



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

Time-dependent injection strategies for multilayer Hele-Shaw and porous media flows

Craig Gin and Prabir Daripa

Phys. Rev. Fluids **6**, 033901 — Published 5 March 2021

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevFluids.6.033901](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevFluids.6.033901)

Time-dependent injection strategies for multi-layer Hele-Shaw and porous media flows

Craig Gin

*Department of Population Health and Pathobiology,
North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 27607*

Prabir Daripa

Department of Mathematics, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843

We use linear stability analysis to demonstrate how to stabilize multi-layer radial Hele-Shaw and porous media flows with a time-dependent injection rate. Sufficient conditions for an injection rate that maintains a stable flow are analytically derived for flows with an arbitrary number of fluid layers. We show numerically that the maximum injection rate for a stable flow decreases proportional to $t^{-1/3}$ for $t \gg 1$ regardless of the number of fluid layers. However, the constant of proportionality depends on the number of layers and increases at a rate that is proportional to the number of interfaces to the two-thirds power. Therefore, flows with more fluid layers can be stable with faster time-dependent injection rates than comparable flows with fewer fluid layers, even when the additional layers are very thin. We also show that for unstable flows, which may be required in order to inject a given amount of fluid in a fixed amount of time, an increasing injection rate is less unstable than a constant or decreasing injection rate, and that the inclusion of more fluid layers can overcome poor injection strategies.

I. INTRODUCTION

There are many applications in which one fluid displaces another fluid in a porous medium including oil recovery, hydrology, filtration, and fixed bed regeneration in chemical processing. In the case that the displacing fluid is less viscous than the displaced fluid, the interface between the fluids is unstable and viscous fingering ensues. In some of the aforementioned applications, several fluids with favorable properties are used in succession to displace the resident fluid in the porous medium. An example of this is chemical enhanced oil recovery (EOR) in which various tertiary displacement processes are employed in order to contain this instability to a meaningful level before breakthrough (see [1–3]). Shah and Schechter [4] describes in detail many of the processes involved in ASP-flooding, a type of chemical EOR, that lead to improved oil recovery. Slobod and Lestz [5] experimentally studied the effect of two types of flooding processes on stabilization in a Hele-Shaw cell. The first flooding process involved the use of a sequence of polysolutions (polymer mixed with an aqueous phase) having different constant viscosities with stepwise jumps in viscosity at each of the fronts that are positive in the direction of displacement. The study resulted in significant stabilization of the fingering instability.

In what follows, we consider the case in which the injected fluids are all immiscible. In some EOR flooding schemes, it is possible that an aqueous phase based liquid is displacing a different aqueous phase liquid. In such a case, a thin layer of spacer fluid of some non-aqueous phase liquid (NAPL) between such miscible phases can be used to ensure immiscibility [6]. Alternatively, the injected fluid layers themselves can alternate between aqueous phases and NAPL's.

Viscous fingering in porous media flows [7] is often studied using the Hele-Shaw model in which there is a sharp interface between immiscible fluids. The influence of heterogeneity in porous media is non-trivial and is difficult to account for with the Hele-Shaw model. Therefore, the Hele-Shaw model is more directly relevant to homogeneous porous media. A linear stability analysis of viscous fingering within the Hele-Shaw model was first performed by Saffman and Taylor [8]. They studied the case in which the fluid moves linearly and orthogonal to a planar interface. We refer to this flow configuration as rectilinear flow. An appropriate model for flow near an injection or production well is radial flow. The stability of radial Hele-Shaw flows was first studied by Bataille [9] and Wilson [10] and was later developed further by Paterson [11].

There are several different strategies that have been used to control or minimize the viscous fingering instability. One class of techniques involves adjusting the geometry of the classical Hele-Shaw cell. An example is the tapered Hele-Shaw cell in which the plates are not parallel but instead there is a gradient in the gap thickness. The effects of the tapered cell on the instability of the interface has been studied analytically, numerically, and experimentally in the rectilinear [12–16] and radial [15, 17–20] geometries. Other modifications to the classical Hele-Shaw cell that impact the stability include rotating the cell [21–24], using an elastic membrane in place of one of the rigid plates [25–29], and changing the gap width over time [30–32]. Another class of techniques used to control the interfacial instability is to alter the properties of the fluids. This includes the use of variable viscosity fluids [33–35], chemically reactive fluids [36] and non-Newtonian fluids [37, 38].

In controlling the instability of Hele-Shaw and porous media flows, one of the simplest parameters to control is the rate at which fluid is injected. Thomé et al. [39] studied Hele-Shaw flow in a sector geometry in order to bridge the gap between rectilinear and radial flow. They showed that a self-similar finger can grow in the sector geometry with an injection rate proportional to $t^{-1/3}$. This was further studied in the sector geometry by Brenner et al. [40], Ben Amar et al. [41], and Combescot and Ben Amar [42]. The $t^{-1/3}$ injection rate was studied numerically in the radial geometry by Li et al. [43]. They showed analytically that the wave number of the most unstable wave (and hence the number of fingers) can be made constant in time by using the $t^{-1/3}$ injection rate. Through numerical experiments, they demonstrated that the limiting shape of the interface is found to be independent of the initial conditions. Zheng et al. [31] studied a class of time-dependent control strategies of which the $t^{-1/3}$ injection rate is a special case. The validity of the $t^{-1/3}$ injection rate for producing self-similar solutions has also been explored numerically in the context of miscible flows [44] and a time-dependent gap width [20].

Another avenue of research involving time-dependent injection rates is attempting to minimize or completely suppress the viscous fingering instability. In the case of miscible flow in the quarter five-spot geometry, Chen and Meiburg [45] found that starting with a slow constant injection rate and then smoothly increasing the injection rate resulted in greater recovery (in the context of EOR) than a constant injection rate with the same average rate. Yuan and Azaiez [46] found that a piecewise constant injection scheme could reduce the fingering instability in comparison to a constant injection scheme for miscible flows in a rectilinear geometry. This came after Dias et al. [47] had shown that a similar strategy could reduce the size of fingers in the case of immiscible flow in a radial geometry. Also in the context of immiscible radial flow, Dias et al. [48] studied the optimal injection policy for a given average injection rate and found that a linearly increasing injection rate approximates the optimal injection rate. Huang and Chen [49] verified the success of a linearly increasing injection rate for a broader range of parameters than [48] and showed that these results do not hold for miscible flow. Going a step further than this is completely stabilizing the flow using a time-dependent injection rate. Beeson-Jones and Woods [50] found the maximum possible time-dependent injection rate for a stable radial Hele-Shaw flow.

Increasing the number of fluid layers can also be an effective means of controlling viscous fingering. This strategy is motivated by the various flooding schemes used in chemical EOR. However, there have been relatively few stability studies on flows with more than two fluid layers. Of the existing studies, the majority are in the rectilinear geometry. Daripa [51] studied three-layer rectilinear Hele-Shaw flows and derive a formula for a critical value of the viscosity of the middle layer fluid that minimizes the bandwidth of unstable waves. Daripa also formulated the stability problem for rectilinear Hele-Shaw flows with an arbitrary number of fluid layers [52]. In that paper, the Rayleigh quotient and some inequalities are used to derive upper bounds on the growth rate of instabilities. Cardoso and Woods [53] studied three-layer flows in both the rectilinear and radial flow geometries. For radial flows, they considered flows in which the inner interface is stable and used the linear theory to predict the number of drops formed when the interfaces meet. Ward and White [54] performed experiments for three-layer radial flows in which a liquid composes the intermediate layer between two gases. Thus, in contrast to [53], the outer interface is stable. White and Ward [55] followed up this work by considering the same problem with a non-Newtonian fluid in the intermediate layer. Gin and Daripa [56] were the first to do a linear stability analysis of multi-layer (i.e. more than two-layer) radial flows in which all of the interfaces are unstable. They studied flows with an arbitrary number of fluid layers. Beeson-Jones and Woods [50] studied three-layer radial flow and used linear stability to find the optimal value of the viscosity of the intermediate fluid in order to inject fluid at the fastest rate possible while maintaining a stable flow. Recently, Anjos and Li [57] performed a weakly nonlinear analysis of three-layer radial flows. This was followed up by nonlinear simulations of three-layer radial flow by Zhao et al. [58].

With all the different types of control strategies described above, it is important to study the interplay between them. Some notable examples of studies that have looked at the interaction between multiple control strategies include Dias and Miranda [59], who studied radial flows in a tapered Hele-Shaw cell in which the gap width is time-dependent, and Morrow et al. [20] who studied a wide variety of control strategies including time-dependent injection, time-dependent gap width, and tapered and rotating Hele-Shaw cells. In the present work, we consider the interplay between time-dependent injection strategies and the use of more than two fluid layers. To date, this has only been studied in a limited capacity. Time-dependent injection was considered for multi-layer flow by Ward and White [54] and White and Ward [55]. These works were experimental and, as previously stated, involved three-layer flows in which only one interface was unstable. The only known analytical study of time-dependent injection for multi-layer flow is Beeson-Jones and Woods [50]. Again, this work only considers three-layer flow and the only time-dependent control strategy considered is completely stabilizing the flow. Therefore, there is a need to study how time-dependent injection schemes impact flows with more than three layers and how these strategies change as additional fluids are added. Examining time-dependent injection strategies for flows with more than three layers is the main thrust of this paper. In what follows, we derive a dynamical system governing the linearized motion of interfaces for an arbitrary number of fluid layers. In contrast to the previous work that considers radial flows with an arbitrary number of fluid layers [56], the formulation in the present work can be used to solve for the motion of each individual interface.




FIG. 1: The basic solution for $(N+2)$ -layer flow. The radius of the outermost interface is R_N .

We then study the maximum injection rate which results in a stable Hele-Shaw flow with an arbitrary number of interfaces. We provide analytically derived bounds on this injection rate and numerically investigate how it changes with the number of fluid layers. Additionally, we numerically investigate two different time-dependent injection strategies and demonstrate that a monotonically increasing injection rate is less unstable than a comparable constant or monotonically decreasing injection rate.

The paper is laid out as follows. In §II, the stability problem is formulated for multi-layer Hele-Shaw flows with an arbitrary number of fluid layers. The maximum time-dependent injection rate that stabilizes a multi-layer flow is analyzed in §III. We provide analytically derived bounds on this injection rate and investigate limiting cases. In §IV, we numerically investigate how the maximum injection rate for a stable flow changes with the number of fluid layers. We also show numerically that the results of [48] about optimal injection strategies extend to multi-layer flows and that multi-layer flows can overcome even bad injection strategies. Concluding remarks are given in §V.

II. PRELIMINARIES

Consider a radial source flow consisting of $(N + 2)$ regions of incompressible, immiscible fluid in a Hele-Shaw cell. By averaging across the gap, we may consider two-dimensional flow in polar coordinates, $\Omega := (r, \theta) = \mathbb{R}^2$. The least viscous fluid with viscosity μ_i is injected into the center of the cell at injection rate Q . The most viscous fluid, with viscosity μ_o , is the outermost fluid. There are N internal layers of fluid with viscosity μ_j for $j = 1, \dots, N$ where $\mu_i < \mu_j < \mu_o$ for all j . The fluid flow is governed by the following equations

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}_m = 0, \quad \nabla p_m = -\frac{\mu_m}{\kappa} \mathbf{u}_m, \quad \text{for } r \neq 0, \quad (1)$$

where $\kappa = b^2/12$, and b is the width of the gap of the Hele-Shaw cell. The governing equations hold within each fluid layer and the subscript $m = i, 1, 2, \dots, N, o$ denotes the fluid region (where i denotes the innermost layer and o denotes the outermost layer). In what follows, we omit this subscript for quantities or equations that apply to all fluid layers and when it will not cause confusion in order to simplify the notation. The first equation $(1)_1$ is the continuity equation for incompressible flow, and the second equation $(1)_2$ is Darcy's law [60]. Initially, the fluids are separated by circular interfaces with radii $R = R_j(0)$, $j = 0, \dots, N$, where $R_j(t)$ are the positions of the interfaces at time t , and T_j are the corresponding interfacial tensions. This set-up is shown in Fig. 1.

The equations admit a simple basic solution in which all of the fluid moves outward radially with velocity $\mathbf{u} := (u_r, u_\theta) = (Q/(2\pi r), 0)$. The interfaces remain circular and move outward with velocity $Q/(2\pi R_j(t))$. The pressure, $p = p(r)$, may be obtained by integrating equation $(1)_2$.

We scale the variables using the characteristic length $R_N(0)$, the characteristic interfacial tension T_N , and the characteristic viscosity μ_o . The characteristic injection rate Q_{ref} is the injection rate at which a single interface at $R_N(0)$ with interfacial tension T_N and for which a fluid with viscosity μ_o is displaced by an inviscid fluid becomes

unstable to a disturbance with wave number 2 (see [50]). Therefore,

$$Q_{ref} = \frac{12\pi\kappa T_N}{R_N(0)\mu_o}, \quad (2)$$

$$Q^* = \frac{Q}{Q_{ref}}, \quad (3)$$

$$r^* = \frac{r}{R_N(0)}, \quad (4)$$

$$\mu^* = \frac{\mu}{\mu_o}, \quad (5)$$

$$t^* = \frac{12\kappa T_N}{R_N^3(0)\mu_o}t, \quad (6)$$

$$\mathbf{u}^* = \frac{R_N^2(0)\mu_o}{12\kappa T_N}\mathbf{u}, \quad (7)$$

$$p^* = \frac{R_N(0)}{12T_N}p, \quad (8)$$

$$T^* = \frac{T}{T_N}. \quad (9)$$

In these dimensionless variables, equation (1) becomes

$$\nabla^* \cdot \mathbf{u}^* = 0, \quad \nabla^* p^* = -\mu^* \mathbf{u}^*, \quad \text{for } r^* \neq 0, \quad (10)$$

and the velocity of the basic solution is $\mathbf{u}^* = (Q^*/(2r^*), 0)$. With a slight abuse of notation, we drop the stars below for convenience. We perturb the basic solution (u_r, u_θ, p) by $(\tilde{u}_r, \tilde{u}_\theta, \tilde{p})$. Since equations (10) are linear, the disturbances satisfy the same equations. Therefore,

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{u}_r}{\partial r} + \frac{\tilde{u}_r}{r} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial \tilde{u}_\theta}{\partial \theta} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial \tilde{p}}{\partial r} = -\mu \tilde{u}_r, \quad \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial \tilde{p}}{\partial \theta} = -\mu \tilde{u}_\theta. \quad (11)$$

We use separation of variables and assume that the disturbances are of the form

$$(\tilde{u}_r, \tilde{u}_\theta, \tilde{p}) = (f(r), \tau(r), \psi(r))g(t)e^{in\theta}. \quad (12)$$

Using (12) in equation (11) yields the following ordinary differential equation for $f(r)$:

$$(r^3 f'(r))' - (n^2 - 1) r f(r) = 0. \quad (13)$$

The above equation is exact since there has been no linearization in its derivation.

Next we derive the boundary conditions for this equation from linearization of the dynamic interfacial boundary conditions. Let the disturbance of the interface located at $R_j(t)$ be given by $A_n^j(t)e^{in\theta}$. The linearized kinematic interface conditions are given by

$$\frac{dA_n^j(t)}{dt} = f(R_j)g(t) - A_n^j(t) \frac{Q}{2R_j^2}. \quad (14)$$

The linearized dynamic interface condition (see equation (10) in [56]) at the innermost interface located at $R = R_0$ is

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ f(R_0)(\mu_i - \mu_1) + R_0 [\mu_i (f^-)'(R_0) - \mu_1 (f^+)'(R_0)] \right\} g(t) \\ &= \left\{ \frac{Qn^2}{2R_0^2}(\mu_1 - \mu_i) - \frac{T_0}{12} \frac{n^4 - n^2}{R_0^3} \right\} A_n^0(t). \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

The linearized dynamic condition at the outermost interface located at $R = R_N$ is

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ f(R_N)(\mu_N - 1) + R_N [\mu_N (f^-)'(R_N) - (f^+)'(R_N)] \right\} g(t) \\ &= \left\{ \frac{Qn^2}{2R_N^2}(1 - \mu_N) - \frac{1}{12} \frac{n^4 - n^2}{R_N^3} \right\} A_n^N(t). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

For any intermediate interface at $R = R_j$, the dynamic condition is

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ f(R_j)(\mu_j - \mu_{j+1}) + R_j [\mu_j (f^-)'(R_j) - \mu_{j+1} (f^+)'(R_j)] \right\} g(t) \\ &= \left\{ \frac{Qn^2}{2R_j^2} (\mu_{j+1} - \mu_j) - \frac{T_j}{12} \frac{n^4 - n^2}{R_j^3} \right\} A_n^j(t). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Note that the dynamic interfacial condition on a three-dimensional interface involves two curvatures. Here, this would mean including the curvature in the thin dimension in the dynamic interfacial condition. This curvature arises due to contact line effects. In what follows, we have neglected this curvature effect with the assumption that contact line effects on the stability results are insignificant. This is done in most stability analyses of Hele-Shaw flows. However, Homsy [61] has addressed how to modify the dynamic boundary condition for Hele-Shaw flows in order to account for contact line effects.

Using the fact that $f(r)$ is a solution to the differential equation (13), the dynamic interface condition (15) at the innermost interface becomes

$$\left\{ \mu_i - \mu_1 \frac{\left(\frac{R_0}{R_1}\right)^{2n} + 1}{\left(\frac{R_0}{R_1}\right)^{2n} - 1} \right\} f(R_0)g(t) + 2\mu_1 \frac{\left(\frac{R_0}{R_1}\right)^{n-1}}{\left(\frac{R_0}{R_1}\right)^{2n} - 1} f(R_1)g(t) = F_0 A_n^0(t), \quad (18)$$

where

$$F_0 = \frac{Qn}{2R_0^2} (\mu_1 - \mu_i) - \frac{T_0}{12} \frac{n^3 - n}{R_0^3}. \quad (19)$$

Similarly, the dynamic interface condition (16) for the outermost interface reduces to

$$\left\{ 1 - \mu_N \frac{\left(\frac{R_{N-1}}{R_N}\right)^{2n} + 1}{\left(\frac{R_{N-1}}{R_N}\right)^{2n} - 1} \right\} f(R_N)g(t) + 2\mu_N \frac{\left(\frac{R_{N-1}}{R_N}\right)^{n+1}}{\left(\frac{R_{N-1}}{R_N}\right)^{2n} - 1} f(R_{N-1})g(t) = F_N A_n^N(t), \quad (20)$$

where

$$F_N = \frac{Qn}{2R_N^2} (1 - \mu_N) - \frac{1}{12} \frac{n^3 - n}{R_N^3}, \quad (21)$$

and the dynamic interface conditions at the intermediate interfaces are

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ -\mu_j \frac{\left(\frac{R_{j-1}}{R_j}\right)^{2n} + 1}{\left(\frac{R_{j-1}}{R_j}\right)^{2n} - 1} - \mu_{j+1} \frac{\left(\frac{R_j}{R_{j+1}}\right)^{2n} + 1}{\left(\frac{R_j}{R_{j+1}}\right)^{2n} - 1} \right\} f(R_j)g(t) \\ &+ 2\mu_j \frac{\left(\frac{R_{j-1}}{R_j}\right)^{n+1}}{\left(\frac{R_{j-1}}{R_j}\right)^{2n} - 1} f(R_{j-1})g(t) + 2\mu_{j+1} \frac{\left(\frac{R_j}{R_{j+1}}\right)^{n-1}}{\left(\frac{R_j}{R_{j+1}}\right)^{2n} - 1} f(R_{j+1})g(t) \\ &= F_j A_n^j(t), \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where

$$F_j = \frac{Qn}{2R_j^2} (\mu_{j+1} - \mu_j) - \frac{T_j}{12} \frac{n^3 - n}{R_j^3}, \quad j = 1, \dots, N-1. \quad (23)$$

Equations (18), (20), and (22) can be written as a system of equations of the form

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_N(t) \begin{pmatrix} f(R_0)g(t) \\ \vdots \\ f(R_N)g(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} F_0 A_n^0(t) \\ \vdots \\ F_N A_n^N(t) \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_N(t)$ is the $(N+1) \times (N+1)$ tridiagonal matrix with entries indexed by $i, j = 0, \dots, N$ given by

$$\begin{aligned}
(\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_N(t))_{00} &= \mu_i - \mu_1 \frac{\left(\frac{R_0}{R_1}\right)^{2n} + 1}{\left(\frac{R_0}{R_1}\right)^{2n} - 1}, & (\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_N(t))_{01} &= 2\mu_1 \frac{\left(\frac{R_0}{R_1}\right)^{n-1}}{\left(\frac{R_0}{R_1}\right)^{2n} - 1} \\
(\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_N(t))_{j,j-1} &= 2\mu_j \frac{\left(\frac{R_{j-1}}{R_j}\right)^{n+1}}{\left(\frac{R_{j-1}}{R_j}\right)^{2n} - 1}, \\
(\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_N(t))_{j,j} &= -\mu_j \frac{\left(\frac{R_{j-1}}{R_j}\right)^{2n} + 1}{\left(\frac{R_{j-1}}{R_j}\right)^{2n} - 1} - \mu_{j+1} \frac{\left(\frac{R_j}{R_{j+1}}\right)^{2n} + 1}{\left(\frac{R_j}{R_{j+1}}\right)^{2n} - 1}, \\
(\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_N(t))_{j,j+1} &= 2\mu_{j+1} \frac{\left(\frac{R_j}{R_{j+1}}\right)^{n-1}}{\left(\frac{R_j}{R_{j+1}}\right)^{2n} - 1}, \\
(\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_N(t))_{N,N-1} &= 2\mu_N \frac{\left(\frac{R_{N-1}}{R_N}\right)^{n+1}}{\left(\frac{R_{N-1}}{R_N}\right)^{2n} - 1}, & (\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_N(t))_{N,N} &= 1 - \mu_N \frac{\left(\frac{R_{N-1}}{R_N}\right)^{2n} + 1}{\left(\frac{R_{N-1}}{R_N}\right)^{2n} - 1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Combining this system of equations with the linearized kinematic interface conditions yields the dynamical system governing the evolution of interfacial disturbances for multi-layer flows.

$$\frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} A_n^0(t) \\ \vdots \\ A_n^N(t) \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{M}_N(t) \begin{pmatrix} A_n^0(t) \\ \vdots \\ A_n^N(t) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{25}$$

where

$$\mathbf{M}_N(t) = \widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_N^{-1}(t) \begin{pmatrix} F_0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & F_N \end{pmatrix} - \frac{Q}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{R_0^2} & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & \frac{1}{R_N^2} \end{pmatrix} \tag{26}$$

For the particular case of $N = 1$ (i.e. three-layer flow), the matrix $\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_1$ is a 2×2 matrix and can be easily inverted and plugged into equation (26) to obtain the matrix $\mathbf{M}_1(t)$ with entries indexed by $i, j = 0, 1$ given by

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbf{M}_1(t))_{00} &= \frac{\left\{ (1 + \mu_1) - (1 - \mu_1) \left(\frac{R_0}{R_1}\right)^{2n} \right\} F_0}{(\mu_1 - \mu_i)(1 - \mu_1) \left(\frac{R_0}{R_1}\right)^{2n} + (\mu_1 + \mu_i)(1 + \mu_1)} - \frac{Q}{2R_0^2}, \\
(\mathbf{M}_1(t))_{01} &= \frac{2\mu_1 \left(\frac{R_0}{R_1}\right)^{n-1} F_1}{(\mu_1 - \mu_i)(1 - \mu_1) \left(\frac{R_0}{R_1}\right)^{2n} + (\mu_1 + \mu_i)(1 + \mu_1)}, \\
(\mathbf{M}_1(t))_{10} &= \frac{2\mu_1 \left(\frac{R_0}{R_1}\right)^{n+1} F_0}{(\mu_1 - \mu_i)(1 - \mu_1) \left(\frac{R_0}{R_1}\right)^{2n} + (\mu_1 + \mu_i)(1 + \mu_1)}, \\
(\mathbf{M}_1(t))_{11} &= \frac{\left\{ (\mu_1 + \mu_i) + (\mu_1 - \mu_i) \left(\frac{R_0}{R_1}\right)^{2n} \right\} F_1}{(\mu_1 - \mu_i)(1 - \mu_1) \left(\frac{R_0}{R_1}\right)^{2n} + (\mu_1 + \mu_i)(1 + \mu_1)} - \frac{Q}{2R_1^2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

Note that these entries are time-dependent because the radii R_0 and R_1 are time-dependent as well as possibly the injection rate Q . Hence the matrix $\mathbf{M}_1(t)$ is time-dependent. Accounting for differences in notation and scaling, this matrix agrees with the one derived in [50].

III. MAXIMUM INJECTION RATE FOR A STABLE FLOW

Traditionally, the injection rate Q for a radial Hele-Shaw flow is taken to be constant. However, in the formulation above, the injection rate can be a function of time. There have been many studies that have explored the implications of using a strategically chosen time-dependent injection rate (see for example [50], [48], [43], and [31]). Almost all of these studies are for two-layer flows with the exception of [50] which considers three-layer flows. In this section, we extend some of these results to flows with an arbitrary number of layers. In particular, we explore the time-dependent maximum injection rate for which a particular flow is stable. This is important for many applications including oil recovery in which it is beneficial to stabilize the flow, but it is also cost effective to inject as fast as possible.

A. Two-layer flow

In order to set the stage for time-dependent injection rates for flows with many fluid layers, we very briefly review a result that has already been established for two-layer flow in [50]. The maximum dimensionless injection rate for which the disturbance with wave number n is stable, which comes from setting the two-layer growth rate equal to zero and solving for the injection rate Q , is

$$Q_M(n) = \frac{1}{6R} \frac{n(n^2 - 1)}{n(1 - \mu_i) - (1 + \mu_i)}. \quad (28)$$

The maximum time-dependent injection rate for which the flow is stable, which we denote by Q_M , is found by taking the minimum of equation (28) over all values of n . It follows from inspecting equation (28) that $R \cdot Q_M$ will be constant over time. By conservation of mass, the injection rate $Q(t)$ is proportional to dR^2/dt . It then follows that $R \cdot dR^2/dt$ is constant or dt is proportional to $R^2 dR$. Upon integration, $R(t)$ is proportional to $t^{1/3}$. Hence, the injection rate Q_M is proportional to $t^{-1/3}$ since $R \cdot Q_M$ is constant.

B. Three-layer Flow

We now wish to obtain a result analogous to equation (28) but for multi-layer flows. The strategy described above for two-layer flow does not work in this case because Q cannot be isolated when setting the equation for the maximum growth rate for three-layer flow equal to zero. Additionally, the fact that $Q_M(n)$ is proportional to $t^{-1/3}$ relies on the fact that $R \cdot Q_M(n)$ is constant (i.e. all time-dependent terms can be moved to one side of equation (28)). This cannot work for three-layer flows because the growth rates depend on the radii of both interfaces (R_0 and R_1). Therefore, instead of seeking an exact expression for $Q_M(n)$ we look for bounds that ensure stability of the flow.

We start by considering three-layer flow. By Gershgorin's Circle Theorem, both of the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{M}_1$ will have a negative real part if the terms on the diagonal are negative and greater in absolute value than the off-diagonal terms in the same row. This condition is satisfied if the following two inequalities hold

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{Q}{2R_0^2} &\geq \frac{\left\{ (1 + \mu_1) - (1 - \mu_1) \left(\frac{R_0}{R_1} \right)^{2n} \right\} F_0 + 2\mu_1 \left(\frac{R_0}{R_1} \right)^{n-1} F_1}{(\mu_1 - \mu_i)(1 - \mu_1) \left(\frac{R_0}{R_1} \right)^{2n} + (\mu_1 + \mu_i)(1 + \mu_1)}, \\ \frac{Q}{2R_1^2} &\geq \frac{\left\{ (\mu_1 + \mu_i) + (\mu_1 - \mu_i) \left(\frac{R_0}{R_1} \right)^{2n} \right\} F_1 + 2\mu_1 \left(\frac{R_0}{R_1} \right)^{n+1} F_0}{(\mu_1 - \mu_i)(1 - \mu_1) \left(\frac{R_0}{R_1} \right)^{2n} + (\mu_1 + \mu_i)(1 + \mu_1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Recall from equations (19) and (21) that both F_0 and F_1 depend on Q . By using (19) and (21) in equation (29) and solving for Q , the following condition on the injection rate is obtained which is sufficient to ensure that the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{M}_1$ have negative real parts.

$$Q \leq \min\{G_0(n), G_1(n)\}, \quad (30)$$

where

$$G_0 = \frac{T_0}{6R_0} \frac{(n^3 - n)D_0}{nD_1 - D_2}, \quad (31)$$

$$G_1 = \frac{1}{6R_1} \frac{(n^3 - n)D_3}{nD_4 - D_2}, \quad (32)$$

$$D_0 = (1 + \mu_1) + 2\mu_1 T_0^{-1} \left(\frac{R_0}{R_1} \right)^{n+2} - (1 - \mu_1) \left(\frac{R_0}{R_1} \right)^{2n}, \quad (33)$$

$$D_1 = (1 + \mu_1)(\mu_1 - \mu_i) + 2\mu_1(1 - \mu_1) \left(\frac{R_0}{R_1} \right)^{n+1} - (1 - \mu_1)(\mu_1 - \mu_i) \left(\frac{R_0}{R_1} \right)^{2n}, \quad (34)$$

$$D_2 = (1 + \mu_1)(\mu_1 + \mu_i) + (1 - \mu_1)(\mu_1 - \mu_i) \left(\frac{R_0}{R_1} \right)^{2n}, \quad (35)$$

$$D_3 = (\mu_1 + \mu_i) + 2\mu_1 T_0 \left(\frac{R_0}{R_1} \right)^{n-2} + (\mu_1 - \mu_i) \left(\frac{R_0}{R_1} \right)^{2n}, \quad (36)$$

$$D_4 = (1 - \mu_1)(\mu_1 + \mu_i) + 2\mu_1(\mu_1 - \mu_i) \left(\frac{R_0}{R_1} \right)^{n-1} + (1 - \mu_1)(\mu_1 - \mu_i) \left(\frac{R_0}{R_1} \right)^{2n}. \quad (37)$$

Therefore, the maximum injection rate for which a disturbance with wave number n is stable, $Q_M(n)$, is bounded below by the right-hand side of equation (30):

$$Q_M(n) \geq \min\{G_0(n), G_1(n)\}. \quad (38)$$

Considering all wave numbers, the maximum injection rate, Q_M , for which the flow is stable satisfies

$$Q_M \geq \min_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{\min\{G_0(n), G_1(n)\}\}. \quad (39)$$

Note that the only terms in the expressions for G_0 and G_1 that are time-dependent are R_0 and R_1 . As time increases, the interfaces come closer to each other and $R_0/R_1 \rightarrow 1$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, from equations (31) and (32), $G_0 \propto 1/R_0$ and $G_1 \propto 1/R_1$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. This is precisely the relationship between Q and R in equation (28). Therefore, if the injection rate is chosen such that $Q = G_0$ or $Q = G_1$ then $Q \propto t^{-1/3}$ for $t \gg 1$.

1. Limiting Cases

We now investigate the condition (30) in the limit when the intermediate layer is very thin ($R_0/R_1 \rightarrow 1$). Note that as fluid is injected for any three-layer Hele-Shaw flow, the average distance between the interfaces, $R_1 - R_0$, decreases with time. Therefore, even if the interfaces are initially far apart, the intermediate layer will eventually become thin. In the limit as $R_0/R_1 \rightarrow 1$, equation (31) becomes

$$\lim_{\frac{R_0}{R_1} \rightarrow 1} G_0(n) = \frac{1}{6R_0} \frac{(n^3 - n)(T_0 + 1)}{n(1 - \mu_i) - (1 + \mu_i)}. \quad (40)$$

Likewise,

$$\lim_{\frac{R_0}{R_1} \rightarrow 1} G_1(n) = \frac{1}{6R_1} \frac{(n^3 - n)(T_0 + 1)}{n(1 - \mu_i) - (1 + \mu_i)}. \quad (41)$$

Since we are considering the limit as $R_0/R_1 \rightarrow 1$, it is also true that $R_0 \rightarrow R_1$. If we denote $R := R_1$, then

$$\lim_{\frac{R_0}{R_1} \rightarrow 1} G_0(n) = \lim_{\frac{R_0}{R_1} \rightarrow 1} G_1(n) = \frac{1}{6R} \frac{(n^3 - n)(T_0 + 1)}{n(1 - \mu_i) - (1 + \mu_i)},$$

and the condition (30) becomes

$$Q \leq \frac{1}{6R} \frac{(n^3 - n)(T_0 + 1)}{n(1 - \mu_i) - (1 + \mu_i)}. \quad (42)$$

After some algebraic manipulation, this condition becomes

$$\frac{Qn}{2R^2} \frac{1 - \mu_i}{1 + \mu_i} - \frac{Q}{2R^2} - \frac{(T_0 + 1)}{1 + \mu_i} \frac{(n^3 - n)}{12R^3} \leq 0. \quad (43)$$

The term on the left-hand side is precisely the two-layer growth rate for a single interface with interfacial tension $T_0 + 1$ (in dimensional variables this is $T_0 + T_1$, the sum of the interfacial tensions of the two interfaces). This is the same thin-layer limit that was found for the exact three-layer growth rate in [56]. The thin-layer limit can also be inferred from physical considerations. The jump in pressure across the two interfaces in the thin layer limit is the sum of the pressure jumps across each of the interfaces since the intermediate layer fluid is non-existent. This is also reflected in equation (43) due to the absence of the viscosity μ_1 of the intermediate layer fluid. This explains, in combination with Laplace's law of surface tension, that the effective interfacial tension must be the sum of the interfacial tensions of two interfaces.

Using a similar analysis of the thick-layer limit ($R_0 \ll R_1$) for $n > 2$, a disturbance with wave number n is stable if the injection rate Q is such that

$$\frac{Qn}{2R_0^2} \frac{\mu_1 - \mu_i}{\mu_1 + \mu_i} - \frac{Q}{2R_0^2} - \frac{T_0}{\mu_1 + \mu_i} \frac{(n^3 - n)}{12R_0^3} \leq 0, \quad (44)$$

and

$$\frac{Qn}{2R_1^2} \frac{1 - \mu_1}{1 + \mu_1} - \frac{Q}{2R_1^2} - \frac{1}{1 + \mu_1} \frac{(n^3 - n)}{12R_1^3} \leq 0. \quad (45)$$

Equation (44) is the condition that the inner interface is stable according to its two-layer growth rate, and equation (45) is the condition that the outer interface is stable according to its two-layer growth rate. Therefore, as expected, in the limit of a thick intermediate layer the interfaces are decoupled and the flow is stable if each interface is individually stable.

C. Multi-layer Flow

We now find sufficient conditions on the injection rate to stabilize a flow with an arbitrary number of fluid layers. The approach used for three-layer flows in §III B which uses Gershgorin's circle theorem can be adapted to flows with four or more layers by calculating the corresponding matrix $\mathbf{M}_N$. However, in order to avoid inverting an $(N + 1) \times (N + 1)$ matrix, we adopt a different approach. In [56, p.22], upper bounds are found on the real part of the growth rate for flows with N internal layers. This upper bound is the maximum of $N + 1$ expressions, each of which has terms that pertain to the parameter values at one of the interfaces. From examining the upper bound, it can be seen that a disturbance with wave number n will be stable if $E_j \leq 0$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, N$. Using a dimensionless version of the upper bounds in [56], the relationship between E_j and F_j (see equations (19), (21), and (23)) is

$$E_0 = nR_0^2 F_0 - \frac{Qn}{2} \mu_i, \quad E_j = nR_j^2 F_j, \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, N-1, \quad E_N = nR_N^2 F_N - \frac{Qn}{2}. \quad (46)$$

$E_j \leq 0$ for all j if

$$Q \leq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{6R_0} \frac{T_0 n(n^2 - 1)}{n(\mu_1 - \mu_i) - \mu_i}, \min_{j=1, \dots, N-1} \frac{1}{6R_j} \frac{T_j(n^2 - 1)}{\mu_{j+1} - \mu_j}, \frac{1}{6R_N} \frac{n(n^2 - 1)}{n(1 - \mu_N) - 1} \right\}. \quad (47)$$

Therefore, a lower bound on the maximum stable injection rate Q_M is given by

$$Q_M \geq \min_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ \min \left\{ \frac{1}{6R_0} \frac{T_0 n(n^2 - 1)}{n(\mu_1 - \mu_i) - \mu_i}, \min_{j=1, \dots, N-1} \frac{1}{6R_j} \frac{T_j(n^2 - 1)}{\mu_{j+1} - \mu_j}, \frac{1}{6R_N} \frac{n(n^2 - 1)}{n(1 - \mu_N) - 1} \right\} \right\}. \quad (48)$$

Notice the similarity between the terms in (48) and the expression for two-layer flows given by equation (28).

The above approach can be used to obtain a bound on a stable injection rate for three-layer flows. However, the approach taken in §III B using Gershgorin's Circle theorem generally produces sharper bounds. This is because the effects of the interfaces have been decoupled in equation (48). Because the motion of the interfaces is inherently coupled, any bound that decouples them will not be a sharp bound.




FIG. 2: (color online). Plots of the maximum stable injection rate vs time for two-layer flow (solid line) and three-layer flow (dashed line) as well as the lower bound for stabilization derived from Gershgorin's Circle Theorem and given by equation (39) (dotted line). The values of the parameters are $\mu_i = 0.2$, $\mu_o = 1$, $T = 1$, $R(0) = 1$ for two-layer flow and $\mu_i = 0.2$, $\mu_1 = 0.6$, $\mu_o = 1$, $T_0 = T_1 = 1$, $R_0(0) = 0.8$, $R_1(0) = 1$ for three-layer flow.

IV. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this section, we first numerically explore the maximum injection rate for a stable flow. Then we consider injection strategies that reduce instabilities for a given average injection rate by numerically integrating the dynamical system (25) to compute the motion of the interfaces within the linear theory and calculating the growth rates of interfacial disturbances. This system has a large parameter space. The parameters involved in the problem include the viscosities of each fluid, the interfacial tension of each interface, the injection rate, the initial positions of the interfaces, and the amplitude and wave numbers of the initial perturbations of the interfaces. In this work, we focus on the injection rate. We have tested many values for the other parameters and have chosen values that exhibit behavior that is typical across parameter space. The values of the parameters are given in the various figure captions below.

All time-stepping is performed using the Dormand-Prince method via MATLAB's `ode45`, and the maximum injection rate for a stable flow is found by using MATLAB's built-in `fzero` command to solve for the value of Q for which the maximum growth rate is zero.

A. Maximum Injection Rate for a Stable Flow

In this section we investigate the maximum value of the injection rate that results in a stable flow, which is denoted Q_M . This was studied analytically in §III. For two-layer radial flow, the maximum stable injection rate for a given wave number n and radius R of the circular interface is given exactly by the expression (28). Q_M is found by taking the minimum value over all integer wave numbers.

For flows with three or more layers, a lower bound on Q_M is calculated by minimizing the expression (39) or (48) over all integer values of n and with the initial positions of the interfaces $R_j(0)$. Then the interfacial positions $R_j(\Delta t)$ at the next time step Δt are calculated using this injection rate and the process is repeated. To find Q_M exactly for three-layer flow (see Fig. 2), an additional calculation is needed. There is no analytical expression for the maximum stable injection rate for given values of n , R_0 , and R_1 analogous to equation (28). Therefore, we use the expression for $\sigma^+(t)$ given in [56]. A root-finding method is used to find the value of Q such that $\sigma^+(t) = 0$. A similar procedure is employed for flows with more than three layers, but the maximum growth rate is calculated numerically from the matrix $\mathbf{M}_n(t)$ in equation (26).

The maximum injection rate for which a certain two-layer flow is stable is given by the solid line in Fig. 2. As a comparison, the maximum stable injection rate is calculated for a three-layer flow in which the outer interface starts in the same position as the interface for two-layer flow, the viscosity of the inner and outer layers are the same as the two-layer flow, and the intermediate layer has a viscosity which is greater than the inner layer and smaller than the outer layer. This is the dashed line in Fig. 2. Note that the three-layer flow is stable for a much larger injection rate due to the fact that the viscosity jumps at the interfaces are smaller. Also included in Fig. 2 is the lower bound on the maximum stable injection rate given in equation (39). This is the dotted line in Fig. 2. Note that for these particular values of the parameters, this bound, while not strict, allows for a significant increase in the injection rate over two-layer flow.




FIG. 3: (color online). Plots of the maximum stable injection rate vs time for two-layer flow (solid line) and three-layer flow (dashed line) as well as the lower bound (39) for three values of R_0 . The values of the parameters are $\mu_i = 0.2$, $\mu_o = 1$, $T = 1$, $R(0) = 1$ for two-layer flow and $\mu_i = 0.2$, $\mu_1 = 0.6$, $\mu_o = 1$, $T_0 = T_1 = 1$, $R_0(0) = 0.7, 0.8, 0.9$, $R_1(0) = 1$ for three-layer flow.




FIG. 4: (color online). Plots of the maximum stable injection rate vs time for flows with two through six fluid layers. Plot (a) uses the lower bound given by equation (48) for flows with three or more layers while plot (b) shows the actual maximum stable injection rate. The values of the parameters are $\mu_i = 0.2$, $\mu_o = 1$, $T_j = 1$ for all j , $R_0(0) = 0.6$, and $R_N(0) = 1$. The interfaces are equally spaced at time $t = 0$ in all cases and the viscous jumps are the same at all interfaces.

In oil recovery applications, it is often expensive to include a more viscous intermediate fluid instead of just using water to displace oil. Therefore, it would be economically advantageous if a minimal amount of fluid could be used in the intermediate layer of a three-layer flow if it still allows the flow to be stabilized at a faster injection rate. This behavior is investigated in Fig. 3. The solid line is the maximum stable injection rate for two-layer flow using the same parameters as in Fig. 2. This flow is compared with three-layer flows for which the inner interface is initially at $R_0(0) = 0.7, 0.8, 0.9$. Notice that as the middle layer becomes thinner, the maximum stable injection rate decreases. Recall from §III B 1 that in the limit of an infinitely thin middle layer, the flow will be stable when Q satisfies (42). The injection rate obtained by taking the minimum value of Q over all n from equation (42) is also plotted against time as “thin-layer limit” in Fig. 3. Equation (42) is the same condition as the stable injection rate for two-layer flow but with effective interfacial tension $T_0 + T_1$. Therefore, a three-layer flow with a very thin intermediate layer will be stable for faster injection rates than the corresponding two-layer flow as long as the sum of the interfacial tensions in the three-layer flow is greater than the interfacial tension of the two-layer flow. Note that this does **not** depend on the viscosity of the intermediate fluid. The fact that the middle layer can be very thin leads to the conclusion that the use of a thin layer of spacer fluid with desirable properties can be a viable injection strategy.

We next compare estimates of the maximum stable injection rates using the lower bound (48) in order to explore how the bound changes as the number of layers increases. Recall that (48) gives a lower bound on the maximum stable injection rate for a flow with $(N + 2)$ layers (or N internal layers). This bound was computed for flows with




FIG. 5: (color online). Plot of the maximum stable injection rate vs time for three-layer flow (solid line) as well as the lower bound derived from Gershgorin's Circle Theorem (see equation (39)) and the decoupled lower bound (see equation (48)). The values of the parameters are $\mu_i = 0.2, \mu_1 = 0.6, \mu_o = 1, T_0 = T_1 = 1, R_0(0) = 0.8, R_1(0) = 1$.

three, four, five, and six layers and plotted in Fig. 4a. For comparison, the maximum injection rate which results in a stable flow is plotted for two-layer flow (see equation (28)). For all flows with more than one interface, the innermost interface has an initial position of $R_0(0) = 0.6$ and the other interfaces are evenly spaced at time $t = 0$. For all flows, the innermost fluid has a viscosity of $\mu_i = 0.2$, the outermost fluid has a viscosity of $\mu_o = 1$, and the viscosities of all intermediate layers are chosen so that the viscous jump at each interface is the same. All interfaces have the same interfacial tension. In general, the addition of more fluid layers increases the lower bound on the maximum stable injection rate. Intuitively, this is because the jumps at the interfaces are smaller when there are more layers of fluid. The one exception is three-layer flow which has a larger lower bound than four-layer flow for short time. This is due to the fact that for three-layer flow, the lower bound on the maximum stable injection rate only includes the first and last term of equation (48), which has a different structure than the intermediate terms. For flows with four or more layers and these parameter values, the intermediate terms produce the minima.

In addition to considering approximations to the maximum stable injection rate from lower bounds as discussed above, we also numerically compute the exact maximum stable injection rate for multi-layer flows. For these computations, a root finding algorithm is used to find the value of Q that results in the maximum eigenvalue of the matrix $\mathbf{M}_N$ (defined in (26)) being zero. Fig. 4b shows the maximum stable injection rates for flows with two, three, four, five, and six layers. The parameters used are the same as in Fig. 4a. A comparison of Figs. 4a and 4b shows that the increase in the maximum stable injection rate from using additional layers of fluid is much greater than what is suggested by the lower bounds. This is especially true for short times. For example, for these values of the parameters the maximum stable injection rate at time $t = 0$ is more than 16 times greater for six-layer flow than it is for two-layer flow.

A comparison of Figs. 4a and 4b shows that the lower bounds given by equation (48) are crude. There is the potential to find analytical bounds which are sharper. In particular, the three-layer lower bound (39) found using Gershgorin's Circle Theorem gives a sharper bound than (48). One reason that the bound given by equation (39) is better is because the interfaces remain coupled whereas in the bounds given by (48) the interfaces have been decoupled. A bound for which the interfaces are coupled has the ability to account for interactions between the interfaces and therefore has the potential to be a sharper bound. Fig. 5 shows a comparison of the two bounds. The solid curve shows the exact value of the maximum stable injection rate for the same three-layer flow considered in Fig. 2. The dashed line is the lower bound given by equation (39) and the dotted line is the lower bound given by equation (48). The difference between the two bounds is stark.

Recall from Section III A that Beeson-Jones and Woods [50] showed that for two-layer flow (i.e. single interface), the maximum stable injection rate scales like $t^{-1/3}$ for $t \gg 1$. This also holds true for flows with multiple interfaces. For flows with 1 through 30 interfaces, we calculated the maximum stable injection rate from $t = 0$ to $t = 100$. For a subsample of these cases, the maximum stable injection rates are shown on a log-log scale in Fig. 6a. As in Fig. 4b, the initial position of the innermost interface is $R = 0.6$ and the initial position of the outermost interface is $R = 1$. The interfaces are equally spaced and the viscous jumps at the interfaces are all the same with $\mu_i = 0.2$ and $\mu_o = 1$. The interfacial tension is 1 for every interface. Note that after an initial period of time, all curves are linear with the same slope. For each curve, we fit an exponential function of the form $Q(t) = Ct^\alpha$ for $t \geq 10$. In all cases, the exponent of the best fit exponential function is approximately $\alpha = -1/3$, which matches with the analytically obtained scaling law for the single interface case. However, the constant C increases with the number of interfaces. The values of C are plotted versus the number of interfaces on a log-log scale in Fig. 6b. The line of best fit through




FIG. 6: (color online). Plot (a) is the maximum stable injection rate versus time for several different numbers of interfaces on a log-log scale. Each curve is of the form $Q(t) = Ct^{-1/3}$ for $t \gg 1$. Plot (b) shows C versus the number of interfaces on a log-log scale. The values of the parameters are $\mu_i = 0.2$, $\mu_o = 1$, $T_j = 1$ for all j , $R_0(0) = 0.6$, and $R_N(0) = 1$. The interfaces are equally spaced at time $t = 0$ in all cases and the viscous jumps are the same at all interfaces.

the points is shown in the figure and has slope $2/3$. Therefore, if N_I is the number of interfaces, $C \propto N_I^{2/3}$. Thus $Q(t) \propto N_I^{2/3} t^{-1/3}$ for $t \geq 10$.

This relationship between C and N_I can be understood in the following way. First, notice that the maximum stable injection rate for flow with a single interface is independent of the interfacial tension T (see equation (28)). However, the interfacial tension is part of both the characteristic injection rate and the characteristic time scale. The dimensionless injection rate Q^* is proportional to $1/T$ and the dimensionless time t^* is proportional to T . Therefore, since $Q^*(t^*) \propto (t^*)^{-1/3}$,

$$\frac{Q(t)}{T} \propto (Tt)^{-1/3} \implies Q(t) \propto T^{2/3} t^{-1/3}.$$

Recall from Section IIIB1 that when there are two interfaces, they will eventually be very close together. In that limit, the maximum stable injection rate reduces to a term that is identical to a single interface maximum stable injection rate but with interfacial tension equal to the sum of the interfacial tensions of the two interfaces. Therefore, if both interfaces have the same interfacial tension, the maximum stable injection rate with two interfaces will be greater than the comparable single interface flow by a factor of $2^{2/3}$. For N_I interfaces, the long-time behavior is the same as the single interface case where the single interface has interfacial tension equal to the sum of the N_I interfacial tensions. Therefore, if all of the interfaces have the same interfacial tension we would expect that $Q(t) \propto N_I^{2/3}$ which agrees very well with the results of Fig. 6a. We further verified this by looking at the maximum stable injection rate for $t \gg 1$ for flows with different numbers of interfaces, but where the sum of the interfacial tensions remained constant. In that case, the maximum stable injection rate converged to $Ct^{-1/3}$ for the same constant C for any number of interfaces because the thin-layer limits are all the same.

In summary, the injection rate for a stable flow increases at a rate proportional to the number of interfaces to the two-thirds power at large time $t \gg 1$. However, at earlier times the number of interfaces can increase the maximum stable injection rate by a much greater amount.

B. Optimizing stability for a fixed mean injection rate

In the previous section, we considered the maximum injection rate for a fully stable flow. However, in practical situations there may be some time constraint that does not allow for a slow enough injection rate to fully stabilize the flow. Another approach to the problem is to consider the case in which a certain amount of fluid needs to be injected in a fixed amount of time. The question is which time-dependent injection rate $Q(t)$ will have the smallest growth rate of instabilities and minimize the effects of viscous fingering. It may appear from the previous section that a **decreasing** injection rate of the form $Q(t) \propto t^{-1/3}$ would be optimal. However, Dias et al. [48] showed that for a single interface, the optimal injection rate is approximated by an injection profile which **increases** linearly with




FIG. 7: The maximum growth rate σ_{max} versus time for two-interface flows with (a) a relatively low constant injection rate $Q = 15$, and (b) a relatively high constant injection rate $Q = 200$. The values of the other parameters are $\mu_i = 0.2$, $\mu_1 = 0.6$, $\mu_o = 1$, $T_0 = T_1 = 1$, $R_0(0) = 0.5$, and $R_N(0) = 1$.

t . We propose that this strategy is also effective for multi-interface flows for the following intuitive reasoning. Fig. 7 shows the maximum growth rate σ_{max} for two flows that both have two interfaces and share the same parameters. The only difference is that the flow represented by Fig. 7a has a low constant injection rate $Q = 15$ for which the flow is initially stable and near the maximum stable injection rate during the duration of time that is plotted, and the flow represented by Fig. 7b has a high constant injection rate $Q = 200$ which is unstable for all time. Note that the slow flow in Fig. 7a has a maximum growth rate that increases with time while the fast flow in Fig. 7b has a maximum growth rate that decreases with time. Therefore, from Fig. 7a it makes sense that finding the maximum stable injection rate, which corresponds to enforcing $\sigma_{max} = 0$, results in a decreasing injection rate. Namely, a slow flow with constant injection rate would become unstable over time, as in Fig. 7a, and therefore a decrease in injection rate is required to maintain stability. However, Fig. 7b shows that for an unstable flow, injecting more quickly at the beginning would lead to instabilities growing very quickly initially. Therefore, it makes sense to inject more slowly at the beginning and gradually increase the injection rate in order avoid the initial behavior of Fig. 7b.

We now demonstrate the effect of a variable injection rate on the motion of the interfaces according to the linear theory. In all of the results that follow, the parameters are chosen so that the jump in viscosity is the same across each interface and the unperturbed interfaces are initially evenly spaced. Fig. 8a shows the results for a three-layer flow with a constant injection rate in which the interfaces are initially disturbed with white noise. The top plot shows the maximum growth rate over time (solid blue curve) and the injection rate (dashed red curve). The bottom plot shows the positions of the interfaces according to the linear theory at the beginning time $t = 0$ (solid blue curves), an intermediate time $t = 0.0125$ (dashed red curves), and at the final time $t = 0.025$ (dotted magenta curves). Fig. 8b shows the results for a three-layer flow with the same parameters except that the injection rate is linearly increasing, but with the same average injection rate as the constant injection flow in Fig. 8a. Notice that the maximum growth rate of disturbances for the linearly increasing injection rate is less than that of the constant injection rate and therefore the interfaces at the final time have a smaller disturbance. This effect is even stronger if more fluid layers are added. A comparable four-layer flow is shown in Fig. 8c. The injection rate for this four-layer flow is linearly increasing and the flow is even less unstable than the three-layer flow with linearly increasing injection rate. Although not shown, the maximum growth rate is even smaller if more fluid layers are added.

An interesting feature of Fig. 8b is that the curve which represents the maximum growth rate σ_{max} versus time is not a smooth curve. This is because $\sigma_{max}(t)$ is the maximum growth rate over all integer values of the wave number n at time t . The curve has a discontinuous derivative with respect to time when the wave number of the most unstable wave, which we denote n_{max} , changes. Fig. 9 shows n_{max} versus time. The times that n_{max} changes correspond to the places where σ_{max} has a jump in its derivative.

The effectiveness of controlling the viscous fingering instability by adding additional fluid layers becomes evident when considering a sub-optimal injection strategy. Fig. 10 shows results that are the same as those in Fig. 8 except that the variable injection strategies use a decreasing injection rate proportional to $t^{-1/3}$. Fig. 10a is the same constant injection flow that is shown in Fig. 8a. We repeat it for convenience. Fig. 10b is a three-layer flow with a decreasing injection rate chosen so that the average injection rate is the same as the constant injection flow. Notice that in this case the variable injection rate causes the maximum growth rate to increase and the disturbances of the interfaces at later times are larger than the comparable constant injection flow. The decreasing injection rate is clearly a bad




FIG. 8: (color online). The top row shows the maximum growth rate σ_{max} versus time and the injection rate Q versus time, and the bottom row shows the positions of the interfaces at the beginning, middle, and end time for (a) a constant injection rate with two interfaces, (b) a linearly increasing injection rate with two interfaces, and (c) a linearly increasing injection rate with three interfaces. The values of the parameters are $\mu_i = 0.2$, $\mu_o = 1$, $T_0 = T_1 = 1$, $R_0(0) = 0.5$, and $R_N(0) = 1$.




FIG. 9: Plot of the wave number n_{max} of the most unstable wave vs time for three-layer flow with a linearly increasing injection rate. The values of the parameters are the same as Fig. 8b ($\mu_i = 0.2$, $\mu_1 = 0.6$, $\mu_o = 1$, $T_0 = T_1 = 1$, $R_0(0) = 0.5$, $R_1(0) = 1$).

strategy. However, the addition of more fluid layers can help stabilize the flow, even with this bad injection strategy. Fig. 10c shows a four-layer flow with a decreasing injection rate. With the addition of only one more fluid, the flow is less unstable than the three-layer flow with a constant injection rate. This demonstrates the using additional fluid layers, even a modest number, is a viable injection strategy even when the injection rate is chosen naively.

In this section, we numerically investigated two different time-dependent injection strategies. First, we considered the maximum injection rate for which the flow is stable. We found that for any number of fluid layers, the maximum stable injection rate is decreasing and proportional to $t^{-1/3}$ for $t \gg 1$. Additionally, the fluid can be injected faster while maintaining stability if the number of layers increases due to the sum of the interfacial tensions increasing. However, when considering a scenario in which the flow cannot be stabilized, for example when a certain amount of fluid must be injected in a given short amount of time, an increasing injection rate leads to a less unstable flow than




FIG. 10: (color online). The top row shows the maximum growth rate σ_{max} versus time and the injection rate Q versus time, and the bottom row shows the positions of the interfaces at the beginning, middle, and end time for (a) a constant injection rate with two interfaces, (b) a decreasing injection rate with two interfaces, and (c) a decreasing injection rate with three interfaces. The values of the parameters are $\mu_i = 0.2$, $\mu_o = 1$, $T_0 = T_1 = 1$, $R_0(0) = 0.5$, and $R_N(0) = 1$.

a constant or decreasing injection rate. Regardless of the injection strategy, adding even one extra layer of fluid can significantly affect the stability.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, linear stability analysis is used to explore several different time-dependent injection strategies that can be used to control the instability of multi-layer immiscible Hele-Shaw and porous media flows. In applications like oil recovery, it can be advantageous to inject fluid as quickly as possible while maintaining a stable flow. For two-layer flows, the maximum injection rate for which a disturbance with a particular wave number is stable is given in [50]. A similar condition is found in the present work for three-layer flows by using Gershgorin's circle theorem. By using upper bounds derived in [56], a sufficient condition on the injection rate to ensure stability is found for a flow with an arbitrary number of fluid layers.

The maximum injection rate for a stable flow is then explored numerically. It is found that flows with more fluid layers can be stable with faster injection rates than comparable flows with fewer fluid layers, even when the intermediate fluid layers are very thin. It is shown that for flows with an arbitrary number of fluid layers the maximum stable injection rate is proportional to $t^{-1/3}$ for $t \gg 1$ with the constant of proportionality being proportional to the number of interfaces raised to the two-thirds power. We also show that when a certain amount of fluid must be injected in a fixed amount of time, an increasing injection rate can produce a less unstable flow than a comparable constant or decreasing injection strategy. Finally, we demonstrate that the addition of even a modest number of additional fluids can overcome even a poor injection strategy.

There are several important future directions of study. This paper contains theoretical results based on linear theory. Since the linear theory may fail after some time or at some length scale, it is necessary to perform physical experiments as well as full numerical simulations in order to explore the nonlinear effects. As evidenced by [58], which is a numerical study of three-layer flow with constant injection, these studies are likely to be very interesting, and may be even more so when the injection rate is time-dependent or the number layers is increased. The findings can be non-trivial and can provide insights into the physics of such multi-interfacial flows. There is also room within the

linear theory to further explore the interfacial morphology and interactions between the interfaces, especially when the number of interfaces is large. Finally, it would be interesting to analyze the stability of multi-layer radial flows with time-dependent injection in non-standard geometries, such as in tapered Hele-Shaw cells, or when the gap width is time-dependent. The effects of different geometries would significantly alter the spectral problem which governs the growth of disturbances.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:

This work has been supported in part by the U.S. National Science Foundation grant DMS-1522782. We sincerely thank the reviewers for useful suggestions which have helped us to improve the paper significantly.

-
- [1] P. Daripa and G. Pasa, An optimal viscosity profile in enhanced oil recovery by polymer flooding, *Int. J. Engg. Sci* **42**, 2029 (2004).
 - [2] F. Fayers, ed., *Enhanced Oil Recovery* (Elsevier, The Netherlands, 1981) p. 596.
 - [3] G. Pope, The application of fractional flow theory to enhanced oil-recovery, *Soc. Pet. Eng. J.* **20**, 191 (1980).
 - [4] D. Shah and R. Schecter, eds., *Improved Oil Recovery by Surfactants and Polymer Flooding* (Academic Press, New York, NY, 1977) p. 513.
 - [5] R. L. Slobod and J. S. Lestz, Use of a graded viscosity zone to reduce fingering in miscible phase displacements, *Producers Monthly* **24**, 12 (1960).
 - [6] P. Daripa and C. Gin, Studies on dispersive stabilization of porous media flows, *Phys. Fluids* **28** (2016).
 - [7] G. Homsy, Viscous fingering in porous media, *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.* **19**, 271 (1987).
 - [8] P. Saffman and G. Taylor, The penetration of a fluid into a porous medium or Hele-Shaw cell containing a more viscous liquid, *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A* **245**, 312 (1958).
 - [9] J. Bataille, Stability of a radial immiscible drive, *Revue Inst. Pétrole* **23**, 1349 (1968).
 - [10] S. Wilson, Measurement of dynamic contact angles, *J. Colloid Interface Sci.* **51**, 532 (1975).
 - [11] L. Paterson, Radial fingering in a Hele-Shaw cell, *J. Fluid Mech.* **113**, 513 (1981).
 - [12] H. Zhao, J. Casademunt, C. Yeung, and J.V. Maher, Perturbing Hele-Shaw flow with a small gap gradient, *Phys. Rev. A* **45**, 2455 (1992).
 - [13] E. Dias and J. Miranda, Finger tip behavior in small gap gradient Hele-Shaw flows, *Phys. Rev. E* **82** (2010).
 - [14] T. Al-Housseiny, P. Tsai, and H. Stone, Control of interfacial instabilities using flow geometry, *Nat. Phys.* **8**, 747 (2010).
 - [15] T. Al-Housseiny and H. Stone, Controlling viscous fingering in tapered Hele-Shaw cells, *Phys. Fluids* **25** (2013).
 - [16] D. Lu, F. Municchi, and I. Christov, Computational analysis of interfacial dynamics in angled Hele-Shaw cells: Instability regimes, *Tran. Porous Media* **131**, 907 (2020).
 - [17] S. Jackson, H. Power, D. Giddings, and D. Stevens, The stability of immiscible viscous fingering in Hele-Shaw cells with spatially varying permeability, *Comput. Methods in Appl. Mech. Eng.* **320**, 606 (2017).
 - [18] P. Anjos, E. Dias, and J. Miranda, Fingering instability transition in radially tapered Hele-Shaw cells: Insights at the onset of nonlinear effects, *Phys. Rev. Fluids* **3** (2018).
 - [19] G. Bongrand and P. Tsai, Manipulation of viscous fingering in a radially tapered cell geometry, *Physical Review E* **97** (2018).
 - [20] L. Morrow, T. Moroney, and S. McCue, Numerical investigation of controlling interfacial instabilities in non-standard Hele-Shaw configurations, *J. Fluid Mech.* **877**, 1063 (2019).
 - [21] L. Schwartz, Instability and fingering in a rotating Hele-Shaw cell or porous medium, *Phys. Fluids A* **1**, 167 (1989).
 - [22] L. Carrillo, F.X. Magdaleno, J. Casademunt, and J. Ortin, Experiments in a rotating Hele-Shaw cell, *Phys. Rev. E* **54**, 6260 (1996).
 - [23] E. Alvarez-Lacalle, J. Ortín, and J. Casademunt, Low viscosity contrast fingering in a rotating hele-shaw cell, *Phys. Fluids* **16** (2004).
 - [24] P. Anjos, V. Alvarez, E. Dias, and J. Miranda, Rotating hele-shaw cell with a time-dependent angular velocity, *Phys. Rev. Fluids* **2** (2017).
 - [25] T. Al-Housseiny, I. Christov, and H. Stone, Two-phase fluid displacement and interfacial instabilities under elastic membranes, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111** (2013).
 - [26] J. Lister, G. Peng, and J. Neufeld, Viscous control of peeling an elastic sheet by bending and pulling, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111** (2013).
 - [27] D. Pihler-Puzovic, R. Périllat, M. Russell, A. Juel, and M. Heil, Modelling the suppression of viscous fingering in elastic-walled Hele-Shaw cells, *J. Fluid Mech.* **731**, 162 (2013).
 - [28] D. Pihler-Puzovic, A. Juel, and M. Heil, The interaction between viscous fingering and wrinkling in elastic-walled Hele-Shaw cells, *Phys. Fluids* **26** (2014).
 - [29] D. Pihler-Puzovic, G. Peng, J. Lister, M. Heil, and A. Juel, Viscous fingering in a radial elastic-walled Hele-Shaw cell, *J. Fluid Mech.* **849**, 163 (2018).

- [30] E. Dias and J. Miranda, Determining the number of fingers in the lifting Hele-Shaw problem, *Phys. Rev. E* **88** (2013).
- [31] Z. Zheng, H. Kim, and H. Stone, Controlling viscous fingering using time-dependent strategies, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115** (2015).
- [32] C. Vaquero-Stainer, M. Heil, A. Juel, and D. Pihler-Puzović, Self-similar and disordered front propagation in a radial Hele-Shaw channel with time-varying cell depth, *Phys. Rev. Fluids* **4** (2019).
- [33] S. Gorell and G. Homsy, A theory of the optimal policy of oil recovery by the secondary displacement process, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **43**, 79 (1983).
- [34] P. Daripa and G. Pasa, A simple derivation of an upper bound in the presence of a viscosity gradient in three-layer Hele-Shaw flows, *J. Stat. Mech. Theory Exp.* (2006).
- [35] P. Daripa, Some useful upper bounds for the selection of optimal profiles, *Physica A* **391**, 4065 (2012).
- [36] A. He, J. Lowengrub, and A. Belmonte, Modeling an elastic fingering instability in a reactive Hele-Shaw flow, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **72**, 842 (2012).
- [37] P. Coussot, Saffman-Taylor instability in yield-stress fluids, *J. Fluid Mech.* **380**, 363 (1999).
- [38] J. Fontana, E. Dias, and J. Miranda, Controlling and minimizing fingering instabilities in non-Newtonian fluids, *Phys. Rev. E* **89** (2014).
- [39] H. Thomé, M. Rabaud, V. Hakim, and Y. Couder, The Saffman–Taylor instability — from the linear to the circular geometry, *Phys. Fluids A* **1**, 224 (1989).
- [40] E. Brener, D. Kessler, H. Levine, and W.-J. Rappel, Selection of the viscous finger in the 90° geometry, *Europhys. Lett.* **13**, 161 (1990).
- [41] M. Ben Amar, V. Hakim, M. Mashaal, and Y. Couder, Self-dilating viscous fingers in wedge-shaped Hele-Shaw cells, *Phys. Fluids A* **3**, 1687 (1991).
- [42] R. Combescot and M. Ben Amar, Selection of Saffman–Taylor fingers in the sector geometry, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 453 (1991).
- [43] S. Li, J. Lowengrub, J. Fontana, and P. Palfy-Muhoray, Control of viscous fingering patterns in a radial Hele-Shaw cell, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102** (2009).
- [44] C.-Y. Chen, C.-W. Huang, L.-C. Wang, and J. Miranda, Controlling radial fingering patterns in miscible confined flows, *Phys. Rev. E* **82** (2010).
- [45] C.-Y. Chen and E. Meiburg, Miscible porous media displacements in the quarter five-spot configuration. part 1. the homogeneous case, *J. Fluid Mech.* **371**, 233 (1998).
- [46] Q. Yuan and J. Azaiez, Miscible displacements in porous media with time-dependent injection velocities, *Tran. Porous Media* **104**, 57 (2014).
- [47] E. Dias, F. Parisio, and J. Miranda, Suppression of viscous fluid fingering: A piecewise-constant injection process, *Phys. Rev. E* **82** (2010).
- [48] E. Dias, E. Alvarez-Lacalle, M. Carvalho, and J. Miranda, Minimization of viscous fluid fingering: a variational scheme for optimal flow rates, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109** (2012).
- [49] Y. Huang and C. Chen, A numerical study on radial Hele-Shaw flow: influence of fluid miscibility and injection scheme, *Comput. Mech.* **55**, 407 (2015).
- [50] T. Beeson-Jones and A. Woods, On the selection of viscosity to suppress the Saffman-Taylor instability in a radially spreading annulus, *J. Fluid Mech.* **782**, 127 (2015).
- [51] P. Daripa, Studies on stability in three-layer Hele-Shaw flows, *Phys. Fluids* **20** (2008).
- [52] P. Daripa, Hydrodynamic stability of multi-layer Hele-Shaw flows, *J. Stat. Mech. Theory Exp.* **12**, 28 (2008).
- [53] S. Cardoso and A. Woods, The formation of drops through viscous instability, *J. Fluid Mech.* **289**, 351 (1995).
- [54] T. Ward and A. White, Gas-driven displacement of a liquid in a partially filled radial Hele-Shaw cell, *Phys. Rev. E* **83** (2011).
- [55] A. White and T. Ward, Constant pressure gas-driven displacement of a shear-thinning liquid in a partially filled radial Hele-Shaw cell: Thin films, bursting and instability, *J. non-Newtonian Fluid Mech.* **206**, 18 (2014).
- [56] C. Gin and P. Daripa, Stability results for multi-layer radial Hele-Shaw and porous media flows, *Phys. Fluids* **27** (2015).
- [57] P. Anjos and S. Li, Weakly nonlinear analysis of the Saffman–Taylor problem in a radially spreading fluid annulus, *Phys. Rev. Fluids* **5** (2020).
- [58] M. Zhao, P. Anjos, J. Lowengrub, and S. Li, Pattern formation of the three-layer Saffman–Taylor problem in a radial Hele-Shaw cell, *Phys. Rev. Fluids* **5** (2020).
- [59] E. Dias and J. Miranda, Taper-induced control of viscous fingering in variable-gap Hele-Shaw flows, *Phys. Rev. E* **87** (2013).
- [60] H. Darcy, *Les Fontaines Publiques de la Ville de Dijon*, Paris (1856).
- [61] C. Park and G. Homsy, Two-phase displacement in Hele–Shaw cells: theory, *J. Fluid Mech.* **139**, 291 (1984).

Appendix A: Derivations

In this section, we give full derivations of the equations in §II. The equations of motion are given by equation (1), which can be written as

$$\frac{\partial u_r}{\partial r} + \frac{u_r}{r} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial u_\theta}{\partial \theta} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial p}{\partial r} = -\frac{\mu}{\kappa} u_r, \quad \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial p}{\partial \theta} = -\frac{\mu}{\kappa} u_\theta, \quad \text{for } r \neq 0. \quad (\text{A1})$$

Recall the scaling given by equations (2)–(9):

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{ref} &= \frac{12\pi\kappa T_N}{R_N(0)\mu_o}, & Q^* &= \frac{Q}{Q_{ref}}, & r^* &= \frac{r}{R_N(0)}, & \mu^* &= \frac{\mu}{\mu_o}, \\ t^* &= \frac{12\kappa T_N}{R_N^3(0)\mu_o}t, & \mathbf{u}^* &= \frac{R_N^2(0)\mu_o}{12\kappa T_N}\mathbf{u}, & p^* &= \frac{R_N(0)}{12T_N}p, & T^* &= \frac{T}{T_N}. \end{aligned}$$

From these scalings, the following substitutions can be derived.

$$Q = Q_{ref}Q^* = \frac{12\pi\kappa T_N Q^*}{R_N(0)\mu_o}, \quad (\text{A2})$$

$$r = R_N(0)r^*, \quad (\text{A3})$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial r} = \frac{\partial}{R_N(0)\partial r^*}, \quad (\text{A4})$$

$$\mu = \mu_o\mu^*, \quad (\text{A5})$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} = \frac{12\kappa T_N}{R_N^3(0)\mu_o} \frac{\partial}{\partial t^*}, \quad (\text{A6})$$

$$\mathbf{u} = \frac{12\kappa T_N}{R_N^2(0)\mu_o} \mathbf{u}^*, \quad (\text{A7})$$

$$p = \frac{12T_N}{R_N(0)} p^*, \quad (\text{A8})$$

$$T_j = T_N T_j^*. \quad (\text{A9})$$

Using (A3), (A4), and (A7) in equation (A1)₁,

$$\frac{12\kappa T_N}{R_N^2(0)\mu_o} \frac{\partial u_r^*}{R_N(0)\partial r^*} + \frac{12\kappa T_N}{R_N^2(0)\mu_o} \frac{u_r^*}{R_N(0)r^*} + \frac{1}{R_N(0)r^*} \frac{12\kappa T_N}{R_N^2(0)\mu_o} \frac{\partial u_\theta^*}{\partial \theta} = 0.$$

Dividing by the constant $(12\kappa T_N)/(R_N^3(0)\mu_o)$ yields

$$\nabla^* \cdot \mathbf{u}^* := \frac{\partial u_r^*}{\partial r^*} + \frac{u_r^*}{r^*} + \frac{1}{r^*} \frac{\partial u_\theta^*}{\partial \theta} = 0. \quad (\text{A10})$$

Plugging (A4), (A5), (A7), and (A8) into equation (A1)₂,

$$\frac{12T_N}{R_N(0)} \frac{\partial p^*}{R_N(0)\partial r^*} = -\frac{\mu_o\mu^*}{\kappa} \frac{12\kappa T_N}{R_N^2(0)\mu_o} u_r^*.$$

Dividing by the constant $12T_N/R_N^2(0)$ gives

$$\frac{\partial p^*}{\partial r^*} = -\mu^* u_r^*. \quad (\text{A11})$$

Plugging (A3), (A5), (A7), and (A8) into equation (A1)₃,

$$\frac{1}{R_N(0)r^*} \frac{12T_N}{R_N(0)} \frac{\partial p^*}{\partial \theta} = -\frac{\mu_o\mu^*}{\kappa} \frac{12\kappa T_N}{R_N^2(0)\mu_o} u_\theta^*.$$

Dividing by the constant $12T_N/R_N^2(0)$ yields

$$\frac{1}{r^*} \frac{\partial p^*}{\partial \theta} = -\mu^* u_\theta^*. \quad (\text{A12})$$

Equations (A10)–(A12) can be collectively written as

$$\nabla^* \cdot \mathbf{u}^* = 0, \quad \nabla^* p^* = -\mu^* \mathbf{u}^*, \quad \text{for } r^* \neq 0, \quad (\text{A13})$$

The original equations admit a simple basic solution in which all of the fluid moves outward radially with velocity $\mathbf{u} := (u_r, u_\theta) = (Q/(2\pi r), 0)$. The interfaces remain circular and move outward with velocity $dR_j/dt = Q/(2\pi R_j(t))$ for $j = 0, \dots, N$. Using equations (A2), (A3), and (A7), the basic solution $\mathbf{u}^*$ in the scaled variables satisfies

$$\frac{12\kappa T_N}{R_N^2(0)\mu_o}\mathbf{u}^* = \frac{12\pi\kappa T_N Q^*}{2\pi R_N^2(0)\mu_o r^*}.$$

Dividing by the constant $12\kappa T_N/(R_N^2(0)\mu_o)$ gives

$$\mathbf{u}^* = \frac{Q^*}{2r^*}. \quad (\text{A14})$$

Equation (A3) implies that $R_j(t) = R_N(0)R_j^*(t^*)$ for all j . Using this along with equations (A2) and (A6), the circular interfaces of the basic solution move outward radially with velocity dR_j^*/dt^* which satisfy

$$\frac{12\kappa T_N}{R_N^2(0)\mu_o} \frac{dR_j^*}{dt^*} = \frac{12\pi\kappa T_N Q^*}{2\pi R_N^2(0)\mu_o R_j^*}.$$

Dividing by $12\kappa T_N/(R_N^2(0)\mu_o)$ gives

$$\frac{dR_j^*}{dt^*} = \frac{Q^*}{2R_j^*}. \quad (\text{A15})$$

For notational convenience, we drop the stars below.

We perturb the basic solution (u_r, u_θ, p) by $(\tilde{u}_r, \tilde{u}_\theta, \tilde{p})$ where the disturbances are assumed to be small. We plug these into equations (A13) and only keep terms that are linear with respect to disturbances. Since equations (A13) are, in fact, linear, the disturbances satisfy the same equations. Therefore,

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{u}_r}{\partial r} + \frac{\tilde{u}_r}{r} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial \tilde{u}_\theta}{\partial \theta} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial \tilde{p}}{\partial r} = -\mu \tilde{u}_r, \quad \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial \tilde{p}}{\partial \theta} = -\mu \tilde{u}_\theta. \quad (\text{A16})$$

We use separation of variables and assume that the disturbances are of the form

$$(\tilde{u}_r, \tilde{u}_\theta, \tilde{p}) = (f(r), \tau(r), \psi(r))g(t)e^{in\theta}. \quad (\text{A17})$$

Using (A17) in equation (A16)₁,

$$f'(r)g(t)e^{in\theta} + \frac{1}{r}f(r)g(t)e^{in\theta} + \frac{in}{r}\tau(r)g(t)e^{in\theta} = 0.$$

Simplifying,

$$f'(r) + \frac{1}{r}f(r) + \frac{in}{r}\tau(r) = 0,$$

and therefore,

$$\tau(r) = \frac{i}{n}(f(r) + rf'(r)). \quad (\text{A18})$$

Next, we use (A17) in equation (A16)₃ which yields,

$$\frac{in}{r}\psi(r)g(t)e^{in\theta} = -\mu\tau(r)g(t)e^{in\theta}.$$

Simplifying,

$$\psi(r) = \frac{ir\mu}{n}\tau(r). \quad (\text{A19})$$

Using equation (A18) in equation (A19),

$$\psi(r) = -\frac{r\mu}{n^2}(f(r) + rf'(r)). \quad (\text{A20})$$

We now cross-differentiate the pressure equation, (A16)₂ and (A16)₃. Taking $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta}$ of (A16)₂ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial r}$ of (A16)₃ yields

$$\frac{\partial^2 \tilde{p}}{\partial r \partial \theta} = -\mu \frac{\partial \tilde{u}_r}{\partial \theta}, \quad \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{p}}{\partial \theta \partial r} = \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial \tilde{p}}{\partial \theta} - r\mu \frac{\partial \tilde{u}_\theta}{\partial r}.$$

Setting these equal gives

$$-\mu \frac{\partial \tilde{u}_r}{\partial \theta} = \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial \tilde{p}}{\partial \theta} - r\mu \frac{\partial \tilde{u}_\theta}{\partial r}. \quad (\text{A21})$$

We use the ansatz (A17) in equation (A21) and get

$$-i\mu n f(r)g(t)e^{in\theta} = \frac{in}{r}\psi(r)g(t)e^{in\theta} - r\mu\tau'(r)g(t)e^{in\theta}.$$

Using equations (A18) and (A19),

$$-i\mu n f(r) = -\mu \frac{i}{n}(f(r) + rf'(r)) - r\mu \frac{i}{n}(2f'(r) + rf''(r)).$$

With some algebraic manipulation, we get the following ordinary differential equation for $f(r)$:

$$(r^3 f'(r))' - (n^2 - 1)rf(r) = 0. \quad (\text{A22})$$

The above equation is exact since there has been no linearization in its derivation.

Next we derive the boundary conditions for this equation from linearization of the kinematic and dynamic interfacial boundary conditions. Let the disturbance of the interface located at $R_j(t)$ be given by $a_n^j(t, \theta) = A_n^j(t)e^{in\theta}$. The linearized kinematic interface conditions (see Appendix A 1) are given by

$$\frac{\partial a_n^j}{\partial t} = \tilde{u}_r(R_j) - a_n^j \frac{Q}{2R_j^2}, \quad (\text{A23})$$

where $\tilde{u}_r$ is continuous at $r = R_j$. Here, the interface condition has been taken at the linearized position $r = R_j$. Using $a_n^j = A_n^j(t)e^{in\theta}$ and the ansatz (A17) in (A23),

$$\frac{dA_n^j(t)}{dt} = f(R_j)g(t) - A_n^j(t) \frac{Q}{2R_j^2}. \quad (\text{A24})$$

The linearized dynamic interface condition (see Appendix A 1) at the innermost interface located at $R = R_0$ is

$$\left\{ \tilde{p}^+(R_0) - a_n^0 \frac{Q\mu_1}{2R_0} \right\} - \left\{ \tilde{p}^-(R_0) - a_n^0 \frac{Q\mu_i}{2R_0} \right\} = \frac{T_0}{12} \frac{a_n^0 + \frac{\partial^2 a_n^0}{\partial \theta^2}}{R_0^2},$$

where T_0 is the interfacial tension of the inner interface and the superscripts “+” and “−” denote the limits from above and below, respectively. Using $a_n^0 = A_n^0(t)e^{in\theta}$ and the ansatz (A17),

$$\left\{ \psi^+(R_0)g(t)e^{in\theta} - A_n^0(t)e^{in\theta} \frac{Q\mu_1}{2R_0} \right\} - \left\{ \psi^-(R_0)g(t)e^{in\theta} - A_n^0(t)e^{in\theta} \frac{Q\mu_i}{2R_0} \right\} = \frac{T_0}{12} \frac{1 - n^2}{R_0^2} A_n^0(t)e^{in\theta}.$$

Using (A20),

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{R_0\mu_1}{n^2} \left(f(R_0) + R_0(f^+)'(R_0) \right) g(t) - A_n^0(t) \frac{Q\mu_1}{2R_0} \\ & + \frac{R_0\mu_i}{n^2} \left(f(R_0) + R_0(f^-)'(R_0) \right) g(t) + A_n^0(t) \frac{Q\mu_i}{2R_0} \\ & = \frac{T_0}{12} \frac{1 - n^2}{R_0^2} A_n^0(t). \end{aligned}$$

After some algebraic manipulation,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ f(R_0)(\mu_i - \mu_1) + R_0[\mu_i(f^-)'(R_0) - \mu_1(f^+)'(R_0)] \right\} g(t) \\ & = \left\{ \frac{Qn^2}{2R_0^2}(\mu_1 - \mu_i) - \frac{T_0}{12} \frac{n^4 - n^2}{R_0^3} \right\} A_n^0(t). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A25})$$

The linearized dynamic condition at the outermost interface located at $R = R_N$ is

$$\left\{ \tilde{p}^+(R_N) - a_n^N \frac{Q}{2R_N} \right\} - \left\{ \tilde{p}^-(R_N) - a_n^N \frac{Q\mu_N}{2R_N} \right\} = \frac{1}{12} \frac{a_n^N + \frac{\partial^2 a_n^N}{\partial \theta^2}}{R_N^2},$$

where T_N is the interfacial tension of the outermost interface. Using $a_n^N = A_n^N(t)e^{in\theta}$ and the ansatz (A17),

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ \psi^+(R_N)g(t)e^{in\theta} - A_n^N(t)e^{in\theta} \frac{Q}{2R_N} \right\} - \left\{ \psi^-(R_N)g(t)e^{in\theta} - A_n^N(t)e^{in\theta} \frac{Q\mu_N}{2R_N} \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{12} \frac{1-n^2}{R_N^2} A_n^N(t)e^{in\theta}. \end{aligned}$$

Using (A20),

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{R_N}{n^2} \left(f(R_N) + R_N(f^+)'(R_N) \right) g(t) - A_n^N(t) \frac{Q}{2R_N} \\ & + \frac{R_N\mu_N}{n^2} \left(f(R_N) + R_N(f^-)'(R_N) \right) g(t) + A_n^N(t) \frac{Q\mu_N}{2R_N} \\ &= \frac{1}{12} \frac{1-n^2}{R_N^2} A_n^N(t). \end{aligned}$$

After some algebraic manipulation,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ f(R_N)(\mu_N - 1) + R_N[\mu_N(f^-)'(R_N) - (f^+)'(R_N)] \right\} g(t) \\ &= \left\{ \frac{Qn^2}{2R_N^2} (1 - \mu_N) - \frac{1}{12} \frac{n^4 - n^2}{R_N^3} \right\} A_n^N(t). \end{aligned} \tag{A26}$$

For any intermediate interface at $R = R_j$, the dynamic interface condition is

$$\left\{ \tilde{p}^+(R_j) - a_n^j \frac{Q\mu_{j+1}}{2R_j} \right\} - \left\{ \tilde{p}^-(R_j) - a_n^j \frac{Q\mu_j}{2R_j} \right\} = \frac{T_j}{12} \frac{a_n^j + \frac{\partial^2 a_n^j}{\partial \theta^2}}{R_j^2},$$

where T_j is the interfacial tension of the interface at $R = R_j$. Using $a_n^j = A_n^j(t)e^{in\theta}$ and the ansatz (A17),

$$\left\{ \psi^+(R_j)g(t)e^{in\theta} - A_n^j(t)e^{in\theta} \frac{Q\mu_{j+1}}{2R_j} \right\} - \left\{ \psi^-(R_j)g(t)e^{in\theta} - A_n^j(t)e^{in\theta} \frac{Q\mu_j}{2R_j} \right\} = \frac{T_j}{12} \frac{1-n^2}{R_j^2} A_n^j(t)e^{in\theta}.$$

Using (A20),

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{R_j\mu_{j+1}}{n^2} \left(f(R_j) + R_j(f^+)'(R_j) \right) g(t) - A_n^j(t) \frac{Q\mu_{j+1}}{2R_j} \\ & + \frac{R_j\mu_j}{n^2} \left(f(R_j) + R_j(f^-)'(R_j) \right) g(t) + A_n^j(t) \frac{Q\mu_j}{2R_j} \\ &= \frac{T_j}{12} \frac{1-n^2}{R_j^2} A_n^j(t). \end{aligned}$$

After some algebraic manipulation,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ f(R_j)(\mu_j - \mu_{j+1}) + R_j[\mu_j(f^-)'(R_j) - \mu_{j+1}(f^+)'(R_j)] \right\} g(t) \\ &= \left\{ \frac{Qn^2}{2R_j^2} (\mu_{j+1} - \mu_j) - \frac{T_j}{12} \frac{n^4 - n^2}{R_j^3} \right\} A_n^j(t). \end{aligned} \tag{A27}$$

Recall that $f(r)$ satisfies equation (A22). Solutions of (A22) are of the form

$$f(r) = \begin{cases} K_{i,1}r^{n-1} + K_{i,2}r^{-(n+1)}, & r < R_0 \\ K_{j,1}r^{n-1} + K_{j,2}r^{-(n+1)}, & R_{j-1} < r < R_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, N \\ K_{o,1}r^{n-1} + K_{o,2}r^{-(n+1)}, & r > R_N. \end{cases}$$

In order to ensure that the disturbances go to zero as $r \rightarrow \infty$ and to avoid a singularity at $r = 0$, we require that $K_{i,2} = 0$ and $K_{o,1} = 0$. Therefore,

$$(f^-)'(R_0) = \frac{(n-1)f(R_0)}{R_0}, \quad (f^+)'(R_N) = -\frac{(n+1)f(R_N)}{R_N}. \quad (\text{A28})$$

The solution to (A22) for $R_{j-1} < r < R_j$ can also be written as

$$f(r) = \frac{\left[f(R_j) \left(\frac{R_{j-1}}{R_j} \right)^{n-1} - f(R_{j-1}) \right] \left(\frac{r}{R_{j-1}} \right)^{-n-1} + \left[f(R_{j-1}) \left(\frac{R_{j-1}}{R_j} \right)^{n+1} - f(R_j) \right] \left(\frac{r}{R_j} \right)^{n-1}}{\left(\frac{R_{j-1}}{R_j} \right)^{2n} - 1}, \quad (\text{A29})$$

for $j = 1, \dots, N$. Taking a derivative of this function and evaluating at R_{j-1} and R_j ,

$$\begin{aligned} (f^+)'(R_{j-1}) &= \frac{n}{R_{j-1}} \frac{f(R_{j-1}) \left[\left(\frac{R_{j-1}}{R_j} \right)^{2n} + 1 \right] - 2f(R_j) \left(\frac{R_{j-1}}{R_j} \right)^{n-1}}{\left(\frac{R_{j-1}}{R_j} \right)^{2n} - 1} - \frac{f(R_{j-1})}{R_{j-1}}, \\ (f^-)'(R_j) &= -\frac{n}{R_j} \frac{f(R_j) \left[\left(\frac{R_{j-1}}{R_j} \right)^{2n} + 1 \right] - 2f(R_{j-1}) \left(\frac{R_{j-1}}{R_j} \right)^{n+1}}{\left(\frac{R_{j-1}}{R_j} \right)^{2n} - 1} - \frac{f(R_j)}{R_j}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A30})$$

Using (A28)₁ and (A30)₁ with $j = 1$ in the interface condition (A25),

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\{ f(R_0)(\mu_i - \mu_1) + \mu_i(n-1)f(R_0) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \mu_1 n \frac{f(R_0) \left[\left(\frac{R_0}{R_1} \right)^{2n} + 1 \right] - 2f(R_1) \left(\frac{R_0}{R_1} \right)^{n-1}}{\left(\frac{R_0}{R_1} \right)^{2n} - 1} + \mu_1 f(R_0) \right\} g(t) \\ &= \left\{ \frac{Qn^2}{2R_0^2}(\mu_1 - \mu_i) - \frac{T_0}{12} \frac{n^4 - n^2}{R_0^3} \right\} A_n^0(t). \end{aligned}$$

Simplifying,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\{ n\mu_i f(R_0) - \mu_1 n \frac{f(R_0) \left[\left(\frac{R_0}{R_1} \right)^{2n} + 1 \right] - 2f(R_1) \left(\frac{R_0}{R_1} \right)^{n-1}}{\left(\frac{R_0}{R_1} \right)^{2n} - 1} \right\} g(t) \\ &= \left\{ \frac{Qn^2}{2R_0^2}(\mu_1 - \mu_i) - \frac{T_0}{12} \frac{n^4 - n^2}{R_0^3} \right\} A_n^0(t). \end{aligned}$$

After further algebraic manipulation,

$$\left\{ \mu_i - \mu_1 \frac{\left(\frac{R_0}{R_1} \right)^{2n} + 1}{\left(\frac{R_0}{R_1} \right)^{2n} - 1} \right\} f(R_0)g(t) + 2\mu_1 \frac{\left(\frac{R_0}{R_1} \right)^{n-1}}{\left(\frac{R_0}{R_1} \right)^{2n} - 1} f(R_1)g(t) = F_0 A_n^0(t), \quad (\text{A31})$$

where

$$F_0 = \frac{Qn}{2R_0^2}(\mu_1 - \mu_i) - \frac{T_0}{12} \frac{n^3 - n}{R_0^3}. \quad (\text{A32})$$

Using (A28)₂ and (A30)₂ with $j = N$ in the interface condition (A26),

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ f(R_N)(\mu_N - 1) - \mu_N n \frac{f(R_N) \left[\left(\frac{R_{N-1}}{R_N} \right)^{2n} + 1 \right] - 2f(R_{N-1}) \left(\frac{R_{N-1}}{R_N} \right)^{n+1}}{\left(\frac{R_{N-1}}{R_N} \right)^{2n} - 1} \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \mu_N f(R_N) + (n+1)f(R_N) \right\} g(t) \\ &= \left\{ \frac{Qn^2}{2R_N^2} (1 - \mu_N) - \frac{1}{12} \frac{n^4 - n^2}{R_N^3} \right\} A_n^N(t). \end{aligned}$$

Simplifying,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ -\mu_N n \frac{f(R_N) \left[\left(\frac{R_{N-1}}{R_N} \right)^{2n} + 1 \right] - 2f(R_{N-1}) \left(\frac{R_{N-1}}{R_N} \right)^{n+1}}{\left(\frac{R_{N-1}}{R_N} \right)^{2n} - 1} + n f(R_N) \right\} g(t) \\ &= \left\{ \frac{Qn^2}{2R_N^2} (1 - \mu_N) - \frac{1}{12} \frac{n^4 - n^2}{R_N^3} \right\} A_n^N(t). \end{aligned}$$

After further algebraic manipulation,

$$\left\{ 1 - \mu_N \frac{\left(\frac{R_{N-1}}{R_N} \right)^{2n} + 1}{\left(\frac{R_{N-1}}{R_N} \right)^{2n} - 1} \right\} f(R_N) g(t) + 2\mu_N \frac{\left(\frac{R_{N-1}}{R_N} \right)^{n+1}}{\left(\frac{R_{N-1}}{R_N} \right)^{2n} - 1} f(R_{N-1}) g(t) = F_N A_n^N(t), \quad (\text{A33})$$

where

$$F_N = \frac{Qn}{2R_N^2} (1 - \mu_N) - \frac{1}{12} \frac{n^3 - n}{R_N^3}. \quad (\text{A34})$$

For the intermediate interfaces, we use (A30) in the interface condition (A27),

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ f(R_j)(\mu_j - \mu_{j+1}) \right. \\ & \quad - n\mu_j \frac{f(R_j) \left[\left(\frac{R_{j-1}}{R_j} \right)^{2n} + 1 \right] - 2f(R_{j-1}) \left(\frac{R_{j-1}}{R_j} \right)^{n+1}}{\left(\frac{R_{j-1}}{R_j} \right)^{2n} - 1} - \mu_j f(R_j) \\ & \quad \left. - n\mu_{j+1} \frac{f(R_j) \left[\left(\frac{R_j}{R_{j+1}} \right)^{2n} + 1 \right] - 2f(R_{j+1}) \left(\frac{R_j}{R_{j+1}} \right)^{n-1}}{\left(\frac{R_j}{R_{j+1}} \right)^{2n} - 1} + \mu_{j+1} f(R_j) \right\} g(t) \\ &= \left\{ \frac{Qn^2}{2R_j^2} (\mu_{j+1} - \mu_j) - \frac{T_j}{12} \frac{n^4 - n^2}{R_j^3} \right\} A_n^j(t). \end{aligned}$$

Simplifying,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\{ \begin{aligned} & f(R_j) \left[\left(\frac{R_{j-1}}{R_j} \right)^{2n} + 1 \right] - 2f(R_{j-1}) \left(\frac{R_{j-1}}{R_j} \right)^{n+1} \\ & -n\mu_j \frac{\left(\frac{R_{j-1}}{R_j} \right)^{2n} - 1}{\left(\frac{R_{j-1}}{R_j} \right)^{2n} - 1} \\ & f(R_j) \left[\left(\frac{R_j}{R_{j+1}} \right)^{2n} + 1 \right] - 2f(R_{j+1}) \left(\frac{R_j}{R_{j+1}} \right)^{n-1} \\ & -n\mu_{j+1} \frac{\left(\frac{R_j}{R_{j+1}} \right)^{2n} - 1}{\left(\frac{R_j}{R_{j+1}} \right)^{2n} - 1} \end{aligned} \right\} g(t) \\
& = \left\{ \frac{Qn^2}{2R_j^2} (\mu_{j+1} - \mu_j) - \frac{T_j}{12} \frac{n^4 - n^2}{R_j^3} \right\} A_n^j(t).
\end{aligned}$$

After further algebraic manipulation,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\{ -\mu_j \frac{\left(\frac{R_{j-1}}{R_j} \right)^{2n} + 1}{\left(\frac{R_{j-1}}{R_j} \right)^{2n} - 1} - \mu_{j+1} \frac{\left(\frac{R_j}{R_{j+1}} \right)^{2n} + 1}{\left(\frac{R_j}{R_{j+1}} \right)^{2n} - 1} \right\} f(R_j)g(t) \\
& + 2\mu_j \frac{\left(\frac{R_{j-1}}{R_j} \right)^{n+1}}{\left(\frac{R_{j-1}}{R_j} \right)^{2n} - 1} f(R_{j-1})g(t) + 2\mu_{j+1} \frac{\left(\frac{R_j}{R_{j+1}} \right)^{n-1}}{\left(\frac{R_j}{R_{j+1}} \right)^{2n} - 1} f(R_{j+1})g(t) \\
& = F_j A_n^j(t),
\end{aligned} \tag{A35}$$

where

$$F_j = \frac{Qn}{2R_j^2} (\mu_{j+1} - \mu_j) - \frac{T_j}{12} \frac{n^3 - n}{R_j^3}, \quad j = 1, \dots, N-1. \tag{A36}$$

1. Linearized Interface Conditions

First we derive the linearized interface conditions in the original dimensional variables. Then we will apply the scaling given by equations (2)–(9) to obtain them in dimensionless form.

Let the disturbance of the interface located at $R_j(t)$ be given by $a_n^j(t, \theta)$. Therefore, the radial position of the interface is $\eta(t, \theta) = R_j(t) + a_n^j(t, \theta)$. The kinematic condition is given by

$$\frac{D\eta}{Dt} = \mathbf{u} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}, \quad r = \eta(t, \theta), \tag{A37}$$

where D/Dt denotes the material derivative, $\mathbf{u} := (u_r, u_\theta)$ is the velocity in polar coordinates, and $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ denotes the unit vector which is normal to the interface. Using that $\eta(t, \theta) = R_j(t) + a_n^j(t, \theta)$, the left-hand side of this equation can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{D\eta}{Dt} &= \frac{dR_j(t)}{dt} + \frac{Da_n^j}{Dt} \\
&= \frac{Q}{2\pi R_j} + \frac{\partial a_n^j}{\partial t} + \frac{u_\theta}{r} \frac{\partial a_n^j}{\partial \theta}.
\end{aligned} \tag{A38}$$

The unit normal vector is given by

$$\hat{\mathbf{n}} = \frac{(1, -\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial \theta})}{\sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial \theta} \right)^2}}. \tag{A39}$$

Using equations (A38) and (A39), the kinematic condition (A37) is

$$\frac{Q}{2\pi R_j} + \frac{\partial a_n^j}{\partial t} + \frac{u_\theta}{r} \frac{\partial a_n^j}{\partial \theta} = \frac{u_r - \frac{u_\theta}{r} \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial \theta}}{\sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial \theta} \right)^2}}, \quad r = \eta(t, \theta), \tag{A40}$$

We expand each term that depends on r in a Taylor series about $r = R_j$. In order to do so, we first recall that the velocity of the basic solution is $(Q/(2\pi r), 0)$ and the disturbance of the velocity is $(\tilde{u}_r, \tilde{u}_\theta)$. Therefore, the components of velocity are

$$u_r = \frac{Q}{2\pi r} + \tilde{u}_r, \quad u_\theta = \tilde{u}_\theta. \quad (\text{A41})$$

Using this expression for u_r and that $\eta(t, \theta) = R_j(t) + a_n^j(t, \theta)$, we get the following expression for $u_r(\eta)$

$$\begin{aligned} u_r(\eta) &= u_r(R_j) + a_n^j \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial r}(R_j) + \mathcal{O}(|a_n^j|^2) \\ &= \frac{Q}{2\pi R_j} + \tilde{u}_r(R_j) + a_n^j \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(\frac{Q}{2\pi r} \right) \Big|_{r=R_j} + a_n^j \frac{\partial \tilde{u}_r}{\partial r}(R_j) + \mathcal{O}(|a_n^j|^2). \end{aligned}$$

Keeping only terms that are linear with respect to disturbances,

$$u_r(\eta) = \frac{Q}{2\pi R_j} + \tilde{u}_r(R_j) - a_n^j \frac{Q}{2\pi R_j^2}. \quad (\text{A42})$$

Likewise, the Taylor series expansion for $u_\theta(\eta)$ about $r = R_j$ is

$$\begin{aligned} u_\theta(\eta) &= u_\theta(R_j) + a_n^j \frac{\partial u_\theta}{\partial r}(R_j) + \mathcal{O}(|a_n^j|^2) \\ &= \tilde{u}_\theta(R_j) + a_n^j \frac{\partial \tilde{u}_\theta}{\partial r}(R_j) + \mathcal{O}(|a_n^j|^2). \end{aligned}$$

Keeping only linear terms,

$$u_\theta(\eta) = \tilde{u}_\theta(R_j). \quad (\text{A43})$$

Plugging (A42) and (A43) into (A40),

$$\frac{Q}{2\pi R_j} + \frac{\partial a_n^j}{\partial t} + \frac{\tilde{u}_\theta(R_j)}{r} \frac{\partial a_n^j}{\partial \theta} = \frac{\frac{Q}{2\pi R_j} + \tilde{u}_r(R_j) - a_n^j \frac{Q}{2\pi R_j^2} - \frac{\tilde{u}_\theta(R_j)}{r} \frac{\partial a_n^j}{\partial \theta}}{\sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial a_n^j}{\partial \theta} \right)^2}}, \quad r = \eta(t, \theta),$$

where we used that $\partial \eta / \partial \theta = \partial a_n^j / \partial \theta$. Linearizing with respect to the disturbances and canceling like terms leads to the linearized kinematic interface condition

$$\frac{\partial a_n^j}{\partial t} = \tilde{u}_r(R_j) - a_n^j \frac{Q}{2\pi R_j^2}. \quad (\text{A44})$$

Next, we derive the linearized dynamic interface condition. The dynamic interface condition is

$$[p] = -T_j \nabla \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}, \quad r = \eta(t, \theta), \quad (\text{A45})$$

where $[p]$ denotes the jump in pressure across the interface and T_j denotes the interfacial tension. Let p_b denote the pressure of the basic solution and $\tilde{p}$ denote the disturbance of the pressure so that $p = p_b + \tilde{p}$. Using a Taylor series expansion about $r = R_j$, the pressure is given by

$$\begin{aligned} p(\eta) &= p(R_j) + a_n^j \frac{\partial p}{\partial r}(R_j) + \mathcal{O}(|a_n^j|^2) \\ &= p_b(R_j) + \tilde{p}(R_j) + a_n^j \frac{\partial p_b}{\partial r}(R_j) + a_n^j \frac{\partial \tilde{p}}{\partial r}(R_j) + \mathcal{O}(|a_n^j|^2). \end{aligned}$$

We wish to evaluate the term $[p] := \lim_{r \rightarrow \eta^+} p(r) - \lim_{r \rightarrow \eta^-} p(r)$. We denote the pressure in the fluid region immediately inside the interface as p^- and the pressure in the fluid region immediately outside the interface as p^+ . Then using the Taylor series expansion above,

$$\begin{aligned} [p] &= \lim_{r \rightarrow R_j^+} \left\{ p_b^+(r) + \tilde{p}^+(r) + a_n^j \frac{\partial p_b^+}{\partial r}(r) + a_n^j \frac{\partial \tilde{p}^+}{\partial r}(r) + \mathcal{O}(|a_n^j|^2) \right\} \\ &\quad - \lim_{r \rightarrow R_j^-} \left\{ p_b^-(r) + \tilde{p}^-(r) + a_n^j \frac{\partial p_b^-}{\partial r}(r) + a_n^j \frac{\partial \tilde{p}^-}{\partial r}(r) + \mathcal{O}(|a_n^j|^2) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We then linearize this equation and use from (A1)₂ that $\partial p_b / \partial r = -(Q\mu)/(2\pi\kappa r)$ to get

$$[p] = \lim_{r \rightarrow R_j^+} \left\{ p_b^+(r) + \tilde{p}^+(r) - a_n^j \frac{Q\mu(r)}{2\pi\kappa r} \right\} - \lim_{r \rightarrow R_j^-} \left\{ p_b^-(r) + \tilde{p}^-(r) - a_n^j \frac{Q\mu(r)}{2\pi\kappa r} \right\}. \quad (\text{A46})$$

Note that for the basic solution, the interface is circular with radius $r = R_j$, and therefore $\nabla \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}} = 1/R_j$. Plugging this into the dynamic interface condition (A45),

$$[p_b] = -\frac{T_j}{R_j}.$$

Using this in equation (A46),

$$[p] = \lim_{r \rightarrow R_j^+} \left\{ \tilde{p}^+(r) - a_n^j \frac{Q\mu(r)}{2\pi\kappa r} \right\} - \lim_{r \rightarrow R_j^-} \left\{ \tilde{p}^-(r) - a_n^j \frac{Q\mu(r)}{2\pi\kappa r} \right\} - \frac{T_j}{R_j}. \quad (\text{A47})$$

Using equation (A39) for the unit normal vector, the curvature of the interface is

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}} &= \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(\frac{r}{\sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial \theta} \right)^2}} \right) + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \left(-\frac{\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial \theta}}{\sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial \theta} \right)^2}} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{r} \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial a_n^j}{\partial \theta} \right)^2}} + \frac{\frac{1}{r^2} \left(\frac{\partial a_n^j}{\partial \theta} \right)^2}{\left(1 + \left(\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial a_n^j}{\partial \theta} \right)^2 \right)^{\frac{3}{2}}} - \frac{\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial^2 a_n^j}{\partial \theta^2}}{\sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial a_n^j}{\partial \theta} \right)^2}} + \frac{\frac{1}{r^2} \left(\frac{\partial a_n^j}{\partial \theta} \right)^2 \frac{\partial^2 a_n^j}{\partial \theta^2}}{\left(1 + \left(\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial a_n^j}{\partial \theta} \right)^2 \right)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where we again used that $\partial \eta / \partial \theta = \partial a_n^j / \partial \theta$. Linearizing with respect to the disturbances,

$$\nabla \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}} = \frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\partial^2 a_n^j}{\partial \theta^2} \Big|_{r=R_j+a_n^j}.$$

We can expand this into a Taylor series about the point $r = R_j$ to get

$$\nabla \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}} = \frac{1}{R_j} - \frac{a_n^j}{R_j^2} - \frac{1}{R_j^2} \frac{\partial^2 a_n^j}{\partial \theta^2} + O(|a_n^j|^2).$$

Again, we keep only terms which are linear with respect to the disturbances. Using this equation and (A47) in the interface condition (A45), we get

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow R_j^+} \left\{ \tilde{p}^+(r) - a_n^j \frac{Q\mu(r)}{2\pi\kappa r} \right\} - \lim_{r \rightarrow R_j^-} \left\{ \tilde{p}^-(r) - a_n^j \frac{Q\mu(r)}{2\pi\kappa r} \right\} - \frac{T_j}{R_j} = -T_j \left(\frac{1}{R_j} - \frac{a_n^j}{R_j^2} - \frac{1}{R_j^2} \frac{\partial^2 a_n^j}{\partial \theta^2} \right),$$

which simplifies to

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow R_j^+} \left\{ \tilde{p}^+(r) - a_n^j \frac{Q\mu(r)}{2\pi\kappa r} \right\} - \lim_{r \rightarrow R_j^-} \left\{ \tilde{p}^-(r) - a_n^j \frac{Q\mu(r)}{2\pi\kappa r} \right\} = T_j \frac{a_n^j + \frac{\partial^2 a_n^j}{\partial \theta^2}}{R_j^2}. \quad (\text{A48})$$

The equations (A44) and (A48) are the linearized kinematic and dynamic interface conditions.

We now apply the scaling (2)-(9) in order to obtain the linearized interface conditions in dimensionless form. Note that since a_n^j is a radial disturbance to the interface, equation (A3) implies that

$$a_n^j = R_N(0)(a_n^j)^*, \quad (\text{A49})$$

where $(a_n^j)^*$ denotes the dimensionless disturbance. For the linearized kinematic condition, we use equations (A2), (A3), (A6), (A7), and (A49) in equation (A44) to get

$$\frac{12R_N(0)\kappa T_N}{R_N^3(0)\mu_o} \frac{\partial (a_n^j)^*}{\partial t^*} = \frac{12\kappa T_N}{R_N^2(0)\mu_o} \tilde{u}_r^*(R_j^*) - R_N(0)(a_n^j)^* \left(\frac{12\pi\kappa T_N}{R_N(0)\mu_o} \right) \left(\frac{Q^*}{2\pi R_N^2(0)(R_j^*)^2} \right).$$

Dividing by the constant $12\kappa T_N/(R_N^2(0)\mu_o)$ gives

$$\frac{\partial(a_n^j)^*}{\partial t^*} = \tilde{u}_r^*(R_j^*) - (a_n^j)^* \frac{Q^*}{2(R_j^*)^2}. \quad (\text{A50})$$

For the linearized dynamic interface condition, using equations (A2), (A3), (A5), (A8), (A9), and (A49) in equation (A48) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{r^* \rightarrow (R_j^*)^+} \left\{ \frac{12T_N}{R_N(0)} (\tilde{p}^*)^+(r) - R_N(0)(a_n^j)^* \left(\frac{12\pi\kappa T_N}{R_N(0)\mu_o} \right) \left(\frac{Q^*\mu_o\mu^*(r)}{2\pi\kappa R_N(0)r^*} \right) \right\} \\ & - \lim_{r^* \rightarrow (R_j^*)^-} \left\{ \frac{12T_N}{R_N(0)} (\tilde{p}^*)^-(r) - R_N(0)(a_n^j)^* \left(\frac{12\pi\kappa T_N}{R_N(0)\mu_o} \right) \left(\frac{Q^*\mu_o\mu^*(r)}{2\pi\kappa R_N(0)r^*} \right) \right\} \\ & = T_N T_j^* \frac{R_N(0)(a_n^j)^* + R_N(0) \frac{\partial^2(a_n^j)^*}{\partial \theta^2}}{R_N^2(0)(R_j^*)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

After some algebraic manipulation,

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{r^* \rightarrow (R_j^*)^+} \left\{ \frac{12T_N}{R_N(0)} (\tilde{p}^*)^+(r) - \frac{12T_N}{R_N(0)} (a_n^j)^* \frac{Q^*\mu^*(r)}{2r^*} \right\} \\ & - \lim_{r^* \rightarrow (R_j^*)^-} \left\{ \frac{12T_N}{R_N(0)} (\tilde{p}^*)^-(r) - \frac{12T_N}{R_N(0)} (a_n^j)^* \frac{Q^*\mu^*(r)}{2r^*} \right\} \\ & = \frac{T_N}{R_N(0)} T_j^* \frac{(a_n^j)^* + \frac{\partial^2(a_n^j)^*}{\partial \theta^2}}{(R_j^*)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Dividing by $12T_N/R_N(0)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{r^* \rightarrow (R_j^*)^+} \left\{ (\tilde{p}^*)^+(r) - (a_n^j)^* \frac{Q^*\mu^*(r)}{2r^*} \right\} - \lim_{r^* \rightarrow (R_j^*)^-} \left\{ (\tilde{p}^*)^-(r) - (a_n^j)^* \frac{Q^*\mu^*(r)}{2r^*} \right\} \\ & = \frac{T_j^*}{12} \frac{(a_n^j)^* + \frac{\partial^2(a_n^j)^*}{\partial \theta^2}}{(R_j^*)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A51})$$

We drop the stars in (A50) and (A51) for convenience and arrive at the dimensionless linearized kinematic and dynamic interface conditions

$$\frac{\partial a_n^j}{\partial t} = \tilde{u}_r(R_j) - a_n^j \frac{Q}{2R_j^2}, \quad (\text{A52})$$

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow R_j^+} \left\{ \tilde{p}^+(r) - a_n^j \frac{Q\mu(r)}{2r} \right\} - \lim_{r \rightarrow R_j^-} \left\{ \tilde{p}^-(r) - a_n^j \frac{Q\mu(r)}{2r} \right\} = \frac{T_j}{12} \frac{a_n^j + \frac{\partial^2 a_n^j}{\partial \theta^2}}{R_j^2}. \quad (\text{A53})$$