

This is the accepted manuscript made available via CHORUS. The article has been published as:

## Simulation of surfactant-mediated tipstreaming in a flow-focusing geometry

Jacek K. Wrobel, Michael R. Booty, Michael Siegel, and Qiming Wang

Phys. Rev. Fluids **3**, 114003 — Published 26 November 2018

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevFluids.3.114003](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevFluids.3.114003)

# Simulation of surfactant mediated tipstreaming in a flow focusing geometry

Jacek K. Wrobel

*Department of Mathematics and Center for Computational Science,  
Tulane University, 6823 St. Charles Ave., New Orleans, LA 70118, USA*

Michael R. Booty, Michael Siegel, and Qiming Wang

*Department of Mathematical Sciences and Center for Applied Mathematics and Statistics,  
New Jersey Institute of Technology,  
University Heights, Newark, New Jersey 07102, USA*

(Dated: October 31, 2018)

## Abstract

Simulations are performed of a surfactant-laden drop that is stretched by an imposed uniaxial extension flow at infinity with flow focusing provided by two transverse, coaxial, annular baffles placed symmetrically to either side of the drop. The geometry is axisymmetric, with additional symmetry in the transverse plane that contains the drop center. Under suitable conditions, the drop can enter a mode of drop breakup referred to as tipstreaming, in which a thin elongated filament or thread is emitted from the drop ends, and which subsequently breaks up into small droplets via capillary instability. The influence that flow focusing has on the conditions required for tipstreaming and on quantities such as the thread radius are investigated by study of sample simulations, and the extent of flow focusing is varied by changing the inner or aperture radius of the annular baffles. The surfactant is soluble, and bulk-interface surfactant exchange is in the mixed-kinetic or finite Biot number regime. The boundary integral method is used for the underlying two-phase Stokes flow solver, combined with a finite difference scheme for evolution of adsorbed surfactant on the interface. The dynamics of dissolved bulk phase surfactant is resolved by a large bulk Peclet number asymptotic approach. Results on the conditions for tipstreaming in the simulations are compared to separate experimental results on conditions for tipstreaming in a microfluidic flow-focusing device.

**PhySH identifiers:** fluid flows, interfacial flows; microscale flows, drop phenomena, pinch-off; microfluidic devices.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Tipstreaming is a mode of drop breakup in which a thin fluid thread is emitted or drawn from the tip of a drop by an extensional flow, and where the thread later breaks into a sequence of small droplets via capillary instability. It was first reported by Taylor in his pioneering experiments on drop deformation and breakup in a four-roller mill [1], where it occurred briefly and apparently by chance. More recently tipstreaming has been attributed to the presence of chemical surfactants, or surface-active agents, and their influence on flow dynamics, which is to reduce the surface tension at interfaces in a multiphase fluid mixture.

Many different types of surfactant are currently in commercial use as detergents, emulsifiers, or foaming and wetting agents in a range of applications from industrial to domestic contexts. Surfactants also occur in nature as biochemical reaction products and are produced by some microorganisms. In addition to supporting natural processes, naturally occurring surfactants are increasingly being adapted to other applications. Descriptions of the properties and uses of surfactants are given in, for example, Refs. [2–4].

In Ref. [5], Stone reviews the theoretical and experimental understanding of the various modes of drop breakup, including tipstreaming, in macroscale unconfined flows at the time of writing in 1994. At around the same time experimental studies by de Bruijn [6] and by Janssen *et al.* [7, 8] found that for surfactant-induced tipstreaming to occur in isolated millimeter-sized drops the viscosity ratio  $\lambda$  of the interior (dispersed) to exterior (continuous) phase fluids needs to be sufficiently small,  $\lambda \lesssim 0.1$ , and that both the ambient surfactant concentration and the capillary number or strain rate of the deforming flow need to lie within a certain intermediate range. The small, dispersed phase droplets that result from tipstreaming have a size of the order of  $10\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ , a high surface surfactant concentration, and consequently a low surface tension. In these studies, the key component of the mechanism for tipstreaming, that it requires a large gradient of the surface tension to develop near the pole or tip of a low viscosity drop in an extensional flow, was explained.

The behavior of drops and fluid interfaces at the microscale is a central theme of microfluidics, where confinement of flow and the need for repeatability or control are important concerns. Configurations in which microfluidic tipstreaming can occur consist of a channel or capillary supplied with a dispersed phase that terminates inside a continuing, parallel outer channel or at intersecting cross-channels that are supplied with an immisci-

ble continuous phase. Flow-focusing can also be introduced, in which the device geometry is modified to cause locally converging and accelerating flow of both phases. In Ref. [9], Anna gives a comprehensive review of drop and interfacial fluid dynamics in the specific context of microfluidics, with and without surfactants. The review also summarizes studies on surfactant-mediated tipstreaming in the presence of flow focusing, which is the main topic for investigation here, and among these studies the experiments described in Refs. [10] and [11] will be given our particular attention. Typical device dimensions here are of the order of  $10 - 300 \mu\text{m}$  and tipstreaming thread and droplet diameters as small as  $200 \text{ nm}$  have been reported [9–12].

In this study the boundary integral method is adapted to simulate the dynamics of a tipstreaming drop in an extensional flow by using a ‘hybrid’ numerical method to resolve the effects of solubility of surfactant in the large bulk Peclet number limit. The hybrid method was introduced in Ref. [13] in the context of an inviscid bubble in 2D, and was later extended to viscous drops in more general linear 2D flows [14] and to a 3D axisymmetric uniaxial extension [15]. Since surfactant molecules are typically large relative to their host solvent molecules they diffuse slowly in the bulk, so that the bulk Peclet number  $Pe$  is large, typically being of the order of  $10^6 - 10^7$  for a drop of radius  $0.1 \text{ mm}$  in an oil-water mixture. Local stretching and contraction of a deforming fluid interface cause surface and bulk surfactant concentrations to move away from equilibrium, resulting in exchange of surfactant between the interface and bulk across a narrow transition layer of width of order  $O(Pe^{-1/2})$  relative to the drop radius. The hybrid method introduces a leading order matched asymptotic reduction of the dynamics in the transition layer to accurately resolve surfactant concentrations and interfacial surface tension in the  $Pe \rightarrow \infty$  limit.

Of the many numerical studies of drop deformation and breakup there are to the best of our knowledge three that evoke the surfactant-induced tipstreaming of experiments. Eggleton, Tsai, and Stebe [16] investigate tipstreaming in an axisymmetric uniaxial extension flow while Bazhlekov, Anderson, and Meijer [17] report on 3D simulations of drop deformation and breakup, including tipstreaming, in a simple shear flow. In both of these studies the surfactant is insoluble. In recent work [15], we have used the hybrid method to report on deformation and tipstreaming of a drop in an axisymmetric uniaxial extension including surfactant effects with solubility. All three studies use the boundary integral method for the underlying Stokes flow solver and are set in an unbounded geometry. They find, in

qualitative agreement with the experimental observations, that there are limitations on the viscosity ratio, surfactant concentration, and capillary number for tipstreaming to occur. In computations using the finite element method Suryo and Basaran [18] observe tipstreaming as a possible mode of flow under specific conditions for equal viscosity fluids but without surfactant, in a bounded co-flow geometry, and with no flow-focusing.

Refs. [19–29] are examples of numerical studies of drop dynamics with soluble surfactant. These either use a finely adapted or refined mesh to resolve surface-bulk exchange of surfactant, with a deformable or non-deformable interface, or simplify the mechanism of surfactant exchange dynamics, or are restricted to artificially small or at most moderate values of  $Pe$ . A recent study [30] uses a fixed uniform mesh with an embedded boundary method to track and resolve interface dynamics with soluble surfactant at non-zero Reynolds number and Peclet number  $Pe = 10^2$ .

In this study we consider an isolated, initially spherical drop at the origin of an impulsively-started uniaxial extension flow. The interface and continuous phase have a surfactant concentration that is initially in equilibrium, and flow focusing is introduced via transverse annular baffles placed concentric with the flow axis and symmetrically on either side of the drop center. This models the flow focusing of the experimental co-flow device [10, 11] but does not include its channel sidewalls. Also, we consider an initial boundary value problem with additional symmetry about the plane  $x = 0$ , as opposed to the experiments’ near semi-infinite geometry and near steady-state operation.

The model set-up is described in more detail in Sec. II. Section III contains the governing equations for Stokes flow with soluble surfactant, together with a description of the large  $Pe$  hybrid method, a note on its conservation of surfactant, and the boundary integral equation for the Stokes flow fluid solver. The numerical implementation is outlined in Sec. IV, which includes a note on a soluble surfactant plume in the downstream wake of a drop as a partial validation of the method and code. Section V is the main section on results. We briefly review the influence of surfactant solubility on tipstreaming in an unbounded flow before studying the influence of flow focusing, via baffles, at a sequence of decreasing aperture sizes and increasing surfactant solubility. We then turn to a comparison of our simulation results with the experimental results of Moyle *et al.* on the conditions needed for tipstreaming [11]. To do so, the simulation data is reformulated to closely approximate the same state space variables used in presenting the data from the experiments. Conclusions are given in

Sec. VI.

## II. MODEL GEOMETRY

An initially spherical drop has a uniform concentration of surfactant on its interface that is in equilibrium with a uniform concentration of surfactant in the continuous bulk phase outside it. The drop is situated between two annular baffles that have a large outer radius and an inner or aperture radius that is less than the initial radius of the drop. At time  $t = 0$  a uniaxial extension flow  $\mathbf{u}^\infty$  is imposed with its axis  $x$  passing through the drop and aperture centers. The geometry is symmetrical about both the  $x$ -axis and the plane  $x = 0$ ; the baffle apertures tend to focus the flow as it passes through them. An illustration of the set-up is given in Fig. 1(a) while an example computation of a 2D profile and 3D shape of a deformed half-drop interface in  $x > 0$  are shown together with the baffle aperture in Figs. 1(b) and 1(c), respectively. Here the capillary number is sufficiently small that the interface is not drawn through the opening.




FIG. 1. (a) A drop is situated in an uniaxial extension flow facing a narrow opening in a baffle on either side. The geometry is axisymmetric. (b) Half of the drop in  $x > 0$  showing a conical tip, 2D profile, and (c) 3D view.

This is proposed to capture the main features of flow focusing in the microfluidic tipstreaming device of Anna and Mayer [10] and Moyle *et al.* [11]. Figure 2(a) shows a schematic of the experimental device with an image of a steady, rounded interface near the aperture  $W_{\text{Or}}$ . The device geometry is rectilinear but the interface becomes nearly axisymmetric close to the aperture, and surfactant is dissolved in the interior or dispersed phase fluid. Figure 2(b) shows an image of streaklines in the dispersed phase, with a conical interface and a thin tipstreaming thread that is drawn through the aperture. The cited ex-




FIG. 2. (a) Schematic diagram (left) indicating flow of the continuous and dispersed phases, and an image (right) of the aperture region with interface not tipstreaming. The dimensions shown are  $W_{up} = 280 \mu m$ ,  $a = 90 \mu m$ ,  $\Delta Z = 180 \mu m$ , and  $W_{or} = 34 \mu m$ . (b) Image showing streaklines in the dispersed phase during formation of a tipstreaming thread (vertical length bar  $50 \mu m$ ). Figure panels reprinted with permission from Ref. [10]. Copyright 2006, AIP Publishing LLC.

perimental references give a more thorough account of the device and its operation [10, 11]. Comparison of the experimental results with our simulation data is given below in Sec. V C.

### III. GOVERNING EQUATIONS IN THE LARGE BULK PECLET NUMBER LIMIT

The drop has viscosity  $\mu_1$ , it occupies a region  $\Omega_1$  and is immersed in an immiscible fluid with viscosity  $\mu_2$  that occupies an unbounded exterior region  $\Omega_2$ . The interface between the two fluids is denoted by  $S$  and the surface of a pair of axisymmetric, annular rigid baffles is denoted by  $S_b$ . In the low Reynolds number limit and in the absence of buoyancy or gravitational effects, the flow in each phase is governed by the incompressible Stokes equations

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \nabla^2 \mathbf{u} &= \nabla p, & \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} &= 0, & \mathbf{x} &\in \Omega_1, \\ \nabla^2 \mathbf{u} &= \nabla p, & \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} &= 0, & \mathbf{x} &\in \Omega_2, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

written in nondimensional form. Here, the viscosity ratio  $\lambda = \mu_1/\mu_2$ . The scale for nondimensionalization of length is the radius  $a$  of the unstretched spherical drop. The fluid velocity  $\mathbf{u}$  is made nondimensional by the capillary velocity  $U = \sigma_0/\mu_2$ , where  $\sigma_0$  is the interfacial surface tension in the absence of surfactant. Time is made nondimensional by  $a/U$ , and the pressure  $p$  is made nondimensional by  $\mu_2 U/a$ .

The fluid velocity is continuous across the interface, which evolves according to the kine-



matic boundary condition, that is

$$[\mathbf{u}]_1^2 = 0, \quad \mathbf{x} \in S, \quad (2)$$

$$\frac{d\mathbf{x}}{dt} = (\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n})\mathbf{n}, \quad \mathbf{x} \in S, \quad (3)$$

where  $[\cdot]_1^2$  denotes the jump or difference as  $S$  is approached from the exterior and interior of  $S$ , and  $\mathbf{n}$  is the outward unit normal on  $S$ . The stress-balance boundary condition, that the net hydrodynamic traction on  $S$  due to the fluid on either side equals the net force acting on  $S$  due to interfacial surface tension, is

$$[\boldsymbol{\sigma}]_1^2 \cdot \mathbf{n} \equiv -(p_2 - p_1)\mathbf{n} + 2(\mathbf{e}_2 - \lambda\mathbf{e}_1) \cdot \mathbf{n} = \sigma\kappa\mathbf{n} - \nabla_s\sigma, \quad \mathbf{x} \in S. \quad (4)$$

Here a subscript denotes the domain,  $\Omega_1$  or  $\Omega_2$ , from which  $\mathbf{x}$  approaches  $S$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$  is the stress tensor,  $\mathbf{e}_i$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) is the rate-of-strain tensor,  $\sigma$  is the interfacial surface tension,  $\kappa$  is the sum of the principal normal curvatures of  $S$ , which are chosen to be positive for a convex intersection with  $S$  seen from  $\Omega_1$ , and  $\nabla_s = \nabla - \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla)$  is the surface gradient operator.

The surface tension  $\sigma$  depends on the concentration of surfactant on the interface  $\Gamma$  according to an equation of state. Here this is taken to be

$$\sigma = 1 + E \ln(1 - \Gamma), \quad (5)$$

where the elasticity number  $E = RT\Gamma_\infty/\sigma_0$  is a dimensionless measure of the sensitivity of surface tension to variations in surface surfactant concentration, which in turn is made nondimensional by the theoretical maximum monolayer surface concentration  $\Gamma_\infty$ . Equation (5) is described as a Langmuir-type surface equation of state [2], the Frumkin surface equation of state [31], or the Szyszkowski surface equation of state [7].

The surface surfactant concentration  $\Gamma$  satisfies the conservation law

$$\left. \frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial t} \right|_n + \nabla_s \cdot (\Gamma \mathbf{u}_s) + \Gamma \kappa u_n = \frac{1}{Pe_s} \nabla_s^2 \Gamma + J \mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla C|_S, \quad \mathbf{x} \in S. \quad (6)$$

Here the time derivative  $\partial_t|_n$  is taken along the direction of the outward normal to the interface when it is in motion, and the remaining terms on the left hand side account for change in  $\Gamma$  due to: (i) advection along the interface with the tangential fluid velocity  $\mathbf{u}_s = \mathbf{u} - (\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n})\mathbf{n}$ , and (ii) motion of a locally nonplanar interface along its normal with speed  $u_n = \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}$ . On the right, the first term describes change in  $\Gamma$  due to surface diffusion, and the surface Peclet number  $Pe_s = aU/D_s$  where  $D_s$  is the surface diffusion coefficient.

The second term denotes the change in surface surfactant concentration  $\Gamma$  due to exchange with the bulk, where  $C$  is the bulk phase surfactant concentration. The rate of exchange is given by the diffusive flux of dissolved surfactant in the bulk phase sub-layer immediately adjacent to  $S$ , and the parameter  $J = DC_\infty/\Gamma_\infty U$  is a dimensionless measure of the change in  $\Gamma$  due to this diffusive exchange relative to advection of surfactant on the interface. The bulk surfactant concentration is made nondimensional by an ambient, constant far-field value  $C_\infty$ , and  $D$  denotes the diffusion coefficient in the bulk.

The bulk surfactant concentration  $C$  advects and diffuses as a passive scalar, so that

$$\frac{\partial C}{\partial t} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla C = \frac{1}{Pe} \nabla^2 C, \quad \mathbf{x} \in \Omega_2, \quad (7)$$

where the bulk Peclet number  $Pe = aU/D$ . Here we take surfactant to be present in the exterior domain alone. The bulk-interface exchange of surfactant satisfies the boundary condition

$$J\mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla C|_S = Bi(K(1 - \Gamma)C|_S - \Gamma), \quad \mathbf{x} \in S, \quad (8)$$

which equates the diffusive flux of dissolved surfactant in the bulk phase sub-layer adjacent to the interface with the local rate of adsorption from the bulk to the interface minus the local rate of desorption from the interface to the bulk. The Biot number  $Bi = a\kappa_d/U$  is the ratio of the flow timescale  $a/U$  to the timescale for kinetic desorption  $\kappa_d^{-1}$ , and  $K = \kappa_a C_\infty / \kappa_d$  is a dimensionless equilibrium partition coefficient with kinetic rate ratio or surface activity  $\kappa_a / \kappa_d$ .

The initial distribution of bulk surfactant is assumed to be spatially uniform and equal to its constant far-field value, so that

$$C(\mathbf{x}, 0) = 1 \text{ for } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega_2, \quad \text{and } C \rightarrow 1 \text{ as } |\mathbf{x}| \rightarrow \infty \text{ for all } t > 0. \quad (9)$$

The configuration is in equilibrium initially, so that the initial drop shape is spherical, and from (8)

$$\Gamma(\mathbf{x}, 0) = \frac{K}{1 + K} \equiv \Gamma_0. \quad (10)$$

The imposed far-field flow that deforms the drop is a uniaxial extension, so that

$$\mathbf{u} \rightarrow \mathbf{u}^\infty = Ca \left( -\frac{r}{2} \mathbf{e}_r + x \mathbf{e}_x \right) \text{ as } |\mathbf{x}| \rightarrow \infty, \quad (11)$$

where  $Ca = Ga/U$  is the capillary number and  $G$  is the dimensional strain rate of the imposed flow. This is consistent with the flow-focusing geometry since the baffles are finite.

### A. The large bulk Peclet number limit

In applications, the bulk Peclet number is large, and typically of the order of  $10^6 - 10^7$ . Since the field equation (7) is singularly perturbed in the limit  $Pe \rightarrow \infty$  this led us to introduce a reduced asymptotic model that is derived in this limit in our earlier work [13–15].

The exterior domain  $\Omega_2$  is divided into two regions. There is an “outer” region where spatial gradients in  $C$  are not large, which is characterized by a regular approximation of (7). In the  $Pe \rightarrow \infty$  limit, the leading order approximation satisfies

$$(\partial_t + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla)C = 0, \quad (12)$$

so that  $C$  is constant on particle paths at this order, and with the uniform initial data of (9) this implies that  $C \equiv 1$  over much of  $\Omega_2$  for  $t \geq 0$ .

When the drop deforms, local change of its interfacial area causes the surface surfactant concentration  $\Gamma$  to depart from its initial equilibrium value  $\Gamma_0$  of (10). The large bulk Peclet number or slow diffusion of bulk surfactant causes large spatial gradients of  $C$  to develop in the normal direction close to the interface, which constitutes a second, “inner” region or transition layer  $\Omega_{2r} \subset \Omega_2$ . In this region the dynamics are described by introducing a surface-fitted or intrinsic coordinate system  $(\xi_1, \xi_2, n)$  and a stretched normal coordinate  $N = n/\epsilon$ , in which  $C = C(\xi_1, \xi_2, N, t)$ . Here  $n$  is the distance normal to the interface, with  $n > 0$  in  $\Omega_2$  and  $n = 0$  on  $S$ , and  $\xi_1$  and  $\xi_2$  are distance coordinates on  $S$ . The system  $(\xi_1, \xi_2, n)$  is chosen to be locally orthogonal, and the small parameter  $\epsilon$  is such that  $0 < \epsilon = Pe^{-1/2} \ll 1$ .

The bulk surfactant dynamics in the transition layer, written in the intrinsic frame, are governed by

$$(\partial_t + \mathbf{v}_s \cdot \nabla_s + \partial_n v_p|_s N \partial_N)C = \partial_N^2 C, \quad \text{in } \Omega_{2r}, \quad (13)$$

$$\text{where } \partial_n v_p|_s = -\kappa u_n - \nabla_s \cdot \mathbf{u}_s, \quad (14)$$

at leading order [13]. Here  $\mathbf{v}_s = \mathbf{u}_s - \partial_t \mathbf{X}|_\xi$  is the tangential interfacial fluid velocity relative to a point  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{X}(\xi_1, \xi_2, t)$  on the interface with fixed  $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\xi_1, \xi_2)$ . The Eulerian fluid velocity  $\mathbf{u}$ , in terms of its projection on the tangent plane  $\mathbf{u}_t$  and normal component  $u_p$ , is  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_t + u_p \mathbf{n}$ , so that the normal component of the fluid velocity relative to the

interface  $S$  is  $v_p = u_p - u_n$ . This vanishes on  $S$  and is approximated by the first term in its Taylor expansion  $\partial_n v_p|_s n$  near  $S$ . In the intrinsic frame, the time derivative  $\partial_t$  of (13) is taken with  $(\xi_1, \xi_2, N)$  fixed, and at zero to moderate values of the Reynolds number there is no boundary layer or  $N$ -dependence of the fluid velocity, so that  $\mathbf{u}_t$  is approximated by the interface tangential fluid velocity  $\mathbf{u}_s$ . As a result, the material derivative and diffusive flux of (7) appear in (13) at leading order, with an error or remainder that is  $O(\epsilon)$  as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ . To the same order, Eq. (14) follows from the incompressibility condition (1) when written in the intrinsic frame, and this allows the quantity  $\partial_n v_p|_s$  to be found in terms of surface data alone. We note that Wong *et al.* [32] show that from the first two terms on the left hand side of Eq. (13) the combination  $\partial_t - \partial_t \mathbf{X}|_\xi \cdot \nabla_s = \partial_t|_n$ , which is the time derivative along the outward normal to a moving interface of Eq. (6). Hence (13) can also be written as

$$(\partial_t|_n + \mathbf{u}_s \cdot \nabla_s + \partial_n v_p|_s N \partial_N) C = \partial_N^2 C. \quad (15)$$

The initial and boundary conditions become

$$C(\xi_1, \xi_2, N, 0) = 1, \quad (16)$$

$$\text{with } J_0 \partial_N C|_s = Bi(K(1 - \Gamma)C|_s - \Gamma) \text{ on } N = 0, \quad (17)$$

$$\text{and as } N \rightarrow \infty \begin{cases} C \rightarrow 1 & \text{when } \partial_n v_p|_s \leq 0, \\ \partial_N C \rightarrow 0 & \text{when } \partial_n v_p|_s > 0. \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

In the bulk-interface surfactant exchange condition (8) we have set  $J = \epsilon J_0$ , where  $J_0 = O(1)$ , to form (17). To find the transition layer far-field condition (18) we note that  $\partial_n v_p|_s$  is the rate of extension of a fluid line element in the transition layer in the direction normal to  $S$ . Where  $\partial_n v_p|_s \leq 0$ , fluid particle paths enter the inner transition layer region from the outer region, which is governed by Eq. (12) with the equilibrium initial value  $C = 1$ , and so this is the matching value of  $C$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . On the other hand, where  $\partial_n v_p|_s > 0$ , fluid particle paths exit the inner transition layer region. Since bulk-interface surfactant exchange is localized near the interface  $N = 0$ ,  $C$  equilibrates far from  $S$  to a constant value that is determined by the transition layer dynamics, so that the matching condition is  $\partial_N C \rightarrow 0$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . This constant value of  $C$  is then maintained on particle paths in the outer region, per (12), and a wake or plume of dissolved surfactant with  $C \neq 1$  develops, leaving the drop interface.

Similar to the formulation of Eq. (17), in the  $Pe \rightarrow \infty$  limit, Eq. (6) for evolution of the

surface surfactant concentration becomes

$$\left. \frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial t} \right|_n + \nabla_s \cdot (\Gamma \mathbf{u}_s) + \Gamma \kappa u_n = \frac{1}{Pe_s} \nabla_s^2 \Gamma + J_0 \left. \frac{\partial C}{\partial N} \right|_s \quad \text{on } S. \quad (19)$$

## B. Conservation of surfactant

Here we show that the asymptotic model of Sec. III A conserves surfactant in the large bulk Peclet number, small- $\epsilon$  limit with an error or remainder of order  $O(\epsilon^2)$ . The integral form of the conservation law (6) for evolution of surfactant  $\Gamma$  on the interface  $S$  is

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_S \Gamma dS = J \int_S \frac{\partial C}{\partial n} dS, \quad (20)$$

which includes the influence of surface diffusion and exchange of surfactant with the bulk. For a Lagrangian fluid volume  $R \subset \Omega_2$  that is bounded by the drop surface  $S$  and a closed surface of material points  $S_R$  outside  $S$ , Reynolds' transport theorem gives the integral form of the conservation law (7) for bulk surfactant  $C$  as

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_R C dV = \frac{1}{Pe} \int_R \nabla^2 C dV. \quad (21)$$

When the divergence theorem is used to express the right hand side of (21) as the net flux of surfactant entering  $R$  across  $S_R$  and from  $S$ , and the flux integral  $\int_S \partial_n C dS$  is eliminated via (20), we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left( \int_R C dV + \frac{1}{JP_e} \int_S \Gamma dS \right) = \frac{1}{Pe} \int_{S_R} \frac{\partial C}{\partial n} dS. \quad (22)$$

Here, the normal derivatives are outward on both  $S$  and  $S_R$ , and the relations (20) to (22) are exact.

Each term of Eq. (22) is estimated based on the leading order asymptotic model of Sec. III A. The surfactant concentrations have expansions in  $\epsilon$ :  $C = C^{(0)} + O(\epsilon)$  and  $\Gamma = \Gamma^{(0)} + O(\epsilon)$ , and we temporarily restore the (0)-superscript on the leading order terms, which was omitted in Sec. III A.

To estimate  $\frac{d}{dt} \int_R C dV$ , the integral over  $R$  is written as the sum of the integral over the inner region of the  $\epsilon$ -width transition layer  $\Omega_{2r}$  and over the outer region of its complement  $R \setminus \Omega_{2r}$ . From Reynolds' transport theorem, each is the integral of the material derivative  $\frac{DC}{Dt}$  over the corresponding volume. In  $\Omega_{2r}$ , the material derivative is given in the intrinsic

frame by the left hand side of Eq. (13) with  $C$  replaced by  $C^{(0)}$  at leading order, plus a remainder that is  $O(\epsilon)$ . From Eq. (13) this leading order term is  $\partial_N^2 C^{(0)}$ , and the volume element in  $\Omega_{2r}$  is  $dV = \epsilon dN dS(1 + O(\epsilon))$ , where terms of the Jacobian that contain the curvature of  $S$  are  $O(\epsilon)$  throughout. The integration with respect to  $N$  across the  $\epsilon$ -width region  $\Omega_{2r}$  can be evaluated, and the contribution as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  is zero from the boundary conditions (18). This produces the integral  $-\epsilon \int_S \partial_N C^{(0)} dS$  over  $S$  plus a remainder that is  $O(\epsilon^2)$ . To estimate the integral over the outer region  $R \setminus \Omega_{2r}$ , we note from Eq. (7) that the material derivative is equal to  $\epsilon^2 \nabla^2 C$ , which is  $O(\epsilon^2)$  in the absence of large spatial gradients there. Over  $R$ , this gives

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_R C dV = -\epsilon \int_S \frac{\partial C^{(0)}}{\partial N} dS + O(\epsilon^2). \quad (23)$$

The term  $\frac{d}{dt} \int_S \Gamma dS$  of Eq. (22) is equal to the integral over  $S$  of the material derivative  $\frac{D\Gamma}{Dt}$  confined to the flow on  $S$ , which in turn is given by the left hand side of (19) with  $\Gamma$  replaced by  $\Gamma^{(0)}$  plus a remainder that is  $O(\epsilon)$ . The leading order term is given by the right hand side of (19), with  $\Gamma$  replaced by  $\Gamma^{(0)}$  and  $C$  replaced by  $C^{(0)}$ , and the integral of the surface diffusion term is zero since  $S$  is closed. Since  $J = J_0 \epsilon$  and  $1/Pe = \epsilon^2$ , this gives

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left( \frac{1}{JPe} \int_S \Gamma dS \right) = \epsilon \int_S \frac{\partial C^{(0)}}{\partial N} dS + O(\epsilon^2). \quad (24)$$

The left hand side of Eq. (22) is therefore given by the sum of (23) and (24), in which the  $O(\epsilon)$  terms on the right hand sides cancel to leave an  $O(\epsilon^2)$  remainder. The right hand side of (22) is also of order  $O(\epsilon^2)$ , since the outer boundary  $S_R$  of  $R$  is in the outer region, where spatial gradients of  $C$  are  $O(1)$  and  $1/Pe = \epsilon^2$ .

We conclude that the hybrid method conserves surfactant at  $O(\epsilon)$ , with remainder of order  $O(\epsilon^2)$ .

### C. Boundary integral formulation

The boundary integral method was chosen to solve the equations for incompressible Stokes flow (1). For a point  $\mathbf{x}_0$  in the exterior flow domain  $\Omega_2$  the fluid velocity  $\mathbf{u}$  satisfies

$$u_j(\mathbf{x}_0) = u_j^\infty(\mathbf{x}_0) - \frac{1}{8\pi} \int_S G_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_0) [\sigma_{ik}(\mathbf{x})]_1^2 n_k(\mathbf{x}) dS(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1-\lambda}{8\pi} \int_S u_i(\mathbf{x}) T_{ijk}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_0) n_k(\mathbf{x}) dS(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{1}{8\pi} \int_{S_b} G_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_0) g_i(\mathbf{x}) dS(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{x}_0 \in \Omega_2, \quad (25)$$

written in suffix notation. The derivation of (25) in the absence of baffles  $S_b$  can be found in Refs. [33] and [34] and is based on the Lorentz reciprocal identity for Stokes flows and application of the divergence theorem. The free-space Green's function, or Stokeslet, and associated stress tensor, or stresslet, are given by

$$G_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_0) = \frac{\delta_{ij}}{r} + \frac{\hat{x}_i \hat{x}_j}{r^3} \quad \text{and} \quad T_{ijk}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_0) = -6 \frac{\hat{x}_i \hat{x}_j \hat{x}_k}{r^5}, \quad (26)$$

respectively, where  $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0$  and  $r = |\hat{\mathbf{x}}|$ . In the integral over the interface  $S$  that contains  $G_{ij}$ , or the single layer potential,  $[\sigma_{ik}(\mathbf{x})]_1^2 n_k(\mathbf{x})$  is the net traction exerted on  $S$  by the bulk flow to either side of it, which is given in terms of the interfacial tension by (4). In the integral over  $S$  that contains  $T_{ijk}$ , or the double layer potential,  $u_i$  is the interfacial fluid velocity on  $S$ . The inclusion of rigid baffles  $S_b$  introduces two analogous integrals. However, of these, the double layer term is zero, since the fluid velocity satisfies the no-slip condition  $\mathbf{u} = 0$  on  $S_b$ , and in the single layer term, which is the last term on the right hand side of (25),  $g_i(\mathbf{x})$  is the net traction exerted by the fluid surrounding  $S_b$ , which is to be determined.

If  $\mathbf{x}_0$  approaches  $S$  from  $\Omega_2$  all terms of (25) are continuous with the exception of the integral for the double layer potential, which in the limit is given by the sum of a local contribution  $4\pi u_j(\mathbf{x}_0)$  from a neighborhood of  $\mathbf{x}_0$  plus the principal value of the integral, which is denoted by  $\mathcal{PV}$  and is the value of the improper integral when  $\mathbf{x}_0$  is on  $S$  [34]. After some rearrangement, this gives the integral equation (27a) below. Conversely, if  $\mathbf{x}_0$  approaches  $S_b$  from  $\Omega_2$  then all terms of (25) are continuous, including the double layer potential, and the fluid velocity  $u_j(\mathbf{x}_0)$  is zero to satisfy the no-slip boundary condition. After rearrangement, this gives the integral equation (27b). We have

$$\begin{aligned} u_j(\mathbf{x}_0) - \frac{1-\lambda}{4\pi(1+\lambda)} \int_S^{\mathcal{PV}} u_i(\mathbf{x}) T_{ijk}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_0) n_k(\mathbf{x}) dS(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{4\pi(1+\lambda)} \int_{S_b} G_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_0) g_i(\mathbf{x}) dS(\mathbf{x}) \\ = \frac{2}{1+\lambda} u_j^\infty(\mathbf{x}_0) - \frac{1}{4\pi(1+\lambda)} \int_S G_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_0) [\sigma_{ik}(\mathbf{x})]_1^2 n_k(\mathbf{x}) dS(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{x}_0 \in S, \end{aligned} \quad (27a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\lambda-1}{8\pi} \int_S u_i(\mathbf{x}) T_{ijk}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_0) n_k(\mathbf{x}) dS(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{8\pi} \int_{S_b} G_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_0) g_i(\mathbf{x}) dS(\mathbf{x}) \\ = u_j^\infty(\mathbf{x}_0) - \frac{1}{8\pi} \int_S G_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_0) [\sigma_{ik}(\mathbf{x})]_1^2 n_k(\mathbf{x}) dS(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{x}_0 \in S_b. \end{aligned} \quad (27b)$$

This is a pair of coupled Fredholm integral equations for the fluid velocity  $\mathbf{u}$  on the drop interface  $S$  and the net traction  $\mathbf{g}$  on the baffles  $S_b$ , where the right hand sides are considered known in terms of the imposed flow  $\mathbf{u}^\infty$  and the net surface traction on  $S$ . When  $\lambda \neq 1$ ,

Eq. (27a) is of the second kind in  $\mathbf{u}$  and first kind in  $\mathbf{g}$ , while Eq. (27b) is of the first kind in both  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{g}$ . When  $\lambda = 1$ , Eq. (27b) is of the first kind in  $\mathbf{g}$  while (27a) gives  $\mathbf{u}$  directly in terms of two single layer potentials, one over  $S$  and one over  $S_b$ .

#### IV. NUMERICAL IMPLEMENTATION

Simplification of (27) occurs since the geometry and flow are axisymmetric about the  $x$ -axis and symmetric about the plane  $x = 0$ . In the surface integrals, the integration in the azimuthal direction can be performed analytically, and the components of the Stokeslet and stresslet that result can be expressed in cylindrical  $r, x$ -coordinates in terms of complete elliptic integrals [34, 35]. The surface integrals are thus reduced to line integrals over the trace or intersection of the interface  $S$  and baffles  $S_b$  with a meridional  $r, x$ -plane in the first quadrant  $r > 0, x > 0$ .

Some of the kernels in the line integrals have integrable logarithmic singularities as  $\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}_0$ . This occurs in the single layer potential terms as  $\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}_0 \in S$  on the right hand side of (27a) and as  $\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}_0 \in S_b$  on the left hand side of (27b). To resolve these the hybrid Gauss-trapezoidal quadrature rules developed by Alpert [36] were used. The quadratures have error of order  $O(h^p \log h)$ , where the choice of the order  $p$  determines the nodes and weights, and in this implementation  $p = 8$ . There are also integrable logarithmic singularities in the kernel of the double layer potential as  $\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}_0 \in S$  in the principal value integral on the left hand side of (27a). These were resolved with the boundary element approach of Stone and Leal [37] and 8-point Gauss-Legendre quadrature rules. The discretized system was solved iteratively using GMRES, with tolerance for convergence set to  $10^{-13}$ .

At the beginning of a time step, the surface traction on  $S$  is known in terms of the surface tension and the interface shape from (4), so that the right hand side of the system (27) is known; it is then solved iteratively to find  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{g}$ . The interface position is then updated in time according to the kinematic condition (3), and the updated curvature  $\kappa$  and normal and tangential field  $(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{t})$  are found on  $S$ . With this information, the bulk and surface surfactant concentrations are updated according to Eqs. (13, 14) and (17-19), and the equation of state (5) is used to update the surface tension, thereby completing the time step. At predetermined intervals mesh points are redistributed so as to be equally spaced in arc length and more interface mesh points may be added.



The discretization for solving the bulk and surface surfactant concentrations used second order finite differences in space and explicit, first order forward Euler for the time step. In the absence of baffles, the discretization of Eq. (27a) has the same, second order, accuracy [15]. However, the overall order of accuracy of the method is lower, and first order in space, when the baffles, which are situated at  $x = \pm l$ , are introduced. The baffle mesh points on  $x = \pm l$  are distributed evenly in the radial coordinate  $r \in [r_0, R]$ , where  $r_0$  is the aperture radius and the outer radius  $R$  is fixed at  $R = 10$  throughout. The accuracy of implementing the no-slip boundary condition on  $S_b$  was verified by evaluating the fluid velocity at mid-points introduced half-way between the baffle mesh points in the absence of the drop. It is given by evaluating the right hand side minus the left hand side of (27b) with  $\mathbf{x}_0$  at each mid-point on  $S_b$ . Figure 3(a) shows the axial and radial velocity components,  $u_x$  and  $u_r$  respectively, evaluated in this way for a typical run with  $r_0 = 1.0$  and  $Ca = 1$ , when the number of baffle mesh points is doubled sequentially from  $N = 16$  to  $N = 128$ . The error is found to be small everywhere, except near the baffle end-points, where it is caused by the singularity of the flow around the sharp aperture edges. The  $L^2$  error of the velocity components on  $S_b$  is seen to decrease with order  $O(h)$ , where  $h$  is the mesh size, in Fig. 3(b).




FIG. 3. (a) The velocity components  $u_x$  and  $u_r$  versus  $r$ , evaluated at the mid-point between each of the  $N$  computational mesh points on the baffle  $S_b$  in the absence of the drop, with values of  $N$  from 16 to 128 as indicated in each panel. The baffle occupies the region  $r \in [1, 10]$  and  $Ca = 1$ . (b) Plot of the  $L^2$  error of the velocity components versus  $N$  on log-log scales. The error is of order  $O(h)$ .

### A. Validation and a note on the width of a surfactant plume

In our earlier work, Wang *et al.* [15], the hybrid method and implementation were used to study the dynamics of a drop that is strained by a uniaxial extension with soluble surfactant in the absence of flow focusing baffles. There we noted that it has been validated by comparison with results presented in earlier studies in which the surfactant is insoluble. In particular, it has accurately reproduced the steady state solutions of Stone and Leal [38] at large and small deformation together with their asymptotic solution in the limit of small capillary number. It has also accurately reproduced the examples of tipstreaming given by Eggleton *et al.* [16].

In Ref. 13 a further partial validation study was performed for steady solutions at small capillary number  $Ca$  with soluble surfactant when  $E = 0$  and the boundary condition (17) is replaced by  $C|_s = 0$ . We return to this here. When  $E = 0$ , the surface tension  $\sigma = 1$  and the coupling from the evolution of surface and bulk surfactant to the underlying flow is removed. The fluid velocity and drop shape in the  $Ca \ll 1$  limit have been given in many small-deformation studies, see for example [38, 39], and two results that we refer to here are that the drop shape and the rate of extension of a fluid line element normal to the interface,  $\partial_n v_p|_s$ , that appears in Eqs. (13), (14), and (18) are given by

$$\rho = 1 + Ca \frac{(16 + 19\lambda)}{8(1 + \lambda)} \left( 1 - \frac{3}{2} \sin^2 \phi \right) + O(Ca^2), \quad (28a)$$

$$\partial_n v_p|_s = Ca \frac{3}{(1 + \lambda)} \left( 1 - \frac{3}{2} \sin^2 \phi \right) + O(Ca^2), \quad (28b)$$

where  $\rho$  and  $\phi$  are the spherical polar distance and the angle of declination from the positive  $x$ -axis, respectively.

Figure 4 shows the result of a numerical simulation of a drop being strained with capillary number  $Ca = 0.04$  using the hybrid method. This is sufficiently small for the drop shape to be steady with small deformation at large times, and the panels of the figure, which are taken at  $t = 50, 200$ , and  $500$  show the development of a wake or plume of surfactant leaving downstream from the drop. The drop shape appears to be steady throughout this interval, although the data show a small change in the surface concentration of surfactant and surface tension. The other parameter values are  $\lambda = 0.05, E = 0.2, Pe_s = 10^3, J_0 = 0.05, K = 0.5$ , and  $Bi = 0.1$ , some of which will remain fixed throughout the simulations reported later, and the value of the bulk Peclet number, which is introduced only for the presentation of

the bulk surfactant concentration data outside the drop, is  $Pe = 10^4$ .




FIG. 4. Drop shape and bulk surfactant concentration with capillary number  $Ca = 0.04$  and initial equilibrium surfactant concentration  $\Gamma_0 = 1/3$ , shown at times  $t = 50, 200$ , and  $500$  as indicated in each panel. At the latest time, the surface and transition layer bulk surfactant concentration profiles have reached a steady state. For other parameter values see text.

The simulation data with surfactant give the drop center to pole distance  $\rho(\phi = 0) = 1.111$  and center to equator distance  $\rho(\phi = \frac{\pi}{2}) = 0.950$ , which are within 3% of the surfactant-free values  $\rho(\phi = 0) = 1.081$  and  $\rho(\phi = \frac{\pi}{2}) = 0.960$  given by the approximation at Eq. (28a). The slightly more prolate drop shape of the simulation is consistent with the presence of surfactant and decreased surface tension in the simulation data. We define the width of the surfactant plume to be the cylindrical radius at which the flow in the transition layer normal to the interface changes from inflow to outflow, i.e., where  $\partial_n v_p|_s = 0$ , per Eq. (18). From Eq. (28b) this occurs when  $\phi = \sin^{-1} \sqrt{2/3} \simeq 54.7^\circ$ , which, neglecting the narrow transition layer width, gives an estimate of the plume width as  $\sim 0.816$ . This is in close agreement with the simulation data at  $t = 500$ . Near the outer edge of the plume  $C < 1$ , since it consists of fluid particles that transit the surfactant-depleted part of the transition layer closer to the drop equator, while the plume core is surfactant-rich,  $C > 1$ .

## V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In the simulations reported below some dimensionless parameters are held fixed. These include the viscosity ratio  $\lambda = 0.05$ , and the two parameters associated with insoluble surfactant,  $E = 0.2$  and  $Pe_s = 10^3$ . It has been noted that it is necessary for  $\lambda \lesssim 0.1$  for tipstreaming to occur [5, 6], and the value used here is the same as that in the simulations of tipstreaming by Eggleton et al. [16]. The chosen value of  $E$  is typical of many surfactants,

and is the same as in other studies [16, 17, 20, 40]. In the asymptotic limit of the hybrid method, the bulk Peclet number  $Pe$  is scaled out of the surfactant dynamics as governed by Eqs. (13-19), but it must be reintroduced to display spatial data for  $C$ , and for this a fixed value of  $Pe = 10^4$  has been chosen. The remaining parameter that is held fixed here is the scaled exchange coefficient  $J_0$  of Eqs. (17) and (19), with  $J_0 = 0.05$ . Equilibrium initial conditions are assumed throughout, so that the initial surface concentration of surfactant and partition coefficient  $K$  are related by Eq. (10).

### A. Tipstreaming and the influence of $Bi$ in the absence of flow focusing

For reference and comparison with the results to follow, we include a sample of simulations that show the influence of the Biot number  $Bi$  on the formation of a filament or thread that tipstreams from a drop in the absence of flow focusing. For this, the capillary number is fixed at  $Ca = 0.10$ , the equilibrium partition coefficient is fixed at  $K = 1.5$ , and drop profiles are shown for a range of values of  $Bi$  in Fig. 5(a). A tipstreaming thread forms when  $Bi \lesssim 1.0$ , for which drop profiles are shown at an instant just before the thread is about to pinch off, at a point where a developing tip-drop joins the main part of the thread, near its downstream end. We note the trend, which we observed in earlier work at similar parameter values, that as the Biot number increases the thread length just before pinch-off decreases while the radius of the tipstreaming thread and tip-drop decrease [15].

When  $Bi = 0$  with  $J_0 \neq 0$  fixed, the boundary condition (17) implies that the bulk-interface exchange term of Eq. (19) is zero, so that in this limit the surface surfactant is insoluble (with  $C \equiv 1$  for all  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $t$ ). This can also be seen on recalling that  $Bi = a\kappa_d/U$  is the ratio of the kinetic rate for desorption to the capillary flow rate, so that in the limit when  $Bi = 0$  with  $K < \infty$  fixed the surfactant exchange kinetics are frozen. With increase of  $Bi$  with  $J_0$  and  $K$ , fixed the influence of surfactant solubility and bulk-interface exchange steadily increases until, in the limit  $Bi \rightarrow \infty$ , the mixed boundary condition (17) is replaced by the Dirichlet boundary condition

$$C|_s = \frac{\Gamma}{K(1 - \Gamma)}. \quad (29)$$

This is referred to as the diffusion-controlled regime [2, 31, 41]. A large Peclet number, bulk surfactant transition layer can still be induced by drop deformation, but the adsorption-




FIG. 5. (a) A surfactant-laden drop, which tipstreams at values of the Biot number indicated when  $Bi \lesssim 1.0$ . The main parameter values are  $\lambda = 0.05$ ,  $Ca = 0.1$ , and the initial surface coverage  $\Gamma_0 = 0.6$ ; for other parameters see text. Tipstreaming profiles are shown just before pinch-off: in the insoluble limit  $Bi = 0.0$  at time  $t = 52.0$ ; with surfactant solubility when  $Bi = 0.01$  at time  $t = 52.0$ ,  $Bi = 0.1$  at time  $t = 64.5$ , and when  $Bi = 1.0$  at time  $t = 88.0$ , respectively. (b) Bulk surfactant concentration for the simulation of (a) when  $Bi = 0.01$ . (c) Surface surfactant concentration  $\Gamma$  (left hand scale) with tangential component  $u_s$  and normal component  $u_n$  of the interfacial fluid velocity (right hand scale) versus  $x$ .

desorption exchange kinetics, and the surface and bulk sublayer surfactant concentration  $C|_S$ , are in local equilibrium at all points on the interface. Figure 5(a) shows a drop profile in this limit that is completely steady. The profile is also steady for all  $Bi \gtrsim 2$ , and the figure includes the profile of a steady, clean or surfactant-free drop ( $E = 0$ ), which at this capillary number is only slightly non-spherical because of its relatively large and uniform surface tension.

Evolution toward the profiles shown in Fig. 5(a) occurs in two phases. Surface surfactant is swept toward the drop pole in the first phase, and then a tipstreaming thread forms and

evolves in the second phase. When  $Pe_s = \infty$  and either  $Bi = 0$  or  $J_0 = 0$ , Eq. (6) or Eq. (19) for the evolution of  $\Gamma$  implies that surfactant on the interface is frozen into the flow, in the sense that it has the same velocity as a fluid particle at the same point on the interface; in this limit surfactant is sometimes referred to as immobile. Although the simulations are performed with  $Pe_s = 10^3$  this is sufficiently large that the influence of surface diffusion on the data is negligible. In the insoluble limit  $Bi = 0$ , or when  $Bi$  is small with  $J_0 > 0$  and fixed, so that the effect of solubility is sufficiently weak, during the first phase surfactant is advected by the flow on the slowly deforming interface toward the drop pole, where it forms a cap of surfactant at high concentration with tangential speed  $u_s = |\mathbf{u}_s| \simeq 0$ , so that the interface is nearly immobilized there. There is a substantial surface tension gradient  $\partial_s \sigma < 0$  around the outer parts of the cap and very low surface tension in a neighborhood of the cap pole. The second phase begins when viscous stress on the surfactant-immobilized part of the cap near the pole overcomes surface tension to draw the pole out to form the beginning of a tipstreaming thread.

The surface surfactant concentration remains high on the downstream part of the thread. There is axial stretching on the evolving thread interface, both where it is drawn out from the more stationary mother drop and downstream, when it is caused by the  $x$ -dependence of the axial component of the imposed flow (11). This can occur since the thread is relatively thin, of low viscosity, and because the surfactant is frozen into the flow, or nearly so, so that the thread has approximately the same axial speed  $u_x = Ca x$  as the imposed flow. In the early part of the second phase, at times before that of the snapshots in Fig. 5, the transition in radius between thread and mother drop is gradual, with no pronounced shoulder or base to the thread and no discernible tip-drop [15]. But by the time that the thread is about to first pinch off due to capillary instability behind the tip-drop, which is the time at which the profiles are shown, a thread base is more readily identifiable. The data show that at these times the axial stretching of the thread interface (with rate  $\partial_s u_s$ ) occurs along the thread surface away from the tip-drop and is greatest in the region just downstream of the thread base. As a consequence of this stretching, and because of the gradient of  $\Gamma$  on the outer parts of the mother drop surfactant cap from which the thread is drawn, the surface concentration  $\Gamma$  is less along much of the thread than it is further downstream, nearer the tip.

This is borne out by the data of Fig. 5(b) for the bulk surfactant concentration  $C$  and

Fig. 5(c) for the surface concentration  $\Gamma$  and the tangential and normal components of the interfacial fluid velocity,  $u_s$  and  $u_n$ . Here  $Bi = 0.01$  and the effect of solubility on tipstreaming is present but mild. On the downstream part of the thread and tip-drop, from  $x \simeq 6.0$  to  $x \simeq 7.5$ ,  $C|_s > 1.5$ , and there is noticeable desorption or leaching of surfactant to the bulk flow, which has had time to develop and spread away from the interface. On the middle part, from  $x \simeq 3.2$  to  $x \simeq 6.0$ ,  $C|_s \simeq 1.5$ , so that desorption occurs but is not as evident, and the data of Fig. 5(c) show that  $u_s$  is approximately linear in  $x$ . From the thread base at  $x \simeq 2.5$  up to  $x \simeq 3.2$ ,  $1 \lesssim C|_s \lesssim 1.5$ , and the desorption is relatively weak. In the vicinity of the thread base  $x \simeq 2.5$ ,  $C$  is non-monotone in the normal direction; away from the region of weak desorption neighboring the interface, fluid particle paths have exited the surfactant-lean region of the mother drop, where surface surfactant has been depleted by advection and some stretching of the interface, and adsorption from the bulk replenishes it.

As the Biot number is increased, the influence of surfactant solubility is increased and the interface becomes more remobilized. When tipstreaming occurs with increasing Biot number, the thread is significantly shorter in length and is thinner in radius at pinch-off. In the first phase, the surface surfactant concentration remains more uniform while the drop is being deformed, and the high concentration surfactant cap that forms at the pole is smaller. The duration of the first phase is longer at increased Biot number, and the interface shape at the pole has a more pointed tip. When a tipstreaming thread first forms it has a smaller radius, corresponding to the smaller pole cap size. Since the thread remains relatively thin along its length, the duration of the second phase, from tipstreaming to first pinch-off, is relatively short. More discussion on the transition between steady and tipstreaming states is given in Wang et al. [15], Secs. IV C and IV D.

## B. The influence of flow focusing on a tipstreaming thread

Flow focusing is introduced in the form of coaxial axisymmetric annular baffles situated at  $x = \pm 2$ . This maintains the symmetry of the simulation geometry about  $x = 0$  and resembles the flow focusing geometry of the experiments [10, 11]. The baffle outer radius is fixed at  $R = 10$ , which is large enough for an increase of  $R$  to have negligible effect on the flow at the aperture, while the inner radius  $r_0$  takes a sequence of values, at each of which  $Ca$  is fixed and  $\Gamma_0$  and  $Bi$  are varied. Other fixed parameters are listed at the beginning of

Sec. V. For most of the simulations reported in this section there are  $N = 256$  computational mesh points on the interface in the first quadrant  $r > 0, x > 0$  of the  $r, x$ -plane and the time step is  $\Delta t = 0.5 \times 10^{-3}$ .

### 1. Aperture radius $r_0 = 0.75$

The initial choice of aperture radius is  $r_0 = 0.75$ , that is, the aperture radius is 0.75 times the initial drop radius. Figure 6 shows a set of simulation data with the capillary number fixed at  $Ca = 0.74$ . Surfactant, when present, is insoluble ( $Bi = 0$ ), and a sequence of relatively low values of the initial surfactant concentration  $\Gamma_0$  is chosen. In the first, the interface is clean or surfactant-free ( $\Gamma_0 = 0$ ), and the interface is shown in profile in Fig. 6(a) and in perspective in Fig. 6(e) at time  $t = 86.3$ . The value of  $Ca = 0.74$  is based on this surfactant-free case as being only marginally above the threshold value at which the drop is drawn through the aperture. When  $Ca$  is just less than 0.74, the drop shape is steady at large times and has a nearly pointed or conical tip with location  $x < 2$ . When  $Ca \gtrsim 0.74$  the size of the daughter drop when pinch-off is first approached is comparable to the size of the aperture and there is no tipstreaming thread, as seen in Figs. 6(a, e).




FIG. 6. Insoluble surfactant ( $Bi = 0$ ) with aperture radius  $r_0 = 0.75$  and  $Ca = 0.74$ . (a, e) A surfactant-free interface ( $\Gamma_0 = 0$ ) shown at time  $t = 86.3$ , (a) in profile, and (e) in perspective. In the remaining panels of the figure the interface is surfactant-laden, shown in profile just before pinch-off at left, and with the distribution of  $\Gamma$  versus  $x$  at the same time at right. (b, f) With  $\Gamma_0 = 0.025$ , shown at time  $t = 13.2$ . (c, g)  $\Gamma_0 = 0.05$ , at time  $t = 12.1$ . (d, h)  $\Gamma_0 = 0.10$ , at time  $t = 11.5$ .

Panels (b) and (f) of Fig. 6 show the interface profile and surface surfactant concentration,



respectively, at time  $t = 13.2$ , for an initial uniform equilibrium concentration of insoluble surfactant  $\Gamma_0 = 0.025$ . In the first phase of the simulation, surfactant is swept to form a cap at the drop pole, which appears to be more or less steady by the time the pole is near the center of the aperture,  $x \simeq 2.0$ , at time  $t \simeq 13.1$ . Away from the cap, the interface is almost completely surfactant-free at this time, whereas the concentration is close to the maximum surface concentration over much of the cap. A thin tipstreaming thread is then emitted abruptly, and at the time  $t = 13.2$  for which it is shown the thread is about to pinch off at its base, where it joins the mother drop. The maximum radius of the thread is less than 0.02 and the radius of the thread tip-drop is about 0.03. The introduction of flow focusing with a small amount of surfactant has decreased the radius of the thread and tip-drop by a factor  $\simeq 5$  relative to the simulation with insoluble surfactant ( $Bi = 0$ ) in the unconfined geometry of Fig. 5(a), for which  $\Gamma_0 = 0.6$ , the thread radius is between 0.08 and 0.15, and the tip-drop radius is 0.165. The substantial difference in capillary number  $Ca$  between the two simulations ( $Ca = 0.10$  vs.  $Ca = 0.74$ ) is caused by confinement of the flow that is introduced by the baffles.

At a lower initial concentration,  $\Gamma_0 < 0.025$ , a surfactant cap forms in a way that is similar to that just described, and the drop pole forms an almost-pointed, nearly steady, conical tip. But instead, no tipstreaming thread is formed, and at larger times the drop undergoes a deformation that is qualitatively similar to the surfactant-free case of Figs. 6(a,e), with the ultimate formation of a large daughter drop downstream of the aperture.

An increase of the initial surfactant concentration from  $\Gamma_0 = 0.025$  to  $\Gamma_0 = 0.05$  produces dynamics that are qualitatively similar, see Figs. 6(c, g), but the accumulating cap of surfactant, and the thread and tip-drop radii, are larger. For example, in Fig. 6(c), when the thread is first about to pinch off, at its base,  $t = 12.1$ , and the tip-drop radius is about 0.05. With a further increase to  $\Gamma_0 = 0.10$ , this trend continues, see Figs. 6(d, h), with a near-doubling of the tip-drop radius to 0.11. The thread radius is again about to pinch off first at its base, but the tip-drop, which is prolate, is now also close to pinch-off.

Solubility of surfactant is introduced to this last example, with  $\Gamma_0 = 0.10$  (i.e.,  $K = 1/9$ ), by increasing the Biot number  $Bi$  from 0 to 0.10, then 0.25, and 0.50. The interface profile and surface surfactant concentration just before pinch-off are shown in Fig. 7, which includes the insoluble ( $Bi = 0$ ) data of Figs. 6(d, h) for comparison in Figs. 7(a, e). As the Biot number is increased through this sequence, the thread steadily shortens and becomes thinner.

The distance from the thread base to tip-drop end is 0.82, 0.63, 0.48, and 0.23, respectively. There is a similar decrease in size of the tip-drop radius, with sequence 0.11, 0.075, 0.04, and 0.018, respectively. This trend with increase in  $Bi$  is qualitatively similar to that noted without flow focusing in Sec. V A (see Fig. 5), and the data for the fluid velocity on the interface and the surfactant concentrations confirm that it is caused by the same mechanism of surface remobilization with increase in solubility of surfactant. However, the decrease in radius of the thread with increase of  $Bi$  is much less noticeable when there is flow focusing than it is in unconfined flow; flow focusing has already caused a substantial decrease in thread radius for insoluble surfactant. An additional feature that shows a similar trend in the data sets of Figs. 5(a) and 7 with increase in  $Bi$  is the decrease in prominence of the shoulder between the mother drop and thread base. This is accompanied by a slight decrease in magnitude or spreading out of the surface surfactant gradient  $\partial_s \Gamma$  on the part of the shoulder where  $0.1 \lesssim \Gamma \lesssim 0.5$ .

The effect of solubility on surface surfactant concentration versus axial distance along the thread is seen in Figs. 7(e-h). In Fig. 7(e) surfactant is insoluble ( $Bi = 0$ ) and the surface concentration  $\Gamma$  is nearly uniform and close to the maximum surface concentration along the thread length. As the Biot number and effect of solubility increases through the figure panels the surface concentration on parts of the thread that were formed at earlier times, i.e., nearer the thread tip, has decreased by up to 10% relative to the value at the thread base, via desorption or leaching from the surface to the bulk flow. A local maximum of the surface concentration is seen at the base of the tip-drop, which is close to pinch-off.

Figure 8 shows the bulk surfactant concentration  $C$  that corresponds to the profile and surface concentration data for  $\Gamma$  of Figs. 7(b, f). From the data for the surface concentration of Fig. 7(f),  $\Gamma \in (0.94, 0.98)$  on the part of the thread and tip-drop for  $x \in (2.30, 2.92)$ , which is far above the equilibrium concentration of  $\Gamma_0 = 0.1$ , so that surfactant desorbs from the thread surface and enters the bulk in high concentration. This large bulk concentration is clearly visible in Fig. 8. Figure 7(f) also shows that  $\Gamma \in (0.050, 0.075)$  on the part of the mother drop for  $x \in (0, 1.9)$ , and  $\Gamma$  increases to the equilibrium value  $\Gamma_0 = 0.1$  at  $x \simeq 2.0$ . The numerical output confirms that there is mild adsorption from the bulk to the mother drop interface, where  $C|_s < 1$ , but the effect is too faint to be seen in the color-coding of Fig. 8.

We note a difference in the range of surfactant concentration data for the confined, flow-




FIG. 7. The influence of Biot number  $Bi$  on drop profiles, shown in the left hand panels (a-d) just before pinch-off, and the corresponding surface surfactant distribution  $\Gamma$ , shown in the right hand panels (e-h), with  $r_0 = 0.75$ ,  $Ca = 0.74$ , and  $\Gamma_0 = 0.10$ . (a, e)  $Bi = 0$ , the insoluble limit, at  $t = 11.5$ , per Figs. 6(d, h). (b, f)  $Bi = 0.10$  at  $t = 11.3$ . (c, g)  $Bi = 0.25$  at  $t = 11.1$ . (d, h)  $Bi = 0.50$  at  $t = 10.9$ .

focusing simulation of Figs. 7(b, f) and 8 when compared to that for the simulation of unconfined tipstreaming of Figs. 5(b, c). This causes the apparent loss of resolution in displaying the bulk surfactant data in Fig. 8. In the unconfined example, the surface concentration  $\Gamma$  on the tipstreaming thread is in the range  $\Gamma \in (0.7, 0.92)$  relative to an initial equilibrium concentration of  $\Gamma_0 = 0.6$ , and the bulk concentration  $C$  that results is in the range  $C \in (0, 2.5)$ . In the confined, flow-focusing example here, the thread surface concentration (where  $\Gamma \in (0.94, 0.98)$ ) is much further away from the equilibrium concentration ( $\Gamma_0 = 0.1$ ) causing enhanced desorption and larger maximum values of the bulk concentration data, which is now in the range  $C \in (0, 5)$ , irrespective of the relatively brief duration of the thread. When displaying bulk concentration data the range  $C \in (0, 5)$  is maintained throughout the discussion that follows.

At this aperture size ( $r_0 = 0.75$ ) the base of the thread, or for the surfactant-free example of Figs. 6 (a, e) the location of the minimum radius, is in the range  $x \in (2.10, 2.35)$ , which is downstream of the aperture location  $x = 2$  in all simulations.

## 2. Aperture radius $r_0 = 0.50$

The aperture radius is decreased to  $r_0 = 0.50$  for a series of simulations at capillary number  $Ca = 1.82$ . These follow the same path in terms of the initial surface surfactant




FIG. 8. Bulk surfactant concentration  $C$  with the same parameter values and time as in Figs. 7(b, f).

concentration  $\Gamma_0$  and the Biot number  $Bi$  as in Sec. VB 1. The same criterion is used for choosing the capillary number of the imposed flow - the value  $Ca = 1.82$  in Eq. (11) is just large enough for the drop to be drawn through the aperture when it is surfactant-free. The decrease in aperture size leaves the qualitative trends with change in  $\Gamma_0$  and  $Bi$  mostly unaltered but it has a more prominent effect on the thread radius and length just before its first pinch-off.

Figure 9 shows the influence of the initial surface surfactant concentration  $\Gamma_0$  in the absence of solubility effects ( $Bi = 0$ ) when it is increased through the same sequence  $\Gamma_0 = 0.0, 0.025, 0.05, 0.10$  as in Fig. 6. In Fig. 9(a,e) the interface is surfactant-free ( $\Gamma_0 = 0$ ). In contrast to the surfactant-free case of Fig. 6(a,e), at this smaller aperture radius the daughter drop pinches off far earlier (at  $t = 50$  vs.  $t = 86.3$ ) and at a much smaller size. The daughter drop radius is now about 0.04 versus 0.50, which is smaller by an order of magnitude and comparable to the thread and tip-drop sizes seen with surfactant. However, there is no thread formation; instead, a protracted conical tip forms on the mother drop that is similar at both values of  $r_0$  in the surfactant-free case, compare Fig. 6(a) and Fig. 9(a).

Thread formation occurs with the addition of interfacial surfactant. Interface profiles just before pinch-off are shown in Fig. 9 panels (b), (c) and (d), for which the initial surface coverage  $\Gamma_0$  is 0.025, 0.05, and 0.10 respectively. The coverage  $\Gamma$  together with the tangential component  $u_s$  and normal component  $u_n$  of the fluid velocity on the interface just before pinch-off is shown in the corresponding right hand panels (f), (g), and (h). The trend of increase in radius of the thread and tip-drop with increase in  $\Gamma_0$  that was observed in Fig. 6 is seen again, but with a sequence of smaller radii so that the effect is less apparent. Here




FIG. 9. Insoluble surfactant ( $Bi = 0$ ) with aperture radius  $r_0 = 0.50$  and  $Ca = 1.82$ . (a, e) A surfactant-free interface ( $\Gamma_0 = 0$ ) shown at time  $t = 50$ , (a) in profile, and (e) in perspective. In the remaining panels of the figure the interface is surfactant-laden, shown in profile just before pinch-off at left, and with the distribution of  $\Gamma$  and interface velocity components ( $u_s, u_n$ ) versus  $x$  at the same time at right. (b, f) With  $\Gamma_0 = 0.025$ , shown at time  $t = 7.6$ . (c, g)  $\Gamma_0 = 0.05$ , at  $t = 9.0$ . (d, h)  $\Gamma_0 = 0.10$ , at  $t = 9.5$ .

the sequence of tip-drop radii is 0.018, 0.03, and 0.04, with similar values for the maximum thread radius. However, the decrease in aperture radius to  $r_0 = 0.50$  causes a noticeable increase in the sequence of thread lengths at pinch-off, which (including tip-drop) are now 0.49, 1.82, and 2.69.

The data of Figs. 9(c, g) show characteristic features that often recur throughout the simulations with  $r_0 \lesssim 0.5$ . Specifically, in Figs. 9(c, g), as  $x$  increases, insoluble surfactant is advected along the nearly stationary drop interface ( $u_n \simeq 0$ ) while the tangential interface velocity  $u_s$  increases due to flow focusing and decreasing drop radius, until  $u_s$  reaches a local maximum at the outer edge  $x \simeq 1.64$  of the drop's surfactant cap. The interface is then partly immobilized as the drop radius decreases and  $u_s$  decreases to a local minimum at  $x \simeq 1.80$ , at which point the drop surfactant cap merges with the base of the tipstreaming thread and  $u_s$  begins to increase. The surfactant concentration  $\Gamma$  continues to increase here due to decreasing drop-thread radius to achieve a local maximum at  $x \simeq 1.90$ . It is only in the region  $1.64 \lesssim x \lesssim 1.90$  of rapid change in  $\Gamma$  that surface diffusion is not negligible. At  $x = 1.90$ , just upstream of the aperture, the tangential velocity  $u_s$  is increasing in  $x$ , stretching the thread and causing  $\Gamma$  to decrease locally. The local minimum of  $\Gamma$  at  $x \simeq 1.97$  and the second local maximum of  $u_s$  at  $x \simeq 2.04$  are nearly coincident with the aperture

location at  $x = 2.0$ . With increase of  $x$  beyond  $x \simeq 2.04$  the flow begins to diverge as it exits the aperture,  $u_s$  decreases while  $\Gamma$  remains near the maximum surface concentration and the local axial compression of the thread is taken up by a slight increase in its radius. Further downstream, away from the baffle, the flow begins to converge again due to the stretching of the imposed flow ( $u_x = Ca x$ ) and convergence of the flow from around the outer edge of the annular baffle ( $R = 10$ ). As a result, when  $x \gtrsim 2.70$  the tangential velocity  $u_s$  increases, causing local stretching of the thread and a decrease of  $\Gamma$  away from the maximum surface concentration. This persists until closer to the tip-drop, where excursions in  $u_s, u_n$  and  $\Gamma$  are caused by impending pinch-off. Along most of the thread, away from its merger with the mother drop and away from the tip-drop, since the surfactant is insoluble and almost diffusion-free, time derivatives are small despite the transient evolution of the thread, and  $u_n \simeq 0$ , the features noted here follow from the observation that the surfactant flux  $r_{th}\Gamma u_s$  is approximately constant, where  $r_{th}$  is the thread radius. This is supported by the simulation data.

When compared with the data of Figs. 9(c, g), in Figs. 9(b, f) the thread is sufficiently short that it is not influenced by flow divergence on exit from the aperture, while in Figs. 9(d, h) the thread is sufficiently long that the downstream stretching with increase of  $u_s$  that occurs when  $x \gtrsim 2.70$  causes a more substantial decrease in  $\Gamma$ , to  $\Gamma \simeq 0.63$  just upstream of the tip-drop. This last effect, of increase in  $u_s$  further downstream from the baffle, is absent in the experiments, since there the flow is confined by parallel channel side walls and is driven by controlled, fixed volume flow rates, so that after decelerating on exit from the aperture,  $u_s$  remains near-constant further downstream.

Similar to the introduction of surfactant solubility effects in Sec. V B 1, but with  $r_0 = 0.50$  here, next the initial surface concentration is held fixed at  $\Gamma_0 = 0.10$  while the Biot number is increased through the same sequence of values: 0.00, 0.10, 0.25, and 0.50. The interface profile and surface surfactant concentration just before pinch-off are shown in Fig. 10, with the data for the insoluble limit ( $Bi = 0$ ) of Figs. 9(d, h) shown again for reference in Figs. 10(a, e). Interface remobilization with increasing  $Bi$  causes the thread length from base to tip-drop end just before pinch-off to decrease noticeably, in the sequence 2.69, 1.90, 1.15, and 0.87. However, the maximum thread and tip-drop radii are now all in the region from 0.02 to 0.05 and show little or no noticeable trend of decrease with increase in  $Bi$ .

At the larger values of  $Bi \gtrsim 0.25$ , the thread experiences axial compression as  $u_s$  de-




FIG. 10. The influence of Biot number  $Bi$  on drop profiles, shown in the left hand panels (a-d) just before pinch-off, and the corresponding surface surfactant distribution  $\Gamma$  and interface velocity components  $(u_s, u_n)$ , shown in the right hand panels (e-h), with  $r_0 = 0.50$ ,  $Ca = 1.82$ , and  $\Gamma_0 = 0.10$ . (a, e)  $Bi = 0$ , the insoluble limit, at  $t = 9.5$ , per Figs. 9(d, h). (b, f)  $Bi = 0.10$  at  $t = 9.2$ , (c, g)  $Bi = 0.25$  at  $t = 8.4$ . (d, h)  $Bi = 0.50$  at  $t = 7.8$ .

creases with  $x$  due to flow divergence on exit from the aperture, but surfactant solubility and desorption are sufficiently large that the surface concentration  $\Gamma$  stays well below the maximum surface concentration, see Figs. 10(g, h), whereas with  $Bi = 0.10$  this is attained for  $2.19 \lesssim x \lesssim 2.66$ , see Fig. 10(f).




FIG. 11. Bulk surfactant concentration  $C$  with the same parameter values and time as Figs. 10(b, f).

Figure 11 shows the bulk surfactant concentration with the same parameter values and at the same instant as in Figs. 10 (b, f). Desorption of surfactant from the interface to the bulk flow occurs along the tipstreaming thread and is most noticeable in the vicinity of the tip-drop. At the time of the figure, the lifetime of the thread tip since leaving the mother

drop is approximately equal to the flow time divided by the capillary number,  $a/CaU$ , so that the ratio of the tip-drop age to desorption time is of the order of  $Bi/Ca \simeq 0.05$ .

With decrease in aperture radius from  $r_0 = 0.75$  to  $r_0 = 0.50$  the location of the thread base has moved from the downstream side to the upstream side of the aperture, in the vicinity  $1.7 \lesssim x \lesssim 1.9$ .

To explore the evolution of the tipstreaming thread at times beyond its first pinch-off, simulations were continued by closing-off the thread interface at its point of minimum radius when this reached a threshold of  $\simeq 10^{-3}$  and omitting the excised, downstream region of the dispersed phase from the computation at later times. This was repeated at consecutive pinch-off events. In these simulations, the minimum radius usually occurred immediately behind the tip-drop, but it also occurred less frequently further upstream along the thread. It is assumed that the omitted interface and dispersed phase ‘droplets’ have negligible influence on the tipstreaming thread.

Figure 12 shows two examples of this. In both examples,  $r_0 = 0.50$ ,  $Ca = 1.82$ , the initial surface surfactant coverage  $\Gamma_0 = 0.10$ , and these are held fixed. For the data of Fig. 12(a) the Biot number is set at  $Bi = 0.25$  and the time of the uppermost frame is  $t = 8.4$ , so that this image is a close-up of the tipstreaming thread of Figs. 10(c, g). The sequence of frames below it are each taken at a fixed time interval of  $\Delta t = 0.3$  thereafter, and one tip-drop has pinched off and been excised between each consecutive frame. During the time interval spanned by the figure, the evolution appears to be approaching a more or less periodic state with period close to 0.3 in the top four frames, but in the last frame of the panel the thread is less uniform in radius with an apparent neck or capillary instability developing in the region  $2.5 \lesssim x \lesssim 2.6$ . It is possible that this is a numerical artifact, but refining the computational mesh by doubling the number of node points on the interface suggests this is not so. The precise location and time at which the instability sets in are mildly sensitive to the mesh size and time step but its occurrence appears to be robust.

For the data of Figs. 12(b) and 12(c) the Biot number is increased to  $Bi = 0.50$ , and in Fig. 12(b) the time of the earliest (uppermost) frame is  $t = 7.8$ , so that this image is a close-up of the tipstreaming thread of Figs. 10(d, h). The sequence of frames below it are taken at a fixed time interval of  $\Delta t = 0.3$ , with a single tip-drop having pinched off and been excised between consecutive frames. The thread shows a slight constriction beginning to develop in the fourth frame of Fig. 12(b) at  $x \simeq 2.43$ . This has moved downstream to






FIG. 12. Thread evolution with aperture radius  $r_0 = 0.50$ ,  $Ca = 1.82$ , and  $\Gamma_0 = 0.10$ . Between each frame a tip-drop pinches off; it is then removed from the computation and is not shown in the figure. (a)  $Bi = 0.25$ , the time interval between frames is  $\Delta t = 0.3$  with the first (top) frame at  $t = 8.4$ . (b)  $Bi = 0.50$ , the frame time interval is  $\Delta t = 0.3$  with the first (top) frame at  $t = 7.8$ , continued by (c) where the frame time interval is  $\Delta t = 0.2$  with the first (top) frame at  $t = 9.2$ .

$x \simeq 2.48$  in the last frame of Fig. 12(b), in which it is the location of the minimum thread radius, while the thread end is at  $x \simeq 2.66$ . Between this frame and the time  $t = 9.2$  of the earliest (uppermost) frame of Fig. 12(c) the thread has pinched off at  $x \simeq 2.50$ , and the substantial segment of the end of the thread downstream of this point has been excised – it has two to three times the volume of the single tip-drops that were emitted earlier in the simulation. The fixed time interval between subsequent frames in Fig. 12(c) is reduced to  $\Delta t = 0.2$ , and the sequence of events repeats in a qualitatively similar way at this reduced time interval. Initially, a sequence of single tip-drops pinches off between consecutive frames, until a capillary instability begins to form some distance upstream of the thread end at a time around that of the fourth and fifth frames. A resolution study suggests that the main features, the pinching off of either a single tip-drop or less frequently a larger section of the thread end, are robust.

### 3. Aperture radius $r_0 = 0.25$

The aperture radius is decreased further to  $r_0 = 0.25$ . At this level of flow focusing there is a difference in the behavior of the interface with respect to the capillary number when it is surfactant-free. For values of the capillary number  $Ca$  up to 85, which is the largest considered, the drop interface is not drawn through the aperture. Instead, there is a smaller

threshold value of the capillary number  $Ca_c \simeq 12.85$ , below which the interface approaches a steady state with a rounded shape and tip, and above which the interface approaches a steady shape where the pole is drawn into a cone that has a very sharp tip situated closer to the aperture. An example of this is shown in Figure 13, where  $Ca = 12.90 > Ca_c$ . The transition between the two configurations with increase in  $Ca$  appears to be discontinuous.




FIG. 13. A steady drop with a conical tip in the absence of surfactant. Aperture radius  $r_0 = 0.25$ , capillary number  $Ca = 12.90$  shown at time  $t = 38.6$ , (a) profile view, and (b) perspective view.

With the capillary number fixed at  $Ca = 12.90$ , the presence of insoluble surfactant ( $Bi = 0$ ) at a relatively modest concentration of  $\Gamma_0 = 0.10$  is sufficient to induce tipstreaming. This is seen in Figure 14(a), which shows the interface, thread, and tip-drop just before pinch-off at  $t = 9.0$ . The tip-drop and maximum thread radius are both  $\simeq 0.016$ , the thread length is  $\simeq 1.90$ , and pinch-off is about to occur at the juncture between thread and tip-drop. At smaller initial concentrations  $\Gamma_0 \lesssim 0.1$  thread formation was not observed.




FIG. 14. The addition of insoluble surfactant at initial concentration  $\Gamma_0 = 0.10$  but with all other parameters as in Fig. 13 induces tipstreaming. Data shown just before pinch-off, at time  $t = 9.0$ . (a) Interface profile. (b) Surface surfactant concentration  $\Gamma$  with tangential component  $u_s$  and normal component  $u_n$  of the interfacial fluid velocity versus  $x$ .

When surfactant solubility is introduced with  $Bi = 0.10$  but with all other parameters

unchanged the thread is considerably shorter and narrower at the instant just before pinch-off. This is seen in Fig. 15, for which the time  $t = 7.6$ . Figure 15(a) shows the interface profile at this time, with tip-drop radius  $\simeq 0.011$  and thread radius just behind the pinch-point nearly constant at  $\simeq 0.007$  over a length  $\Delta x \simeq 0.3$ . The tendency of solubility to result in a thread that is noticeably shorter and slightly narrower was noted above at larger aperture radii.




FIG. 15. The inclusion of surfactant solubility with  $Bi = 0.1$  but with all other conditions as in Fig. 14 leads to a shorter and slightly narrower thread just before pinch-off, at time  $t = 7.6$ . Aperture size  $r_0 = 0.25$ , capillary number  $Ca = 12.90$ ,  $\Gamma_0 = 0.10$ . (a) Interface profile. (b) Surface surfactant concentration  $\Gamma$  and interfacial fluid velocity components  $(u_s, u_n)$  versus  $x$ . (c) Bulk surfactant concentration  $C$ .

The shoulder or decrease in radius where the mother drop merges with the thread is more gradual here, both with and without surfactant solubility, than was found at the larger aperture radii discussed above, to the extent that the location of a thread base is not as clearly identifiable in the interface profiles. The decrease in aperture radius from  $r_0 = 0.75$  has caused the region of drop-thread merger to move continually upstream, until it is located in the region  $1.50 \lesssim x \lesssim 1.65$  when  $r_0 = 0.25$ , and the more gradual decrease in interface radius corresponds to the slower rate of convergence of the flow further upstream away from the aperture.

However, the data of Figs. 14(b) and 15(b) show a point where a fairly sharp increase in the interfacial stretch rate  $\partial_s u_s$  occurs. This is at  $x \simeq 1.63$  with insoluble surfactant in Fig. 14(b) and is more visible at  $x \simeq 1.52$  with soluble surfactant in Fig. 15(b). We take this to be the point of demarcation between the mother drop and tipstreaming thread. Returning to Fig. 14(b), although the interfacial stretch rate is positive and increasing with  $x$  near the drop-thread merger at  $x \simeq 1.63$  there is a decrease in interface radius there that is sufficient to cause a fairly rapid increase in the surface surfactant concentration  $\Gamma$ , until it attains a

local maximum of  $\Gamma \simeq 0.70$  at  $x \simeq 1.69$ . The thread then experiences increased stretching followed by compression during its transit across a neighborhood of the aperture at  $x = 2.0$ . The local maximum of  $u_s$  and local minimum of  $\Gamma$  at  $x \simeq 2.0$  are clearly visible in the figure, and the thread radius of 0.005 there is close to the limit that the computations can resolve before indicating pinch-off. Downstream of the aperture, the region of flow divergence and interface compression end at  $x \simeq 2.43$ , where a second local maximum of  $\Gamma \simeq 0.91$  occurs.

For the two runs shown in this section, despite the decrease in aperture radius to  $r_0 = 0.25$ , both with and without solubility effects the surface surfactant concentration  $\Gamma$  remains well below the maximum surface concentration everywhere along the thread, whereas this was often attained in the simulations at the larger aperture openings of Secs. V B 1 and V B 2.

### C. Comparison of simulation and experimental studies

In this section we compare results from our numerical simulations with results from the experiments reported by Moyle *et al.* [11].

#### 1. Comparison of parameters

A complete list of apparatus dimensions and fluid properties for the experiments is given in Table I of Ref. [11], and those quantities that are needed for comparison are reproduced in Table I here. The values of dimensionless quantities such as the viscosity ratio  $\lambda$  and elasticity number  $E$  for the experimental data and as set in the simulations are given in Table II. Some quantities from the experimental and simulation data sets are in close agreement while others are not and require comment. For example, the baffle location of the simulations at  $x = l = 2.0$  is within 1% of the analogous quantity in the experiments, which is  $\Delta Z/a$ , see Fig. 2(a). Based on the apparatus dimensions in Table I the experimental value is 2.02, which is given together with the simulation value in Table II.

The dimensionless aperture radius  $r_0$  is 0.20 in the experiments versus 0.50 in the simulations. We found tipstreaming in simulations when  $r_0 = 0.25$ , as described in Sec. V B 3, but at this and smaller values of the aperture radius it becomes increasingly difficult to determine if tipstreaming occurs at neighboring parameter values, and computational runs are costly due to the need for a small time step. We have therefore kept the aperture radius

fixed at the value  $r_0 = 0.50$  of Sec. VB 2, and give an estimate of the influence of  $r_0$  on the data below. The viscosity ratio  $\lambda$  is 0.025 in the experiments as opposed to 0.050 in the simulations. Simulations were made successfully at the smaller value  $\lambda = 0.025$  but showed sufficiently little difference in the dynamics and data that  $\lambda$  was kept fixed at the value  $\lambda = 0.050$  of the other simulations of this study.

TABLE I. Data for the geometry, fluid, and surfactant properties in the experiments reported by Moyle *et al.* [11], with other data as indicated. Data reproduced with permission from Refs. [10] and [11]. Copyright 2006, 2012, AIP Publishing LLC.

| Property description  | Symbol                     | Value  |
|---|----------------------------|--|
| Width of continuous phase feed channels                               | $w_c \equiv W_{\text{up}}$ | $285\mu\text{m}$   |
| Half width of dispersed phase channel                                 | $a$                        | $94\mu\text{m}$  |
| Length from channel merger to focusing aperture                       | $L \equiv \Delta Z$        | $190\mu\text{m}$   |
| Width of focusing aperture  | $w_{or}$                   | $38\mu\text{m}$  |
| Viscosity of continuous phase   | $\mu_2$                    | 40 cP  |
| Viscosity of dispersed phase  | $\mu_1$                    | 1 cP   |
| Oil-water clean interface surface tension                             | $\sigma_0$                 | 62 mN/m  |
| Interfacial surfactant maximum packing concentration                  | $\Gamma_\infty$            | $2.25\mu\text{mol}/\text{m}^2$                                     |
| Kinetic desorption rate constant                                      | $\kappa_d$                 | $6.86 \times 10^{-6} \text{ s}^{-1}$                               |
| Kinetic adsorption rate constant                                      | $\kappa_a$                 | $22.1 \text{ m}^3/(\text{s mol})$                                  |
| Bulk surfactant diffusivity <sup>a</sup>                              | $D$                        | $10^{-10} \text{ m}^2\text{s}^{-1}$                                |
| Bulk surfactant concentration range <sup>b</sup>                      | $C_\infty$                 | $1.5 \times 10^{-2} \leq C_\infty \leq 1.5 \text{ mol}/\text{m}^3$ |
| Capillary velocity scale $U = \sigma_0/\mu_2 = 1.55 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ |                            |  |

<sup>a</sup> This representative value is given in various studies [31, 41–44].

<sup>b</sup> The value at CMC given by Anna and Mayer [10] is  $C_\infty = 10^{-1} \text{ mol}/\text{m}^3$ .

The experimental data gives an elasticity number  $E = 0.09$  versus the value  $E = 0.20$  used in the simulations. For tipstreaming to occur there must be a significant reduction in the local surface tension  $\sigma$  near the drop pole. However, in practice there is a maximum reduction that can be achieved with surfactants, and for an oil-water interface this is reported to be between about one seventh (Anna and Meijer [10]) and one tenth (de Bruijn [6]) of the clean, surfactant-free value  $\sigma = 1$ . From the equation of state (5) this leads to a surface

concentration  $\Gamma$  that satisfies

$$1 - \Gamma = e^{-(1-\sigma)/E}.$$

When  $E$  is small, at this minimum achievable surface tension  $\Gamma$  is exponentially close to both the theoretical maximum concentration, at which  $\sigma = 0$ , and the logarithmic singularity of the equation of state, at  $\Gamma = 1$ . Further, the sensitivity of surface tension to changes in surfactant concentration, given by

$$\frac{d\sigma}{d\Gamma} = \frac{-E}{1 - \Gamma} = -Ee^{(1-\sigma)/E},$$

is exponentially large, and this can easily induce numerical instability in simulations of tipstreaming. We have set  $E = 0.20$  to avoid this computational difficulty and note that this value is representative of many fluid-surfactant systems [6, 31, 41] and has been used in other numerical studies [16, 17, 20, 40].

TABLE II. Values of dimensionless quantities in the experimental study by Moyle *et al.* [11] and in the simulations summarized in Fig. 16(b).

| Dimensionless quantity  | Value in experiments                           | Value in simulations                          |
|---|--|---|
| Baffle location, $x = l = \Delta Z/a$                                 | 2.02   | 2.0   |
| Aperture radius, $r_0 = w_{or}/2a$                                    | 0.20   | 0.50  |
| Viscosity ratio, $\lambda = \mu_1/\mu_2$                              | 0.025  | 0.050   |
| Elasticity number, $E = RT\Gamma_\infty/\sigma_0$                     | 0.09   | 0.20  |
| Peclet numbers, $Pe_s \simeq Pe = Ua/D$                               | $1.46 \times 10^6$                             | $Pe_s = 10^3$                                 |
| Expansion parameter, $\epsilon = Pe^{-1/2}$                           | $0.83 \times 10^{-3}$                          | —   |
| Exchange coefficient <sup>a</sup> , $J = DC_\infty/\Gamma_\infty U$   | $4.30 \times 10^{-7}$ to $4.30 \times 10^{-5}$ | —   |
| Scaled exchange coefficient <sup>a</sup> , $J_0 = J/\epsilon$         | $5.18 \times 10^{-4}$ to $5.18 \times 10^{-2}$ | $7.8 \times 10^{-4}$ to $10^{-1}$             |
| Biot number, $Bi = a\kappa_d/U$                                       | $4.16 \times 10^{-10}$                         | $10^{-3}$                                     |
| Partition coefficient <sup>a</sup> , $K = \kappa_a C_\infty/\kappa_d$ | $4.83 \times 10^4$ to $4.83 \times 10^6$       | $1.56 \times 10^{-2}$ to 2.0                  |
| Modified Biot number <sup>a</sup> , $BiK$                             | $2.0 \times 10^{-5}$ to $2.0 \times 10^{-3}$   | $1.56 \times 10^{-5}$ to $2.0 \times 10^{-3}$ |

<sup>a</sup> Experimental values at CMC are estimated to be:  $K = 3.22 \times 10^5$ ,  $J = 2.87 \times 10^{-6}$ ,  $J_0 = 3.46 \times 10^{-3}$ , and  $BiK = 1.3 \times 10^{-4}$

Surface and bulk Peclet numbers are believed to be nearly equal, and from the experimental data  $Pe_s \simeq Pe = 1.46 \times 10^6$ , which leads to a value for the expansion parameter

of the hybrid numerical method of  $\epsilon = 0.83 \times 10^{-3}$ . In the simulations, the surface Peclet number was set to  $10^3$ . The numerical data and separate simulations with  $Pe_s = 0$  show that the influence of surface diffusion in the surfactant conservation equation (19) is negligible except in the region from the outer edge of the surfactant cap to the drop-thread merger, close to the end of the mother drop, where there is a substantial increase in  $\Gamma$ , e.g., at  $1.64 \lesssim x \lesssim 1.90$  in Figs. 9(c, g), and the addition of some surface diffusion there is desirable to prevent overshoot in  $\Gamma$ .

The bulk-interface exchange coefficient  $J$  and equilibrium partition coefficient  $K$  are the only dimensionless parameters in the simulations that depend on the ambient bulk surfactant concentration  $C_\infty$ , to which they are both directly proportional, see the definitions in Table II. The experimental data imply a range of  $J$  as shown in the table when  $C_\infty$  is varied. This leads to an estimate of the experimental range for the scaled exchange coefficient  $J_0 = J/\epsilon$  that is very close to the range used in the surfactant exchange term of Eq. (19) in the simulations.

Chang and Franses [31] note that in the context of an air-water interface the surface activity  $K_L = \kappa_a/\kappa_d$  for common surfactants can vary widely, from  $10^{-3}$  to  $10^7$  m<sup>3</sup>/mol. From Table I, the value for the experimental data of  $K_L = 3.22 \times 10^6$  is near the upper end of this range, and in predicting conditions for tipstreaming in their experiments Moyle *et al.* [11] justifiably neglect desorption of surfactant from the interface upstream of the base of a tipstreaming thread. However, in contrast, for the equilibrium initial conditions of the simulations the initial surface surfactant concentration  $\Gamma_0 = K/(1+K)$ , and for large  $K$  this is sufficiently close to  $\Gamma = 1$ , with a small surface tension everywhere on the interface, that the imposed flow can not induce the surface tension gradients that are necessary to produce tipstreaming, and a mode of drop breakup that is similar to “drop fracture” occurs instead [6, 15]. To induce tipstreaming in the simulations a range of smaller values of  $K$  must be chosen, and for the choice made here this gives an initial surface surfactant concentration  $\Gamma_0$  in the range from  $1.56 \times 10^{-2}$  to 0.67.

Since the ratio  $J_0/K$  is independent of  $C_\infty$  it is held fixed throughout, and in the simulations  $J_0/K = 5 \times 10^{-2}$ . To compensate for the decrease in  $K$  relative to the experiments the Biot number  $Bi$  is increased in the simulations to  $Bi = 10^{-3}$ , see Table II. This choice closely reproduces the experimental values for the product  $BiK$  and the  $C_\infty$ -independent ratio  $J_0/BiK$ , which is 25.8 in the experiments versus 50 in the simulations. In summary,

the simulations closely replicate the experimental values of  $J_0$  and  $BiK$ , but at larger values of  $Bi$  and smaller values of  $K$ , and so it is expected that the relative importance of adsorption is maintained while the role of desorption is enhanced. However, in the simulations desorption was seen in Sec. VB to be significant only on the downstream sections of an already developed tipstreaming thread - not in its initial formation by flow-focusing.

## 2. Comparison of results

For the set-up and geometry of the experiments a two dimensional state-space is introduced. This consists of a dimensionless bulk surfactant concentration  $\bar{C}$  and a dimensionless flow rate or local capillary number  $\bar{Q}$ , that is based on the axial elongation flow rate near the focusing aperture, defined by

$$\bar{C} = \frac{\mu_0 a \kappa_a C_\infty}{RT\Gamma_\infty} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{Q} = \frac{20}{3} \frac{\mu_0 a^2 \phi Q_o}{(RT\Gamma_\infty) D_H^3 L} \left\{ 1 - \frac{w_{or}}{2w_c} \right\}. \quad (30)$$

These are given at Eqs. (18) and (19) of Ref. [11], and quantities on the right hand side are dimensional. In the expression of (30) for  $\bar{Q}$ , referring to the quantities indicated in Fig. 2, in which  $Q_C \equiv Q_o$  and  $Q_D \equiv Q_i$ , we have:  $\phi = Q_i/Q_o$  is the ratio of the dispersed phase volume flow rate  $Q_i$  to the exterior or continuous phase volume flow rate  $Q_o$ ;  $D_H$  is the hydraulic diameter of the focusing aperture; and  $L \equiv \Delta Z$ ,  $w_{or}$ , and  $w_c \equiv W_{up}$  are apparatus dimensions given in Table I. To compare the experimental and simulation results we use the closest analog for these quantities when an exact equivalent is not available: The dispersed phase channel half-width  $a$  in (30) is taken to be the radius of the initial undeformed spherical drop, and is the length scale for nondimensionalization. The circular aperture of the simulations has hydraulic diameter  $D_H = 2r_0$ . The ratio of the aperture width  $w_{or}$  to the outer channel width  $w_c$  is such that  $w_{or}/2w_c \simeq 0.067$  in the experiments, which is neglected in approximating  $\bar{Q}$  for the simulation data. The volume flow rate of the interior phase,  $Q_i = \phi Q_o$ , is approximated by  $Q_i = \pi r_{th}^2 u_{th}$ , where  $r_{th}$  and  $u_{th}$  are respectively the radius and axial interfacial velocity of the tipstreaming thread at the center of the aperture. Since the ratio of the tipstreaming thread to aperture radii is small this is independent of the precise form of the fluid velocity profile at the aperture, and in the simulation data  $r_{th}/r_o \lesssim 0.04$  in all computational runs. This leads to the analogous expression for the



simulation data flow rate

$$\bar{Q} = \frac{5\pi}{6} \frac{\mu_0 a^2 r_{th}^2 u_{th}}{(RT\Gamma_\infty) r_0^3 L}. \quad (31)$$

So that, in terms of the dimensionless velocity scale  $U$  and groups  $E$ ,  $Bi$ , and  $K$ , we have

$$\bar{C} = \frac{BiK}{E} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{Q} = \frac{5\pi}{6} \frac{r_{th}^2 u_{th}}{Er_0^3 l}, \quad (32)$$

where all quantities are now nondimensional.




FIG. 16. Data in the  $\bar{Q}, \bar{C}$ -state-space plane. (a) Conditions for tipstreaming observed experimentally by Moyle *et al.* [11] are denoted by a square. Lines denote boundaries outside which tipstreaming is not expected to occur based on a model of the set-up and due to physical limits as indicated in the plot. Panel reproduced with permission from Ref. [11]. Copyright 2012, AIP Publishing LLC. (b) Conditions for tipstreaming predicted by the flow-focusing simulations of this study, with symbol and capillary number  $Ca$  as indicated. Close agreement is found for the range of the dimensionless bulk surfactant concentration data  $\bar{C}$ . The difference in the range of values for the dimensionless flow rate  $\bar{Q}$  is attributed mostly to the difference in the aperture radius  $r_0$ .

Figure 16 shows points in the  $\bar{Q}, \bar{C}$ -plane that correspond to tipstreaming conditions, as observed in the experiments in Fig. 16(a), and as predicted by the simulations in Fig. 16 (b). About one week (wall clock time) was needed for each computational run, and from eight to ten runs were made for each of the imposed flow capillary number values  $Ca = 1, (0.4), 2.2, 3.0$  as indicated in the inset. Some of these runs as well as runs at smaller  $Ca$  did not produce tipstreaming. The figure shows close agreement between the range of experimental and simulation data for the dimensionless bulk surfactant concentration  $\bar{C}$

that produce tipstreaming. From the expression for  $\bar{C}$  of Eq. (32) this is assisted by closely reproducing the experimental range of values for the product or modified Biot number  $BiK$  in the simulations, while the factor of two difference in  $E$  is partly covered up by the log scale of the figure.

By contrast, the range of  $\bar{Q}$  for tipstreaming that is predicted by the simulations is not so close to the data of the experiments. An approximate range for the experimental data is  $\bar{Q} \in (0.3, 1.0)$  compared with  $\bar{Q} \in (0.001, 0.2)$  for the simulations. Based on the expression for  $\bar{Q}$  of Eq. (32), if the volume flux of the tipstreaming thread, or equivalently  $r_{th}^2 u_{th}$ , is considered unaltered, the difference in aperture radius between the experiments ( $r_0 = 0.2$ ) and the simulations ( $r_0 = 0.5$ ) suggests a simple rescaling of the simulation data for  $\bar{Q}$  by the factor  $2.5^3$ , which puts it in the range  $\bar{Q} \in (0.016, 3.13)$  and better reconciles the two data sets.

## VI. CONCLUSION

We have investigated the influence of geometric flow focusing on the tipstreaming of a drop that is facilitated by soluble surfactant. A hybrid numerical method has been used to incorporate the effect of surfactant solubility. This resolves the fine spatial scale of a transition layer situated adjacent to the drop interface, in which the gradient of the dissolved surfactant concentration in the normal direction is large due to slow diffusion or large bulk Peclet number  $Pe$ . The method combines an asymptotic reduction in an interface-fitted coordinate system in the limit  $Pe \rightarrow \infty$  to resolve transport of dissolved surfactant in the layer with a method for solving two-phase flow with adsorbed interfacial surfactant. The two components are solved numerically, in parallel, and here the surface-based boundary integral method has been used to resolve the interfacial dynamics. To complement study of soluble surfactant in a microscale geometry the mixed-kinetic or finite Biot number form of the boundary condition for bulk-interface surfactant exchange has been used [31].

Here, flow focusing is provided by transverse, coaxial, annular baffles that are placed symmetrically to either side of an isolated drop, flow is induced by a uniaxial extension at infinity, and the initially spherical drop has a surfactant-laden interface at equilibrium with its surroundings. Among the main findings are that a modest amount of focusing, for example with dimensionless aperture radius  $r_0 = 0.75$ , at an imposed flow capillary number that

is just sufficient to draw a surfactant-free drop through the aperture, the addition of a small amount of surfactant to the drop interface alters the mode of deformation at the drop tip to produce a narrow tipstreaming thread. The thread radius is significantly smaller than that produced at moderately higher initial surfactant concentrations without flow confinement, and it decreases further with increase of flow focusing down to the minimum aperture radius of the simulations reported, which is  $r_0 = 0.25$ . At this smallest aperture size, we find that a surfactant-free drop cannot be drawn through the aperture even at large capillary number, whereas at moderate capillary number a small initial surfactant concentration produces tipstreaming.

For the simulations of this study, when all other conditions including the aperture size are fixed, an increase in initial concentration of surfactant produces a thread that is longer at the time when the thread first pinches off when the surfactant is insoluble. With other conditions fixed, an increase of surfactant solubility due to an increase in Biot number produces a thread that is shorter at first pinch-off, and this is attributed mainly to interface remobilization and desorption of surfactant from the thread, which leads to higher surface tension.

We have included results from two sets of simulations that are continued to times beyond first pinch-off of the thread by excising the small drops that break off from the thread's downstream end. These suggest that the process of thread breakup in the simulations is nearly-periodic, at least for limited time intervals, and this is consistent with experimental observations [10, 45].

The simulation results have been compared to experimental data on the conditions necessary for tipstreaming in the microscale flow device of Moyle *et al.* [11]. Differences between the dimensions and fluid properties of the simulations and experiment were noted in Sec. V C. Despite these, in a two dimensional state space broad agreement for tipstreaming conditions has been found between the two data sets. Given additional apparent differences between the set-up of the simulations and experiments the agreement in the data is perhaps surprising. These differences include: (i) The simulations are for the evolution of an initially undeformed drop, in equilibrium, and with a given uniform surfactant concentration, so the context is that of an initial value problem. Whereas in the experiments there is a continual supply of surfactant from one phase that is adsorbed onto an initially fresh surfactant-free interface at the merger of the dispersed and continuous phase feed channels (see Fig. 2(b)).

(ii) In the experimental data that is used for comparison, dissolved surfactant is supplied to the interface from the dispersed phase while in the simulations it is soluble only in the continuous phase. Parallel channel sidewalls downstream of the aperture are also absent from the simulations but may not influence conditions for tipstreaming and the initial formation of a thread.

In the experiments, the point at which the cone of the interface merges with the base of the tipstreaming thread relative to the center of the aperture can be altered by adjusting the two phase volume flow rates. In a more recent experimental study this has been held nearly fixed via an active feedback control loop, thereby extending the time interval during which periodic behavior of thread breakup into nearly monodisperse droplets occurs [46]. In contrast, in the simulations, for given fluid properties the location of the mother drop to thread merger is determined by the aperture radius  $r_0$  and the imposed flow capillary number, and under the conditions of this study the point moves upstream relative to the aperture as  $r_0$  is decreased.

We have shown the extent to which the large  $Pe$  hybrid method conserves surfactant in Sec. III B, and we have included a note on the development of a surfactant plume downstream of a steady, unconfined drop in Sec. IV A.

## Acknowledgements

This work was supported in part by the NSF under Grant Nos. DMS-1412789 and DMS-1009105.

- 
- [1] G. I. Taylor, “The formation of emulsions in definable fields of flow,” *Proc. R., Soc. London A* **146**, 501–523 (1934).
  - [2] D. A. Edwards, H. Brenner, and D. T. Wasan, *Interfacial Transport Processes and Rheology* (Butterworth-Heinemann, Boston, 1991).
  - [3] K. Holmberg, “Natural surfactants,” *Curr. Opin. Colloid Interface Sci.* **6**, 148–159 (2001).
  - [4] E. Z. Ron and E. Rosenberg, “Natural roles of biosurfactants,” *Environ. Microbiol.* **3**, 229–236 (2001).
  - [5] H. A. Stone, “Dynamics of drop deformation and breakup in viscous fluids,” *Annu. Rev. Fluid*

- Mech. **26**, 65–102 (1994).
- [6] R. A. de Bruijn, “Tipstreaming of drops in simple shear flows,” Chem. Eng. Sci. **48**, 277–284 (1993).
  - [7] J. J. M. Janssen, A. Boon, and W. G. M. Agterof, “Influence of dynamic interfacial properties on droplet breakup in simple shear flow,” AIChE Journal **40**, 1929–1939 (1994).
  - [8] J. J. M. Janssen, A. Boon, and W. G. M. Agterof, “Influence of dynamic interfacial properties on droplet breakup in plane hyperbolic flow,” AIChE Journal **43**, 1436–1447 (1997).
  - [9] S. L. Anna, “Droplets and bubbles in microfluidic devices,” Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech. **48**, 285–309 (2016).
  - [10] S. L. Anna and H. C. Mayer, “Microscale tipstreaming in a microfluidic flow focusing device,” Phys. Fluids **18**, 121512 (2006).
  - [11] T. M. Moyle, L. M. Walker, and S. L. Anna, “Predicting conditions for microscale surfactant mediated tipstreaming,” Phys. Fluids **24**, 082110 (2012).
  - [12] W.-C. Jeong, J.-M. Lim, J.-H. Choi, J.-H. Kim, Y.-J. Lee, S.-H. Kim, G. Lee, J.-D. Kim, G.-R. Yi, and S.-M. Yang, “Controlled generation of submicron emulsion droplets via highly stable tip-streaming mode in microfluidic devices,” Lab Chip **12**, 1446–1453 (2012).
  - [13] M. R. Booty and M. Siegel, “A hybrid numerical method for interfacial fluid flow with soluble surfactant,” J. Comput. Phys. **229**, 3864–3883 (2010).
  - [14] K. Xu, M. R. Booty, and M. Siegel, “Analytical and computational methods for two-phase flow with soluble surfactant,” SIAM J. Appl. Math. **73**, 523–548 (2013).
  - [15] Q. Wang, M. Siegel, and M. R. Booty, “Numerical simulation of drop and bubble dynamics with soluble surfactant,” Phys. Fluids **26**, 052102 (2014).
  - [16] C. D. Eggleton, T.-M. Tsai, and K. J. Stebe, “Tip streaming from a drop in the presence of surfactants,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 048302 (2001).
  - [17] I. B. Bazhlekov, P. D. Anderson, and H. E. H. Meijer, “Numerical investigation of the effect of insoluble surfactants on drop deformation and breakup in simple shear flow,” Journal of Colloid and Interface Science **298**, 369–394 (2006).
  - [18] R. Suryo and O. A. Basaran, “Tip streaming from a liquid drop forming from a tube in a co-flowing outer fluid,” Phys. Fluids **18**, 082102 (2006).
  - [19] W. J. Milliken and L. G. Leal, “The influence of surfactant on the deformation and breakup of a viscous drop: The effect of surfactant solubility,” J. Colloid Interface Sci. **166**, 275–285

- (1994).
- [20] C. D. Eggleton and K. J. Stebe, “An adsorption-desorption-controlled surfactant on a deforming droplet,” *J. Colloid Interface Sci.* **208**, 68–80 (1998).
  - [21] Y. Wang, D. T. Papageorgiou, and C. Maldarelli, “Increased mobility of a surfactant-retarded bubble at high bulk concentrations,” *J. Fluid Mech.* **390**, 251–270 (1999).
  - [22] Y. Liao and J. B. McLaughlin, “Bubble motion in aqueous surfactant solutions,” *J. Colloid Interface Sci.* **224**, 297–310 (2000).
  - [23] S. N. Ghadiali, D. Halpern, and D. P. Gaver, “A dual-reciprocity boundary element method for evaluating bulk convective transport of surfactant in free-surface flows,” *J. Comput. Phys.* **171**, 534–559 (2001).
  - [24] F. Jin, N. R. Gupta, and K. J. Stebe, “The detachment of a viscous drop in a viscous solution in the presence of a soluble surfactant,” *Phys. Fluids* **18**, 022103 (2006).
  - [25] R. G. M. van der Sman and S. van der Graaf, “Diffuse interface model of surfactant adsorption onto flat and droplet interfaces,” *Rheol. Acta* **46**, 3–11 (2006).
  - [26] J. Zhang, D. M. Eckmann, and P. S. Ayyaswamy, “A front tracking method for a deformable intravascular bubble in a tube with soluble surfactant transport,” *J. Comput. Phys.* **214**, 366–396 (2006).
  - [27] M. Muradoglu and G. Tryggvason, “A front-tracking method for computation of interfacial flows with soluble surfactants,” *J. Comput. Phys.* **227**, 2238–2262 (2008).
  - [28] K. E. Teigen, P. Song, J. Lowengrub, and A. Voigt., “A diffuse-interface method for two-phase flows with soluble surfactants,” *J. Comput. Phys.* **230**, 375–393 (2011).
  - [29] K.-Y. Chen and M.-C. Lai, “A conservative scheme for solving coupled surface-bulk convection-diffusion equations with an application to interfacial flows with soluble surfactant,” *J. Comput. Phys.* **257**, 1–18 (2014).
  - [30] S. Khatri and A.-K. Tornberg, “An embedded boundary method for soluble surfactants with interface tracking for two-phase flows,” *J. Comput. Phys.* **256**, 768–790 (2014).
  - [31] C.-H. Chang and E. I. Franses, “Adsorption dynamics of surfactants at the air/water interface: A critical review of mathematical models, data, and mechanisms,” *Colloid Surface A* **100**, 1–45 (1995).
  - [32] H. Wong, D. Rumschitzki, and C. Maldarelli, “On the surfactant mass balance at a deforming fluid interface,” *Phys. Fluids* **8**, 3203–3204 (1996).

- [33] J. M. Rallison and A. Acrivos, “A numerical study of the deformation and burst of a viscous drop in an extensional flow,” *J. Fluid Mech.* **89**, 191–200 (1978).
- [34] C. Pozrikidis, *Boundary Integral and Singularity Methods for Linearized Viscous Flow* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992).
- [35] G. K. Youngren and A. Acrivos, “Stokes flow past a particle of arbitrary shape: a numerical method of solution,” *J. Fluid Mech.* **69**, 377–403 (1975).
- [36] B. K. Alpert, “Hybrid Gauss-trapezoidal quadrature rules,” *SIAM J. Sci. Comp.* **20**, 1551–1584 (1999).
- [37] H. A. Stone and L. G. Leal, “Relaxation and breakup of an initially extended drop in an otherwise quiescent fluid,” *J. Fluid Mech.* **198**, 399–427 (1989).
- [38] H. A. Stone and L. G. Leal, “The effects of surfactants on drop deformation and breakup,” *J. Fluid Mech.* **220**, 161–186 (1990).
- [39] R. G. Cox, “The deformation of a drop in a general time-dependent fluid flow,” *J. Fluid Mech.* **37**, 601–623 (1969).
- [40] C. D. Eggleton, Y. P. Pawar, and K. J. Stebe, “Insoluble surfactants on a drop in an extensional flow: a generalization of the stagnated surface limit to deforming interfaces,” *J. Fluid Mech.* **385**, 79–99 (1999).
- [41] J. Eastoe and J. S. Dalton, “Dynamic surface tension and adsorption mechanisms of surfactants at the air/water interface,” *Adv. Colloid Interface Sci.* **85**, 103–144 (2000).
- [42] R. Pan, J. Green, and C. Maldarelli, “Theory and experiment on the measurement of kinetic rate constants for surfactant exchange at an air/water interface,” *J. Colloid Interface Sci.* **205**, 213 (1998).
- [43] J. K. Ferri and K. J. Stebe, “Which surfactants reduce surface tension faster? A scaling argument for diffusion-controlled adsorption,” *Adv. Colloid Interface Sci.* **85**, 61 (2000).
- [44] F. Jin, R. Balasubramaniam, and K. J. Stebe, “Surfactant adsorption to spherical particles: The intrinsic length scale governing the shift from diffusion to kinetic-controlled mass transfer,” *J. Adhes.* **80**, 773 (2004).
- [45] W. Lee, L. M. Walker, and S. L. Anna, “Role of geometry and fluid properties in droplet and thread formation processes in planar flow focusing,” *Phys. Fluids* **21**, 032103 (2009).
- [46] T. M. Moyle, L. M. Walker, and S. L. Anna, “Controlling thread formation during tipstreaming through an active feedback control loop,” *Lab Chip* **13**, 4534–4541 (2013).