Drag Coefficient of a Rigid Spherical Particle in a Near-Critical Binary Fluid Mixture beyond the Regime of the Gaussian Model
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The drag coefficient of a rigid spherical particle deviates from the Stokes law when it is put into a near-critical fluid mixture in the homogeneous phase with the critical composition. The deviation ($\Delta \gamma_d$) is experimentally shown to depend approximately linearly on the correlation length far from the particle ($\xi_\infty$), and is suggested to be caused by the preferential attraction between one component and the particle surface. In contrast, the dependence was shown to be much steeper in the previous theoretical studies based on the Gaussian free-energy density. In the vicinity of the particle, especially when the adsorption of the preferred component makes the composition strongly off-critical, the correlation length becomes very small as compared with $\xi_\infty$. This spatial inhomogeneity, not considered in the previous theoretical studies, can influence the dependence of $\Delta \gamma_d$ on $\xi_\infty$. To examine this possibility, we here apply the local renormalized functional theory, which was previously proposed to explain the interaction of walls immersed in a (near-)critical binary fluid mixture, describing the preferential attraction in terms of the surface field. The free-energy density in this theory, coarse-grained up to the local correlation length, has much complicated dependence on the order parameter, as compared with the Gaussian free-energy density. Still, a concise expression of the drag coefficient, which was derived in one of the previous theoretical studies, turns out to be available in the present formulation. We show that, as $\xi_\infty$ becomes larger, the dependence of $\Delta \gamma_d$ on $\xi_\infty$ becomes distinctly gradual and close to the linear dependence.

1. Introduction

The Brownian motion has been one of the main topics in the physics for a long time \cite{Bian2016}. When a rigid spherical particle moves translationally at a sufficiently low constant speed in a quiescent one-component fluid, the fluid exerts a drag force, whose magnitude is proportional to the particle speed. The constant of proportionality, called the drag coefficient, is given by $6\pi \eta_o a$, where $\eta_o$ is the fluid viscosity and $a$ is the particle radius, according to the Stokes law \cite{Stokes1851}. The self-diffusion coefficient of a colloidal particle is usually equal to $k_B T$ divided by the drag coefficient \cite{Sutherland1905, Einstein1905}, where $k_B$ is the Boltzmann constant and $T$ is the temperature of the fluid. This relation (Einstein’s relation) can be derived from a linear Langevin equation for the particle velocity even if it is generalized to have the memory kernel representing the back-flow effect \cite{Zwanzig1970, Widom1971, Caflisch1971, Kubo1991, Bian2016}. A Brownian particle has been used experimentally as a probe for local
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Some properties of a binary fluid mixture in the homogeneous phase near the demixing critical point can be also probed by a Brownian particle in the mixture \cite{Bonn2009, Mazur1978, van der Zwan1979, Furukawa2013, Barbot2015, Camley2014, Tani2018}. The particle surface usually attracts one of the two components more; this preferential attraction can be described using a surface field in a coarse-grained picture. As a result, the preferred component is absorbed near the particle surface; the composition deviation from the composition in the bulk decays very slowly in the adsorption layer, which extends from the surface by the thickness comparable with the correlation length of the order parameter in the bulk \cite{Cahn1977, Binder1983, Beysens1982, Holyst1987}.

It has been observed that the self-diffusion coefficient of a particle, put in a mixture with the critical composition, becomes smaller as the critical temperature is approached on the side of the homogeneous phase \cite{Bal'tsevich1967, Martynets1970, Lyons1973, Lyons1974, Lee1976, Omari2009}. Let us write $\gamma_d$, $\Delta \gamma_d \equiv \gamma_d - 6\pi \eta_o a$, and $\xi_\infty$ for the drag coefficient, the deviation of $\gamma_d$ from the Stokes law, and the correlation length far from the particle, respectively. Some researchers \cite{Lee1976, Omari2009} interpreted their data suggesting the linear dependence of $\Delta \gamma_d$ on $\xi_\infty$ by assuming the particle radius to be effectively enlarged by the thickness of the adsorption layer, which is on the order of $\xi_\infty$.

Clearly, the adsorption layer is not a part of a rigid particle; it can be deformed and is open to fluid flows. It is thus necessary to explain the deviation in terms of the hydrodynamics which can describe the flow in the adsorption layer. In this line of study, Okamoto et al. \cite{Okamoto2013} employed the hydrodynamics based on the Gaussian free-energy density with the surface field being considered, and revealed that the osmotic pressure due to the composition gradient around the particle can cause the deviation. However, their result of $\Delta \gamma_d$ is proportional to $\xi_\infty^6$, which is much steeper than the observed dependence. Their calculation, supposing sufficiently weak adsorption, was extended to treat strong adsorption in the framework based on the Gaussian free-energy density in \cite{Fujitani2018}, where the dependence of $\Delta \gamma_d$ on $\xi_\infty$ is still shown to be steeper than linear. The Gaussian model used in these previous studies supposes a small and homogeneous correlation length. However, as the adsorption is stronger, the correlation length near the particle becomes smaller than $\xi_\infty$ because the composition there becomes farther from the critical composition, which is realized far from the particle \cite{Okamoto2012}. This inhomogeneity can reduce the dependence of $\Delta \gamma_d$ on $\xi_\infty$ from the one in the Gaussian model.

In the present study, instead of the Gaussian model, we apply the renormalized local functional theory to consider the inhomogeneity. This theory was originally proposed by Fisher and Au-Yang \cite{Fisher1980} for static properties of binary fluid mixtures at the critical point and extended by Okamoto and Onuki \cite{Okamoto2012} to describe those near the critical point. In this theory, the free-energy density of the Ginzburg-Landau-Wilson type is coarse-grained up to the local correlation length, as mentioned in Sect. 2.1. From this density, the hydrodynamics for the length scales larger than the local correlation length can be formulated \cite{Yabunaka2013}, which is mentioned in Sect. 2.2. The procedure of formulating the hydrodynamics is the same as in the model H (a standard model for the critical dynamics) \cite{Hohenberg1977}.
the thermal noise need not be considered here for the dynamics at the large length scales (Okamoto et al. 2013; Furukawa et al. 2013). In fact, considering the thermal noise in a near-critical mixture does not change the Stokes law if the preferential attraction is not considered, according to Mazur & van der Zwan (1978).

The Gaussian free-energy density is composed of a quadratic function with respect to the order parameter and the square gradient term, while the density is much more complicated in the renormalized local functional theory. Still, a concise expression of the drag coefficient, which was previously derived in the Gaussian model (Fujitani 2018), is shown in Sect. 2.3 to remain available in the present study. The perturbation with respect to a dimensionless surface field, employed in (Fujitani 2018), is not available here. We instead devise an alternative procedure in Sect. 3.1. Two points peculiar to our calculation are stated in the rest of Sect. 3. Our results are shown in Sect. 4 and are discussed in Sect. 5.

2. Formulation

Suppose a near-critical binary fluid mixture with the critical composition in the homogeneous phase; $T$ is assumed to be homogeneous and close to the critical temperature $T_c$. The reduced temperature is defined as $\tau \equiv |T - T_c|/T_c > 0$. The composition is here represented by the difference between the mass densities of the two components, which is denoted by $\varphi$. We define $\psi$ as $\varphi - \varphi_c$, where $\varphi_c$ represents the critical composition. In the mixture bulk at the equilibrium, the order parameter $\psi$ fluctuates around zero with the time $t$ significantly on length scales smaller than the correlation length, and the thermal average of $\psi$ equals $\psi_c$. On larger length scales, we can neglect the fluctuation about the equilibrium profile, which can deviate from zero near a wall or a surface in contact with the mixture because of the preferential attraction. We assume the binary fluid mixture to be incompressible, which means that the sum of the mass densities of the two components is regarded as a constant.

In the renormalized local functional theory (Okamoto & Onuki 2012), the free-energy functional, given by (2.1) below, is renormalized up to the local correlation length, which is denoted by $\xi$. Minimizing the functional under appropriate boundary conditions thus gives the equilibrium profile coarse-grained up to $\xi$, as shown in (Okamoto & Onuki 2012; Yabunaka et al. 2013; Yabunaka & Onuki 2017). In the hydrodynamics, which is formulated on length scales larger than $\xi$, the coarse-grained profile of $\psi$ deviates from the equilibrium one to alter the non-dissipative stress determined by the free-energy functional (Yabunaka et al. 2015).

2.1. Statics

A single rigid spherical particle, with the radius $a$, is assumed to be fixed in the mixture. The $\psi$-dependent part of the free-energy functional is assumed to be given by

$$F[\psi] = \int_{V^e} dx \left[ f(\psi) + \frac{1}{2} M(\psi) |\nabla \psi|^2 \right] + \int_{\partial V} dS f_s(\psi),$$

(2.1)

where $\psi$ depends on the spatial position $x$. The first term on the right-hand side above is the volume integral over the mixture region $V^e$, while the second term is the surface integral over the particle surface $\partial V$. The definition of $f(\psi)$ is given below; $M(>0)$ depends on $\xi$ and is thus regarded as a function of $\psi$ at a given temperature. The surface energy density, denoted by $f_s(\psi)$, is assumed to be linear with respect to $\psi$; we suppose that the preferential attraction is caused by such a short-range interaction as the hydrogen bond. The surface field is defined as $h = -f'_s(\psi)$; the prime hereafter
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indicates the derivative with respect to the variable. In the Gaussian model, \( f(\psi) \) is a quadratic function and \( M \) is a constant. In the present study, employing the notation of [Okamoto & Onuki 2012], we instead assume

\[
f(\psi) \equiv k_B T_c \left( \frac{1}{2} C_1 \xi_0^{-2} \omega^{-1} \sigma \psi^2 + \frac{1}{12} C_1 C_2 \xi_0^{-2} \omega^{-2} \gamma^{-2} \psi^4 \right),
\]

(2.2)

according to the renormalized local functional theory. Hereafter, \( \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \nu, \) and \( \eta \) are the critical exponents for binary mixtures near the demixing critical point (or in the three-dimensional Ising model), \( C_1 \) is a nonuniversal constant, and \( C_2 \) is given by

\[
C_2 = 3 u^* C_1 \xi_0.
\]

(2.3)

Here, the scaled coupling constant \( u^* \) at the Wilson-Fisher fixed point is evaluated as \( u^* = 2 \pi^2 / 9 \) in the three dimensions at the 1-loop order. The "distance" from the criticality is represented by a dimensionless quantity \( \omega \), which is defined to give \( \xi = \xi_0 \omega^{-\nu} \) with \( \xi_0 \) denoting a nonuniversal microscopic length. A self-consistent condition gives

\[
\omega = \tau + C_2 \omega^{1-2\beta} \psi^2,
\]

(2.4)

which leads to \( \xi_\infty = \xi_0 \tau^{-\nu} \) because the composition is critical far from the particle. The coefficient of the square gradient term in (2.1) equals

\[
M = k_B T_c C_1 \omega^{-\eta \nu}.
\]

(2.5)

Using the procedure mentioned in the preface of Sec. 2, we find the equilibrium profile to satisfy

\[
0 = f'(\psi) - \frac{1}{2} M'(\psi) |\nabla \psi|^2 - M(\psi) \Delta \psi \quad \text{in} \quad V^e,
\]

(2.6)

which implies that the chemical potential conjugate to \( \psi \) vanishes at the equilibrium, and

\[
0 = h + M n \cdot \nabla \psi \quad \text{at} \quad \partial V,
\]

(2.7)

where \( n \) is the unit normal vector on the surface towards outside the particle.

We here assume that the preferential attraction is represented by only the surface field and neglect higher-order terms with respect to \( \psi \), such as the second-order term involving the surface enhancement (Bray & Moore 1977; Diehl 1986, 1997; Cardy 1996), to study how the adsorption influences the drag coefficient, as in the previous studies of the renormalized local functional theory or the deviation of the drag coefficient (Okamoto & Onuki 2012; Yabunaka et al. 2013; Yabunaka & Onuki 2017; Yabunaka et al. 2015; Okamoto et al. 2013; Furukawa et al. 2013; Fujitani 2018).

2.2. Dynamics

We can consider the hydrodynamics of the mixture on length scales larger than \( \xi \) to neglect fluctuations (Furukawa et al. 2013; Yabunaka et al. 2015; Fujitani 2017); hereafter \( \psi(x, t) \) represents the coarse-grained profile of the order parameter. In the dynamics, because of the local equilibrium, the chemical potential \( \mu \) is still given by the left-hand side of (2.6), i.e.,

\[
\mu(x, t) = f'(\psi) - \frac{1}{2} M'(\psi) |\nabla \psi|^2 - M(\psi) \Delta \psi \quad \text{for} \quad x \in V^e,
\]

(2.8)

and (2.7) holds as it is. The latter is mentioned at (62c) of (Diehl & Janssen 1992) and in Appendix A of (Okamoto et al. 2013). The first term of (2.7) generates the non-dissipative stress in the bulk, as in the model \( H \) (Hohenberg & Halperin 1977; Onuki 1991).
Writing \( \Pi \) for its negative, we have

\[
\Pi = \left( -f + \mu \psi - \frac{M}{2} |\nabla \psi|^2 \right) \mathbf{1} + M \nabla \psi \nabla \psi ,
\]

where \( \mathbf{1} \) denotes the isotropic tensor. Equation \( \text{(2.9)} \) with the composition gradient being neglected gives a better-known expression of the osmotic pressure exerted on a semipermeable membrane \( \psi f' - f \), which is mentioned in (de Gennes 1979) for example. The velocity field in the mixture \( \mathbf{v} \) satisfies the incompressibility condition \( \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0 \). Because of

\[
\nabla \cdot \Pi = \psi \nabla \mu ,
\]

the Stokes approximation gives

\[
0 = -\nabla p - \psi \nabla \mu + \eta_0 \Delta \mathbf{v} .
\]

Here, the viscosity \( \eta_0 \) is assumed to be homogeneous, considering the weak dependence of its singular part on \( \xi \) (Ohta 1975; Ohta & Kawasaki 1976). The convective term is neglected because we consider the regime the drag force is proportional to the particle speed. Here, the pressure \( p \) only plays a role of keeping the incompressibility. The diffusive flux between the two components is proportional to the gradient of \( \mu \), and the mass conservation of each component leads to

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \psi(x, t) = -\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \psi + \nabla \cdot [L(\psi) \nabla \mu] .
\]

The first and second terms on the right-hand side above represent the mass transport due to the convection and the one due to the diffusion, respectively. The Onsager coefficient \( L(>0) \) depends on \( \xi \) and is regarded as a function of \( \psi \) at a given temperature. This dependence is not negligible (Kawasaki 1970; Onuki 2002), as mentioned in Sect. 3.2.

We assume that the particle undergoes translational motion with a constant velocity \( \varepsilon U e_z \) in a quiescent fluid, where \( U \) is a nonzero constant with the dimension of speed, \( e_z \) denotes the unit vector along \( z \) axis, and \( \varepsilon \) is a dimensionless parameter introduced for convenience in calculating the drag coefficient. We set the spherical polar coordinate system \((r, \theta, \phi)\) so that the particle motion is along the polar axis, and consider the instance that the particle center passes the origin. The no-slip boundary condition is imposed at the particle surface. The diffusion flux cannot pass across the particle surface. We thus have

\[
\mathbf{v} = \varepsilon U e_z \text{ for } r = a \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{v} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } r \rightarrow \infty ,
\]

while we have

\[
L \partial_r \mu = 0 \text{ for } r = a \quad \text{and} \quad \mu \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } r \rightarrow \infty ,
\]

where \( \partial_r \) implies \( \partial / (\partial r) \). The first entry of \( \text{(2.14)} \) comes because the diffusive flux is defined on the frame co-moving with the particle. The surface boundary condition for \( \psi \) is given by \( \text{(2.7)} \); \( \psi \) approaches zero far from the particle. This and the second entry of \( \text{(2.14)} \) come because of the critical composition far from the particle. Viewed from the co-moving frame, the fields are stationary, and thus \( \text{(2.12)} \) leads to

\[
[\mathbf{v} - \varepsilon U e_z] \cdot \nabla \psi = \nabla \cdot [L(\psi) \nabla \mu] .
\]

We can consider the Stokes approximation for \( \text{(2.11)} \) on this co-moving frame.

2.3. Set up for calculations

We linearize the dynamics of the fields about the reference state, where the particle center is fixed at the origin and the ambient mixture is quiescent, as in (Fujitani 2018).
In this state, $\psi$ can be calculated from (2.6) and (2.7) with $\partial V$ being located at $r = a$; we write $\psi^{(0)}(r)$ for this solution, considering the rotational symmetry of the reference state. Over the mixture in this state, $\mu$ vanishes and $p$ equals a constant, for which we write $p^{(0)}$. Up to the order of $\varepsilon$, we expand the fields as

$$
\psi(x) = \psi^{(0)}(r) + \varepsilon \psi^{(1)}(x), \\
\mu(x) = \varepsilon \mu^{(1)}(x), \\
p(x) = p^{(0)} + \varepsilon p^{(1)}(x), \\
and\ \psi(x) = \varepsilon \psi^{(1)}(x),
$$

(2.16)

where each of the fields with the superscript $(1)$ is defined so that it becomes proportional to $\varepsilon$ after being multiplied by $\varepsilon$. They all vanish far from the particle because of the boundary conditions already mentioned. The time variable $t$ is not explicitly written here because we consider the instance specified above (2.13). Because of the symmetry of the particle motion, we use a spherical harmonics $Y_{10}(\theta) = \sqrt{3/(4\pi)} \cos \theta$ to have $\mu^{(1)}(x) = Q_{10}(r) Y_{10}(\theta)$ and $v_r^{(1)}(x) = R_{10}(r) Y_{10}(\theta)$,

(2.17)

whereby $Q_{10}$ and $R_{10}$ are defined. The $\theta$-component of the velocity, $v_{\theta}$, is related with $v_r$ through the incompressibility condition [Okamoto et al. 2013]. Using a dimensionless radial distance $\rho = r/a$, we introduce dimensionless functions,

$$
\mathcal{R}(\rho) = \frac{R_{10}(r)}{U} \sqrt{\frac{3}{4\pi}}, \quad Q(\rho) = \frac{Q_{10}(r)}{U \sqrt{\eta_o}} \sqrt{\frac{3}{20\pi}},
$$

(2.18)

and

$$
\Psi(\rho) = -\frac{\rho^2}{3\sqrt{5\eta_o} L(0)} \frac{d\psi^{(0)}(r)}{dr},
$$

(2.19)

where $L(0)$ is $L(\psi)$ for $\psi = 0$. We rewrite the $r$ and $\theta$ components of (2.11) at the order of $\varepsilon$ by using (2.16) and (2.17). Eliminating the term involving $p^{(1)}$ and using the incompressibility condition, we obtain

$$
\eta_o (\rho \partial_{\rho} + 1) (\rho \partial_{\rho} - 2) (\rho \partial_{\rho} + 3) \rho \partial_{\rho} \mathcal{R}(\rho) = -30 \Psi(\rho) Q(\rho).
$$

(2.20)

Equation (2.13) yields

$$
(\rho \partial_{\rho} - 1) (\rho \partial_{\rho} + 2) Q(\rho) = -3 \Psi(\rho) [A(\rho) (\mathcal{R}(\rho) - 1) - B(\rho) \partial_{\rho} Q(\rho)],
$$

(2.21)

where $A$ and $B$ are defined as

$$
A(\rho) = \frac{L(0)}{L(\psi^{(0)}(a \rho))} \quad \text{and} \quad B(\rho) = \frac{L(\psi^{(0)}(a \rho))}{a L(\psi^{(0)}(a \rho))} \sqrt{5\eta_o} L(0).
$$

(2.22)

Equation (2.13) gives

$$
\mathcal{R} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_{\rho} \mathcal{R} = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad \rho = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R} \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \rho \to \infty,
$$

(2.23)

while (2.14) gives

$$
\partial_{\rho} Q = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad \rho = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad Q \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \rho \to \infty.
$$

(2.24)

Regarding (2.20) as an equation for $\mathcal{R}$, we have

$$
\mathcal{R}(\rho) = 1 + \alpha_0(\rho) \int_1^{\infty} d\sigma \Gamma_{\mathcal{R}}(\rho, \sigma) \Psi(\sigma) Q(\sigma),
$$

(2.25)
where the kernel $\Gamma_R$ is given in Appendix and $\alpha_0$ is defined as

$$\alpha_0(\rho) = \frac{3}{2\rho} - \frac{1}{2\rho^3} - 1.$$  

(2.26)

Thus, $1 + \alpha_0(\rho)$ gives $R(\rho)$ in the absence of the preferential attraction.

The drag force is along the $z$ axis. Dividing its $z$ component at the order of $\varepsilon$ by $-\varepsilon U$ gives the drag coefficient $\gamma_d$. We write $E$ for the rate-of-strain tensor; $E_{xz} = (\partial_x v_x + \partial_z v_z)/2$, for example. The $z$ component of the drag force is given by \[\int_{\partial V} dS \, e_z \cdot \left( -II \cdot e_r + \nabla_{||}f_s - \frac{2f_s}{a} e_r - p\mathbf{1} \cdot e_r + 2\eta_o E \cdot e_r \right), \]  

(2.27)

where $\nabla_{||}$ denotes the projection of $\nabla$ on the tangent plane, $1/a$ is the mean curvature of the particle surface, and $e_r$ is the unit vector in the radial direction. The two terms involving $f_s$ in (2.27) are canceled with each other after the integration, and thus need not be considered here, as mentioned in Appendix A of Fujitani (2014). Writing $\varepsilon II^{(1)}$ for $II$ at the order of $\varepsilon$, we need to calculate the left-hand side of (2.28) below in calculating the contribution from the first term in the parentheses of (2.27) to $\gamma_d$. Because of (2.29), $II^{(1)}$ contains $\psi^{(1)}$, which satisfies (2.28). The distortion of the order-parameter profile from the equilibrium one naturally contributes to $\Delta \gamma_d$. Thus, it appears that, even after we have solved $R(\rho)$ and $Q(\rho)$ for a given $\Psi(\rho)$ to find $\mu^{(1)}$ and $\psi^{(1)}$, we still have to obtain $\psi^{(1)}$ from (2.28) in advance to calculate $\gamma_d$. However, this calculation can be evaded. We have

$$\int_{\partial V} dS \, e_z \cdot \left( -II \cdot e_r + \nabla_{||}f_s - \frac{2f_s}{a} e_r - p\mathbf{1} \cdot e_r + 2\eta_o E \cdot e_r \right) = \int_{\partial V} dS \, e_z \cdot \left( -II \cdot e_r + \nabla_{||}f_s - \frac{2f_s}{a} e_r - p\mathbf{1} \cdot e_r + 2\eta_o E \cdot e_r \right),$$  

where the two equalities are derived with the aid of (2.10) and Gauss’ divergence theorem. The formula given by (2.28) is helpful because its right-hand side does not contain $\psi^{(1)}$ and we need not obtain $\psi^{(1)}$ from (2.28). The formula is essentially the same as used at (37) of Fujitani (2018), where the author calculated the quantity corresponding with $\psi^{(1)}$ by solving a linear differential equation to derive the formula in the Gaussian model. This derivation cannot be applied in the present formulation because an analytical expression of $\psi^{(1)}$ cannot be derived from (2.8), which is highly nonlinear with respect to $\psi$. Equation (2.28) gives an alternative and much simpler derivation, which is valid in cases more general than the previous derivation, including the present formulation.

The rest terms in the integrand of (2.27) involve $p$ and $E$. The latter is rewritten in terms of $R$ through the definition of $E$. The former at the order of $\varepsilon$ is related to $R$ through the definition of $E$. The former at the order of $\varepsilon$ is related to $R$ with the aid of the $\theta$ component of (2.11). Thus, we can substitute (2.25) into the contribution to $\gamma_d$ from the last two terms in the parentheses of (2.27). With the aid of (A.2), we arrive at

$$\gamma_d = 6\pi\eta_o a \left( 1 + \frac{10}{3} \int_{1}^{\infty} d\rho \, \alpha_0(\rho) Q(\rho) \Psi(\rho) \right).$$  

(2.29)

The second term in the parentheses above gives $\Delta \gamma_d$ divided by $6\pi\eta_o a$ of the Stokes law. The quotient is below referred to as the normalized deviation, denoted by $\Delta \gamma_d$. Instead of using (A.2), we can use the Lorentz reciprocal theorem (Lorentz 1896) to derive (2.29), as shown in Appendix B of Fujitani (2018).
### 3. Elements of the calculation procedure

Our task is to calculate the drag coefficient by means of (2.29). For this, we should calculate \(Q\) by determining the dependence of \(L\) on \(\psi\) and by obtaining \(\psi^{(0)}\). How to carry out these steps are mentioned in the following subsections. In particular, in Sect. 3.1, we introduce an artificial parameter to derive a series expansion of the solution of the simultaneous equations (2.20) and (2.21). Simultaneous equations of the same type are derived in the Gaussian model in [Fujitani 2018], where the derivative of the difference in the mass densities in the reference state, corresponding with \(\psi^{(0)}\) in the present study, is proportional to the surface field and a series expansion with respect to a dimensionless surface field is naturally introduced. In contrast, in the present formulation, \(\Psi \propto \psi^{(0)}\) in (2.20) and (2.21) is not proportional to \(h\). This is the reason we need an artificial parameter.

#### 3.1. Calculation for \(Q\)

We introduce an artificial parameter \(\kappa\), and replace \(\Psi\) with \(\kappa \Psi\) in (2.20) and (2.21). The solutions of these modified equations become dependent on \(\kappa\), and are denoted by \(\tilde{Q}(\rho, \kappa)\) and \(\tilde{R}(\rho, \kappa)\). Below, we obtain \(\tilde{Q}\) instead of \(Q\) into (2.29) yields a series expansion of \(\Delta \gamma_d\) with respect to \(\kappa\). By putting \(\kappa\) equal to unity in this series, we obtain \(\Delta \gamma_d\) in the original problem.

After the modification mentioned above, we have (2.25) with \(\Psi(\sigma)\) being replaced by \(\kappa \Psi(\sigma)\). Then, a formal solution of (2.21) and (2.24) is

\[
\tilde{Q}(\rho, \kappa) = \kappa \int_1^{\infty} d\sigma \Gamma_Q(\rho, \sigma) \Psi(\sigma) \left[ A(\sigma) \left( \tilde{R}(\sigma, \kappa) - 1 \right) - B(\sigma) \partial_\sigma \tilde{Q}(\sigma, \kappa) \right].
\]  

(3.1)

where the kernel \(\Gamma_Q\) is shown in Appendix. Substituting (2.25) with the replacement into (3.1) gives an integral equation with respect to \(\tilde{Q}\). Writing \(\tilde{q}_1, \tilde{q}_2, \ldots\) for the expansion coefficients, we assume

\[
\tilde{Q}(\rho, \kappa) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \tilde{q}_n(\rho) \kappa^n.
\]

(3.2)

The difference in the braces of (3.1) equals \(A(\sigma)\alpha_0(\rho)\) at the order of \(\kappa^0\), and we obtain

\[
\tilde{q}_1(\rho) = \int_1^{\infty} d\sigma \Gamma_Q(\rho, \sigma) \Psi(\sigma) A(\sigma) \alpha_0(\sigma).
\]

(3.3)

Similarly, we obtain

\[
\tilde{q}_2(\rho) = -\int_1^{\infty} d\sigma \Gamma_Q(\rho, \sigma) \Psi(\sigma) B(\sigma) \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \tilde{q}_1(\sigma),
\]

(3.4)

and

\[
\tilde{q}_n(\rho) = \int_1^{\infty} d\sigma \left[ \Gamma(\rho, \sigma) \Psi(\sigma) q_{n-2}(\sigma) - \Gamma_Q(\rho, \sigma) \Psi(\sigma) B(\sigma) \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} q_{n-1}(\sigma) \right]
\]

(3.5)

for \(n = 3, 4, \ldots\), where the kernel \(\Gamma\) is defined as

\[
\Gamma(\rho, \sigma) = \int_1^{\infty} d\tau \Gamma_Q(\rho, \tau) \Psi(\tau) A(\tau) \Gamma_R(\tau, \sigma).
\]

(3.6)

Because of (2.29), \(\Delta \gamma_d\) is given by \(\chi_1 + \chi_2 + \cdots\), where \(\chi_n\) is defined as

\[
\chi_n = \frac{10}{3} \int_1^{\infty} d\rho \alpha_0 \tilde{q}_n(\rho) \Psi(\rho).
\]

(3.7)
3.2. Dependence of $L$ on the order parameter

In this paragraph, we consider the near-critical fluctuation about the equilibrium in the absence of a particle; $\xi$ is homogeneous. Here, the thermal average of the composition in the mixture is uniform but not necessarily equal to the critical one; $\varphi(x, t)$ represents the fluctuating composition and $\delta \varphi(x, t)$ is defined as $\varphi(x, t) - \bar{\varphi}$, where $\bar{\varphi}$ denotes the thermal average of $\varphi$. We write $C_k(t)$ for the spatial Fourier transform of the correlation function, i.e., the thermal average of $\delta \varphi(x, t) \delta \varphi(0, 0)$, with $k$ denoting the wave-number vector. In the mode-coupling theory (Kawasaki 1970; Swinney & Henry 1973; Onuki 2002), the convection at smaller length scales is regarded as a part of the diffusion at larger length scales, which leads to

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} C_k(t) = -\frac{k_B T_c}{6\pi \eta_0 \xi} |k|^2 C_k(t)$$

for small wave-number $|k| \sim \xi^{-1}$. Here, the regular part of the Onsager coefficient is assumed to be much smaller than the singular part, which is found to be proportional to the correlation length. The fraction in (3.8) gives the diffusion coefficient in a coarse-grained picture, where the convection does not contribute to the mass transport. The time derivative of $\delta \varphi$ on large length-scales should be also given by the second term on the right-hand side of (2.12) if $\psi$ effectively plays a role of $\bar{\varphi}$ at every locus. Then, we can approximate $\mu$ of (2.8) to be $f'(\psi)$ for long wave-length fluctuations, and rewrite the second term as $L f''(\psi) \Delta \delta \varphi(x, t)$. Multiplying this term with $\delta \varphi(x, t)$ and taking the thermal average of the product, we should find that the Fourier transform of the average equals the right-hand side of (3.8). For this to hold, $L f''$ should be approximately equal to the fraction in (3.8) for $|k| \xi \ll 1$.

Let us turn back to our calculation of the drag coefficient. We assume that the equality mentioned at the end of the preceding paragraph locally holds when the particle moves in the mixture. Thus, in calculating $\gamma_d$, we use

$$L(\psi) = \frac{k_B T_c C_2 \psi \gamma}{6\pi \eta_0 \xi f''(\psi)} ,$$

where $f''$ is the inverse susceptibility. The approximation introduced here presupposes small spatial variation of $\psi$. At least, the variation of $L(\psi)$ over $\xi$ is required to be small as compared with its typical value at every locus. From (2.2) and (2.4), we derive

$$f'(\psi) = k_B T_c C_2 \psi \gamma \frac{2 - \alpha + 4(1 - \alpha) \tau \omega^{-1} + 5\alpha \tau^2 \omega^{-2}}{18u^* [2\beta + (1 - 2\beta) \tau \omega^{-1}]} \xi_0^3 .$$

Similarly, we can calculate $f''(\psi)$, although its lengthy expression is not shown here. This expression tells

$$f''(\psi) \to k_B T_c C_1 \tau^\gamma \xi_0^{-2} \quad \text{as} \quad \psi \to 0 ,$$

which leads to

$$L(0) = \frac{\xi_0}{6\pi \eta_0 C_1 \tau^\gamma \nu} .$$

Because of $\gamma \approx 2\nu$ mentioned later, $L(0)$ is approximately proportional to $\xi_\infty$.

3.3. Dimensionless parameters and the equilibrium profile

We numerically calculate the equilibrium profile, $\psi(0)(r)$, by solving (2.6) and (2.7), as was done in (Okamoto & Onuki 2013). A characteristic reduced temperature $\tau_a$ is defined so that $\xi$ becomes $a$ for $\psi = 0$ at $\tau = \tau_a$. A characteristic order parameter $\psi_a$ is
defined so that \( \xi \) becomes \( a \) for \( \psi = \psi_\alpha \) at \( \tau = 0 \). Equation (2.4) gives

\[
\tau_a = (\xi_0/a)^{1/\nu} \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_\alpha = \tau_\alpha^\beta / \sqrt{C_2}.
\]

The reduced temperature and order parameter are respectively scaled as \( \hat{\tau} = \tau / \tau_a \) and \( \hat{\psi} = \psi (a \rho) / \psi_\alpha \). Introducing a dimensionless surface field, defined as

\[
\hat{h} = \frac{h a \sqrt{C_2}}{k_B T_c C_1 \tau_a^\beta},
\]

we can rewrite (2.7) as

\[
\partial_\rho \hat{\psi}^{(0)}(\rho) = -\hat{h} \omega^{\nu \eta} \quad \text{at} \quad \rho = 1,
\]

where \( \hat{\psi}^{(0)}(\rho) \) is defined as \( \psi^{(0)}(a \rho) / \psi_\alpha \). Noting (2.18), (2.19), and (3.12), we find

\[
\psi(\rho) = -\frac{\rho^2}{\sqrt{5\pi \hat{\tau}^{\nu - \gamma}}} \frac{d\hat{\psi}^{(0)}(\rho)}{d\rho}.
\]

We have \( \nu = 0.627 \) and \( \eta = 0.036 \) for a three-dimensional binary fluid (Pelisetto & Vicari 2002). Unless otherwise stated, we hereafter put \( \eta = 0 \) for simplicity. This allows us to take \( M \) as a constant \( k_B T_c C_1 \) because of (2.5). Equations (2.6) and (3.10) give

\[
(\partial_\rho^2 + 2 \rho^{-1} \partial_\rho) \hat{\psi}^{(0)}(\rho) = \frac{[2 - \alpha + 4 (1 - \alpha) \hat{\tau} \hat{\omega}^{-1} + 5 \alpha \hat{\tau}^2 \hat{\omega}^{-2}] \hat{\omega}^\gamma \hat{\psi}^{(0)}(\rho)}{6 \left[ 2/\beta + (1 - 2/\beta) \hat{\tau} \hat{\omega}^{-1} \right]} \quad \text{for} \quad \rho > 1,
\]

where \( \hat{\omega} \) is defined as \( \omega / \tau_a \) and satisfies \( \hat{\omega}^\gamma = \hat{\tau} + \hat{\omega}^{1-2/\beta} \hat{\psi}^2 \) because of (2.4). We numerically solve (3.15) with \( \eta \) being put equal to zero and (3.17) by using Mathematica (Wolfram) to obtain \( \hat{\psi}^{(0)}(\rho) \), and then \( \Psi(\rho) \) with the aid of (3.16). When \( \eta \) vanishes, (3.15) does not involve \( \omega \), and thus we can proceed with the calculation only by fixing the values of \( \hat{h} \) and \( \xi_\infty / a = \hat{\tau}^{\nu} \). Otherwise, the value of \( \tau_a \) should be fixed in addition. The scaling relations for the critical exponents for \( \eta = 0 \) give

\[
\alpha = 2 - 3\nu, \quad \beta = \nu / 2, \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma = 2\nu.
\]
correlation length becomes smaller as \( \hat{h} \) increases. The stronger adsorption makes the mixture near the surface more off-critical. At a distance of \( \xi_{\infty} \) from the particle surface, \( \psi^{(0)} \) is approximately reduced to \( \psi_{\infty} \). The local correlation length \( \xi \) should be smaller than the local length scale that the flow changes, denoted here by \( l \), for the validity of the hydrodynamics formulated from the coarse-grained free-energy density. In the flow around a particle moving translationally, \( l \) would be equal or larger than the distance from the particle center \( r \). In Fig. 1(b), \( \xi \) is much smaller than \( r \). Thus, the hydrodynamics in the present formulation is available in calculating the drag coefficient for the parameter values examined.

It is known that the Gaussian free-energy density can describe the static properties only when the mixture is not so much close to the critical point. The proportionality of \( \xi \propto \tau^{-\nu} \) with \( \nu \approx 0.627 \) is observed in the bulk of a binary fluid mixture with the critical composition when it is sufficiently close to the critical point. The Gaussian free-energy density, giving \( \xi \propto \tau^{-0.5} \) instead, appears to be valid when \( \xi \) is smaller than approximately 15 nm in the bulk of the mixture of 2, 6-lutidine and water (Jungk et al. 1987). When the particle motion is studied in the Gaussian model (Okamoto et al. 2013; Fujitani 2018), the correlation length is assumed to be homogeneous and much smaller than the minimum of \( l \), i.e. approximately \( a \), for the validity of the hydrodynamics based on the free-energy density. Thus, the Gaussian model is valid for small \( \xi_{\infty} \) (< 15 nm in the example above) and \( \xi_{\infty}/a \ll 1 \). The present formulation is not tied to these constraints.

In Fig. 2(a), \( \xi \) at the surface (denoted by \( \xi_1 \)) is approximately equal to \( \xi_{\infty} \) for small \( \xi_{\infty}/a \), and reaches a plateau after a slight peak as \( \xi_{\infty}/a \) increases. The plateau of \( \xi_1 \) indicates that \( \psi^{(0)} \) at the surface becomes independent of \( \xi_{\infty}/a \). The discrepancy between \( \xi_1 \) and \( \xi_{\infty} \) implies the inhomogeneity in \( \xi \), and cannot be described by the Gaussian model. As \( \hat{h} \) increases in Fig. 2(a), the inhomogeneity appears above smaller \( \xi_{\infty}/a \) and the plateau value is smaller, which is expected because the preferential attraction causes the inhomogeneity. At the critical point (\( \xi_{\infty} = \infty \)), the equilibrium profile around a spherical particle is calculated in Yabunaka & Onuki 2017, where \( \xi_1/a \) is found to be given by \( 6^{-1/3} \hat{h}^{-2/3} \) for \( \hat{h} \gg 1 \). This theoretical result respectively gives \( \xi_1/a = 6.6, 3.6, \) and \( 1.9 \times 10^{-2} \) for \( \hat{h} = 24, 60, \) and \( 150 \). The values on the extreme right in Fig. 2(a) are 7.4, 3.8, and \( 2.0 \times 10^{-2} \) for these values of \( \hat{h} \), respectively. The latter two agree well with the corresponding theoretical results, showing the strong adsorption (\( \tau \ll \omega \) at the surface). Depending on the values of \( a \) and \( \hat{h} \), it is possible that the inhomogeneity occurs to invalidate the Gaussian model even when the Gaussian free-energy density gives good approximation to static properties in the bulk. Judging from Fig. 2(a), when \( a \) equals 100 nm, the inhomogeneity begins to occur at the value of \( \xi_{\infty} \) smaller than 10 nm for the strong adsorption. At this small value of \( \xi_{\infty} \), the Gaussian free-energy density can describe the correlation length in the bulk of the mixture of 2, 6-lutidine and water.

The Onsager coefficient \( L \) depends on the equilibrium profile of \( \psi^{(0)} \) and increases as the critical point is approached, which is shown in Fig. 2(b). At a distance of \( \xi_{\infty} \) from the particle surface, \( L \) increases to become approximately 70\% of its value far from the particle, \( L(0) \). Judging from Figs. 1(a) and 2(b), as is known, \( \xi_{\infty} \) gives a typical thickness of the adsorption layer. The inset of Fig. 2(b) shows \( \xi L^{-1} dL/(dr) \), whose absolute value represents the variation divided by the typical value mentioned below \( \xi_{\infty} \). The absolute value is sufficiently small for \( \hat{h} = 60 \) over the region of \( \rho \) examined, while it is still smaller than unity but becomes rather large around \( \rho = 1.5 \) for \( \hat{h} = 150 \).
4. Results

We truncate the infinite sum of $\chi_n$ of (3.7) appropriately to calculate $\Delta \hat{\gamma}_d$. The change of the partial sum occurring when the number of the terms ($N$) increases by one becomes smaller than 1% of the partial sum for $N \geq 109$ in Fig. 3. In this example, we can regard the partial sum of $N = 109$ as the infinite sum. As $\hat{h}$ or $\xi_{\infty}/a$ increases, we need larger $N$ to obtain the infinite sum with the same accuracy, although data not shown.

It is shown in Fig. 4 how $\Delta \hat{\gamma}_d$ changes as the critical temperature is approached. The deviation increases with $\hat{h}$ and $\xi_{\infty}/a$, as is expected because it is caused by the adsorption. In this figure, for small $\xi_{\infty}/a$, $\Delta \hat{\gamma}_d$ appears to be proportional to $(\xi_{\infty}/a)^4$. This power is mentioned at the end of the penultimate paragraph of Sect. 4 of (Fujitani 2018), where the Gaussian model is studied. As $\xi_{\infty}/a$ increases in Fig. 4(a), the slope becomes more gradual and the dependence appears to shift to the linear dependence; the shift occurs at larger $\xi_{\infty}/a$ as $\hat{h}$ decreases. This gradual dependence was not derived in the Gaussian model used in (Okamoto et al. 2013; Fujitani 2018). For large $\xi_{\infty}/a$ in Fig. 4(b), $\Delta \hat{\gamma}_d$ appears to be a linear function of $\xi_{\infty}/a$, whose slope is calculated from the two data points on the right end to give 0.31, 0.34, and 0.35 for $\hat{h} = 24, 60, 150$, respectively. This suggests that the slope should become insensitive to $\hat{h}$ as $\xi_{\infty}/a$ increases.

By assuming $L$ to be homogeneous, instead of using (3.9), we calculate $\Delta \hat{\gamma}_d$ to obtain the symbols of $\times$ in Fig. 5(a). This drastic change in modeling $L$ does not influence
\( \Delta \hat{\gamma}_d \) for smaller values of \( \xi_\infty/a \), and reduces \( \Delta \hat{\gamma}_d \) rather slightly as \( \xi_\infty/a \) increases. It is unchanged that the dependence of \( \Delta \hat{\gamma}_d \) on \( \xi_\infty/a \) becomes more gradual than in the Gaussian model. We thus expect that the appearance of the gradual dependence should be robust against the details of the dependence of \( L \) on \( \psi \), although the results in the inset of Fig. 2(b) suggest that (3.9) is not completely reliable especially for \( \hat{h} = 150 \).

As mentioned in Sect. 1, some researchers regard the deviation of \( \gamma_d \) as caused by effective enlargement of the particle radius due to the adsorption layer. However, for the parameter values examined in Fig. 5(b), the change of \( \theta/\bar{U} \) at \( \theta = \pi/2 \) due to the preferential attraction is smaller than approximately 20% of \( \theta/\bar{U} \) in its absence; the velocity field is not so much changed by the preferential attraction and the mixture fluid in the adsorption layer cannot be regarded as a part of the rigid particle. The velocity gradient at the surface becomes more gradual as \( \xi_\infty/a \) increases, which suggests reduction in the viscous stress exerted on the particle. The velocity field is influenced by \( \Pi \) because of (2.10), (2.11), and (2.16). How \( \Pi \) changes with \( \xi_\infty/a \) determines the dependence of \( \Delta \hat{\gamma}_d \) on \( \xi_\infty/a \) not only directly through the first term in the parentheses of (2.27) but also through the last two terms by changing the flow field.

The dependence of \( \Delta \hat{\gamma}_d \) on \( \xi_\infty/a \) becomes close to the linear one in Fig. 4(a) in the range of \( (\hat{h}, \xi_\infty/a) \) showing the inhomogeneity of \( \xi \) in Fig. 2(a). Both of them occur for larger \( \xi_\infty/a \) as \( \hat{h} \) decreases. This is reasonable because of the close relationship between \( \psi^{(0)} \) and \( \Delta \gamma_d \) shown by (2.29). In Fig. 2(a), the inhomogeneity occurs approximately when \( \xi_1/a \) exceeds \( \xi_\infty/a \). Thus, when large \( \hat{h} \) causes the strong adsorption, the dependence in Fig. 4(a) becomes close to the linear one if we have

\[
\frac{\xi_\infty}{a} > 6^{-1/3} \hat{h}^{-2/3} .
\]  

\textbf{5. Discussion}

Omari et al. [Omari et al. 2009] measured the self-diffusion of silica particles in a near-critical mixture of 2,6-lutidine and water, for which \( T_c \) is approximately 307 K [Güları et al. 1972; Jungk et al. 1987]. The former is preferentially attracted by the particle, and the self-diffusion coefficient is suppressed as \( T_c \) is approached. The data on the top of Fig. 2 of [Omari et al. 2009], except the data point on the extreme left, are replotted in Fig. 6: \( a = 25 \) nm and \( \xi_0 = 0.25 \) nm used in this reference lead to
Figure 5. (a) The normalized deviation $\Delta \hat{\gamma}_d$ is obtained for $\hat{h} = 60$ by assuming (red ◦) and by assuming $L$ to be homogeneous (×). Some of the symbol ◦ show results in Fig. 4 (b) The tangential component of the velocity field $v_{\theta}$ divided by $U$ is plotted against $\rho$ on the equatorial plane $\theta = \pi/2$. Dot-dash curve (blue) represents the results in the absence of the preferential attraction ($h = 0$). Dash, solid, and two-dot chain curves (black, red, and green, respectively) represent the results for $(\hat{h}, \xi/\rho) = (60, 0.19), (150, 0.19), \text{ and } (60, 0.36)$, respectively.

Figure 6. Solid squares represent part of the data in the top of Fig. 2 of Omari et al. (2009). Circles and crosses represent the calculation results with $\eta = 0.036$ for $\hat{h} = 60$ and 150, respectively. The calculated values are slightly larger for large $\xi/\rho$ than the ones obtained with $\eta = 0$. For $(\hat{h}, \xi/\rho) = (60, 0.4) \text{ and } (60, 0.5)$, we have $\Delta \hat{\gamma}_d = 0.119 \, (0.121)$ and $0.148 \, (0.152)$ by using $\eta = 0 \, (0.036)$, respectively.

$\tau_a = 6.5 \times 10^{-4}$. We thus have $\xi/\rho = 0.76$ for $\tau = 10^{-3}$; the replotted data range from $\tau = 3.6 \times 10^{-3} \text{ to } 2.3 \times 10^{-4}$. Equations (3.13) and (3.14) give $\hat{h} = h \sqrt{3 u^* a^3 / (k_B T_c \sqrt{C_1})}$ for $\eta = 0$. The value of $h$ may be usually smaller than $10^{-5} \, \text{ m}^3/\text{s}^2$, considering the following three points; (1) a typical energy of the hydrogen bond is $10^{-20} \, \text{ J per a molecule}$, (2) the area of the particle surface interacting with one molecule of the mixture would be larger than approximately $1 \, \text{ nm}^2$, and (3) $|\psi|$ is at most $10^3 \, \text{ kg/m}^3$. Using a typical value of $M$ for alkanes, $10^{-16} \, \text{ m}^7/(\text{kg} \cdot \text{s}^2)$ (Carey et al. 1980; Cornelisse et al. 1996), we find that $h$ is smaller than approximately 160. We calculate $\Delta \hat{\gamma}_d$ by using $\eta = 0.036$ to plot the results for small values of $\xi/\rho$ in Fig. 6. The calculation results for $h = 60$ and 150 appear to have almost the same slopes with the slope suggested by the experimental data. However, judging from Fig. 6 the calculation would yield smaller $\Delta \hat{\gamma}_d$ than the experimental data, even if performed for the same values of $\xi/\rho$ that gives the experimental data.

The underestimation may be attributed to our assumption of homogeneous viscosity.
We find \( L \propto \xi \) from (3.39) with the aid of (3.13), considering that \( f'' \) gives the inverse of the susceptibility involving the critical exponent \( \gamma \). This proportionality is derived in the mode-coupling theory on the fluctuation about the equilibrium (Kawasaki 1970; Onuki 2002), although the power is found to be slightly smaller than unity in the dynamic renormalization group calculation (Siggia et al. 1976). In contrast, the singular part of the viscosity is proportional to \( \xi^{1/19} \) up to the 1-loop order (Ohta 1975; Ohta & Kawasaki 1976; Siggia et al. 1976). Thus, its nonuniversal regular part, which can depend on the free-energy density, is larger than approximately 80 nm, the singular part should become more explicit above \( \xi \) satisfying (4.1).

We find that the free-energy density can describe the static properties in the bulk and so that the correlation length can be regarded as homogeneous. The latter condition can require smaller \( \xi \) for the strong adsorption than the former. Thus, the Gaussian model is not always available in calculating \( \gamma_d \) in the mixture whose static properties in the bulk can be described by the Gaussian free-energy density, as mentioned in Sect. 4. The Gaussian free-energy density in (2.1) is completely free from these conditions because it can describe the static properties in the bulk even at the critical point and the inhomogeneity of \( \xi \). This inhomogeneity is correlated with the appearance of the approximate linearity between \( \Delta \gamma_d \) and \( \xi \), which should occur for large \( \xi/a \) satisfying (4.1). When the adsorption is strong, as in Fig. 1(b), \( \xi \) is much smaller than \( a \) near the particle, and increases to approach \( \xi \) mainly in the region of \( r-a<\xi \). Then, \( \xi \) nowhere exceeds the length scale that the flow changes \( l \), which would be equal or larger than \( r \). It is thus expected that, when we consider a large particle (\( a \approx 100 \text{ nm} \)) in a near-critical mixture whose singular part of the viscosity is not explicit (\( \xi<80 \text{ nm} \) in the mixture mentioned above), \( l \)
is sufficiently large as compared with $\xi$ everywhere to make the present hydrodynamic formulation valid.

When $\xi_\infty/a$ is sufficiently large, the distortion of the adsorption layer due to the particle motion may become so significant that the linearity between the drag force and the particle speed does not hold, as suggested by (Furukawa et al. 2013). This would break Einstein’s relation linking the self-diffusion coefficient and the drag coefficient, although the range of $\xi_\infty/a$ where this occurs remains to be studied.
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Appendix A. Some details

The kernel appearing in (2.25) is given by

$$\Gamma_R(\rho, \sigma) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{(3-5\sigma^2)}{2\sigma^3\rho^3} + \frac{5(3\rho^2-1)}{2\sigma^3\rho} + \sigma^2 - 5\rho^{-1} & \rho \geq \sigma \\
\frac{(3-5\sigma^2)}{2\sigma^3\rho^3} + \frac{5(3\rho^2-1)}{2\sigma^3\rho} + \rho^2 - 3\sigma^{-3} - 5\sigma^{-1} & \sigma \geq \rho. 
\end{cases} \tag{A1}$$

We find

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^3 \rho}{\rho} + 2 \frac{\partial^2 \rho}{\rho}\right) \Gamma_R(\rho, \sigma) = 15 \left[\alpha_0(\sigma) + 1\right]. \tag{A2}$$

The kernel appearing in (3.1) is given by

$$\Gamma_Q(\rho, \sigma) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{(\rho\sigma)^{-2}}{2 + \rho\sigma^{-2}} & \rho \leq \sigma \\
\frac{(\rho\sigma)^{-2}}{2 + \sigma\rho^{-2}} & \sigma \leq \rho. 
\end{cases} \tag{A3}$$

These kernels are originally obtained in (Okamoto et al. 2013).

We can calculate the equilibrium profile numerically by using (2.6) and (2.7), as they are, after the non-dimensionalization mentioned in Sect. 3.3. Alternatively, we can utilize (A5) of (Fujitani 2016), whose $s(\psi(\rho))$ is defined by $\omega(\psi(\rho))/\tau - 1$ becomes proportional to $e^{-2\rho a/\xi_\infty}/\rho^2$ far from the particle. The differential equation with respect to the ratio of the former to the latter, that is $\psi(\rho)e^{2\rho a/\xi_\infty}\rho^2$, can be derived from (2.6), and is solved numerically under the boundary conditions imposed sufficiently far from the particle. At $\rho = 10$, we required the derivative of $s$ with respect to $\rho$ to vanish, and fixed the value of $s$ so that $\hat{h}$ becomes a prescribed value with the aid of (2.7).
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