



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

## Force and Mass Dynamics in Non-Newtonian Suspensions

Melody X. Lim, Jonathan Barés, Hu Zheng, and Robert P. Behringer

Phys. Rev. Lett. **119**, 184501 — Published 31 October 2017

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.119.184501](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.119.184501)

# Force and Mass Dynamics in Non-Newtonian Suspensions

Melody X. Lim,<sup>1,\*</sup> Jonathan Barés,<sup>1,†</sup> Hu Zheng,<sup>1</sup> and Robert P. Behringer<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics & Center for Nonlinear and Complex Systems,  
Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 27708, USA*

(Dated: August 18, 2017)

Above a certain solid fraction, dense granular suspensions in water exhibit non-Newtonian behavior, including impact-activated solidification. Although it has been suggested that solidification depends on boundary interactions, quantitative experiments on the boundary forces have not been reported. Using high-speed video, tracer particles, and photoelastic boundaries, we determine the impactor kinematics and the magnitude and timings of impactor-driven events in the body and at the boundaries of cornstarch suspensions. We observe mass shocks in the suspension during impact. The shockfront dynamics are strongly correlated to those of the intruder. However, the total momentum associated with this shock never approaches the initial impactor momentum. We also observe a faster second front, associated with the propagation of pressure to the boundaries of the suspension. **The two fronts depend differently on the initial impactor speed,  $v_0$ , and the suspension packing fraction. The speed of the pressure wave is at least an order of magnitude smaller than (linear) ultrasound speeds obtained for much higher frequencies, pointing to complex amplitude and frequency response of cornstarch suspensions to compressive strains.**

PACS numbers: 47.57.Gc, 81.05.Rm, 78.20.hb

Keywords: Granular materials, Granular flow, Suspensions, Impact

Dense suspensions, such as cornstarch in water, provide a rich set of phenomena: non-Newtonian response to shear [1–6], discontinuous shear thickening (DST) [5], and impact-activated solidification (IAS), the focus here. Brown and Jaeger [6] provide a good snapshot of the field. **Cornstarch suspensions are also remarkable for striking behavior such as the formation under vibration of holes and fingers [7, 8]. Also, one can run but not walk across a pool of suspension without sinking.** During IAS, the suspension responds to a rapid impact with large normal stresses. DST and IAS occur for packing fractions,  $\phi$ , close to jamming, i.e. where suspensions, granular materials, etc. become solid-like and support finite stresses [5, 9–12]. The details of impact *dynamics* into suspensions is crucial to understanding the nature of IAS, and its connection to a much broader range of phenomena in suspensions and other particulate systems. Frictional granular materials jam under shear strain [10] for  $\phi < \phi_{J-frictionless}$ , and frictional effects may play an important role in suspensions [5, 11, 12]. Impacts on dry granular systems [13–15] show shock-like response, where again friction/no-friction matters [14]. Experiments [16–20] suggest that during IAS, a dynamic jamming and unjamming process occurs: the suspension temporarily solidifies above a critical impact velocity [19], connecting the impactor and the suspension boundary [18, 19].

However, quantitative experiments on the forces experienced by the boundaries have not been reported, to our knowledge. We measure the strain response within the suspension, and the force response at the boundaries of the suspension, due to impact of an intruder into a vertical channel of a water-cornstarch suspension. An important finding of this work is a fast pressure signal that carries the majority of the momentum and that reaches

the boundary before a mass shock of transiently solid material.

We correlate dynamics of the fronts inside the suspension and forces on the suspension boundaries with the impactor dynamics using two types of experiments. In both, we dropped a metal disc from varying heights into a cornstarch suspension with  $0.38 < \phi < 0.48$ . Typically, the suspension was enclosed in a rectangular acrylic channel ( $h \times l \times w = 177 \times 138 \times 15$  mm), with  $\sim 35\%$  occupied by the gelatin boundary, as shown in Fig. 2A. The disk was guided by a chute above the container. The disk had a diameter of  $D = 63.5$  mm, width 11mm, mass 291g, and had a 10mm hole in the center for tracking. We recorded impacts with a Photron FASTCAM SA5. In all experiments, we tracked the impactor using a circular Hough transform at each frame, then numerically computed the impactor velocity and acceleration, filtering with a low-pass filter (cut-off 200 Hz).

To access the boundary stresses, (first experiments) we lined one side of the container with gelatin, a good photoelastic material [24] having a low friction coefficient with acrylic ( $\sim 0.01$ ). The container plus suspension was placed between crossed circular polarizers, yielding the photoelastic boundary response. The apparatus was lit from behind by a halogen lamp with diffuser hood. We recorded the photoelastic video response at 42,000 frames/second.

The second experiments visualized the suspension flow field. The suspension was mixed with tracer particles (black glitter, diameter  $\sim 0.25$ mm). We recorded the tracer particle motion with front lighting, and without crossed polarizers at 10,000 frames/second. We used particle image velocimetry (PIV) to extract the suspension velocity field and to deduce the position of the wavefront.

We also characterized the suspension flow by differencing successive video frames, producing a space-time plot of the movement of tracer particles in the suspension.

To test for significant coupling between the Plexiglas faces and the cornstarch, we carried out a third limited study with additional 2.5 mm thick layers of gel between the Plexiglas and the cornstarch. As discussed in supplementary information, the propagation speeds were not affected by replacing the Plexiglas faces with soft faces.

We therefore can combine data for the timings of (i) impactor dynamics events, (ii) photoelastic boundary events, and (iii) events in the body of the suspension, providing insight into the physical basis of the impact-activated solidification of the cornstarch suspension.

We begin with the timing of the impactor dynamics shown in Fig. 1. After striking the surface of the suspension, the impactor settles briefly into the suspension. It then experiences a significant upward normal force from the suspension, stopping the impactor motion at a maximum depth,  $d_{max}$ . This force lasts for an extremely brief period of time, as seen in the rapid increase in the intruder acceleration to  $a_{max}$ . This causes the impactor to rebound with a peak velocity  $v_{min}$ , before settling into the suspension at a much lower speed.

Beneath the impactor, the suspension velocity just after impact rises well above the background, e.g. Fig. 1 inset. The lower boundary of this region moves downward with speed  $v_{wave}$  that is strongly correlated with the impactor acceleration. There is a small delay between the times of maximum impactor acceleration,  $\tau_a$ , and maximum  $v_{wave}$ . This shows the formation of a solid mass beneath the impactor that moves at a uniform velocity.

We estimate the momentum transferred to the suspension during an impact by integrating over the velocity field, Fig. 1 inset, multiplied by the associated volume and density. The total momentum transferred to the suspension and the momentum of the impactor during the same impact, are shown in the bottom of Fig. 1. Strikingly, the momentum transferred to the suspension never approaches the initial intruder momentum, suggesting that the majority of the impactor momentum must reach the boundaries without appearing in the mass flow of the suspension.

These results indicate key timings for the suspension, impactor dynamics, and the boundaries. These timings include  $\tau_d$ , the time at which the impactor reaches its maximum depth before sinking, and  $\tau_b$ , the time when the mass shock forms. Also, there is a pressure front, separate from the mass shock, that transmits the majority of the impactor momentum to the suspension boundary.

Understanding the propagation of stresses to the boundary is critical. Figure 2-A-inset shows a typical photoelastic image from the boundary during an impact. The main panel shows the total signal intensity of the photoelastic boundary during an impact. Two important




FIG. 1. (color online) Inset: An impact on the suspension with  $\phi = 0.42$  showing the position of the impactor (dashed circle) and the velocity field within the suspension (see supplementary material for video), derived using particle image velocimetry (PIV, green arrow). The wavefront position in each frame is extracted from the dashed line, which is numerically differentiated to give the front speed. Main panel: Time series are shown for (from top to bottom): the depth of impactor, the velocity of impactor normalized by impact velocity,  $v/v_0$  ( $v_0 = 1.9\text{m/s}$ ), the acceleration of the impactor normalized by maximum acceleration,  $a/a_{max}$  ( $a_{max} = 360\text{m/s}^2$ ), the speed of the mass shock within the suspension normalized by its maximum velocity,  $v_{wave}/v_{wave_{max}}$  ( $v_{wave_{max}} = 1.5\text{m/s}$ ), and the momentum of the impactor and suspension normalized by the initial impactor momentum. Upon impact, the impactor rebounds from the surface of the suspension, as if colliding with an elastic solid, but also sinks slowly into the suspension after rebounding, as if into a viscous liquid. Note the well defined time-series of events after impact ( $\tau_a$ ,  $\tau_b$ ,  $\tau_d$ ,  $\tau_v$ ). Additionally, the momentum transferred to the suspension never approaches the initial impactor momentum (data shown for a different experiment).

events are marked by red and yellow lines: the time when the first signal from the impactor reaches the boundary,  $\tau_{ps}$ , and the time when the boundary intensity signal is maximal,  $\tau_{p_{max}}$ . 120 Hz oscillations due to the flickering of the light source have been substantially reduced by a notch filter. In **B**, the times for the two events of part **A** are plotted vs. initial impactor speed  $v_0$ , along with fitted curves. We also plot  $\tau_a$  on the same axes.




FIG. 2. (color online) Events in the boundary of the photoelastic material. Inset: An image of the photoelastic signal from the boundary during an impact with  $\phi = 0.42$  (see supplementary material for video). A: Total intensity of the signal from the photoelastic boundary as a function of time. B: The times for the two events of part B are plotted vs. initial impactor speed  $v_0$ , along with fitted curves. For a more complete picture of events in the suspension, we also plot  $\tau_a$  on the same axes (crosses).




FIG. 3. (color online) Correlations between the timings of events in the suspension boundary, in the impactor, and in the motion of the solid mass within the suspension ( $\phi = 0.42$ ). A: The time at which the first signal at the boundary is received,  $\tau_{ps}$ , is the same as the time at which bulk motion is first observed beneath the impactor,  $\tau_b$ . B: The time at which the stress on the boundary is maximal,  $\tau_{pmax}$ , is the same as the time at which the impactor reaches its maximum depth,  $\tau_d$ .

The variation of both  $\tau_{ps}$  and  $\tau_{pmax}$  is consistent with the inverse impactor speed, and thus the suspension deformation rate  $v_0/D$ .

We gain further insight by correlating events in the boundary with impactor dynamics and the bulk suspension motion, e.g. Fig. 3. Part A shows  $\tau_b$  and  $\tau_{ps}$  on the same axes: the time when the mass shock begins moving and the time when the first signal reaches the suspension boundary are indistinguishable, despite the fact that the mass shock wavefront is  $\sim$  millimeters below the impactor, while the boundary is  $\sim$  centimeters from the impactor. Information about the impactor reaches the boundaries faster than the formation of the solid mass beneath the impactor, presumably due to a pressure wave in the suspension, which also likely carries the bulk of the intruder momentum to the boundaries. Figure 3-B compares  $\tau_{pmax}$  and  $\tau_d$ : the time when the boundary stress is maximal is indistinguishable from the time when the depth of the impactor is maximal. The short time delay between  $\tau_d$  and  $\tau_{pmax}$  further supports our argument that there is a fast timescale for force/pressure propagation between the suspension boundary and the impactor.

We characterize this pressure wave by finding the first arrival time of pressure signals at the edge of the photoelastic boundary (blue dashed line in the inset of Fig. 2A). Fig. 4A gives a typical space-time plot of the pressure signal moving along the boundary of the photoelastic material. This wave arrives first at a depth of  $\approx 0.04$  m, then propagates in both directions along the boundary from the point of first arrival, slowing as it progresses. Fig. 4C shows the first arrival times of the pressure along the photoelastic material vs. depth, for various  $v_0$ 's. As  $v_0$  is increased, the nonlinearity in the propagation of the signal along the boundary remains consistent, as does the first arrival of the wave at a depth  $\approx 0.04$  m. The speed of the pressure wave, Fig. 4C inset, depends strongly on its position along gel boundary. A space-time plot of the mass shock, Fig. 4B, does not show a similar nonlinearity, supporting our argument that the pressure wave and mass shock are two separate fronts propagating through the suspension.

Figure 5 contrasts the maximum speeds of the mass shock and pressure waves for different  $v_0$  and suspension packing fractions,  $\phi$ . The speed of the mass shock has little measurable dependence on  $\phi$ , but there is a moderate increase in the pressure wave speed for increasing  $\phi$ . Critically, the mass shock and pressure waves depend differently on  $v_0$ ; the pressure wave speed is equal to or greater than the mass shock speed. The pressure wave speeds observed here,  $\sim 10^2$  m/s, for frequencies  $\sim$  kHz, sharply differ from ultrasound speeds [25, 26],  $\sim 1.7 \times 10^3$  m/s at MHz frequencies. Our imaging rate, 42,000 frames/s should detect waves at this speed, if they were present: a speed  $1.7 \times 10^3$  m/s would cover  $\sim 0.04$  m in  $23.5 \mu$ s, only slightly different from our resolution of  $1/(4.20 \times 10^4 \text{ s}^{-1}) = 23.8 \mu$ s.




FIG. 4. (color online) Propagation of the pressure wave through the boundary of the photoelastic material. A: Space-time plot of signals from the edge of the suspension after impact. Blue corresponds to low signal intensity, and yellow to high signal intensity. B: Space-time plot of differences between successive frames in direct high speed video of the mass shock. Again blue corresponds to low difference and yellow to high. The stripes correspond to the motion of individual tracer particles. C: First arrival time of the pressure wave as a function of depth, for different initial impactor velocities  $v_0$ . The pressure wave arrives first at a nonzero depth, then propagates both upwards and downwards along the suspension boundary. For clarity, individual data points have been joined to form lines. Inset: Speed of the pressure wave as a function of depth, as  $v_0$  is varied. The maximum speed of the pressure wave shows some dependence on  $v_0$ . Again, individual data points have been joined to form lines.




FIG. 5. (color online) Maximum speed of pressure wave plotted as a function of initial impactor speed,  $v_0$  (circles), compared to the maximum speed of the mass shock within the suspension (crosses). Data from suspension volume fractions ranging from  $\phi = 0.39$  to  $0.475$  are shown. The speed of the pressure wave shows a systematic increase with increasing  $\phi$ , while the speed of the mass shock does not.

As noted, we carried out additional experiments where the Plexiglas faces were isolated from the suspension by layers of soft gel. These data, presented in the supplementary materials, agree with Figure 5.

We also compare the present results to experiments involving impacts into dry granular materials [14, 15]. In these studies, the mass flow tracked the intruder speed very closely but, the stress signal propagated faster than the intruder speed, and depended nonlinearly on that speed. In the granular case, the force propagation was known at the particle scale, unlike the present case. Hence, comparisons between the present experiments and granular impacts can only be qualitative.

To conclude, we observe two separate fronts reaching the suspension boundary. The first is a mass shock, consistent with the observations of [17, 18, 27]. But, the suspension momentum does not approach the initial impactor momentum, suggesting that the majority of the impactor momentum reaches the suspension boundary by a different process. Also, information concerning the impactor dynamics reaches the boundary before it is carried outward via the mass shock via a second front, by visualizing the arrival of a pressure wave along the photoelastic boundary. The dynamics of this front are not strongly correlated with the motion of cornstarch particles in the suspension, but rather with the impactor dynamics. The pressure front speed, which grows strongly with  $v_0$ , and exhibits nonlinear dynamics along the boundary of the suspension, is generally faster than the mass shock speed, which grows only moderately with  $v_0$ . The observed pressure wave speeds for  $\sim 1ms$  times, hence frequencies  $\sim kHz$ , are at least an order of magnitude lower than ultrasound speeds obtained at  $MHz$  frequencies [25, 26]. Also, the present experiments are in a manifestly nonlinear regime. These differences point to intriguing and little investigated phenomena in the compressive response of cornstarch suspensions as a function of frequency and amplitude. Given the complex response of these suspensions to shear strain, it is not surprising that they might have a complex frequency and amplitude response to compression. We close by noting a possible heuristic connection to the fact that one can run but not walk across a large container of cornstarch without sinking. Although it may be circumstantial, it is interesting that the pressure wave speeds observed here rise above the mass shock speeds for  $v_0$ 's that separate walking and running speeds.

Acknowledgements: This work is supported by NSF grant DMR1206351 and NASA grants NNX10AU01G and NNX15AD38G.



- 
- \* Current address: Department of Physics and James Franck Institute, The University of Chicago, 5720 S. Ellis Ave, Chicago, Illinois 60637, USA
- † Current address: LMGC, UMR 5508 CNRS-University Montpellier, 34095 Montpellier, France
- [1] J. F. Brady and G. Bossis. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 155:105–129, 1985.
  - [2] N. Wagner and J. Brady. *Phys. Today*, Oct. 2009, 2009.
  - [3] E. Brown, N. A. Forman, C. S. Orellana, H. Zhang, B. W. Maynor, D. E. Betts, J. M. DeSimone, and H. M. Jaeger. *Nature materials*, 9(3):220–224, 2010.
  - [4] M. Roché, E. Myftiu, M. C. Johnston, P. Kim, and H. A. Stone. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 110:148304, 2013.
  - [5] M. Wyart and M. E. Cates. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 2014.
  - [6] E. Brown and H. M. Jaeger. *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **77**, 2014.
  - [7] Florian S. Merkt, Robert D. Deegan, Daniel I. Goldman, Erin C. Rericha, and Harry L. Swinney. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 92:184501, 2004.
  - [8] Stefan von Kann, Jacco H. Snoeijer, and Deveraj van der Meer. *Phys. Fluids*, 26:113302, 2014.
  - [9] C. S. O’Hern, L. E. Silbert, A. J. Liu, and S. R. Nagel. *Phys. Rev. E*, 68:011306, 2003.
  - [10] D. Bi, J. Zhang, B. Chakraborty, and R. P. Behringer. *Nature*, 480:355–358, 2011.
  - [11] R. Seto, R. Mari, J. F. Morris, and M. M. Denn. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 111:218301, 2013.
  - [12] I. R. Peters, S. Majumdar, and H. M. Jaeger. *Nature*, in Press, 2016.
  - [13] S. van den Wildenberg, R. van Loo, and M. van Hecke. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 111:218003, 2013.
  - [14] A. H. Clark, A. J. Petersen, L. Kondic, and R. P. Behringer. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 114:144502, 2015.
  - [15] L. Kondic, A. H. Clark and R. P. Behringer. 2016.
  - [16] M. Shelley, B. Liu and J. Zhang. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 2010.
  - [17] S. R. Waitukaitis and H. M. Jaeger. *Nature*, 487:205–209.
  - [18] I. R. Peters and H. M. Jaeger. Submitted to ArXiv, 2014.
  - [19] B. Allen, S. Mukhopadhyay and E. Brown. Submitted to ArXiv, 2014.
  - [20] J. H. Snoeijer, S. von Kann and D. van der Meer. *Phys. Rev. E*, 84.
  - [21] G. Katgert, B. P. Tighe, M. E. Mobius, and M. van Hecke. *Europhysics Letters*, 90:54002, 2010.
  - [22] J. Goyon, A. Colin, G. Ovarlez, A. Ajdari, and L. Bocquet. *Nature*, 454(7200):84–87, 2008.
  - [23] K. Kamrin and G. Koval. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 108:178301, 2012.
  - [24] D. Kilcast, M. M. Boyar, and J. B. Hudson. *Journal of Food Science*, 49:654–655, 1984.
  - [25] B. L. Johnson, M. R. Holland, J. G. Miller, and J. I. Katz. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 2013.
  - [26] Endao Han, Nigel Van Ha, and Heinrich M. Jaeger. *Soft Matter*, 13:3506–3513, 2017.
  - [27] S. R. Waitukaitis. PhD thesis, U. of Chicago, 2014.