We consider the gravity-driven flow of a perfect dielectric, viscous, thin liquid film, wetting a flat substrate inclined at some non-zero angle to the horizontal. The dynamics of the thin film is influenced by an electric field which is set up parallel to the substrate surface. We give fully nonlinear Benney and weighted integral boundary layer (reduced-order) models for the interface height (and fluid flux) which incorporate the electric field effect, as well as inertia, surface tension, and gravitational forces. The term corresponding to the electric field is nonlocal, and provides a stabilising effect on the dynamics; a temporal linear stability analysis shows that increasing the electric field strength causes a decrease in linear growth rates and shrinks the band of unstable wavenumbers – on finite domains, the flat film solution is thus completely stabilisable for a sufficiently strong field. We also note that for non-zero field strengths, ignoring surface tension forces (if they are weak) results in well-posed equations. Our primary interest is in the use of the reduced-order models to predict the regions of parameter space for which a hanging electrified film on an inverted substrate drips. Precisely, for given fluid and geometrical parameters, we seek a critical electric field strength beyond which no dripping occurs. Unlike the problem of an electrified film hanging from a horizontal substrate, a temporal instability analysis does not provide insight into this problem – the linear stabilisation of the flat state is dependent on the system length, whereas the critical electric field strength required to prevent dripping is length-independent (for sufficiently long domains), with non-trivial wave-train solutions emerging. We investigate the transition from convective to absolute instability for hanging flows which was shown to have reasonable predictability of the dripping limit for the non-electrified case. This is achieved by considering the dispersion relations of the various reduced-order models, and applying the Briggs–Bers criterion. The weighted integral boundary layer models predict a fluid-independent critical angle, below which only convective instabilities occur. This critical angle is an increasing function of the electric field strength, i.e. a stronger field decreases the region of parameter space in which absolute instability is observed. We additionally obtain the regions of absolute instability for the full Stokes flow problem, and compare to the results of the long-wave models at zero Reynolds number. The accuracy of the spatial stability predictions of the reduced-order models is validated by performing full direct numerical simulations of the Navier–Stokes equations coupled with electrostatics, taking small-amplitude pulse initial conditions. With direct numerical simulations on an extended computational domain and inlet/outlet boundary conditions, we investigate the dripping limit for both non-electrified and electrified liquid films. We find three regimes: no dripping, dripping due to pulse coalescence and interaction, and dripping due to instability of individual solitary pulses. In the non-electrified case, dripping due to pulse coalescence appears to be transient, and thus we define the dripping limit as the loss of stability of pulses. We find that the absolute instability and dripping thresholds align reasonably well. For the electrified problem, absolute instability is also a good predictor of the loss of stability of pulses, however, the regime of dripping due to coalescence and interaction of pulses is large in parameter space and the behaviour persists in time. The absolute instability threshold remains a good order-of-magnitude estimate for the onset of the latter phenomena (which cannot be obtained from a temporal instability analysis). We find that a sufficiently large, yet physically acceptable, electric field strength may be used to suppress dripping in castor oil liquid films, resulting in bounded wave-train solutions.
I. INTRODUCTION

The stabilisation of thin liquid films has industrial applications in coating processes, in particular lab-on-a-chip systems [1]. However, despite the stabilising action of surface tension, it may be impossible to achieve a stable or flat film within the range of desired parameters (such as film thickness and inclination angle), given a restrictive range of real fluid parameters (such as density and viscosity) due to inertial and gravitational instabilities. In this work, we consider the dynamics of gravity-driven perfect dielectric films subject to an electric field which is set up parallel to the substrate surface. This addition to the thin film flow problem introduces a stabilising nonlocal effect (in contrast to a perpendicular field), which can be utilised to prevent absolute instabilities and arrest dripping of liquid films hanging from inverted substrates.

The non-electrified thin film flow problem has been studied extensively since the experimental work of Kapitza and Kapitza [2]. For an overlying film flow with a sufficiently shallow inclination angle, a flat interface with semi-parabolic velocity profile is an exact and stable solution (known as the Nusselt solution [3]). With a linear stability analysis, Yib [4, 5] and Benjamin [6] obtained a critical Reynolds number, dependent on the inclination angle, beyond which this flat film solution first becomes unstable. Two-dimensional solitary waves form [7], which transition to three-dimensional waves due to secondary instabilities [8]. Inlet forcing can be used to preserve the two-dimensional phase of the dynamics, as opposed to allowing the instability to develop from noise alone [9]. For hanging film flows, the situation is more complicated and there are fewer experimental and numerical studies. The cross-stream component of gravity now destabilises the film interface, aiding the inertial (Kapitza) instability in the streamwise direction, and inducing the classical Rayleigh–Taylor instability in the spanwise direction. The latter gives rise to rivulet structures as observed in experiments [10–12], with waves on the crests which may drip depending on parameters [13, 14].

Rothrock [10] was the first to perform a careful experimental study of liquid films on inverted substrates, additionally carrying out a linear stability analysis to obtain onset conditions for waves on pendent rivulets – these conditions agreed with experiments. Film dewetting was observed, as the rivulets which formed at near the inlet fed into a wedge-shaped fluid film which ended with a single pendent rivulet. Regimes of dripping and no dripping were seen. Drop fall-off from pendent rivulets was studied by Indeikina et al. [13], with further experiments and the consideration of a long-wave lubrication equation (without inertial effects) and a matched asymptotics procedure. The authors identified two distinct mechanisms for dripping depending on the static contact angle of the rivulet and substrate inclination angle: a jet mechanism at high flow rates due to failure of axial curvature to counteract gravity, and another due to the failure of azimuthal curvature. Charogiannis and Markides [11] and Charogiannis et al. [12] performed experiments with fully wetting films on the underside of a flat substrate inclined at 15°, 30° and 45° beyond vertical, for which no dripping was reported. The interface shapes observed were strongly three-dimensional, with clear rivulet formation in the majority of cases with low to moderate Reynolds numbers. The pulses on the crests of the rivulets increased in amplitude as the Reynolds number increased. For larger Reynolds numbers, wavefronts formed across multiple rivulets, causing loss of fluid mass from the rivulets into the separating troughs. By approximating the transverse wavelength from experimental data, Charogiannis et al. [12] classified two types of rivulet formation depending on the inclination angle and the Kapitza number. They found that the wavelengths of the transverse rivulets for the more extreme inclinations (i.e. 45° beyond vertical) and/or lower Kapitza numbers, were as predicted by the linear stability of the flat film solution, matching the wavelength of the most unstable transverse mode arising from the competition between the cross-stream component of gravity and surface tension. However, for much smaller inclinations beyond vertical and/or larger Kapitza numbers, they found that the transverse wavelength matched that of the canonical Rayleigh–Taylor instability for a film hanging from a horizontal substrate (full vertical gravity versus surface tension). They suggested that in the former case, the primary instability was Rayleigh–Taylor, whereas in the latter case, the rivulet formation was due to a secondary instability of suspended two-dimensional wavefronts. This latter phenomenon is likely impossible to capture with reduced-order models.

A hierarchy of reduced-order models may be constructed using a long-wave methodology to describe the dynamics of the fluid film; these simplify the problem both analytically and numerically while retaining the relevant physical effects. A so-called Benney equation [15, 16] for the film thickness may be constructed, valid for Reynolds numbers close to critical. This highly nonlinear equation retains the effects of inertia, gravity, viscosity and surface tension. Analytical and numerical studies of the Benney equation were carried out by a number of authors [17–23], and finite time blow-ups were observed in simulations (regions of parameter space in which blow-up occur coincide closely with parameters for which no travelling waves exist [17, 23]). Rosnau et al. [18] considered the Benney equation with a full-curvature regularisation, however this was not effective for all parameters for which finite-time blow-up occurred. Coupled systems for the interface height and fluid flux may be constructed using an averaging methodology, which give much better agreement for moderate Reynolds numbers. Such models were first constructed by Kapitza [24, 25] and Shkadov [26], however these models predicted an incorrect critical Reynolds number. This issue was corrected by the weighted integral boundary layer (WIBL) models developed by Ruyer–Quil and Manneville [27, 28]. These models show good agreement with direct numerical simulation (DNS) and experiment [29], and the linear theory matches...
that of the corresponding Orr–Sommerfeld problem much more closely than that of the Benney equation \cite{31}.

The mechanisms for the dripping of a hanging film are not yet fully understood; however, their relation to the spatial stability of the Nusselt solution has been the subject of recent research. Overlying and vertical film flows exhibit convective instabilities, whereas for a film hanging from a horizontal surface, the interface exhibits an absolute Rayleigh–Taylor instability. Thus, for given fluid parameters, a film flow must transition from convective to absolutely unstable as the inclination is increased to a critical angle beyond vertical. The connection between absolute instability and dripping of hanging films was first investigated by Brun et al. \cite{14}. The authors derived an inertialless Benney equation for the two-dimensional flow, and obtained the regions of parameter space for which the flat interface solution was absolutely unstable. They found good agreement with the parameters for which dripping was observed experimentally. The experiments were conducted by pouring castor oil onto a flat substrate, and letting it spread until the fluid layer was roughly uniform with a given thickness. The substrate was then rotated to some angle beyond vertical, and the number of drips falling from a fixed region of the substrate was recorded. It is noticeable from their results that only a small amount of dripping was observed just beyond the absolute–convective (A/C) threshold, with much more intense dripping further into the absolute instability regime. Inertial effects and higher order terms were included by Scheid et al. \cite{32} in their study of the A/C transition for WIBL models. The authors observed a large discrepancy to the results for the inertialless Benney equation away from zero Reynolds numbers, and found a fluid-independent critical angle below which only convective instabilities exist for their models. Kofman et al. \cite{33} employed DNS for the two-dimensional problem with periodic boundary conditions, finding that the dripping onset did not coincide closely with the A/C transition line obtained from the WIBL models in \cite{32}. They attribute dripping to a secondary instability of stationary solutions. We note that, the results of Kofman et al. \cite{33} improve in their agreement with A/C predictions as the length of the periodic domain increases (in the region where the A/C curve in terms of thickness and inclination angle is monotonic). We emphasise that due to nonlinear effects, dripping and absolute instability will not align exactly, however a predictor for very nonlinear phenomena based on linear theory is useful. The consideration of two-dimensional models to study the inherently three-dimensional process of dripping is not entirely justified, in particular they cannot capture the second mechanism obtained by Indeikina et al. \cite{13}. However, for domains which are sufficiently small in the spanwise direction, i.e. below the threshold of the spanwise Rayleigh–Taylor instability, the flow should be two-dimensional. Furthermore, we believe a two-dimensional model is a reasonable first approximation for the flow on the crest of a wide rivulet.

In a related study, Lin et al. \cite{34} considered the dynamics of a fully three-dimensional fluid front hanging from an inclined plane with a very thin precursor film, and performed numerical simulations of a multidimensional Benney equation. They found that the fluid fronts were unstable to a transverse fingering instability. Thin rivulets form with approximately equal width in the spanwise direction, with fast moving “drop-like” waves appearing on the rivulets as observed in the wetted case. Although the finger formation is not attributed to the Rayleigh–Taylor instability, the dynamics on their crests is of relevance to both the wetted and non-wetted case. The effect of electric fields and temperature gradients on the linear stability of such fluid fronts has recently been considered by Conroy et al. \cite{35}.

The use of horizontal electric fields to stabilise the Rayleigh–Taylor instability in stratified systems of dielectric fluids was considered by Cimpeanu et al. \cite{36} and Anderson et al. \cite{37}. The former work investigates an unbounded two-fluid system of viscous dielectrics with a less dense lower layer. The latter study considers the related problem of a thin upper fluid layer and a hydrodynamically passive lower layer bounded above and below by solid dielectric substrates. The linear theory shows that an increase in the electric field strength yields a decrease in growth rates, and shrinks the band of unstable wavenumbers. Then, if the domain is finite in the horizontal direction, complete linear stabilisation of the flat interface solution may be obtained with a sufficiently strong field. DNS of the Navier–Stokes equations coupled with electrostatics is carried out, and is found to agree well with the linear theory; finger formation is suppressed for field strengths beyond the linear stability threshold. The authors derive a nonlinear nonlocal evolution equation for the interfacial dynamics. A semi-spectral approach is employed to solve the PDE numerically, with solutions accurately capturing the primary collar and secondary lobe structures present in the early stages of finger formation (validated with DNS). In both \cite{36} and \cite{37}, the authors consider an on/off strategy to actively control the Rayleigh–Taylor instability, where the electric field is switched on when the interface minimum is below a given depth, and switched off when the film minimum is above a prescribed depth. The motivation for this is to induce and maintain regular interfacial oscillations to maximise mixing, for example, as in \cite{38}. Importantly, we note that such varying electric fields are required for this particular problem to give bounded nontrivial solutions at large times; for constant field strengths, either the flat state is stable or finger formation occurs. This indicates that dripping can be predicted using a temporal stability analysis for the horizontal substrate problem. Although we do not consider effects of conductivity (leaky dielectrics) in the present work, the parallel electric field remains stabilising in the case of a conducting liquid layer as long as the electrical permittivity of the fluid is greater than that of the gas phase, but can be destabilising in other cases \cite{39, 40}.

The above studies were conducted in the absence of a mean fluid flow, which adds to the complexity of the studied physical systems and further enriches the interplay between the competing mechanisms. In the present work, we
consider the application of electric fields to gravity-driven flows on inclined flat substrates. Electrodes are set-up at the fluid inflow and outflow so that the undisturbed electric field lines are parallel to the substrate (also parallel to the undisturbed film flat film solution), with all phases assumed to be perfect dielectrics. We consider a two-dimensional formulation of the problem (spanwise effects are ignored), and allow the fluid to be either overlying or hanging. The work considered here can be easily extended to the case of both layers being hydrodynamically active, i.e. gravity-driven liquid–liquid stratification. A long-wave assumption allows us to construct a fully nonlinear Benney equation with nonlocal electric field effects. We also provide electrified versions of two WIBL models derived by Ruyer-Quil and Manneville [27, 29]. The temporal linear stability of these three models is studied and the stabilising effect of the electric field is shown; in analog with the results in [36, 57], the linear theory predicts that a sufficiently strong electric field will stabilise the flat film solution for a system of finite length, even with negligible surface tension. From this point, we focus on hanging films, and consider the effect of the electric field on the A/C transition. Unsurprisingly, we find that an increased field strength results in a restriction on the range of parameters yielding absolutely unstable systems. Using a WIBL model, we obtain a minimum critical angle depending on the electric field strength, below which only convective instabilities occur, extending the result in [32]. Comparisons with results for the full Orr–Sommerfeld problem at zero Reynolds number are also provided. A similar study in the spatial stability of a nonlocal problem was performed for the Benney equation with normal electric field effects by Blyth et al. [11]; however, in their case, increased field strengths promote absolute instability.

Following the work of [14, 33], we investigate the relationship between absolute instability and dripping of hanging films, both with and without electric fields. The working fluid for DNS is the same as used by Brun et al. [14] in experiment. Contrasting [33] (where periodic boundary conditions are used), we initialise with a flat interface and excite the most unstable waves with time-periodic forcing at the inflow (as used in [30] for computation of solitary waves). With this, we both mimic experimental conditions and are able to produce solutions with regular spacing of waves/drops. In the non-electrified case, we find a reasonably close agreement between the onset of dripping and the lower threshold of absolute instability. We believe that this is partly due to the low Reynolds numbers we consider, but also due to the use of long domains in our DNS computations with inflow/outflow boundary conditions. In borderline cases, it can take many wavelengths from the inlet for a drip to develop. Our simulations indicate that (non-transient) dripping takes place as an instability of individual solitary pulses, agreeing with the characterisation of dripping in [33] as the loss of stability of stationary waves. For the electrified problem, the agreement is less good, but the A/C threshold still remains a good order-of-magnitude estimate for dripping suppression which could not be obtained from a temporal linear stability analysis. Increased electric field strengths delay the first dripping event, and induce temporally and spatially irregular dripping that does not appear to be transient (as in the non-electrified case). We believe that the nonlocality of the problem is an important factor here. We emphasise that, unlike the electric field stabilisation of the classical Rayleigh–Taylor instability [36, 57], the mean flow gives rise to nontrivial bounded solutions (wave trains that do not drip) below the threshold of stabilisation of the flat interface solution. Active control strategies are not required to maintain a solution with bounded interfacial deformations.

In §2, we present the physical model and full set of governing equations for the two-dimensional flow. In §3, we give the long-wave models for the electrified gravity-driven film flow, and perform a temporal linear stability analysis. In §4 we specialise to hanging film flows, and perform a spatial stability analysis to determine parameter regimes of absolute or convective instabilities in the long-wave models. We obtain a minimum critical angle, depending on the electric field strength, below which all instabilities are convective for all flow parameters. We also compare the results of the long-wave models at zero Reynolds number to those of the full Stokes flow problem. In §5, we perform (two-dimensional) DNS of the full problem with small-amplitude pulse initial data to verify the regimes of absolute and convective instability predicted by the reduced-order models. Lastly, §6 provides DNS of the full problem to determine the dripping onset for both the non-electrified and electrified cases, and investigate its relation to absolute instability.

**II. PHYSICAL MODEL AND GOVERNING EQUATIONS**

We consider a Newtonian fluid with constant density \( \rho \), dynamic viscosity \( \mu \), and kinematic viscosity \( \nu \), flowing under gravity on a flat substrate inclined at some angle \( \theta \) to the horizontal. For the two-dimensional problem considered here, we take coordinates \((x, z)\) with \(x\) in the streamwise direction and \(z\) perpendicular to the substrate surface – see the schematic in figure 1. We have overlying film flows for \( \theta \in (0, \pi/2) \), a vertical film flow for \( \theta = \pi/2 \), and hanging flows for \( \theta \in (\pi/2, \pi) \) as shown in figure 1. The surface tension coefficient between the fluid and the surrounding medium is \( \sigma \), and the acceleration due to gravity is \( g = (g \sin \theta, -g \cos \theta) \). The local film thickness is denoted by \( h(x, t) \), a function of space and time, with unperturbed thickness \( \ell \). The liquid layer is denoted by Region I, and the surrounding hydrodynamically passive medium is denoted by Region II. The fluid in Region I is governed by the
Navier–Stokes equations

\[ u_t + (u \cdot \nabla)u = -\frac{1}{\rho} \nabla p + \nu \nabla^2 u + g, \quad \nabla \cdot u = 0, \tag{1} \]

where \( u = (u, w) \) is the velocity field, \( p \) is the pressure, \( \nabla \) is the two-dimensional gradient operator, and \( \nabla^2 = \nabla \cdot \nabla \) is the Laplacian operator. At the substrate surface, we have the no-slip and impermeability conditions, \( u|_{z=0} = 0 \).

We assume that the substrate, fluid, and gas phase are perfect dielectrics with dielectric constants (relative permittivities) \( \epsilon^S \), \( \epsilon^I \), and \( \epsilon^{II} \), respectively. Furthermore, the voltage potentials in the substrate and Regions I and II are denoted by \( V^S \), \( V^I \), and \( V^{II} \), respectively, each with corresponding electric fields satisfying \( E^\iota = -\nabla V^\iota \) for \( \iota = S, I, II \) (this follows from Maxwell’s equations in the limit appropriate to this study). Since we assume no volume charges in the substrate or fluid regions, by Gauss’ law, the voltage potentials are governed by Laplace equations, \( \nabla^2 V^\iota = 0 \), for \( \iota = S, I, II \). We introduce an electric field by imposing a potential difference between the fluid inlet and the fluid outlet, so that far from the liquid phase in the normal direction, the electric field is constant and parallel to the flow direction, i.e.

\[ \nabla V^S \rightarrow -E_0, \quad \text{as } z \rightarrow -\infty, \quad \nabla V^{II} \rightarrow -E_0, \quad \text{as } z \rightarrow +\infty, \tag{2} \]

where \( E_0 = (E_0, 0) \). If \( V_0 \) is the imposed potential difference and \( L_0 \) is the system length from the fluid inlet to outlet, then \( E_0 = V_0 / L_0 \). We will see that the orientation of the electrodes is unimportant, only the magnitude of the electric field strength. We assume that the surface charge density of the free charge at the substrate surface and film interface is zero, i.e. the system is grounded before the potential difference is imposed. At the substrate surface we have the boundary condition for the voltages,

\[ [\epsilon^I V^I_z]^S = 0, \quad [V^I]^S = 0, \quad \text{at } z = 0, \tag{3} \]

where the jump notation \( [\cdot]^S = (\cdot)_S - (\cdot)_I \) has been introduced. The first condition follows from Gauss’ law across interfaces and the second is the continuity of the voltage potentials.

We now calculate the conditions at the interface. For this, we define the tangent vector \( t = (1, h_x)^T \) and unit normal vector \( n = (-h_x, 1)^T / \sqrt{1 + h_x^2} \). For the remainder of the section, all \( z \)-dependent expressions are evaluated at the interface \( z = h \). The kinematic condition is

\[ w = h_t + uh_x, \tag{4} \]

and we have conditions on the voltage potentials,

\[ [\epsilon^I \nabla V^I \cdot n]^I = 0, \quad [V^I]^I = 0, \tag{5} \]
which are the equivalents of \( \mathbf{C} \) at the fluid interface. The stress tensors in Regions I and II have components

\[
T_{jk}^I = \mu \left( \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_k} \right) + \epsilon_0 \epsilon^I \left( \frac{\partial V_j^I}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial V_k^I}{\partial x_k} - \frac{1}{2} \left| \nabla V^I \right|^2 \delta_{jk} \right) - p \delta_{jk},
\]

\[
T_{jk}^{II} = \epsilon_0 \epsilon^{II} \left( \frac{\partial V_j^{II}}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial V_k^{II}}{\partial x_k} - \frac{1}{2} \left| \nabla V^{II} \right|^2 \delta_{jk} \right) - p_{\text{atm}} \delta_{jk},
\]

respectively, where \( p_{\text{atm}} \) is the atmospheric pressure in Region II, \( \epsilon_0 \) is the permittivity of free space, and we have employed the usual subscript notation for the coordinate system and velocity components. These tensors are the sum of the Cauchy and Maxwell stress tensors (without the deviatoric component in Region II since it is hydrodynamically passive). Note that the Maxwell stresses are divergence free since the bulk of each phase is assumed to be charge-free.

Balancing the stresses in the normal and tangential directions at the interface yields \((\mathbf{T} \cdot \mathbf{n})_I = \sigma h_{xx}/(1 + h_x^2)^{3/2}\) and \((\mathbf{T} \cdot \mathbf{n})_II = 0\), respectively. The normal stress balance written out in full is

\[
2\mu (u_x(h_x^2 - 1) - (u_z + w_z)h_z) + \frac{\epsilon_0 \epsilon^I}{2} \left( (h_x^2 - 1)((V_z^I)^2 - (V_z^I)^2) - 4h_x V_z^I V_z^I \right)
\]

\[
+ (p_{\text{atm}} - p)(1 + h_z^2) = \sigma \frac{h_{xx}}{(1 + h_x^2)^{1/2}},
\]

and \((\mathbf{T} \cdot \mathbf{n})_I = 0\) is used to simplify the tangential stress balance to

\[
(1 - h_x^2)(u_z + w_z) + 4w_z h_x = 0.
\]

The normal stress balance alone couples the electrostatic and hydrodynamic problems, with no contributions from the electric field in the tangential stresses – this is the case for interfaces between perfect dielectrics and between a perfect dielectric and a perfect conductor [39]. The Taylor–Melcher leaky dielectric model is appropriate if one of the phases has a finite non-zero conductivity [42][44].

### A. Exact solution and non-dimensional equations

An exact solution to the full formulation is

\[
\begin{align*}
\bar{h} &= \ell, \quad \bar{u} = \frac{g \sin \theta}{2\nu}(2\ell z - z^2), \quad \bar{w} = 0, \\
p &= p_{\text{atm}} - \frac{\epsilon_0 \epsilon^I}{2} (\epsilon^I - \epsilon^{II}) - \rho g z \cos \theta, \quad \bar{V}^* = -E_0 x \quad \text{for } \ell = S, I, II.
\end{align*}
\]

The velocity profile is semi-parabolic in \( z \), and the voltage potential is linear in \( x \). We non-dimensionalise velocities with the base velocity at the free surface, \( U_0 = \pi |z = \ell| = \frac{g \ell^3}{2\nu} \sin \theta / \ell \), and make use of the non-dimensional parameters

\[
Re = \frac{U_0 \ell}{\nu} = \frac{g \ell^3 \sin \theta}{2 \nu^2}, \quad We = \frac{\epsilon_0 E_0^2 \ell}{2 \mu U_0} = \frac{\epsilon_0 E_0^2}{\rho g \ell \sin \theta}, \quad C = \frac{U_0 \mu}{\sigma} = \frac{\rho g \ell^2 \sin \theta}{2 \sigma}.
\]

Here, \( Re \) is the Reynolds number measuring the ratio of inertial to viscous forces, \( We \) is the electric Weber number measuring the ratio of electrical to fluid pressures, and \( C \) is the capillary number measuring the ratio of surface tension to viscous forces. In order to non-dimensionalise and simplify the problem, we write

\[
\begin{align*}
x^* &= \frac{1}{\ell} x, \quad y^* = \frac{1}{\ell} y, \quad z^* = \frac{1}{\ell} z, \quad u^* = \frac{1}{U_0} u, \quad t^* = \frac{U_0}{\ell} t, \quad h^* = \frac{1}{\ell} h, \\
p^* &= \frac{\ell}{\mu U_0} \left( p - p_{\text{atm}} + \frac{\epsilon_0 E_0^2}{2} (\epsilon^I - \epsilon^{II}) + \rho g z \cos \theta \right), \quad (V^*)^* = \frac{1}{E_0 \ell} (V^* + E_0 x) \quad \text{for } \ell = S, I, II.
\end{align*}
\]

We substitute \((11)\) into the governing equations and boundary conditions, and drop the stars. In Region I, the Navier–Stokes equations transform to

\[
Re(\mathbf{u}_t + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{u}) = -\nabla p + \nabla^2 \mathbf{u} + 2\mathbf{e}_x, \quad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0,
\]

\((12)\)
where \( e_x = (1,0) \). The no-slip and impermeability conditions, and Laplace’s equations for the voltage potentials are unchanged under the change of variables \([11]\). The far-field condition \([2]\) becomes
\[
\nabla V^S \to 0, \quad \text{as } z \to -\infty, \quad \nabla V^{\Pi} \to 0, \quad \text{as } z \to +\infty,
\]
while the conditions for the voltage potentials at the substrate surface \([3]\) are unchanged. For the interfacial conditions, the kinematic condition \([4]\), tangential stress balance \([8]\), and continuity of voltage \([5]\) are also unchanged. Equation \([5a]\) transforms to
\[
[\epsilon'(-h_x(V_x^i - 1) + V_z^i)]_\Pi = 0.
\]
Finally, the normal stress balance becomes
\[
u_x(h_x^2 - 1) - (u_x + w_x)h_x + h(1 + h_x^2) \cot \theta - \frac{1}{2} p(1 + h_x^2)
+ \frac{We}{2} \left[ \epsilon' \left( (h_x^2 - 1)((V_x^i)^2 - (V_z^i)^2) - 4h_x(V_x^i - 1)V_z^i + (1 + h_x^2) \right) \right]_\Pi
= \frac{1}{2C} \frac{h_{xx}}{(1 + h_x^2)^{1/2}}.
\]
The exact Nusselt solution to the Navier–Stokes equations \([12]\) and the above boundary conditions in non-dimensional form is
\[
\bar{h} = 1, \quad \bar{u} = 2z - z^2, \quad \bar{w} = 0, \quad \bar{p} = 0, \quad \nabla' = 0 \quad \text{for } t = S, I, II.
\]
In Appendix \([A]\) we derive the Orr–Sommerfeld system for the linearisation of the dynamics about \([16]\); the electrostatics component is solved fully so that the remaining problem is a slight modification of the usual Orr–Sommerfeld system for thin films \([31]\). We also consider the Stokes flow limit in Appendix \([A]1\) for which we obtain an exact dispersion relation – we compare this with the linear behaviour of the long-wave models given next.

### III. Hierarchy of Long-Wave Models

For our analysis of the absolute or convective behaviour of the interfacial dynamics, we consider a hierarchy of long-wave models. These are the Benney model and two WIBL models. We omit the majority of the details of the derivations of these models since they may be found in \([45, 46]\) for the Benney equation and \([27–29]\) for the WIBL long-wave models. These are the Benney model and two WIBL models. We omit the majority of the details of the derivations of these models since they may be found in \([45, 46]\) for the Benney equation and \([27–29]\) for the WIBL long-wave models. We omit the majority of the details of the derivations of these models since they may be found in \([45, 46]\) for the Benney equation and \([27–29]\) for the WIBL long-wave models. We omit the majority of the details of the derivations of these models since they may be found in \([45, 46]\) for the Benney equation and \([27–29]\) for the WIBL long-wave models. We omit the majority of the details of the derivations of these models since they may be found in \([45, 46]\) for the Benney equation and \([27–29]\) for the WIBL long-wave models.

For our analysis of the absolute or convective behaviour of the interfacial dynamics, we consider a hierarchy of long-wave models. These are the Benney model and two WIBL models. We omit the majority of the details of the derivations of these models since they may be found in \([45, 46]\) for the Benney equation and \([27–29]\) for the WIBL long-wave models. These are the Benney model and two WIBL models. We omit the majority of the details of the derivations of these models since they may be found in \([45, 46]\) for the Benney equation and \([27–29]\) for the WIBL long-wave models.

For an approximation of the interface thickness \( H \) (the first two terms of an asymptotic expansion of \( h \)), the Benney model with errors of \( O(\delta^2) \) is
\[
H_t + \left[ \frac{2}{3} H^3 + \delta \left[ H^6, H^3, \frac{1}{3} H^3 P_x \right] \right]_x = 0.
\]

Here, \( P \) is the leading order pressure at the interface which is assumed to be \( O(1) \). The Benney equation is only effective at modelling flows for Reynolds numbers just beyond critical, with finite time blow-ups observed in numerical simulations \([17, 18]\) – this is due to the highly nonlinear inertial term.

WIBL models are far more accurate than Benney equations at describing thin films for Reynolds numbers further from critical; they are able to correctly capture the dynamics beyond the drag–gravity regime to which Benney equations are restricted \([31]\). In order to obtain the WIBL models, we rewrite the kinematic condition \([4]\) as
\[
h_t + f_x = 0,
\]
where \( f \) is the fluid flux through a slice of the film
\[
f(x,t) = \int_0^{h(x,t)} u(x,z,t) \, dz.
\]
Following a weighted residuals strategy, in which the flow field is expanded in polynomials of $z$, the WIBL2 (simplified second order) model, which comprises an approximation of the kinematic condition [18] coupled to an equation for the time evolution of $F$ (an approximation of $f$), is given by

$$H_t + F_x = 0,$$
$$F + \frac{2}{5} \frac{2\text{Re}}{5} H^2 F_1 = \frac{2}{3} H^3 + \delta \left[ \frac{18\text{Re}}{35} H_x F^2 - \frac{34\text{Re}}{35} H F F_x - \frac{1}{3} H^3 P_x \right] + \delta^2 \left[ \frac{8}{9} H_x F - \frac{9}{5} H H_x F_x - \frac{12}{5} H H_x F + \frac{9}{5} H^2 F_{xx} \right].$$

The WIBL1 (first order) model is obtained by omitting the $O(\delta^2)$ term in (21). The dependence on the flow field variables is not completely eliminated as in the Benney equation, but the latter may be obtained from WIBL1 with elimination of $F$ in the $O(\delta)$ terms of [21] using the leading order relation $F = 2H^3/3$. Furthermore, Benney and WIBL1 are identical at zero Reynolds numbers, and all models reduce to the same degenerate equation for $\delta = 0$. Denner et al. [30] reported that fully nonlinear simulations of WIBL2 correctly captured the main humps in solitary wave trains even up to $\text{Re} = 100$, agreeing with DNS and experiments, but overestimated the amplitude of the leading capillary ripples for $\text{Re} \gtrsim 10$ (note that $\text{Re}$ is 1.5 times greater than the Reynolds number used in [30]) – we consider Reynolds numbers up to these values in the linear theory to follow, it is known that there is good agreement with the Orr–Sommerfeld linear theory for these values [31]. It remains to compute $P$ in terms of $H$.

Starting from (13) under the lubrication scalings and discarding lower order terms, it can be seen that the leading order normal stress balance at the fluid interface is

$$h \cot \theta - \frac{1}{2} p + \frac{W e}{2} \left[ c^I (2\delta V_x^I + (V_z^I)^2 + 4\delta h_x V_z^I) \right]_{11} = \frac{\delta^2}{2C} h_{xx} + O(\delta),$$

where we have retained up to $O(\delta)$ terms inside the bracket corresponding to the electric field effect. In order to calculate the contribution of the electric field to the interfacial pressure, we consider the asymptotic expansions

$$h = h_0 + \delta h_1 + \ldots, \quad V^I = V_0^I + \delta V_1^I + \ldots,$$

for $i = I, II, S$. We additionally introduce an auxiliary normal variable $\zeta = \delta z$ in the substrate and Region II, so that the Laplace equations in the three regions are

$$\delta^2 V_{xx}^I + V_{zz}^I = 0, \quad V_{xx}^I + V_{zz}^I = 0, \quad \text{for } i = S, I, II.$$

In preparation for a spatial stability analysis in the following section, we consider complex wavenumbers $\xi = \xi_r + i\xi_i \in \mathbb{C}$. From the Laplace equations and far field boundary conditions [13], the Fourier transforms (in $x$) of the voltage potentials in the substrate and Region II take the form

$$\hat{\nabla}^S = \hat{A}^S(\xi) e^{i\text{sign}(\xi_i)\xi \zeta}, \quad \hat{\nabla}^{II} = \hat{B}^{II}(\xi) e^{-i\text{sign}(\xi_i)\xi \zeta},$$

where the multipliers $\hat{A}^S$ and $\hat{B}^{II}$ have asymptotic expansions similar to [23]. The solution in Region I has the asymptotic expansion

$$\hat{\nabla}^I = \hat{C}^I_0(\xi) z + \hat{D}^I_0(\xi) + \delta \left( \hat{C}^I_1(\xi) z + \hat{D}^I_1(\xi) \right) + O(\delta^2).$$

After applying the change of variables, the boundary conditions for the electrostatics problem at the substrate surface ($\zeta = z = 0$) yield the equalities

$$\hat{A}^S_0(\xi) = \hat{D}^I_0(\xi), \quad \hat{A}^S(\xi) = \hat{D}^I(\xi), \quad \hat{C}^I_0(\xi) = 0, \quad \text{e}^S \text{sign}(\xi_i) \xi \hat{A}^S_0(\xi) - \text{e}^I \hat{C}^I_1(\xi) = 0.$$

From the interfacial boundary conditions for the voltage potentials, we also obtain

$$\hat{D}^{II}_0(\xi) = \hat{D}^I_0(\xi), \quad (\text{e}^I - \text{e}^{II}) i\xi \hat{h}_0 + \text{e}^I \hat{C}^I_1(\xi) + \text{e}^{II} \text{sign}(\xi_i) \xi \hat{D}^{II}_0(\xi) = 0.$$

These give the Fourier transform of the voltage potential at the interface to leading order as (c.f. equation (40) in [37] with $\epsilon_B = 1$ – corresponding to the case of no lower bounding solid)

$$\hat{V}^I = \left( \frac{\text{e}^{II} - \text{e}^I}{\text{e}^S + \text{e}^{II}} \right) i\xi \text{sign}(\xi_i) \hat{h}_0 + O(\delta), \quad \Rightarrow \quad V^I = \left( \frac{\text{e}^I - \text{e}^{II}}{\text{e}^S + \text{e}^{II}} \right) \mathcal{H}(h_0) + O(\delta),$$

where $\mathcal{H}(h_0)$ is the function that expresses the hydrostatic pressure.
for \( i = 1, \Pi \), where \( \mathcal{H} \) denotes the Hilbert transform with Fourier symbol \( \hat{\mathcal{H}}(\xi) = -i \text{sign}(\xi) \) for \( \xi \in \mathbb{R} \). The expression for \( \hat{\mathcal{V}}^i \) for complex wavenumbers given in (29a) will be important for the spatial stability analysis in the next section. It follows from this result and (22) that in order to retain the effects of surface tension and the electric field in the leading order dynamics, we must take \( We = O(\delta^{-1}) \) and \( C^{-1} = O(\delta^{-2}) \). Collecting the leading order terms of the normal stress balance (22) gives

$$
P = 2 \left[ H \cot \theta + \delta \ We' \mathcal{H}(H_x) - \frac{\delta^2}{2C} H_{xx} \right], \tag{30}
$$

where to simplify the parameterisations, we have defined the rescaled electric Weber number,

$$
We' = \frac{(\ell^I - \ell^{II})^2}{\ell^{II} + \ell^S} We. \tag{31}
$$

We note that the electric field has no effect if the permittivities on either side of the fluid interface are equal (the rescaled electric Weber number is always zero); the impact of the electric field is maximised for \( \ell^I \) large, with \( \ell^S \) and \( \ell^{II} \) both small. The \( z \)-momentum equation implies that \( p_z = O(\delta) \), so (30) gives the constant leading order pressure across a fluid slice.

With the rescaling \( \delta(\partial_t, \partial_x) \to (\partial_t, \partial_x) \), we may return to the original time and space variables (as in the non-dimensional Navier–Stokes setting), formally setting \( \delta = 1 \) in the long-wave models (assumed from this point). As we will see in the following linear stability analysis, both surface tension and the electric field have a stabilising effect on the interface dynamics; for \( C^{-1/2} \sim We' \), both effects are relevant. For the results of the models to be valid, parameters should be chosen so that at least one of these effects is retained; if both surface tension and the electric field are negligible in the leading order dynamics, the instability moves towards the short waves, invalidating the initial long-wave assumption. Although the small parameter is now scaled out of the equations, it remains in the problem implicitly, indicating the subset of parameter space which is compatible with the long-wave assumption. For non-zero field strengths, the models are well-posed in the limit of weak surface tension, i.e. \( C^{-1/2} = o(We') \), in the sense that high wavenumbers remain damped. The corresponding weakly nonlinear evolution for electrified flows with \( \epsilon = 0 \), and thus, for any \( \delta \), we have \( \epsilon = 0 \). The expression (30) gives the constant leading order pressure

$$
\eta_t + \eta_{tx} + \eta_{xx} - \mathcal{H}(\eta_{xx}) = 0, \tag{32}
$$

which is also well-posed. A fourth order term is included if surface tension effects are not negligible. We do not consider (32) in the current work.

### A. Temporal linear stability analysis

We consider a spatially periodic disturbance with wavenumber \( \xi \in \mathbb{R} \), and let \( \omega = \omega_r + i\omega_i \in \mathbb{C} \). For the Benney model, we substitute \( H = 1 + He^{i\xi x + \omega t} \) into (17) and linearise for small \( \hat{H} \) to obtain the linear dispersion relation,

$$
\omega + 2i\xi + \left( 2\cot \frac{\theta}{3} - \frac{8Re}{15} \right) \xi^2 + \frac{2We'}{3} |\xi|^3 + \frac{1}{3C} \xi^4 = 0. \tag{33}
$$

Taking the imaginary part yields the phase velocity \( -\omega_i/\xi = 2 \), and taking the real part shows that inertial forces are linearly destabilising, while the electric field effect and surface tension forces are both linearly stabilising. Gravitational forces are stabilising for overlying films \( (\theta < \pi/2) \), and destabilising for hanging film flows. For overlying flows, the correct critical Reynolds number at which the flat film state destabilises is recovered, \( Re_c = 5 \cot \theta/4 \), a quantity which is zero for vertical films. It is particularly clear from (33) (and is also true for the WIBL models and the full system) that if a flow is above critical (either \( Re > Re_c \) or \( \theta > \pi/2 \)), then the strengthening of stabilising surface tension or electric field effects cannot prevent linear instability in all wavenumbers; we have \( \omega_r \sim \xi^2 \) locally near \( \xi = 0 \), and thus, for any \( We' \) and \( C \), the flat state will be linearly unstable on a sufficiently large spatial domain. To study the temporal linear stability of the WIBL models, we substitute \( H = 1 + He^{i\xi x + \omega t} \) and \( F = 2/3 + Fe^{i\xi x + \omega t} \) into (20,21), and linearise for small \( \hat{H} \) and \( \hat{F} \) to obtain a quadratic in \( \omega \):

$$
\frac{2Re}{5} \omega^2 + \left( 1 + \frac{68Re}{105} i\xi + \frac{9}{5} \xi^2 \right) \omega + 2i\xi + \frac{2\cot \theta}{3} - \frac{8Re}{35} \xi^2 + \frac{2We'}{3} |\xi|^3 + \frac{1}{3C} \xi^4 + \frac{8}{5} \xi^3 = 0. \tag{34}
$$

The two double-underlined terms in the above expression correspond to \( O(\delta^3) \) terms in the WIBL2 model, and are dropped for the consideration of WIBL1. Both WIBL models have the same critical Reynolds number \( Re_c \) as the Benney model and Orr–Sommerfeld theory, improving on the IBL model of Shkadov [20] near critical.
FIG. 2: Linear growth rates as a function of the wavenumber for a range of electric Weber numbers, \( W'e = 0, 10, 20 \). The parameters taken are \( \theta = \pi/2 \) (\( \cot \theta = 0 \)) and \( C = 0.01 \). The dotted/dashed/solid line corresponds to the Benney/WIBL1/WIBL2 model, respectively. Panels (a,b) take the cases \( Re = 1, 4 \), respectively.

FIG. 3: Critical wavenumber dependence on the Reynolds number for a vertical film flow (\( \theta = \pi/2 \)) with \( C = 0.01 \) and \( W'e = 0, 40 \). The dotted, dashed, and solid lines correspond to the results for the Benney/WIBL1, WIBL2, and Orr–Sommerfeld models, respectively. The electrical permittivities used in the Orr–Sommerfeld model are \( \epsilon^S = 1.5 \), \( \epsilon^I = 2 \), \( \epsilon^{II} = 1 \).

Figure 2 shows the growth rates for the long-wave models in the vertical flow case, \( \theta = \pi/2 \), with \( C = 0.01 \) and \( W'e = 0, 10, 20 \), taking \( Re = 1 \) in panel (a) and \( Re = 4 \) in panel (b). The growth rates for the Benney model, WIBL1 and WIBL2 are plotted with dotted, dashed and solid lines, respectively. It is very apparent that the linear behaviour of the long-wave models agrees much more closely for near-critical Reynolds numbers (\( Re_c = 0 \) for the results in figure 2), with large disagreements in panel (b). The stabilising effect of the electric field is evident – in panel (a), the band of modes with wavenumbers between approximately 0.06 and 0.12 become linearly stable as \( W'e \) is increased from 0 to 10, and the maximum growth rate decreases. The band of unstable modes with positive (real) wavenumbers \( (0, \xi_c) \) is the same for the Benney and WIBL1 models, where \( \xi_c \) is the critical wavenumber which satisfies \( \omega_r = 0 \) (the WIBL1 dispersion relation agrees with (33) for \( \omega_r = 0 \)). The critical wavenumber determines the length of the shortest unstable wave; linear stability is obtained if the system length is below the corresponding critical wavelength, i.e. \( L_0 < 2\pi/\xi_c \). For the case of a vertical film flow with \( C = 0.01 \) and permittivities \( \epsilon^S = 1.5 \), \( \epsilon^I = 2 \) and \( \epsilon^{II} = 1 \), figure 3 plots the variation of the critical wavenumber \( \xi_c \) against \( Re \) for the non-electrified flow and the case of \( W'e = 40 \) (see...
IV. ABSOLUTE AND CONVECTIVE INSTABILITIES

In this section we investigate the absolute or convective nature of the linear instabilities for the various long-wave models. If the model is accurate for the given non-dimensional parameters, it is expected that the regions of absolute and convective instability approximate those of the full problem. We check this exactly in the case of zero Reynolds number, since the Orr–Sommerfeld problem yields an explicit dispersion relation in this limit. We also perform DNS with pulse initial conditions in the next section to validate the following results.

A linearly unstable system is classified as convectively unstable if its response to a small perturbation is convected away from the location of the initial disturbance. On the other hand, absolutely unstable systems are those in which small perturbations grow locally. This classification is of particular interest in the thin film scenario as it would be expected that an absolutely unstable hanging film is susceptible to dripping, since for a linear system, absolute instability ensures local unbounded growth. However, the evolution of liquid films, and in particular the dripping process, is very nonlinear. Moreover, it is difficult to predict if a convectively unstable system will still drip far downstream from the inlet, or converge to a bounded wave-train of pulses with nonlinearity saturating any instabilities. Brun et al. [31] considered this scenario in the case of a two-dimensional flow with small Reynolds numbers and derived an inertialess Benney equation given in terms of our non-dimensional parameters as \( \text{Re} \approx 0 \). They determined regions of absolute and convective instability analytically in terms of the inclination angle and the ratio of mean film thickness to capillary length (this can be rewritten as a relationship between \( \theta \) and \( c \)). They found good agreement with experiments, where films in the convectively stable regime of the long-wave model were found not to drip at all, or yielded relatively few drops compared to the absolutely unstable parameter regime. There was an increased number of drips deeper into the absolute instability regime. The linear theory was extended to more complex WIBL models by Scheid et al. [32] without the low Reynolds number restriction. They calculated a fluid-dependent critical angle in terms of the Kapitza number (fixed for a given fluid) above which only convective instabilities may exist for any Reynolds number; the minimum of these is a fluid-independent critical angle (corresponding to the limit of zero Kapitza number). In what follows, we show that an electric field may be used to increase these critical angles towards the horizontal arrangement, i.e. increase the parameter space of convectively unstable systems.

The simple recipe utilised in [14, 32] for determining absolute and convective instabilities is immediately applicable for problems with dispersion relations which are analytically extensible to the complex plane. In such cases, it can be shown that the flow transitions for parameters when pinching of the zero contours of \( \omega_r \) (the real part of the dispersion relation) occurs – this is known as the Briggs–Bers criterion. This line in parameter space can be formulated as the solution to \( \omega_r = 0 \) with the zero group velocity condition \( \partial_\xi \omega = 0 \). For nonlocal problems, however, such as those considered here, care must be taken to apply this method (see [14] for a discussion of such issues). Despite this, we will show that the Briggs–Bers pinching criterion is applicable through a symmetry of the dispersion relations. In order to apply our analysis, the dispersion relations obtained in the previous section must be extended correctly to the complex plane. From (29), we see that \( |\xi|^3 \) must be extended as \( \text{sign}(\xi) |\xi|^3 \); note that this term is not analytic on the imaginary wavenumber axis \( \xi = 0 \), yet is symmetric about it.

We proceed in the formulation of Fokas and Papageorgiou [33]. Consider a general linear PDE for a real-valued function \( H \) with dispersion relation \( \omega(\xi) \) extended to complex wavenumbers \( \xi = \xi_r + i\xi_i \in \mathbb{C} \). For the restriction of \( \omega \) to real wavenumbers, we assume that all unstable frequencies are contained in the interval \(( -\xi_c, \xi_c )\), where \( \xi_c \in \mathbb{R} \) is the critical wavenumber. We also assume conjugate symmetry of the dispersion relation, \( \omega(-\xi) = \overline{\omega(\xi)} \), a condition
that is satisfied by the dispersion relations under consideration since the solution is real-valued. Given an initial condition $H_0(x)$, the solution of the linear PDE may be expressed as

$$H(x,t) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int \hat{H}_0(\xi)e^{i\xi x + \omega(\xi)t} d\xi,$$

where $\hat{H}_0(\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} H_0(x)e^{-i\xi x} dx.$ (35)

Note that $\hat{H}_0(\xi)$ is also conjugate symmetric since the initial condition $H_0(x)$ is real-valued. For the long-wave models considered in the previous section, $\omega(\xi)$ is given by either (33) or (34) with $|\xi|^3$ replaced by its correct generalisation to complex wavenumbers, $\text{sign}(\xi^3)$. The first integral in (35) may be split into two parts, one integral over the stable frequencies, $\mathbb{R}\setminus(-\xi_c,\xi_c)$, and another over the interval $(-\xi_c,\xi_c)$ which is denoted $J(x,t)$. It can be shown that the former integral decays to zero as $t \to \infty$ while keeping $x = 0$, thus $J(x,t)$ alone may inform us of the absolute or convective nature of the instability. Using the conjugate symmetry of the dispersion relation and $\hat{H}_0(\xi)$, we have the expression

$$J(x,t) = \frac{1}{\pi} \text{Re} \left[ \int_{0}^{\xi_c} \hat{H}_0(\xi)e^{i\xi x + \omega(\xi)t} d\xi \right].$$ (36)

Then it follows from [45] that the type of instability can be determined by the topology of the curves $\omega_i(\xi)$ in the right half-plane. Cauchy’s theorem is applicable since the dispersion relation is analytic and bounded in this region, where $\text{sign}(\xi^3) \approx -\xi^3$. If the integral over $(0,\xi_c)$ can be deformed to part of the curve $\omega_i(\xi) = 0$ in the right half-plane, then it can be shown that $J(x,t)$ decays for $t$ fixed with $|x| \to \infty$, and for $x$ fixed with $t \to \infty$; thus the instability is convective. In the case that the curves of $\omega_i(\xi) = 0$ do not connect the points $0$ and $\xi_c$ on $\mathbb{R}_+$, then the instability is absolute. The Briggs–Bers pinching criterion can then be applied to our problem. Solving $\omega_i = 0$ and $\partial_t \omega = 0$ for complex wavenumbers in the right half-plane is an algebraic problem, the solutions of which separate the regions between absolute and convective instability. In order to find the transition line in parameter space, we proceed with numerical continuation of solutions to the algebraic problem using the continuation software AUTO-07P [49].

Both the Benney and WIBL1 models are identical for $Re = 0$, and without electric field effects become the inertialless Benney equation studied by Brun et al. [43]. We have a unique non-trivial exact solution to the Briggs–Bers criterion for this system with $\xi_r > 0$. The critical angle $\theta \in (\pi/2, \pi)$ for this exact solution is defined by $\cot^3 \theta = -243/4C(17 + 3/2)$, with wavenumber $\xi$ given by

$$\xi_i = \frac{2^{4/3}Z^{2/3} + 3^{1/3}C \cot \theta}{2^{5/3}3^{2/3}Z^{1/3}}, \quad \xi_r = (3\xi_i^2 - C \cot \theta)^{1/2}, \quad \text{where} \quad Z = \sqrt{\frac{729C^2}{256} - \frac{3C^3 \cot^3 \theta}{16} - \frac{27C}{16}},$$ (37)

and $\omega_i = -3\xi_r / 2 - 2 \cot(\theta) \xi_i \xi_r / 3$. In the case of $C = 0.01$, this exact solution is $\theta \approx 2.963$ (about 80° beyond vertical), $\xi_i \approx -0.0873$, $\xi_r \approx 0.280$ and $\omega_i \approx -0.510$.

Given a capillary number $C$, the line in parameter space separating convective from absolute instability for either the Benney or WIBL1 models can be continued from this exact solution as $Re$ increases from zero. This exact solution can also be continued to solutions of the Briggs–Bers criterion for WIBL2 by introducing an additional parameter in front of the $O(\delta^2)$ viscous extensional stress terms in (21) which varies from 0 (corresponding to WIBL1) to 1 (corresponding to WIBL2). The A/C transition curves in parameter space can be validated from the topology of the $\omega_i = 0$ for the given parameters. In figure 4(a,b), we give examples of the $\omega_i = 0$ curves in the right half-plane (the diagram is symmetric about the imaginary axis) for the Benney and WIBL1 models, respectively. The parameters taken are $C = 0.01$, $Re = 4$, $\cot \theta = -8$, with rescaled electric Weber numbers $We' = 0, 20, 40$. For the Benney model in panel (a), the non-trivial real root is connected to the origin when $We' = 40$, but not for $We' = 0, 20$. Then, in the former case, the Benney equation is convectively unstable, but absolutely unstable in the latter case. The “pinching” of the roots (change in the topology of the $\omega_i = 0$ curves) corresponding to the Briggs–Bers criterion occurs between $We' = 20$ and $We' = 40$ for the Benney model. This is different to the results for WIBL1 shown in panel (b), with absolute instability only for $We' = 0$ (the root plot for WIBL2 with these parameters is very similar). The non-analyticity of the dispersion relation is apparent in panel (a), where the curves are not smooth at the non-trivial purely imaginary roots for $We' > 0$. In figure 4(c), we plot the A/C transition curves obtained from numerical continuation of the Briggs–Bers criterion for fixed $C = 0.01$ and $We' = 0, 20, 40$, as $Re$ and $\cot \theta$ vary; these lines separate the absolutely unstable parameter region (on the left) from the convectively unstable region (on the right) for the Benney and WIBL models. The Benney model has a linear transition curve, as follows from the corresponding polynomial $\omega_i = 0$. Because of this, the Benney model incorrectly forecasts that a vertical film flow undergoes the transition from convective to absolute instability at $Re = 6.939$, and that overlying film flows may become absolutely unstable for higher Reynolds numbers. In contrast, the more accurate WIBL1 and WIBL2 models diverge very quickly from the Benney line and yield fold points, marked with triangles in the figure. This
can be understood as the existence of a fluid-dependent critical angle, above which all instabilities are convective. Importantly, this critical angle has a negative cotangent and corresponds to a hanging film, i.e. the WIBL models for overlying films can only be convectively unstable. Note that the curves for the inertialess Benney would be vertical lines emanating from the square markers on the $Re = 0$ axis – this is much closer to the WIBL curves than the inertial Benney equation for most parameters (this is purely coincidental, and does not attest to the accuracy of the model). All models agree that increasing electric field strength has a stabilising effect on the dynamics, moving the transition line further to the left. The star in panel (c) corresponds to the parameters used in panels (a) and (b); the star lies between the A/C curves for the Benney and WIBL cases with $We' = 20$, in agreement with the root plots. Figure 4(d) plots the zero Reynolds number transition lines and fold points as the electric Weber number increases; it is evident that
there is good agreement between the long-wave models at \( Re = 0 \), and that WIBL1 and WIBL2 agree closely on the location of the critical angle fold point for these parameters; increasing \( We' \) from 0 to 40 moves the \( Re = 0 \) transition and fold points by over 5\(^\circ\). Our parameters are related to those in Scheid et al. \[32\] (denoted with a superscript Sch) by \( \delta^{\text{Sch}} = 21/3C^{1/3}Re \), \( \zeta^{\text{Sch}} = 21/3C^{1/3}\cot \theta \), \( \eta^{\text{Sch}} = 2^{2/3}C^{2/3} \). These are the reduced Reynolds number, the reduced inclination number, and the viscous extensional number, respectively. For the WIBL1 (and Benney) model, viscous extensional stresses are ignored, i.e. \( \eta^{\text{Sch}} = 0 \) or dropping the \( O(\delta^2) \) terms in \[21\]. As for the computations for WIBL2 shown in figure \[3\] (c,d), we have \( \eta^{\text{Sch}} = 0.0737 \) – see figure 3 in \[32\]. From the results shown in figure \[4\] we recover their critical values of \( \zeta^{\text{Sch}} \approx -1.507 \) corresponding to the transition point for zero Reynolds numbers, and \( \zeta^{\text{Sch}} \approx -1.221 \), corresponding to the fold point for the WIBL1 transition curve; the latter of these is the maximum value of \( \zeta^{\text{Sch}} \) even for non-zero extensional stresses.

As discussed in Scheid et al. \[32\], there is no guarantee that the continued pinching (saddle) point remains dominant across the parameter space (except for the Benney equation \[17\] where there are no other saddle points). Other saddle points can be found for our dispersion relations, and the topology of the \( \omega_c = 0 \) curves might change in such a way that the connectivity of the origin and the non-trivial real root cannot be related to the continued pinching point. Healey \[50\] observed such a scenario in his consideration of the problem of plane mixing layers with confining parallel substrates. The saddle point which is dominant for the unconfined flow is dominated by additional saddle points which arise due to confinement as the fluid layer width decreases. This drastically alters the resulting A/C instability diagram from that which has been produced by continuation of the unconfined dominant pinching point alone. We have not seen similar phenomena for the parameters and models utilised in the current study, and have checked the topology of \( \omega_c = 0 \) in many places to verify that the curves from the continuation procedure indeed demarcate the absolute and convective regions. Fully nonlinear simulations of the relevant model is another way to check that the correct saddle point is captured by the continuation. In a later section, we perform DNS of the full Navier–Stokes equations coupled with electrostatics – this serves as a check that the dominant saddle point is obtained, and also to test the accuracy of the model predictions for the A/C threshold of the full problem.

The results in figure 4 are computed for a fixed capillary number; varying \( C \) gives a two-dimensional surface separating the regions of absolute and convective instability. We may then perform continuation in \( We' \) to find the dependence of the surface on the electric field strength. In their study of the non-electrified case, Scheid et al. \[32\] showed the existence of a fluid-independent critical angle \( \theta_c = 147.4^\circ \) \( (\theta_c - 90^\circ = 57.4^\circ \text{ beyond vertical}) \) for the full second-order WIBL model, below which absolute instabilities cannot exist (see figures 4, 5 and 6 in \[32\]), i.e. a lower bound on the A/C transition surface in terms of the inclination angle. For the non-electrified case, this lower bound is attained at zero Reynolds numbers. We recover the minimum critical angle with the simplified WIBL2 system, but not WIBL1 – inclusion of viscous extensional stresses is vital as absolute instability can be found for WIBL1 at any angle beyond vertical. Figure 5(a,b) plots the A/C transition surfaces of the WIBL2 model for \( We' = 0,5 \), respectively; parameters above the surface correspond to an absolutely unstable system, with convective instability below. For comparison with the results in \[32\], we give the critical inclination angle from the vertical, \( \theta_c - 90^\circ \), expressed in degrees, not radians. The dotted lines are the transition curves for fixed values of \( Re \) as \( C \) varies, and the solid lines track the minima of these lines, i.e. the minima of the angle \( \theta_c - 90^\circ \) over \( C \) for a given value of \( Re \). The solid line in figure 5(a) is monotonically increasing in \( Re \), with the minimum value \( \theta_c - 90^\circ = 57.4^\circ \text{ at } Re = 0 \) as obtained by Scheid et al. \[32\] using the full second-order WIBL model. Interestingly, the minima are found at \( O(1) \) values of \( C \); this is not an artefact of the long-wave modelling approach, as DNS agrees with the non-monotonic A/C threshold (see fig. 7 in \[32\]). Unsurprisingly, the strong surface tension limit yields critical angles which are very close to horizontal for any \( Re \). For \( We' = 5 \) in panel (b), the solid line tracing the minima diverges to \( C = \infty \) as the Reynolds number is decreased from 100, corresponding to zero surface tension effects. The dotted lines for small \( Re \) shown in panel (b) are monotonically decreasing in \( C \), and their minimum value is obtained in the limit \( C \rightarrow \infty \), which is qualitatively different to the non-electrified case. This is verified by performing continuation of the algebraic system corresponding to the Briggs–Bers criterion in the parameter \( 1/Re \), where it is found that the fold point passes to prohibited negative values of \( 1/Re \) as the Reynolds number is decreased. Panel (c) gives the projection of the minimum curves in panels (a) and (b) with other choices of \( We' \) against \( Re \). The region above a given line corresponds to either absolute or convective instability, whereas all parameters below the line give convectively unstable systems. We find three regimes depending on the value of \( We' \): For \( We' < 1.85 \), the critical angle for each \( Re \) is attained at finite \( C \), and the minimum critical angle is found in the zero Reynolds number limit. For \( We' \in (1.85,3.62) \), the critical angle for small Reynolds numbers is found in the limit of zero surface tension (indicated with a dotted line section), yet the minimum is still found at \( Re = 0 \). The former is also true for \( We' > 3.62 \), except the minimum critical angle is found for \( Re > 0 \), shown with diamonds in panel (c). The minimum critical angle (the minimum of the A/C transition surface over both \( C \) and \( Re \)) is plotted as a function of \( We' \sin \theta \) \( (\theta \text{-independent quantity}) \) in figure (c,d), where the three sections of the solid line (separated with stars) correspond to the three cases in panel (c). The dotted lines are continuations of the middle section of the solid line corresponding to \( Re = 0 \) and \( C \rightarrow \infty \).
The A/C instability regions of WIBL2 in the weak surface tension limit are shown in figure 6. Panel (a) plots the transition surface in terms of \( \text{Re} \) and \( \text{We}' \). The dotted lines are the transition curves for fixed values of \( \text{Re} \) as \( \text{We}' \) varies, and the solid line tracks these minima. Note that the minima are attained at \( \text{We}' = 0 \) for \( O(1) \) values of \( \text{Re} \), but at non-zero \( \text{We}' \) for larger Reynolds numbers. It is surprising that figure 5(a) and figure 6(a) are qualitatively different, where either one of the electric field or surface tension forces is zero. It may be of interest to consider generalisations of the stabilising terms in the interfacial pressure (30), but this is beyond the scope of the current study. The projection of the solid curve in panel (a) onto the \( \text{Re} \)-direction is given in panel (b), where the dotted line indicates that the minimum is attained at \( \text{We}' = 0 \). As before, parameters above the line yield absolute or convective instability, with only convective instability below the curve. The minimum critical angle of 59.2° below vertical is obtained for \( \text{Re} = 0 \) – as shown above, inclusion of surface tension can increase or decrease this value. The minimum of the surface in figure 5(a) over \( \text{Re} \) (this is not the projection of the solid line onto the \( \text{We}' \)-direction) can be obtained from figure 4(d); it comprises of the initial dotted line for \( \text{We}' \sin \theta < 0.675 \), and the two other solid line segments – these three line sections correspond to minima attained in the zero surface tension limit.
A. Comparison of long-wave models with Stokes flow results

We now provide comparisons between the A/C regions for the long-wave models with the corresponding results for the full Stokes flow problem, which does not require a long-wave methodology. The regions of validity in parameter space of the long-wave models are restricted due to their asymptotic derivation, whereas for the full Stokes flow problem, there are no restrictions on $C$, $We$, or the electrical permittivities. Obviously, the results that follow are only accurate for very low Reynolds numbers.

From the full Orr–Sommerfeld system for the electrified problem given in Appendix A, the exact dispersion relation in the Stokes flow limit is obtained in Appendix A1,

$$\omega = -\frac{i\xi(1 + \xi^2 + \cosh^2(\xi))}{\xi^2 + \cosh^2(\xi)} - \left(\cot \theta + i We\xi[e^{\frac{\gamma}{\epsilon}}]_{II} + (2C)^{-1}\xi^2 \right) \frac{\sinh(\xi) \cosh(\xi) - \xi}{\xi(\xi^2 + \cosh^2(\xi))}, \tag{38}$$

where the electric field term is defined in (A18). As in the case of the long-wave models, we are able to take advantage of symmetries of the dispersion relation in order to apply the Briggs–Bers criterion in the right-half $\xi$-plane. We again utilise AUTO-07P to solve this algebraic problem and perform solution continuation. The expressions for the real and imaginary parts of $\omega$ and $\partial_\xi \omega$ are exceedingly long – we utilised Maple to expand these expressions and convert them into a format which was appropriate for AUTO-07P.

Figure 7 gives a comparison of the results obtained from the Stokes flow calculations with the corresponding WIBL2 results at zero Reynolds number. Panels (a,b) plot the critical inclination angle for the Stokes flow problem (solid line) and WIBL2 model (dotted line) against $C$, for $We' = 0, 5$, respectively. The curves agree closely in the case of strong surface tension, $C \to 0$, with deviation for larger capillary numbers. This is expected as the system becomes short-wave unstable for these parameters, invalidating the long-wave model. In the non-electrified case, the minimum is again found an $O(1)$ value of $C$, although at a different value of $\theta_c$, further confirming that the non-monotonic A/C behaviour is not a fabrication of the long-wave methodology. The minimum critical angle of $58.0^\circ$ below the vertical is obtained, differing from the result of $57.4^\circ$ for WIBL2 (and the full second-order WIBL model). It may be the case that a higher order long-wave model captures this value more accurately (WIBL3), but this is beyond the scope of the current study. This reveals a slight downfall in the use of long-wave models to predict the A/C behaviour of the full problem. The results for $We' = 5$ also agree qualitatively, although with a discrepancy for negligible surface tension – $We'$ is not large enough to maintain the long-wave assumption in this limit. Panel (c) shows a continuation of the minimum critical angle against $We' \sin \theta$. The curves intersect and do not converge together as the field strength increases; this may be expected as the instability moves towards the short waves, and the capillary number where the minima are attained increases (to the right of the stars, $C \to \infty$). To compute the results for the Stokes flow problem, we used permittivities $\epsilon^S = 1.5$, $\epsilon^I = 2$, and $\epsilon^{II} = 1$ (as in figure 3).
(a) A/C transition line for $We' = 0$.  
(b) A/C transition line for $We' = 5$.  
(c) Minimum critical angle against $We' \sin \theta$.

FIG. 7: Comparison of A/C regions for Stokes flow (solid) with WIBL2 at zero Reynolds number (dotted). Panels (a,b) plot the transition curves for $We' = 0, 5$, respectively. Panel (c) plots the minimum critical angle against $We' \sin \theta$; the values to the right of the stars are attained in the weak surface tension limit, as in panel (b). The permittivities used for the Stokes flow computations are $\epsilon^S = 1.5$, $\epsilon^I = 2$, and $\epsilon^{II} = 1$.

V. DIRECT NUMERICAL SIMULATIONS: PULSE INITIALLYATION

In this section, we perform DNS of the full Navier–Stokes problem coupled with electrostatics, taking a small-amplitude pulse disturbance to the Nusselt solution as the initial condition. This is utilised to check the accuracy of the predictions of A/C instability for the full problem based on the A/C behaviour of the low-dimensional models. A similar numerical experiment was performed for the non-electrified case by Scheid et al. [32], who showed that the full second-order WIBL model captured the correct A/C behaviour of the Navier–Stokes problem. This section provides a similar validation with the addition of the stabilising electric field.

The hydrodynamical component of the results presented in the previous section can be recast in terms of the mean interface height $\ell$, inclination angle $\theta$, and a geometry-independent Kapitza number $\sigma/\rho g^{1/3} \nu^{2/3}$, which is fixed for a given fluid. Fixing the dielectric constants also means that $E_0$ alone parameterises the electrical component of the problem. Thus, we may obtain a surface in $(\ell, \theta, E_0)$-space separating the regions of absolute and convective instability for each model. This surface is not monotonic (for a model including viscous extensional stresses) – this is visible from the results for the non-electrified problem by taking a constant-Kapitza number slice of figure 5(a), as well as fig. 7 in [32] and fig. 3 in [33]. For brevity, we do not re-plot the results in terms of these parameters, but provide A/C thresholds in tables when comparing to DNS.
We fix the working fluid to be the Castor Oil (Hänsele AG) used in experiment by Brun et al. [14]. They measured the capillary and viscous lengths to be 1.91 mm and 4.4 mm, respectively, and also give the dynamic viscosity to be $865 \pm 5 \pi P$. The fluid properties corresponding to these measurements are given in SI units in Table I and we also fix $g = 9.81 \, m/s^2$ for all calculations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\rho$ (kg/m$^3$)</th>
<th>$\nu$ (m$^2$/s)</th>
<th>$\mu$ (kg/m·s)</th>
<th>$\sigma$ (N/m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>946</td>
<td>$1.94 \times 10^{-4}$</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>0.0339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE I: Physical parameters for Castor Oil (Hänsele AG)**

We assign to the fluid the dielectric constant $\varepsilon = 5$, which is roughly the value found for castor oils. We note that, although castor oils typically have a very low electrical conductivity (less than $10^{-10}$ Siemens/m), they have been observed in certain experiments to behave as a leaky dielectric rather than a perfect dielectric [51] – we ignore this for the purposes of the present study. We set $\varepsilon^I = 1$, the value for air. Since $\varepsilon > \varepsilon^I$, the parallel field still has a linearly stabilising effect on the interface even if the conductivity of the castor oil is accounted for [39, 40]. By choosing the electrical permittivity of the solid substrate to match that of the liquid phase, $\varepsilon^S = 5$ – a realistic value for Pyrex glass, we do not need to solve for $V^S$ (the numerical implementation is discussed later). For our calculations, we take the permittivity of free space to be $\varepsilon_0 = 8.85 \times 10^{-12}$ $A^2 \cdot s^4 / kg \cdot m^3$. We note that the dielectric breakdown of air occurs for electric field strengths beyond approximately $E_0 = 3 \times 10^6$ $V/m$ [52], and thus we do not consider values of $E_0$ beyond this.

For our numerical simulation of the full system with pulse initial conditions, we choose $\theta = 5\pi/6$ and $\ell = 2.5\, mm$, in which case, all models (long-wave and Stokes) predict the non-electrified case to be absolutely unstable. However, this is close enough to a region of convective instability as the field strength is increased, that the required $E_0$ is feasible. The critical values of $E_0$ above which the models exhibit convective instability are summarised in Table II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Inertial Benney</th>
<th>Benney</th>
<th>WIBL1</th>
<th>WIBL2</th>
<th>Stokes flow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$E_0$ (V/m)</td>
<td>$3.07 \times 10^5$</td>
<td>$3.45 \times 10^5$</td>
<td>$3.34 \times 10^5$</td>
<td>$2.48 \times 10^5$</td>
<td>$2.10 \times 10^5$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE II: Critical $E_0$ (V/m) for A/C transition with $\theta = 5\pi/6$ and $\ell = 2.5\, mm$.**

The critical value of $E_0$ decreases with increasing accuracy of the inertial long wave models, with the inertial Benney and Stokes flow dispersion relations also giving reasonable values. The field strengths in Table II were produced by continuation of the dominant saddle point, and additionally verified with root plots as in figure 3(a,b).

For the DNS, we employ the open-source volume-of-fluid solver * Gerris* [53, 54]. We use viscous-gravity length and time scales as described by Samanta et al. [56] in order to non-dimensionalise the system, as it provides a convenient unit effective Reynolds number, embedding the parameter variation inside the dimensionless film thickness and surface tension coefficient instead. We consider a finite computational domain of length $L_0 = 400\ell$ in the streamwise variable, with an extent of $50\ell$ in the perpendicular $z$-direction. For an undisturbed interface, the region $\ell < z < 50\ell$ of the computational domain is occupied by the second fluid, in our case we take air (at room temperature). For DNS, Region II is hydrodynamically active; its fluid properties are such that this has a negligible effect, and a comparison with long-wave models derived assuming that Region II is hydrodynamically passive remains valid. We set the density in Region II to 1.17 kg/m$^3$ and take a dynamic viscosity of $1.83 \times 10^{-3}$ kg/m·s, both of which are significantly lower than their liquid film counterparts given in Table I. A spatial filtering technique smoothing out the interface is hence employed to improve the performance of the underlying projection solver. The no-slip and impermeability conditions are applied at the solid substrate boundary ($z = 0$), and a no-stress conditions is imposed on the opposite side of the computational domain at $z = 50\ell$. Dirichlet boundary conditions for the voltage potential are prescribed at the inlet and outlet, chosen to give the desired field strength $E_0$. Neumann conditions for the voltage potential are imposed at the upper and lower boundaries of the computation domain – these are found to be an effective equivalent of the far-field conditions since we have chosen $\varepsilon^S = \varepsilon^I$. The Nusselt base profile, given by 1 in dimensional variables, is prescribed as the initial condition, on top of which we add a Gaussian pulse with amplitude being 1% of the liquid film thickness, with centre located 150\ell from the inlet (far enough to prevent unwanted boundary noise/effects). Guided by the linear theory of the long-wave models, we choose the pulse width to be approximately $4\ell$ to induce the desired instability and minimise transient effects. The Nusselt solution is also used as the inlet condition, while standard outflow conditions are considered at the downstream boundary. We prescribe the maximum level of refinement around
(a) Evolution of wavepacket for $E_0 = 0 \, V/m$.  
(b) Evolution of wavepacket for $E_0 = 6 \times 10^5 \, V/m$.  

(c) Upstream edge of wavepacket.

FIG. 8: Panels (a,b) plot interfacial profiles starting from pulse initial data for $E_0 = 0, \, 6 \times 10^5 \, V/m$, respectively. For the height axes on the left hand sides, the substrate is at $-2.5$. For clarity, we include an (off-vertical) arrow indicating the direction of gravity. Panel (c) shows the evolution of the upstream edge of the wavepacket, from left to right, the lines correspond to $E_0 = 0, 1.5, 3, 4.5, 6, 7.5 \times 10^5 \, V/m$. In all panels, the profiles are shifted so that the initial Gaussian pulse is located at the origin.

The interfacial shape, as well as close to the substrate in order to capture the details of the underlying boundary layer. Changes in the velocity field otherwise dictate the adaptive mesh refinement strategy. Considering the above, the discretised domain is described by approximately $10^5$ computational grid cells, with the target evolution to the first dripping events requiring several days of runtime on local high performance computing facilities. The code is executed in parallel on up to 16 CPUs, with load balancing capabilities resulting in reasonably good scalability properties.

The results of the DNS are shown in figure 8. Panels (a,b) show the evolution of the pulse initial data for the cases of $E_0 = 0, 6 \times 10^5 \, V/m$, respectively. The profiles are shifted so that the initial pulse is centred at the origin. Note also the vector showing the direction in which gravity is acting for these hanging films. From the height scales on the left hand sides of each panel, there is a clear difference in growth rate across these two cases, and the non-electrified dynamics reaches a nonlinear phase of evolution at around $t = 4 \, s$. In order to determine the absolute or convective nature of the instability, we monitor the upstream edge of the wavepacket – plotted in figure 8(c) for a range of $E_0$. These curves were computed using the region of $(x,t)$ space for which $|h(x,t) - \ell|$ was above a given tolerance. The boundary of this region is wavy, and so the curves were computed by fitting through the farthest upstream points (similar to figure 8 in [57]). There is an initial transient phase in which the wavepacket is convected downstream in all cases – we found this is difficult to avoid by choosing better initial data due to DNS constraints. For the
non-electrified case, the wavepacket edge begins to move back upstream at $t \approx 2$ s, and similarly for $E_0 = 1.5 \times 10^5$ at $t = 3$ s. We are confident that these cases show linear (and nonlinear) absolute instability after a transient phase, as predicted by the low-dimensional models (see Table III), rather than a linear convective instability followed by a nonlinear absolute instability as discussed by Delbende and Chomaz. The choices of $E_0 \geq 3 \times 10^5$ all showed convective instabilities (in both the linear and nonlinear phase), in agreement with the predictions of WIBL2 and the Stokes dispersion relation.

VI. DIRECT NUMERICAL SIMULATIONS: DRIPPING

In this section, we perform DNS of the full Navier–Stokes equations coupled with electrostatics on a spatial domain of length $L_0$, and determine parameters for which dripping occurs. We consider inflow and outflow boundary conditions to mimic an experimental set-up, unlike the study in [33] on periodic domains. The majority of the details of the DNS set-up are exactly as in the previous section. We initialise our simulations with the Nusselt solution, and apply a time-periodic forcing at the inlet (located at $x = 0$) of the form

$$u_{x=0}(t) = (1 + \alpha \sin(2\pi f t))\bar{u}$$

where $\bar{u}$ is the base Nusselt velocity defined in [3], and $f$ is a frequency chosen to excite the most unstable interfacial waves using predictions from the long-wave models. The strength of the time-periodic inlet perturbation, $\alpha$, was varied to reduce the transient phase of the dynamics and ensure the development of a clean wave-train close to the inlet. This form of inlet forcing was used effectively by Denner et al. [30] in their computation of solitary wave profiles. Furthermore, we find that the resulting solutions are robust to variations in the forcing frequency $f$. For all numerical experiments, we fix the aspect ratio by taking the system length (between inlet and outlet) to be 300 times the film thickness, i.e. $L_0 = 300\ell$. While the domain imposed to capture the dripping dynamics is marginally smaller than in the case of the pulse evolution, the timescale required to comprehensively investigate the instability is at least one order of magnitude larger due to a significant transient period, thus resulting in a considerably increased computational effort. The computational framework described in the previous section naturally allows for interfacial break-up, however we have opted to remove resulting drops as soon as they detach from the main body of fluid to avoid interactions with the opposite boundary, as well as to concentrate computational resources at the level of the investigated liquid film.

A. Non-electrified case

For our investigation of the dripping limit for a non-electrified flow, we considered three choices of the inclination angle $\theta$, and varied the film thickness $\ell$. The three values of $\theta$ are given in Table III along with absolute instability regions in $\ell$ for all of the models discussed in the present paper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\theta$</th>
<th>$\theta - 90(\degree)$</th>
<th>Inertialess Benney</th>
<th>Benney</th>
<th>WIBL1</th>
<th>WIBL2</th>
<th>Stokes flow</th>
<th>$\ell_{\text{drip}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$7\pi/8$</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>1.52 $\leq \ell$</td>
<td>1.52 $\leq \ell$</td>
<td>1.52 $\leq \ell$</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>1.35 $\leq \ell$</td>
<td>8.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5\pi/6$</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.19 $\leq \ell$</td>
<td>2.15 $\leq \ell$</td>
<td>2.16 $\leq \ell$</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>2.18 $\leq \ell$</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$49\pi/60$</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.51 $\leq \ell$</td>
<td>2.42 $\leq \ell$</td>
<td>2.44 $\leq \ell$</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE III: Absolute instability regions and dripping limits for non-electrified case (lengths are given in mm).

In the case of the WIBL2 model, for example, the values are obtained by taking a constant-Kapitza number slice of the surface shown in figure 3a; the resulting curve is then considered for the three values of $\theta$. Both WIBL2 and the Stokes flow models exhibit a non-monotonic $A/C$ threshold, in agreement with DNS of the Navier–Stokes equations. The dashes in the last row indicate that the models are convectively unstable for all choices of $\ell$. The other models do not include viscous extensional stresses.

For each case of $\theta$, we performed DNS for a range of values of $\ell$, guided by the results of the spatial stability analysis. We do not present simulation results for large values of $\ell$ near the upper bounds of the absolute instability regions; we found immediate and extensive dripping for these parameters. In agreement with the results of Kofman et al. [32] (see their figure 3), we are confident that only the lower $A/C$ threshold can be used as a predictor of dripping; in this regime, viscous extensional stresses are not important and the critical angle for absolute instability depends monotonically on $\ell$. It is expected that the dripping angle should also be monotonic in $\ell$. It is worthy to note that
(a) Bounded wave-train for $\ell = 1.35\ mm$.

(b) Wave-train with dripping due to coalescence (transient) for $\ell = 1.40\ mm$.

(c) Dripping due to instability of solitary waves (not coalescence) for $\ell = 1.45\ mm$.

FIG. 9: Snapshots of the fluid interface for $\theta = 7\pi/8$ and a range of inflow film thicknesses. The dashed line indicates the inflow film thicknesses $\ell$, and the dotted line is given by $h_{\text{max}} = 1.649\ell$ (see the text). The waves with peaks above the dotted line in panels (b,c) eventually yield dripping events. Note that the height axes are reversed to emphasise that the films are on the underside of the flat substrate.

there are $O(10)$ variations of the non-dimensional parameters in the cases for which we perform DNS (although $Re$ still remains small), with parameters ranging from $Re = 0.005$ and $C = 0.0885$ for $\ell = 1.3\ mm$ and $\theta = 7\pi/8$, to $Re = 0.05$ and $C = 0.466$ for $\ell = 2.5\ mm$ and $\theta = 49\pi/60$.

For $\theta = 7\pi/8$, we find a very clear separation between three cases which are plotted in figure 9. From simulations with $\ell = 1.25, 1.30, 1.35\ mm$, we find a linear relationship between the mean film thickness and maximum wave height, approximately $h_{\text{max}} = 1.649\ell$. This linear relationship is expected and in agreement with the results in [30, 59] for overlying films. No drips are observed for these cases, even after the coalescence of neighbouring pulses. In figure 9(a) we plot a snapshot of such a bounded wave train for $\ell = 1.35\ mm$; some of the pulses are wider as they result from the coalescence of two smaller pulses, but all waves very clearly attain the maximum bound sufficiently far from the inflow. Increasing the inflow film thickness to $\ell = 1.40\ mm$, we find similar bounded wave trains (the dotted line in figure 9(b) indicates the estimate for $h_{\text{max}}$), but occasionally in the transient phase of the dynamics, dripping occurs due to the coalescence of two adjacent pulses. Interactions and coalescence between pulses is common for smaller values of $\ell$, however not leading to dripping events. Further increasing $\ell$ to 1.45 mm, we see dripping due to a different mechanism as displayed in the snapshot in figure 9(c). The individual solitary waves destabilise and form drips, rather than dripping due to coalescence or pulse interaction (however, the latter is still possible in this case). The pulses appear to attain the predicted $h_{\text{max}}$ briefly, before further increasing in amplitude until pendant drips form. We thus define $\ell_{\text{drip}}$ to be the length beyond which dripping occurs due to instability of individual pulses far from the inlet (not transient effects or pulse interactions/coalescence). We believe this to be a sensible definition for this phenomenon. We give predicted ranges for $\ell_{\text{drip}}$ in Table III based on our DNS results – much longer computations would be required to refine these further.

In all cases we found that the transient dynamics were significantly long, often requiring prohibitively large timescales to observe convergence to a regular state. For $\theta = 7\pi/8$, a shallow angle close to the horizontal set-up, the dynamics
are relatively well-behaved and the prevailing regime is clearly apparent, with wave-trains developing not too far downstream as shown in figure 9. On the other hand, the inclinations further from horizontal exhibited more complex pulse interactions with wave-trains develop far from the inlet, and hence a more challenging detection of features at the level of the individual pulses required to inform our previously defined metric for dripping. The predicted intervals of $\ell_{\text{drip}}$ for $\theta = 5\pi/6$ and $\theta = 49\pi/60$ in Table III are correspondingly much wider. We note that the regularity of dripping is a useful indicator; for $\ell > \ell_{\text{drip}}$, drips often occur at regular time intervals, at a fixed spatial location. For the transient dripping with $\ell < \ell_{\text{drip}}$, there is very little regularity in the temporal or spatial location of the dripping events. We see from Table III that the predicted $\ell_{\text{drip}}$ appears to be monotonic in $\theta$, as expected.

**B. Electrified case**

In order to study the effect of the electric field on the dripping dynamics, we focus on the case of $\theta = 5\pi/6$ and $\ell = 2.5$ mm as considered in the previous section – see Table II for the critical values of $E_0$ for which the various models transition from convective to absolute instability. Since we fix the aspect ratio to $L_0 = 300\ell$, we may express the required voltage in terms of the electric field strength as $V_0 = 300\ell E_0$. We note from Table III that the film drips without an electric field.

In figure 10, we present time series for the maximum deviation of the interface from the mean thickness, $h_{\text{max}} - \ell$, for a range of $E_0$. We show the first 50 s of longer simulations in the figure; note that the axes are reversed so that downward spikes indicate dripping events. For $E_0 = 0.0, 1.5, 3.0 \times 10^5$ V/m, we see very regular dripping events, both temporally and spatially (from inspection of the interfacial evolution). Delay of the first dripping event, and temporal and spatial irregularity of dripping events is clear for $E_0 = 4.5, 6.0 \times 10^5$ V/m. This appears to be due
to time-periodic disturbances that travel from the inlet downstream, disrupting the regular structure of the pulses and causing considerable pulse interaction. This behaviour does not appear to be transient and thus our previously defined metric of dripping is invalid for the electrified problem. However, this transition between dripping due to loss of stability of pulses and dripping due to pulse interaction does agree well with the A/C threshold. For \( E_0 = 7.5, 9.0 \times 10^5 \) \( V/m \), bounded wave trains emerge (with only a few transient drips). Dripping suppression is obtained for \( E_0 \) at least double the convective instability threshold; we expect that the increased disparity between the linear and nonlinear phenomena is due to the nonlocality of the electric field effect.

We note that, although the A/C threshold does not agree as closely with the dripping limit as in the non-electrified case, it provides a good order-of-magnitude approximation of the required \( E_0 \) for dripping stabilisation. Furthermore, a temporal linear stability does not provide a good estimate of the dripping stabilisation threshold since the required \( E_0 \) for linear stability of the system is dependent on \( L_0 \).

VII. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

Absolute linear instability of the flat interface solution and the highly nonlinear process of dripping are not equivalent, however, it has been found that their thresholds are close in parameter space for non-electrified film flows, but not identical \[14, 35\]. In the present work, we considered the addition of a stabilising electric field to the problem, and performed a linear stability analysis for a range of long-wave models and the Stokes flow limit. In agreement with \[30, 37\], we found that a sufficiently strong electric field may be employed to ensure linear and nonlinear stability of the fluid interface. We found that an absolutely unstable system will become convectively unstable if the imposed electric field is sufficiently strong. Employing DNS to study the full physical system (Navier–Stokes coupled with electrostatics) with pulse initial conditions, we showed that the A/C predictions of the long-wave models are closely aligned with the A/C behaviour of the full model.

Following an extensive DNS study on long domains using inflow/outflow boundary conditions, we observed a separation of the dripping dynamics into three regimes: no dripping, dripping due to coalescence and pulse interaction, and dripping due to instability of individual pulses. For both non-electrified and electrified flows, we found that the threshold of absolute instability was a good predictor of the onset of the latter phenomena. For the non-electrified problem, dripping due to coalescence appears to be transient, and thus it is reasonable to define the dripping threshold as the loss of stability of pulses. However, for the electrified flow, the regime of dripping due to coalescence and pulse interaction is large in parameter space, and the behaviour appears to be persistent – accordingly, we cannot define the dripping limit as in the non-electrified case. The A/C threshold remains a good order-of-magnitude estimate for the critical electric field strength required to prevent dripping. We expect this to be true for hanging film flows with a range of external effects imposed, e.g. magnetic fields, thermal effects, surfactants. This study shows that long-wave modelling approaches can provide valuable predictions for very nonlinear processes; as a consequence, computationally expensive DNS to find a more precise result can be performed in a smaller region of parameter space. For comparison with experiments and relevance to applications, an extension of the theory to conducting fluid phases is warranted.

A separation of dripping dynamics into three regimes was observed by Rietz et al. \[60\] in an experimental study of a liquid film on the exterior of a vertical rotating cylinder. No dripping was observed for convectively unstable systems. For flows just beyond the A/C threshold, they found that two-dimensional wave-fronts destabilised into rivulets which emit drips – this is due to wave coalescence on the rivulets. Going further into the absolute instability regime decreases the inception length of the dripping process, until drips form immediately at the inlet. We find a similar separation into three regimes for our problem. There are no details in the experimental work of Brun et al. \[14\] whether the dripping events observed are due to coalescence of waves, but the increase in number of drips deeper into the absolute instability regime is congruent with our findings. The inclination angles considered in the experiments of Charogiannis and Markides \[11\] and Charogiannis et al. \[12\] are well below the values for which we predict absolute instability or dripping from our two-dimensional study – their results are in agreement since no dripping is observed. Further experimental work at more extreme inclinations, such as those considered in \[14\], would be of great interest. It would be of particular interest to identify regimes of dripping due to coalescence and secondary instability of pulses, respectively, as found in the present work.

It would be of interest to compare the A/C predictions and DNS results with the matched asymptotics theory of Indeikina et al. \[13\] for individual static (pinned) rivulets. The fully wetting rivulet structures observed in the experiments of Charogiannis and Markides \[11\] and Charogiannis et al. \[12\] at moderate inclination angles (not close to vertical) have wavelength given by the most unstable spanwise mode, resulting from the balance of destabilising cross-stream gravity and stabilising surface tension; this is \( \sqrt{2} \) larger than the wavelength of the static rivulets considered in \[13\] which correspond to the neutrally stable spanwise mode. Lin et al. \[34\] considered both the dynamics on a static pinned (neutral-mode) rivulet as in \[13\], and the development of a front on a thin precursor film (no dewetting or contact lines), finding in the latter case the most unstable mode dominates. The collection of experimental and
numerical studies indicate a shift to shorter (stable) wavelengths when the film dewets. However, we also note the hysteresis effect observed in [13], whereby the pinning points of a rivulet with an imposed fluid flux contract as the inclination is increased, but remain fixed as the angle is decreased. This indicates that the rivulets may exist for a range of base widths and static contact angles for a given flow rate. Can fully wetting rivulet structures survive into the dripping regime, or do they give way to one or more static rivulets as observed in [10] [13]? The edges of the fluid film are observed to contract towards the centre in experiments in [11] [12]. If dripping occurs in the wedge shaped transition between the inlet and the single rivulet, the mass and fluid flux of the latter are unknown. Thus, it is unclear how to extract a useful prediction from the work of Indeikina et al. [13] for the present two-dimensional setting, since it is non-obvious what the dimensions of an effective underlying static rivulet should be, in either the wetted or dewetted regime. We leave such comparisons to future work on the three-dimensional problem.

The electrified aspect of the fully three-dimensional problem is also an interesting extension. For this, we allow the electric field to be skewed at an angle $\phi$ to the streamwise flow direction, yet still parallel to the substrate surface. The far field boundary condition for the voltage potentials in this problem is then

$$\nabla V \rightarrow -(E_0 \cos \phi, E_0 \sin \phi, 0), \quad \text{as } z \to \pm \infty.$$  \hspace{1cm} (40)

If $\phi = 0$, we recover the arrangement considered in the present work, and if $\phi = \pi/2$ the field is directed purely in the transverse direction. Following through with the long wave analysis, we find that the electric field contribution, which has Fourier symbol $|\xi|^3$ in the two-dimensional formulation, now appears as the operator with symbol

$$(\xi_1^2 + \xi_2^2)^{1/2}(\xi_1 \cos \phi + \xi_2 \sin \phi)^2,$$  \hspace{1cm} (41)

for wavenumber vector $(\xi_1, \xi_2)$. From this expression, it is apparent that the electric field has the strongest stabilising effect on waves which are in the same direction as the undisturbed field lines, and has no influence on interfacial waves which are perpendicular, with a smooth variation in-between. Thus, a strong electric field with a skew can ensure that an interface can only develop instabilities of a select few modes. In particular, a field set up transverse to the flow direction may be employed in experiments to preserve the two-dimensional phase of the dynamics for overlying films, i.e. impede secondary instabilities, or to prevent the formation of rivulets for hanging films without affecting the streamwise dynamics. A detailed study of the fully three-dimensional problem will be presented in future work. Additionally, work is underway on the full three-dimensional problem with an electric field set up normal to the substrate, investigating the electrostatically-induced rivulet formation predicted in [16] for overlying liquid films.

**Appendix A: Orr–Sommerfeld system**

In this appendix, we derive the Orr–Sommerfeld system for the case of the two-dimensional electrified flow. By seeking the evolution of a perturbation about the exact Nusselt solution [16], with perturbations denoted by tildes, the linearisation of the non-dimensional Navier–Stokes equations [12] is

\[
\text{Re}(\tilde{u}_t + \tilde{u}\nabla x + \tilde{w}\nabla z) = -\tilde{p}_x + \nabla^2 \tilde{u}, \quad \text{Re}(\tilde{w}_t + \tilde{w}\nabla x) = -\tilde{p}_z + \nabla^2 \tilde{w}, \quad \nabla \cdot \tilde{u} = 0,
\]  \hspace{1cm} (A1)

with the no-slip and impermeability conditions unchanged. The kinematic condition and tangential stress balance become

\[
\tilde{w} = \tilde{h}_t + \tilde{h}_x, \quad \tilde{u}_z - 2\tilde{h} + \tilde{w}_x = 0, \quad \text{at } z = 1,
\]  \hspace{1cm} (A2)

and the normal stress balance is now

\[
\tilde{w}_z + (1 + \tilde{h}) \cot \theta - \frac{1}{2} \tilde{p} + \text{We} \left[ \epsilon \tilde{V}_z^1 \right]_{II} = \frac{1}{2C} \tilde{h}_{xx}, \quad \text{at } z = 1,
\]  \hspace{1cm} (A3)

where we have used the continuity equation to obtain the first term. The majority of the problem for the voltage potentials remains the same for the perturbed variables; these are the Laplace equations, far-field conditions [13], and the solid–fluid boundary conditions [3]. However, the conditions for the voltage potentials at the free surface become

\[
\left[ \epsilon (\tilde{h}_x + \tilde{V}_z) \right]_{II} = 0, \quad \left[ \tilde{V}^1 \right]_{II} = 0 \quad \text{at } z = 1.
\]  \hspace{1cm} (A4)

To proceed with the Orr–Sommerfeld analysis, we rearrange these equations to obtain a system for $\tilde{h}$, $\tilde{w}$, and $\tilde{V}^1$ alone. By taking the divergence of the momentum equation, we obtain

\[
\nabla^2 \tilde{p} = -2\text{Re} \tilde{u}_z \tilde{w}_x = 4\text{Re}(z-1)\tilde{w}_x, \quad \nabla^2 \tilde{p}_z = 4\text{Re}\tilde{w}_x - 2\text{Re} \tilde{u}_z \tilde{w}_{xz} = 4\text{Re}\tilde{w}_x + 4\text{Re}(z-1)\tilde{w}_{xz}.
\]  \hspace{1cm} (A5)
Next, by taking the Laplacian of the z-momentum equation and using (A5b) we obtain
\[ \nabla^2 \left( Re \dot{w}_z - \nabla^2 \dot{w} \right) + Re(2 + \pi \nabla^2) \dot{w}_z = 0. \] (A6)

Noting from (A5b) that \( \nabla^2 \dot{p} = 0 \) at \( z = 1 \), we take the derivative of the z-momentum equation with respect to \( z \) and evaluate at \( z = 1 \) to obtain
\[ \dot{p}_{xx} = Re(\dot{w}_{tx} + \dot{w}_{xz}) - \nabla^2 \dot{w}_z, \quad \text{at } z = 1. \] (A7)

Then, by applying \( \partial^2 \dot{Z} \) to the normal stress balance and using the previous equation, we find
\[ 3\dot{w}_{xxx} + \dot{w}_{zzz} + 2\dot{h}_{xx} \cot \theta - Re(\dot{w}_{tx} + \dot{w}_{xz}) + 2We \left[ \epsilon^i \tilde{V}_{xx} \right]_{\Pi1} - \frac{1}{C} \dot{h}_{xxxx} = 0, \quad \text{at } z = 1. \] (A8)

Lastly, by taking a derivative of the tangential stress boundary condition with respect to \( x \) we obtain
\[ \dot{w}_{xx} - \dot{w}_{zz} = 2\tilde{h}_x, \quad \text{at } z = 1. \] (A9)

We consider perturbations of the form
\[ \tilde{h} = e^{i\xi x + \omega t}, \quad \dot{w} = W(z)e^{i\xi x + \omega t}, \quad \tilde{V} = \tilde{A} e^{i\xi x + \omega t} \quad \text{for } \iota = S, I, II, \] (A10)
where we allow \( \xi \in \mathbb{C} \) (\( \xi \in \mathbb{R} \) is sufficient for a temporal linear stability analysis). In keeping with the literature, we denote the ordinary derivative with respect to \( z \) by \( D_z \) or primes. Substitution of (A10) into (A6) and the Laplace equations yield
\[ (D_z^2 - \xi^2) [D_z^2 - \xi^2 - Re\omega] W - i\xi Re[\pi(D_z^2 - \xi^2) + 2] W = 0, \quad (D_z^2 - \xi^2) \tilde{A}^\iota = 0, \] (A11)
for \( \iota = S, I, II \). The boundary conditions at the substrate surface \( z = 0 \) are
\[ W = 0, \quad W' = 0, \quad \epsilon^S(\tilde{A}^S)' = \epsilon^I(\tilde{A}^I)', \quad \tilde{A}^S = \tilde{A}^I, \] (A12)
where (A12a) is obtained using the no-slip condition and continuity equation. The far field conditions give
\[ \tilde{A}^S(z) \to 0, \quad \text{as } z \to -\infty, \quad \tilde{A}^II(z) \to 0, \quad \text{as } z \to +\infty, \] (A13)
and the interfacial conditions at \( z = 1 \) are
\[ W = i\xi + \omega, \quad [D_z^2 + \xi^2] W + 2i\xi = 0, \quad [D_z^2 - 3\xi^2 - Re(\omega + i\xi)] W' = 2\xi^2 \cot \theta + 2iWe\xi^3 \left[ \epsilon^I \tilde{A}^I \right]_{\Pi1} + \frac{\xi^4}{C}, \] (A14)
\[ e^I(i\xi + (\tilde{A}^I)') = e^I(i\xi + (\tilde{A}^II)'), \quad \tilde{A}^I = \tilde{A}^II. \] (A15)

The electrostatics component of this problem, comprising (A11b), (A12d), (A13) and (A15), can be solved analytically in full,
\[ \tilde{A}^S = \Gamma(\xi)e^{\text{sign}(\xi)\xi z}, \quad \tilde{A}^I = \Gamma(\xi) \left[ \cosh(\xi z) + \text{sign}(\xi) \frac{\xi^4}{C} \sinh(\xi z) \right], \]
\[ \tilde{A}^II = \Gamma(\xi) \left[ \cosh(\xi) + \text{sign}(\xi) \frac{\xi^4}{C} \sinh(\xi) \right] e^{\text{sign}(\xi)\xi(1-z)}, \] (A16)
where
\[ \Gamma(\xi) = \frac{(e^I - e^I) i \text{sign}(\xi)}{(e^I + e^S) \cosh(\xi) + \text{sign}(\xi) \left( e^I + \frac{2\text{sign}(\xi)}{C} \right) \sinh(\xi)}. \] (A17)

Thus, we can analytically give the electric field contribution in (A14c) at \( z = 1 \),
\[ 2iWe\xi^3 \left[ \epsilon^I \tilde{A}^I \right]_{\Pi1} = 2We\xi^3 \frac{\text{sign}(\xi) \cosh(\xi) + \frac{\xi^4}{C} \sinh(\xi)}{\cosh(\xi) + \text{sign}(\xi) \left( \frac{(\xi)\xi + 4\text{sign}(\xi)}{C(\xi + \pi^2)} \right) \sinh(\xi)}, \] (A18)
so that only the fluid dynamics problem in the region \( 0 \leq z \leq 1 \) remains. The leading order term of (A18) for small wavenumbers is \( 2We\xi^3 \text{sign}(\xi) \) which is consistent with the long-wave calculations. The Orr–Sommerfeld system may be solved easily with the bifurcation and continuation software AUTO-07P, as discussed in [31]. With this, we produced the solid line in figure 8 showing the dependence of the critical wavenumber \( \xi_c \) on the Reynolds number and electric field strength.
1. Stokes flow

At zero Reynolds number, the Orr–Sommerfeld equation \( (A11a) \) reduces to

\[
(D_x^2 - \xi^2)^2 W = 0,
\]  
(A19)

with boundary conditions \( (A12a,b) \) and \( (A14) \) (with \( Re = 0 \) and \( (A18) \)). Equation \( (A19) \) has the general solution

\[
W = J_1(\xi) z \cosh(\xi z) + J_2(\xi) z \sinh(\xi z) + J_3(\xi) \cosh(\xi z) + J_4(\xi) \sinh(\xi z).
\]  
(A20)

The boundary conditions \( (A12a,b) \) give \( J_3(\xi) = 0 \) and \( J_1(\xi) + \xi J_4(\xi) = 0 \), respectively, and the conditions \( (A14b,c) \) at the interface imply that

\[
J_2(\xi) = \frac{i(\xi \tanh(\xi) - 1) - \xi \cot \theta - i W e^{2[\epsilon^+ H]_{il}} (2C)^{-1} \xi^3}{(\xi^2 + \cosh^2(\xi)) \sinh(\xi)}, \quad J_4(\xi) = \frac{J_2(\xi)(1 + \xi \tanh(\xi)) + i \sech(\xi)}{\xi^2}.
\]  
(A21)

With these, the dispersion relation in the Stokes flow limit can be obtained from \( (A14b) \) as

\[
\omega = -\frac{i \xi (1 + \xi^2 + \cosh^2(\xi))}{\xi^2 + \cosh^2(\xi)} \left( \cot \theta + i W e^{2[\epsilon^+ H]_{il}} (2C)^{-1} \xi^2 \right) \frac{\sinh(\xi) \cosh(\xi) - \xi}{\xi^2 + \cosh^2(\xi)} \]  
(A22)

With the small wavelength approximations

\[
\hat{\epsilon}_1(\xi) := \frac{i \xi (1 + \xi^2 + \cosh^2(\xi))}{\xi^2 + \cosh^2(\xi)} = 2i \xi + O(\xi^3), \quad \hat{\epsilon}_2(\xi) := \frac{\sinh(\xi) \cosh(\xi) - \xi}{\xi^2 + \cosh^2(\xi)} = \frac{2}{3} \xi^2 + O(\xi^4),
\]  
(A23)

we recover the Benney dispersion relation \([33]\) at zero Reynolds number to leading order.
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