

Magnetization of rotating ferro fluids: predictions of different theoretical models

A. Leschhorn and M. Lucke
 Institut für Theoretische Physik,
 Universität des Saarlandes,
 D-66041 Saarbrücken, Germany

(Dated: January 23, 2019)

Abstract

We consider a ferro fluid cylinder, that is rotating with constant rotation frequency $\omega = \omega e_z$ as a rigid body. A homogeneous magnetic field $H_0 = H_0 e_x$ is applied perpendicular to the cylinder axis e_z . This causes a nonequilibrium situation. Therein the magnetization M and the internal magnetic field H are constant in time and homogeneous within the ferro fluid. According to the Maxwell equations they are related to each other via $H = H_0 - M/2$. However, H and M are not parallel to each other and their directions differ from that of the applied field H_0 . We have analyzed several different theoretical models that provide equations for the magnetization in such a situation. The magnetization M is determined for each model as a function of ω and H_0 in a wide range of frequencies and fields. Comparisons are made of the different model results and the differences in particular of the predictions for the perpendicular components $H_y = -M_y/2$ of the fields are analyzed.

I. INTRODUCTION

There are several theoretical equations for the dynamics of the magnetization $M(r;t)$ of a ferrofluid that is flowing with velocity $u(r;t)$ in an externally applied magnetic field H_0 [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]. Here we compare their predictions for a simple special case that is experimentally accessible. We consider a ferrofluid cylinder of radius R of sufficiently large length to be approximated as infinite in a homogeneous applied field $H_0 = H_0 e_x$ in x -direction. The ferrofluid cylinder is enforced via its walls to rotate as a rigid-body around its long axis with constant rotation frequency $\omega = \omega e_z$ being oriented perpendicular to H_0 . The flow field is thus $u(r) = \omega \times r = \omega r e_\phi$, where e_ϕ is the unit vector in azimuthal direction. In such a situation all aforementioned models allow for a spatially and temporally constant nonequilibrium magnetization M that is rotated out of the directions of H_0 and H by the flow. The Maxwell equations demand that the fields H and M within the ferrofluid are related to each other via

$$H = H_0 - \frac{1}{2}M \quad (1.1)$$

as indicated schematically in Fig. 1 and that the magnetic field outside the ferrofluid cylinder

$$H^{\text{out}} = H_0 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{R^2}{r^2} - 2 \frac{rM}{r} \frac{r}{r} = M \quad (1.2)$$

is a superposition of the applied field H_0 and the dipolar contribution from M .

II. MAGNETIZATION EQUATIONS

The model equations that we compare here imply a relaxational dynamics either of M towards the equilibrium magnetization

$$M_{\text{eq}}(H) = \frac{M_{\text{eq}}(H)}{H} H = F(H)H \quad (2.1)$$

or of the "local equilibrium" or "effective" field

$$H_{\text{eff}}(M) = \frac{M_{\text{eq}}^{-1}(M)}{M} M = F(M)M \quad (2.2)$$

towards the internal field H . The equilibrium magnetization $M_{\text{eq}}(H)$ referring to the functional relation between internal field H and magnetization in the case of $\omega = 0$ is a thermodynamic material property of the ferrofluid. The effective field H_{eff} lies parallel to M and




FIG . 1: Schem atic plot of relevant vectors.

can be seen as the inverse of the defining requirement

$$M = M_{eq}(H_{eff}) : \tag{2.3}$$

In equilibrium, $\dot{M} = 0$, one has $H_{eff} = H$ and $M = M_{eq}$.

We consider here the relations

$$\text{Debye: } M = \frac{1}{\chi} (M - M_{eq}) \tag{2.4}$$

$$\text{S'72 [2]: } M = \frac{1}{\chi} (M - M_{eq}) + \frac{0}{4} M (M - H) \tag{2.5}$$

$$\text{FK [3]: } M = \chi_H (H_{eff} - H) + \frac{0}{4} M (M - H) \tag{2.6}$$

$$\text{S'01 [4]: } H_{eff} = \frac{1}{\chi} (H_{eff} - H) + \frac{0}{4} H_{eff} (M - H) \tag{2.7}$$

$$\text{ML [5]: } M = \chi (H_{eff} - H) \tag{2.8}$$

resulting for the rotating cylinder from the above 5 models. In ML we use the weak field variant of ref. [5]. These equations have to be solved numerically in combination with the Maxwell equation (1.1).

As an aside we mention that the above equations can be written in the common form

$$M (\chi + \chi_3 M - H_0) = \chi_1 (H_0 - \chi_2 M) \tag{2.9}$$

with coefficients:




FIG. 2: Equilibrium magnetization $M_{eq}(H)$ used as input into the models compared here.

Debye	$\chi_1 = -$	$\chi_2 = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}$	$\chi_3 = 0$
S'72	$\chi_1 = -$	$\chi_2 = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}$	$\chi_3 = \frac{0}{4}$
S'01	$\chi_1 = \frac{1}{F}$	$\chi_2 = F + \frac{1}{2}$	$\chi_3 = \frac{0}{4}$
FK	$\chi_1 = H$	$\chi_2 = F + \frac{1}{2}$	$\chi_3 = \frac{0}{4}$
ML	$\chi_1 =$	$\chi_2 = F + \frac{1}{2}$	$\chi_3 = 0$

III. RESULTS

In order to make the comparison of the theoretical results easier we replace the equilibrium magnetization $M_{eq}(H)$ by the Langevin expression $M_{eq}(H) = M_{sat}L(\frac{H}{M_{sat}})$ with the initial susceptibility $\chi_0 = \chi(H=0)$. We use $\chi_0 = 1.09$ and $M_{sat} = 18149A/m$ for the saturation magnetization which is appropriate for the ferro uid APG 933 of FERROTEC. The resulting curve is shown in Fig. 2. Furthermore, we replace the relaxation time $\tau(H)$ by $\tau_B = 6 \cdot 10^4 s$. For $\frac{\omega}{2}$ we use the values $\omega = 0.5Pa$ and $\omega = 0.041$ and for H we use $H = \omega = \tau_B$ [6]. For the parameter of ML [5] we investigate two different choices: Either the low-field variant, $\chi = \chi_0 = \tau_B$, as in FK that is denoted here by ML(F). Or the variant $\chi = 1 = [F(M)_B]$ as in S'01 that is denoted here by ML(S).

Especially the perpendicular component $H_y = \frac{1}{2}M_y$ of the magnetic field is suited for a comparison of the different models with each other and with experiments. Before doing the former we should like to draw the attention to the frequency behavior of $M_y(H_0; \omega)$. We mentioned already that M_y vanishes for zero vorticity, $\omega = 0$. Furthermore, one finds that

M_y as well as M of eq.(2.9) in th of as in Fig.

ite the solution m as a function




FIG .3: Comparison of the predictions of the different theoretical models for the transverse internal field H_y versus rotation frequency Ω .

The differences in the results for the different models are easily captured by comparing their predictions for the maximum values of $|H_y|$, the locations of these maxima at Ω^{max} , and the initial slopes $\frac{d|H_y|}{d\Omega}$ at $\Omega = 0$, each as a function of applied field H_0 . This is done in Fig. 4.

The maximal values of $|H_y|$ of Debye and S'72 are the same while their locations, Ω^{max} , differ. The models S'01, FK, and ML formulated in terms of the effective field also share a common maximal value of $|H_y|$ being larger than that of Debye and S'72 while the location, Ω^{max} , differ partly substantially. Hence the magnetic torque, $M \propto H$, entering into S'72, FK, and S'01 only shifts the frequency Ω^{max} . It remains to be seen whether experiments can be performed with sufficient accuracy to discriminate between the different theoretical




FIG. 4: (a) Frequency Ω^{\max} leading to maximal transverse field, (b) largest transverse field, and (c) initial slope $\frac{dH_y}{d\Omega}$ at $\Omega = 0$. Fig. etwas langer machen ???

predictions.

[1] R. E. Rosensweig, *Ferrohydrodynamics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1985).
 [2] M. I. Shliomis, *Sov. Phys. JETP* 34, 1291 (1972).
 [3] B. U. Felderhof and H. J. Krah, *J. Chem. Phys.* 110, 7403 (1999); B. U. Felderhof, *Phys. Rev. E* 62, 3848 (2000); *ibid* 64, 063502 (2001).
 [4] M. I. Shliomis, *Phys. Rev. E* 64, 060501 (2001); *ibid* 64, 063501 (2001).

[5] H. W. Müller, M. Liu, Phys. Rev. E 64, 061405 (2001).

[6] B. U. Felderhof, Phys. Rev. E 64, 021508 (2001).