Computational modeling of multiphase elastoviscoplastic flows
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Summary

A numerical solver is developed for suspensions of rigid and soft particles and droplets in viscoelastic and elastoviscoplastic (EVP) fluids. The fluid is modelled by the Oldroyd-B, neo-Hookean, FENE-P, and Saramito EVP models, and the additional equations for the non-Newtonian stresses are fully coupled with the flow. The rigid particles are discretized on a moving Lagrangian grid while the flow equations are solved on a fixed Eulerian grid. The solid particles are represented by an Immersed Boundary method (IBM) with a computationally efficient direct forcing method. The immersed boundary force is computed at the particle surface and then included in the momentum equations as a body force. The droplets and soft particles are simulated in a fully Eulerian framework, the former with a level-set method to capture the moving interface and the latter with an indicator function. The solver is first validated for various benchmark single-phase and two-phase elastoviscoplastic flow problems through comparison with data from the literature. Finally, we present new results on the dynamics of a buoyancy driven drop in an elastoviscoplastic fluid.
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INTRODUCTION

Multiphase flows of elastoviscoplastic fluids appear in many industrial applications, for example in petroleum, concrete, mining, cosmetics, and foodstuff transport industries, and in biological materials such as blood. Elastoviscoplastic materials exhibit simultaneously elastic, viscous and plastic properties. At low strains the material exhibits elastic deformation, whereas at sufficiently high strains the material experiences irreversible deformation and starts to flow. Even conventional yield-stress test fluids (such as Carbopol solutions and liquid foams) are shown to exhibit simultaneously elastic, viscous and yield stress behavior. Hence, in order to accurately predict the behavior of such materials, it is essential to model them as an EVP fluid, rather than an ideal yield-stress fluid (e.g., using Bingham or Herschel-Bulkley model).

There are different types of models that have been proposed for EVP fluids. For instance, Saramito proposed a tensorial constitutive law under the Eulerian framework, which is based on the combination of the Bingham viscoplastic and the Oldroyd viscoelastic models in a way which satisfies the second law of thermodynamics. This model predicts a Kelvin-Voigt viscoelastic solid (an ideal Hookean solid) response before yielding, when the von Mises criterion is not satisfied. Once the strain energy exceeds a threshold value that is specified by the von Mises criterion, the material yields, and the stress field is given by the non-linear viscoelastic constitutive law. This model was later improved by the same author to account for the
shear-thinning behavior of the shear viscosity, and also for the smoothness of the plasticity criterion. Moreover, this model is capable of predicting the first normal stress difference along with the yield stress behavior in simple shear flows as a result of combining viscoelasticity and viscoplasticity.

The prediction of an ideal Hookean solid of Saramito’s models\textsuperscript{15} for the EVP material before yielding causes the model to always predict a zero phase difference between the strain oscillation and the material shear stress, which in turn contributes to vanishing viscous harmonics. This results in an erroneous prediction of zero loss modulus ($G''$), which is in disagreement with the large amplitude oscillatory shear (LAOS) experiments for identifying and characterizing the properties of the EVP materials.\textsuperscript{6,7} It was shown by Dimitriou and co-workers\textsuperscript{20} that for a Carbopol gel (EVP material), in the limits of small deformation amplitudes, the loss modulus ($G''$) is always non-zero and indeed is smaller than the storage modulus ($G'$) by an order of magnitude. The Isotropic Kinematic Hardening (IKH) idea was then suggested by Dimitriou and co-workers\textsuperscript{8} and Dimitriou and McKinley\textsuperscript{9} to tackle this problem and to specify the parameters of the models correctly. Based on this concept, the material yield stress builds up and evolves in time together with the flow field, where the steady state yield stress is determined via the back stress modulus (a new material parameter) and the deformation of microstructure (a hidden internal dimensionless evolution variable). By this method, the energy is allowed to be dissipated, and thus, at small strain amplitudes, it predicts a non-vanishing loss modulus. Recently, a comprehensive IKH constitutive framework has been developed to model the thixotropic behavior presents in some practical EVP materials such as waxy crude oils\textsuperscript{10}.

De Souza Mendes\textsuperscript{11} proposed another constitutive equation for EVP fluids. The basic idea of this model is to modify the classical version of the Oldroyd-B equation, where the constant parameters, i.e. the relaxation time ($\lambda_1$), the retardation time ($\lambda_2$) and the viscosity ($\eta$), are replaced with functions of the deformation rate. This model reduces to the classical Oldroyd-B equation in the limit of zero shear rate for the unyielded material. Benito and co-workers\textsuperscript{12} presented another minimal, fully tensorial and rheological constitutive equation for EVP fluids. This model predicts the material behaviour as a viscoelastic solid, capable of deforming substantially before yielding, and predicts a viscoelastic fluid after yielding. Moreover, based on the second law of thermodynamics this model has a positive dissipation. Recently, Fraggedakis et al.\textsuperscript{13} performed a systematic comparison of these recently proposed EVP fluid models. The models were tested in simple viscometric flows and against available experimental data.

A significant number of numerical studies have analysed purely viscoelastic and purely viscoplastic fluids, but a very limited number accounted for EVP fluids in which neither elastic nor plastic effects are negligible. The main reason is that numerical simulations of EVP fluid flows are not a straightforward task due to the inherent non-linearity of the governing equations. Nevertheless, numerical simulations can provide quantitative information which is extremely difficult to access by experiments in EVP fluids (for example, velocity fields and stress fields, separated into different contributions), and also detailed understanding of the physics of the interaction between particles and droplets in EVP fluids.

Numerical simulations have already helped to reveal elastic effects in liquid foams and Carbopol. First, Dollet and co-workers\textsuperscript{14} performed experimental measurements for the flow of liquid foam around a circular obstacle, where they observed an overshoot of the velocity (so-called negative wake) behind the obstacle. Then, Cheddad\textsuperscript{15} simulated the flow of an EVP fluid around a circular obstacle by employing Saramito’s EVP model\textsuperscript{1}. The numerical simulation using the EVP model captured the negative wake. A purely viscoplastic flow model (Bingham model) on the other hand always predicted fore-aft symmetry and the lack of a negative wake, in contrast with the aforementioned experimental observations. The numerical simulations could hence prove that the negative wake was an elastic effect. Recently, the loss of the fore-aft symmetry and the formation of the negative wake around a single particle sedimenting in a Carbopol solution was captured by transient numerical calculations by Fraggedakis and co-workers\textsuperscript{16} by adopting the EVP tensorial constitutive law of Saramito\textsuperscript{1}. This was in a quantitative agreement with the experimental observations by Holenberg and co-workers for the flow of Carbopol gel\textsuperscript{17}. The elastic effects on viscoplastic fluid flows have also been addressed in numerical simulations of the EVP fluids through an axisymmetric expansion-contraction geometry\textsuperscript{18} by using the finite element method. It was observed that elasticity alters the shape and the position of the yield surface remarkably, and elasticity needs to be included to reach qualitative agreement with experimental observations for the flow of Carbopol aqueous solutions.\textsuperscript{19} Computations in the same geometry have also been performed by implementing the hybrid finite element-finite volume subcell scheme, and combining a regularization approach with the EVP model of Saramito.\textsuperscript{20} Furthermore, Saramito model has been used to simulate the flow of liquid foam in a Taylor-Couette cell.\textsuperscript{21,22} By adopting the EVP constitutive equation proposed by de Souza Mendes,\textsuperscript{23} the flow pattern of EVP fluids in a cavity was investigated numerically, and it was demonstrated that the elasticity strongly affects the material yield surface.\textsuperscript{22} Recently, De Vita et al.\textsuperscript{23} numerically investigated the elastoviscoplastic flow through porous media by adopting Saramito’s model.
The motivation behind this work is to develop an efficient and scalable tool to deal with suspensions of particles and droplets in EVP fluids. In this work, we model an EVP fluid via the constitutive law proposed by Saramito, which provided excellent results in previous numerical studies of e.g. Carbopol, used in many experiments.

Multiphase viscoelastic (EV) fluid flows have been studied much more than EVP flows, and indeed some of the results in literature will be used to validate our numerical implementation. To give a few examples of such studies, we list 2D and 3D direct numerical simulations of the dynamics of a rigid single particle, two particles, multiple particles, as well as droplets in viscoelastic two-phase flow systems in which one or both phases could be viscoelastic, including the case of soft particles modeled as a neo-Hookean solid (a deformable particle is assumed to be a viscoelastic fluid with infinite relaxation time).

In the case of a pure visco-elastic (VP) suspending fluid, there is an abundance of computational studies of single and multiple particles. Full 3D suspension flows for visco-plastic fluids are time consuming, and thus limited to a few benchmark calculations and lower mesh resolutions. However, 2D suspension flows are feasible. The key computational challenge is to resolve the structure of the unyielded regions, where the stress is below the yield stress, and to locate the yield surfaces that separate unyielded from yielded regions. Two basic methods are used: regularization and the Augmented Lagrangian (AL) approach. Regularization tends to be faster, but may still require significant more resources than a Newtonian flow. AL approaches, although slower, properly resolve the stress fields. This is relevant for resolving important physical features of suspensions of particles in visco-plastic fluids, e.g. the fact that buoyant particles can be held rigidly in suspension and the limited influence of multiple particles on each other and the finite arrest time, see Ref. for more details. To overcome these limitations, researchers have addressed yield stress suspensions from a continuum modeling closure perspective, deriving bulk suspension properties that agree with rheological experiments.

The present manuscript is organized as follows. In the next section, the governing equations and the elastoviscoplastic constitutive models for multiphase elastoviscoplastic flows in complex geometries are briefly described. The numerical methodology is presented in Section and the numerical method is validated for various single-phase and two-phase elastoviscoplastic benchmark problems, and employed for buoyancy-driven elastoviscoplastic two-phase systems. In this work, we adopt two different IBM schemes to simulate EVP suspension flows which are modifications and improvements of the original IBM scheme proposed by Peskin. They are explained in section in more details. Finally some conclusions are drawn in Section.

2 MATHEMATICAL FORMULATION

The dynamics of an incompressible flow of two immiscible fluids is governed by the Navier-Stokes equations, written in the non-dimensional form:

\[ \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0, \]  
\[ \rho \left( \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} \right) = -\nabla p + \nabla \cdot \left( \mu_s (\nabla \mathbf{u} + (\nabla \mathbf{u})^T) \right) + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{\tau} + \rho \mathbf{g} + \mathbf{f}, \]  

where \( \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t) \) is the velocity field, \( p = p(\mathbf{x}, t) \) is the pressure field, \( \mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{x}, t) \) is an extra stress tensor (defined below) and \( \mathbf{g} \) is a unit vector aligned with gravity or buoyancy. The term \( \mathbf{f} \) is a body force that is used to numerically impose the boundary conditions at the solid boundaries (particle-laden flow) and at the fluid-fluid interfaces (bubbly flow), as described in sections and Finally, \( \rho \) and \( \mu_s \) are the density and the solvent viscosity of the fluid.

In the present study, the viscoelastic and elastoviscoplastic effects in the flow are reproduced by the extra stress tensor \( \mathbf{\tau} \). All the flow models (i.e. the Neo-Hookean, viscoelastic Oldroyd-B, FENE-P and elastoviscoplastic Saramito model) can be expressed with a generic transport equation as

\[ \left( \frac{\partial \mathbf{B}}{\partial t} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{B} - \mathbf{B} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} - (\nabla \mathbf{u})^T \right) \mathbf{B} = \frac{a}{\lambda} \mathbf{I} - \frac{\mathbf{F}}{\lambda} \mathbf{B}, \]  

where \( \lambda \) and \( \mu_s \) are the relaxation time and polymeric viscosity, respectively. The definition of \( \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{F} \) and \( a \) used in Eq. are specified in Table for the different models considered in the present study. In the Neo-Hookean material, \( G \) is the shear elastic modulus; this model is analogous as considering the material as a viscoelastic fluid with infinite relaxation time \( \lambda \to \infty \). In the Saramito model, \( \tau^d \) is the deviatoric stress tensor and its magnitude is defined as

\[ |\tau^d| = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \tau^d_{ij} \tau^d_{ij}}. \]
In the FENE-P model, \( L \) is the extensibility parameter defined as the ratio of the length of a fully extended polymer dumbbell to its equilibrium length. From a numerical point of view, therefore, the challenges associated to the solution of equation (2) are similar, independently of which of the different material is considered.

### TABLE I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>( B )</th>
<th>( F )</th>
<th>( a )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neo-Hookean</td>
<td>( \frac{\tau}{G} )</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldroyd-B</td>
<td>( \frac{\tau \lambda}{\mu_p} + I )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saramito</td>
<td>( \frac{\tau \lambda}{\mu_p} + I ) \max(0, 1 - \frac{\tau e}{</td>
<td>\tau</td>
<td>})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FENE-P</td>
<td>( \frac{\tau \lambda}{\mu_p} + a I ) \frac{F}{(L^2 - \text{trace}(B))}</td>
<td>( L^2/(L^2 - 3) )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3 | NUMERICAL METHOD

In this section, we outline the flow solver which has been previously developed for particle-laden flow\(^{62,63,64,65}\) for bubbly flow\(^{66}\) and for viscoelastic flow\(^{67}\). The grid is a staggered uniform Cartesian grid in which the velocity nodes are located at the cell faces, while the material properties, the pressure and the extra stresses are all located at the cell centers. The flow equations are solved using a projection method. The spatial derivatives are approximated using second-order central differences, except for the advection terms in Eqs. (2), (5) and (8) where the fifth-order WENO or HOUC schemes are applied.

#### 3.1 | Non-Newtonian fluid flow

In non-Newtonian flow, the transport equation for the extra stress tensor Eq. (2) presents specific challenges. Advection terms such as \( \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{B} \) need a special consideration due to the lack of diffusion terms in the equations. The most common approach is to introduce upwinding for the advection terms. However, that approach adds artificial dissipation that can cause the configuration tensor \( \mathbf{B} \) to lose its positive definiteness, which eventually results in numerical breakdown\(^{68,69}\). Min et al.\(^{70}\) tested different spatial discretizations for a polymeric FENE-P fluid and showed that a third-order compact upwind scheme has better performance. Dubief et al.\(^{71}\) have also favored this scheme among the others. A local artificial diffusion is added in both of these studies where the tensor \( \mathbf{B} \) experiences a loss of positive definiteness (\( \text{det}(\mathbf{B}_{ij}) < 0 \)). This discretization scheme works well, but is computationally expensive, because it requires to solve a set of linear equations for each component of the configuration tensor in each direction to calculate the derivatives. In this study we have substituted the compact upwind with an explicit fifth-order WENO scheme\(^{72}\), a considerably less expensive method that matches the performance of the compact scheme as the test case below illustrates; the method has been recently used successfully by Rosti and Brandt for an elastic material\(^{62}\).

Next, we demonstrate the performance of our method of simulating the non-Newtonian fluid flow. A two-dimensional vortex pair interacting with a wall is simulated, similarly to Min et al.\(^{70}\) in a FENE-P fluid. In this flow, \( Re = \frac{\rho \Gamma_0}{(\mu_\tau + \mu_p)} = 1800 \) and \( Wi = \lambda \Gamma_0 / \delta^2 = 5 \), where \( \Gamma_0 \) is the initial circulation of the vortex and \( \delta \) is the initial distance between the vortex pair center and the wall. The initial radius of each vortex is 0.145 and the distance between the two centers is set to two radii. The solvent to total viscosity ratio \( \beta = \mu_\tau / (\mu_\tau + \mu_p) \) is 0.9 and the FENE-P extensibility parameter \( L^2 \) is 400.

Simulations are performed in a domain of size \( 2\delta \times 2\pi\delta \), with 64 grid cells per \( \delta \). Periodic boundary conditions are employed in the \( x \)-direction, and no-slip/no penetration boundary conditions are employed in the \( y \)-direction. A time sequence of the vorticity contours is shown in figure [1] where the result for a Newtonian flow is also given as a reference. It can be observed that the secondary vortices are significantly attenuated in the polymeric flow.

A local artificial diffusion is added to the polymer equations (2) in two instances: if the tensor \( \mathbf{B} \) experiences a loss of positive definiteness (\( \text{det}(\mathbf{B}_{ij}) < 0 \)), and if the trace of the tensor \( \mathbf{B} \) reaches 95% of its maximum (which is \( L^2 \)). It is worth pointing out that in the case shown here, artificial diffusion was added in only a fraction of 0.1% of the grid points. Contours of \( B_{xx}, B_{xy}, B_{yy} \) and the trace of tensor \( \mathbf{B} \), normalized with \( L^2 \) are given in figure [2] at \( t = 15\delta^2 / \Gamma_0 \). Adding the artificial diffusion to only a small fraction of grid points preserves the sharp spatial gradients of the tensor \( \mathbf{B} \), as shown in this figure. The required amount of
artificial diffusion needs to be tuned for each individual simulation as it changes with the relevant parameters of the polymeric flow; e.g. simulating the same test case here with $L^2 = 100$ removes any need for local artificial diffusion.

3.2 | Bubbly flow

Fluid-fluid interfaces are captured by the interface-correction level-set method and the surface tension force is described by the continuum surface force (CSF) model. The second-order Adams-Bashforth scheme (AB2) is used for the integration.
FIGURE 2 Contours of $B_{xx}$ (a), $B_{xy}$ (b), $B_{yy}$ (c) and of the trace of the tensor $B$, normalized with $L^2$ (d) at $t = 15\delta^2/\Gamma_0$ of governing equations of an EVP bubbly flow. Note that the AB2 scheme is used to facilitate the implementation of the fast pressure-correction method developed by Dong and Shen\textsuperscript{73} and Dodd and Ferrante\textsuperscript{74}.

3.2.1 Level-set method

In two-fluid systems, an interface between the phases can be resolved using a fully Eulerian method. The body force $f$ due to surface tension, see Eqs. (1), is expressed as:

$$f = \sigma \kappa \delta(\phi) \mathbf{n},$$

where $\delta$ is a regularized delta function and $\sigma$ is the surface tension.

In this paper, we have adopted a mass-conserving, interface-correction level-set method to capture an interface by a continuous level-set function. The level-set function $\phi(x, t)$ approximates the signed distance from the interface. Hence, $\phi = 0$ denotes the interface, $\phi > 0$ denotes fluid 1 and $\phi < 0$ fluid 2. The interface is convected with the local velocity field, i.e.

$$\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \phi = 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

To calculate body force in Eq. (4) the unit normal vector, $\mathbf{n}$, and the local mean curvature, $\kappa$, can be simply computed as

$$\mathbf{n} = \frac{\nabla \phi}{|\nabla \phi|},$$

$$\kappa = -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{n}. $$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

(7)

With time, if simply advected, the level set field will no longer equal a signed distance to the interface. It is essential that the signed distance property is preserved near the interface, because of the normal and curvature computation. We therefore redistance the level set field every 10-20 time steps by solving the Hamilton-Jacobi (reinitialization) equation:

$$\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \tau} + S(\phi_0)(|\nabla \phi| - 1) = 0,$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

where $\phi_0$ is the level set field before redistancing, $\tau$ is pseudo-time and $S(\phi_0)$ is the mollified sign function\textsuperscript{66}. One can observe that if a steady state is reached, then the zero level set contour (interface location) is unaltered, while the level set field has returned to a signed distance function. In practice, this equation is iterated only for a few steps towards steady state. The level set advection Eq. (5) and reinitialization Eq. (8) are solved using a three-stage total-variation-diminishing (TVD) third-order Runge-Kutta scheme\textsuperscript{23}. 

The density, the solvent and the polymeric viscosities, and the relaxation time vary across the fluid interface and are expressed in a mixture form as
\[ \rho = \rho_1 H(\phi) + \rho_2 (1 - H(\phi)), \quad \lambda = \lambda_1 H(\phi) + \lambda_2 (1 - H(\phi)), \]
\[ \mu_s = \mu_{s,1} H(\phi) + \mu_{s,2} (1 - H(\phi)), \quad \mu_p = \mu_{p,1} H(\phi) + \mu_{p,2} (1 - H(\phi)), \]  \tag{9}
where the subscripts 1 and 2 denote the properties of the bulk and suspended fluids, respectively, and \( H(\phi) \) is the regularized Heaviside function defined such that it is zero inside the bubbles and unity outside.

A complete description of the level set methodology can be found in Sussman et al.\textsuperscript{76} and Ge et al.\textsuperscript{65} and references therein.

### 3.2.2 Time integration: Adams-Bashforth scheme

To advance the solution from time level \( n \) to \( n + 1 \), we proceed as follows. First, we advance the level set function and update the density and viscosity fields accordingly. Second, we advance the extra stress tensor and the velocity field in time with the second-order Adams-Bashforth scheme as
\[
B^{n+1} = B^n + \Delta t \left( \frac{3}{2} RT_{ab}^n - \frac{1}{2} RT_{ab}^{n-1} \right), \tag{10}
\]
\[
u^* = \nu^n + \Delta t \left( \frac{3}{2} RU_{ab}^n - \frac{1}{2} RU_{ab}^{n-1} \right), \tag{11}
\]
where we have defined the right-hand sides of the Eqs. (3) \( RT_{ab}^n \) and of eq. (10) as \( RU_{ab}^n \), with
\[
RT_{ab}^n = \left[ \frac{1}{\lambda} \left( \alpha I - \mathcal{P} B \right) - \left( \nu \cdot \nabla B - B \cdot \nabla \nu - \nabla \nu^T \cdot B \right) \right]^n, \tag{12}
\]
\[
RU_{ab}^n = - \nabla \cdot (\nu \nu^*) + g + \frac{1}{\rho^{n+1}} \left( \nabla \cdot \left[ \mu^{n+1} \left( \nabla \nu^n + (\nabla \nu^n)^T \right) \right] + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{r}^{n+1} + \sigma \kappa^{n+1} \delta(\phi^{n+1}) \mathbf{n}^{n+1} \right). \tag{13}
\]
To enforce a divergence-free velocity field, Eq. (13), we proceed by solving the Poisson equation for the pressure\textsuperscript{27} \textit{i.e.}
\[
\nabla \cdot \left( \frac{1}{\rho^{n+1}} \nabla p^{n+1} \right) = \frac{1}{\Delta t} \nabla \cdot \nu^*, \tag{14}
\]
and finally, the velocity at the next time level is corrected as
\[
u^{n+1} = \nu^* - \frac{\Delta t}{\rho^{n+1}} \nabla p^{n+1}. \tag{15}
\]

In the droplet-laden flow, the pressure Poisson equation is solved in both phases, with unequal densities. Per default, the left hand side of the Poisson equation has variable coefficients. In order to utilise an efficient FFT-based pressure solver with constant coefficients\textsuperscript{25}, we use the following splitting of the pressure term\textsuperscript{23},
\[
\frac{1}{\rho^{n+1}} \nabla p^{n+1} \rightarrow \frac{1}{\rho_0} \nabla p^{n+1} + \left( \frac{1}{\rho^{n+1}} - \frac{1}{\rho_0} \right) \nabla \left( 2 \rho^n - \rho^{n-1} \right), \tag{16}
\]
where \( \rho_0 \) is the density of the lower density phase (a constant). With this splitting, and after multiplying by \( \rho_0 \), the Poisson equation (Eq. 14) becomes:
\[
\nabla \cdot \nabla p^{n+1} = \nabla \cdot \left[ \left( 1 - \frac{\rho_0}{\rho^{n+1}} \right) \nabla \left( 2 \rho^n - \rho^{n-1} \right) \right] + \frac{\rho_0}{\Delta t} \nabla \cdot \nu^*. \tag{17}
\]
and the velocity correction (Eq. 15) transforms to:
\[
u^{n+1} = \nu^* - \Delta t \left[ \frac{1}{\rho_0} \nabla \rho^{n+1} + \left( \frac{1}{\rho^n} - \frac{1}{\rho_0} \right) \nabla \left( 2 \rho^n - \rho^{n-1} \right) \right]. \tag{18}
\]

### 3.3 Particle-laden flow

The governing equations of EVP particle-laden flow are integrated in time with a third-order Runge-Kutta (RK3) scheme. The RK3 scheme is third order accurate, low storage, and improves the numerical stability of the code, allowing for larger time steps. Both rigid and deformable particles are considered here. The rigid particles are included using the immersed boundary method (IBM) that allows us to solve the Navier-Stokes equations on a Cartesian grid despite the presence of particles or complex wall
geometries, and has become a popular tool in recent years. The IBM consists of an extra force, added to the right-hand side of the momentum equations, see Eqs. (1), to mimic boundary conditions, creating virtual boundaries inside the numerical domain. This extra force acts in the vicinity of a solid surface to impose indirectly the no-slip/no-penetration (ns/np) boundary condition.

In the case of deformable particles, we use the method described in Rosti and Brandt[67,68,69]. The solid is an incompressible viscous hyper-elastic material undergoing only the isochoric motion, where the hyper-elastic contribution is modeled as a neo-Hookean material, thus satisfying the incompressible Mooney-Rivlin law. To numerically solve the fluid-structure interaction problem, we adopt the so-called one-continuum formulation[80], where only one set of equations is solved over the whole domain. Thus, at each point of the domain the fluid and solid phases are distinguished by the local solid volume fraction $s$, which is equal to 0 in the fluid, 1 in the solid, and between 0 and 1 in the interface cells. The set of equations can be closed in a purely Eulerian manner by introducing a transport equation for the volume fraction $s$ (the equation is formally the same used in the level-set method, i.e., equation (5)). The instantaneous local value of the elastic force is found by solving equation (2), which represents the upper convected derivative of the left Cauchy-Green deformation tensor. The right hand side of equation (2) is identically zero for a hyperelastic material[81].

### 3.3.1 Time integration: Runge-Kutta scheme

When using the third order Runge-Kutta scheme, the extra stress tensor and the unprojected field are computed by defining $R_{rk3}^k$ and $RU_{rk3}^k$ as

$$RT_{rk3}^k = \zeta^k \left[ \frac{1}{\Delta t} (aI - \nabla B) - \left( \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla B - B \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} - \nabla \mathbf{u}^T \cdot B \right) \right] \right]^{k-1} + \xi^k \left[ \frac{1}{\Delta t} (aI - \nabla B) - \left( \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla B - B \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} - \nabla \mathbf{u}^T \cdot B \right) \right]^{k-2},$$

which are the right-hand sides of the Eqs. (2) and (1b). Integrating in time yields

$$B^k = B^{k-1} + \Delta t R_{rk3}^k,$$

$$\mathbf{u}^* = \mathbf{u}^{k-1} + \Delta t RU_{rk3}^k.$$

In the previous equations, $\Delta t$ is the overall time step from $t^n$ to $t^{n+1}$, the superscript * is used for the predicted velocity, while the superscript $k$ denotes the Runge-Kutta substep, with $k = 0$ and $k = 3$ corresponding to time $n$ and $n + 1$.

The pressure equation that enforces the solenoidal condition on the velocity field is solved via a Fast Poisson Solver

$$\nabla \cdot \nabla p^k = \frac{\rho}{2 \alpha^k \Delta t} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^*,$$

and, finally, the pressure and velocity are corrected according to

$$p^k = p^{k-1} + \psi^k,$$

$$\mathbf{u}^k = \mathbf{u}^* - 2 \alpha^k \Delta t \nabla \psi^k,$$

where $\psi$ is the projection variable. $\alpha$, $\zeta$, and $\xi$ are the integration constants, whose values are

$$\alpha^1 = \frac{4}{15}, \quad \alpha^2 = \frac{1}{15}, \quad \alpha^3 = \frac{1}{6},$$

$$\zeta^1 = \frac{8}{15}, \quad \zeta^2 = \frac{5}{12}, \quad \zeta^3 = \frac{3}{4},$$

$$\xi^1 = 0, \quad \xi^2 = \frac{17}{60}, \quad \xi^3 = -\frac{5}{12}.$$
3.3.2 Immersed boundary method

The IBM force $f$ cannot be formulated by means of a universal equation and therefore IBMs differ in the way $f$ is computed. This method was first developed by Peskin\cite{61} and numerous modifications and improvements have been suggested since (for a review, see Ref.\cite{82}). In this study we use two different IBM schemes: the volume penalization IBM\cite{83,84} to generate obstacles and complex geometries, and the discrete forcing method for moving particles\cite{85,86,87} to fully resolve particle suspensions in elastoviscoplastic flows.

**Volume penalization IBM**

Kajishima et al. and Breugem et al.\cite{83,84} proposed the volume penalization IBM, where the IBM force $f$ is calculated from the first prediction velocity $u^*$ that is obtained by integrating Eq. (1) in time without considering the IBM force and the pressure correction. The IBM force $f$ and the second prediction velocity $u^{**}$ are then calculated as follows:

\[
f_{ijk} = \rho \alpha_{ijk} \frac{(u^*_j - u^*_i)_{jk}}{\Delta t}, \tag{26a}
\]

\[
u^{**}_{ijk} = u^*_{ijk} + \Delta t \frac{f_{ijk}}{\rho}, \tag{26b}
\]

where $\alpha_{ijk}$ is the solid volume fraction in the grid cell with index $(i, j, k)$, varying between 0 (entirely located in the fluid phase) and 1 (entirely located in the solid area) and $u^*_j$ is the solid interface velocity within this grid cell. Figure 3 indicates the solid volume fractions (highlighted area) for grid cells around $u(i, j)$ and $v(i-1, j-1)$. Solid boundary in this figure is shown by red dashed line. For non-moving boundaries, $u^*_j$ is 0 and Eq. (26) reduce to:

\[
u^{**}_{ijk} = (1 - \alpha_{ijk}) u^*_{ijk}. \tag{27}
\]

The second prediction velocity $u^{**}$ is then used to update velocities and pressure following a classical pressure correction scheme\cite{85}.

The volume penalization IBM is computationally very efficient, since the solid volume fractions around velocity points can be calculated at the beginning of the simulation using an accurate method, or they can even be extracted directly from a physical sample by magnetic resonance imaging and X-ray computed tomography\cite{84}.

**Discrete forcing method for moving particles**

Following the IBM framework, we impose the no-slip/no penetration condition at the particle surfaces by adding an extra force $f$ on the right hand side of the fluid momentum equations (1). Uhlmann\cite{88} developed a computationally efficient IBM to fully resolve particle-laden flows. Breugem\cite{85} introduced improvements to this method, making it second order accurate in space by
applied a multi-direct forcing scheme\textsuperscript{89} to better approximate the no-slip/no-penetration (ns/np) boundary condition on the surface of the particles and by introducing a slight retraction of the grid points on the surface towards the interior. The numerical stability of this method for particle over fluid density ratio near unity was also improved by accounting the inertia of the fluid contained within the particles\textsuperscript{90}. Ardekani \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{87} extended the original method to simulate suspension of spheroidal particles with lubrication and contact models for the short-range particle-particle (particle-wall) interactions.

In this study we apply the same scheme to fully resolved simulations of particle suspensions in elastoviscoplastic flows. We apply the IBM force on the predicted velocities $u^*$, which have been obtained as in the single-phase situation. The second prediction velocity $u^{**}$ is then obtained after the application of the IBM force, and $u^{**}$ substitutes $u^*$ in the pressure correction scheme given in the previous section. The formulation to calculate the second prediction velocity is given here:

\begin{equation}
U^{*l} = \sum_{ijk} u^*_{ijk} \delta_d (x_{ijk} - X^{l-1}_l) \Delta x \Delta y \Delta z ,
\end{equation}

(28a)

\begin{equation}
F^{k-1/2}_l = \rho_f \frac{U_l (X^{k-1}_l) - U^*_l}{\Delta t} ,
\end{equation}

(28b)

\begin{equation}
\tau^{k-1/2}_{ijk} = \sum_l F^{k-1/2}_l \delta_d (x_{ijk} - X^{k-1}_l) \Delta V_l ,
\end{equation}

(28c)

\begin{equation}
u^{**} = u^* + \Delta t \frac{\tau^{k-1/2}}{\rho_f} ,
\end{equation}

(28d)

where capital letters indicate the variable at a Lagrangian point with index $l$. In equation (28a), we interpolate the first prediction velocity $u^*$ from the Eulerian grid to the Lagrangian points on the surface of the particle, $U^{*l}$, using the regularized Dirac delta function $\delta_d$ of Roma \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{91} This approximated delta function essentially replaces the sharp interface with a thin porous shell of width $3\Delta x$; it preserves the total force and torque on the particle in the interpolation, provided that the Eulerian grid is uniform. The IBM force at each Lagrangian point, $F^{k-1/2}_l$, is proportional to the difference between the interpolated predicted velocity and the local velocity of the surface of the particle (for rigid particles, $U_p + \omega_p \times r$, calculated as shown in the paragraph below). In equation (28b), the IBM forces obtained at the Lagrangian points are interpolated back to the Eulerian grid by the same regularized Dirac delta function. In equation (28c), the IBM forces in the Eulerian grid ($\tau^{k-1/2}_{ijk}$) are added to the first prediction velocity to obtain the second prediction velocity $u^{**}$.

Given the smooth delta function and resolutions typically used, the Eulerian forces obtained from two neighboring Lagrangian points overlap. The \textit{multidirect forcing} scheme proposed by Luo \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{89} is therefore employed to iteratively determine the IBM forces such that the no-slip boundary conditions, $U^{**} \approx U$, are collectively imposed at the Lagrangian grid points. The new second prediction velocity $u^{**}$ is then obtained by solving the equations above iteratively (typically 3 iterations is enough) using the new $u^{**}$ as $u^*$ at the beginning of the next iteration with equation (28b) substituted by:

\begin{equation}
F^{k-1/2}_l = F^{k-1/2}_l + \rho_f \frac{U_l (X^{k-1}_l) - U^{**}_l}{\Delta t} .
\end{equation}

(29)

The second prediction velocity $u^{**}$ is then used to update velocities and pressure following the procedure described in the previous section.
Taking into account the inertia of the fictitious fluid phase inside the particle volumes, Breugem\(^{85}\) showed that equations for particle motion can be rewritten as:

\[
\rho_p V_p \frac{dU_p}{dt} \approx - \sum_{i=1}^{N_i} F_i \Delta V_i + \rho_f \frac{d}{dt} \left( \int_{V_p} u \, dV \right) + \left( \rho_p - \rho_f \right) V_p g + F_c, \tag{30}
\]

\[
\frac{d (I_p \omega_p)}{dt} \approx - \sum_{i=1}^{N_i} \left( \mathbf{r}_i \times F_i \right) \Delta V_i + \rho_f \frac{d}{dt} \left( \int_{V_p} \left( \mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{u} \right) \, dV \right) + T_c. \tag{31}
\]

where \(U_p\) and \(\omega_p\) are the particle translational and the angular velocity, \(\rho_p\), \(V_p\) and \(I_p\) are the mass density, volume and moment-of-inertia tensor of a particle, and \(\mathbf{r}\) is the position vector with respect to the center of the particle. The first terms on the right hand side of equations are the summation of IBM forces and torques that act on each Lagrangian point. The second terms account for the translational and angular acceleration of the fluid trapped inside the particle shell. The force term \(-\rho_f V_p g\) accounts for the hydrostatic pressure with \(g\) the gravitational acceleration. \(F_c\) and \(T_c\) are the force and torque resulting from particle-particle (particle-wall) collisions (see\(^{87}\) for more details). These equations are integrated in time using the Runge-Kutta scheme explained in the previous section.
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**FIGURE 5** Start-up Poiseuille flow for an Oldroyd-B fluid. (a) Time evolution of the centerline streamwise velocity component and (b) \(\tau_{xy}^*\) stress at channel wall. The symbols represent our numerical results while the solid lines are the analytical solution derived by Waters and King\(^{92}\) \((Re = 0.125, Wi = 0.125\) and \(\beta = 0.1)\).

## 4 | VALIDATION

### 4.1 | Single-phase flow

#### 4.1.1 | Poiseuille flow

The first test case deals with the start-up Poiseuille flow of an Oldroyd-B and FENE-P fluid \((Bi = 0)\) in a planar channel. The geometry is a two-dimensional channel bounded by two parallel walls separated by a distance \(h = L_y\), where \(y\) denotes the wall-normal direction, and \(x\) is the streamwise direction. The fluid is initially at rest and set into motion by applying of a constant pressure gradient in the streamwise direction. No-slip boundary conditions are applied at the walls. As our method solves the three-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations, we impose periodic boundary conditions in the streamwise and spanwise directions
FIGURE 6 Poiseuille flow of an Oldroyd-B fluid. (a) Steady state streamwise velocity component profile, (b) $\tau^{*}_{xx}$ (black color) and $\tau^{*}_{xy}$ (red color) stress profiles. The symbols represent our numerical results while the solid lines are the analytical solution derived by Waters and King $^{92}$ ($Re = 0.125$, $W i = 0.125$ and $\beta = 0.1$).

FIGURE 7 Poiseuille flow of a FENE-P fluid. (a) Steady state streamwise velocity component profile, (b) $B_{xx}$ (black color) and $B_{xy}$ (red color) profiles. The symbols represent our numerical results while the solid lines are the analytical solution. ($Re = 300$, $W i = 25$ and $\beta = 0.9$).

to emulate the two-dimensional geometry. The following dimensionless variables are introduced:

$$
Y = \frac{y}{h}, \quad \tau^{*} = \frac{\tau h}{u_0 (\mu_s + \mu_p)}; \quad T = \frac{t (\mu_s + \mu_p)}{\rho h^2}; \quad V = \frac{u}{u_0}, \quad \beta = \frac{\mu_s}{\mu_s + \mu_p}; \quad Re = \frac{\rho u_0 h}{\mu_s + \mu_p}; \quad Wi = \frac{\lambda u_0}{h},
$$

(32)

where $\tau^{*}$ is non-dimensional stress, $T$ is a non-dimensional time and the velocity scale is $u_0 = -h^2 dp/dx/8(\mu_s + \mu_p)$. The uniform grid has the grid size $\Delta y = h/180$. The time-evolution of the centerline velocity and the wall shear stress is shown for the Oldroyd-B fluid case in Fig. 5. The velocity and the stress components show oscillating behaviour with overshoots and undershoots before settling down to their fully developed values. The steady state profiles for velocity and stress components are shown in Figs. 6 and 7 for the Oldroyd-B and FENE-P fluids, respectively. As can be seen from these figures, there is an excellent agreement between our numerical and existing analytical results.
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**FIGURE 8** (a-c) Instantaneous contours of the absolute value of vorticity at time $T \approx 20$, 60 and 100. The color scale from black to white ranges from 0.05 to 0.4 in (a), from 0.05 to 0.3 in (b) and from 0.05 to 0.25 in (c). (d) Time evolution of the $B_{xx}$ component of the polymer conformation tensor. The red line displays our numerical results, while the symbols display the results of Min et al. $^{70}$ ($Re = 50$, $Wi = 25$, $\beta = 0.9$, $L^2 = 100$).

### 4.1.2 Temporally evolving mixing layer

The FENE-P model implementation has been validated by simulating a viscoelastic temporally evolving mixing layer flow and by comparing our results with those provided by Min et al. $^{70}$ We consider the initial velocity field $u = 0.5(tanh \, y)$, and trigger the roll-up of the shear layer with a small 2D perturbation. The characteristic velocity and length scales are $\Delta u = u_{max} - u_{min}$ and $\delta = du/(du/dy)_{max}$, respectively. The Reynolds number is fixed at $Re = \rho \delta \Delta u/\mu_s = 50$ and the Weissenberg number $Wi = \lambda \Delta u/\delta = 25$; moreover, the extensibility $L^2$ is set to 100, and the solvent viscosity ratio $\beta = 0.9$. Dimensionless time is defined as $T = t \Delta u/\delta$. The 2D numerical domain has the size $30\delta \times 100\delta$, discretised by $128 \times 384$ grid points. Note that the flow configuration and domain are the same used by Min et al. $^{70}$ Figures 8(a - c) show the instantaneous vorticity contours for the Newtonian flow, where we can observe that the initial perturbation grows in time and generates two vortices (panel a - $T \approx 20$), which subsequently roll up (panel b - $T \approx 60$) and eventually merge into one large vortex (panel c - $T \approx 100$); the polymeric flow shows a similar behavior. The quantitative validation is shown in the bottom panel, where we plot the time history of $B_{xx}$ in the center of the domain: the symbols represent the literature results, whereas the red line indicates our numerical data. We find a good agreement of the conformation tensor component time history over the whole vortex merging process.

### 4.1.3 Shear flow

Next, the method is validated for elastoviscoplastic (EVP) single-phase flows. For this purpose, two test cases are considered. The first case is a simple shear flow. Initially, the fluid is at rest and set into motion by a constant shear rate $\dot{\gamma}_0$. This test case has a constant dimensionless velocity gradient $Vu = [0 \ 0 \ 1]$, the Weissenberg number $Wi = \lambda \dot{\gamma}_0 = 1$, the Bingham number $Bi = \tau_0/\mu_0 \dot{\gamma}_0 = 1$, and $\beta = 1/9$. The time evolution of the stresses is shown in Fig. 9(a). The stress components increase as long as the yield criterion is not satisfied; once the criterion is fulfilled ($T \approx 1$), the energy starts to dissipate as a result of viscous effects, which is clearly seen in the figure as the slope of the time evolution of the stresses decreases significantly.
The second test case considers the periodic shear flow of an EVP fluid. An oscillatory flow is applied by imposing the shear strain $\gamma_0 \sin(\omega t)$, where $\gamma_0$ is the strain amplitude and $\omega$ is the angular frequency of the oscillation. The Weissenberg number is defined as $Wi = \omega$ and the Bingham number as $Bi = \tau_\gamma/\left(\rho_0 \omega\right)$ in this case. Computations are performed for two different Bingham numbers, i.e., $Bi = 0$ and $300$. Note that these two values are extreme cases for which the material behaves like a viscoelastic fluid ($Bi = 0$) and like an elastic solid ($Bi = 300$). The viscoelastic case can be reached at large strain amplitudes $\gamma_0 \to \infty$, whereas the elastic solid behavior is obtained when the amplitude is small $\gamma_0 \to 0$. The other dimensionless parameters of the problem are kept constant at $Wi = 0.1$ and $\beta = 0$. The evolution of the shear stress component $\tau_{xy}$ is displayed in Fig. 9(b) for $Bi = 0$ and $300$. As can be seen in these figures, there is a good agreement between our simulation and the analytical solutions, thus indicating an accurate solution of the EVP model equations.

### 4.2 Multiphase flow

#### 4.2.1 Sedimentation of a spherical particle

After validating the numerical method for simple viscometric flows, the method is now applied to study the sedimentation of a spherical particle in a channel filled with an EVP fluid. This problem exhibits different viscometric flows simultaneously, i.e., biaxial stretching upstream the particle, shear flow on the sides, and uniaxial extensional flow downstream of it. The Saramito model is employed here to facilitate comparison of the present results with the numerical results by Fraggedakis et al.\textsuperscript{16} and with the experimental data by Holenberg et al.\textsuperscript{17} A single spherical particle of radius $R$ is centered in a domain of size $(L_x \times L_y \times L_z) = (12R \times 20R \times 12R)$; a grid of $144 \times 240 \times 144$ points is used to discretize the computational domain. Periodic boundary conditions are imposed in the $x$ (spanwise) and $y$ (gravity) directions whereas a free slip/no penetration condition is enforced in the $z$ direction. The particle starts moving due to the gravity in an otherwise quiescent ambient EVP fluid. Following Fraggedakis et al.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>$V$ (mm s$^{-1}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present work</td>
<td>0.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraggedakis et al.</td>
<td>0.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holenberg et al.</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 10 Sphere settling in EVP fluid. Velocity magnitude, scaled with the terminal velocity of the settling sphere from (a) the present study and (b) Fraggedakis et al\textsuperscript{16}. The different symbols represent different experimental series for the solid-fluid boundary defined by Holenberg et al\textsuperscript{17}. \((Ar = 0.03, Wi = 1.04, Bn = 0.089, \rho^o = 1.38 \text{ and } \beta = 0.01)\).

al\textsuperscript{16}, the non-dimensional parameters are defined as follows:

\[
Ar = \frac{\Delta \rho g R^3}{\mu_s + \mu_p}; \quad Wi = \frac{\lambda \Delta \rho g R}{\mu_s + \mu_p}; \quad Bn = \frac{\tau_y}{\Delta \rho g R}; \quad \rho^o = \frac{\rho_s}{\rho_f}, \quad (33)
\]

where \(Ar, Wi, Bn,\) and \(\rho^o\) represent the Archimedes number, the Weissenberg number, the Bingham number, and the density ratio, respectively. In Eq. (33), the density difference is defined as \(\Delta \rho = \rho_f (\rho^o - 1) = \rho_s - \rho_f\), where \(\rho_s\) and \(\rho_f\) are the solid and fluid densities, respectively. The present results are compared with the computational simulations by Fraggedakis et al\textsuperscript{16} and the experimental results by Holenberg et al\textsuperscript{17}. The simulation is performed for \(Ar = 0.03, Wi = 1.04, Bn = 0.089, \rho^o = 1.38 \text{ and } \beta = 0.01\). Note that the “rough heavy sphere” case is considered in the present study, referring to the no-slip boundary condition on the particle. First, a quantitative comparison is conducted based on the steady state settling speed of the particle in the EVP fluid. The terminal velocity predicted by the present study, the one in the numerical simulation in Ref\textsuperscript{16} and the one observed experimentally\textsuperscript{17} are reported in Table 2. As can be seen from the table, the present results could capture the terminal velocity accurately, and indeed the result of the present study deviates from that in other published studies by less than 4%. Next, we present a qualitative comparison of the velocity fields around the spherical particle. The steady state velocity contours normalized with the particle terminal velocity are displayed in Fig. 10(a) and Fig. 10(b) for the present work and the one by Fraggedakis et al\textsuperscript{16}. Direct comparisons with the experimental data of\textsuperscript{17} are also included for the yield surface represented by the white markers around the sphere, where the circular and square marks indicate two different experimental series. Holenberg et al\textsuperscript{17} determined the yielded region by means of PIV and PTV techniques, i.e., they defined the yielded region where the velocity magnitude exceeded 10\% of the settling velocity. To facilitate direct comparison with experimental data, the velocity contours shown in Fig. 10(a) are constructed as follows: the distance between the consecutive contour lines is the same and equals to 10\% of the terminal velocity, starting from 10\% to 90\% of the velocity. Generally, we are in good agreement with the experimental marks\textsuperscript{17} and simulation results\textsuperscript{16}. Similarly to\textsuperscript{16}, the current methodology could capture the expected loss of the fore-aft symmetry. On the other hand, a slight discrepancy between the present results and those by\textsuperscript{16} is visible and can be attributed to a different computational box and a lower resolution. Indeed, in the present study a full three-dimensional flow is employed, whereas Fraggedakis et al\textsuperscript{16} consider an axisymmetric configuration. Moreover, local grid refinement is used in Ref\textsuperscript{16}. Their very fine grid in the vicinity of the sphere may result in an improved resolution of the yielded region.
4.2.2 Deformable dilute suspension in a shear flow

Steady deformation of a neo-Hookean elastic particle in a shear flow

In this test case, we simulate the flow in a plane Couette geometry. We use a Cartesian uniform mesh in a rectangular box of size $16R \times 10R \times 16R$, with 16 grid points per particle radius $R$. Periodic boundary conditions are imposed in the streamwise ($x$) and spanwise ($z$) directions, and the no-slip condition at the walls ($y = -h$ and $y = h$), which move in two opposite directions with a constant streamwise velocity $\pm U = h\dot{\gamma}$. The Reynolds number $Re = \rho \dot{\gamma} R^2 / \mu$ is fixed at 0.1 and the Capillary number $Ca = \mu \dot{\gamma} / G$ varied one order of magnitude between 0.05 and 0.5. After the transients die out, the sphere deforms to approximately an ellipsoid, and we therefore characterize these shapes by the Taylor parameter ($D$) and the angle $\theta$. The Taylor deformation parameter is defined as $D = (L - B)/(L + B)$, where $L$ and $B$ are the major and minor axis of the equivalent ellipsoid in the middle plane, and $\theta$ is the inclination angle with the respect to the streamwise direction. The steady state values of $D$ and $\theta$ are reported in Fig. 11 for different $Ca$, and compared with those by Villone et al. Similarly to the case of a viscoelastic droplet in a Newtonian medium, deformation as well as the tendency to align with the flow increases with $Ca$, i.e. with deformability. Very good agreement is found between our numerical results and those in the literature. Further validation and details of our implementation can be found in.[67, 78, 79]

Viscoelastic droplet

Verhulst et al. and Cardinaels et al. considered full 3D shear-driven droplets in which either the droplet or the surrounding fluid is viscoelastic. The Oldroyd-B model is employed in the present study to facilitate direct comparison with the results of Verhulst et al. and Cardinaels et al. The spherical droplet of radius $R$ is centered in a computational domain. Opposite velocities, $V$ and $-V$, are enforced on the two walls located at $z = 0$ and $z = H$ to obtain the shear rate $\dot{\gamma} = 2V/H$. Periodic boundary conditions are imposed in the $x$ (spanwise) and $y$ (streamwise) directions and no-slip boundary condition at the two walls. Following Verhulst et al. and Cardinaels et al., the non-dimensional parameters are defined as follows: the Reynolds number $Re = \rho \dot{\gamma} R^2 / \mu_1$, the capillary number $Ca = R \dot{\gamma} \mu_1 / \sigma$, the Weissenberg number $Wi = \lambda \dot{\gamma}$, the viscosity ratio $k_\mu = \mu_2 / \mu_1$, the density ratio $k_\rho = \rho_2 / \rho_1$, and the confinement ratio $\chi = 2R/H$. Alternatively, two Deborah numbers can be defined as $De_1 = (1 - \beta)Wi/Ca$ and $De_2 = (1 - \beta)Wi/(k_\rho Ca)$. The results are presented in terms of the Deborah number and dimensionless capillary time $t_\gamma/Ca$. The droplet deformation in the $y - z$ plane is measured by the Taylor deformation parameter introduced above. Following Ramanujan and Pozrikidis, the inertia tensor of the drop is used to find the equivalent ellipsoid.
First, we consider the startup dynamics of an Oldroyd-B droplet in a Newtonian medium (VN). The viscoelastic spherical droplet is centred in a computational domain of size $L_x = H, L_y = 2H, L_z = H$, which is discretised with a resolution of $\Delta x = \Delta y = \Delta z = H/192$. The simulations are performed at $Re = 0.05$, $De_2 = 1.54$, $\beta = 0.68$, $k_\rho = 1, k_\mu = 1.5$ and $\chi = 0.25$. The evolution of the Taylor parameter and the angle of inclination for a viscoelastic droplet in a Newtonian fluid at $Ca = 0.14$ and $0.32$ are depicted in Fig. 12(a) together with the numerical results by Verhulst et al [94]. As expected, the drop deformation and alignment with the flow increase with $Ca$. Also, the time evolution of both the Taylor parameter and the inclination angle are in good agreement with the results reported in Ref. [92].

Next, the dynamics of a Newtonian droplet in an Oldroyd-B fluid (NV) is studied. The resolution is fixed at $\Delta x = \Delta y = \Delta z = H/64$ and the computational domain is $L_x = 2H, L_y = 4H, L_z = H$. The computations were performed for $Re = 0.1$, $De_1 = 1, Ca = 0.2, \beta = 0.68, k_\rho = 1$ and $k_\mu = 1.5$. The evolution of the drop deformation parameter and its orientation angle are shown in Fig. 12(b) for two different confinement ratios: $\chi = 0.46$ and $\chi = 0.76$. As can be seen in the figure, the confinement ratio increases both the drop deformation and the drop orientation angle. The comparison between the present results and those by Cardinaels et al [95] shows good agreement.
4.2.3 Buoyancy-driven droplet

Finally, the method is validated for buoyancy-driven (rising) droplets. We start from a Newtonian droplet rising in a Newtonian and viscoelastic fluid. The Oldroyd-B model is used in the present work to facilitate direct comparison with the results by Prieto et al.\textsuperscript{97} and Vahabi and Sadeghy.\textsuperscript{98} The fully Newtonian case is a classical benchmark, see e.g., Hysing et al.\textsuperscript{100} The domain is rectangular with the width \( L_x = 1 \) and the height \( L_y = 2 \). A spherical droplet with a radius \( R \) is initially placed at the centerline of the channel at a distance of \( L_y/4 \) from the lower part of the channel. The no-slip boundary conditions are applied at the horizontal walls. It should be noted that Prieto\textsuperscript{97} used the free-slip boundary conditions on the vertical walls, whereas Zainali et al.\textsuperscript{99} and Vahabi and Sadeghy imposed no-slip boundary conditions. The non-dimensional parameters pertaining to this problem are defined as: the Reynolds number \( Re = \rho_i U \sqrt{\frac{L}{\mu_i}} \), the Eötvös number \( Eo = \rho_i U^2 \sqrt{\frac{L}{\sigma}} \), the Weissenberg number \( Wi = \lambda U \sqrt{\frac{L}{\mu_i}} \), Bingham number \( Bi = \tau_y / \rho g L \), the viscosity ratio \( k_\nu = \mu_2 / \mu_1 \), the density ratio \( k_\rho = \rho_2 / \rho_1 \) and the confinement ratio \( \chi = 2R/L_x \). The reference length scale is \( L = 2R \), the velocity scale is \( U_g = \sqrt{gL} \), where \( g \) is the gravitational constant, and the time scale is \( L/U_g \).

First, we show a comparison of rising droplets to the computational study of Prieto\textsuperscript{97} in two cases: (NV) denotes a Newtonian droplet in a viscoelastic medium (\( Wi = 1, \beta = 0.5 \)), and (N) denotes a Newtonian droplet in a Newtonian medium (\( Wi = 0, \beta = 1 \)). The other parameters are: \( Re = 35, Eo = 10, Bi = 0, k_\rho = 0.1, k_\mu = 0.1 \) and \( \chi = 0.5 \). Figure 13 shows the evolution of the terminal velocity and the steady state shape for a fully Newtonian (N) case and for a Newtonian droplet in a viscoelastic medium (NV), both of which are in good agreement with the literature results. Note that, in the study of Prieto\textsuperscript{97} the microscopic Hooke model was used rather than the Oldroyd-B model considered in the present work; despite of that, very similar results are obtained.

Next, we compare our results in the NV case against the results by Zainali et al.\textsuperscript{99} and Vahabi and Sadeghy.\textsuperscript{98} Following these authors, the values of the non-dimensional parameters are \( Re = 1.419, Eo = 35.28, Wi = 8.083, Bi = 0, \beta = 0.07, k_\rho = 0.1, k_\mu = 0.1 \) and \( \chi = 0.3 \). The droplet interface shapes that we obtained at \( t = 0.13s \) together with the ones by Zainali et al.\textsuperscript{99} and Vahabi and Sadeghy\textsuperscript{98} are depicted in Fig. 14. It can be seen in the figure that the present result is consistent with the one reported by Vahabi and Sadeghy\textsuperscript{98}; on the contrary, Zainali et al.\textsuperscript{99} have not observed the cusped trailing edge, which is however a common feature for the case of Newtonian droplet in viscoelastic medium at high polymer concentrations.\textsuperscript{100,101,102}

Finally, some sample simulations are presented for a Newtonian droplet moving in an EVP fluid. The physical properties pertinent to the problem are the same as in Zainali et al.\textsuperscript{99} and Vahabi and Sadeghy\textsuperscript{98} except for a non-zero Bingham number; indeed, the Bingham number is varied between \( Bi = 0 \) and 0.1. Fig. 15 shows snapshots at \( t = 0.13s \) of the streamlines inside the computational domain for the fully Newtonian case (N), and for the EVP fluid with \( Bi = 0, 0.01 \) and 0.1. In the figure,
FIGURE 14 Shape of a Newtonian droplet rising in an Oldroyd-B fluid at $t = 0.13s$. The present results (○) are compared with the results of Zainali et al.\textsuperscript{[98]} (×) and the results of Vahabi and Sadeghy (■). ($Re = 1.419$, $Eo = 35.28$, $Wi = 8.083$, $Bi = 0$, $\beta = 0.07$, $k_\rho = 0.1$, $k_\mu = 0.1$, $\chi = 0.3$, with 120 × 240 grid points).

blue line denotes the solid-fluid boundary defined via the isoline $F = 0.5$, where $F$ is defined in Table 1. Note that all the non-Newtonian cases display a negative wake, and therefore they have four closed streamline zones instead of two zones for the Newtonian droplet. When increasing the Bingham number $Bi$, the extent of the yielded region decreases and the solid-fluid boundary approaches the droplet. At $Bi = 0.01$, the fluid region occupies most of the domain, but there is a solid region above and below the droplet, as well as two small ellipsoidal regions on both sides of the droplet. Finally for $Bi = 0.1$, the solid region occupies almost the whole domain, except for two narrow "caps" at the trailing and leading edges of the droplet.

FIGURE 15 Streamlines for the Newtonian droplet rising in a EVP fluid and its respective shape at $t = 0.13s$. Computations are performed for the Newtonian case (N), and EVP fluids with $Bi = 0$, 0.01 and 0.1. The blue line denotes the solid-fluid boundary defined via contour $F = 0.5$. ($Re = 1.419$, $Eo = 35.28$, $Wi = 8.083$, $\beta = 0.07$, $k_\rho = 0.1$, $k_\mu = 0.1$, $\chi = 0.3$, and Grid: 120 × 240).
5 | CONCLUSION

An efficient solver is developed for the direct numerical simulations of viscoelastic and elastoviscoplastic multiphase flows. The solver is general and applicable to non-Newtonian fluids with a dispersed phase which is either rigid or deformable (drops, bubbles and elastic particles). The fluid phases can be chosen to be simple EVP fluids following the model of Saramito[1]. The method can be later adapted to more complex EVP models.

To obtain a stable and accurate solution of the transport equations for the stresses (EVP, elastic or viscoelastic), we use a fifth-order upwinded WENO scheme for the advection term in the stress model equations. This is found to be very robust and considerably less expensive than the third-order compact upwind scheme suggested in the literature. To avoid numerical breakdown at moderate Weissenberg numbers, a local artificial diffusion can be added. We find that a local diffusion is preferable to the global diffusion which can lead to inaccurate solutions by significantly smearing out the gradients.

The interface between the continuous and dispersed phases is tracked using different approaches for different systems. For the case of deformable viscoelastic particles, we adopt an indicator function based on the local volume fraction, whereas for droplets, a recently developed mass-conserving level set method is used, including an accurate computation of the surface tension force based on the local curvature. The overall solution approach proposed here is independent of the specific interface tracking method. The advantage of these methods is that they are fully Eulerian, efficient, accurate and portable from existing available implementations. For rigid particles, on the other hand, the interface is tracked using an immersed boundary method. In this case, the carrier phase is solved on a fixed Eulerian grid, whereas the interface is represented by a Lagrangian grid following the particle. When comparing to the conventional body fitted grid, the IBM is more simple and versatile for moving rigid bodies.

The method is first validated for single-phase elastoviscoplastic flows including the start up flow in planar channel, temporally evolving mixing layer and simple and oscillating shear flows. Then, it is applied to the sedimentation of a spherical particle in an EVP fluid, a viscoelastic drop under shear flow and a buoyancy-driven viscoelastic droplet. In all the cases mentioned above, the results obtained with our code are found to be in good agreement with previous results found in the literature. Finally, sample results are presented for a Newtonian droplet rising in an elastoviscoplastic fluid. This, and the behaviour of rigid particle suspensions in EVP fluids, will be interesting topics for future investigations.
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