Analytical formula for cluster diameter and its dispersion at the end of nucleation stage
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We analyze cluster size evolution when supersaturated gas cools down and forms small clusters or droplets. Main focus of this study is nucleation stage when there is a barrier for nucleation of small clusters due to surface effects. In the nucleation stage, as gas cools down and the saturation pressure drops precipitously with the temperature faster than gas pressure, the gas becomes supersaturated and therefore out of equilibrium (the gas pressure is higher than saturated vapor pressure). The return to equilibrium occurs in the nucleation burst via the rapid formation of small clusters/droplets, when the barrier to formation of small clusters due to surface tension can be overcome at sufficiently lower temperature due to the supersaturation degree increase. The time elapsed before the clusters are generated is the nucleation burst time. The corresponding value of the supersaturation degree are crucial parameters describing the process of cluster formation and growth. We have derived the relation between the time of nucleation burst, the corresponding value of the supersaturation degree, as well as the cluster size and its dispersion at the end of nucleation stage and rate of gas cooling. We find that the cluster size and its dispersion are proportional to the gas pressure and inversely proportional to the cooling rate.

I. INTRODUCTION

Cluster growth in a cooling gas2,3 can be divided into two stages4,5: the nucleation and growth stage. As gas cools down and gas pressure drops below the saturation pressure, gas starts to form clusters. With further gas temperature drop, the saturation pressure decreases precipitously with the temperature faster than gas pressure, and the gas becomes supersaturated and therefore out of equilibrium, because the gas pressure is higher than saturated vapor pressure. Here, we only consider homogeneous nucleation where small cluster/droplets form in its own gas (as opposed to heterogeneous nucleation which denotes the condensation of impurities). We consider here mostly condensation of metal cluster formation in plasmas, though analytical formulas can be applied to other cases. Metal clusters form at temperatures of order few thousands. This high temperature typically achieved in plasma arc or torch6,7. In the nucleation stage, as gas cools down and the saturation pressure drops precipitously with the temperature faster than gas pressure, the gas becomes supersaturated and therefore out of equilibrium (the gas pressure is higher than saturated vapor pressure). The return to equilibrium occurs in the nucleation burst via the rapid formation of small clusters/droplets, when the barrier to formation of small clusters due to surface tension can be overcome at sufficiently lower temperature due to the supersaturation degree increase. The time elapsed before the clusters are generated in nucleation burst and corresponding value of the supersaturation degree are crucial parameters describing the process of cluster formation and growth. A good description of the nucleation process can be given by the classical nucleation theory (CNT)6,9. In this paper, we are also using a moment model developed by Friedlander10. During the gas cooling when monomers associate to form clusters, small clusters form first and later grow by absorbing more and more monomers. However, formation of small clusters is energetically unfavorable. They have to overcome an energy barrier10 ΔΦ = Φ − Φ0, where Φ is the thermodynamic potential of the system \{vapour, liquid drop\} and Φ0 the potential of the system before the liquid drop formation. Let’s express the energy barrier which needs to be overcome for a cluster containing n monomers to form:

\[ \Delta \Phi = \mu_l n_l + \mu_g n_g + 4\pi r^2 \sigma - \mu_g (n_g + n_l) \]
\[ = -(\mu_g - \mu_l) n_l + 4\pi r^2 \sigma \]
\[ = -\frac{\mu_l - \mu_g}{N_A} n + \epsilon_s n^{2/3} \]  

(1)

Here \( n_l \) and \( n_g \) are the amount of liquid and gas in the final state (the total amount of matter \( n_g + n_l \) is conserved). In the last equation, the first term in the right-hand side (RHS) corresponds to the binding energy of atoms within the liquid volume; \( \mu_l \) is the molar liquid chemical potential, and \( \mu_g \) is the molar gas chemical potential, \( N_A \) is the Avogadro number. Second term in the RHS corresponds to the surface energy (it is proportional to the cluster surface area or \( n^{2/3} \)), which, in fact represents an effect of the binding energy reduction for such processes as agglomeration10 or condensation11.

In this paper, we are interested in determining how does the transition time between the two stages and the mean cluster diameter and its dispersion vary with the cooling rate and initial gas pressure.

In order to describe these variations, we need to study the particle’s nucleation and growth. A good description of the nucleation process can be given by the classical nucleation theory (CNT)6,9. In this paper, we are also using a moment model developed by Friedlander10. During the gas cooling when monomers associate to form clusters, small clusters form first and later grow by absorbing more and more monomers. However, formation of small clusters is energetically unfavorable. They have to overcome an energy barrier10 ΔΦ = Φ − Φ0, where Φ is the thermodynamic potential of the system \{vapour, liquid drop\} and Φ0 the potential of the system before the liquid drop formation. Let’s express the energy barrier which needs to be overcome for a cluster containing n monomers to form:

\[ \Delta \Phi = \mu_l n_l + \mu_g n_g + 4\pi r^2 \sigma - \mu_g (n_g + n_l) \]
\[ = -(\mu_g - \mu_l) n_l + 4\pi r^2 \sigma \]
\[ = -\frac{\mu_l - \mu_g}{N_A} n + \epsilon_s n^{2/3} \]  

(1)

Here \( n_l \) and \( n_g \) are the amount of liquid and gas in the final state (the total amount of matter \( n_g + n_l \) is conserved). In the last equation, the first term in the right-hand side (RHS) corresponds to the binding energy of atoms within the liquid volume; \( \mu_l \) is the molar liquid chemical potential, and \( \mu_g \) is the molar gas chemical potential, \( N_A \) is the Avogadro number. Second term in the RHS corresponds to the surface energy (it is proportional to the cluster surface area or \( n^{2/3} \)), which, in fact represents an effect of the binding energy reduction for
the surface tension coefficient $\gamma$ is the specific surface energy of the cluster which can be deduced from the surface tension coefficient $\gamma \ (N m^{-1})$ by $\epsilon_s = 4\pi r_0^2 \gamma$, where $r_0$ is the Wigner-Seitz radius.

For an ideal gas and incompressible liquid, the chemical potential difference can be written as:

$$\mu_l - \mu_g = k N_1 T \ln(S)$$

where the supersaturation degree $S$ is defined using $N_1$ - the monomer’s density in the gas, $N_{sat}$ - the density corresponding to the saturation conditions:

$$S = \frac{P}{P_{sat}} = \frac{N_1}{N_{sat}}$$

The saturation pressure $P_{sat}$ being given by the Clausius-Clapeyron law:

$$P_{sat}(T) = P_{a_0} e^{\frac{\mu_g - \mu_l}{kT}}$$

where $(P_{a_0}, T_0)$ is a couple of tabulated pressure and temperature for a given material, $T$ is the actual temperature, $P$ - actual pressure, $k$ is Boltzmann’s constant, and $\epsilon_a$ is the vaporization energy per atom.

Typical profile of the $G_n$ function for fixed temperature and supersaturation degree $S$ is shown in Fig.1. The function is non-monotonic, for small clusters the free surface energy (second term in the RHS of Eq.(1)) dominates over the binding energy (first term in the RHS of Eq.(1)) and the Gibbs energy $G_n$ is growing with $n$. At some value of $n$ commonly referred as the critical number $n_c$ (corresponding to critical size $r_c = r_W n_c^{1/3}$)

$$n_c = \left(\frac{2\epsilon_s}{3kT \ln S}\right)^{3/2}$$

the function reaches its maximum and then monotonically decreases. In other words, for small clusters with less atoms than $n_c$, growth is energetically unfavorable (attachment of each next atom to the cluster results in the Gibbs energy increase), but for larger clusters with more atoms than $n_c$ growth is energetically favorable. Hence, once a cluster has reached a critical size it will spontaneously and unimpededly grow by consuming the gas monomers depositing on its surfaces. But to reach the critical size, a cluster needs to overcome the energy barrier $G(n_c) = 4\epsilon_s^2 / 27(kT \ln(S))^2$, thus the production of critical size clusters is a slow process, especially when $S$ is small.

As pointed out in Bakhtar’s paper, historically there were two approaches in developing the CNT: a thermodynamic approach and a statistical approach. Unfortunately, despite a century of research there is still space for a definitive nucleation theory to emerge. One of the main point of contention of the CNT is the capillary approximation which extends the bulk thermodynamic properties to nano-scale clusters, which lead in turn to errors in estimating the free energy of small clusters. There were several attempts to correct this problem, but the most consistent with discrete codes one (consistent does not necessarily mean experimentally accurate) is Girshick correction which lead to the following expression of the rate of production of particles of critical size $n_c$ or nucleation rate:

$$J = N_1 N_{sat} V_1 \sqrt{\frac{2\gamma}{\pi m_a}} e^{\theta - 4\theta^3 / 27 \ln(S)^2}.$$
Here, $t_0$ is time when the nucleation burst occurs, or simply nucleation time and $N_0$ - the initial density of the monomer gas. The time $t_0$ and corresponding value of $S$ are crucial parameters describing when mass cluster formation and further growth happens in the cooling gas. These parameters are the main focus of this paper.

There are multiple papers on numerical modeling the nucleation and growth processes using NGDE model or Kinetic Monte Carlo\cite{28} but not only are they computationally demanding, but they suffer (especially NGDE) from numerical diffusion due to discretization of the cluster size distribution in the numerical model. They also fail to capture simultaneously the nucleation event and the nanoparticle growth, since these are on different scales. An analytical solution would be useful and would allow an easy calculation of the main parameters without the need of running the simulations.

In the following chapters, we derive an analytical expression for $t_0$ and corresponding $S$ based on a simple and accurate moment model for the cluster size distribution derived by S.K. Friedlander\cite{11}. We show how these parameters as well as the mean diameter of the clusters depend on the initial condensing vapor pressure $P_0$ and the cooling rate $T_0$.

### II. FRIEDLANDER’S MODEL

The Friedlander’s moment model\cite{11} is a system of equations for certain moment of the particles size distribution, linking the total surface area $A$ of particles above the critical diameter $d_p^c$ to the total number of particles $N$ with $d_p > d_p^c$. If we consider the particle size distribution $n(d_p)$ where $d_p$ is the actual diameter of a given particle then its first three moments are given by:

$$N = \int_{d_p^c}^{\infty} n(d_p) d(d_p), \quad M_1 = \int_{d_p^c}^{\infty} d_p n(d_p) d(d_p), \quad A = \int_{d_p^c}^{\infty} \pi d_p^2 n(d_p) d(d_p).$$

It is then possible, by supposing a growth law of the form: $\frac{dA}{dt} = 2(N - N_{sat})V_1 \sqrt{\frac{kT}{2\pi m}}$ to write Eq(9)-(11). This growth law (number of available monomers times the thermal speed) neglects agglomeration and puts us in the free molecular range\cite{28}. We then write a monomer balance in the form of Eq.(12) to complete our model:

$$\frac{dN}{dt} = J$$

$$\frac{dM_1}{dt} = 2r_W n_c^{1/3} J + 2V_1 v_{th}(N_1 - N_{sat})N$$

$$\frac{dA}{dt} = A_1 n_c^{2/3} J + 4\pi V_1 v_{th}(N_1 - N_{sat})M_1$$

$$\frac{dN_1}{dt} = -n_c J - v_{th}(N_1 - N_{sat})A$$
Eq. (9) describes the evolution of the clusters density \( N \); only clusters above critical size are considered. Clusters of critical size form at a rate \( J \) which is determined by Eq. (6), and all the clusters formed stay above critical size because they only grow and never reduce in size. Agglomeration of clusters is not considered in the model, which is a valid simplification for nucleation stage.

Eq. (10) describes size evolution of the clusters average diameter. \( M_1 \) is first moment of the clusters size distribution, i.e. clusters average diameter times their density \( N \). First term in the right-hand side (RHS) accounts for formation of new clusters of critical size. The second term in the RHS stands for the clusters growth via atoms deposition on their surface. It is convenient that clusters diameter growth rate depends only on the deposition flux and does not depend on a cluster size. This is equivalent to ignore the effect of surface curvature on saturation pressure. Net deposition flux is derived as difference between evaporation and deposition fluxes: \( V_1 v_{th} (N_1 - N_{sat}) \). Here, \( v_{th} = \sqrt{\frac{4kT_v}{\pi m_a}} \) is the thermal velocity of the monomers.

Eq. (11) describes evolution of the clusters average area (second moment of the size distribution). \( A \) is clusters total surface area within a gas volume unit. As in equations (10) and (12), the first term in the RHS stands for formation of new critical size clusters \( (A_1 = 4\pi r_c^2) \), the second term in the RHS accounts for the surface deposition \( (V_1 \) is volume occupied by a monomer within a cluster, \( V_1 = \frac{4\pi r_c^3}{3} \).

Eq. (12) describes decay of the monomers density due to formation of new clusters and the gas condensation on the surface of existing clusters.

We performed simulations with both the Friedlander’s model and the NGDE solver for an example of Aluminum vapor cooling with \( T_0 = 1000 \) K/s and \( T_0 = 1773 \) K. At the initial moment saturated gas is considered \( (S = 1) \). Fig. 2 and Fig. 3 shows the comparison between two models. There is a very good agreement between the Friedlander’s model and the full general differential equation, showing that agglomeration of clusters (which is neglected in the Friedlander’s model but accounted in NGDE) does not play a significant role during the nucleation stage.

We also verified the negligible role that the carrier gas plays in our case. We used Wedekind work to change the nucleation rate and observed negligible change in the final diameter. We conclude that the thermalization with the carrier gas is sufficiently rapid to keep nucleation under isothermal condition.

### III. ANALYTIC EXPRESSION FOR THE NUCLEATION TIME

In this section we give an analytic expression to the crucial parameter that describes the nucleation stage - the nucleation time \( t_0 \). As we will see further, once we have found \( t_0 \), using Eq.(7) and the Friedlander’s model, we can express such quantities as the total number of nucleated particles and their final diameter.

In order to find this time, we need to understand the reason of such an abrupt and rapid drop in the supersaturation degree when the gas is cooling at a constant rate. In Appendix 1 we derive, from the Friedlander’s model and the full general differential equation, the following equation for the evolution of \( S \):

\[
\frac{dS}{dt} = -\frac{T_0 v_a}{kT_0^2} S + (S - 1)v_{th} A = 0
\]

At the beginning \( A \) is small since the critical size is infinite \((S \) close to 1) and clusters can not durably form via monomer attachment. We can neglect the term in \( A \) which gives us an exponential growth of \( S \).

When \( A \) becomes sufficiently big, because of it growing as the triple integral of \( J \) (increasing function of \( S \), which is clear if we substitute Eq. (9) in Eq. (10) and Eq. (11)), we can neglect the middle term. It leads us to an equation on \( S - 1 \), since \( \frac{dS}{dt} = \frac{d(S-1)}{dt} \). We deduce from this equation a rapid decrease of \( S - 1 \) to 0. The reason of
the very sharp drop of the supersaturation is, as expected - the strong non-linear dependence of the nucleation rate on $S$. This strong dependence (see Fig.10 for $J$ and $N$ and Fig.3 for $N_0$) allows us to evaluate the coefficients of $A$, $M_1$, and $N$ in $t_0$, because of their slower time variation. Physically it means that we can neglect the history of their evolution because of the very sharp increase of $J$ and of the moments that are mainly integrals of $J$. We can thus find $A$ by integrating Eq.(10-12) and suppose $dS/dt = 0$ in Eq.(9). It is thus sufficient for finding $t_0$ - the time at which $dS/dt = 0$, to estimate the increase rate of $J$, for example by approximating it with an exponential function. This is done in Appendix I.

It is convenient to work with the following dimensionless time:

$$u_0 = \frac{\Delta T}{T_0} = \frac{T_0 - T(t_0)}{T_0} = \frac{T_0 t_0}{T_0}$$

IV. DIAMETER

Let’s recall Girshick’s reasoning which explains the dependence of the mean diameter on $T_0$ and $N_0$ using the system’s response time to the rise in supersaturation $	au = \frac{1}{N_0\beta_{11}}$, where $\beta_{11}$ ($m^3 s^{-1}$) is the collision frequency function for Brownian collisions between monomers.

Suppose that there is an increase in the cooling rate $T_0$, the response time remaining the same, we will have a rise in the supersaturation. This will lower the critical size at the nucleation burst and more particles will be available for condensation resulting in a decrease of the mean diameter.

If there is an increase in the pressure $P_0$, or equivalently $N_0$, the response time will decrease resulting in a quicker response of the monomers to supersaturation increase. The maximum supersaturation degree will then be lower resulting in an increase in the mean diameter.

We found an analytical formula in very good agreement with the simulations as shown in Fig.5 and Fig.6. It involves a $h$ function introduced in Appendix 1 and is given by:

$$u_0 = \frac{\Delta T}{T_0} = \frac{T_0 t_0}{T_0} = h \left( \frac{\alpha \theta_0 P_0}{2 \frac{T_0}{T_0}} \right)^{\sqrt{6}} - 1$$

Here $v_0$ is $v_{th}(t = 0)$, $\theta(t = 0)$ and $b$ is given by $b = \frac{4\theta_0^2}{27(c_a/\kappa h_0 - 1)^2}$. We find the behavior announced in the abstract - $t_0$ has a weak dependence on the initial pressure and a strong one on the cooling rate since $T_0$ is a logarithmic function of pressure and the $h$ function is slowly varying.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>$\alpha T_0/T_0$</th>
<th>$\sqrt{b} \theta_0$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al</td>
<td>$8.9 \times 10^{21}$</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Au</td>
<td>$9.3 \times 10^{20}$</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>$3.3 \times 10^{21}$</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu</td>
<td>$9.9 \times 10^{22}$</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>$5.1 \times 10^{12}$</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VIII. CONCLUSION

The simulations as shown in Fig.5 and Fig.6, confirms the predictions which were observed by Girshick. We should first show that Friedlander’s model have a low dispersion. This will allow us to give in Appendix 3 an analytic derivation of the mean diameter and dispersion.

In the abstract - $t_0$ has a weak dependence on the initial pressure and a strong one on the cooling rate since $T_0$ is a logarithmic function of pressure and the $h$ function is slowly varying.

![Graph of log-log scale between analytic diameter, and diameter from Friedlander’s model, here $T_0^* = 1000$ K/s and $d_1 = 2r_W$.](image)
FIG. 7: Comparison between analytic diameter, and diameter from Friedlander’s model, here $T_0^* = 1000$ K/s and $d_1 = 2r_W$.

FIG. 8: The first two moments of the particle size distribution $n(d)$ for $T_0 = 1773$ K and $T_0 = 10^5$ K/s.

We recognize a nucleation term in the two equations, and an attachment term in the diameter derivative. When the nucleation has finished, $J$ drops very rapidly to 0, so that only the mean diameter continues to grow because of a monomer deposition on the clusters. It eventually reaches an asymptote when excess of the monomers from the gas phase has condensed on the clusters and $S$ drops to 1 after the nucleation has finished. As expected, the dispersion $\sigma$ will reach an asymptote immediately after the nucleation. This dependence of the derivative in $J$ gives a low dispersion to Friedlander’s model.

Before the nucleation burst, the dispersion is low since very few particles are produced by $J$, and the exponential term will be a constant, after $J$ reaches its maximum, the very rapid drop of $J$ to 0 will stop the dispersion’s growth. The dispersion is thus negligible with respect to the mean diameter after nucleation. Numerical simulations with the NGDE code confirm this idea.

Since Friedlander’s model has a low dispersion as compared with the mean diameter, we can compute $\langle d \rangle$ using the total number of nucleated clusters $N_\infty = N(t = \infty)$. At the end, almost all the monomers are attached to clusters so that $N_0/N_\infty$ represent the average number of monomers in a cluster. From that, it is straightforward to deduce:

$$\langle d \rangle = \left( \frac{6V_1 N_0}{n N_\infty} \right)^{1/3}$$ \hspace{1cm} (18)

We thus only need to compute $N_\infty = \int_0^\infty J(t) \, dt$ which we know, in the absence of agglomeration to be close to $\int_0^{t_\tau} J(t) \, dt$ since almost all the particles come from the nucleation before the nucleation burst. We show in Appendix 3:

$$\langle d \rangle = \frac{8V_1 \varepsilon_v \nu_0}{27k_e a} \frac{P_0/T_0}{\ln(\alpha P_0/T_0)}$$

$$\sigma = \frac{\nu_0 V_1 \varepsilon_v}{3k_e a} \frac{P_0/T_0}{\ln(\alpha P_0/T_0)^{3/2}}$$ \hspace{1cm} (19)

This confirms the variations of $\langle d \rangle$ with the cooling rate and the pressure announced at the beginning.

We also see a linear dependence on pressure and power dependence on the cooling rate in agreement with Fig.7 and Fig.8.

V. CONCLUSION

In this study we derived an analytical formula for both mean diameter and its dispersion using a Friedlander’s momentum model at the end of the nucleation stage. We have derived the relation between the time of nucleation burst, the corresponding value of the supersaturation degree, as well as a the cluster size and it dispersion at the end of nucleation stage and rate of gas cooling. We find that the cluster size and its dispersion are proportional to the gas pressure and inversely proportional to the cooling rate. We compared our results with a nodal code (NGDE) and obtained excellent agreement.
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In this section we obtain an analytical formula for the nucleation time $t_0$ defined as $\frac{dN}{dt} (t = t_0) = 0$ using Friendlander’s moment equations Eq.(9-12). We first obtain a simplified version of these equations by neglecting the nucleation terms with $J$ in Eq.(10-12). Let’s show that for reasonable cooling rates (typically $T_0 < 10^6$ K/s) we can neglect the nucleation terms with respect to the deposition terms (containing $N_1 - N_{sat}$). Since $N = \int_0^\infty J(t)dt$ and $J$ is varying over a small time $\delta t$, we can write $N \approx J\delta t$, then near the nucleation burst $(t = t_0)$ in Eq.(12):

$$n_cJ \ll v_{th}(N_1 - N_{sat})A \approx v_{th}N_0A_1N \approx v_{th}N_0A_1J\delta t \quad (20)$$

Neglecting $n_cJ$ with respect to $v_{th}(N_1 - N_{sat})A$ is thus equivalent to showing that $n_c \ll v_{th}N_0A_1\delta t$. Here $v_{th}N_0A_1\delta t$ is the number of particles attached to a cluster during the nucleation burst (during $\delta t$). For low cooling rates this number is bigger than the critical number at the nucleation burst (where $n_c$ reaches its minimum).

Actually, during the nucleation burst a lot of clusters of critical size are formed and grow essentially from the monomer attachment, so the number of monomers that can attach during this time to a particular cluster, or $v_{th}N_0A_1\delta t$ should be much bigger than $n_c$ - the number of monomers in a nucleated cluster. Numerical simulations confirm this idea. If we compare the ratio between $v_{th}N_0A_1\delta t$ and $n_c$, we find for aluminium at $T_0 = 1773K : v_{th}N_0A_1\delta t/n_c \approx 10$ for $T_0 = 10^8$ K/s , and $v_{th}N_0A_1\delta t/n_c \approx 1000$ when $T_0 = 10^5$ K/s, as expected.

By neglecting nucleation terms, we simplify Friedlan-
der’s model as follows:

\[
\frac{dN_1}{dt} = -v_{th}(N_1 - N_{sat}) A
\]
\[
\frac{dA}{dt} = 4\pi V_1 v_{th}(N_1 - N_{sat}) M_1
\]
\[
\frac{dM_1}{dt} = 2V_1 v_{th}(N_1 - N_{sat}) N
\]
\[
\frac{dN}{dt} = N_1 N_{sat} V_1 \sqrt{\frac{2}\pi m_a} e^{\theta - 4\theta^3/27\ln(S)^2}.
\]

(21)

While replacing \( N_1 \) by \( N_0 \), we refer to Fig.3(a) to observe that the monomer’s density is almost constant throughout the nucleation process, before the nucleation burst. From a mathematical point of view it is due to our initial conditions in Eq.(10-12) since we set the derivatives of \( N_1 \) as being 0 at \( t = 0 \) up to the fourth order. Physically, we understand the slow variation of \( N_1 \) as a consequence of the high energy barrier that the small clusters need to overcome to grow and thus consume monomers.

Let’s then assume that \( N_1(t) = N_0 \) before \( t_0 \) and see how can we simplify the Friedlander’s model.

We replace for simplicity \( v_{th} \) by \( v_0 = v_{th}(t = 0) \), since \( v_{th} \) is a slowly varying function of \( T \), and introduce a dimensionless time by:

\[
u = \frac{T_0 t}{T_0}
\]

(22)

We accentuate that the difficulty of integrating Eq.(22) is in the dependence of the nucleation rate(RHS in the last equation of the set (22)) on \( N_1 \) via \( S \) (in a strongly non linear way). This mutual dependence of the main variables can be waded in the interval \([0, t_0]\) by approximating \( N_1 \) with \( N_0 \) as we did. Let’s express the nucleation rate as a function of \( u \) : \( S = N_1/N_{sat} \)

\[
\ln(S) \approx \ln\left(\frac{N_0}{N_{sat}}\right) = \ln(1 - u) + \frac{e_a}{kT_0} \left(1 - \frac{1}{u}\right)
\]

\[
\approx \left(\frac{e_a}{kT_0} - 1\right) u + \left(\frac{e_a}{kT_0} - \frac{1}{2}\right) u^2
\]

\[
\approx \left(\frac{e_a}{kT_0} - 1\right) u(1 + u)
\]

(23)

Now with \( N_1 N_{sat} \approx N_0^2 \) and \( \theta(0) = \theta_0 \) we can express \( J \) as:

\[
J(u) = N_0^2 V_1 \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{\pi m_a}} e^{\theta_0 g(u)}
\]
\[
g(u) = \frac{b}{u^2(1 - u)} \approx \frac{b(1 + u)}{u^2}
\]
\[
b = \frac{4\theta_0^3}{27\theta_0^2(kT_0 - 1)^2}
\]

(24)

The nucleation rate is now only a function of \( u \), which allows us to transform Eq.(22) into a directly integrable system of equations. To do so, let’s recall that from (Eq.3) and with \( P_{sat} = N_{sat} kT \) we get:

\[
\frac{dS}{du} = \frac{e_a}{kT_0} S + (S - 1) \frac{v_0 T_0}{T_0} A = 0
\]
\[
\frac{dA}{du} = \frac{T_0}{T_0} 4\pi V_1 v_0(N_0 - N_{sat}) M_1
\]
\[
\frac{dM_1}{du} = \frac{T_0}{T_0} 2V_1 v_0(N_0 - N_{sat}) N
\]
\[
\frac{dN}{du} = \frac{T_0}{T_0} N_0^2 V_1 \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{\pi m_a}} e^{\theta_0 / kT_0} e^{-g(u)}
\]

(25)

Even if (Eq.26) is a simplified version of (Eq.22), it is still impossible to integrate it analytically (because of \( e^{-g(u)} \)). In order to integrate the system, we will develop the nucleation rate near \( u_0 = \frac{\theta_0}{2b} \) as an exponential function. To do so, we write \( g \) near \( u_0 \) as \( g(u) \approx g(u_0) + (u - u_0) g'(u_0) \) and with \( g'(u_0) \approx -2b/u_0^3 \), we get:

\[
J = J(u_0) e^{-b(u-u_0) g'(u_0)} \approx J(u_0) e^{2b(u-u_0)/u_0^3}
\]

(26)

Now we can explicitly find \( N, M_1, A \) and \( N_1 \) by direct integration of Eq.(26). We see from Fig.10(b), the results of our approximations of \( J \) and the errors that we get by integrating one term \( J \) to obtain \( N \) on Fig.10(a). We will however perform this integration to find the nucleation time \( t_0 \) since the sharp increase of \( J \) ensures a small error in the nucleation time, as we will see further.

Now we replace \( N_0 - N_{sat}(t) \) by \( N_0 - N_{sat}(t_0) \approx N_0 \) following the idea that the coefficients have a slower variation in time than the moments (see section III). Replacing the coefficients by their value at \( t_0 \) allows us to analytically integrate (Eq.26). First it transforms into the system:

\[
\frac{dS}{du} = \frac{e_a}{kT_0} S + \frac{v_0 T_0}{T_0} A(S - 1) = 0
\]
\[
\frac{d^3 A}{du^3} = a e^{2b(u-u_0)/u_0^3}
\]
\[
a = \left(\frac{T_0}{T_0}\right)^3 8\pi V_1^2 v_0^2 N_0^2 J(u_0)
\]

(27)

Then, by neglecting the terms in \( e^{-2b/u_0^3} \) while integrating \( A \):

\[
A(u) = a \left(\frac{u_0^3}{2b}\right) e^{2b(u-u_0)/u_0^3}
\]

(28)

From (Eq.28) with \( S_{max} \) being the maximum supersaturation degree \( S(u_0) \) and with \( \frac{dS}{du}(u_0) = 0 \), we get:
\[ A(u_0) = \frac{c_a \dot{T}_0}{kT_0^2 v_0} \frac{S_{max}}{S_{max} - 1} \approx \frac{c_a \dot{T}_0}{kT_0^2 v_0} \]  

Using both (Eq.29) and (Eq.30) we obtain an equation on \( u_0 \):

\[ u_0^9 J(u_0) = \frac{b^5 e_a T_0^4}{\pi kT_0 v_0^3 V_1^2 N_0^2} \]  

We could find the nucleation time numerically from the last equation, but we notice that if we approach \( u_0^9 \approx (b/g(u_0))^{9/2} \) (from Eq.(25)), we can get an explicit formula using the W Lambert’s function(lambertw in Matlab or scipy.special.lambertw in Python).

\[ (g(u_0))^{-9/2} e^{-g(u_0)} = \left( \frac{T_0}{P_0} \alpha \right)^4 (3kT_0/8^{2/3} e_s)^{9/2} \approx \left( \frac{2T_0}{P_0} \alpha \theta_0 \right)^4 \]  

Here we neglected \( \sqrt{\theta_0} \) with only minor changes on the final result and approach \( 3/8^{2/3} \approx 1.89 \) with 2, and \( \alpha \) being given by:

\[ \alpha = e^{b_{v_0}/4} T_0^2 \frac{2\pi g_s}{m_a} \]  

So that:

\[ g(u_0) = \frac{9}{2} \left( \frac{2 \dot{T}_0}{\alpha \theta_0 P_0} \right)^{8/9} \]  

where \( g(u) \) was defined earlier in Eq.(25).

In our case, the inverse of \( u \mapsto \frac{b^{1+u}}{u^2} \) is:

\[ u \mapsto \frac{b}{2u} + \sqrt{\frac{b}{u} + \frac{b^2}{4u^2}} \approx \sqrt{\frac{b}{u} + \frac{b}{2u}} \approx u \mapsto e^{\sqrt{b}/\sqrt{u}} - 1 \]

Finally:

\[ u_0 = \frac{T_0 t_0}{T_0} = h \left( \frac{\alpha \theta_0 P_0}{2 T_0} \right)^{\sqrt{b}} - 1 \]

where \( h \) is given by:

\[ h(x) = \exp \left( \sqrt{\frac{2/9}{W(2x^{-8/3}/9)}} \right) \]

VII. APPENDIX 2

We will derive here a more simple, yet less accurate formula for the nucleation time \( u_0 \) that we will use further to express the mean diameter. Let’s find first an explicit expression of the monomer concentration \( N_1 \). From Eq.(22) with \( N_1 - N_{sat} \approx N_0 \):

\[ \frac{dN_1}{du} = -\frac{T_0}{T_0} u_0 N_0 A(u) \]

using Eq.(29) we obtain for \( N_1 \):

\[ N_1(u) = N_0 \left( 1 - v_0 \alpha \frac{T_0}{T_0} u_0^{12} e^{2b(u-u_0)/u_0^3} \right) \]

By looking at Fig.11 one can see that \( N_1(u_0) \approx 0 \) provides us with a good estimate of \( u_0 \). This is due to the very sharp increase in the second term of the RHS. Setting \( N_1(u_0) = 0 \) gives another equation on the nucleation time:

\[ u_0^{12} J(u_0) = \frac{2T_0^4 b^4}{\pi V_1^2 v_0^3 N_0^2 T_0^4} \]
We substitute \( u_0 = \left( \frac{2{T_0}^8}{\pi V_0^2 N_0^2} f(u_0) \right)^{1/12} \) in Eq.(31) to obtain:

\[
J(u_0) = \frac{e^4 T_0^4}{\pi k^4 T_0^8} v_0^{1/2} \nu^2
\]

(39)

so that finally with \( g(u) \approx b/u^2 \):

\[
u_0 = \sqrt{\frac{b}{4 \ln(\alpha P_0/T_0)}}
\]

(40)

VIII. APPENDIX 3

In this section we derive an expression for the mean diameter \( \langle d \rangle \) and of the dispersion \( \sigma \) after the nucleation burst, when the monomers have condensed on the clusters and S has become equal to 1. This corresponds to the asymptotic values of \( \frac{M_1}{N} \) and of \( \sqrt{A/\pi N} - (M_1/N)^2 \) from Friedlander's model Eq.(9-12). We want to integrate \( J \) on the interval \([0, u_0]\) since the main contribution to the total number of clusters in the absence of coagulation comes from the cluster nucleation, so that, using expression (27) for \( J \):

\[
N_\infty \approx N_{u_0} = \frac{T_0}{T_0} \int_{0}^{u_0} J(u_0) e^{2b(u-u_0)/u_0^3} du
\]

(41)

\[
= \frac{T_0 u_0^3}{2b T_0} J(u_0) \left( 1 - e^{-2b/u_0^3} \right)
\]

\[
\approx \frac{T_0 u_0^3}{2b T_0} J(u_0)
\]

In Section IV we showed that Friedlander’s model should have a low dispersion since the dispersion \( \sigma \) stops growing after the nucleation burst. In the limit of zero dispersion, average diameters of the clusters can be expressed via their average volume as follows:

\[
\langle d \rangle = \left( \frac{6 V_1 N_0}{\pi N_\infty} \right)^{1/3} \approx \left( \frac{12 V_1 N_0 b T_0}{\pi T_0 u_0^3 J(u_0)} \right)^{1/3}
\]

(42)

Using Eq.(31) we obtain

\[
\langle d \rangle = \left( \frac{3}{4} \right)^{1/3} \frac{T_0 v_0^6 \nu_0^3}{e_2^2} \frac{P_0}{T_0}
\]

(43)

With Eq.(40):

\[
\langle d \rangle = \frac{8 V_1 \epsilon_0 v_0}{27 k e_2} \frac{P_0/T_0}{\ln(\alpha P_0/T_0)}
\]

(44)

With Eq.(41), Eq.(29) which we integrate two times and neglect the exponential terms, we obtain (the expressions are evaluated in \( u_0 \) at the nucleation burst):

\[
\sigma^2 = \frac{A}{\pi N} - \left( \frac{M_1}{N} \right)^2
\]

(45)

\[
= 2 V_1^3 v_0^6 N_0^2 \frac{T_0^2 v_0^6}{T_0^2 b^2}
\]

\[
- V_1^2 v_0^6 N_0^2 \frac{T_0^3 u_0^6}{T_0^2 b^2}
\]

\[
(27 e_2^2 V_1 v_0^3 P_0 T_0)
\]

Combining Eq.(40) and Eq.(45) yields finally:

\[
\sigma = \sqrt{27 e_2^2 V_1 v_0^3 P_0 T_0}
\]

(46)

\[
- 16 k e_2 \sqrt{\theta} \ln(\alpha P_0/T_0)^{3/2}
\]

(47)

We can see on Fig.12 how \( \sigma \approx \langle d \rangle \) at \( t_0 \) and how different they are at the end. We can recover this behaviour from the equations above.

FIG. 11: (a) Comparison between diameter and dispersion at \( t_0 \). (b) The diameter and dispersion at the end of the nucleation phase for \( P_0 = 1 \) atm