcal{M}$. This is one way of formulating the necessary freedom in the transformation between thermodynamic- and seepage velocities, expressed in terms of bundles.

Due to the linearity of the map τ_x , the solder form can be incorporated into the covariant derivative, where its effect enters into the connection coefficients Γ_{ij}^k in eq. (85). The connection coefficients contain contributions from a metric (which can be zero), in addition to terms that can arise if the frame is anholonomic, i.e. not a coordinate frame. This is the case for a solder form, which enter into the connection coefficients as this latter type of term. These are the terms that give rise to torsion of the connection. In terms of the frame $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$, an often used picture of torsion of a connection is to parallel transport the frame vectors along each other some unit distance. If the two parallel-transported vectors and the two frame vectors form a closed parallelogram, the connection is free of torsion [43] ¹³.

The takeaway is that in our case, eqs. (85) and (86) are not mutually exclusive, as V_M can be included into eq. (85). We then have several ways of viewing V_M : either as related to a solder form, or more generally the connection coefficients of some frame, or as induced by some metric. In conclusion, a differential geometric treatment that allows for additional "translational" terms in eqs. (57) and (78) is much more involved, and depends on how the frame $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$ is defined.

VI. CONCLUSION

We have in this work introduced basic geometric ideas into the analysis of a pseudo-thermodynamic description of two-phase flow in porous media. The goal was to pave the way for the usage of geometry in interpreting and classifying relations occurring in the theory and in equilibrium thermodynamics in general. A relatively terse introduction of necessary concepts was presented in the context of our choice of extensive and intensive variables. in addition to the underlying assumption of degree-1 Euler homogeneity of the total volumetric flow rate in the extensive variables. We have in this endeavour provided two potential routes of further study of the relations presented in Section II. One is to apply the language of classical affine and projective geometry and work directly with functional values of the velocities. To the authors' knowledge, this approach is new in the context of twophase flow in porous media, and uncommon in the study of thermodynamics in general.¹⁴

The second route is to bring the formalism closer to contemporary formulations of the geometric structure of thermodynamics. The approach in this article was a natural continuation of investigating vector spaces and co-

¹³ This is a bit imprecise, as how fast the gap between the transported vectors matter as the distance they are transported increases. It poses no harm to ignore this here.

ordinates on the space of extensive variables in previous work [31].

On the subject of continued work on tangent vector fields as presented in this work, it would be interesting to see how the terms $\sim a$ in equation (6) can appear if more variables are included in the space of extensive variables. Even though the framework presented here cannot claim any predictive power for the parameters b,a in the constitutive equation for v_m , it aids in gaining intuition for what the co-moving velocity and other relations in Section II represents geometrically. Future work on the theoretical basis of the pseudo-thermodynamic theory of two-phase flow which applies more standard formalism used in geometric equilibrium thermodynamics, (for instance contact geometry), the geometric concepts introduced here still applies. Moreover, a separate study in terms of contact geometry is highly relevant.

In the classical description where points of the affine space of velocities were identified with numbers, the most natural way forward is to formulate the theory in terms of projective geometry. Projective geometry is a particularly rich and well-known topic in both mathematics and physics, and presents many avenues of exploration. One of these could be to try to explicitly compute an invariant of projective geometry, the so-called cross-ratio [45, 47], from the values of the velocities. One could use this to investigate the assumption of homogeneity in more detail, and possibly use projective relations as a guide to obtain new constitutive relations for the co-moving velocity.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, H.P.; Validation, A.H.; Writing—original draft, H.P.; Writing and editing, A.H. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This work was partly supported by the Research Council of Norway through its Centers of Excellence funding scheme, project number 262644. AH furthermore acknowledges funding from the European Research Council (ERC) through grant agreement 101141323 AGIPORE.

Data Availability Statement: The original contributions presented in this study are included in the article. Further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author.

Acknowledgments: We thank Santanu Sinha for valuable discussions and comments.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

¹⁴ One only implicitly uses this structure when considering specific quantities in thermodynamics.

- J. Bear, Dynamics of Fluids in Porous Media, Dover Books on Physics and Chemistry (Dover, New York, 1988).
- [2] M. Sahimi, Flow and Transport in Porous Media and Fractured Rock: From Classical Methods to Modern Approaches (John Wiley & Sons, 2011).
- [3] M. J. Blunt, Multiphase Flow in Permeable Media: A Pore-Scale Perspective (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2017).
- [4] J. Feder, E. G. Flekkøy, and A. Hansen, *Physics of Flow in Porous Media* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2022).
- [5] P. W. Anderson, More Is Different, Science 177, 393 (1972).
- [6] H. B. Callen and H. B. Callen, *Thermodynamics and an Introduction to Thermostatistics*, 2nd ed. (Wiley, New York, 1985).
- [7] S. Roy, H. Pedersen, S. Sinha, and A. Hansen, The Co-Moving Velocity in Immiscible Two-Phase Flow in Porous Media, Transport in Porous Media 10.1007/s11242-022-01783-7 (2022).
- [8] M. Erpelding, S. Sinha, K. T. Tallakstad, A. Hansen, E. G. Flekkøy, and K. J. Måløy, History independence of steady state in simultaneous two-phase flow through two-dimensional porous media, Physical Review E—Statistical, Nonlinear, and Soft Matter Physics 88, 053004 (2013).
- [9] R. Holtzman, M. Dentz, R. Planet, and J. Ortín, The origin of hysteresis and memory of two-phase flow in disordered media, Communications physics 3, 222 (2020).
- [10] T. Poston and I. Stewart, Catastrophe Theory and Its Applications (Courier Corporation, 2014).
- [11] A. Hansen, E. G. Flekkøy, S. Sinha, and P. A. Slotte, A statistical mechanics framework for immiscible and incompressible two-phase flow in porous media, Advances in Water Resources **171**, 104336 (2023).
- [12] A. Hansen, S. Sinha, D. Bedeaux, S. Kjelstrup, M. A. Gjennestad, and M. Vassvik, Relations Between Seepage Velocities in Immiscible, Incompressible Two-Phase Flow in Porous Media, Transport in Porous Media 125, 565 (2018).
- [13] S. Roy, S. Sinha, and A. Hansen, Flow-Area Relations in Immiscible Two-Phase Flow in Porous Media, Frontiers in Physics 8, 4 (2020).
- [14] F. Weinhold, Metric geometry of equilibrium thermodynamics, The Journal of Chemical Physics 63, 2479 (1975).
- [15] G. Ruppeiner, Riemannian geometry in thermodynamic fluctuation theory, Reviews of Modern Physics 67, 605 (1995).
- [16] B. Andresen, R. Berry, R. Gilmore, E. Ihrig, and P. Salamon, Thermodynamic geometry and the metrics of Weinhold and Gilmore, Phys. Rev. A 37, 10.1103/Phys-RevA.37.845 (1988).
- [17] R. Hermann, Geometry, Physics, and Systems, Pure and Applied Mathematics, 18 (M. Dekker, New York, 1973).
- [18] K. T. Tallakstad, H. A. Knudsen, T. Ramstad, G. Løvoll, K. J. Måløy, R. Toussaint, and E. G. Flekkøy, Steadystate two-phase flow in porous media: Statistics and transport properties, Physical Review Letters 102, 074502 (2009).

- [19] K. T. Tallakstad, G. Løvoll, H. A. Knudsen, T. Ramstad, E. G. Flekkøy, and K. J. Måløy, Steady-state, simultaneous two-phase flow in porous media: An experimental study, Physical Review E 80, 036308 (2009).
- [20] S. Sinha and A. Hansen, Effective rheology of immiscible two-phase flow in porous media, Europhysics Letters 99, 44004 (2012).
- [21] O. Aursjø, M. Erpelding, K. T. Tallakstad, E. G. Flekkøy, A. Hansen, and K. J. Måløy, Film flow dominated simultaneous flow of two viscous incompressible fluids through a porous medium, Frontiers in physics 2, 63 (2014).
- [22] Y. Gao, Q. Lin, B. Bijeljic, and M. J. Blunt, X-ray microtomography of intermittency in multiphase flow at steady state using a differential imaging method, Water Resources Research 53, 10274 (2017).
- [23] S. Sinha, A. T. Bender, M. Danczyk, K. Keepseagle, C. A. Prather, J. M. Bray, L. W. Thrane, J. D. Seymour, S. L. Codd, and A. Hansen, Effective rheology of twophase flow in three-dimensional porous media: Experiment and simulation, Transport in Porous Media 119, 77 (2017).
- [24] Y. Gao, Q. Lin, B. Bijeljic, and M. J. Blunt, Pore-scale dynamics and the multiphase Darcy law, Physical Review Fluids 5, 013801 (2020).
- [25] Y. Zhang, B. Bijeljic, Y. Gao, Q. Lin, and M. J. Blunt, Quantification of nonlinear multiphase flow in porous media, Geophysical Research Letters 48, e2020GL090477 (2021).
- [26] Y. Zhang, B. Bijeljic, and M. J. Blunt, Nonlinear multiphase flow in hydrophobic porous media, Journal of Fluid Mechanics 934, R3 (2022).
- [27] H. Fyhn, S. Sinha, S. Roy, and A. Hansen, Rheology of immiscible two-phase flow in mixed wet porous media: Dynamic pore network model and capillary fiber bundle model results, Transport in Porous Media 139, 491 (2021).
- [28] A. Anastasiou, I. Zarikos, A. Yiotis, L. Talon, and D. Salin, Steady-state dynamics of ganglia populations during immiscible two-phase flows in porous micromodels: Effects of the capillary number and flow ratio on effective rheology and size distributions, Transport in Porous Media 151, 469 (2024).
- [29] F. Alzubaidi, J. E. McClure, H. Pedersen, A. Hansen, C. F. Berg, P. Mostaghimi, and R. T. Armstrong, The impact of wettability on the co-moving velocity of twofluid flow in porous media, Transport in Porous Media 151, 1967 (2024).
- [30] A. Hansen, Linearity of the co-moving velocity, Transport in Porous Media 151, 2477 (2024).
- [31] H. Pedersen and A. Hansen, Parameterizations of immiscible two-phase flow in porous media, Frontiers in Physics 11, 10.3389/fphy.2023.1127345 (2023).
- [32] E. T. Jaynes, Information Theory and Statistical Mechanics, Physical Review 106, 620 (1957).
- [33] D. Reguera, J. M. Rubí, and J. M. G. Vilar, The Mesoscopic Dynamics of Thermodynamic Systems, The Journal of Physical Chemistry B 109, 21502 (2005).
- [34] M. Grmela, Contact Geometry of Mesoscopic Thermodynamics and Dynamics, Entropy 16, 1652 (2014).
- [35] J. M. Lee, Introduction to Smooth Manifolds, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol. 218 (Springer New York, New

York, NY, 2012).

- [36] J. W. Milnor and J. D. Stasheff, *Characteristic Classes*, Annals of Mathematics Studies No. no. 76 (Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J, 1974).
- [37] A. Bravetti, Contact geometry and thermodynamics, International Journal of Geometric Methods in Modern Physics 16, 1940003 (2019).
- [38] A. A. Simoes, M. de León, M. L. Valcázar, and D. M. de Diego, Contact geometry for simple thermodynamical systems with friction, Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences 476, 20200244 (2020).
- [39] R. Balian and P. Valentin, Hamiltonian structure of thermodynamics with gauge, The European Physical Journal B - Condensed Matter and Complex Systems 21, 269 (2001).
- [40] V. I. Arnold, Mathematical Methods of Classical Mechanics, edited by C. C. Moore, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol. 60 (Springer New York, New York, NY, 1978).
- [41] J. Oppenheim, Thermodynamics with long-range interactions: From Ising models to black holes, PHYSICAL REVIEW E.
- [42] R. Mrugala, On contact and metric structures on thermodynamic spaces, RIMS Kokyuroku 1142 (2000).
- [43] C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne, and J. A. Wheeler, *Gravi*tation (W. H. Freeman, San Francisco, 1973).
- [44] M. Crampin and F. A. E. Pirani, Applicable Differential Geometry, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987).
- [45] M. Berger, Geometry, corr. 2nd print ed., Universitext (Springer-Verlag, Berlin; New York, 1994).
- [46] J. M. Lee, Introduction to Riemannian Manifolds, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol. 176 (Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2018).
- [47] J. Richter-Gebert, Perspectives on Projective Geometry: A Guided Tour Through Real and Complex Geometry (Springer, Berlin, 2011).
- [48] J. Gallier, Geometric Methods and Applications: For

Computer Science and Engineering, Texts in Applied Mathematics, Vol. 38 (Springer New York, New York, NY, 2011).

- [49] D. J. Saunders, *The Geometry of Jet Bundles*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989).
- [50] G. de Saxcé and C. Vallée, Affine tensors in mechanics of freely falling particles and rigid bodies, Mathematics and Mechanics of Solids 17, 413 (2012).
- [51] G. Sardanashvily, Advanced Differential Geometry for Theoreticians. Fiber Bundles, Jet Manifolds and Lagranian Theory (2013).
- [52] M. Spivak, A Comprehensive Introduction to Differential Geometry, 3rd ed. (Publish or Perish, Inc, Houston, Tex, 1999).
- [53] A. Hansen and S. Sinha, Thermodynamics-like formalism for immiscible and incom- pressible two-phase flow in porous medi, Entropy. An International and Interdisciplinary Journal of Entropy and Information Studies 27, 121 (2012).
- [54] A. van der Schaft, Liouville geometry of classical thermodynamics, Journal of Geometry and Physics 170, 104365 (2021).
- [55] L. W. Tu, *Differential Geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol. 275 (Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2017).
- [56] R. T. Rockafellar, *Convex Analysis*, 10th ed., Princeton Landmarks in Mathematics and Physics (Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 1997).
- [57] T. A. Ivey and J. M. Landsberg, Cartan for Beginners: Differential Geometry via Moving Frames and Exterior Differential Systems, , 77.
- [58] K. Ehlers, J. Koiller, R. Montgomery, and P. M. Rios, Nonholonomic systems via moving frames: Cartan equivalence and Chaplygin Hamiltonization, in *The Breadth* of Symplectic and Poisson Geometry, Vol. 232, edited by J. E. Marsden and T. S. Ratiu (Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 2007) pp. 75–120.