Scaling laws of top jet drop size and speed from bubble bursting including gravity and inviscid limit
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Jet droplets from bubble bursting are determined by a limited parametrical space: the liquid properties (surface tension $\sigma$, viscosity $\mu$, and density $\rho$), mother bubble size $R_0$ and acceleration of gravity $g$. A detailed physical description of the ejection process to model the ejected droplet radius $R$ and its initial launch speed $V$ is provided, leading to the scaling law: $R/R_0 = k_d (\text{Oh}_1 - \text{Oh} + k_{\text{in},1}\text{Bo})^{5/4} (\text{Oh} + \text{Oh}_2)^{-1/2}$, where Oh = $\mu/\rho R_0 g$ and Bo = $\rho R_0^2/\sigma$ are the Ohnesorge and Bond numbers. Oh$_1$ is the critical Ohmnsorge number above which no droplet ejection takes place, and Oh$_2$ is a new critical Ohnesorge number indicating when viscous effects vanish. This scaling law begets an extraordinary collapse of all published experimental measurements collected with Oh$_1 = 0.038$ (Walls et al. 2015 Phys. Rev. E 92, 021002(R) reported Oh$_1 = 0.037$), Oh$_2 = 0.0045$, $k_{\text{in},1} = 0.006$, and $k_d = 0.9$ (scaling prefactor). The scaling law for the jet speed $V$ is also obtained from the same physical principles, but given that it drastically varies along the ejection process, one should write $V/V_o = k_v (\text{Oh} + \text{Oh}_2 - k_{\text{in},2}\text{Bo})^{1/2} (\text{Oh}_1 - \text{Oh} + k_{\text{in},2}\text{Bo})^{-3/4}$, where $k_{\text{in},1}$ and $k_{\text{in},2}$ should be introduced for a complete physical description. Those parameters depend on the criteria to measure the jet speed. Reliable measurements of $V$ taken with a homogeneous criterium (e.g., the front jet speed when it reaches the free surface) from different authors yield $k_{\text{in},1} = 0.14$ and $k_{\text{in},2} = 0.004$, with the scaling prefactor $k_v = 13.5$.

Bubble bursting is a particular case of a general class of free surface axisymmetric capillary flows producing unsteady liquid ejections. Yarin [1] discussed several related phenomena (droplet impact, film breakage in bubble bursting, etc.) where a sudden change in the overall potential energy of the system leads to the radial progression and collapse of a wave package [2 3]. Those phenomena plague the dynamics of free surface flows at scales comparable to capillary lengths. At planetary scales, the largest free surface between liquid and gas is the sea surface, where the dynamical interaction between these phases involves scales spanning about ten orders of magnitude (from tens of nanometers to hundreds of meters). Yet, the mixing and penetration of each phase in the other (in the form of droplets or bubbles) is dominated by the capillary lengths and below. This peculiar feature is so fundamental that it largely determines the global dynamics of the gas phase (atmosphere) through the continuous formation of large masses of aerosols from ocean spray [4]. These aerosols form the cloud condensation nuclei (CCN) that eventually regulate precipitations and the radiant balance of the earth.

Among the different spray formation mechanisms, the one producing the deepest penetration from the very inception is, conspicuously, what is known as bubble jetting early identified by climate scientists [5 10]. That penetration comes from the vigorous ejection taking place at high speeds perpendicularly from the free liquid surface in the form of tiny droplets. This phenomenon, observed since early studies [2 8], entails the collapse of a capillary wave package onto the axis of symmetry and the eventual ejection of mass along the axis of symmetry, due to conservation of mass and momentum. The enormous allure of this particular phenomenon comes not only from its own beauty, symmetry and physical richness from very limited parameters, but from its transversal impact and direct role in creating global complexity at fourteen orders of magnitude larger scales (planetary scales).

This work analyzes in detail bubble bursting on a surface, with the aim to provide a complete description and related predicting model for the two main mechanical parameters to determine the fate of the ejecta as airborne aerosols: the droplet size (radius) $R$ and its initial speed $V$. In this phenomenon, the source of energy comes from both the breakage of a liquid film exposed to air and the sudden gravity potential disequilibrium associated to the cavity created right after. The physics involved has been discussed by several authors who have provided successive insightful approaches [8 11 15]. A synthesis of the existing arguments was briefly discussed in [17]: those arguments pointed to the existence of an overall speed of the capillary wave front that should be $V_o \sim \left(\frac{\sigma}{\rho R_o}\right)^{1/2}$. This assumes that (i) the dominant wave number $k$ should be comparable to $R_o^{-1}$, and (ii) that the wave undergoes a viscous damping rate as $t_D^{-1} \sim \mu/\rho R_o^2$ which should be smaller than the inverse of the time of collapse of the wave $t_o \sim \left(\frac{\sigma}{\rho R_o}\right)^{1/2}$. In other words, one should have $t_D > t_o$, which immediately implies that the Ohnesorge number $\text{Oh} = \left(\frac{\mu}{\rho R_o}\right)^{1/2}$ should be below a critical one $\text{Oh}_1$ in the event of a sufficiently energetic jetting to beget droplet ejection. That critical number $\text{Oh}_1$ was experimentally calculated by Walls et al. [13], including the influence of the grav-
ity using the Bond number $\text{Bo} = \rho g R^2 / \sigma$. In the limit of very small $\text{Bo}$ numbers, they obtained $\text{Oh}_1 \simeq 0.037$, which was confirmed in [14].

However, identifying the critical $\text{Oh}_1$ does not resolve the dependency that both the ejected droplet size and its speed should have on the three relevant physical properties of the liquid $\{\rho, \sigma, \mu\}$, the bubble radius $R_o$, and the acceleration of gravity $g$. Following dimensional analysis, that dependency should be of the forms $R / l_\mu = f_R (\text{Oh}, \text{Bo})$ and $V / V_o = f_V (\text{Oh}, \text{Bo})$, or alternatively $R / R_o = f_R (\text{Oh}, \text{Bo})$ and $V / V_o = f_V (\text{Oh}, \text{Bo})$. Among others, Krishnan et al. [14] neatly described (see their figure 8) how the different wavelengths $\lambda_i$ of the wave packed produced by the breakup of the liquid film sequentially arrive at the axis segregated by their different wave speeds $(\sigma / (\rho \lambda_i))^{1/2}$. In [16], I observed that when the front of the main capillary wave producing ejection collapses at the axis, the curvature reversal of the surface involved in the onset of ejection imply that all terms of the momentum equation should be locally comparable. In brief, the collapse of a wave with speed $V_L$ and amplitude $L$ leading to the ejection of a mass with characteristic radial size $R$ and axial speed $V$ should obey the dimensional balance:

$$O \left( \rho V^2 / L \right) \sim O \left( \mu V L \right) \sim O \left( \sigma R^{-2} \right)$$ \hspace{1cm} (1)

which together with the conservation of mass, i.e.

$$O \left( V R^2 \right) \sim O \left( V L R_o \right)$$ \hspace{1cm} (2)

leads to:

$$R / l_\mu \sim (V / V_o)^{-5/3}, \text{ or } R / R_o \sim \text{Oh}^{1/3} (V / V_o)^{-5/3},$$ \hspace{1cm} (3)

$$L / l_\mu \sim (V / V_o)^{-4/3}, \text{ or } L / R_o \sim \text{Oh}^{2/3} (V / V_o)^{-4/3},$$ \hspace{1cm} (4)

$$V_L / V_{\mu} \sim (V / V_o)^{3/2}, \text{ or } V_L / V_o \sim \text{Oh}^{-1/3} (V / V_o)^{3/2}$$ \hspace{1cm} (5)

In reality, the scaling relationships [5] hold for every wave with arbitrary wavelength $L$ that successfully arrives at the axis, be that wave one of the precursor wavelets or the main wave with a wavelength comparable to $R_o$. Indeed, when Oh is sufficiently small, the precursor waves segregate according to their wave speed $V_L$, forming the capillary ripples studied by different authors [17–19]: each individual wavelet arrival from the precursor wave pack [8, 11, 14, 15] produces its own collapse with curvature reversal and partial ejection, which is overcome by the more energetic wave leading to first successful ejection. For example, Deike et al [15] show in their figure 4b more than one partial velocity peak at the axis. In this sense, the wave collapse sequence observed is akin to a race among small, fast but weak devices and larger, slower but stronger ones: at some point, one of them has the right balance of velocity and strength to produce droplet ejection. A salient feature observed at the collapse of the capillary wave pack at the axis is that the amplitude of the waves appear comparable to their wavelength (see [8], and [15] figure 4a). Close to collapse, a wave is akin to a hydraulic shoulder that often engulfs a tiny bubble after collapse.

For any wavelength $L$, one has $V_L \sim (\sigma / (\rho L))^{1/2}$, or $\rho V_L^2 \sim \sigma / L$. Moreover, given the near-zero stress condition at the surface, the strong wave leading to ejection would also induce a radial motion in the underlying layer of liquid with speed $V$ such that $\rho V^2 \sim \mu V / L$. $V$ is akin to the mass-transport velocity in the analysis of Longuet-Higgins [19]. One important remark here is that the induced velocity (or mass-transport velocity, see [19], figure 11) never overcomes the wave speed, i.e. $O (V) \lesssim O (V_L)$, which ensures that the mass balance $O (V R^2) \sim O (V L R_o)$ previously used is not altered. Indeed, one should expect that the ratio $V / V_L$ vanishes for vanishing Oh numbers: in this case, only the waves with wavelength comparable to $R_o$ which set in motion most of the liquid surrounding the bubble would produce sufficient push to eject a jet. Finally, the induced velocity $V$ should eventually be comparable to the axial speed $V$ due to conservation of momentum after collapse.

The reader can readily verify that these alternative arguments based on the wave pack collapse, i.e. $\rho V_L^2 \sim \sigma / L$ and $\rho V^2 \sim \mu V / L$ are exactly equivalent to say that all terms of the momentum equation at the location of collapse should balance, expressed as in [1]. Finally, the condition of an efficient collapse entails that the wave front should induce an axial motion sufficient to launch a liquid column at vertical distances comparable to $R_o$. This can be summarized in a global energy budget as (see [10]):

$$\left( \text{Oh}_1 \sigma R_o^2 - \mu \left( \sigma R_o^3 / \rho \right)^{1/2} \right) = k p V^2 R^2 R_o$$ \hspace{1cm} (6)

i.e. that the total available energy in the form of surface energy, proportional to $\sigma R_o^2$, minus the total viscous dissipation of the complete wave pack $\mu (\sigma R_o^3 / \rho)^{1/2}$ should be proportional to the mechanical energy of the liquid ejected column $\rho V^2 R^2 R_o$. At this point, one should be careful at considering what is understood as the ejection speed $V$ since it varies strongly with space and time time. Most authors take velocity measurements when the jet front reaches the level of the original free surface, which supports using $R_o$ as the characteristic length for the liquid column in the right hand side of (6). Besides, the constant $\text{Oh}_1$ is precisely that critical Ohnesorge number above which the viscous dissipation would overcome the available surface energy, as one may readily observe dividing the whole equation (6) by $\sigma R_o^2$. Combining equations (1), (2), and (6), one obtains [10]:

$$\frac{R}{l_\mu} = k_d \varphi^{5/4}, \quad \frac{V}{V_{\mu}} = k_v \varphi^{-3/4},$$ \hspace{1cm} (7)

where $\varphi = \text{Oh}^{-2} (\text{Oh}_1 - \text{Oh})$, or alternatively:

$$\frac{R}{R_o} = k_d \text{Oh}^{-1/2} (\text{Oh}_1 - \text{Oh})_o^{5/4} = k_d \varphi R_o,$$ \hspace{1cm} (8)
V/V_o = k_d Oh^{1/2} (Oh_1 - Oh)^{-3/4} = k_o \varphi_{vo}, \quad (9)

k_d and k_o would be expected to be universal constants under the same definite criteria to measure R and V, or at least have a weak dependency with Bo and Oh. Besides, one also obtains:

\frac{L}{R_o} \sim (Oh_1 - Oh)^{5/4}, \quad \frac{V_L}{V_o} \sim (Oh_1 - Oh)^{-1/2}. \quad (10)

From these results, one has

\frac{V}{V_L} \sim Oh^{1/2} (Oh_1 - Oh)^{-1/4} \quad (11)

As anticipated, V/V_L vanishes for vanishing Oh, providing consistent support to all prior assumptions. This means that in the limit Oh → 0, one should expect a significant deviation from the scaling proposed, since in this limit the large wavelength waves would take over as experimentally observed. In summary, we have to possible causes of deviation: (i) very small Oh values, and (ii) non small Bo values.

About 350 published experimental and numerical data since 1954 (see table 1) have been analyzed [5,10,12,13,20,22]. The liquid properties are listed in table 1. A first important remark here is that we are considering the scaling laws for the ejection of the first drop (or top jet drop), which entails univalued universal constants. This does not exclude the ejection of other subsequent differently sized droplets; in particular, one can observe how the first smallest waves eject a first small drop if they are sufficiently energetic, while the last wave may also eject a large drop (see [14], figures 15 and 16). Second, we use experimental data where the authors measure the velocity of ejection when the jet front reaches the free surface; we call this V, while the final ejection velocity of the droplet (right at pinch-off, as considered by Deike et al. [15]) will be called V_j.

For the first drop, the scaling laws (7) and (8) in [16] showed a very good agreement with experiments for Bond numbers Bo < 0.1. However, as anticipated, one can observe apparent deviations from the alternative form of the scaling laws [8] and [9] for both very small Oh and Bo of the order unity.

Deike et al. [15] made an exhaustive numerical analysis on the dynamics of the ejected jets, proposing a correction of the form k_o (Bo) = Oh^{3/4} (1 + \alpha Bo)^{-3/4} for the scaling law (8) in [16] when Bo > 0.1, with a critical Ohnesorge number Oh_D = La_c^{-1/2} = 0.045 (Gaián-Calvo previously obtained a critical value Oh* = 0.043), and \alpha = 2.2. Their model is applied to the same data of figure 1 defining the appropriate scaling variable as

\varphi_{Deike} = Oh^{-2/3} (Oh_D - Oh) (1 + \alpha Bo) \quad (12)

Deike’s proposal improves significantly (see figure 3) the dispersion observed in figure 1. However, that proposal does not address simultaneously the outstanding issues for both Oh → 0 and non small Bo. To do so, we propose:

1. The induced momentum \rho V^2 comes from both the faster wave by viscous mechanisms, i.e. \mu V_L/L, and from the final inertial push of the largest wave, i.e. \rho V_o^2. This can be formulated as:

\rho V^2 \sim \mu V_L + \rho V_o^2 \quad (13)
FIG. 2. Non-dimensional ejection speed as a function of the scaling variable \( \varphi_{\text{Deike}} \). The first five data sets show \( V/V_o \), while the last three ones are for \( V/V_o \). Both data sets show deviations below 20% from the model proposed by Deike at al. [15].

where the constant \( \text{Oh}_2 \) is called this way because it will indeed have that specific physical meaning: it will signal the small limiting value of \( \text{Oh} \) below which the inertial push of the large wave takes over. It is expected to have a universal value for this problem. Retracing the same steps as before, one arrives to the following scaling expressions:

\[
\frac{V}{V_o} \sim \left(1 + \frac{\text{Oh}_2}{\text{Oh}}\right)^{1/5} \left(\frac{R}{R_o}\right)^{-3/5},
\]

Alternatively, one has

\[
\frac{V}{V_o} \sim (\text{Oh} + \text{Oh}_2)^{1/5} \left(\frac{R}{R_o}\right)^{-3/5}.
\]

2. The gravity potential imbalance \( \rho g R_o \) created by the cavity after the film burst should be taken into account as an additional asset of energy proportional to \( (\rho g R_o) R_o^3 \) for the ejection. This should be formulated as an augmented version of equation [6]:

\[
\text{Oh}_1 \sigma R_o^2 - \mu \left(\frac{\sigma R_o^3}{\rho}\right)^{1/2} + k_{\text{bo,1}} (\rho g R_o) R_o^3 = k' \rho V^2 R^2 R_o,
\]

or in non-dimensional form:

\[
\text{Oh}_1 - \text{Oh} + k_{\text{bo,1}} \text{Bo} = k' \frac{\rho}{\sigma R_o} V^2 R^2,
\]

where both \( k_{\text{bo,1}} \) and \( k' \) are expected, again, to have universal values under the same criteria to measure \( R \) and \( V \). In this regard, it is worth noting that equation [16] assumes a balance that should hold at each point of the ejection, which entails having different values for \( k_{\text{bo,1}} \) and \( k' \) if one considers that \( V \) is the jet front speed measured at the free surface or anywhere else. We will come back to this issue once we get to the experimental validation.

Given that the ejected droplet radius \( R \) has an unequivocal final value, while \( V \) depends on the measurement criteria, we can first focus on the scaling law of \( R \). Eliminating \( V \) from (14) or (15), and (17), one explicitly has for the ejected droplet radius:

\[
\frac{R}{R_o} \sim \left(\frac{\text{Oh}^{-1} (\text{Oh} - 1 + k_{\text{bo,1}} G)}{1 + (\text{Oh} R_o)^{1/2}}\right)^{5/4} \equiv \varphi_R,
\]

where \( G = \text{Bo}/\text{Oh} \) is the ratio of gravity over viscous forces, with \( k_{\text{bo,1}} \) a fitting constant. Alternatively, from [18], one has:

\[
\frac{R}{R_o} \sim \left(\frac{\text{Oh}_1 - \text{Oh} + k_{\text{bo,1}} \text{Bo}}{\text{Oh} + \text{Oh}_2}\right)^{5/4} \equiv \varphi_R \text{Oh}^2.
\]

One would expect that the experiments should provide universal values of the critical numbers \( \text{Oh}_1 \) and \( \text{Oh}_2 \). To this end, one may use the same experimental data set of figures [1] employed in [13]. First, \( \text{Oh}_1 \) and \( \text{Oh}_2 \) are resolved together with the fitting parameters \( k_{\text{bo,1}} \) and \( k_{\text{bo,2}} \) by any valid optimization method (e.g. minimum least squares) using measurements of the jet droplet radius \( R \). The optimum fitting is shown in figure [2] with \( \text{Oh}_1 = 0.038 \) (very close to Walls’ critical value 0.037), \( \text{Oh}_2 = 0.0045 \), \( k_{\text{bo,1}} = 0.006 \). The scaling prefactor such that \( R/R_o = k_d \varphi_R \) results \( k_d = 0.9 \).

The extraordinary fitting found (compare figures [1a and 1b]) validates the proposed scalings (18) and (19). These scalings encapsulate a very rich physical spectrum summarized in the following:

1. The number \( \text{Oh}_1 \) indicates the limiting value of the Ohnesorge number for which the droplet radius nearly vanishes, and below which no droplet ejection takes place. Walls obtained \( \text{Oh}_1 \approx 0.037 \) while we propose \( \text{Oh}_1 = 0.038 \) (practically indistinguishable) when \( \text{Bo} \to 0 \). More precisely, to this end one should have \( G \to 0 \).

2. The number \( \text{Oh}_2 \) (small compared to \( \text{Oh}_1 \)) is the value of the Ohnesorge number below which viscous forces become negligible compared to capillary and inertia forces. The main mechanism leading to ejection becomes the collapse of the larger and slower non-linear capillary wave which inertially pushes the liquid towards the axis. In this region (\( \text{Oh} \ll \text{Oh}_2 \)) the inviscid limit studied by Boulton-Stone and Blake is beautifully recovered [11] (data from their figure 4a & 4b; see figure [3] here). The resulting limit is a function of the Bond number:

\[
\frac{R}{R_o} = k_d \text{Oh}_2^{-1/2} (\text{Oh}_1 + k_{\text{bo,1}} \text{Bo})^{5/4}.
\]

3. In the intermediate asymptotic region \( \text{Oh}_1 \gg \text{Oh} \gg \text{Oh}_2 \), one has \( R/R_o \approx \).
or alternatively:

$$V \sim \frac{(Oh + Oh_2 - k_{Bo,2}Bo)^{1/2}}{(Oh - Oh + k_{Bo,1}Bo)^{-3/4}} \equiv Oh \varphi_V.$$  

Thus, doing the same optimum collapse process as for the droplet radius, one effectively obtains $Oh_1 = 0.038$ and $Oh_2 = 0.0045$, consistently with expectations, and $k_{Bo,1} = 0.14$ and $k_{Bo,2} \approx 0.004$, with a scaling prefactor $k_V = 13.5$ such that $V/V_o = k_V \varphi_V$. Again, a very good collapse is obtained (compare data dispersion in either figures 1 or 2 with the one of lower panel in figure 4), validating the proposed model and resulting scaling. Observe that the inviscid limit (lower panel) is also recovered for the jet speed, naturally.
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