Steady capillary jet length

Alfonso M. Gañán-Calvo,1 Henry N. Chapman,2,3,4 Michael Heymann,5 Max O. Wiedorn,2,3,4 Juraj Knoska,2,3 Yang Du,2 Braulio Ganan-Riesco,6 Miguel A. Herrada,1 José M., López-Herrera,1 Francisco Cruz-Mazo,1 and Saša Bajić7

1Departamento de Ingeniería Aerospatial y Mecánica de Fluidos, Universidad de Sevilla.
Camino de los Descubrimientos s/n 41092, Spain.
2Center for Free-Electron Laser Science, Deutsches Elektronen Synchrotron (DESY), Notkestrasse 85, 22607 Hamburg, Germany.
3Dept. Physics, University of Hamburg, Luruper Chaussee 149, 22761 Hamburg, Germany.
4Centre for Ultrafast Imaging, Luruper Chaussee 149, 22761 Hamburg, Germany.
5Max Planck Institute of Biochemistry, Am Klopferspitz 18, 82152 Martinsried, Germany
6Ingemiatrics Tec. S.L., 41900 Camas, Sevilla, Spain.
7Deutsches Elektronen Synchrotron (DESY), Notkestrasse 85, 22607 Hamburg, Germany.

Despite their fundamental and applied importance, a general model to predict the nearly deterministic natural breakup length of steady capillary jets has not been proposed yet. Here we describe and quantify the energy route that sets this length for a given set of liquid properties, geometry and operating conditions. We find that the underlying mechanism that determines the jet length is the short-term transient growth rate of perturbations excited by the jet breakup itself. We propose a perturbation analysis of the time averaged energy conservation equation of the system in the absence of body forces (applicable to flow focused and ballistic capillary jets). The balance of total energy rates due to the perturbations is reduced, by dimensional analysis, to a closed algebraic expression with two universal constants. These constants are calculated by optimal fitting of a large set of experimental measurements of jet breakup lengths, including previously published data from different sources. Available experimental and numerical data conform remarkably well to the universal scaling law found.

PACS numbers: 47.55.D-, 47.55.db, 47.55.df

Capillary jets, their instability and breakup have attracted scientific curiosity since long ago [1, 2]. They provide a perfectly gentle and reproducible way to transport a liquid without solid contact at long distances from a source compared to the size of the source (or its transversal size) [3]. Demand for increasingly precise means to deliver tiny liquid samples has grown explosively with the advent of faster and more sensitive detection and analysis procedures. For example, maximum jet length combined with jet diameters below 5 microns is desirable in serial femtosecond crystallography (SFX) [4, 5], which is one of several applications for microjets with particular properties (see appendix Methods). Many other applications would also benefit from this knowledge.

Despite numerous previous studies of the development length of jet instabilities [6,10], we are still lacking a general theoretical model describing an intact length achieved by a steady, freely released capillary jets [6,11–16] before their capillary breakup [17].

The most accurate description of the natural (not externally excited) breakup physics of capillary jets has been recently given by Umemura [17], who described it as a “self-destabilizing loop” [17]. We share the view of Umemura and propose that the energy content of the upstream perturbations (initial value problem) that lead to subsequent natural (unforced) jet breakup comes exclusively from the downstream perturbations due to earlier breakups. In summary, the instability of steady capillary jets comes from the transient growth [18,19] of self-generated nonmodal perturbations, whose energy content comes exclusively from the jet’s own surface energy excess at breakup. That energy is on average a 20% of the surface energy of each jet portion that leads to a drop by Rayleigh’s capillary breakup (i.e. the average drop surface is about 20% smaller than that of the jet portion which caused it). Although most of this energy is eventually dissipated, a small component of the energy spectrum is capable to propagate upstream (in particular that with smaller wavelength) and form imperceptible perturbations that eventually evolve by transient growth. However, it has not yet been established why a capillary jet that breaks up by natural means becomes destabilized in a rather deterministic manner, within relatively narrow statistical limits, at a certain downstream position.

Here we demonstrate the universality and deterministic nature of the natural breakup mechanism and the energies involved, for capillary jets in the absence of body forces (e.g. ballistic and flow focused micro-jets). We focus on the range of Weber and capillary numbers for which the jet breaks up axisymmetrically [6]. The reason for this choice is that the intact length of capillary jets is maximized for the flow regimes where axisymmetric breakup conditions prevail. Otherwise, the transient growth of asymmetric perturbations, which is larger than that of the axisymmetric ones [20], and the greater irregularity and inhomogeneity of the asymmetric breakup would make the jet shorter, as experimentally observed during asymmetric breakup (compare for example figures 2(a)
FIG. 1. (a) Typical gas flow focused capillary jet configuration [5]. \( \Delta P \) is the total pressure drop along the streamlines of the gas through the outlet. Geometrical parameters \( D \), \( H \), \( D_1 \) and \( L \) are indicated. (b) Freely released capillary jet from a round orifice or tube. \( L \) is the length of the outlet (plate thickness, tube length), and \( D_j \) is the jet diameter, approximately equal to the outlet diameter (see main text).

and 3(a) in [3]. The statistical irregularity in the jet breakup length is equally reflected in the droplet size (see figure 4(b) in [21] for a general picture of droplet size variability as a function of \( \text{We} \)).

Our analysis follows a formal perturbation scheme in a fixed framework, applied to a steady capillary jet that conveys a steady flow rate \( Q \) of a liquid with density \( \rho \), viscosity \( \mu \), and surface tension \( \sigma \) with an environment whose dynamic effects are assumed negligible. The jet exhibits an average intact length \( L_j \) from its source to its natural breakup region, and a diameter \( D_j \) close to that region.

We propose a universal model for the energy involved in the self‐destabilizing loop that sets the effective capillary jet length. This energy (a fraction of that associated with surface tension, as subsequently discussed) is small compared to the kinetic energy of the liquid in the jet, as reflected by its Weber number which should be greater than unity. Based on this, a steady base flow solution and a time‐dependent perturbation is considered. The appendix Methods provides a formal integral formulation for the perturbation scheme in a fixed framework taking time averages. By describing the jet as a combination of steady flow superimposed with perturbations, it is possible to separate the energy balance into two independent balances—one for the steady flow and the other for the average energy balance of the perturbations. This separation relies upon the additive character of the average energies. The energy equation of the perturbation then determines \( L_j \). Defining the appropriate non‐dimensional variables and parameters (here, the Weber and the capillary numbers), this equation is reduced to an algebraic second‐order equation for \( L_j \) with two universal constants. The explicit solution for this equation can be found by fitting the experimental data and calculating these two universal constants.

The conclusions that can be drawn from the formulation and perturbation analysis described in the appendix Methods are here summarized as follows: the scaling of \( L_j \) is obtained from the balance of the perturbation energy rates (power) involved in the breakup: (i) The time averaged excess of surface energy rate just before breakup, corresponding to that previously mentioned \( \sim 20% \) surface energy excess in the jet. That time averaged excess should be an (expectedly) universal fraction of the surface energy rate \( Q \cdot \sigma / D_j \); (ii) The average rate of transversal kinetic energy, of the order of \( Q \cdot \rho \left( Q / D_j L_j \right)^2 \); (iii) the work rate of viscous forces, comparable to \( Q \cdot \mu Q / D_j L_j D_j^{-1} \). The latter two energy rates are expected to have negative sign (propagating upstream) for two reasons. Firstly, when the droplets are formed, the final surface energy leaves the jet in the form of spherical droplets at a rate that is about 80% of that steadily flowing from the jet towards the breakup region. Since surface energy is the energy driver in the perturbation analysis, this necessarily requires the excess surface energy rate (comprising an ample spectrum of wavelength scales) propagating from the jet breakup in both upstream and downstream directions. In other words, the \( \sim 20% \) excess of surface energy gets split in two parts after breakup: one stays at the drop, provoking oscillations and internal motion that become dissipated by viscosity, and the other gets trapped in the jet side. The only main route available for the latter can be in the upstream direction, since the (continuous) jet domain ends at the breakup region. It is driven by the average rates of the transversal kinetic energy and the work of viscous forces at the breakup region: i.e. both terms would exhibit a negative sign in the energy balance equation. Hence, both feed the upstream perturbations. Consequently, the second‐order energy balance can be finally reduced to (see appendix Methods for a detailed formulation):

\[
\frac{\sigma}{D_j} = k_3 \rho \left( \frac{Q}{D_j L_j} \right)^2 + k_4 \mu \frac{Q}{D_j L_j} D_j^{-1} \tag{1}
\]

where \( k_3 \) and \( k_4 \) are universal constants (subsequently discussed) that should be determined for each configuration (figure 1). This is in essence the physics of natural capillary jet breakup that does not need specific details of the breakup mechanism. Rayleigh’s classical theory for the inviscid breakup of cylindrical capillary jets and its subsequent refinements describe the evolution of the most unstable temporal mode in a Lagrangian framework.
moving with the jet speed \(4Q/(\pi D_j^2)\). However, this approach lacks energy feedback: the initial perturbation is a free parameter, and the theory is therefore unable to predict the jet length. The same happens with both spatial and spatiotemporal stability analyses. Approaches like IVP (initial value problem) suffer from the same drawbacks. In contrast, the energy balance in present theory, formulated in a fixed framework, identifies the second-order energy source of perturbations of the system and resolves the jet length. In addition, it can be applied without limitation to steady jets whose shape and speed may exhibit axial variations.

In order to reduce equation (1) to a non-dimensional expression with just two parameters, we define a reference length \(d_\sigma = \sigma / \Delta P\), Weber number \(We = D_G/d_\sigma\), reference jet diameter \(D_G = \left(\frac{2gQ^2}{\pi^2\Delta P}\right)^{1/4}\), and capillary number \(Ca = \left(\frac{\mu^2\Delta P}{\pi^4\rho}\right)^{1/2}\). The parameter \(\Delta P\) is the applied gas pressure drop across the discharge orifice for flow focused jets \(8\), while for ballistic jets \(\Delta P = 8\rho Q^2/(\pi^2D_j^4)\). \(D_G\) is an important parameter to estimate \(D_j\) (jet diameter close to the breakup region) since \(D_G\) is approximately the diameter of a focused jet at the exit of the nozzle orifice (see \(9, 22\)), while \(D_G = D_j = D\) for ballistic jets, where \(D\) is the orifice diameter in this latter case. However, \(D_j < D_G\) for gas flow focused jets due to the diffusion of momentum from the surrounding faster gas jet at the discharge. With these definitions, equation (1) reduces to a second order algebraic equation whose physically meaningful solution is:

\[
\frac{L_j}{d_\sigma} = k_1 We^2 \left(\left(\frac{D_j}{d_\sigma} + k_2 Ca^2\right)^{1/2} - k_2 Ca\right)^{-1} \equiv k_1 \zeta
\]

where, for convenience, we define \(k_1 = \left(k_3 \pi^2 / 8\right)^{1/2}\), \(k_2 = \frac{k_3 \pi^2}{2k_1^3}\). Tracking back the meaning of the constants, \(k_1, k_2\) reflects the fraction of the surface energy rate that feeds the kinetic plus viscous energy rates of the relative transversal motion at breakup. Thus, \(k_2/k_1\) measures the ratio of the viscous to the transversal kinetic energy rates. Equation (2) suggests that the only relevant non-dimensional parameters in this problem are reduced to We and Ca. Indeed, the problem is determined by five dimensional parameters: three liquid properties (\(\sigma, \rho\) and \(\mu\)) and two operating parameters (\(Q\) and \(\Delta P\)); dimensional analysis reduces the parametrical dependence of the problem to two non-dimensional ones (here, We and Ca).

One may also consider the possible influence of the ratio of densities and the ratio of viscosities between outer and inner fluids. For gas-focused jets that influence is reflected in the calculation of the base flow solution whose steady jet diameter as a function of the axial coordinate is \(d_j(z)\) (see \(22\), and appendix Methods). For ballistic jets, we assume that the influence of these ratios is negligible (except close to the dripping-jetting transition, due to the existence of gas boundary layers \(15\)).

To confirm the scalings suggested by equation (2), we combine: (i) a series of 400 measurements of gas-focused jets using four different liquids (see table II) and six different devices and geometries (see table I); (ii) 30 measurements of lengths of free water jets emanating from a capillary tube with an internal diameter of 250 \(\mu\)m; (iii) a data series extraction from \(17\); and (iv) results from two numerically simulated ballistic jets.

In our flow focusing experiments, liquid and gas mass flow rates were fixed using a precision syringe pump and a GP1 (Equilibar Inc., Fletcher, USA) gas pressure regulator. The gas mass flow rate was monitored using a Bronkhorst flow meter. The pressure drop through the orifice \(\Delta P\) was calculated using classical adiabatic gas flow expansion; an average discharge coefficient \(\eta = 0.85\) was used (appendix Methods), based on thousands of prior measurements with orifice sizes from about 20 \(\mu\)m to about 2 mm. Consistent with equation (2), the experiments show that \(L_j/d_\sigma\) is a regular function when \(\rho_\sigma/\rho\) and \(\mu_\sigma/\mu\) vanish, where \(\rho_\sigma\) and \(\mu_\sigma\) are the density and viscosity of the focusing gas at the discharge region. To confirm this, we jetted into both atmospheric pressure and rough vacuum (a few Pascals), and noticed no appreciable effect of \(\rho_\sigma/\rho\) and \(\mu_\sigma/\mu\) on the results.

The most rational way to obtain the proposed universal constants \(\{k_1, k_2\}\) is to represent the experimental measurements of \(L_j/d_\sigma\) as a function of the non-dimensional explicit variable \(\zeta = We^2 \left(\left(\frac{D_j}{d_\sigma} + k_2 Ca^2\right)^{1/2} - k_2 Ca\right)^{-1}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Device no.</th>
<th>orifice shape</th>
<th>dimensions (in (\mu)m)</th>
<th>feeding capillary (D_1) (in (\mu)m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>slit</td>
<td>15×45</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>slit</td>
<td>20×60</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>round</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>round</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>round</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>round</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II. Micro-nozzles with different size and shape orifice and feeding capillary diameter used in this study. A lateral view of nozzles 1-5 is shown in fig. 3. Device type 6 is described in \(24\) and \(16\).
from \(2\), where \(D_j\) is the theoretically calculated or experimentally measured (as in this study) steady jet diameter close to the breakup region (as close as possible to the breakup point to measure the jet diameter without blurring). The best fit of all data to the predicted scaling with minimum variance and zero average error is represented in figure \(2\). For all jets studied, minimum variance value \(s^2 = 0.02208\) (standard deviation \(s = 0.1486\)) for the logarithmic error \(\varepsilon = \log \left( k_1 \zeta / (L_j / d_j) \right) \) is obtained with the following values: \(k_1 = 15.015\) and \(k_2 = 0.53\). The relatively large value of \(k_1\) indicates the relatively small fraction of surface energy necessary to feed the upstream perturbations that set \(L_j\), as expected.

![FIG. 2. Natural breakup lengths \(L_j\) of capillary jets, compared to scaling law. The insets show physical measures of \(L_j\) for given flow rates \(Q\) (a more detailed, extended view of this same plot of dimensional variables is given in the appendix Methods). Intact jet length is measured from the nozzle exit section up to the location where the droplets form. In general, the instantaneous jet length oscillates about 10% to 20% around the average length in our experiments (a 15% can be estimated as the usual measurement error, in agreement with what can be found by numerical simulation, see appendix Methods). To experimentally measure that length, we pinpoint where the average location of breakup events are visually perceived during some seconds (many thousands of events). The legend lists orifice shape and dimensions and in brackets the liquid type (water, Ethanol, Glycerol or their mixtures) and the environment (vacuum or air).

The universality of the scaling proposed is demonstrated by two facts: (i) the agreement with experiments is remarkable, and (ii) experimental uncertainty (natural breakup length variations) is not smaller than the experimental deviation of all available data from the scaling. In this regard, the scaling would be validated if the natural fluctuations of the jet length (e.g. see \(17\) produce associated measurement errors in statistical consistency with that deviation. Statistical analysis shows that the logarithmic errors \(\varepsilon\) present a good fit to a Gaussian distribution (see figure \(3\)). In addition, two careful full numerical simulations of ballistic capillary jets (\(\{\text{We, Ca}\} = \{(5, 15), (5 \times 10^{-3}, 3 \times 10^{-3})\}\), see appendix Methods) show statistical fluctuations \(\varepsilon\) with approximate Gaussian distribution and a standard deviation of 13%. These results support the validity of the proposed scalings and assumptions made.

![FIG. 3. Distributions of logarithmic errors around scaling laws for the jet lengths. Ordinates in units of probability density function. The reference normal distribution has zero average and standard deviation equal to 0.15 (variance 0.0225). Figure \(4\) shows micrographs of two cases of flow focused microjets (from short to long breakup length) as examples of the ability to set operating parameters to achieve a given jet length. Finally, figure \(5\) shows the range of values of We and Ca numbers explored in this study. As far as our setup allowed, we measured jet diameters and lengths for conditions from just beyond the onset of dripping to the onset of asymmetric breakup. Although

![FIG. 4. (a) A short water microjet from a 50 \(\mu\)m orifice nozzle, water flow rate \(Q = 8.2 \mu\text{l/min}\), helium mass flow rate \(G_o = 10.4 \text{mg/min}\). The focused capillary meniscus from whose apex the jet issues can be observed through the translucent plastic nozzle. The jet length is approximately 105 \(\mu\)m: it was taken from the multiple exposures provided by a high speed jet movie. (b) A long microjet of a mixture of glycerol 80% and water 20 % \(\nu/\nu\); liquid flow rate \(Q = 20 \mu\text{l/min}\), helium mass flow rate \(G_o = 7 \text{mg/min}\) (same nozzle as in (a)). Pulsed laser illumination (from 5 to 500 ns) is used in all collected images to avoid blurred images of jet length.]
Ca numbers above 15 have not been explored in this study, two fundamental observations can be made: (i) the maximum length (which implies axisymmetric breakup) seems to be associated with We numbers around 35 for both flow focused and ballistic jets, and (ii) the minimum length occurs for We numbers below the classical theoretical prediction of Leib & Goldstein [25], compatible with the analysis performed in [15] including the effect of the boundary layers due to the coflowing gas. It is noteworthy that about two and four orders of magnitude in We and Ca have been explored, respectively. From these observations, using available geometries with usual dimensions of $H/D \sim 1$ (figure 1), we determine that the maximum lengths of flow focused jets are achieved for flow rates $Q \approx 35^2 \left( \frac{\pi^2}{8} \right)^{1/2} \left( \frac{\sigma}{\rho \cdot 36} \right)^{1/2} \equiv 1.36 \times 10^4 Q_\sigma$ [22].

Finally, the universality of constants $k_1$ and $k_2$ within the extensive parameter space and for different geometries as explored experimentally support the validity of the proposed rigorous methodology and the obtained scaling. Using this universal model, one can select the best combination of liquid formulation (liquid properties), nozzle (outlet area) and operating parameters to obtain a desired jet length, diameter and liquid velocity for specific applications. In particular, this is remarkably valuable for designing and operating microjet devices in serial femtosecond crystallography experiments (SFX) [5, 20], where liquid formulations should also be compatible with protein crystals buffer solution.
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APPENDIX: METHODS

TIME AVERAGED ENERGY BALANCE OF CAPILLARY LIQUID JETS: BASE FLOW AND PERTURBATIONS

Consider a steady capillary jet of a liquid with density $\rho$, viscosity $\mu$ and surface tension $\sigma$, that conveys a constant flow rate $Q$ and exhibits an average length $L_j$ up to its natural breakup into droplets. We define the Weber and capillary numbers $\text{We}=\left( \frac{8}{\pi^2} \right)^{1/4} \left( \frac{Q}{\sigma} \right)^{1/2}$ and $\text{Ca}=\left( \frac{\rho^2 \Delta P}{\sigma^2 \rho} \right)^{1/2}$, respectively. $d_\sigma=\sigma/\Delta P$ and $Q_\sigma=\left( \frac{\rho^4}{\pi^2 \rho^2} \right)^{1/2}$ are a reference length and flow rate [6], respectively. The liquid is set in motion by a pressure difference $\Delta P$ that for flow focused jets is produced across the nozzle discharge. In our experiments, the nozzle geometry can be considered the classical one in all cases (a capillary in front of a round orifice of diameter $D$ in a plate [6]), although the differences with other geometries is hardly noticeable, as the experiments will show. For ballistic jets, we assume that $\Delta P$ is equal to the kinetic energy of the liquid at the jet’s source outlet.

The problem variables can be written as the sum of a steady part (base flow) plus a time dependent perturbation as $\psi(z, t) = \psi_0(z) + \psi_1(z, t)$, such that $\psi_1/\psi_0 \ll 1$, and where $z$ and $t$ indicate the axial coordinate and time. Furthermore, consider a control volume as shown in figure 6 for either flow focused or ballistic jets, where $S_c$ is comprised by sections $S_i$, $S_o$, and the free surface $S_j$ of the jet between both sections: $S_c = S_i + S_o + S_j$. $V_c$ is the volume contained in $S_c$. The nature of the spatial growth of perturbations makes them much smaller at section $S_i$ than at $S_o$.

Time averaging is defined as $\langle \cdot \rangle = \frac{1}{t_0} \int_0^{t_0} \cdot dt$. Thus, the time average of the mass conservation for times $t_0 \gg D_G L_j/Q$ can be written as:

$$\langle \frac{dV_c}{dt} \rangle + \int_{S_c} (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_c) \cdot \mathbf{n} dA = 0,$$

where $D_G = \text{We} d_\sigma$ is the theoretical jet diameter derived in [6], and $\mathbf{v}_c$ is the velocity of the free liquid surface ($\mathbf{v}_c = 0$ at both $S_i$ and $S_o$). The liquid incompressibility and the long term steadiness of the flow requires

$$\langle \frac{dV_c}{dt} \rangle = 0.$$

FIG. 5. Parametrical space \{We, Ca\} explored in this analysis. Minimum We number for flow focused jets compatible with the theoretical analysis with boundary layer in [15] is approximately indicated by a black dashed line as an eye guide. For ballistic jets in air, boundary layers produce a stabilizing effect as well [15]. FF in the legend refers to “flow focusing”, and B.L. stands for “boundary layers”. The theoretical minimum We for a cylindrical jet in vacuum by Leib & Goldstein [25] is the red dashed line. Maximum We number is the dashed blue vertical line. The upper cloud of points corresponds to the higher viscosity liquid used in experiments.
and therefore:
\[ \langle \int_{S_o} (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_c) \cdot \mathbf{n} dA \rangle = 0. \]  
(5)

Writing \( \mathbf{v}(z, t) = \mathbf{v}_0(z) + \mathbf{v}_1(z, t) \), since the flow rate \( Q = \int_{S_o} \mathbf{v}_0 \cdot \mathbf{n} dA \) is kept constant, equation (5) yields
\[ \langle \int_{S_o} \mathbf{v}_1 \cdot \mathbf{n} dA \rangle = 0. \]  
(6)

This is so because \( \mathbf{v}_1 \) is much smaller at \( S_i \) than at \( S_o \). The commutative property of space integral over a fixed surface \( S_o \) and time averaging, i.e. \( \langle \int_{S_o} \mathbf{v}_1 \cdot \mathbf{n} dA \rangle = \int_{S_o} \langle \mathbf{v}_1 \rangle \cdot \mathbf{n} dA \), necessarily requires:
\[ \langle \mathbf{v}_1 \rangle = 0, \]  
(7)

for any fixed downstream position of \( S_o \) close to the breakup region.

In the following we neglect thermal effects including diffusion of heat and the work of body forces, and a nearly isothermal process (very large liquid thermal capacity) is assumed. Thus, assuming
\[ \langle \frac{d}{dt} \int_{V_c} \rho \mathbf{v}^2/2 dV \rangle = 0 \]  
(8)
due to long term steadiness, the time averaged form of the mechanical energy balance can be written as:
\[ \frac{\rho}{2} \langle \int_{S_c} \mathbf{v}^2 (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_c) \cdot \mathbf{n} dA \rangle = - \langle \int_{S_c} \rho \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} dA \rangle + \langle \int_{S_c} \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{\tau'} \cdot \mathbf{n} dA \rangle, \]  
(9)

where \( \mathbf{\tau'} = \mu (\nabla \mathbf{v} + (\nabla \mathbf{v})^T) \) and \( p \) is the pressure. The right hand side term of (9) is a function of the nozzle discharge geometry and the properties of the environment (e.g. a gas stream). An analysis of the time-averaged integral in the left hand side of (9) yields, for \( \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}_0 + \mathbf{v}_1 \):
\[ \langle \int_{S_c} \mathbf{v}^2 (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_c) \cdot \mathbf{n} dA \rangle = (\mathbf{v}_0^2 + (\mathbf{v}_1^2)) Q + 2 \int_{S_c} \langle \mathbf{v}_0 \cdot \langle \mathbf{v}_1 \rangle \rangle \mathbf{v}_0 \cdot \mathbf{n} dA + \int_{S_c} \mathbf{v}_1^2 \langle \mathbf{v}_1 \rangle \cdot \mathbf{n} dA \]  
(10)

The last two integrals in the right hand side of (10) are zero by virtue of (7). Furthermore, the time averaged pressure work term in (9) can be written as:
\[ - \langle \int_{S_c} \rho \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} dA \rangle = Q (\Delta P - \sigma \langle d_j(z_o, t)^{-1} \rangle + \Psi_{S_i} - \int_{S_i} \mathbf{P}_i \cdot \mathbf{n} dA, \]  
(11)

where \( \Delta P = \mathbf{P}_{int} - \mathbf{P}_{ext} \) is the pressure drop through the discharge orifice, \( z_o \) is the axial coordinate of section \( S_o \), \( P_1 \) is the pressure perturbation at \( S_o \), and the last term in the right hand side of (11) is zero. \( P_1 \) is not retained at \( S_i \) because it is much smaller than at \( S_o \). \( \Psi_{S_i} \) is the local curvature of the liquid surface at \( S_i \), where perturbations can be many orders of magnitude smaller than at \( S_o \). For flow focused jets, \( \Psi_{S_i} \ll D_j^{-1} \), and it will be neglected. For ballistic jets, section \( S_i \) can be taken just down stream of the discharge orifice where the velocity profile becomes nearly flat, i.e. the velocity profile relaxation distance, of the order of \( \text{Re}D_j \cdot D = \frac{4\mu}{\sigma} \ll L_j \) (see figure 6). This makes \( \Psi_{S_i} \), and \( \Psi_{S_o} \) (at \( S_i \) and \( S_o \)) cancel out each other. Finally, the time averaged work of viscous forces is:
\[ \int_{S_c} \mu \mathbf{v} \cdot (\nabla \mathbf{v} + (\nabla \mathbf{v})^T) \cdot \mathbf{n} dA = \int_{S_c} \mu \mathbf{v}_0 \cdot (\nabla \mathbf{v}_0 + (\nabla \mathbf{v}_0)^T + (\nabla \mathbf{v}_1 + (\nabla \mathbf{v}_1)^T)) \cdot \mathbf{n} dA, \]  
(12)

since \( \mu \int_{S_c} \langle \mathbf{v}_1 \rangle \cdot (\nabla \mathbf{v}_0 + (\nabla \mathbf{v}_0)^T) \cdot \mathbf{n} dA = 0. \)

Energy equation of the base flow

Flow focused jets

Gathering the first order (steady) terms from the balance (9), the equation of the base flow can be written

\[ \frac{\rho}{2} \langle \int_{S_c} \mathbf{v}^2 (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_c) \cdot \mathbf{n} dA \rangle - \langle \int_{S_c} \rho \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} dA \rangle + \langle \int_{S_c} \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{\tau'} \cdot \mathbf{n} dA \rangle = Q (\Delta P - \sigma \langle d_j(z_o, t)^{-1} \rangle + \Psi_{S_i} - \int_{S_i} \mathbf{P}_i \cdot \mathbf{n} dA. \]  
(11)
as:
\[ \rho v_0^2/2 = \Delta P - \sigma D_j^{-1} + Q^{-1} \mu \int_{S_e} v_0 \cdot (\nabla v_0 + \nabla v_1^T) \cdot dA \]  
(13)
where \( v_0^2/2 = \rho \frac{\delta_0^2}{z_0^2} \), and \( D_j \) is the value of \( (d_j(z, t)) \) at the jet section \( S_o \) close to the breakup zone. One can reduce this integral balance to a differential form equivalent to equation (2.2) in [23] using an arbitrary position \( z \) for \( S_o \). The normal and tangential stress balances at the liquid surface and the actions of the outer gas stream is reflected by the last term in the right hand side of (13).

Although this is not the purpose of this work, calculating the last term of equation (13) requires the knowledge of the gas jet profile and its properties, detailed geometries, and boundary conditions. This was already analyzed in [23]. In our experiments for flow focused jets, we made careful measurements of the steady jet diameter \( D_{j, \text{exp}} \) close to the breakup region, for 400 different values of \( \text{We} \) and \( \text{Ca} \), where \( D_{j, \text{exp}} \) are the experimental measurements of \( D_j \). As we will see, neglecting third order errors we take \( D_j = D_{j, \text{exp}} \) in the final comparison with experiments.

For the interested reader, since the breakup region can be located at very different axial stages \( z_o \) of the base flow depending on \( \text{We} \), the collection of jet diameter measurements \( D_{j, \text{exp}} \) can be certainly representative of the jet profile. Thus, we used a fitting function for the total right hand side term of equation (13) as \( F(z) = c_0 \Delta P (1 + c_1 z) \). Doing so, we obtained the minimum standard deviation of the values \( \delta_z = \log (D_{j, \text{exp}}/D_{j, \text{exp}}) \) for \( c_0 = 1.9 \pm 0.05 \) and \( c_1 D = 0.0 \pm 0.002 \), where \( D_{j, \text{exp}} \) is the local average value of \( D_j \) for \( z \in (z_o - 0.2L_j, z_o + 0.2L_j) \). On the other hand, the relatively high value of \( c_0 \) in our experiments using helium compared to [23] using air (\( c_0 \approx 1 \)) reflects the significantly larger expansion velocity of helium compared to air, and the larger diffusion of momentum exerted on the jet by the former, which produces significantly faster and thinner jets. This is the main reason for the use of helium as the standard gas in SFX [5] [20].

**Ballistic jets**

In the case of ballistic jets, the base flow energy balance can be assumed a identity of the trivial form \( 0 = 0 \) since the inflow and outflow terms of the energy integrals of the base flow are identical.

**Energy equation of the perturbations**

Now, gathering the second order terms in \( \sigma \), the energy balance of the perturbations for all capillary jets in the absence of body forces and thermal effects can be written as:
\[ \frac{Q}{2} \langle v_1^2 \rangle = -(P_1)Q + \int_{S_e} \mu v_0 \cdot (\nabla v_1 + \nabla v_1^T) \cdot dA, \]  
(14)
where \( z_2 \) is the value of the axial coordinate at \( S_o \). Here, the surface tension term (first one in the right hand side of (14)) reflects the average surface energy generated up to stage \( S_o \) per unit time. Since the perturbation velocity \( v_1 \) is mainly transversal, due to the jet slenderness one has \( v_1 \sim v_o D_j/L_j \). Estimating the orders of magnitude of the different terms in (14) one has:
\[ \frac{\rho}{2} \langle v_1^2 \rangle \sim \rho \left( \frac{Q}{D_j L_j} \right)^2, \]  
(15)
\[ Q^{-1} \int_{S_e} \mu v_0 \cdot (\nabla v_1 + \nabla v_1^T) \cdot dA \sim \mu \nabla v_1 \sim \frac{Q}{D_j L_j} \frac{D_j^{-1}}{D_j}, \]  
(16)
Finally, the time averaged pressure perturbation \( \langle P_1 \rangle \) should be a relatively small but (expectedly) fixed fraction of the Laplace pressure during breakup, of the order of \( \sigma D_j^{-1} \). If this assumption is correct, these estimations and the additive nature of (14) would allow one to write a closed algebraic expression as:
\[ \sigma \frac{D_j}{D_j} = k_3 \rho \left( \frac{Q}{D_j L_j} \right)^2 + k_4 \mu \frac{Q}{D_j L_j} D_j^{-1}, \]  
(17)
where \( k_3 \) and \( k_4 \) should be universal constants. Anticipating what experiments show (see main text), one has: (i) the signs of \( k_3 \) and \( k_4 \) result positive and universal for both flow focused and ballistic jets, and (ii) \( k_3 \) and \( k_4 \) are relatively large numbers (approximately, \( k_3 = 182.7 \) and \( k_3 = 14.33 \) ), which effectively support our initial guess about \( P_1 \).

**Experiments**

In our flow focusing experiments, liquid and gas mass flow rates were fixed using a precision syringe pump and a GP1 (Equilibar Inc., Fletcher, USA) gas pressure regulator. The gas mass flow rate was monitored using a Bronkhorst flow meter. The pressure drop through the orifice \( \Delta P \) was calculated using classical adiabatic gas flow expansion; an average discharge coefficient \( \eta = 0.85 \) was used, based on thousands of prior measurements with orifice sizes from about 20 \( \mu \text{m} \) to about 2 \( \text{mm} \). Consistent with equation (2), the experiments show that \( L_j/d_\sigma \) is a regular function when \( \rho_o/\rho \) and \( \mu_o/\mu \) vanish, where \( \rho_o \) and \( \mu_o \) are the density and viscosity of the focusing gas at the discharge region. To confirm this, we jetted into both atmospheric pressure and rough vacuum (a few Pascals), and noticed no appreciable effect of \( \rho_o/\rho \) and \( \mu_o/\mu \) on the results.
The total pressure drop experienced by the gas particles surrounding the jet from the outlet of the liquid feeding source to the outer environment (sufficiently far from the gas outlet) is the stagnation pressure \( P_o \) of the gas around that liquid feeding source minus the gas pressure at that outer environment. In all experiments, the axial shape of the gas outlet is convergent, with the minimum cross section \( A_s \) at the exit. Thus, classical gas flow through apertures teaches that one may have the following two cases:

(i) When the pressure of the outer environment \( P_a \) is below \( P_o \left( \frac{\gamma+1}{2} \right)^{-\gamma/(\gamma-1)} \), the nozzle is choked and the theoretical mass flow rate of the gas \( G_o \) for adiabatic discharge is given by:

\[
G_o = \frac{\gamma^{1/2} P_o}{(R_g T_o)^{1/2} A_s} \left( \frac{\gamma+1}{2} \right)^{-\left(\frac{\gamma+1}{\gamma-1}\right)} \tag{18}
\]

from which the total pressure drop acting on the jet is:

\[
\Delta P = G_o (R_g T_o)^{1/2} \left( \frac{\gamma+1}{2} \right)^{\left(\frac{\gamma+1}{\gamma-1}\right)} - P_a, \tag{19}
\]

where \( R_g \) is the gas constant, \( \gamma \) the adiabatic gas constant, and \( T_o \) the stagnation temperature of the gas.

(ii) When \( P_a > P_o \left( \frac{\gamma+1}{2} \right)^{-\gamma/(\gamma-1)} \), the theoretical adiabatic gas mass flow is:

\[
G_o = \frac{\gamma^{1/2} P_o}{(R_g T_o)^{1/2} A_s} \left( \frac{2}{\gamma-1} \right)^{1/2} \times \left( \frac{P_o}{P_a} \right)^{\left(\frac{\gamma+1}{\gamma-1}\right)} - 1 \right)^{1/2} \tag{20}
\]

In the usual case where the temperature of the environment \( T_a \) is the same as the stagnation temperature of the gas source (the gas reservoir is usually in the same room or at room temperature), then we have:

\[
G_o = \frac{\gamma^{1/2} P_o}{(R_g T_o)^{1/2} A_s} \left( \frac{2}{\gamma-1} \right)^{1/2} \times \left( \frac{P_o}{P_a} \right)^{\left(\frac{\gamma+1}{\gamma-1}\right)} - 1 \right)^{1/2} \tag{21}
\]

This is in reality a second order polynomial equation for \( \left( \frac{P_o}{P_a} \right)^{\left(\frac{\gamma+1}{\gamma-1}\right)} \), which allows the explicit calculation of \( P_o \):

\[
P_o = P_a \left( 1 + \left( 1 + 4 \alpha \right)^{1/2} \right)^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma+1}} \tag{22}
\]

where

\[
\alpha = \left( \frac{G_o}{P_a A_s} \right)^2 \frac{\gamma-1}{2\gamma} R_g T_a \tag{23}
\]

In all cases, the real discharge of a gas is not exactly adiabatic, due to the existence of boundary layers and recirculation regions. Normally, a discharge coefficient \( \eta \) is used, defined as the ratio of measured to theoretical mass flow rate \( \eta = G/G_o \). We have used a value \( \eta = 0.85 \), which is approximately an average value found for the discharge of gases through small orifices from about 50 \( \mu m \) to 2 mm.

The calculations above assume that \( P_o \) is the pressure of an environment with the same composition as the gas discharged. In the case of discharging helium in air at atmospheric pressure (the case of some experiments reported), the actual pressure \( P_a \) in the above calculations is not the one of air, but it has to be calculated using partial pressures and speeds of each gas species at discharge. Alternatively, \( P_a \) can be indirectly measured with sufficient precision by a systematic measurement of the jet diameter at the exit. Thus, a sufficiently precise calibration of the system is made using the well established formula for the jet diameter (from [24]), equating it to the experimental measurement for several operating conditions (liquid and gas flow rates), and calculating \( \Delta P \), from which \( P_a \) can be obtained. The optimum value of \( P_o \) resulted \( 9 \times 10^3 \) Pasc. for discharge in air at atmospheric pressure, and virtually zero for discharge in rough vacuum. These values produced a minimum standard deviation of measurements around the theoretical prediction \( s = 0.108 \). This calibration of \( P_o \) (equivalent to an average partial pressure of helium at the discharge in our case) is used for the rest of the series with the same environment.

To conclude, the physical parameters that determine the jet length and diameter for flow focused jets are the operating parameters \( Q \) and \( \Delta P \), and the liquid properties \( \sigma, \mu \) and \( \rho \). No geometrical parameters of the device are directly involved if \( \Delta P \) is known. On the contrary, if the gas flow rate is known, the only geometrical parameter affecting the length and diameter of flow focused jets is the effective discharge area of the nozzle outlet, since the gas pressure drop \( \Delta P \) through the orifice for a given gas flow rate can be calculated using that area.

**NUMERICAL SIMULATION**

We provide two careful simulations of ballistic jets surrounded by a dynamically negligible environment, for two sets of Weber and capillary numbers: (i) \( We=5 \), \( Ca=5 \times 10^{-3} \), and (ii) \( We=15 \), \( Ca=3 \times 10^{-3} \). The density and viscosity of the gas environment are 1000 and 100 times smaller, respectively, than those of the liquid domain, which realistically reflects the experimental conditions of other ballistic jets used in this work. The liquid is injected from the rear section of the liquid channel (see figure [7] region marked with a circle) with an im-
posed flow rate that would produce a jet with constant velocity, the same radius $R$ as the liquid channel, and the imposed We number. The evolution of the jet front is tracked from the first instant when the liquid reaches the outlet section, starting from a void channel.

The long-term evolution of the position of the liquid front for the case $\text{We}=5$, $\text{Ca}=5 \times 10^{-3}$ (the one running longer for this purpose) is plotted in figure 8.
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FIG. 7. Numerical domain and initial grid. The figure just shows the computational domain generating the axisymmetric space. The generatrix of the jet shape is indicated by a blue dashed line, and the distance from the jet outlet to the instantaneous jet front position is indicated by $L_j(t)$. Results for level $\ell = 10$, 11, and 13 are plotted.

The dimensional data set used in this study is provided in [27]. Basilisk provides solvers for general fluid dynamics problems (shallow-water, compressible, incompressible, viscoelastic, multi-phase...). In the present case we have used a two-phase finite-volume incompressible solver based in a second-order in space time-splitting projection method. The interface is tracked with a “color” variable which represents the volume fraction. The volume fraction equation is solved by computing the flux of fluid from the local linear reconstructed geometry [28]. The surface tension stresses are added to the momentum equation with the CSF method [29] in a balanced manner which avoid parasitic currents, being the curvature of the interface accurately computed with the height function approach [28, 30].

The open source code Basilisk discretizes the computational domain using a structured grid of square finite volumes (termed hereafter cells) that can be either uniform or non-uniform. If a non-uniform grid is preferred, the discretization is arranged hierarchically in a quadtree structure [31]. In this type of structure, the size of a cell, $h$, is characterized by its level, $\ell$, at which it is located. Hence, the size of the cells at that level is $h \propto 2^{-\ell}$. A prototypical cell of level $\ell$ can be parent of 4 children cells (at the level $\ell+1$). The root cell is that corresponding to $\ell = 0$ from which the rest of the cells at a higher level hang down. A leaf cell is a cell without any child. This tree-type grid structure allows a fast and efficient do-loop across the grid nodes. Complex computational domains can be obtained by masking partially the cells in the quadtree structure. Besides, adding a few constraints in the growth of the tree branches allows the grid to be refined and coarsened dynamically (adapted). Doing so, the simulation proceeds at an affordable computational cost. The adaptation is based on a multi-resolution analysis of selected scalar fields.

Figure 7 shows details of the computational domain and initial grid. The simulation is axisymmetric and the injection channel of length equal to $2R$ is generated by masking the cells above the channel radius $R$, i.e the cells whose center is $r > R$ and $x < 2R$. The width of computational domain is equal to $256R$. The minimum cell size is $h = 3.125 \times 10^{-2}R$ (equivalent to 32 cells per radius $R$ and a cell level, $\ell = 13$). The maximum cell size allowed is equal to $R$, and is located far away (outer boundaries) of the gas domain. The simulation is adapted each step by monitoring the interface position and the velocity field. We have performed a sensitivity analysis for levels $\ell = 10$, 11, and 13 (see figure 8). The solution was statistically nearly invariant between levels 11 and 13 (average jet length difference of 2.8%) for $\text{We}=5$ and $\text{Ca}=5 \times 10^{-3}$. The complete data set corresponding to $\text{We}=5$ is provided as an additional supplemental material for numerical time steps $\Delta = 0.1$.

FIG. 8. Time evolution of the position of the liquid front for the case $\text{We}=5$, $\text{Ca}=5 \times 10^{-3}$. Times measured in capillary time units (i.e. one takes $\left( \frac{\rho R^3}{\sigma} \right)^{1/2} = 1$ in numerical units).

The simulations have been performed using the free software Basilisk. Basilisk provides solvers for general fluid dynamics problems (shallow-water, compressible, incompressible, viscoelastic, multi-phase...). In the present case we have used a two-phase finite-volume incompressible solver based in a second-order in space time-splitting projection method. The interface is tracked with a “color” variable which represents the volume fraction. The volume fraction equation is solved by computing the flux of fluid from the local linear reconstructed geometry [28]. The surface tension stresses are added to the momentum equation with the CSF method [29] in a balanced manner which avoid parasitic currents, being the curvature of the interface accurately computed with the height function approach [28, 30].

**RAW DATA**

The dimensional data set used in this study is provided in Figure 9. It can be used to identify the orifice shape and dimensions of each measurement in the data set. In brackets, the liquid type (water, Ethanol, Glycerol or their mixtures) and the environment (vacuum or air) is given. Helium is the focusing gas used in all experiments of flow focused jets. Ballistic jets are discharged in air at atmospheric pressure.
FROW FOCUSCED CAPILLARY JETS IN SFX

Serial femtosecond crystallography is a new method that records single flash diffraction patterns of many individual protein crystals. The femtosecond pulses outrun radiation damage (before destroying the sample) and require the means to replenish fresh crystal into the beam focus at a rate that matches the arrival of X-ray pulses (and diffraction measurements). Most experiments to date in SFX have utilized a steady liquid microjet to perform this sample delivery. This jet is usually generated by aerodynamic flow focusing (fig. 1(a) in main text) of a liquid stream supplied at a low flow rate \(Q\) in the order of a few microliters per minute [6,12]. There are several other experimental requirements to the jet properties. The liquid stream should be steady to ensure that it consistently intersects the X-ray beam focus for efficient data collection. The liquid must be compatible with the particular samples being delivered, which is usually the buffer or mother liquor in which the microcrystals were grown. Given that the carrying liquid produces a background diffraction signal, the liquid jet must be as thin as possible [5]. The jet must be fast enough to ensure exposed sample and the resulting explosion [22] exits the interaction region before the next pulse: while this is not a severe condition for X-ray FELs that operate at 120 Hz repetition rates, it must be considered for megahertz pulse rates at novel x-ray laser facilities such as the European XFEL [5]. The X-ray interaction region must also be sufficiently far from the nozzle exit to avoid a rapid collection of sputtered material (from the X-ray-induced explosion) on the nozzle tip and to prevent parasitic X-ray scattering from the nozzle itself. Some of these conditions are in contradiction—for example, thin jets are short as well—which tend to impose severe constraints on the geometrical design of issuing nozzles [5,12,24,33].
