Shear-Driven Flow of Athermal, Frictionless, Spherocylinder Suspensions in Two Dimensions: Orientational Ordering and Spatial Correlations
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We use numerical simulations to study the flow of a bidisperse mixture of athermal, frictionless, soft-core two dimensional spherocylinders driven by a uniform steady-state simple shear applied at a fixed finite strain rate \( \dot{\gamma} \). Energy dissipation is via a viscous drag with respect to a uniformly sheared host fluid, giving a simple model for flow in a non-Brownian suspension with Newtonian rheology. Considering a range of packing fractions \( \phi \) and particle asphericities \( \alpha \) at low \( \dot{\gamma} \), we study the angular rotation \( \theta_i \) and orientational ordering \( S_2 \) of the particles induced by the shear flow, finding a non-monotonic behavior as the packing \( \phi \) is varied. We interpret this non-monotonic behavior as a crossover from a low \( \phi \) region where single particle-like behavior occurs, to a large \( \phi \) region where reduced free volume inhibits motion and leads to a random Poisson-like process for particle rotations. We show that angular fluctuations obey a critical scaling as jamming is approached. We show that the nematic ordering \( S_2 \) has a constant value in the steady-state, and that when perturbed it relaxes to the steady-state via an incoherent rotation of individual particles. We show that the limit \( \alpha \to 0 \), approaching circular particles, is singular and that \( S_2 \) at and above jamming stays finite in this limit. We also consider the behavior of particles under a pure shear and contrast with that under simple shear. We discuss spatial correlations for particle density, nematic ordering, and angular velocity, and show that these correlations remain short ranged. We discuss aspects of systems of particles monodisperse in size and systems polydisperse in shape. In particular we show, that for a dilute number of elongated spherocylinders embedded in a sea of circular disks, shearing results in a local clustering of the spherocylinders.
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I. INTRODUCTION

In a system of athermal granular particles with only repulsive contact interactions, as the packing fraction of particles \( \phi \) increases, the system undergoes a jamming transition [1,2] at a critical \( \phi_J \). For \( \phi < \phi_J \) the system behaves similar to a liquid, while for \( \phi > \phi_J \) the system behaves like a rigid but disordered solid. One way to probe the jamming transition is through the application of a simple shear deformation to the system. For an infinite system in the “thermodynamic limit,” if one applies a simple shear stress \( \sigma \) no matter how small, then if the system is below \( \phi_J \) the system responds with a simple shear flow, with a velocity profile that varies linearly in the direction transverse to the flow. Above \( \phi_J \), the application of a small shear stress causes the system to have an elastic shear distortion determined by the finite shear modulus of the solid phase; the system does not flow. However, if \( \sigma \) exceeds a critical yield stress \( \sigma_0 \), then plastic deformations cause the solid to flow. The point where this yield stress \( \sigma_0(\phi) \) vanishes upon decreasing \( \phi \) then determines the shear-driven jamming transition \( \phi_J \) [3,4,5]. For frictionless particles, such as those considered in this work, \( \sigma_0 \) vanishes continuously [3,4] as \( \phi \to \phi_J \) from above.

Many numerical studies of the jamming transition, and granular materials more generally, have used spherically shaped particles for simplicity. It is therefore interesting to ask how behavior is modified if the particles have shapes with a lower rotational symmetry [6]. In a recent work [7] we considered the shear-driven jamming of athermal, bidisperse, overdamped, frictionless, spherocylinders in two dimensions (2D), uniformly sheared at a fixed strain rate \( \dot{\gamma} \). In that work we considered the global rheology of the system, investigating how pressure, deviatoric shear stress, and macroscopic friction vary with particle packing fraction \( \phi \), shear strain rate \( \dot{\gamma} \) and particle asphericity \( \alpha \). We determined the jamming packing fraction \( \phi_J(\alpha) \) as a function of the spherocylinder asphericity, and the average number of contacts per particle at jamming, \( Z_J(\alpha) \). We also studied the probability for an inter-particle contact to form at a particular angle \( \theta \) along the surface of the spherocylinder, and argued that the \( \alpha \to 0 \) limit approaching a circular particle was singular; we found that the total probability for a contact to form somewhere on one of the flat sides of the spherocylinder stays constant as \( \alpha \to 0 \), even as the length of those flat sides becomes a vanishing fraction of the total particle perimeter.

In the present work we continue our studies of this 2D spherocylinder model, but now concentrating on the rotational motion of particles, their orientational ordering, and spatial correlations within the system. As this work is a continuation of our work in Ref. [7], the introduction and description of the model presented here are abbreviated. We therefore refer the reader to Ref. [7] for a discussion of the broader context of, and motivation for, our model, a more complete list of references, and more de-
tials of the derivation of our equations of motion. Some of our results in the current work have been presented previously [8]; here we broaden these prior investigations and present greater detail.

When sheared, aspherical particles are known to undergo orientational ordering due to the torques induced on the particles by the shear flow. Several numerical works focused on this shear-induced orientational ordering of ellipsoids [9] and rod-shaped particles [10] of different aspect ratios in three dimensions (3D) approaching, but staying below, jamming. They found that orientational order increased with increasing packing φ, and that particles were preferentially oriented at a finite angle θ → 0 with respect to the direction of the shear flow. Experiments and simulations of rod-shaped particles in 3D [12,13] found similar results, while also studying the rotation of particles in steady-state simple shear, and the transient approaches to the steady state. Other experimental works have studied the transient behavior of orientational ordering and pressure p of ellipses in 2D under quasistatic shearing [16,17]. Numerical simulations, measuring rheological properties as well as orientational order in the hard-core limit below jamming, have been carried out for frictional 3D spherocylinders sheared by biaxial compression [18,19], frictionless 3D spherocylinders in steady-state simple shear [20], and for both frictionless and frictional 2D ellipses in steady-state simple shear [21]. The rheology of 3D frictional and frictionless spherocylinders in steady simple shear has also recently been simulated [22].

In this work we consider the uniform steady-state shearing of a system of 2D spherocylinders, considering a broad range of particle asphericities, from moderately elongated to very nearly circular. The above previous works [9,13,18,22] modeled dry granular materials, in which energy is dissipated in particle collisions, rheology is Bagnoldian, and there may be microscopic inter-particle Coulombic friction. In contrast, here we model particles in suspension, where the rheology is Newtonian at low strain rates below jamming. We use a simple model that has been widely used in studies of the shear-driven jamming of spherical and circular particles [3,4,7,8,28,31]. In this model, particles are frictionless with a soft-core, one-sided, harmonic repulsive interaction, and energy is dissipated by a viscous drag with respect to an affinely sheared host medium. Particles obey an overdamped equation of motion and inertial effects are thus ignored.

Our simple model omits several physical processes that may be relevant to real physical suspensions, such as hydrodynamic forces [32], lubrication forces [33,35], inertial effects [36], as well as frictional contact interactions which have recently been proposed as a possible mechanism for shear thickening [37,35]. However, the greater simplicity of our model allows a more thorough investigation over a wide range of the parameter space, in particular going to lower values of the strain rate γ and smaller values of the particle asphericity α. Our work is carried out in the spirit that it is useful to first understand the behavior of simple models before adding more realistic complexities.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II we define our model and the quantities to be computed. In Sec. III we consider the behavior of an isolated spherocylinder in an affinely sheared host medium, considering the rotational motion and the probability for the particle to be at a particular orientation. Understanding the motion of a single particle will help inform our understanding of the many particle system. In Sec. IV we present our numerical results for the rotational motion of particles and their orientational ordering as the packing of particles increases through the jamming transition. We consider the average as well as the distribution of particle angular velocities. We show that fluctuations in particle angular velocity obey a critical scaling relation as jamming is approached. We consider the time evolution of particle rotations and the waiting time between successive rotations by π. We consider the magnitude and direction of the nematic order parameter S2, showing that in steady-state S2 is constant; there is no time-dependent coherent tumbling or wagging of the orientational ordering. We find that both the average angular velocity and the magnitude of nematic ordering are non-monotonic as the packing increases. We consider the relaxation back to steady-state when the nematic order parameter S2 is rotated away from the steady-state value; we find that this relaxation is due to the incoherent rotation of individual particles. We consider the limit of vanishing asphericity, α → 0, where our spherocylinders approach circular, and show that this limit is singular; S2 stays finite at φj and above as α → 0. We then compare orientational ordering under pure shear, as compared to simple shear. Finally we investigate a numerical mean field model to describe behavior in terms of a single particle acted upon by an average torque from elastic collisions; we find good agreement provided the elastic torque is taken to depend on the orientation of the particle, and near jamming includes a random noise term.

In Sec. V we consider the spatial structure and correlations in the system. For elongated particles we find shear banding on small strain scales, but the bands are not static; the location of the bands wander such that the velocity profile averaged over the entire course of the simulation is linear as expected. We consider correlations of the transverse velocity and find evidence for a diverging length scale as jamming is approached, similar to what has previously been found for circular particles [8]. We compute density-density correlations and find that there is neither any long range translational order, nor do the particles organize into well defined channels parallel to the flow direction. We consider correlations of the nematic order parameter S2 and of the angular velocity θ, in both cases we find correlations to be short ranged. In Sec. VI we summarize our results. We conclude that the orientational ordering is a consequence of the shear serving as an ordering field rather than due to cooperative behavior among the particles. We find
that the non-montonic behavior of $S_2$ and $\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle / \dot{\gamma}$ can be viewed as a crossover between a single particle-like behavior at low $\phi$, where the imposed simple shear results in a steady but non-uniform rotation of the particles, to a many particle behavior at large $\phi$, where the decreasing free volume inhibits particle rotation, which becomes more of a random Poisson-like process. As $\alpha \to 0$ below $\phi_J$, the steady rotation due to simple shear destroys orientational ordering; but above $\phi_J$ the decrease of free volume results in particles becoming oriented, similar to what happens under pure shear, even as $\alpha \to 0$. We believe this is the mechanism for the discontinuous jump in $S_2$ that we observe at jamming even as $\alpha \to 0$.

Finally in an Appendix we consider several ancillary matters. We compare how a size monodisperse system of elongated particles compares with the size bidisperse system considered in the main part of this work. We investigate systems consisting of a mixture of elongated spherocylinders and perfectly circular particles, as the fraction of spherocylinders increases, and find that shearing results in a local clustering of the spherocylinders. We consider a system of spherocylinders that is polydisperse in asphericity $\alpha$ and show that the singularity we found as $\alpha \to 0$ persists for this shape polydisperse cases. Lastly we investigate the simple shear behavior of a system that starts from an initial ordered configuration. We find, except for highly ordered configurations at very dense packings, that after a sufficiently large shear strain, the initial order is lost, and behavior becomes the same as when we start from an initial random configuration.

II. MODEL AND SIMULATION METHOD

Our model system is one of $N$ two dimensional, athermal, frictionless spherocylinders, consisting of a rectangle with two semi-circular end caps, as illustrated in Fig. 1. The half length of the rectangle of particle $i$ is $A_i$, the radius is $R_i$, and we define the asphericity $\alpha_i$ as,

$$\alpha_i = A_i / R_i$$

so that $\alpha = 0$ is a pure circular particle. The “spine” of the spherocylinder is the axis of length $2A_i$ that goes down the center of the rectangle. For every point on the perimeter of the spherocylinder, the shortest distance from the spine is $R_i$. The center of mass of the particle is $r_i$ and the angle $\theta_i$ denotes the orientation of the spine with respect to the $\hat{x}$ direction. Our system box has $L_x$ and $L_y$ in the $\hat{x}$ and $\hat{y}$ directions, respectively. We will in general take $L_x = L_y$ unless otherwise noted. If $A_i$ is the area of spherocylinder $i$, the packing fraction $\phi$ is,

$$\phi = \frac{1}{L^2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} A_i.$$  

Unless otherwise stated, all our particles have equal asphericity $\alpha$, and are bidisperse in size with equal numbers of big and small particles with length scales in the ratio $R_b / R_s = 1.4$.

The dynamics of our model has been described in detail in Ref. [7], here we summarize the main features. Periodic boundary conditions are taken along $\hat{x}$, while Lees-Edward boundary conditions [44] are taken along $\hat{y}$ to introduce a simple shear strain $\gamma$. We take $\gamma = \dot{\gamma}t$ to model simple shear flow in the $\hat{x}$ direction at a fixed finite strain rate $\dot{\gamma}$. Particles interact with each other via elastic contact interactions. Energy dissipation is due to a viscous drag between the particles and an affinely sheared host medium,

$$v_{\text{host}}(r) = \dot{\gamma} y \hat{x},$$

modeling the behavior of particles in a uniform non-Brownian suspension.

Defining $r_{ij}$ as the shortest distance between the spines of spherocylinders $i$ and $j$ [45], and $d_{ij} = R_i + R_j$, two spherocylinders are in contact whenever $r_{ij} < d_{ij}$. In this case there is a repulsive harmonic interaction between the particles with the force on $i$,

$$F_{ij}^e = \frac{k_e}{d_{ij}} \left( 1 - \frac{r_{ij}}{d_{ij}} \right) \hat{n}_{ij},$$

where $k_e$ is the particle stiffness and $\hat{n}_{ij}$ the unit vector pointing normally inwards to particle $j$ at the point of contact with $i$. $F_{ij}^e$ acts at the contact point, which is located a distance $(R_{i}/d_{ij})r_{ij}$ from the spine of particle $i$, along the cord $r_{ij}$, and gives rise to a torque on particle $i$,

$$\tau_{ij}^e = \hat{z} \tau_{ij}^e = \hat{s}_{ij} \times F_{ij}^e,$$

where $\hat{s}_{ij}$ is the moment arm from the center of mass of $i$ to its point of contact with $j$. The total elastic force and torque on particle $i$ are then

$$F_i^e = \sum_j F_{ij}^e, \quad \tau_i^e = \sum_j \tau_{ij}^e,$$

where the sums are over all particles $j$ in contact with $i$.

The viscous drag between particle $i$ and the host medium gives rise to a dissipative force,

$$F_{i}^{\text{dis}} = \int d^2r f_{i}^{\text{dis}}(r),$$
where the integral is over the area of particle $i$ and the dissipative force per unit area acting at position $r$ on the particle is given by the local velocity difference between the particle and the host medium,

$$f_{i \text{dis}}(r) = -k_d [v_i(r) - v_{\text{host}}(r)], \tag{8}$$

where $k_d$ is a viscous damping coefficient and $v_i(r)$ is the local velocity of the particle at position $r$.

$$v_i(r) = \dot{r}_i + \dot{\theta}_i \hat{z} \times (r - r_i). \tag{9}$$

Here $\dot{r}_i = dr_i/dt$ is the center of mass velocity of the particle and $\dot{\theta}_i$ is its angular velocity about the center of mass. The corresponding dissipative torque is,

$$\tau_{i \text{dis}} = \hat{z} \dot{\theta}_i \times \int_i d \hat{z}', \tau_{i \text{dis}}(r). \tag{10}$$

The above elastic and dissipative forces are the only forces included in our model; there are no inter-particle dissipative or frictional forces. We will carry out our simulations in the overdamped (low particle mass) limit, where the total force and torque on each particle are damped to zero,

$$F_{i \text{el}} + F_{i \text{dis}} = 0, \quad \tau_{i \text{el}} \tau_{i \text{dis}} = 0. \tag{11}$$

The resulting translational and rotational equations of motion for particle $i$ can then be written as [17].

$$\dot{r}_i = \dot{\gamma} y_i \hat{x} + \frac{F_{i \text{el}}}{k_d A_i}, \tag{12}$$

$$\dot{\theta}_i = -\dot{\gamma} f(\theta_i) + \frac{\tau_{i \text{el}}}{k_d I_i A_i}, \tag{13}$$

where $A_i$ is the area of particle $i$, $I_i$ is the trace of the particle’s moment of inertia tensor, and

$$f(\theta) = \frac{1}{2} [1 - (\Delta I_i/I_i) \cos 2\theta], \tag{14}$$

where $\Delta I_i$ is the absolute value of the difference of the two eigenvalues of the moment of inertia tensor. We assume a uniform constant mass density for both our small and big particles.

For our simulations we take $2R_s = 1$ as the unit of distance, $k_e = 1$ as the unit of energy, and $t_0 = (2R_s)^2 k_d / k_e = 1$ as the unit of time. We numerically integrate the equations of motion [12] and [13] using a two-stage Heun method with a step size of $\Delta t = 0.02$. Unless otherwise stated, we begin each shearing run in a finite energy configuration at the desired packing fraction $\phi$ with random initial particle positions and orientations. To generate such initial configurations we place the spherocylinders in the system one-by-one, while rejecting and retrying any time a new placement would lead to an unphysical overlap where the spines of two spherocylinders intersect. In general we use $N = 1024$ particles. Most of our simulations extend to total strains of $\gamma \approx 150$. Discarding an initial $\Delta \gamma \approx 20$ of the strain from the averaging so as to eliminate transients effects, we find that our steady state averages are generally insensitive to the particular starting configuration [40]. See the Supplemental Material to Ref. [8] for tests that these simulation parameters, in particular $N$ and $\Delta t$, are sufficient to obtain accurate results for particles with our smallest asphericity, $\alpha = 0.001$. Note, we restrict the strain coordinate $\gamma$ used in our Lees-Edwards boundary condition to the range $\gamma \in (-L_x/2L_y, L_x/2L_y)$; whenever it exceeds this maximum it is reset by taking $\gamma \rightarrow \gamma - L_x/L_y$, allowing us to shear to arbitrarily large total strains.

\section{Isolated Particles: Rotations and Orientational Ordering}

Although the main objective of this work is to study the behavior of many interacting particles, it is of interest to first consider the case of an isolated particle, for which $F_{i \text{el}} = \tau_{i \text{el}} = 0$. In this case Eq. [12] gives that the particle flows with the local host velocity, $\dot{r}_i = \dot{\gamma} y_i \hat{x}$, while from Eq. [13] the rotational motion obeys the deterministic equation, $\dot{\theta}_i = -\dot{\gamma} f(\theta_i)$ with $f(\theta)$ as in Eq. [14]. Since in general $f(\theta) > 0$, the particle will rotate continuously clockwise, but with a non-uniform angular velocity that is slowest at $\theta_i = 0$ or $\pi$ where $f(\theta_i)$ is at its minimum, and fastest at $\theta_i = \pi/2$ or $3\pi/2$ where $f(\theta_i)$ is at its maximum. This is analogous to the Jeffrey orbits of ellipsoids in a viscous fluid [17]. The particle will thus spend more time oriented at $\theta_i = 0$, aligned parallel to the flow direction $\hat{x}$. We show this explicitly by integrating the equation of motion and plotting $\theta_i(t)$ vs $\gamma = \dot{\gamma} t$ in Fig. 2(a) for spherocylinders of several different $\alpha$.

For such an isolated particle tumbling in the flow field of the host medium, we can compute the probability density for the particle’s orientation to be at a particular
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\[
\frac{\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle}{\dot{\gamma}} = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T dt \delta(\theta_i(t) - \theta)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{T} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta_i \frac{\delta(\theta_i - \theta)}{|\theta_i|} = \frac{1}{T^2} \Theta(\theta)
\]  

(15)

(16)

where T is the period of the rotation.

We plot \( P(\theta) \) vs \( \theta \) for spherocylinders with different \( \alpha \) in Fig. 2(b).

Normalization of \( P(\theta) \) then determines the period \( T \) and thus gives for the average angular velocity,

\[
-\frac{\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle}{\dot{\gamma}} = \frac{2\pi}{\gamma T} = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{1 - (\Delta I_i/I_i)^2}
\]  

(17)

For a circular particle one has \( \Delta I_i/I_i = 0 \) and so \(-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle/\dot{\gamma} = 1/2\). More generally, since \( 0 \leq \Delta I_i/I_i < 1 \), then one has \( -\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle/\dot{\gamma} \leq 1/2\).

Since \( P(\theta + \pi) = P(\theta) \), corresponding to the fact that the particle has neither head nor tail, orientational order
will be nematic. The direction of the nematic order parameter \( S_2 \) is \( \theta = 0 \), aligned with the flow, while the magnitude is given by,

\[
S_2 = \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta P(\theta) \cos 2\theta = \frac{1}{\gamma} \sqrt{1 - (\Delta I_i/I_i)^2}
\]  

(18)

In Fig. 3(a) we plot \(-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle/\dot{\gamma} \) and \( S_2 \) vs \( \Delta I_i/I_i \) for an isolated particle, using Eqs. (17) and (18). We see, not surprisingly, an anti-correlation between the two quantities; \(-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle/\dot{\gamma} \) decreases as the particle becomes more aspherical (i.e., as \( \Delta I_i/I_i \) increases), while \( S_2 \) increases. For spherocylinders of asphericity \( \alpha \) we have,

\[
\frac{\Delta I_i}{I_i} = \frac{2\alpha[4 + 3\pi \alpha + 4\alpha^2]}{3\pi + 24\alpha + 6\pi \alpha^2 + 8\alpha^3}
\]  

(19)

which we plot in Fig. 3(b).

As the packing \( \phi \) increases from zero, the above single particle behavior will be modified due to collisions that occur between particles, giving rise to elastic forces and torques. It is interesting to consider a naive model in which, at low \( \phi \), we regard these collisions as introducing uncorrelated random torques, as if the particle were at a finite temperature. We therefore rewrite Eq. (13) as,

\[
\frac{\dot{\theta}_i}{\dot{\gamma}} = \frac{d\theta_i}{d\gamma} = -f(\theta_i) + \zeta(\gamma)
\]  

(20)

where \( \zeta = \tau_i^\gamma/(k_d I_i A_i \dot{\gamma}) \) and we assume,

\[
\langle \zeta(\gamma) \rangle = 0, \quad \langle \zeta(\gamma) \zeta(\gamma') \rangle = \epsilon^2 \delta(\gamma - \gamma').
\]  

(21)

Numerically integrating Eq. (20), in Fig. 4(a) we plot the resulting probability density \( P(\theta) \) for a spherocylinder of \( \alpha = 4 \), for various noise levels \( \epsilon \). We see several significant changes from the noiseless case. As \( \epsilon \) increases, we see that the amplitude of the variation in \( P(\theta) \) decreases, and the location of the peak shifts from \( \theta = 0 \) to larger \( \theta > 0 \). This indicates that the magnitude of the nematic order \( S_2 \) is decreasing and the nematic director becomes oriented at a finite positive angle with respect to the shear flow.

To quantify this observation, we compute the nematic order parameter as follows: for a particle in 2D, the magnitude \( S_2 \) and orientation \( \theta_2 \) of the nematic order parameter \( S_2 \) are given by [48],

\[
S_2 = \frac{\max \{\langle \cos(2[\theta - \theta_2])\rangle\}}{\theta_2}
\]  

(22)

where \( \langle \ldots \rangle \) denotes an average over time, or equivalently over strain \( \gamma = \dot{\gamma} t \). From this one can show,

\[
S_2 = \sqrt{\langle \cos 2\theta \rangle^2 + \langle \sin 2\theta \rangle^2}
\]  

(23)

and

\[
\tan 2\theta_2 = \langle \sin 2\theta \rangle / \langle \cos 2\theta \rangle.
\]  

(24)

In Fig. 4(b) we plot \( \theta_2 \) vs noise level \( \epsilon \) for several different spherocylinder asphericities \( \alpha \). The values of \( \theta_2 \) for \( \alpha = 4 \) coincide with the locations of the peaks in \( P(\theta) \) in Fig. 4(a). We see that there is no strong dependence of \( \theta_2 \) on \( \alpha \), except at small \( \epsilon \), and that \( \theta_2 \) saturates to 45\(^\circ\) as \( \epsilon \) gets large; 45\(^\circ\) corresponds to the eigen-direction of expansion of the affine strain rate tensor, and hence also the direction of minimal stress.

In Fig. 4(c) we plot \( S_2 \) vs \( \epsilon \) for different \( \alpha \) and see that \( S_2 \) decays to zero as \( \epsilon \) increases; we find the large \( \epsilon \) tail of this decay to be well fit to an exponential \( \sim \exp(-\epsilon/\epsilon_0) \), with \( \epsilon_0 \approx 1.16 \) for all \( \alpha \). Finally in Fig. 4(d) we plot the scaled average angular velocity \(-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle/\dot{\gamma} \) vs \( \epsilon \) for different \( \alpha \). As \( \epsilon \) increases, \(-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle/\dot{\gamma} \) saturates to 1/2, the rotational velocity of the affinely sheared host medium, as well as the value expected for a circular particle. We find the large \( \epsilon \) behavior to be well fit to the form \( \sim \frac{1}{2}[1 - c \exp(-\epsilon/\epsilon'_0)] \), with \( \epsilon'_0 \approx 0.34 \) for all \( \alpha \). As in Fig. 3(a) we see that \( S_2 \) and \(-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle/\dot{\gamma} \) are anticorrelated; as one increases, the other decreases.
FIG. 4. (a) Probably density $p(\theta)$ for a spherocylinder of asphericity $\alpha = 4$ to be oriented at angle $\theta$, for various strengths $\varepsilon$ of uncorrelated random torque noise. (b) Orientation $\theta_2$ of the nematic order parameter. (c) magnitude of uncorrelated random torque noise. (b) Orientation $\theta_2$ of the nematic order parameter, and (d) scaled particle angular velocity $-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle / \dot{\gamma}$ vs noise strength $\varepsilon$, for spherocylinders of various $\alpha$.

These results are easy to understand. The nematic ordering, in the isolated particle limit, is determined by how long the particle spends at the preferred alignment $\theta = 0$ or $\pi$, where $f(\theta)$ has its minimum. When a particle oriented near $\theta = 0$ receives a random kick directed counter-clockwise, the particle deflects to positive $\theta$, but then quickly relaxes back towards $\theta = 0$ under the influence of the driving term $-f(\theta)$; however if the random kick is directed clockwise, the particle will rapidly rotate through $\pi$, before relaxing towards the preferred alignment at $\theta = \pi$. This effect results in the particle spending more time at angles $\theta > 0$ than at corresponding angles $\theta < 0$, and as a consequence $\theta_2$ becomes finite and positive, growing with the strength of the random kicks. At the same time, the occurrence of clockwise directed random kicks serves to shorten the time the particle spends in the preferred aligned direction $\theta = 0$ or $\pi$, resulting in an increase in the average angular velocity $-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle / \dot{\gamma}$ and a decrease in the magnitude of the nematic ordering $S_2$.

In the following sections we explore what happens as the packing $\phi$ increases in a true model of $N$ interacting spherocylinders. We will see that, as $\phi$ increases from low values, $\theta_2$ increases from zero in accord with the above naive model. However we will see that $S_2$ and $-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle / \dot{\gamma}$ behave qualitatively the opposite of this naive model; as $\phi$ increases from low values, $S_2$ increases while $-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle / \dot{\gamma}$ decreases. As we will see in Sec. [IV E] the reason for this difference is that, while our naive model above assumed the collisions provided no net torque $\langle \zeta \rangle = 0$, in fact the collisions that occur due to shearing create an orientation-dependent elastic torque on on a particle which on average is finite and counter-clockwise, thus slowing down the rotation of particles and increasing orientational ordering.

IV. NUMERICAL RESULTS: ROTATIONS AND NEMATIC ORDERING

At finite packing $\phi$, particles will come into contact, $\tau_i^{el}$ will no longer be zero, and the isolated particle behavior of the previous section will be modified. Here we report on our numerical results for systems of particles with different asphericity $\alpha = 0.001$ to 4, for a range of packings $\phi$ from dilute, to jamming, and above. We will look in greater detail at the two specific cases of moderately elongated particles with $\alpha = 4$, and nearly circular particles with $\alpha = 0.01$. When comparing results for systems of different $\alpha$, we will find it convenient to plot quantities in terms of a reduced packing fraction, $\phi/\phi_J(\alpha)$, where $\phi_J(\alpha)$ is the shear-driven jamming packing fraction for particles of that particular value of $\alpha$. For reference, in Fig. [5] we plot this $\phi_J$ vs $\alpha$, as we have determined in our earlier work [7].

A. Angular Velocity and Particle Rotations

We first consider the angular velocity of the particles. For the coordinate system of our model, a counter-clockwise rotation is a positive angular velocity, while a clockwise rotation is negative. Since our particles have a net rotation that is clockwise, it is therefore convenient to consider $-\dot{\theta}_i$. It will also be convenient to measure in dimensionless units, which we will find gives a finite value in the quasistatic limit $\dot{\gamma} \to 0$. Hence, when we speak
results at two different small strain rates, \( \dot{\gamma} \) for spherocylinders of different asphericity \( \alpha \). For each \( \alpha \) we show results for two different small strain rates \( \dot{\gamma} \) (solid symbols) < \( \dot{\gamma} \) (open symbols), see Table II for values. The vertical dashed line indicates the jamming transition \( \phi_J/\phi \), while the horizontal dashed line denotes the rotation 1/2 of the affinely sheared host medium.

here of the angular velocity of particle \( i \), we will be referring to \( -\theta_i/\dot{\gamma} \).

1. Average Angular Velocity

From Eq. (13) we can write for the average angular velocity of individual particles,

\[
-\langle \theta_i \rangle/\dot{\gamma} = \left\langle \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[ f(\theta_i) - \frac{\tau_{ikl}}{\gamma_{kdl} A_{kdl}} \right] \right\rangle ,
\]

where \( \langle \ldots \rangle \) indicates an average over configurations in the steady state. In Fig. 6 we plot \( -\langle \theta_i \rangle/\dot{\gamma} \) vs the reduced packing fraction \( \phi/\phi_J \), for spherocylinders of different asphericity \( \alpha = 0.001 \) to 4. For each \( \alpha \) we show results at two different small strain rates, \( \dot{\gamma}_1 < \dot{\gamma}_2 \), in order to demonstrate that our results, except for the largest \( \phi \) near and above jamming, are in the quasistatic limit where \( \langle \theta_i \rangle/\dot{\gamma} \) is independent of \( \dot{\gamma} \). The values of \( \dot{\gamma}_1 \) and \( \dot{\gamma}_2 \) used for each \( \alpha \) are given in Table II. That \( -\langle \theta_i \rangle/\dot{\gamma} > 0 \) indicates that the particles continuously rotate in a clockwise direction, and such rotation persists even in the dense region above jamming. Here, and in subsequent plots, error bars represent one standard deviation of estimated statistical error; when error bars are not visible, they are smaller than the size of the symbol representing the data point.

In Fig. 6 we similarly plot \( -\langle \theta_i \rangle/\dot{\gamma} \) vs \( \phi \), but now showing results for multiple different strain rates \( \dot{\gamma} \), for the two particular cases of moderately extended rods, with \( \alpha = 4 \), and nearly circular particles, with \( \alpha = 0.01 \). We see, as mentioned above, that the \( \dot{\gamma} \) dependence of the angular velocity increases as one approaches and goes above \( \phi_J \), but seems to be approaching a finite limiting value as \( \dot{\gamma} \to 0 \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \alpha )</th>
<th>( \dot{\gamma}_1 )</th>
<th>( \dot{\gamma}_2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>( 1 \times 10^{-7} )</td>
<td>( 4 \times 10^{-7} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>( 4 \times 10^{-7} )</td>
<td>( 1 \times 10^{-6} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \alpha \geq 0.06 )</td>
<td>( 1 \times 10^{-5} )</td>
<td>( 4 \times 10^{-5} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Angular Velocity Distribution

Having shown the average angular velocity in Figs. 6 and 7, we consider next the probability density \( P_{av} \) for a particular particle to have an instantaneous angular
velocity given by $-\dot{\theta}_i/\dot{\gamma}$. In Fig. 8 we plot $P_{av}(-\dot{\theta}_i/\dot{\gamma})$ vs $-\dot{\theta}_i/\dot{\gamma}$ for different packings $\phi$ at a fixed strain rate $\dot{\gamma} = 10^{-5}$. Figures 8(a) and 8(b) are for spherocylinders of aspect ratio $\alpha = 4$ while 8(c) and 8(d) show spherocylinders with $\alpha = 0.01$ at low and high $\phi$ respectively. For $\alpha = 4$, $\phi_J = 0.906$, while for $\alpha = 0.01$, $\phi_J = 0.845$. In general, a sparse set of symbols is used to help differentiate curves of different $\phi$, with many data points existing between adjacent symbols on any curve.

The straight line behavior of $P_{av}$ at large $|\dot{\theta}_i/\dot{\gamma}|$ on these semi-log plots show that the tails of the distribution are exponential, $P_{av} \sim \exp[-\lambda|\dot{\theta}_i/\dot{\gamma}|]$, with a decay rate $\lambda$ that decreases as $\phi$ increases.

The plots in Fig. 8 are at the fixed strain rate $\dot{\gamma} = 10^{-5}$. At small packing $\phi$, this $\dot{\gamma}$ is small enough to be in the quasistatic limit; further reducing $\dot{\gamma}$ gives no change in the distribution $P_{av}$. However as $\phi$ increases, and approaches $\phi_J$, an increasing dependence on $\dot{\gamma}$ appears. In Figs. 8(a) and 8(b) we show $P_{av}$ vs $-\dot{\theta}_i/\dot{\gamma}$ for different values of $\gamma$, for $\alpha = 4$ at $\phi_J$, respectively. At fixed $\phi_J$ we use $\phi = 0.905 \approx \phi_J = 0.906$ for $\alpha = 4$, and $\phi = 0.845 \approx \phi_J$ for $\alpha = 0.01$. We see that the tails of the distribution steadily broaden as $\dot{\gamma}$ decreases. Fitting these tails to $P_{av} \sim \exp[-\lambda|\dot{\theta}_i/\dot{\gamma}|]$, with $\lambda_+ \approx \lambda_-$, a log-log plot in Figs. 9(c) and 9(d). We see that $\lambda_+ \approx \lambda_-$ for $\alpha = 4$, but there is a small difference at the larger $\dot{\gamma}$ for $\alpha = 0.01$; it is unclear whether this is a real effect, or if it is due to the distribution tails not being precisely exponential, and so the value of $\lambda$ varies a bit depending on which range of $\dot{\gamma}$ one fits to. Nevertheless, we see in both cases a power-law fit, $\lambda \approx \dot{\gamma}^q$, with, to one digit accuracy, $q \approx 0.7$ for
3. Critical Scaling of Angular Velocity Fluctuations

The behavior seen in Figs. 10(a) and 10(b), and the power-law scaling in $\dot{\gamma}$ at $\phi_J$ seen in Figs. 10(c) and 10(d), is reminiscent of the critical scaling we have previously observed [7] for the pressure transport coefficient, $\eta_p = p/\dot{\gamma}$. It is thus of interest to see if the data of Fig. 10 can similarly be described by a critical scaling analysis. Before proceeding with such an analysis we first note that, for our data of Fig. 10, we have estimates for the expected statistical error (one standard deviation), which we obtain using a standard data-blocking procedure [19] (all error bars on data in this work are obtained by this method). We can thus do a quantitative test of the goodness of the power-law fits shown in Figs. 10(c) and 10(d), by measuring the chi squared per degree of freedom of the fits, $\chi^2/\text{dof}$, and by measuring the sensitivity of the fitted values of $q$ to the range of data, $\dot{\gamma} \leq \dot{\gamma}_{\text{max}}$, used in the fits. For $\alpha = 4$ we find that $q$ stays constant, within the estimated errors, as $\dot{\gamma}_{\text{max}}$ is decreased, and that the $\chi^2/\text{dof} \approx 1$ for $\dot{\gamma}_{\text{max}} \leq 4 \times 10^{-5}$; these results indicate that the power-law fit is robust and a good model for the data. For $\alpha = 0.01$ however, while we find that the value of $q$ stays roughly stable for all $\dot{\gamma}_{\text{max}} \leq 4 \times 10^{-5}$, we have $\chi^2/\text{dof} \approx 10$. This suggest that, despite the nice appearance of the fit in Fig. 10(d), a pure power-law fit is probably not a good model for the data. This might be because the $\phi = 0.845$ that is used in Fig. 10(d) is not close enough to the exact value of $\phi_J$, or, more likely, because $\alpha = 0.01$ is so close to circular that there are large corrections-to-scaling [4] which must be accounted for. Simple power-law scalings only hold when one is sufficiently close to the critical point, in this case $\phi \rightarrow \phi_J$ and $\dot{\gamma} \rightarrow 0$. If one is insufficiently close, then the leading critical power-law behavior must be augmented by a second, non-leading, power-law known as a corrections-to-scaling.

For our model with circular particles, it is known [4] that corrections-to-scaling are significant and must be accounted for at the strain rates $\dot{\gamma}$ we consider here, hence it seems likely they will also be significant for nearly circular spherocylinders with $\alpha = 0.01$. However, for rod-like spherocylinders with $\alpha = 4$, we have found [7] that a critical scaling analysis of pressure seemed to be reasonable without such corrections. We thus proceed with a scaling analysis of $\text{var}[-\dot{\theta}_i/\dot{\gamma}]$ only for $\alpha = 4$.

According to the scaling hypothesis, fluctuations of angular velocity should obey a scaling law,

$$\text{var}[-\dot{\theta}_i/\dot{\gamma}] = \dot{\gamma}^{-2q} h \left( \frac{\delta \phi}{\dot{\gamma}^{1/z\nu}} \right),$$

(27)

where $\delta \phi = \phi - \phi_J$, $q$ and $1/z\nu$ are critical exponents, and $h(x)$ is an apriori unknown scaling function. The exponent $q$ varies with the particular critical observable being considered, but the values of $\phi_J$ and $1/z\nu$ should be common to all critical observables. If $h(0) = \text{constant}$, then exactly at $\phi_J$ we have $\text{var}[-\dot{\theta}_i/\dot{\gamma}] \sim \dot{\gamma}^{-2q}$, as was found in Fig. 10(c).
We attempt to fit our data to this form by expanding the logarithm of the unknown scaling function as a fourth order polynomial, \( h(x) = \exp(c_0 + c_1 x + c_2 x^2 + c_3 x^3 + c_4 x^4) \), and then fitting to our data with \( \phi_J \), \( q \), \( 1/z\nu \), and the \( c_i \) as free fitting parameters. For our scaling analysis we use data from simulations with \( N = 1024 \) particles for all but our smallest strain rate; for \( \dot{\gamma} \geq 10^{-6} \) we have explicitly checked that \( N = 1024 \) is sufficiently large to avoid finite size effects. However for \( \dot{\gamma} = 4 \times 10^{-7} \) we have observed a small finite size effect for \( N = 1024 \), hence for this rate we use data from a larger system with \( N = 2048 \). Since critical scaling holds only asymptotically close to the critical point, we restrict the data to be used in our fit to packing fractions close to \( \phi_J \), \( 0.88 \leq \phi \leq 0.91 \), and to strain rates \( \dot{\gamma} \leq \dot{\gamma}_{\text{max}} \). We then vary \( \dot{\gamma}_{\text{max}} \) to shrink the window of data closer to the critical point. If our fits are to be regarded as good and stable we hope to find \( \chi^2/\text{dof} \approx 1 \), and that the fitted parameters stay constant, within the estimated statistical error, as \( \dot{\gamma}_{\text{max}} \) decreases.

In Fig. 11(a) we plot our results for \( \phi_J \), \( q \), \( 1/z\nu \), and the \( \chi^2/\text{dof} \) from this scaling fit vs \( \dot{\gamma}_{\text{max}} \), for \( \dot{\gamma}_{\text{max}} \) from \( 10^{-4} \) to \( 10^{-5} \). We find that all fitted parameters stay constant, within the estimated errors, as \( \dot{\gamma}_{\text{max}} \) decreases. The \( \chi^2/\text{dof} \) decreases as \( \dot{\gamma}_{\text{max}} \) decreases, reaching a smallest value of \( 1.4 \) at \( \dot{\gamma}_{\text{max}} = 10^{-5} \). Our scaling fit thus seems both stable and reasonable. In Fig. 11(b) we show the resulting data collapse using the parameters obtained with \( \dot{\gamma}_{\text{max}} = 10^{-5} \), plotting var[\( -\dot{\theta}/\dot{\gamma} \)] vs \( \chi = (\phi - \phi_J)/\dot{\gamma}^{1/2} \). In this plot we include data that lie outside the narrow range that was used to obtain the fit. We see what appears to be a reasonable collapse close to the jamming critical point \( x = 0 \). As \( |x| \) increases away from the critical point, we start to see deviations from the common scaling curve for the larger \( \dot{\gamma} \). This is as expected since such points are too far from the critical point to lie in the scaling region. The parameters we get from this fit are, \( \phi_J = 0.904 \pm 0.002 \), \( 1/z\nu = 0.27 \pm 0.01 \), and \( q = 0.73 \pm 0.04 \). This is in reasonable agreement with our earlier results from a scaling analysis of pressure \( \gamma \), \( \phi_J = 0.9058 \pm 0.0004 \), \( 1/z\nu = 0.26 \pm 0.01 \), and the values of \( q \) inferred from Figs. 9 and 10.

Since we know from Fig. 10 that var[\( -\dot{\theta}/\dot{\gamma} \)] approaches a well defined limiting curve as \( \dot{\gamma} \to 0 \) below \( \phi_J \), the scaling function of Eq. (27) must satisfy,

\[
\lim_{x \to -\infty} h(x) \sim |x|^{-2qz\nu},
\]

and so the fluctuations in the scaled angular velocity diverge as \( \phi \to \phi_J \) from below as,

\[
\lim_{\dot{\gamma} \to 0} \text{var}[\dot{\theta}/\dot{\gamma}] \sim |\phi - \phi_J|^{-2qz\nu} \sim |\phi - \phi_J|^{-5.4}.
\]

For \( \phi > \phi_J \) we speculate that var[\( -\dot{\theta}/\dot{\gamma} \)] \( \sim 1/\dot{\gamma}^2 \), so that var[\( -\dot{\theta}/\dot{\gamma} \)] \( \sim \text{var}[\dot{\theta}_i/\dot{\gamma}] \) \( \sim \dot{\gamma} \) \( \sim |\phi - \phi_J|^{-5.4} \) do much better than a simple power-law \( \dot{\gamma}^b \), confirming that var[\( -\dot{\theta}_i \)] \( \to \) constant as \( \dot{\gamma} \to 0 \). This result implies that,

\[
\lim_{x \to +\infty} h(x) \sim |x|^{2(1-q)z\nu},
\]

and so the fluctuations in angular velocity vanish as \( \phi \to \phi_J \) from above as,

\[
\text{var}[\dot{\theta}_i] \sim |\phi - \phi_J|^{2(1-q)z\nu} \sim |\phi - \phi_J|^2.
\]

Our results thus lead to the conclusion that as \( \dot{\gamma} \to 0 \) above \( \phi_J \), \( -\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle \to 0 \) but \( \text{var}[\dot{\theta}_i] \) stays finite.

4. Strain Averaged Angular Velocity Distribution

The distribution \( P_{av} \) of the previous two sections is that of the instantaneous particle angular velocity. As \( \phi \)
increases and the system becomes dense, there develops a lot of angular jittering motion, where particles make rapid small angular deflections without much net rotation. The instantaneous angular velocity thus becomes more a measure of the instantaneous elastic torques on the particle than it is a measure of net rotation. In this section we therefore consider the strain averaged angular velocity, \(-\Delta \theta_i/\Delta \gamma\), defined as the net angular deflection \(\Delta \theta_i\) of a particle over a window of strain \(\Delta \gamma = \gamma \Delta t\).

In Fig. 13 we plot the probability density \(P_{av}(\Delta \theta_i/\Delta \gamma)\) vs \(-\Delta \theta_i/\Delta \gamma\), for moderately elongated spherocylinders of asphericity \(\alpha = 4\) at a strain rate \(\dot{\gamma} = 10^{-5}\). We show results for (a) a low value of the packing \(\phi = 0.5\), (b) a value \(\phi = 0.8\approx \phi_{\theta_{\min}}\) near the minimum in \(-\langle \theta_i/\dot{\gamma}\rangle\), (c) \(\phi = 0.905 \approx \phi_J\), and (d) a large \(\phi = 0.95\) above jamming. In each case we show results for a range of strain windows \(\Delta \gamma = 0.5\) to 2.5, as well as the distribution of the instantaneous angular velocity \(-\theta_i/\dot{\gamma}\) (dotted curve). For reference, the vertical dashed lines locate the minimum \(-\theta_{i\min}/\dot{\gamma}\) = \(f(0) = (1 - \Delta I_i/I_i)/2\) and the maximum \(-\theta_{i\max}/\dot{\gamma}\) = \(f(\pi/2) = (1 + \Delta I_i/I_i)/2\) angular velocities for an isolated particle, and the dotted vertical line locates the average \(-\langle \theta_i/\dot{\gamma}\rangle\); in all cases this \(-\langle \theta_i/\dot{\gamma}\rangle\) lies close to \(-\theta_{i\min}/\dot{\gamma}\), and for (c) and (d) they are difficult to distinguish from each other in the plot.

We see that averaging over the strain \(\Delta \gamma\) greatly reduces the width of the distributions, removing the slowly decaying exponential tails, especially at large \(\dot{\phi}\); note in Figs. 13(c) and 13(d) the instantaneous angular velocity distribution looks almost flat on the scale of the strain averaged distribution. At low \(\phi = 0.5\) the distribution \(P_{av}\) shares the same signatures as the instantaneous distribution \(P_{av}\), which shares the signatures of the isolated particle, i.e., sharp peaks at \(-\theta_{i\max}/\dot{\gamma}\) and \(-\theta_{i\min}/\dot{\gamma}\). At larger \(\phi\) the peak at \(-\theta_{i\min}/\dot{\gamma}\) becomes a broader but still relatively sharp peak at \(-\Delta \theta_i/\Delta \gamma \approx 0\), representing fluctuations about particles of fixed orientation, and a noticeable but reduced in magnitude shoulder near \(-\Delta \theta_i/\Delta \gamma \approx \theta_{i\max}/\dot{\gamma}\), representing particles that are rotating with a faster angular velocity of roughly \(-\theta_{i\max}/\dot{\gamma}\).

In Fig. 14 we plot \(P_{av}\) for fixed \(\Delta \gamma = 1\), but for a range of packings \(\phi = 0.5\) to 0.95. We see that the height of the shoulder near \(-\theta_{i\max}/\dot{\gamma}\) is non-monotonic in \(\phi\), first decreasing as \(\phi\) increases, then reaching a minimum near \(\phi = 0.80\) or 0.85, then increasing as \(\phi\) increases further towards and going above jamming. We note that the \(\phi\) locating the minimum height of this shoulder roughly corresponds to \(\phi_{\theta_{\min}}\) where \(-\langle \theta_i/\dot{\gamma}\rangle\) has its minimum, thus supporting the identification of this shoulder with a fraction of particles that are rotating rapidly as the particle flips orientation by \(-\pi\).

In Figs. 15 and 16 we present similar results, but now for nearly circular particles with \(\alpha = 0.01\), at strain rate \(\dot{\gamma} = 10^{-6}\). Here we use a linear vertical scale so as to enhance features of interest. In Fig. 16(a) we show results for \(\phi = 0.81\), the packing where \(-\langle \theta_i/\dot{\gamma}\rangle\) starts to take its sharp drop (see Fig. 7(b)). Rather than the nearly exponential distribution of the instantaneous angular momentum, here we see a broader, nearly Gaussian, distribution centered near \(-\langle \theta_i/\dot{\gamma}\rangle\) \(\approx 0.5\). As \(\Delta \gamma\) increases, this distribution sharpens. This suggests that particles are undergoing uncorrelated fluctuations about a uniform average angular velocity \(-\langle \theta_i/\dot{\gamma}\rangle\) \(\approx 0.5\). However, as \(\phi\) increases, we see that this peak shifts downwards to \(-\langle \theta_i/\dot{\gamma}\rangle \approx 0\) and a shoulder that develops into a secondary peak at larger \(-\langle \theta_i/\dot{\gamma}\rangle\). Fig. 15(b) shows \(\phi = 0.83 \approx \phi_{\theta_{\min}}\) which is near the minimum in \(-\langle \theta_i/\dot{\gamma}\rangle\), 15(c) shows \(\phi = 0.84\), near the jamming \(\phi_J = 0.845\), and 15(d) shows \(\phi = 0.86\), above jamming. In Figs. 15(c) and 15(d), vertical arrows locate the position of the secondary peak, and these occur exactly where \(-\Delta \theta_i = \pi\), i.e., where \(-\Delta \theta_i/\Delta \gamma = \pi/\Delta \gamma\) on each curve. The secondary peaks thus represent the fraction of particles that have flipped orientation, rotating clockwise by \(\pi\), within the strain \(\Delta \gamma\). In Fig. 15(d) one also sees a side peak at \(-\Delta \theta_i = -\pi\), indicating particles that have rotated counterclockwise by \(\pi\).
In Fig. 16 we plot $\bar{P}_{av}$ vs $-\Delta \theta / \Delta \gamma$ at fixed $\Delta \gamma = 2$, for various $\phi = 0.81$ to 0.86. We see clearly the shift of the main peak from $-\Delta \theta / \Delta \gamma \approx 0.5$ towards $-\Delta \theta / \Delta \gamma \approx 0$ and the development of the secondary peak at $-\Delta \theta / \Delta \gamma = \pi/2$, as $\phi$ increases above $\phi = 0.82$. The distributions for $\phi = 0.85$ and 0.86 are essentially identical. Our results thus suggest that, as the system gets denser, particles go from roughly uniform rotation at low $\phi$, to a fixed orientation except for occasional flips in orientation by $\pi$, as $\phi$ approaches and goes above jamming. At these larger $\phi$, the average $-\langle \theta_i \rangle / \gamma$ is thus determined by the rate of these particle flips. We will further explore this scenario in the following section.

5. Time Dependence of Particle Rotations

The preceding sections dealt with the distribution of an individual particle’s angular velocity in the steady state. Here we consider instead the time evolution of a particle’s rotation. We consider first the case of elongated particles with $\alpha = 4$. In Fig. 17, we plot $\theta_1(\gamma)$ vs $\gamma = \gamma t$ for six randomly selected particles, three big and three small, at several different packing fractions $\phi$ and $\gamma = 10^{-5}$. The average motion, $\bar{\theta}_1 = [\langle \theta_1 \rangle / \gamma]$, is indicated by the dashed diagonal line. Comparing Fig. 17 with the corresponding curve for a isolated particle shown in Fig. 2(a), we see a general similarity: there are plateaus near integer values $\bar{\theta}_1 = -n \pi$, separated by regions where $\theta_i$ rapidly transitions by an amount $-\pi$, representing a clockwise flipping of the orientation of the particle. Upon further inspection, however, there are two important differences. For the case of the isolated particle in Fig. 2(a), the plateaus show a small downwards slope due to the finite angular velocity $\dot{\theta}_1 / \gamma = d \theta_1 / d \gamma = \pi f(0) = -1 - (\Delta I_i / I_i)$ when the particle is oriented parallel to the flow. In Fig. 17 however, the plateaus appear on average to be mostly flat. For the isolated particle, the jumps in $\theta_i$ by
peak in $P_{\gamma}$ steadily shifts to lower values of $\Delta \gamma$ and the 
large $\Delta \gamma$ tail of the distribution becomes exponential, as 
seen by the roughly linear decrease of the distributions 
on our semi-log plot. This exponential waiting time 
between flips, $\Delta t = \Delta \gamma/\dot{\gamma}$, suggests that at large $\phi$ particle 
flips are a Poisson-like process, and that, aside from an 
initial waiting time corresponding to the rise of $P_{\gamma}$ to its 
peak, the time until the next particle flip is independent 
of how long the particle has spent since its last flip. Thus, 
unlike for the case of an isolated particle in which the particle 
undergoes steady but non-uniform rotation, here our 
results suggest a scenario in which, as the particle density 
increases, the reduced free volume between particles 
blocks particle rotations, leaving particles to spend most 
of their time having small angular deflections about a 
fixed value. Then, after some random strain $\Delta \gamma$, a local 
rerearrangement appears that allows the particle to rotate 
rapidly through $\Delta \theta = -\pi$. The exponential distribution 
of the waiting times implies that the appearance of 
such local rearrangements are uncorrelated, except for 
a minimal waiting time.

Fitting the large $\Delta \gamma$ tail of the distribution to $P_{\gamma} \propto 
\exp[-\Delta \gamma / \Delta \gamma_0]$, we determine the rate of particle flips 
$1 / \Delta \gamma_0$. This rate, which is just the slope of the linearly 
decreasing distributions in the semi-log plot of Fig. 18(a), 
is seen to be non-monotonic in $\phi$, reaching a minimum 
value near $\phi \approx 0.80$. In Fig. 18(b) we plot this rate as 
$\pi/\Delta \gamma_0$ vs $\phi$ and compare it to the average angular velocity 
$-\langle \dot{\theta} \rangle / \dot{\gamma}$, shown previously in Fig. 2(a). If the $P_{\gamma}$ 
were exactly exponential distributions, these two curves 
would be equal. But $P_{\gamma}$ is not precisely exponential, 
due to the waiting time represented by the rise of $P_{\gamma}$ 
to its peak value. Because of this waiting time we expect 
$\langle \Delta \gamma \rangle > \Delta \gamma_0$, and so $-\langle \dot{\theta} \rangle / \dot{\gamma} = \pi / \langle \Delta \gamma \rangle$ will lie below 
$\pi / \Delta \gamma_0$, as we indeed find to be the case. Nevertheless 
we see that at the larger $\phi$, $\pi / \Delta \gamma_0$ behaves qualitatively

$$-\pi, \text{ as the particle flips orientation, occur in a perfectly}$$
$$\text{periodic fashion. In Fig. 17, however, the timing between}$$
$$\text{such jumps appears to be more random. In the densest}$$
$$\text{system at } \phi = 0.95 > \phi_J, \text{ shown in Fig. 17(d), we also}$$
$$\text{see that particle 1 makes a counterclockwise flip of } +\pi$$
$$\text{at small } \gamma; \text{ but for } \alpha = 4 \text{ these counterclockwise flips are}$$
$$\text{rare events, occurring infrequently for } \phi = 0.95, \text{ and even}$$
$$\text{less so for lower } \phi, \text{ over the length of our simulations.}$$

In Fig. 17 we see that fluctuations about the plateaus 
tend to increase as $\phi$ increases, and that the average value of 
$\theta_i$ on these plateaus lies slightly above the values $-n\pi$ 
at the larger values of $\phi$; the particles are thus at some 
small finite angle $[\theta_i \text{ modulo } \pi] > 0$ with respect to the 
flow direction. We will return to this point in Sec. 4V.B.3.

Measuring the strain $\Delta \gamma$ between two successive ro-
tational flips of a particle by $-\pi$, we plot the distribution 
$P_{\gamma}(\Delta \gamma)$ vs $\Delta \gamma$ for different $\phi$ at fixed $\dot{\gamma} = 10^{-5}$ 
in Fig. 18(a). For the smaller values of $\phi$ we find that 
$P_{\gamma}$ peaks at the value $\Delta \gamma \approx 16$, which is the same as 
the strain interval between the periodic flips by $-\pi$ 
for an isolated particle, as seen in Fig. 2(a); however as $\phi$ 
increases, the distribution broadens and is increasingly 
skewed towards values on the large $\Delta \gamma$ side of the peak. 
As $\phi$ increases further, we see that the location of the
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**FIG. 17.** For spherocylinders of asphericity $\alpha = 4$ at strain 
rate $\dot{\gamma} = 10^{-5}$, particle orientation $\theta_i$ vs net strain $\gamma = \dot{\gamma} t$ for 
six randomly selected particles at packings (a) $\phi = 0.50$, (b) 
$\phi = 0.80$, (c) $\phi = 0.905 \approx \phi_J$, and (d) $\phi = 0.95$. In each 
case particles 1, 2 and 3 are big particles, while 4, 5 and 6 
are small particles. The diagonal dashed lines indicate the 
average rotation, $\theta_i = \langle \theta_i \rangle / \gamma$.
the same as $-\langle \theta_i \rangle / \dot{\gamma}$, with a similar minimum around $\phi_{\theta_{\min}} \approx 0.80$; the difference between the two curves becomes greatest as $\phi$ decreases below the minimum.

We thus form the following picture. At low $\phi$ particles behave similarly to isolated particles, with the typical strain $\Delta \gamma$ between particle flips being roughly equal to that of an isolated particle, but with random fluctuations due to particle collisions; these fluctuations are skewed to larger $\Delta \gamma$ thus causing the decrease in $-\langle \theta_i \rangle / \dot{\gamma}$. The average $\langle \Delta \gamma \rangle$ at these low $\phi$ is significantly different from the $\Delta \gamma_0$ that describes the large $\Delta \gamma$ tail of the distribution. As $\phi$ increases however, the flips become more of a Poisson-like process in which the average time until the next particle flip is independent of the time since the last flip. The exponential part of the distribution $P_{\gamma}$ dominates the behavior and $\Delta \gamma_0$ gives a qualitative explanation for the average angular velocity $-\langle \theta_i \rangle / \dot{\gamma}$ in the region approaching the minimum $\phi_{\theta_{\min}}$ and going above.

Next we consider the case of nearly circular particles with $\alpha = 0.01$. For an isolated particle, $\Delta I_i / I_i = 0.0085$ is so small that a plot of $\theta_i$ vs $\gamma$ would look like a straight line of slope $-1/2$; no plateaus are observable to the eye. In Fig. 19 we plot $\theta_i(\gamma)$ vs $\gamma = \dot{\gamma} t$ for six randomly selected particles, three big and three small, at several different packing fractions $\phi$ and $\dot{\gamma} = 10^{-6}$.

The average motion, $\theta_i = [\langle \theta_i \rangle / \dot{\gamma}] \gamma$, is indicated by the dashed diagonal line. For $\phi = 0.81$, below the minimum in $-\langle \theta_i \rangle / \dot{\gamma}$ at $\phi_{\theta_{\min}}$ (see Fig. 17(b)), we see in Fig. 19(a) small fluctuations about the isolated particle behavior. For $\phi = 0.83 \approx \phi_{\theta_{\min}}$ in Fig. 19(b), near the minimum in $-\langle \theta_i \rangle / \dot{\gamma}$, we see larger fluctuations, some small isolated plateaus where particles stay at a fixed orientation, but for the most part particles are rotating nearly uniformly. However, for $\phi = 0.84$ in Fig. 19(c), just below the jamming $\phi_J = 0.845$, and for $\phi = 0.86$ in Fig. 19(d), above $\phi_J$, we see dramatically different behavior. Fluctuations are now extremely large, and rotation is highly non-uniform. Compared to Fig. 17 for $\alpha = 4$, here it is hard to identify clear plateaus, and there is considerable counterclockwise rotation (where $\theta_i$ increases with increasing $\gamma$) in addition to clockwise rotation (where $\theta_i$ decreases with increasing $\gamma$).

Nevertheless, we can still carry out an analysis of flipping times in analogy with what we did for $\alpha = 4$ in Fig. 18. If we denote as $\gamma_1$ the strain at which a given particle trajectory first passes through $\theta_i = -n \pi$ upon rotating clockwise, and $\gamma_2$ as the strain at which it next passes through $\theta_i = -(n + 1) \pi$, then $\Delta \gamma_\gamma = \gamma_2 - \gamma_1$ can be taken as the net strain displacement over which the particle has flipped its orientation, rotating clockwise through an angle $\pi$. In a similar way we can determine $\Delta \gamma_{\gamma \min}$ the net strain displacement for the particle to flip its orientation rotating counterclockwise through an angle $\pi$.

In Figs. 20(a) and 20(b) we plot the distributions $P_{\gamma}^-(\Delta \gamma_-)$ for clockwise flips, and $P_{\gamma}^+(\Delta \gamma_+)$ for counterclockwise flips, respectively, for different packings $\phi$ at $\dot{\gamma} = 10^{-6}$. Despite the qualitative differences in the trajectories $\theta_i(\gamma)$ for $\alpha = 0.01$, shown in Fig. 19 from those for $\alpha = 4$, shown in Fig. 17 the distribution $P_{\gamma}^-$ for $\alpha = 0.01$ shows the same qualitative behavior as the $P_{\gamma}$ found for $\alpha = 4$ in Fig. 18(a). For low $\phi \lesssim 0.82$, the peak in $P_{\gamma}^-$ lies close to $\Delta \gamma_- \approx 6.3$, which is the same as the strain interval between the periodic rotations by $\pi$ of an isolated particle. However as $\phi$ increases, approaching the minimum in $-\langle \theta_i \rangle / \dot{\gamma}$ at $\phi_{\theta_{\min}} \approx 0.83$, the distribution broadens and an exponential tail appears on the large $\Delta \gamma_- \text{ side of the peak. As } \phi \text{ increases above 0.83 the location of the peak in } P_{\gamma}^- \text{ shifts towards smaller } \Delta \gamma_-, \text{ the exponential tails grow, until at our largest values of } \phi \text{ the distribution } P_{\gamma}^- \text{ is almost a pure exponential. Fitting to the large } \Delta \gamma_- \text{ tail of } P_{\gamma}^- \text{ we determine the exponential rate } 1/\Delta \gamma_0^-, \text{ which is just the slope of the linearly decreasing distributions in the semi-log plot of Fig. 20(a). We see that this rate is non-monotonic, having its smallest value at } \phi \approx 0.83 \approx \phi_{\theta_{\min}} \text{ where the average angular velocity } -\langle \theta_i \rangle / \dot{\gamma} \text{ is minimum.}$

For counterclockwise rotations, we see that the distributions of $P_{\gamma}^+$, shown in Fig. 20(b), are close to exponential, with a rate that rapidly decreases as $\phi$ decreases from above jamming towards the $\phi_{\theta_{\min}} \approx 0.83$ that locates the minimum in $-\langle \theta_i \rangle / \dot{\gamma}$. For $\phi < 0.835$, coun-
terclockwise rotations are so rare over the length of our simulation runs that we are unable to determine the distribution \( P_\gamma^- \) at such low \( \phi \). For \( \phi \geq 0.835 \) we fit the large \( \Delta \gamma_+ \) tails of \( P_\gamma^+ \) to determine the exponential rate \( 1/\Delta \gamma_{0+} \). In Fig. 21(a) we plot the clockwise and counterclockwise rates as \( \pi/\Delta \gamma_{0-} \) and \( \pi/\Delta \gamma_{0+} \) vs \( \phi \). As found for \( \pi/\Delta \gamma_0 \) for \( \alpha = 4 \) in Fig. 18(b), we see that \( \pi/\Delta \gamma_{0-} \) has a minimum at \( \phi = 0.83 \approx \phi_{\theta \text{min}} \) where \(-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle/\dot{\gamma} \) is minimum. In contrast, \( \pi/\Delta \gamma_{0+} \) is getting small, and perhaps vanishing, as \( \phi \rightarrow 0.83 \) from above.

If the distributions \( P_\gamma^- \) and \( P_\gamma^+ \) were exactly exponential, then the average angular velocity would just be \( (\pi/\Delta \gamma_{0-}) - (\pi/\Delta \gamma_{0+}) \). In Fig. 21(b) we compare this quantity with the exactly computed \(-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle/\dot{\gamma} \), plotting both vs the packing \( \phi \). As for the case of spherocylinders with \( \alpha = 4 \), shown in Fig. 18(b), we see that these two curves qualitatively agree upon approaching the minimum at \( \phi_{\theta \text{min}} = 0.83 \) and going above, but they quickly separate as \( \phi \) decreases below 0.83. As with \( \alpha = 4 \), the difference between the two curves results from the fact that the distributions \( P_\gamma^- \) and \( P_\gamma^+ \) are not exactly exponential, with \( \langle \Delta \gamma_\pm \rangle > \Delta \gamma_{0\pm} \) due to the rise of the distributions to their peak at a finite \( \Delta \gamma_\pm \); this difference becomes more pronounced at the lower \( \phi \) < 0.83.

Our analysis of spherocylinders with both \( \alpha = 4 \) and \( \alpha = 0.01 \) thus points to a common scenario. The minimum in \(-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle/\dot{\gamma} \) at \( \phi_{\theta \text{min}} \) results from a crossover between two different regions of behavior. For \( \phi \leq \phi_{\theta \text{min}} \), particles behave qualitatively like isolated particles. While an isolated particle will have perfectly periodic rotations by \( \pi \) given by a strain period of \( \Delta \gamma = 2\pi/\sqrt{1 - (\Delta I_i/I_i)^2} \) (see Eq. 17), the interacting particles will have a distribution of \( \Delta \gamma \) that peaks near \( \Delta \gamma \) but has a finite width, with a skew to the large \( \Delta \gamma \) side of the peak; the width of the distribution and the skew increase as \( \phi \) increases, giving a decreasing \(-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle/\dot{\gamma} \). This effect is presumably a result of the reduction in free volume between the particles as \( \phi \) increases, thereby inhibiting rotations. For \( \phi \gtrsim \phi_{\theta \text{min}} \), however, the distribution peak shifts down towards zero, and the distribution becomes increasingly exponential, as \( \phi \) increases. This exponential distribution suggests that rotations by \( \pi \) become a Poisson-like process; particles in general fluctuate about fixed orientations, while flips with a \( \pi \) rotation occur at uncorrelated random times set by a rate \( 1/\Delta \gamma_0 \). The time until the next flip is largely independent of the time since the last flip, except for a minimum waiting time. As \( \phi \) increases above \( \phi_{\theta \text{min}} \), the flipping rate \( 1/\Delta \gamma_0 \) increases and so \(-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle/\dot{\gamma} \) increases. Why the rate \( 1/\Delta \gamma_0 \) should increase as \( \phi \) increases we will explore in future sections.

Finally, we make one last point concerning the angular velocity. Since our system is bidisperse in particle size, one can separately compute the average angular velocity for big as compared to small particles. In Figs. 22(a) and 22(b) we plot these for spherocylinders with \( \alpha = 4 \) and 0.01, respectively. Not surprisingly, we see that big particles rotate more slowly than the average, while small particles rotate more quickly. We can similarly measure the waiting time distributions \( P_\gamma^\pm (\Delta \gamma_\pm) \) separately for big and small particles. We find distinct distributions with exponential tails of slightly different rates \( 1/\Delta \gamma_{0\pm} \). Thus the distribution of Figs. 18(a) and 20 are each more correctly the sum of two distributions, corresponding to big and small particles, with slightly different exponential tails. Repeating our analysis to take this into account would result in small qualitative changes in Figs. 18(b) and 21, however the qualitative behavior remains the same.

---

FIG. 20. For spherocylinders of asphericity \( \alpha = 0.01 \) at strain rate \( \dot{\gamma} = 10^{-6} \): (a) Distributions \( P^-_{\gamma} (\Delta \gamma_-) \) for the strain interval \( \Delta \gamma_- \) between successive clockwise rotations of a particle by \( \pi \) for different packings \( \phi \), and (b) \( P^+_{\gamma} (\Delta \gamma_+) \) for the strain interval \( \Delta \gamma_+ \) between successive counterclockwise rotations of a particle by \( \pi \) for different packings \( \phi \).

FIG. 21. For spherocylinders of asphericity \( \alpha = 0.01 \) at strain rate \( \dot{\gamma} = 10^{-6} \): (a) Rates \( \pi/\Delta \gamma_{0-} \) and \( \pi/\Delta \gamma_{0+} \) characterizing the exponential tails of the distributions \( P^-_{\gamma} \) and \( P^+_{\gamma} \) for the wait times for clockwise and counterclockwise rotations of a particle by \( \pi \). (b) Average particle angular velocity \(-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle/\dot{\gamma} \) compared to \( (\pi/\Delta \gamma_{0-}) - (\pi/\Delta \gamma_{0+}) \) vs packing \( \phi \). The dashed vertical line locates the jamming \( \phi_j \).
small particles separately, for spherocylinders with \( \alpha \approx 10^{-5} \) and \( \alpha = 0.01 \) at \( \dot{\gamma} = 10^{-6} \). The average over all particles is given by the dashed line.

**B. Nematic Ordering**

In this section we consider the orientational ordering of the interacting particles. For a system in \( d \) dimensions, the nematic order parameter \( S_2 \) can be obtained from the traceless, symmetric, ordering tensor of an \( N \) particle configuration,

\[
T = \frac{d}{(d-1)N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[ \hat{\ell}_i \otimes \hat{\ell}_i - \frac{1}{d} \mathbf{I} \right],
\]

where \( \hat{\ell}_i \) is a unit vector that lies along the spine of particle \( i \), and \( \mathbf{I} \) is the identity tensor. The magnitude \( S_2 \) of the nematic order parameter is given by the largest eigenvalue of \( T \), and the corresponding eigenvector \( \hat{\ell}_2 \) gives the orientation of the nematic director. We will denote the nematic order parameter as \( S_2 = S_2 \hat{\ell}_2 \). For our system in \( d = 2 \) dimensions, the angle of \( \hat{\ell}_2 \) with respect to the flow direction \( \hat{x} \) will define the orientation angle \( \theta_2 \) of the nematic director.

We define the instantaneous nematic order parameter, given by \( S_2(\gamma) \) and \( \theta_2(\gamma) \), in terms of the tensor \( T(\gamma) \) for the specific configuration of the system after a total strain \( \gamma \). We define the ensemble averaged nematic order parameter, given by \( S_2 \) and \( \theta_2 \), in terms of the ensemble averaged tensor \( \langle T \rangle \), which is an average over configurations in the steady state. Note, while \( \langle T \rangle \) is a linear average over the instantaneous \( T(\gamma) \), the same is not in general true of \( S_2 \) and \( \theta_2 \) because of variations in the eigenvector directions of \( T(\gamma) \), due either to fluctuations about a steady-state, or to possible systematic variations of \( T(\gamma) \) with \( \gamma \).

For a \( d = 2 \) dimensional system, one can show that the above definitions for \( S_2 \) and \( \theta_2 \) are equivalent to generalizations of Eqs. (22)-(24). For a given configuration after total strain \( \gamma \) we have for the instantaneous order parameter,

\[
S_2(\gamma) = \max_{\theta'} \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \cos(2[\theta_i - \theta']) \right],
\]

with \( \theta_2(\gamma) \) being the maximizing value of \( \theta' \). From this one can show [44],

\[
S_2(\gamma) = \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \cos(2\theta_i) \right]^2 + \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sin(2\theta_i) \right]^2
\]

and

\[
\tan[2\theta_2(\gamma)] = \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sin(2\theta_i) \right] / \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \cos(2\theta_i) \right].
\]

The ensemble averaged order parameter, given by \( S_2 \) and \( \theta_2 \), are similarly obtained, except by replacing the square brackets \( \langle \ldots \rangle \) in Eqs. (33)-(35), which represent sums over particles in a particular configuration, by ensemble averages \( \langle \ldots \rangle \) over the many different configurations in the steady-state.

1. **Time Dependence of Nematic Ordering**

The athermal shearing of aspherical rod-shaped particles has been compared to the thermalized shearing of nematic liquid crystals [12–14]. In the latter case, several different types of behavior may occur depending on material parameters [50–53]. The system may settle into a steady-state with constant \( S_2 \) and \( \theta_2 \); the system may “tumble,” with the orientation of the nematic director \( \theta_2 \) rotating through \( \pi \) over a well-defined period; or the system might show “wagging,” in which \( \theta_2 \) has periodic variations back and forth within a fixed interval without rotating. We thus wish to investigate whether such time varying behavior exists in our athermal system. Given that we do find that individual particles continue to rotate even as the system gets dense, is there any coherent rotation of particles that would lead to a systematic variation of \( S_2(\gamma) \) with \( \gamma \)? For our 2D spherocylinders we do indeed see both tumbling and wagging of the nematic director, however we believe that these occur only as a transient effect due to poor equilibration of the rotational degrees of freedom, either because the density \( \phi \) is so low that collisions are rare, or because \( \alpha \) is so small that small moment arms lead to small elastic torques and so take long times to reach proper equilibration.

In Fig. 23 we plot the instantaneous \( S_2(\gamma) \) and \( \theta_2(\gamma) \) vs total strain \( \gamma = \dot{\gamma} t \), for spherocylinders of \( \alpha = 4 \) at \( \dot{\gamma} = 10^{-5} \) for a few different packings \( \phi \). Our shearing starts from a random initial configuration for which \( S_2(0) \approx 0 \). For the very low \( \phi = 0.1 \) we see damped oscillations in both \( S_2(\gamma) \) and \( \theta_2(\gamma) \) with a period \( \Delta \gamma \approx 16.1 \), almost equal to the period 16.04 of an isolated particle. The behavior of \( \theta_2(\gamma) \) identifies this as a wagging
of the order parameter. As $\gamma$ increases, the amplitude of these oscillations decays, but the periodicity remains. For $\phi = 0.3$, the behavior at small $\gamma$ is similar to that at $\phi = 0.1$, but the amplitude of the oscillations dies out faster. At larger $\gamma$ there is no longer any remnant of the initial periodic behavior, and $S_2(\gamma)$ and $\theta_2(\gamma)$ show only random fluctuations about the ensemble averaged values $S_2$ and $\theta_2$. For larger $\phi$, the initial transient dies out even more quickly.

In Fig. 24 we show similar plots of $S_2(\gamma)$ and $\theta_2(\gamma)$, but now for particles of $\alpha = 0.01$ at $\dot{\gamma} = 10^{-6}$. For the lowest $\phi = 0.77$ shown we see strong oscillations in $S_2(\gamma)$, and $\theta_2(\gamma)$ initially makes full clockwise rotations with a period $\Delta \gamma \approx 6.7$, close to the period 6.28 for an isolated particle. As $\gamma$ increases, the rotations become a wagging, the amplitude of the oscillations in $S_2(\gamma)$ decreases, but there remains a clear periodic behavior. For $\phi = 0.81$ there are no longer any initial rotations, but the wagging continues with a small erratic amplitude but definite periodicity out to the largest $\gamma$. For $\phi = 0.83$ and above, we see only random fluctuations about the ensemble averaged values. We conclude from Figs. 23 and 24 that the rotating and wagging of the nematic order parameter $S_2$ are only transient effects that should die out if the simulation is run long enough, rather than being stable periodic motions of the macroscopic order parameter.

2. Ensemble Averaged Nematic Ordering

We turn now to consider the ensemble averaged nematic order parameter, given by $S_2$ and $\theta_2$, which we believe represents the true steady state of the system. In Fig. 25 we plot $S_2$ vs the scaled $\phi/\phi_J$ for spherocylinders of different aspect ratios $\alpha = 0.001$ to 4. We show results at two different strain rates $\dot{\gamma}_1 < \dot{\gamma}_2$, whose values are given in Table I to demonstrate that our results are in the quasistatic limit where $S_2$ becomes independent of $\dot{\gamma}$, except for the largest $\phi$ approaching and going above jamming. In Fig. 26 we similarly plot $S_2$ vs $\phi$, but now showing results for a wider range of strain rates $\dot{\gamma}$, for the two particular cases $\alpha = 4$ and $\alpha = 0.01$. We see that the dependence of $S_2$ on $\dot{\gamma}$ is strongest near the jamming transition, but that $S_2$ appears to be approaching a finite limit as $\dot{\gamma} \to 0$.

Our results show several significant features: (i) As was found for the angular velocity $-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle / \dot{\gamma}$ in Fig. 6, $S_2$ is non-monotonic, reaching a maximum at $\phi_{S_2 \text{ max}}$ somewhat below the jamming $\phi_J$. As was found for an isolated particle in Fig. 8(a), comparing Figs. 6 and 25 we see an anti-correlation between angular velocity and nematic ordering; roughly speaking, when $-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle / \dot{\gamma}$ decreases $S_2$ increases, and vice versa. In Fig. 27 we plot $\phi_{S_2 \text{ max}}$, the location of the maximum in $S_2$, and $\phi_{\theta \text{ min}}$, the location of the minimum in $-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle / \dot{\gamma}$, vs $\alpha$. We see that they are close and become roughly equal for $\alpha \lesssim 0.5$. (ii)
As $\alpha$ decreases, the variation in $S_2$ gets squeezed into an increasingly narrow range of $\phi$, closer to $\phi_J$, and the degree of ordering $S_2$ decreases. However, even for the very nearly circular particles with $\alpha = 0.001$, the maximum value $S_2_{\text{max}} = 0.33$ remains relatively large. (iii) In the dilute limit at low $\phi$, we see $S_2$ is increasing as $\phi$ increases, which is the opposite of the behavior seen in Fig. 4(c) for the noisy isolated particle. Thus, as we concluded also from the behavior of $-\langle \hat{\theta}_i \rangle / \dot{\gamma}$, one cannot regard the elastic collisions in the dilute “gas” limit as behaving similarly to an effective temperature.

Next we consider the orientation of the nematic director. In Fig. 28 we plot $\theta_2$ vs the scaled packing $\phi / \phi_J$ for different asphericities $\alpha$, showing results for the two values of strain rate $\dot{\gamma}_1 < \dot{\gamma}_2$ (see Table I for values). For an isolated particle, $\theta_2 = 0$, indicating average alignment parallel to the flow direction $\hat{x}$. As $\phi$ increases from this low $\phi$ isolated particle limit, we see that $\theta_2$ initially goes negative. Increasing $\phi$ further, $\theta_2$ increases, becomes positive, and upon approaching $\phi_J$ saturates to a value that increases towards $45^\circ$ as $\alpha$ decreases; as $\phi$ gets close to and goes above $\phi_J$, we see a slight decrease in $\theta_2$.

While at very low packing $\phi$ the particles tend to align with the flow direction, one might think that, as the particle packing increases, the nematic director would align with the direction of minimal stress. However we find that this is in general not so. If $p$ is the pressure and $\sigma$ is the deviatoric shear stress, the orthogonal eigenvectors of the stress tensor, corresponding to eigenvalues $p \pm \sigma$, are oriented at angles $\theta_{\pm}$ with respect to the flow direction $\hat{x}$. In an earlier work [7] we have computed the angle of the minimum stress eigenvector, $\theta_-$. At low $\phi$ for any $\alpha$ we find $\theta_- \approx 45^\circ$, as it would be for a uniformly sheared continuum. At dense $\phi$, near and above jamming, we find that $\theta_- \rightarrow 45^\circ$ as $\alpha \rightarrow 0$, but otherwise decreases from $45^\circ$ as $\alpha$ increases. In between, $\theta_-$ can vary non-monotonically as $\phi$ increases. In Fig. 29 we plot $\theta_2 - \theta_-$ vs $\phi$ for different $\alpha$, at the strain rate $\dot{\gamma}_1$ (see Table I for values). We see that only for the smaller values $\alpha \lesssim 0.25$, and only approaching $\phi_J$ and going above, do we find $\theta_2 \approx \theta_-$, i.e. the nematic order parameter is aligning close to the minimum stress direction.

3. Distribution of Particle Orientations

The ensemble averages defining $S_2$ and $\theta_2$ in Eqs. (33) can be expressed in terms of a probability density $P(\theta)$ for a given particle to be oriented at angle $\theta_i = \theta$, where $P$ is determined by sampling both over different particles $i$ within an individual configuration, and over different configurations within our steady-state sheared ensemble. In this context, $S_2$ and $\theta_2$ can viewed as giving
the first term in a Fourier series expansion of $P(\theta)$,

$$P(\theta) = \frac{1}{2\pi} + \frac{1}{\pi} \sum_{m \text{ even}} S_m \cos[m(\theta - \theta_m)],$$  \hspace{1cm} (36)$$

where only even integer $m$ terms appear in the sum because $P(\theta)$ has a periodicity of $\pi$, and the normalization is taken such that $\int_0^{2\pi} d\theta P(\theta) = 1$.

It is therefore of interest to consider the distribution $P(\theta)$ directly, and see, for example, where the nematic director angle $\theta_2$ lies with respect to this distribution. Does $\theta_2$ also correspond to the most likely particle direction, where $P(\theta)$ has its maximum, or is $P(\theta)$ sufficiently skewed so that these two differ?

In Fig. 30(a) we plot $P(\theta)$ vs $\theta$, at several different packings $\phi$, for nearly circular particles with $\alpha = 0.01$ at strain rate $\dot{\gamma} = 10^{-6}$. We show only the range $-\pi/2 < \theta < \pi/2$ because $P(\theta)$ has a periodicity of $\pi$. The solid, nearly horizontal, line labeled $\phi = 0.0$ is the distribution for an isolated particle, computed using Eq. (16); since $\Delta I_1/\Delta I_2 = 0.0085$ for $\alpha = 0.01$, this isolated particle distribution is essentially flat on the scale of the figure. As $\phi$ increases, and $S_2$ correspondingly increases (see Fig. 26(b)), $P(\theta)$ develops a strong $\theta$ dependence. The curves for $\phi \geq 0.81$ in Fig. 30(a) show a roughly sinusoidal variation in $\theta$, with an amplitude that varies non-monotonically as $\phi$ increases through the value $\phi_{S_2, \text{max}} \approx 0.83$ where $S_2$ has its maximum. The dotted curves in Fig. 30(a) show the approximation to $P(\theta)$ obtained from the Fourier series expansion of Eq. (36), keeping only the lowest $m = 2$ term, determined by the nematic order parameter. For the denser packings $\phi \gtrsim 0.84$, near and above the jamming $\phi_J \approx 0.845$, this gives an excellent approximation to $P(\theta)$; for lower $\phi < 0.84$ we see noticeable deviations. The direction $\theta_2$ of the nematic order parameter, which always lies at the peak of the dotted curves, is thus very close to the most probable particle orientation $\theta_{\text{max}}$ for the dense cases $\phi \gtrsim 0.84$, but we see that $\theta_2$ is slightly larger than $\theta_{\text{max}}$ for the more dilute cases.

In Fig. 30(b) we show similar plots of $P(\theta)$ vs $\theta$ at different $\phi$, but now for elongated particles with $\alpha = 4$ at $\dot{\gamma} = 10^{-5}$. The localized shape of $P(\theta)$ at all $\phi$ indicates that one would have to take many terms $m$ in the expansion of Eq. (36) to get a good approximation. Nevertheless one can still ask where $\theta_2$ (indicated by the arrows in Fig. 30) lies with respect to the most probable value $\theta_{\text{max}}$. At the lowest $\phi = 0.5$, the distribution $P(\theta)$ is largely symmetric about its maximum and $\theta_2 \approx \theta_{\text{max}}$. As $\phi$ increases, the location of the maximum $\theta_{\text{max}}$ increases slightly, but the distribution also becomes noticeably skewed towards the large $\theta$ side of the peak. Thus we find that $\theta_2$ shifts to the right of the peak and $\theta_2 > \theta_{\text{max}}$. This difference seems to be at its largest near the $\phi_{\text{min}} \approx 0.80$ where $-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle / \dot{\gamma}$ is at its smallest.
This gives a stable steady-state equilibrium value of \( \theta_2 \), except now it is assumed that \( \kappa > 0 \). In both cases \( \theta_2 - \theta_{\text{max}} \) is negative at low \( \phi \), then increases as \( \phi \) increases, becoming positive and reaching a maximum near (though not exactly equal) to the packing \( \phi_{\theta_{\text{min}}} \) where \( -\langle \theta_2 \rangle / \gamma \) has its minimum, then decreasing again until \( \phi \approx \phi_{\theta_{\text{j}}}, \) at which point it increases again as \( \phi \) goes above jamming.

4. Relaxation to the Steady State

In a previous section we argued that the nematic order parameter \( S_2 \) does not show any coherent time-dependent behavior, but rather has a constant value in the steady state. Here we ask whether this relaxation can be described by a simple macroscopic equation of motion.

In Ref. [1] Wegner et al. suggested, by analogy with behavior in nematic liquid crystals, that the relaxation of \( S_2 \) should obey an equation of motion that can be written in the form,

\[
\dot{\theta}_2 = -\gamma C (1 - \kappa \cos 2\theta_2). \tag{37}
\]

This is similar to Eq. [13] for the rotation of an isolated particle, except now it is assumed that \( \kappa > 1 \). This gives a stable steady-state equilibrium value of \( \theta_{2s} = \frac{1}{2} \arccos(1/\kappa) \) and an unstable equilibrium value \( \theta_{2s} = 0 \) at \( \theta_{2s} = -\theta_{2s} \). One can then rewrite Eq. (37) as,

\[
\dot{\theta}_2 = -\gamma C \left( 1 - \frac{\cos 2\theta_2}{\cos 2\theta_{2s}} \right). \tag{38}
\]

Defining \( \theta_2 \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2) \), the above equation of motion predicts that when \( |\theta_2| < \theta_{2s} \), then \( S_2 \) will relax to the steady state by rotating counter-clockwise to approach \( \theta_{2s} \); however, when \( \theta_2 \) lies outside this interval, \( S_2 \) will relax to the steady state by rotating clockwise to approach \( \theta_{2s} \).

To test this prediction we prepare numerical samples in which the steady-state \( S_2 \) is rotated clockwise by a predetermined amount, and then measure the relaxation of \( S_2 \) and \( \theta_2 \) back to the steady-state as the system is sheared. To create these samples with rotated \( S_2 \) we use the method illustrated in Fig. 32. A system with shear strain \( \gamma \), sampled from our steady-state ensemble, is rotated clockwise by the angle \( \psi = \cot^{-1} \gamma \), so that the two sides of the system boundary which were previously slanted now become the horizontal sides parallel to the flow direction. We then continue to shear the system in the horizontal direction.

Such a rotation preserves the boundary conditions of the original configuration; the periodic boundary condition previously obeyed at the slanted sides now becomes the Lees-Edwards boundary condition at the new horizontal sides, and vice versa, as illustrated by the shaded circles and squares on the various sides in Fig. 32. If the original configuration had a length \( L_x \) and a height \( L_y \), the new rotated configuration has length \( L_y \sqrt{1 + \gamma^2} \) and height \( L_x / \sqrt{1 + \gamma^2} \). If the original \( S_2 \) was at an angle \( \theta_2 \), close to but not necessarily exactly equal to \( \theta_{2s} \) because of fluctuations, the new \( S_2 \) will be at an angle \( \theta_2 - \psi \). By choosing different strains \( \gamma \) at which to make this system rotation, we wind up with configurations in which the original steady-state \( S_2 \) has been rotated by various angles \( \gamma = \cot^{-1} \gamma \). To avoid a too elongated system when we rotate at a large \( \gamma \) (so as to produce a small rotation angle \( \psi \)), we start with an initial system in which \( L_x > L_y \), instead of our usual \( L_x = L_y \).

We first consider the relaxation of a system of moderately elongated spherocylinders with asphericity \( \alpha = 4 \). Using a system sheared at a strain rate \( \dot{\gamma} = 10^{-5} \), Fig. 33

![FIG. 31. Difference between the angle \( \theta_2 \) of the nematic order parameter and the angle \( \theta_{\text{max}} \) that gives the most probable particle orientation, vs packing \( \phi \). For \( \alpha = 0.01 \) results are from a strain rate \( \dot{\gamma} = 10^{-6} \); for \( \alpha = 4 \) results are from \( \dot{\gamma} = 10^{-5} \).](image)

![FIG. 32. Schematic of procedure to construct a configuration in which the nematic order parameter \( S_2 \) is rotated clockwise by an angle \( \psi \). Start with a configuration with a net shear strain \( \gamma = \cot \psi \) (left figure) and rotate by \( \psi \) to create the new configuration (right figure). Under this transformation the configuration boundary conditions are preserved, as indicated by the shaded circles and squares on the various sides of the system boundary, but the the system aspect ratio changes, \( L_y/L_x \rightarrow L_x/L_y(1 + \gamma^2) \).](image)
the ensemble averaged steady state value of $S$ has been shifted so that the point where $\theta$ is the largest of our comparison, the strain axis has been shifted for each curve so that the horizontal dashed lines give the ensemble averaged steady state values of $\pm \theta_{ss}^\gamma$. In (c) and (d) the horizontal dashed line gives the ensemble averaged steady state value of $S$. For ease of comparison, the strain axis has been shifted for each curve so that the point where $\theta = 0$ or $90^\circ$ occurs at $\gamma = 0$. The two thicker curves denote (i) the largest of our $\theta_{ss}^\gamma$ that results in a pure clockwise relaxation to the steady-state, and (ii) the smallest of our $\theta_{ss}^\gamma$ that results in a mostly counter-clockwise relaxation.

shows the relaxation of the rotated nematic order parameter $S$ back to the steady state. In Figs. 33(a) and 33(b) we show the relaxation of the orientation $\theta$ vs net strain $\gamma = \dot{\gamma} t$, at packing fractions $\phi = 0.80$ and $\phi = 0.95$ respectively; $\phi = 0.80$ is the packing that gives the minimum in $-(\theta_\gamma)/\gamma$, while $\phi = 0.95$ is above the jamming $\phi_J = 0.906$. In (a) and (b) the left most point on each curve gives the initial value $\theta_{ss}^\gamma$ after the system rotation; the horizontal dashed lines give the ensemble averaged steady state values of $\pm \theta_{ss}^\gamma$. In (c) and (d) the horizontal dashed line gives the ensemble averaged steady state value of $S$. For each $\phi$ we show results for rotations through several different angles $\psi$, giving different initial values of $\theta_{ss}^\gamma$. For ease of comparison, for each curve the strain axis has been shifted so that the point where $\theta = 0$ occurs at $\gamma = 0$; this also corresponds to the point where $d\theta/d\gamma$ is largest (for the cases with the smallest $\theta_{ss}^\gamma$, where particles relax by a pure clockwise rotation, this point corresponds to where $\theta = 0$, consistent with our definition of $\theta_{ss}^\gamma \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2)$, takes a discontinuous jump from $-90^\circ$ to $+90^\circ$).

In Figs. 33(a) and 33(b) we see that for $\theta_{ss}^\gamma$ sufficiently smaller than $-\theta_{ss}^\gamma$, the order parameter angle $\theta$ relaxes to the steady state by rotating clockwise, in agreement with Eq. (38). Similarly, for $-\theta_{ss}^\gamma < \theta_{ss}^\gamma < 0$ we see that $\theta$ relaxes by rotating counter-clockwise, again in agreement with Eq. (37). However there exists a region of $\theta_{ss}^\gamma \gtrsim -\theta_{ss}^\gamma$ where the order parameter starts rotating clockwise, then reverses direction to rotate counter-clockwise, overshoots $\theta_{ss}^\gamma$, then reverses direction again, rotating clockwise to relax back to $\theta_{ss}^\gamma$. The two curves that separate the region where $\theta$ relaxes in a purely clockwise fashion from the region where it starts clockwise but then reverses to counter-clockwise, are indicated by thicker lines in the figures. Thus Eq. (38) cannot be describing the system well in this region. Moreover, being a first order differential equation, Eq. (38) would predict that $\theta(\gamma)$ would follow a fixed trajectory determined solely by the initial value $\theta_{ss}^\gamma$. But in Fig. 33(a) and (b) we see curves that pass through the same value of $\theta$ (for example $\theta = 0$) but do not then follow the same trajectory as $\gamma$ increases.

The reason for this more complex behavior lies in the behavior of the magnitude of the order parameter, which in Eq. (38) is presumed to stay constant. In contrast, we see in Figs. 33(c) and 33(d) that the rapid change in $\theta$ at $\gamma = 0$ is accompanied by a pronounced drop in the magnitude of the order parameter $S$. The largest drop in $S$ occurs at $\gamma = 0$, but not quite to zero, occurs for those $\theta_{ss}^\gamma$ which give curves that are on the border between a pure clockwise relaxation and where the relaxation reverses from initially clockwise to counter-clockwise (indicated by the thicker curves in the figure).

To understand this behavior of $S$, in Fig. 34 we show
an intensity plot of the orientations $\theta_i$ of the individual particles, as a function of the net shear strain $\gamma = \dot{\gamma} t$, as the system relaxes following the rotation of a configuration sampled from the steady-state. At each $\gamma$, the range of angles $\theta_i$ is binned into $2^\circ$ intervals and we count the number of particles with orientation $\theta_i$ in each bin; this count is then imaged by the grey scale as shown. We use the same system as in Figs. 33(a) and 33(c), with $\alpha = 4$ and $\dot{\gamma} = 10^{-3}$ at packing $\phi = 0.80$; a rotation is chosen that corresponds to the curve with the largest drop in $S_2$ seen in Fig. 33(c). We see that some fraction of the particles relax by rotating clockwise, while the others relax by rotating counter-clockwise. At $\gamma = 0$, corresponding to the smallest value of $S_2$, we see the broadest distribution of values of $\theta_i$. The sharp drop in $S_2$ as the system relaxes back to steady state is thus due to the lack of coherence in the relaxation of the individual particles. We find qualitatively the same behavior if we look at other packing fractions near and above jamming. We note that similar results as in our Figs. 33 and 34 have been observed experimentally by Börzsönyi et al. for the relaxation of shear-reversed dry granular 3D packings of glass cylinders [13].

Finally, in Figs. 35 and 36 we show similar plots, but now for nearly circular particles with $\alpha = 0.01$. We see the same qualitative features as were found for the more elongated particles with $\alpha = 4$.

C. The $\alpha \to 0$ limit

For perfectly circular particles with $\alpha = 0$, the rotational invariance of the particles implies that there can be no nematic ordering, and so $S_2 = 0$. Moreover, for perfectly circular particles the elastic forces are directed radially inwards to the center of the particle and so the torque from the elastic particle collisions necessarily vanishes, $\tau_{el}^i = 0$. Since our model has no Coulomb frictional forces, the rotation of circular particles is thus determined solely by the dissipative torque $\tau_{dis}^i$ due to the drag with respect to the background, affinely sheared, host medium. Since by symmetry the moment of inertia has equal eigenvalues, then $\Delta I_i = 0$ and Eq. (13) gives a fixed uniform rotational motion for each particle, $\theta_i = -\dot{\gamma}/2$. One might therefore expect that, for spherocylinders of asphericity $\alpha > 0$, one would find that $S_2 \to 0$ and $-\langle \theta \rangle / \dot{\gamma} \to 1/2$ continuously as $\alpha \to 0$.

However, as we have already noted in connection with Fig. 6 for $-\langle \theta \rangle / \dot{\gamma}$ and Fig. 25 for $S_2$, we see a sizable value for $S_2$ and a sizable difference between $-\langle \theta \rangle / \dot{\gamma}$ and $1/2$, even for very nearly circular particles with $\alpha = 0.001$, for which the flat sides of the spherocylinder comprise only 0.064% of the total perimeter. Here we will argue that the $\alpha \to 0$ limit is singular, and that if one sits at the jamming transition then $\lim_{\alpha \to 0} S_2$ and $\lim_{\alpha \to 0} \langle \theta \rangle$ stay finite. We have previously reported on this effect in Ref. 8, here we provide further details.

We are interested in the quasistatic $\dot{\gamma} \to 0$ limit of $S_2(\phi)$ as $\alpha \to 0$. To determine this limit, we define several benchmarks. The first is the height of the peak in $S_2$ as $\phi$ varies, which we denote as $S_{2\text{max}}$, occurring at $\phi = \phi_{2\text{max}}$. Next is the value $S_2(\phi_{J}^{(0)})$ at the $\alpha \to 0$ jamming transition of circular particles, $\phi_{J}^{(0)} = 0.8433$. To characterize the location of the peak in $S_2(\phi)$ we define

$$\Delta \phi_1 = \phi_{J}^{(0)} - \phi_{2\text{max}},$$

the distance of the peak to $\phi_{J}^{(0)}$. To characterize the width of the peak we define

$$\Delta \phi_2 = \phi_{2\text{max}} - \phi_{2\text{half}},$$

where $\phi_{2\text{half}} < \phi_{2\text{max}}$ is the packing at which $S_2$ takes half the value at its peak, $S_2(\phi_{2\text{half}}) = S_{2\text{max}}/2$.

These parameters are all indicated in Fig. 37(a) where we plot $S_2$ vs $\phi$ for our smallest asphericity $\alpha = 0.001$,
FIG. 36. For spherocylinders of asphericity $\alpha = 0.01$ at strain rate $\dot{\gamma} = 10^{-8}$ and packing $\phi = 0.83$: Intensity plot showing the number of particles oriented at a particular angle $\theta_i$, vs net strain $\gamma = \dot{\gamma} t$, as the system relaxes back to steady-state after an initial rotation of a configuration sampled from the steady state ensemble. The nematic order parameter $S_2$ is rotated to have the value of $\theta_{2\text{pit}}$ that corresponds to the curve in Figs. 35(c) that has the largest drop in the magnitude to have the value of $\theta_i$ in $S_2$, as the system relaxes back to steady-state after an initial rotation of a configuration sampled from the steady state ensemble. The strain scale $\gamma$ has been shifted so that the left edge of the figure corresponds to the initial configuration after the rotation, while $\gamma = 0$ corresponds to the strain at which $\theta_2 = 0$. Horizontal dashed lines indicate the values of $\pm \theta_{2\text{pit}}$; the vertical dashed line indicates $\gamma = 0$.

FIG. 37. (a) For spherocylinders with $\alpha = 0.001$, $S_2$ vs $\phi$ at strain rates $\dot{\gamma} = 10^{-6}, 4 \times 10^{-7}$ and $10^{-7}$. The black dot labeled “QS” represents the extrapolated $\dot{\gamma} \to 0$ value of $S_2$ at $\phi_j^{(0)} = 0.8433$. Widths $\Delta \phi_1 = \phi_j^{(0)} - \phi_{S_2 \text{max}}$, and $\Delta \phi_2 = \phi_{S_2 \text{max}} - \phi_{S_2 \text{half}}$ are denoted in the figure. (b) $S_2$ vs $\gamma$ at $\phi_j^{(0)}$ for $\alpha \leq 0.12$. Solid lines connect the data points, dashed lines are fits of the small $\dot{\gamma}$ points to the form $a + b\dot{\gamma}^c$ and are used to extrapolate to the $\dot{\gamma} \to 0$ limit.

at the three smallest strain rates $\dot{\gamma}$. We see that our smallest $\dot{\gamma} = 10^{-7}$ has reached the desired quasistatic limit for all $\phi$ up to, and including, the peak. However above the peak, in particular at $\phi_j^{(0)}$, there remains a noticeable dependence on $\dot{\gamma}$. To obtain the quasistatic limit in this case, in Fig. 37(b) we plot $S_2(\phi_j^{(0)})$ vs $\dot{\gamma}$ for our smallest $\alpha \leq 0.12$ (for larger $\alpha$, our smallest $\dot{\gamma}$ has reached the quasistatic limit at $\phi_j^{(0)}$). We fit the small $\dot{\gamma}$ data points to the empirical form $a + b\dot{\gamma}^c$, shown as the dashed lines, to estimate the quasistatic $\dot{\gamma} \to 0$ limit. For $\alpha = 0.001$, this quasistatic value is shown as the black dot in Fig. 37(a).

Note, to improve our estimate for $\alpha = 0.001$ we have included in Fig. 37(b) results from a simulation at $\phi_j^{(0)}$ with $\dot{\gamma} = 4 \times 10^{-5}$. Due to the empirical nature of our fits in Fig. 37(b), and the limited range of small $\dot{\gamma}$ for which we have data, one may question the precision of our estimate for the quasistatic limit of $S_2(\phi_j^{(0)})$. However, we believe our results are sufficiently accurate to assert that, for $\alpha = 0.001$, $S_2$ remains finite at $\phi_j^{(0)}$ and above.

In Fig. 38(a) we plot $S_{2\text{max}}$ and the extrapolated quasistatic values of $S_2(\phi_j^{(0)})$ vs $\alpha$. We see that both appear to stay finite as $\alpha \to 0$. Fitting the four smallest $\alpha$ data points to the empirical form $a + b\dot{\gamma}^c$, shown as the dashed lines, we estimate $\lim_{\alpha \to 0} S_{2\text{max}} = 0.28$ and $\lim_{\alpha \to 0} S_2(\phi_j^{(0)}) = 0.15$. In Fig. 38(b) we plot $\Delta \phi_1$ and $\Delta \phi_2$ vs $\alpha$. From the straight line formed by the smallest data points on this log-log plot, we conclude that both $\Delta \phi_1$ and $\Delta \phi_2$ are vanishing algebraically as $\alpha \to 0$. Fitting to this algebraic decay we find $\Delta \phi_1,2 \sim \alpha^{0.47}$. From Fig. 38(b) we thus conclude that, as $\alpha \to 0$, the location of the peak in $S_2$ moves to $\phi_j^{(0)}$ and the width of the low $\phi$ side of this peak shrinks to zero, so $S_2 \to 0$ for $\phi < \phi_j^{(0)}$. But from Fig. 38(a) we conclude that $S_2$ stays finite at and above $\phi_j^{(0)}$, though there is a discontinuous drop in $S_2$ as $\phi$ increases above $\phi_j^{(0)}$.

We next consider the average particle angular velocity. Since at $\alpha = 0$ we expect particles to have $-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle / \dot{\gamma} = 1/2$ at all $\phi$, we consider here the deviation from that value. With $\theta_i^\prime = d\theta_i/d\gamma = \dot{\theta}_i/\dot{\gamma}$, we define

$$\Delta \theta' = 1/2 - \langle \dot{\theta}_i / \dot{\gamma} \rangle.$$  \hspace{1cm} (41)

In Fig. 39(a) we plot $\Delta \theta'$ vs $\phi$ for $\alpha = 0.001$, showing results for our three smallest strain rates $\dot{\gamma}$. Similar to our analysis of $S_2$ we denote the height of the peak value in $\Delta \theta'$ as $\phi$ varies as $\Delta \theta'_{\text{max}}$, occurring at $\phi_{\Delta \theta'_{\text{max}}}$, occurring at $\phi_{\Delta \theta'_{\text{max}}}$, the
FIG. 39. (a) For spherocylinders with $\alpha = 0.001$, $\Delta \theta' = 1/2 - \langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle / \dot{\gamma}$ vs $\phi$ at strain rates $\dot{\gamma} = 10^{-6}$, $4 \times 10^{-7}$ and $10^{-7}$. The black dot labeled “QS” represents the extrapolated $\dot{\gamma} \to 0$ value of $\Delta \theta'$ at $\phi_j^{(0)} = 0.8433$. Widths $\Delta \phi'_1 \equiv \phi_j^{(0)} - \phi_{\Delta \theta' \text{max}}$, and $\Delta \phi'_2 = \phi_{\Delta \theta' \text{max}} - \phi_{\Delta \theta' \text{half}}$ are denoted in the figure. (b) $\Delta \theta'$ vs $\dot{\gamma}$ at $\phi_j^{(0)}$ for $\alpha \leq 0.12$. Solid lines connect the data points, dashed lines are fits of the small $\dot{\gamma}$ points to the empirical form $a + b\dot{\gamma}^c$ and are used to extrapolate to the $\dot{\gamma} \to 0$ limit.

value at the $\alpha = 0$ jamming point $\Delta \theta'(\phi_j^{(0)})$, and the value $\phi_{\Delta \theta' \text{half}}$ as the packing where $\Delta \theta'$ takes half the value at its peak, $\Delta \theta'(\phi_{\Delta \theta' \text{half}}) = \Delta \theta'_{\text{max}}/2$. We similarly define the location of the peak in $\Delta \theta'$ with respect to the jamming transition of circles as

$$\Delta \phi'_1 = \phi_j^{(0)} - \phi_{\Delta \theta' \text{max}},$$

and the half width of the peak as

$$\Delta \phi'_2 = \phi_{\Delta \theta' \text{max}} - \phi_{\Delta \theta' \text{half}}.$$

These are indicated in Fig. 39(a).

As seen with $S_2$, we see in Fig. 39(a) that our smallest $\dot{\gamma} = 10^{-7}$ has reached the quasistatic limit for all $\phi$ up to, and including the peak. However at $\phi_j^{(0)}$ we see that there remains a noticeable dependence on $\dot{\gamma}$. Proceeding as was done similarly for $S_2$, in Fig. 39(b) we plot $\Delta \theta'(\phi_j^{(0)})$ vs $\dot{\gamma}$ for the smaller $\alpha$, and fit to the form $a + b\dot{\gamma}^c$ to extrapolate to the $\dot{\gamma} \to 0$ limit. This extrapolated value for $\alpha = 0.001$ is indicated by the black dot in Fig. 39(a).

In Fig. 40(a) we plot $\Delta \theta'_{\text{max}}$ and the extrapolated quasistatic values of $\Delta \theta'(\phi_j^{(0)})$ vs $\alpha$. As with the corresponding quantities for $S_2$, we see that both appear to stay finite as $\alpha \to 0$. Fitting the four smallest $\alpha$ data points to the empirical form $a + b\dot{\gamma}^c$, shown as the dashed lines, we estimate $\lim_{\alpha \to 0} \Delta \theta'_{\text{max}} = 0.084$ and $\lim_{\alpha \to 0} \Delta \theta'(\phi_j^{(0)}) = 0.029$. In Fig. 40(b) we plot $\Delta \phi'_1$ and $\Delta \phi'_2$ vs $\alpha$ from the straight line fitted by the smallest data points on this log-log plot, we conclude that both $\Delta \phi'_1$ and $\Delta \phi'_2$ are vanishing algebraically as $\alpha \to 0$. Fitting to this algebraic decay we find $\Delta \phi'_1 \sim \alpha^{0.44}$ and $\Delta \phi'_2 \sim \alpha^{0.56}$. Thus we find for $\Delta \theta'$ qualitatively similar behavior as we found for $S_2$: from Fig. 40(b) we conclude that, as $\alpha \to 0$, the location of the peak in $\Delta \theta'$ moves to $\phi_j^{(0)}$ and the width of the low $\phi$ side of this peak shrinks to zero, so $\Delta \theta' \to 0$ for $\phi < \phi_j^{(0)}$; but from Fig. 40(a) we conclude that $\Delta \theta'$ stays finite at and above $\phi_j^{(0)}$, though there is a discontinuous drop as $\phi$ increases above $\phi_j^{(0)}$.

In Fig. 41 we sketch the quasistatic ($\dot{\gamma} \to 0$) $\alpha \to 0$ limiting behavior of the nematic order parameter magnitude $S_2$ and angular velocity $-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle / \dot{\gamma}$ vs $\phi$, that follows from the results of Figs. 38 and 40.

D. Pure Shear

All the results elsewhere in this paper involve the behavior of our system under a simple shear. However, in order to better understand the singular behavior as $\alpha \to 0$, discussed in the previous section, here we consider the behavior of our system under a pure shear.

In our model, dissipation arises due to a viscous drag between the local velocity of the particle and the local velocity $\mathbf{v}_{\text{host}}(\mathbf{r})$ of the suspending host medium. For simple shear in the $\hat{x}$ direction, $\mathbf{v}_{\text{host}}(\mathbf{r}) = \dot{\gamma} \hat{y} \hat{x}$. For a more general linear distortion of the host medium we
can write,

$$\mathbf{v}_{\text{host}}(\mathbf{r}) = \mathbf{\hat{G}} \cdot \mathbf{r}, \quad (44)$$

with $\mathbf{\hat{G}}$ the strain rate tensor. For simple shear we can write,

$$\mathbf{\hat{G}}_{ss} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \dot{\gamma} / 2 \\ \dot{\gamma} / 2 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \dot{\gamma} / 2 \\ -\dot{\gamma} / 2 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (45)$$

The first term on the right most side of Eq. (45) represents a pure shear distortion, in which the host medium is expanded in the $\hat{x} + \hat{y}$ direction, while being compressed in the $\hat{x} - \hat{y}$ direction, both at a rate $\dot{\gamma} / 2$, so as to preserve the system area. The second term represents a clockwise rotation ($-\dot{\gamma} / 2) \hat{z} \times \mathbf{r}$, with angular velocity $-\dot{\gamma} / 2$. Thus a simple shear can be viewed as the sum of a pure shear and a rotation. It is this rotational part which gives rise to the constant term $1 / 2$ in the angular driving function $f(\theta)$ of Eq. (11), while the pure shear part gives rise to the cosine term. It is the rotational part that drives the continuous rotation of particles under simple shear, resulting in the finite $-\langle \omega z \rangle / \dot{\gamma} > 0$ found in steady-state, as seen in Fig. 9. Studying pure shear thus allows us to study the orientational ordering of the system in the absence of the rotational drive.

For our pure shear simulations we choose $\hat{x}$ as the expansive direction and $\hat{y}$ as the compressive direction, using periodic boundary conditions in both directions. In this case, the translational and rotational equations of motion for pure shear become,

$$\mathbf{r}_i = \frac{\dot{\gamma}}{2} [x_i \hat{x} - y_i \hat{y}] + \frac{\mathbf{F}_{\text{el}}^i}{k_B \mathbf{A}_i}, \quad (46)$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{r}}_i = -\frac{\dot{\gamma}}{2} \Delta I_i / I_i \sin 2\theta_i + \frac{\tau_i^{\text{el}}}{k_B I_i \mathbf{A}_i}. \quad (47)$$

For an isolated particle, where $\tau_i^{\text{el}} = 0$, one can solve the rotational equation of motion analytically,

$$|\tan \theta_i(t)| = e^{-\gamma t / \Delta I_i / I_i} |\tan \theta_i(0)|. \quad (48)$$

An isolated particle will relax exponentially to $\theta_i = 0$ or $\pi$ with a relaxation time $t_{\text{relax}}$ set by a total strain $\gamma_{\text{relax}} = \dot{\gamma} t_{\text{relax}} = I_i / \Delta I_i$. Unlike simple shear, there is no continuous rotation of the particle. Thus, at low $\phi$ near this isolated particle limit, we expect to find near perfect nematic ordering with $S_2 \approx 1$ and $\theta_2 = 0$ for particles of any asphericity $\alpha$.

Now in the limit $\alpha \to 0$, Eq. (19) gives $\Delta I_i / I_i \sim \alpha \to 0$, and so for simple shear in the isolated particle limit, Eq. (18) gives $S_2 \sim \Delta I_i / I_i \to 0$. This is due to the rotational driving term in $\mathbf{F}_i$, which causes an isolated particle to continuously rotate with an angular velocity that becomes uniform as $\alpha \to 0$ and the particle becomes circular. For pure shear, however, there is no rotational drive and Eq. (48) results in the particle always relaxing to align with the direction of minimal stress, with $S_2 = 1$. Thus it is the rotational driving term, present in simple shear but absent in pure shear, that leads to a dramatically different steady-state behavior of $S_2$ for isolated particles, and hence at low $\phi$, in the $\alpha \to 0$ limit. Note, however, that as $\alpha \to 0$, the relaxation time needed to achieve this highly ordered state under pure shear diverges as $\gamma t_{\text{relax}} = (I_i / \Delta I_i) \sim 1 / \alpha$.

To investigate the response to pure shear at finite $\phi$, in particular near and above jamming, we carry out numerical simulations. Unlike simple shear, where the system lengths $L_x$ and $L_y$ remain constant as the system strains, under pure shear these lengths change with the total strain $\gamma$ according to $L_x(\gamma) = L_x(0) e^{\gamma / 2}$ and $L_y(\gamma) = L_y(0) e^{-\gamma / 2}$. Thus a practical limitation of pure shear simulations is that, unlike for simple shear, there is a limit to the total strain $\gamma$ that can be applied to a finite numerical system before the system collapses to a narrow height of order one particle length. Therefore, to increase the total possible strain $\gamma$, we use systems with an initial system aspect ratio of $L_y(0) / L_x(0) = \beta$, and shear to a strain $\gamma$ such that $L_y(\gamma) / L_x(\gamma) = 1 / \beta$, thus allowing a maximum strain of $\gamma_{\text{max}} = 2 \ln \beta$. The value of $\beta$ and the number of particles $N$ is varied with $\alpha$, so that the final system height after the maximal strain is comparable to the fixed system length of our simple shear simulations.
In particular, for $\alpha \leq 0.01$ we use $\beta = 12$ and $N = 4096$; for $0.01 < \alpha < 4$ we use $\beta = 16$ and $N = 8192$; for $\alpha = 4$ we use $\beta = 20$ and $N = 16384$. All our results below use a fixed strain rate $\dot{\gamma} = 10^{-6}$, and start from random initial configurations, constructed in the same manner as for our simple shear simulations.

In Fig. [12]a we plot $S_2$ vs strain $\gamma$ at several different packings $\phi$, for our elongated particles with $\alpha = 4$. We see that as $\gamma$ increases, $S_2$ rises from its near zero value in the initial random configuration and saturates to a constant steady-state value at large $\gamma$. As $\phi$ increases, this steady-state value of $S_2$ decreases, as the decreasing free volume associated with the increasing particle density blocks particles from perfect alignment. In Fig. [12]b we plot the corresponding orientation of the nematic order parameter $\theta_2$ vs $\gamma$. We see that $\theta_2$ starts at some finite value, depending on the small, randomly directed, residual $S_2$ in the initial random configuration, and then rapidly decays to $\theta_2 = 0$ as $\gamma$ increases. Thus, as expected, the pure shearing orders the particles with a nematic order parameter oriented parallel to the minimal stress direction. Our results in Figs. [12]c and [12]d are from a single pure shear run at each $\phi$.

In Figs. [12]c and [12]d we show corresponding results for $S_2$ and $\theta_2$ vs $\gamma$ for the case of nearly circular particles with $\alpha = 0.01$. Again we see that $S_2$ increases from zero to saturate at a steady-state value as $\gamma$ increases. Unlike the very slow relaxation $\gamma_{\text{relax}} \sim 1/\alpha$ we expect for an isolated particle, here we see that relaxation to the steady-state is relatively rapid at large packings $\phi$; the frequent collisions between particles at large densities act to quickly equilibrate the system. However as $\phi$ decreases, the relaxation strain $\gamma_{\text{relax}}$ increases, and at our lowest packing $\phi = 0.82$, $S_2$ fails to saturate to the steady-state value within our maximum strain $\gamma_{\text{max}} = 2 \ln 12 \approx 5$. We previously reported similar results for $\alpha = 0.001$ in the Supplemental Material to Ref. [8]. Our results in Figs. [12]c and [12]d are from the average of two independent runs at each $\phi$.

We note that similar simulations have been carried out by Azéma and Radjai in Ref. [18] for frictional 2D spherocylinders near the jamming packing, but using a constant lateral pressure rather than a constant volume, and shearing only to much smaller total strains than we do here. They similarly find that particles orient parallel to the minimal stress direction as they are sheared, but they seem to reach the large strain steady-state only for relatively small particle asphericities.

In Fig. [43] we plot the pure shear steady-state value of $S_2$ vs $\phi$ (solid symbols, dotted lines) at several of our smaller $\alpha$, showing only results where $S_2(\gamma)$ has saturated to the large $\gamma$ steady-state value. We see that as $\phi$ decreases, $S_2$ monotonically increases. Based on the behavior of an isolated particle, given by Eq. [45], we believe that $S_2$ will continue to increase and approach unity as $\phi \rightarrow 0$, however we cannot see this explicitly since we would need larger strains $\gamma$ to reach the steady-state as $\phi$ decreases.

For comparison, we also show in Fig. [43] our results for the steady-state value of $S_2$ vs $\phi$ obtained from simple shear (open symbols, solid lines). For $\alpha = 0.001$ and 0.01 we show results for $\dot{\gamma} = 10^{-6}$, the same rate as we used in the pure shear simulations. For $\alpha = 0.06$ we use $\dot{\gamma} = 4 \times 10^{-6}$ and for $\alpha > 0.06$ we use $\dot{\gamma} = 10^{-5}$, however in these cases the results of Fig. [25] show that these larger $\gamma$ have already reached the quasistatic limit, where $S_2$ becomes independent of $\gamma$.

While at the largest $\phi$ we see that $S_2$ from pure shear is somewhat smaller than that from simple shear, the two are qualitatively similar, and remain so as $\phi$ decreases. However as $\phi$ approaches and decreases below $\phi_{S_2,\text{max}}$, the location of the peak in $S_2$ for simple shear, we see that $S_2$ for pure shear continues to increase while $S_2$ for simple shear reaches its maximum and then decreases. Thus above $\phi_{S_2,\text{max}}$ pure and simple shear induce qualitatively similar orientational ordering, while below $\phi_{S_2,\text{max}}$ they become dramatically different.

The non-monotonic behavior of $S_2$ under simple shear can thus be understood as a competition between rotational drive and free volume. At large $\phi$, the small free volume inhibits particles from aligning. As $\phi$ decreases, the free volume increases allowing a better particle alignment and a larger $S_2$. In this dense region, particles undergoing simple shear still rotate with a finite $\langle \theta \rangle / \gamma$, however, according to the results of Sec. [IV A 5] these rotations occur randomly as a Poisson-like process with the average rotation rate being determined by the long waiting time tails of the distribution (see Figs. [18]a) and [20]a); particle orientations are driven primarily by the interactions with other particles. As $\phi$ decreases below $\phi_{S_2,\text{max}}$, the rotational drive of the simple shear becomes
dominant, and particle rotation becomes more similar to that of an isolated particle, but with random perturbations due to particle collisions (see Sec. 14A5 particularly Figs. 18(a) and 20(a)). In this case, the particle rotations act to reduce the orientational ordering (and destroy it as \( \alpha \to 0 \)), and \( S_2 \) decreases; this is unlike the case of pure shear where there is no such rotational driving term and \( S_2 \) continues to increases as \( \phi \) decreases.

The above scenario also helps to understand the singular \( \alpha \to 0 \) behavior under simple shear, discussed in the previous section. At low \( \phi \), well below \( \phi_{S2,max} \), the rotational drive causes nearly circular particles with small \( \alpha \) to rotate almost uniformly with \(-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle /\gamma \approx 1/2\), which by Eqs. (18) and (19) results in a small \( S_2 \sim \alpha \). Particle collisions that give significant torques that increase \( S_2 \) only occur as the particle density increases to \( \phi_{S2,max} \), which itself increases to \( \phi_j^{(0)} \) as \( \alpha \to 0 \). Thus we expect that as \( \alpha \to 0 \), \( S_2 \sim \alpha \to 0 \) for all \( \phi < \phi_j^{(0)} \). Above \( \phi_j^{(0)} \), however, particle interactions dominate over the rotational drive, and \( S_2 \) behaves as it would under pure shear, with a finite \( S_2 \) that decreases as \( \phi \) increases. Moreover, as \( \alpha \to 0 \), we found in Fig. 28 that the orientation of the of the nematic order parameter becomes \( \theta_2 \approx 45^\circ \) above \( \phi_j^{(0)} \), hence \( S_2 \) is aligning along the minimal stress direction (see also Fig. 29), again just as it does under pure shear.

We have thus explained the non-monotonic behavior we have for \( S_2 \) in terms of the competition between rotation and free volume. However, recent simulations by Trulsson [21], on the simple shearing of 2D ellipses, found that the non-monotonic behavior of \( S_2 \), seen for frictionless particles as \( \phi \) increases, goes away once inter-particle frictional forces are added. Instead of \( S_2 \) decreasing as \( \phi \) increases above some \( \phi_{S2,max} \), for frictional particles \( S_2 \) seems to saturate to a constant value as \( \phi \) increases. However Trulsson simulates in the hard-core particle limit, and so all his simulations take place for \( \phi < \phi_j(\mu_p) \), where \( \phi_j(\mu_p) \) is the jamming packing fraction for particles with inter-particle frictional coefficient \( \mu_p \). For frictional particles, the additional frictional forces act to stabilize particle packings at lower densities than the geometric jamming limit found for frictionless particles [54, 55], and so \( \phi_j(\mu_p) < \phi_j(\mu_p = 0) \). The difference between \( \phi_j(\mu_p) \) and \( \phi_j(\mu_p = 0) \) increases as \( \alpha \) increases [21]. Whereas for simple shear-driven jamming \( \phi_j(\mu_p = 0) \) seems to monotonically increase as \( \alpha \) increases, \( \phi_j(\mu_p) \) initially increases, reaches a maximum, then decreases; the difference in \( \phi_j \) between the frictionless and the frictional cases becomes more dramatic as \( \mu_p \) increases (see Fig. 6 of Ref. [21]). Thus Trulsson’s simulations do not probe the high density limit approaching geometric random close packing, and so might not reach the dense limit where free volume effects are dominating the behavior of \( S_2 \). Fixed volume simulations with soft-core frictional particles, allowing one to investigate the region above \( \phi_j(\mu_p) \), might thus help clarify to the situation.

### E. A Numerical Mean-Field Model

In the preceding sections we have argued that, although individual particles continue to rotate in the shear driven flow, there is no macroscopically coherent rotation of particles. In this section we therefore explore whether one can make a mean-field-like model for the rotation of a particle, that depends only on the state of the individual particle itself, but reproduces reasonably the observed ensemble averages for the nematic order parameter \( S_2 \) and the angular velocity \(-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle /\gamma \), as time averages of a single particle.

The rotational motion of a particle is governed by Eq. (13), which we can rewrite as,

\[
\frac{\dot{\theta}_i}{\gamma} = \frac{d\theta_i}{d\gamma} = -f(\theta_i) + g_i, \quad \text{where} \quad g_i = \frac{\tau_{el}^i}{k_d \gamma A_i \gamma} \quad (49)
\]

which gives the interaction with other particles due to the torques from elastic collisions. We consider four different approximations to \( g_i \), replacing the term from the fluctuating collisional torques by:

(i) \( g_i \to \bar{g} \equiv \langle g_i \rangle \) \quad (50)

where we average over both different particles in a given configuration, and over different configurations in the steady-state ensemble.

(ii) \( g_i \to \bar{g} + \delta g(\gamma) \)

where \( \delta g(\gamma) \) is an uncorrelated Gaussian white noise with

\[
\langle \delta g(\gamma) \rangle = 0, \quad \langle \delta g(\gamma) \delta g(\gamma') \rangle = [\delta g]^2 \delta(\gamma - \gamma'),
\]

with \([\delta g]^2 = \text{var}[g_i]\), where the variance is computed from the steady-state ensemble.

In the mean-field models (i) and (ii) the elastic torque that the particle feels is independent of the orientation of the particle. As a next level of approximation, we consider mean-field models in which the elastic torques are a function of the particle’s orientation \( \theta \). For a fixed angle \( \theta \), the mean-field torque is

\[
\tau_{el}^i = \frac{\tau_{el}^i(\theta)}{k_d \gamma A_i \gamma},
\]

(iii) \( g_i \to \bar{g}(\theta) = \langle g_i \rangle_\theta \),

where now the average is restricted to particles oriented at a particular angle \( \theta \).

(iv) \( g_i \to \bar{g}(\theta) + \delta g(\theta; \gamma) \)

where \( \delta g(\theta; \gamma) \) is an uncorrelated Gaussian white noise with

\[
\langle \delta g(\theta; \gamma) \rangle = 0, \quad \langle \delta g(\theta; \gamma) \delta g(\theta; \gamma') \rangle = [\delta g(\theta)]^2 \delta(\gamma - \gamma'),
\]

with \([\delta g(\theta)]^2 = \text{var}[g_i]_\theta\), where the variance is taken only over particles with orientation \( \theta \). These different approximations allow us to examine the relative importance of
FIG. 44. For mean-field models (i) and (ii): average elastic torque \( \bar{g} = \langle \tau_{el}^i / k_d I_i A_i \rangle_\theta \) and associated noise magnitude \( \delta \bar{g} \) vs packing \( \phi \) for (a) \( \alpha = 0.01 \) at \( \gamma = 10^{-5} \), and (b) \( \alpha = 4 \) at \( \gamma = 10^{-5} \). Horizontal dashed lines \( f_{\min} \) and \( f_{\max} \) denote the minimum \( f(0) \) and maximum \( f(\pi/2) \) values of \( f(\theta) = (1 - [\Delta I_i / I_i] \cos 2 \theta) / 2 \) in Eq. (13); note, for \( \alpha = 0.01 \) these two are nearly indistinguishable since \( \Delta I_i / I_i = 0.00847 \) is so small. Vertical dashed lines locate the jamming packings, \( \phi_J = 0.845 \) for \( \alpha = 0.01 \) and \( \phi_J = 0.906 \) for \( \alpha = 4 \).

FIG. 45. For mean-field models (iii) and (iv): average elastic torque \( \bar{g}(\theta) = \langle \tau_{el}^i / k_d I_i A_i \rangle_\theta \) and associated noise \( \delta \bar{g}(\theta) \) for particles oriented at angle \( \theta \). Top row (a) and (b) is for \( \alpha = 0.01 \) at \( \gamma = 10^{-6} \), with \( \phi_J = 0.845 \); bottom row (c) and (d) is for \( \alpha = 4 \) at \( \gamma = 10^{-5} \), with \( \phi_J = 0.906 \). (a) and (c): \( f(\theta) - \bar{g}(\theta) \) vs \( \theta \) at different packings \( \phi \), where \( f(\theta) = (1 - [\Delta I_i / I_i] \cos 2 \theta) / 2 \) as in Eq. (13). The thick solid black line is just \( f(\theta) \), corresponding to \( \phi \to 0 \) where \( \bar{g}(\theta) = 0 \). Thin colored lines are the Fourier series approximation to the data at each \( \phi \), as given by Eq. (58). (b) and (d): magnitude of the noise \( \delta \bar{g}(\theta) \) vs \( \theta \) at different packings \( \phi \). Note the logarithmic vertical scale.

average torque vs torque noise, and the sensitivity of behavior to the variation of elastic torque with particle orientation.

In Fig. 44 we plot our results for \( \bar{g} \) and \( \delta \bar{g} \) vs \( \phi \), that are used in constructing the mean-field (MF) models (i) and (ii). In Fig. 44(a) we show results for nearly circular particles with \( \alpha = 0.01 \) at strain rate \( \gamma = 10^{-6} \); in (b) we show results for elongated particles with \( \alpha = 4 \) at \( \gamma = 10^{-5} \). The horizontal black dashed lines in each panel are the values of \( f_{\min} \equiv f(0) = (1 - \Delta I_i / I_i) / 2 \) and \( f_{\max} \equiv f(\pi/2) = (1 + \Delta I_i / I_i) / 2 \), which are the minimum and maximum values of \( f(\theta) = (1 - [\Delta I_i / I_i] \cos 2 \theta) / 2 \) given in Eq. (14). If ever we have \( f_{\min} < \bar{g} < f_{\max} \), then in MF (i) the direction \( \theta_i \) such that \( f(\theta_i) = \bar{g} \) is a stationary point where \( \theta_i / \gamma = 0 \). From Fig. 44 we see that this situation never arises for \( \alpha = 0.01 \), however it does occur for \( \alpha = 4 \) when \( \phi > 0.5 \). Note that in both cases the average elastic torque \( \bar{g} = \langle \tau_{el}^i / k_d I_i A_i \rangle_\theta \) is positive, showing that, on average, the elastic torques serve to slow down the clockwise rotation of the particles.

Note also that in both cases the magnitude of the noise \( \delta \bar{g} \) is one or more orders of magnitude larger than the average \( \bar{g} \) for the range of \( \phi \) considered.

In Fig. 45, we show results for \( \bar{g}(\theta) \) and \( \delta \bar{g}(\theta) \) vs \( \theta \), that are used for constructing the models MF (iii) and MF (iv). In Figs. 45(a) and 45(b) we show results for \( \alpha = 0.01 \) at \( \gamma = 10^{-6} \), while in 45(c) and 45(d) we show results for \( \alpha = 4 \) at \( \gamma = 10^{-5} \). In each case we show results at four different typical values of \( \phi \): below \( \phi_s \) max, near \( \phi_s \) max, near \( \phi_J \) and above \( \phi_J \). Rather than show \( \bar{g}(\theta) \) directly, in (a) and (b) we instead plot \( f(\theta) - \bar{g}(\theta) = -\bar{\theta}_i / \gamma \), since this more directly gives the rotational motion of the particle. A positive value of \( f(\theta) - \bar{g}(\theta) \) indicates a clockwise rotation. A value of \( \theta \) such that \( f(\theta) - \bar{g}(\theta) = 0 \) indicates a stationary point in MF (iii), where \( \bar{\theta}_i / \gamma = 0 \); if \( df(\theta) / d\theta > 0 \) this is a stable stationary point.

At the larger values of \( \phi \) our data for \( f(\theta) - \bar{g}(\theta) \) become quite scattered, particularly for \( \alpha = 4 \). To get a smooth \( \bar{g}(\theta) \) for integrating our mean-field single particle equation of motion we therefore approximate \( \bar{g}(\theta) \) by expanding our data as a Fourier series and keeping only the lowest several terms,

\[
\bar{g}(\theta) = \frac{a_0}{\pi} + 2 \sum_{n=1}^{n=\text{terms}} [a_n \cos 2n\theta + b_n \sin 2n\theta],
\]

(58)

\[
a_n = \int_{-\pi/2}^{\pi/2} d\theta \bar{g}(\theta) \cos 2n\theta,
\]

(59)

\[
b_n = \int_{-\pi/2}^{\pi/2} d\theta \bar{g}(\theta) \sin 2n\theta.
\]

(60)

For the largest \( \phi \), where the data are most scattered, we use up to \( n = 3 \) terms for our approximate \( \bar{g}(\theta) \); for lower \( \phi \), where the data are smoother but where there are regions of \( \theta \) where \( \bar{g}(\theta) \) is rather flat, we have used up to \( n = 16 \) terms. This Fourier approximation gives the solid lines in Figs. 45(a) and 45(c).

We now consider how well these mean-field models do
in describing the behavior of our interacting many particle system. In Fig. 46 we show our results for $-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle / \dot{\gamma}$, $S_2$ and $\theta_2$ (top, middle, and bottom rows respectively) vs the packing $\phi$, comparing our $N = 1024$ particle simulations against that of the single particle mean-field models MF (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv). The left column is for nearly circular particles with $\alpha = 0.01$ at $\dot{\gamma} = 10^{-6}$, while the right column is for elongated particles with $\alpha = 4$ at $\dot{\gamma} = 10^{-5}$.

We discuss $\alpha = 0.01$ first. We see in Fig. 46(a) that all the models MF (i) – (iv) do a good job for predicting the angular velocity $-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle / \dot{\gamma}$. This is not surprising. For $\alpha = 0.01$, the term $\Delta I_i / I_i = 0.00847$ is so small that the variation in $f(\theta)$ is exceedingly slight, and so to good approximation one can take $f(\theta) \approx 1/2$; an isolated particle is essentially rotating uniformly. The elastic torque of MF (i), modeled by the $\theta$-independent $\bar{g}$, with $\bar{g} < f_{\text{min}}$ at all $\phi$ (see Fig. 44(a)), then just subtracts from this average drive $f \approx 1/2$ to give the correct average angular velocity. Adding the noise $\delta g$ in MF (ii), or using an orientationally dependent $\bar{g}(\phi)$ in MF (iii) and corresponding noise $\delta g(\phi)$ in MF (iv), do not change this average rotational behavior. Only as one goes above $\phi_J$, and correlations between particles become longer ranged, do we see a difference between the interacting many particle system and our single particle mean-field models.

In contrast, if we consider $S_2$, we see in Fig. 46(b) that the simple MF (i) does an exceedingly poor job. Again, this is not surprising. As discussed above, since for $\alpha = 0.01$ the model MF (i) results in a particle that rotates almost uniformly, there is no mechanism for $S_2$ to grow above the very small value $S_2 = 0.0042$ that is found for an isolated particle. Similarly, as seen in Fig. 46(c), MF (i) gives $\theta_2 = 0$, just as for an isolated particle. Adding noise, as in MF (ii), does nothing to improve the results for $S_2$ or $\theta_2$. However, using the orientationally dependent average elastic torque $\bar{g}(\theta)$ of MF (iii) results in excellent agreement for both $S_2$ and $\theta_2$. The strong variation of $\bar{g}(\theta)$ with $\theta$, as seen in Fig. 45(a), results in the non-uniform rotation of the particle that is essential to dramatically increase $S_2$ over the isolated particle limit. No further improvement is found by adding the orientationally dependent noise $\delta g(\phi)$ of MF (iv).

Turning to elongated particles with $\alpha = 4$, we see in Fig. 46(d) that now MF (i) fails dramatically even when considering $-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle / \dot{\gamma}$. While agreement is not bad at the smallest $\phi$, once $\phi$ increases above 0.5 and $\bar{g}$ increases above $f_{\text{min}} = f(0)$ (see Fig. 44(b)), the particle locks into a stationary state where $\dot{\theta}_i / \dot{\gamma} = 0$, and consequently one has $S_2 = 1$, as seen in Fig. 46(e). The orientation $\theta_2$, shown in Fig. 46(f), then increases with $\phi$ so as to obey $f(\theta_2) = \bar{g}$. Adding the noise $\delta g$ of MF (ii) is not sufficient to allow the particle to escape from this stationary state, until $\phi$ gets close to 0 and goes above jamming.

To get good agreement for $\alpha = 4$ it is thus necessary, as we found for $\alpha = 0.01$, to consider the orientational dependence of the average elastic torque. Using the $\bar{g}(\theta)$ of MF (iii) we see that we get excellent agreement for all three quantities, $-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle / \dot{\gamma}$, $S_2$ and $\theta_2$, for all $\phi$ except upon approaching close to the jamming $\phi_J$. Close to $\phi_J$, Fig. 45(c) shows that $f(\theta) - \bar{g}(\theta)$ can go negative, giving rise to a stationary state when $f(\theta) - \bar{g}(\theta) = 0$. Thus we see in Fig. 46(d) that as $\phi$ approaches $\phi_J$, $-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle / \dot{\gamma}$ drops to zero, while in Fig. 46(e) we see that $S_2$ jumps to unity. However adding the noise $\delta g(\phi)$ of MF (iv) is sufficient to allow the particle to escape this stationary state, and restore good agreement with the many particle simulation, until one goes above $\phi_J$. We thus conclude that our single-particle mean-field model gives an excellent description of the rotational motion of our particles, over a wide range of asphericities $\alpha$ and packings $\phi$, provided one includes the proper orientational dependence to the average torque from the elastic interactions, as in MF (iii). Agreement at large $\phi$ approaching jamming is further improved by adding the noise term of MF (iv). However our mean-field model seems to do less well as $\phi$ increases above $\phi_J$. Whether
this is an effect of increasing correlations between particles as they jam, or whether it is due to poor accuracy in our estimate of $\bar{g}(\theta)$, due to poor statistics, remains unclear.

V. RESULTS: SPATIAL STRUCTURE AND CORRELATIONS

The previous section dealt with global physical quantities. In this section we consider the spatial structure of our system, and the spatial correlations of physical observables. In Fig. 47 we show typical configurations sampled during steady-state shearing at strain rate $\dot{\gamma} = 10^{-6}$. In Fig. 47(a) we show a system with $\alpha = 4$ at packing $\phi = 0.905$ very close to the jamming $\phi_J = 0.906$. In Fig. 47(b) we show a system with $\alpha = 0.01$ at packing $\phi_J = 0.845$. Because the $\alpha = 0.01$ are to the eye indistinguishable from circles, we draw a line on each particle to indicate the direction of the particle spine. Animations showing the evolution of particle positions and orientations, as these systems are sheared starting from the random initial configuration, may be found in our Supplemental Material [56].

While the structure and flow of the particles in these animations look complex, especially for $\alpha = 4$, the orientational ordering of the particles can be represented more simply by constructing a local nematic order parameter $S_2(r)$. To do this we divide our system up into a $12 \times 12$ grid of square cells centered at fixed positions $r$. At any given strain $\gamma = t \dot{\gamma}$ we take all particles whose center of mass $r_i$ lie in the cell at $r$ and construct the local $S_2$ of that cell, using Eqs. (33) and (35) but with the sum restricted to only the particles in that cell; on average there are about 7 particles in each cell. In Figs. 47(c) and 47(d) we show the resulting $S_2(r)$ corresponding to the particle configurations in 47(a) and 47(b). For the $\alpha = 4$ configuration, which has a relatively large global $S_2 \approx 0.78$, we see that the $S_2(r)$ clearly look ordered, with for the most part nearly equal magnitudes $S_2(r)$ and oriented close to the flow direction. For the $\alpha = 0.01$ configuration, which has a considerably smaller global $S_2 \approx 0.23$, the $S_2(r)$ look more disordered, with a greater variation in magnitudes and varying directions fluctuating about the global orientation $\theta_2 \approx 45^\circ$.

Animations of the evolution of $S_2(r)$ as $\gamma$ increases may be found in our Supplemental Material [56]. We see that the $S_2(r)$ start in a randomized initial configuration, but then order as the system is sheared. After sufficient shearing, the $S_2(r)$ tend to fluctuate about a well defined average, and there is no evidence of any coherent time dependent motion. Occasionally we see that $S_2(r)$ in a given cell shrinks in size to a small value, then grows back to the average; this occurs when there is a rotation of particles in that cell. We now seek to quantify aspects of the spatial flow and structure by measuring the spatial correlations of several different observables.

A. Flow Profile

First we wish to check that the simple shearing in the $x$ direction gives rise to the linear velocity profile, $\langle v_x(y) \rangle = \dot{\gamma} y$, that is expected for a uniformly sheared system. To compute $\langle v_x(y) \rangle$ we divide the system into strips of thickness $\Delta y$ running the length $L_x$ of the system parallel to the flow direction. We then compute for a given configuration,

$$v_x(y) = \frac{1}{N_y} \sum_{i=1}^{N_y} v_{ix}$$

where $v_{ix}$ is the $x$ component of the center of mass velocity of particle $i$, and the sum is over all the $N_y$ particles $i$ contained within the strip centered at height $y$. On average $N_y = N \Delta y / L_x$. We then average this over configurations contained with in window of strain from $\gamma_0$ to $\gamma_0 + \Delta \gamma$, with $\Delta \gamma = 5$, to compute an average $\langle v_x(y) \rangle_{\gamma_0}$ at that point $\gamma_0$ in the shearing. We also average over all configurations in the steady-state ensemble, starting from $\gamma_0 = 25$ to allow for equilibration, to com-
compute the ensemble average \( \langle v_x(y) \rangle \). We will consider here configurations sheared at a rate \( \dot{\gamma} = 10^{-6} \).

In Fig. 48(a) we show our results for nearly circular spherocylinders with \( \alpha = 0.01 \), at our densest packing \( \phi = 0.90 \), well above the jamming \( \phi_J = 0.845 \). We see that the velocity profile agrees quite well with the expected linear \( \langle v_x(y) \rangle / \dot{\gamma} = y \), both for the ensemble average over the entire run, as well as the averages over the strain windows of width \( \Delta \gamma \) distributed throughout the shearing. The same is true for all packings at lower \( \phi \).

In Figs. 48(b), 48(c), and 48(d) we show results for elongated spherocylinders with \( \alpha = 4 \), at packings \( \phi = 0.905 \approx \phi_J, 0.91, \) and 0.95 respectively. Note, all systems have \( N = 1024 \) particles except for 48(d) which has \( N = 2048 \) particles. For \( \phi < \phi_J \) (not shown) the velocity profiles on the short strain scale of \( \Delta \gamma = 5 \) are all linear, similar to what is seen in Fig. 48(a) for \( \alpha = 0.01 \). However, as \( \phi \) increases above \( \phi_J \), we see in Figs. 48(b), 48(c), and 48(d), that the velocity profiles averaged over \( \Delta \gamma = 5 \) start to noticeably fluctuate away from linear, and this effect grows in magnitude as \( \phi \) increases. We see a step-like structure, with distinct regions of different

d(\nu_x)/d\gamma, i.e., regions of different local strain rate. The system thus displays shear banding. In some cases there are regions where \( d(\nu_x)/d\gamma \approx 0 \), indicating strongly correlated rows of particles that move together as a block, with an interface region of large strain rate between such blocks, suggesting a stick-slip type of motion between rows of particles. However, comparing velocity profiles at different strains \( \gamma_0 \) during the shearing run, we see that these shear bands are not stationary, but wander as the system is sheared. Averaging over the entire shearing run, the expected linear profile for \( \langle v_x(y) \rangle \) is recovered, and so on average the system is uniformly sheared as expected.

**B. Transverse Velocity Correlations**

Next we consider the correlations of the transverse velocity, \( v_{iy} = y_i \). It was previously found for our model [3], that when circular disks are sheared, then the transverse velocity correlation

\[
C_{v_y}(r) \equiv \langle v_y(x)v_y(0) \rangle
\]

goes negative and has a minimum at some \( x_{\text{min}} \), before decaying to zero at large \( x \). It was observed that the location of this minimum \( x_{\text{min}} \) increased in a seemingly divergent way as jamming was approached. Thus \( x_{\text{min}} \) was identified with the divergent correlation length \( \xi \) at the jamming transition [3]. We now examine this velocity correlation for spherocylinders.

If \( r_i^c \) is the center of mass position of particle \( i \) in configuration \( c \), and \( v_i^c = r_i^c \) is the center of mass velocity, we compute the velocity correlation as,

\[
\langle v_y(r)v_y(0) \rangle = \frac{1}{N_r} \sum_i \sum_{j<i} v_i^c y_i^c \Delta(r_i^c - r_j^c + r).
\]

Here the first sum is over configurations \( c \) in the sheared steady-state, while the second sum is over all pairs of particles \( (i,j) \) in configuration \( c \). To coarse grain the point center of masses, we take \( \Delta(r) \) as a window function, such that \( \Delta(r) = 1 \) within a small square area of width \( \Delta x = \Delta y = R_h = 0.5 \) centered about \( r = 0 \), and \( \Delta(r) = 0 \) elsewhere. \( N_r \) is the total number of non-zero terms in the sum.

Setting \( r = x\hat{x}, \) we show our results in Fig. 49 for nearly circular spherocylinders with \( \alpha = 0.01 \) and moderately elongated spherocylinders with \( \alpha = 4 \), considering different packing fractions \( \phi \), below, near to, and above \( \phi_J \); our results are for a strain rate \( \dot{\gamma} = 10^{-6} \). In order to more easily compare correlations at different packings \( \phi \), we show the normalized correlation \( C_{v_y}(x)/C_{v_y}(0) \) vs \( x \). For \( \alpha = 0.01 \), shown in Fig. 49(a) we see behavior similar to that found [3] for circular particles. The correlation shows a clear minimum at an \( x_{\text{min}} \) that increases as \( \phi \) approaches \( \phi_J \). Above \( \phi_J \) this \( x_{\text{min}} \) increases to \( L/2 \), indicating long range transverse velocity correlations.
Were ing correlation length $\xi$ of spherocylinders of asphericity $\alpha = 0.01$ with $\phi_J = 0.845$ and system length $L \approx 40$, and (b) $\alpha = 4$ with $\phi_J = 0.906$ and system length $L \approx 90$. Both systems are sheared at a strain rate $\dot{\gamma} = 10^{-6}$ and have $N = 1024$ particles. Lengths are measured in units of the small particle diameter $2R_s = 1$.

For the elongated particles with $\alpha = 4$, shown in Fig. [49] (b), the situation is quite different. At low $\phi$ behavior is similar to $\alpha = 0.01$, with a minimum at an $x_{\text{min}}$ that increases as $\phi$ increases. However as the packing increases above $\phi \approx 0.88$, but still below the jamming $\phi_J = 0.906$, the behavior changes dramatically with $x_{\text{min}}$ suddenly decreasing from $x_{\text{min}} \approx 18$ to $x_{\text{min}} \approx 2$, and the correlations staying quite flat and zero for $x \gtrsim 10$. Increasing $\phi$ further, to jamming and above, results in little further change in $C_{v_y}(x)/C_{v_y}(0)$.

The difference in behavior at small $x \lesssim 2R_s$, between $\alpha = 0.01$ and 4, can partially be understood as an effect of the change in particle shape. For small $x$, of order the particle size, $C_{v_y}(x)/C_{v_y}(0)$ is determined by contacts between particles whose centers of mass are separated by $x \hat{x}$. Since the force is always directed normal to the particle’s surface, for circular and nearly circular particles this force is typically closely aligned with the $\hat{x}$ direction, and so by itself induces no correlation in the $v_y$ components of the two particles’ velocities. Any correlation in $v_y$ between these two particles presumably comes from a third particle in contact with both, either from above or below, as illustrated in Fig. [50] (a), and so leads to a positive correlation. For two elongated spherocylinders, however, if the particles are oriented at some finite angle $\theta_i > 0$, then the force of the two contacting particles has a finite component in the $\hat{y}$ direction, leading to an anti-correlation in the $v_y$ components of the two particles’ velocities, as illustrated in Fig. [50] (b).

We note that the identification of $x_{\text{min}}$ with a diverging correlation length $\xi$ has recently been questioned [58]. Were $x_{\text{min}} \propto \xi$, one would expect that a scaled $C_{v_y}(x)/C_{v_y}(0)$, when plotted vs $x/x_{\text{min}}$ at different $\phi$ or $\dot{\gamma}$, would show a collapse to a common curve at large $x/x_{\text{min}}$. But, for circular particles, this has been found not to be the case; rather the minimum at $x_{\text{min}}$ is now believed to be a consequence of competition between two different length scales. One should therefore not take the results of Fig. [49] (b) as clear evidence for the absence of a diverging $\xi$ for $\alpha = 4$, and indeed the critical scaling analysis of pressure that we have recently done for $\alpha = 4$ [7] suggests that such a diverging $\xi$ does indeed exist, although it is apparently not evident in the transverse velocity correlations.

C. Positional Correlations

For spherical particles, it is observed that there is no long range translational ordering when the particles are sheared [57]. Since our spherocylinders do show orientational ordering when sheared, it is of interest to see if such orientational ordering might induce any translational ordering. We therefore consider the positional correlations of the particles, to confirm that there is no such translational ordering. With the average particle density given by $n_0 \equiv N/L^2$, we define the density-density correlation function as,

$$C_n(r) = \frac{1}{n_0^2} \langle [n(r)n(0)] - n_0^2 \rangle. \tag{64}$$

To evaluate $C_n(r)$, we compute the ensemble average,

$$C_n(r) = \frac{1}{n_0^2} \left\langle \frac{1}{L^2} \sum_{i,j} \delta(\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j + \mathbf{r}) \right\rangle - 1, \tag{65}$$

where in practice the $\delta(r)$ is smeared out over a small bin of area $\Delta \alpha$ centered at the origin, so that $\delta(r) = 0$.
outside the bin and $1/\Delta a$ within the bin; the width of the bin is roughly $\sqrt{\Delta a} \approx 0.1$ for $\alpha = 0.1$ and $\sqrt{\Delta a} \approx 0.2$ for $\alpha = 4$, where $R_s = 0.5$ is the radius of the small particles. The finite width of our bins will effect the heights and fine structure of the sharp peaks in $C_n(r)$ that occur at separations corresponding to neighboring particle contacts, but otherwise does not effect the large $|r|$ behavior that is our interest here. With the normalization we have chosen, our density correlation $C_n(r)$ is simply related to the usual pair correlation function $g(r)$ by

$$g(r) = C_n(r) + 1.$$ \hspace{1cm} (66)

Because the rotational symmetry of the system is broken by both the flow direction $\hat{x}$ and by the direction of the nematic order parameter $S_2$, the correlation $C_n(r)$ similarly will not be rotationally invariant. Therefore, instead of averaging over orientations and plotting as a function of the radial coordinate, as is often done, we will instead consider separately the behavior of $C_n(r)$ in orthogonal directions. On choice would be to look along the $x$ and $y$ directions, parallel and transverse to the shear flow. However, since individual particles tend to align parallel to $S_2$, we consider instead the direction oriented parallel to $S_2$, which we denote as $x'$, and the orthogonal direction, which we denote as $y'$. Writing $r = (x', y')$, in Fig. 51 we plot $C_n(x', 0)$ vs $x'$, and $C_n(0, y')$ vs $y'$, for spherocylinders of asphericity $\alpha = 0.01$ and $\alpha = 4$. We show results at several different packings $\phi$, below, near to, and above $\phi_J$; our results are for a strain rate $\dot{\gamma} = 10^{-6}$.

For the nearly circular particles with $\alpha = 0.01$, shown in Figs. 51(a) and 51(b), we see little difference between the $x'$ and $y'$ directions, or among the different $\phi$. Fitting the peak heights to an exponential decay, we find that the correlation $C_n(r)$ decays to zero on a length scale $\approx 1$, much shorter than the system half length, $L/2 \approx 20$. We see that $C_n(r) = -1$ for $x', y' \lesssim 1$, since no particles may come closer to each other than $2R_s = 1$ without an unreasonable particle overlap. We see the initial nearest neighbor peak is split into three at distances $x', y' \approx 1.0, 1.2$, and 1.4, corresponding to contacts between small, small-big, and big-big particles.

For the elongated particles with $\alpha = 4$, shown in Figs. 51(c) and 51(d), however, we see a big difference between the $x'$ and $y'$ directions. Since the $(x', y')$ coordinates are aligned parallel and perpendicular to $S_2$, and since particles on average are also aligned with their spines parallel to $S_2$, the $x'$ coordinate on average runs parallel to the particle spines. Therefore, for parallel oriented particles aligned in a row, the closest approach to another particle can make in the $x'$ direction is the length of a small particle, $2R_s(\alpha + 1) = 5$, and hence in Fig. 51(c) we see the nearest neighbor peaks at $x' \approx 5, 6, 7$, corresponding to nearest contacts between small-small, small-big, and big-big particles. In the transverse $y'$ direction, however, corresponding to the narrow width of the particle, the closest parallel oriented particles aligned in a row may come is $2R_s = 1$. In principle we would expect to see peaks at $y' = 1, 1.2$ and 1.4, corresponding to small-small, small-big, and big-big particle contacts, however the finite size of our bins (which are a bit larger here than for $\alpha = 0.01$) make these less sharply distinguished.

Note, for $\alpha = 4$, the correlation $C_n(0, y')$ drops sharply to $-1$ as $y'$ decreases below unity. This is because the shortest distance any two particles may approach each other, without unreasonable overlaps, is $2R_s = 1$. However for $C_n(x', 0)$ we see no such sharp drop as $x'$ decreases below $2R_s(\alpha + 1) = 5$. In fact, $C_n(x', 0)$ becomes, and stays equal to, $-1$ only when $x'$ decreases below $2R_s = 1$. The reason for this is that not all particles are aligned nearly parallel to $S_2$. When two adjacent particles are aligned nearly perpendicular to $S_2$, then one can have a contact at $x' \approx 1$; although this is possible (see Fig. 47(a)), it is relatively uncommon, hence $C_n(r)$ increases slowly above $-1$ as $x'$ increases above unity, then takes a rapid increase at $x' \approx 5$. This lack of perfect alignment of particles parallel to $S_2$ is also responsible for the the fact that the sharp peaks in Fig. 51(c) are not exactly at $x' = 5, 6$, and 7, but rather are at slightly lower values.

Comparing the $\phi$ dependence of $C_n(r)$ for $\alpha = 4$, we see little effect in the transverse direction $y'$, but in the $x'$ direction one sees more clearly higher order peaks as $\phi$ approaches and goes above $\phi_J$. In all cases, however, $C_n(r)$ decays to zero as $|r|$ increases; for the $y'$ direction the decay length is $\approx 1.3$, while in the $x'$ direction it is $\approx 4$.

The above calculations show that there is no long range translational order in the sheared system. However we still wish to investigate if there can be any shear induced smectic-like ordering, where particles order into well de-
defined channels oriented parallel to the flow direction \( \hat{\mathbf{x}} \).
To investigate this we average the \( C_n(\mathbf{r}) \) correlation over the \( x \) direction to define the transverse density correlation function \( \tilde{C}_n(y) \).

\[
\tilde{C}_n(y) = n_0 \int_0^L dx C_n(x, y).
\] (67)

Our results are shown in Fig. 52 for spherocylinders of \( \alpha = 0.01 \) and 4. Again we see that these correlations rapidly decay to zero as the separation \( y \) increases. Fitting the peak heights to an exponential gives a decay length between 1 and 2. Thus we conclude that the particles do not flow in well defined channels and there is no smectic ordering.

### D. Nematic Correlations

Next we wish to consider the correlations of the nematic order parameter \( \mathbf{S}_2 \). We have found that the shearing induces a finite \( \mathbf{S}_2 \) in the system at any \( \phi \), but our arguments in the preceding sections have suggested that this finite \( \mathbf{S}_2 \) arises because the shearing acts like an ordering field, rather than there being any many-particle cooperative behavior arising from a long range coherence of particle orientations. Computing the \( \mathbf{S}_2 \) correlations will confirm this.

The nematic correlation function is,

\[
C_{S_2}(\mathbf{r}) = \langle \cos 2[\theta(\mathbf{r}) - \theta(0)] \rangle - S_2^2,
\] (68)

where the first term is computed similarly to Eq. (63). If \( \theta_i^c \) is the orientation of particle \( i \) in configuration \( c \), then

\[
\langle \cos 2[\theta(\mathbf{r}) - \theta(0)] \rangle = \frac{1}{N_r} \sum_c \sum_{i,j} \cos 2(\theta_i^c - \theta_j^c) \Delta(\mathbf{r}_i^c - \mathbf{r}_j^c + \mathbf{r}),
\] (69)

where \( \Delta(\mathbf{r}) \) is the same window function as used in computing \( C_{\theta_\parallel}(x) \), and \( N_r \) is the number of non-zero terms being summed.

In Fig. 53 we show our results for \( C_{S_2}(\mathbf{r})/C_{S_2}(0) \) in the \( x' \) and \( y' \) directions, parallel and orthogonal to the global nematic order parameter \( \mathbf{S}_2 \). We show results for different packings \( \phi \), below, near to, and above \( \phi_J \), for systems sheared with strain rate \( \dot{\gamma} \approx 10^{-6} \). For nearly circular particles with \( \alpha = 0.01 \), shown in Figs. (53a) and (53b), we see that there is little difference in the correlation function comparing the different packings \( \phi \), or comparing the \( x' \) and \( y' \) directions, and that the correlations decay rapidly to zero within one small particle width, \( 2R_s = 1 \) (note, although no two particles may come much closer than \( 2R_s = 1 \) without an unreasonable overlap, here we see a large drop at \( x' = y' = 0.75 \); this is an artifact of the finite width \( \Delta x = \Delta y = 0.5 \) of our window function \( \Delta(\mathbf{r}) \)).

For moderately elongated particles with \( \alpha = 4 \), shown in Figs. (53c) and (53d), we see a noticeable difference between the \( x' \) and \( y' \) directions. Along the \( x' \) direction \( C_{S_2}(\mathbf{r})/C_{S_2}(0) \) oscillates with a period of roughly \( \approx 6 \), corresponding to the average length of the particles. A rough estimate gives a decay length \( \approx 5 \). Along the \( y' \) direction correlations remain positive, and we see that the decay length takes a noticeable increase as \( \phi \) increases, from roughly \( \approx 1.5 \) at \( \phi = 0.80 \) to \( \approx 5 \) at \( \phi = 0.90 \) and above. However in all cases we see that \( C_{S_2}(\mathbf{r})/C_{S_2}(0) \) decays to zero relatively rapidly, on the order of a typical particle size, as \( |\mathbf{r}| \) increases. We thus confirm that there is no long-range orientational correlations between the particles.

### E. Angular Velocity Correlations

Finally we consider the correlations of the scaled angular velocity, \( \theta_i' = d\theta_i/d\gamma = \dot{\theta}_i/\dot{\gamma} \),

\[
C_{\theta'}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{\langle [\dot{\theta}(\mathbf{r})\dot{\theta}(0)] - \langle \dot{\theta}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle \langle \dot{\theta}(0) \rangle \rangle}{\dot{\gamma}^2}.
\] (70)
FIG. 54. Angular velocity correlation $C_{\phi}(\mathbf{r})/C_{\phi}(0)$, where $\theta'_i = \dot{\theta}_i/\dot{\gamma}$, vs coordinates $x'$ and $y'$, parallel and orthogonal to the global nematic order parameter $S_2$, at different packing fractions $\phi$. (a) and (b) are for spherocylinders of $\alpha = 0.01$, with $\phi_J = 0.845$ and system length $L \approx 40$; (c) and (d) are for $\alpha = 4$, with $\phi_J = 0.906$ and $L \approx 90$. Both systems are sheared at a strain rate $\dot{\gamma} = 10^{-6}$ and have $N = 1024$ particles. Lengths are measured in units of the small particle diameter, $2R_0 = 1$.

As we have done for other quantities, if $\dot{\theta}_i^c$ is the angular velocity of particle $i$ in configuration $c$, then we compute

$$
\langle \dot{\theta}(\mathbf{r})\theta(0) \rangle = \frac{1}{N_r} \sum_c \sum_{i,j} \dot{\theta}_i^c \dot{\theta}_j^c \Delta (\mathbf{r}_i^c - \mathbf{r}_j^c + \mathbf{r}).
$$

In Fig. 54 we show our results for $C_{\phi}(\mathbf{r})/C_{\phi}(0)$ in the $x'$ and $y'$ directions, parallel and orthogonal to the global nematic order parameter $S_2$. We show results for different packings $\phi$, below, near to, and above $\phi_J$, for systems sheared with strain rate $\dot{\gamma} = 10^{-6}$. For both nearly circular particles with $\alpha = 0.01$, shown in Figs. 54(a) and 54(b), and for moderately elongated particles with $\alpha = 4$, shown in Figs. 54(c) and 54(d), we see that the correlation drops rapidly and stays flat at zero, once $|r|$ is greater than the particle length $1 + \alpha$. Only nearest neighbor particles are at all correlated, and those are anti-correlated, as indicated by the negative value of $C_{\phi}(\mathbf{r})/C_{\phi}(0)$ at $|r| \approx 1$.

To illustrate the origin of this anti-correlation of nearest neighbor angular velocities, in Fig. 55 we sketch two nearest neighbor, nearly parallel, particles with separation $|r| \approx 1$. We see that a collision between the two particles, indicated by the double headed arrow in the sketch, leads to oppositely oriented changes in angular velocity for the two particles, and hence the anti-correlation. However for larger $|r|$, on the order of a few or more particle separations, our results in Fig. 54 indicate that fluctuations in the particles’ angular velocities are completely uncorrelated.

VI. SUMMARY

In this work we have considered a model of sheared, athermal, frictionless two dimensional spherocylinders in suspension at constant volume. The simplicity of our model, in which the only interactions are pairwise repulsive elastic forces and a viscous damping with respect to the suspending host medium, allows us to shear to very large strain rates and completely characterize the behavior of the system over a wide range of packing fractions $\phi$, strain rates $\dot{\gamma}$, and particle asphericities $\alpha$. In a prior work we focused on the rheological properties of this model and the variation of the jamming transition $\phi_J$ with particle asphericity $\alpha$. In the present work we have focused on the shear-induced rotation of particles, their nematic orientational ordering, and the spatial structure and correlations of the system.

We find that, under simple shearing, particles continue to rotate at all packings, even above jamming, and that the nematic order parameter $S_2$ has a constant, time-independent, value in the sheared steady-state. We have found that the average angular velocity of particles $-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle/\dot{\gamma}$ and the magnitude of the nematic order parameter $S_2$ are non-monotonic as the packing $\phi$ increases, with the minimum of $-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle/\dot{\gamma}$ and the maximum of $S_2$ occurring below the jamming transition. By considering the distribution of strain intervals $\Delta \gamma$ between successive rotations of a particle by $\pi$ in Sec. VI A 5 and by comparing the response of the system under pure shear as opposed to simple shear in Sec. IV D, the following scenario emerges. At the lower packings $\phi$, behavior is qualitatively similar to that of an isolated particle. The rotational drive implicit in simple shearing (but absent in pure shearing) causes particles to rotate with a non-uniform angular velocity that depends on the particle’s orientation. As $\phi$ increases, the rate of collisions between particles increases, leading to a broadening of the distribution of rotation times, but still with a typical rotation time comparable to the average. The average $S_2$ is dominated by the average particle rotation, as evidenced by the observed difference in $S_2$ between simple and pure shearing; in contrast to the increase in $S_2$ as $\phi$ increases under simple shearing, under pure shearing, which has no rotational driving term, $S_2$ shows perfect ordering at low $\phi$ and is monotonically decreasing as $\phi$ increases.
At larger \( \phi \), however, the system becomes so dense that the decreasing free volume inhibits rotations. Particles tend to lock into the local configuration, with rotational rattling about a particular orientation, until a shear-induced fluctuation in the local particle structure allows a rotation to take place. Particle rotations become a Poisson-like process in which the time until the next particle rotation is largely independent of the time since the last rotation. The average \( S_2 \) is now dominated by the local structure of the dense packing, rather than the particle rotations, as evidenced by the qualitative agreement now found in this region between the behavior of \( S_2 \) comparing simple and pure shear (see Fig. 13).

Further support for this scenario comes from results described in our Appendix, where we consider the behavior of a size monodisperse system of particles with \( \alpha = 4 \), as compared to the bidisperse system considered in the main part of the text. We find that both \(-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle / \dot{\gamma} \) and \( S_2 \) are identical for monodisperse and bidisperse system when \( \phi \) is below the peak in \( S_2 \), however these quantities differ at larger \( \phi \), above the peak in \( S_2 \). If behavior is qualitatively single-particle like, then we should expect no big differences between a monodisperse and a bidisperse system. However if behavior is governed by the local structure of dense configurations, then we could well expect to see differences in behavior comparing monodisperse and bidisperse systems, since local spatial correlations are different in the two systems at such high densities (compare Figs. [51]c and [51]d with Figs. [59]a and [59]b)). This thus explains the differences between monodisperse and bidisperse systems shown in Fig. [57].

The above scenario helps to explain our surprising result in Sec. [IVC] (see also Ref. [8]) that the \( \alpha \rightarrow 0 \) limit, approaching perfectly circular particles, is singular. As particles approach the rotationally invariant circular shape, one would naively expect that the nematic orientational order parameter \( S_2 \) should vanish. However, in the limit of finite \( \alpha \rightarrow 0 \), we find that \( S_2 \) vanishes below \( \phi J \), but remains finite at \( \phi J \) and above. To explain this, consider first behavior under pure shear, where we have argued that particles of any finite \( \alpha \), no matter how small, will exponentially relax their orientation to the minimal stress direction, and so eventually order with \( S_2 \approx 1 \), at sufficiently low packings \( \phi \). As \( \phi \) increases, the decreasing free volume inhibits particle rotation, limiting the extent of ordering, and leading to an \( S_2 \) that decreases monotonically as \( \phi \) increases; we find numerically that \( S_2 \), under pure shear, remains finite above jamming even for very small \( \alpha \). Consider now the behavior under simple shear. According to the above scenario, above the peak in \( S_2 \) under simple shear, behavior is dominated by the local structure of the dense configuration, and simple and pure shear result in qualitatively similar ordering. As \( \alpha \rightarrow 0 \) the location of the peak in \( S_2 \) moves to the jamming transition. Hence we expect that, even as \( \alpha \rightarrow 0 \), the simple sheared system will order with finite \( S_2 \) for \( \phi \geq \phi J \). However for \( \phi < \phi J \), the rotational drive of the simple shear, absent for pure shear, will dominate and cause the particles to rotate with an increasingly uniform (i.e., independent of the particle orientation) angular velocity as \( \alpha \) gets small. As \( \alpha \rightarrow 0 \) this uniform rotation will drive \( S_2 \rightarrow 0 \). Hence our scenario leads one to expect that, as \( \alpha \rightarrow 0 \), one will have \( S_2 = 0 \) for \( \phi < \phi J \) but \( S_2 > 0 \) for \( \phi \geq \phi J \), just as we find to be the case.

Although our sheared system of aspherical particles displays finite nematic orientational ordering at any packing \( \phi \), this ordering is not due to long range coherence between particles as in an equilibrium liquid crystal, but rather is due to the shearing acting as an ordering field. Evidence for this conclusion lies in the absence of any long-range correlations for \( S_2 \), as explicitly computed in Sec. [V D]. This conclusion is further supported by our results in Sec. [IV B 3], where we investigated the relaxation of \( S_2 \) upon being rotated away from its steady-state direction. The sharp drop in the magnitude \( S_2 \) to small values, as the system relaxes back to steady-state, indicates that the relaxation takes place through the incoherent rotation of individual particles, not a coherent rotation of many particles that would preserve the magnitude of the ordering. Additionally, the success of our numerical mean-field model of Sec. [IV E] in which we modeled the system by an isolated particle being acted upon by an orientation dependent average elastic torque and random incoherent torque noise, indicates that correlations between particles are not important to describe the behavior of the system.

We have also considered in depth, in Secs. [IV A 2] and [IV A 3], the fluctuations of the instantaneous angular velocity of individual particles. We show that the probability distribution of the angular velocity scaled by the strain rate, \( \dot{\theta}_i / \dot{\gamma} \), develops exponential tails as the packing \( \phi \) increases, and that the decay rate of these exponential tails vanish as the strain rate \( \dot{\gamma} \rightarrow 0 \) at the jamming \( \phi J \). We show that the variance \( \text{var}[\dot{\theta}_i] / \dot{\gamma} \) obeys a critical scaling relation and, in the quasistatic limit of \( \dot{\gamma} \rightarrow 0 \), diverges as jamming is approached. Our scaling analysis leads us to conclude that in the quasistatic limit \( \dot{\gamma} \rightarrow 0 \), while the average angular velocity vanishes at all \( \phi \), \( \langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle \propto \dot{\gamma} \rightarrow 0 \) as \( \dot{\gamma} \rightarrow 0 \), the variance of the angular velocity, though vanishing below \( \phi J \), becomes finite as \( \phi \) increases above \( \phi J \), \( \text{var}[\dot{\theta}_i] \sim (\phi - \phi J)^2 \).

Finally, the simulations presented in the main part of this work concerned systems in which the particles were bidisperse in size, but uniform in shape. In our Appendix we consider systems that are also disperse in shape, in particular mixtures of circles and elongated spherocylinders, and systems in which the asphericity \( \alpha \) of individual particles is chosen from a distribution of finite width. For mixtures of elongated spherocylinders and circles, we find that the average rotation and extent of orientational ordering of the spherocylinders is strongly influenced by the fraction of spherocylinders in the system, and that spherocylinders tend to form local clusters of particles in side-to-side contact. For systems with a polydisperse distribution of \( \alpha \), we find that the \( \alpha \rightarrow 0 \) singularity found
in Sec. IV C continues to exist as \( \langle \alpha \rangle \to 0 \). In general we find that the main conclusions of our work continue to hold even in the presence of shape dispersity.
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**APPENDIX**

In the main body of this work we have studied systems which are bidisperse in particle size, but monodisperse in particle shape, and for which the initial configuration from which shearing begins is random. In this Appendix we consider the behavior of other systems, particularly systems monodisperse in both size and shape, and systems bidisperse and polydisperse in shape. We also consider behavior when one shears from a strongly ordered initial configuration.

A. Size Monodisperse Rods

When studying jamming in two dimensional systems of circular particles, it is common to consider bidisperse or polydisperse distributions of particle sizes, so as to avoid crystallization into an ordered hexagonal lattice. When studying aspherically shaped particles, one can ask if the possibility of such crystallization still remains for size monodisperse particles. In particular, for particles driven by simple shear, the shear-driven rotation of particles could conceivably disrupt crystalline structure in densely packed systems, if the particles are sufficiently aspherical. In this section, therefore, we study the case of a size monodisperse system of moderately elongated spherocylinders, all of constant asphericity \( \alpha = 4 \).

For the bidisperse distribution we have previously determined \(^7\) the shear-driven jamming transition to be at \( \phi = 0.906 \). For the monodisperse distribution we have not carried out a detailed analysis to try and locate \( \phi_J \) accurately. However, by comparing the dependence of the pressure on \( \phi \) and \( \gamma \), our crude estimate for the jamming of the monodisperse system is \( \phi_J \approx 0.92 \). We have found that reliable results are difficult to obtain for the monodisperse system above this \( \phi = 0.92 \), because at large packings particles tend to lock into local configurations. This is illustrated by considering the flow profile \( \langle v_x(y) \rangle \), that was defined earlier in Sec. V A.

In Fig. 56a, we see that the flow profile \( \langle v_x(y) \rangle / \gamma \) is almost perfectly linear for all strain windows, indicating that the shear flow is uniform even on short strain scales. For \( \phi = 0.95 \), above jamming, shown in 56b), we see the step-like structure indicative of shear banding on short strain scales; however the location and size of these steps fluctuate with \( \gamma_0 \), and when averaging over the entire run we regain the expected linear flow profile.

However for \( \phi = 0.95 \), above jamming, something dramatically different occurs. In the earlier part of the shearing run we see wandering shear bands on short strain scales, similar to what is seen at the lower \( \phi = 0.92 \), only now with wider bands. But after shearing a large total strain, we see that the system separates into two sharply defined bands, each with constant velocity, one small, one large, with a large velocity jump between them. The bands at \( \gamma_0 = 225 \) and \( \gamma_0 = 275 \) are identical, indicating that the system has locked into this particular state.

![Fig. 56. For \( N = 1024 \) monodisperse particles of asphericity \( \alpha = 4 \), sheared at \( \gamma = 10^{-6} \): Average velocity of particles in the flow direction scaled by the strain rate, \( \langle v_x(y) \rangle / \gamma \), as a function of height \( y \) transverse to the flow, for packing fractions (a) \( \phi = 0.90 \), (b) \( \phi = 0.92 \), and (c) \( \phi = 0.95 \). Curves labeled by a value of \( \gamma_0 \) represent averages over a strain window from \( \gamma_0 \) to \( \gamma_0 + \Delta \gamma \). The horizontal dotted line locates the interface between two coherently moving blocks of particles, as shown by the sharp jump in velocity of the corresponding curve in (c). Different colors in (d) are used to help distinguish different particles and have no other meaning. An animation of this configuration is available in our Supplemental Material.](image-url)
characterized by two blocks of coherently flowing particles, each moving at different constant velocities, and sliding over each other along a sharply defined interface.

In Fig. 56(d) we show a snapshot of the configuration for \( \phi = 0.95 \) at \( \gamma_0 = 250 \), after the system has locked into this state of coherently sliding blocks. The interface between the two blocks of particles is indicated by the horizontal dotted line at height \( y = 50 \). In either block there is neither more spatial nor orientational order than typical in a homogeneously shearing configuration, although there exist many local clusters of particles contacting along their flat sides, oriented nearly in parallel; many of these clusters are oriented with the particle spines nearly parallel to the flow direction \( \xi \), however many are oriented at relatively large angles with respect to the flow. Along the interface where the sliding takes place, one sees two rows of particles, oriented parallel to the flow, extending the length of the system; it is these rows, sliding one upon the other, that cause the large jump in velocity between the two blocks. An animation of the shearing at \( \phi = 0.95 \) is available in our Supplemental Material 56; the animation starts after the system has already been sheared a considerable amount, but before it has locked into the state of coherently sliding blocks, which occurs around the midpoint of the animation.

We now consider the behavior of global quantities that measure the rotation and orientational ordering of the particles. In Fig. 57 we show the average angular velocity \( \langle \theta_i \rangle / \gamma \), the magnitude of the nematic order parameter \( S_2 \), and the the orientation of the nematic order parameter \( \theta_2 \), vs packing \( \phi \). We compare results for a size monodisperse distribution of particles with the bidisperse distribution studied in the main part of this work. We show results for the strain rates \( \dot{\gamma} = 10^{-5} \) (open symbols) and \( \dot{\gamma} = 10^{-6} \) (solid symbols). At low \( \phi \) we see that there is no difference in any of these quantities when comparing monodisperse and bidisperse systems. However as \( \phi \) increases above the \( \phi_{S_2 \text{max}} \) where \( S_2 \) has its maximum, significant difference appear. In particular, both \( -\langle \theta_i \rangle / \dot{\gamma} \) and \( S_2 \) for the monodisperse system become noticeably smaller than for the bidisperse system, indicating that particles rotate more slowly but are also less orientationally ordered. However as \( \phi \) increases further, approaching jamming, we see that \( S_2 \) for the monodisperse system starts to increase, suggesting that jamming helps order the system.

In the main part of this work we have argued that the peak in \( S_2 \) marks a crossover from a region of qualitatively single particle behavior below \( \phi_{S_2 \text{max}} \), to a region above \( \phi_{S_2 \text{max}} \) where decreasing free volume inhibits particle rotations; rotations occur at random uncorrelated times when fluctuations in the particle configuration open a local region of greater free volume that permits a rotation to take place. Thus behavior above \( \phi_{S_2 \text{max}} \) is determined by the local structure of the dense packing, which can be expected to differ between monodisperse and bidisperse systems.

To illustrate how the local packing differs between monodisperse and bidisperse systems, in Fig. 58(a) we plot the probability density \( P(\theta) \) for a particle to have orientation \( \theta \), at different values of the packing \( \phi \), for a monodisperse system sheared at \( \dot{\gamma} = 10^{-6} \). \( P(\theta) \) for the bidisperse system, shown in Fig. 58(b), has a peak at a \( \theta_{\text{max}} \) that shifts to increasing values as \( \phi \) increases; the distribution becomes skewed to the right of the peak as \( \phi \) increases, so that the orientation of the nematic order parameter \( \theta_2 \) is shifted to a slightly larger value than \( \theta_{\text{max}} \), but the distribution otherwise shows no distinguishing features. In contrast, for the monodisperse system, as \( \phi \) increases the peak in \( P(\theta) \) stays fixed at a constant \( \theta_{\text{max}} \) just slightly larger than zero, but a side peak at larger \( \theta \) develops and the distribution becomes bimodal; the orientation \( \theta_2 \) of the nematic order parameter shifts to larger values as \( \phi \) increases, due to the growth in this side peak.

In Fig. 58(b) we show a snapshot of a configuration at \( \phi = 0.90 \). As in Fig. 56(d), here we again see many lo-
FIG. 58. For \( N = 1024 \) monodisperse particles of asphericity \( \alpha = 4 \), sheared at \( \dot{\gamma} = 10^{-6} \): (a) Probability density \( \mathcal{P}(\theta) \) for a particle to have orientation \( \theta \), for different packings \( \phi \). Arrows indicate the orientation \( \theta_2 \) of the nematic order parameter for \( \phi = 0.70, 0.85, \) and \( 0.92 \). In (b) is shown a snapshot of a configuration at \( \phi = 0.90 \). Different colors in (b) are used to help distinguish different particles and have no other meaning. An animation of this configuration is available in our Supplemental Material [56].

FIG. 59. For \( N = 1024 \) monodisperse particles of asphericity \( \alpha = 4 \), sheared at \( \dot{\gamma} = 10^{-6} \): Density correlation \( C_n(r) \) vs coordinates (a) \( x \) and (b) \( y \), parallel and orthogonal to the flow direction \( \mathbf{S} \), for different packing fractions \( \phi \). Peak heights in (c) \( C_n(x,0) \) vs \( x \) for \( x_m \approx 5m \), and in (d) \( C_n(0,y) \) vs \( y \) for \( y_m \approx m \); straight lines are fits to an exponential decay. Lengths are measured in units of the particle diameter, \( 2R = 1 \) and the system width is \( L \approx 90 \).

cal clusters of particles contacting along their flat sides, oriented nearly in parallel. Most of these clusters are oriented with the particle spines nearly parallel to the flow direction \( \mathbf{S} \), giving rise to the main peak in \( \mathcal{P}(\theta) \) at \( \theta \text{max} \approx 0 \). However, many are oriented at relatively large angles with respect to the flow, often in small stacks, giving rise to the side peak. Comparing Fig. 58(b) for the monodisperse system to Fig. 47(a) for the bidisperse system, both near \( \phi \approx 0.90 \), we see that the monodisperse system appears to have a larger degree of local order, with more and larger clusters of nearly parallel particles; this local order presumably inhibits particle rotations leading to the smaller \( -\dot{\theta} / \dot{\gamma} \) compared to the bidisperse system. The particles in the large \( \theta \) side peak of \( \mathcal{P}(\theta) \), being locally ordered but with orientations at large angles compared to the shear flow direction, presumably result in the decreased \( S_2 \) compared to the bidisperse system, as \( \phi \) increases above \( \phi_{S_2,\text{max}} \). However, as \( \phi \) increases further, we see that \( \mathcal{P}(\theta) \) becomes more sharply bimodal, with less of a spread in values of \( \theta \) and with more of the particles at orientations near \( \theta \approx 0 \); this leads to the increase observed in \( S_2 \) as \( \phi \) increases above 0.85, and the corresponding decrease observed in \( \theta_2 \).

Finally, to further investigate ordering in the monodisperse system, we consider the positional and orientation correlation functions, \( C_n(r) \) and \( C_{S_2}(r) \), defined in Secs. \text{V C} and \text{V D}. Since \( \mathcal{P}(\theta) \) in Fig. 58(a) indicates that the majority of particles align near to the flow direction \( \mathbf{S} \) rather than at \( \theta_2 \) along \( \mathbf{S}_2 \), here we will plot the correlations as functions of the \( x \) and \( y \) coordinates, rather than the \( x' \) and \( y' \) coordinates (parallel and orthogonal to \( \mathbf{S}_2 \)) used for the bidisperse system.

In Figs. 59(a) and 59(b) we show \( C_n(r) \) vs \( x \) and \( y \), respectively, at several different values of the packing \( \phi \) for a system strained at the rate \( \dot{\gamma} = 10^{-6} \). Comparing to Figs. 51(c) and 51(d) for a bidisperse system, for the monodisperse system we see that the peaks in both the \( x \) and \( y \) directions are more sharply defined and persist out to considerably longer length scales. The peaks are perfectly periodic with a spacing \( \Delta x = 5 \) along the \( x \) direction, and \( \Delta y = 1 \) along the \( y \) direction. Nevertheless, the peak heights still decay exponentially with distance, as is seen in Figs. 59(c) and 59(d) where we plot just the \( \hat{x} \) peaks more quickly. In Figs. 60(c) and 60(d) we plot the peak heights vs \( \phi \approx 4 \), sheared at \( \dot{\gamma} = 10^{-6} \); (a) Probability density \( \mathcal{P}(\theta) \) at \( \theta \approx 0 \). Different colors in (b) are used to help distinguish different particles and have no other meaning. An animation of this configuration is available in our Supplemental Material [56].
than two particle lengths. The monodisperse system thus does not have any long range translational order. From the nematic order parameter correlations $C_{S_2}$ we get a decay length in the $y$ direction that varies between 1.5 and 7.3, comparable to that found from $C_n$. In the $x$ direction the decay length from $C_{S_2}$ varies between 6.5 and 22, roughly double that found from $C_n$. The largest value $\xi_x \approx 22 \approx L/4$ is roughly one quarter the length of the system, and so in Fig. 61(a) one does not see the peaks in $C_{S_2}(x, 0)$ decaying to zero, although from Fig. 61(c) the decay does appear to be exponential. Simulations of a larger length system would be needed to confirm that the value $\xi_x \approx 22$ really is finite, and that there is no long range nematic ordering.

B. Mixtures of Circular Disks and Rods

In this section we consider a system with a bidispersity in particle shape. We consider mixtures of circular disks and spherocylinders of asphericity $\alpha = 4$. A fraction $f$ of the $N$ total particles are the spherocylinders, while the remaining $1 - f$ of the particles are circular disks. We take the circular disks to be bidisperse in size, with equal numbers of big and small particles with radii in the ratio $R_i/R_b = 1.4$. The spherocylinders are taken as size monodisperse, with endcap radius equal to $R_b$.

We use a system with $N = 2048$ total particles, and consider the cases where the number of spherocylinders is $N_{sp} = 1, 64, 128, 256$, and 512 giving fractions $f = 0.00049, 0.03125, 0.0625, 0.125$, and 0.25. A more geometric measure of the density of spherocylinders is the ratio of the packing fraction of the spherocylinders $\phi_{sp}$ to the total packing fraction $\phi$ of all particles. Our cases then correspond to $\phi_{sp}/\phi = 0.00392, 0.206, 0.350, 0.536$, and 0.729. Our results in this section are all for a constant strain rate $\dot{\gamma} = 10^{-5}$.

In Fig. 62 we plot $-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle / \gamma$, $S_2$, and $\theta_2$ vs the total packing fraction $\phi$, for the above different values of $N_{sp}$. In computing these quantities, we average only over the $N_{sp} = fN$ spherocylinders, since the circular disks experience no collisional elastic torques and so rotate uniformly and do not order. For comparison, we also show the same quantities for the bidisperse system of only spherocylinders ($N = 1024$), as considered in the main part of this work.

We see in Fig. 62 the same qualitative behavior for the mixtures as we saw previously for just spherocylinders. The angular velocity $-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle / \gamma$ is non-monotonic, decreasing to a minimum and then increasing as $\phi$ increases. The magnitude of the nematic order parameter $S_2$ is similarly non-monotonic, increasing to a maximum and then decreasing as $\phi$ increases. For most of the range of $\phi$, we see that as the fraction of spherocylinders decreases, $-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle / \gamma$ decreases, while $S_2$ increases; the spherocylinders rotate more slowly and are more orientationally ordered. The orientation $\theta_2$ of the nematic order parameter is small at low $\phi$, then increases as jamming is approached. It is interesting to note that, near jamming, $\theta_2$ is increasing as the fraction of spherocylinders decreases, and is largest for the case of a single spherocylinder.

In the case $N_{sp} = 1$, where we have only a single spherocylinder, we see that $-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle / \gamma \approx 0$ within the estimated errors and $S_2$ is close to unity. This indicates that the angular motion of the spherocylinder consists only of small angular deflections about a fixed direction. In Fig. 63 we show the evolution of the spherocylinder’s orientation, $\theta_1$ vs $\gamma$, as the system is sheared. We show one curve for each of several different total packings $\phi$, and see explicitly that the spherocylinder displays rotations (within the total length of our shearing run) only at the smallest $\phi = 0.3$. As $\phi$ increases, rotations stop, and both the average $\theta_1$ and the fluctuations in $\theta_1$ increase. Thus, unlike the case of a system consisting of only bidisperse (or

FIG. 60. For $N = 1024$ monodisperse particles of asphericity $\alpha = 4$, sheared at $\dot{\gamma} = 10^{-6}$: Nematic order parameter correlation $C_{S_2}(r)/C_{S_2}(0)$ vs coordinates (a) $x$ and (b) $y$, parallel and orthogonal to the flow direction $\hat{x}$, for different packing fractions $\phi$. Peak heights in (c) $C_{S_2}(x, 0)/C_{S_2}(0, 0)$ vs $x$ for $x_m \approx 5m$, and in (d) $C_{S_2}(0, y)/C_{S_2}(0, 0)$ vs $y$ for $y_m \approx m$; straight lines are fits to an exponential decay. Lengths are measured in units of the particle diameter, $2R = 1$ and the system width is $L \approx 90$.

FIG. 61. For $N = 1024$ monodisperse particles of asphericity $\alpha = 4$, sheared at $\dot{\gamma} = 10^{-6}$: Correlation lengths in the $x$ and $y$ directions, parallel and orthogonal to the flow, as obtained from the exponential fits to the peaks in the density correlation $C_n(r)$ and the nematic order parameter correlation $C_{S_2}(r)$, shown in Figs. 59(c) and 60(d) and 60(c) and 60(d).
monodisperse) spherocylinders, where particles continue to rotate even in dense packings above jamming, embedding a single spherocylinder in a sea of circular disks seems to block almost all rotation of the spherocylinder.

We speculate that the reason for this is as follows. While we have shown that there are no long range correlations between particle positions, for a spherocylinder of length $\ell = (1 + \alpha)2R_d$ to rotate there must be a correlated rearrangement of its neighboring particles on the length scale $\ell$. Consider the rotation of a spherocylinder in two systems at equal packing $\phi$: (i) a system consisting only of size bidisperse spherocylinders, and (ii) a system consisting of the single spherocylinder under consideration, which is embedded in a sea of size bidisperse circular disks. Although these two systems are at the same packing $\phi$, it should be noted that the density of particles $n$ in the two systems is very different, with $n^{(i)}/n^{(ii)} = A_{\text{disk}}/A_{\text{sp}}$, where $A_{\text{sp}}$ is the average area of the spherocylinders in (i) and $A_{\text{disk}}$ is the average area of the disks in (ii). For spherocylinders of $\alpha = 4$, we have $n^{(i)}/n^{(ii)} = \pi/(4\alpha + \pi) = 0.164$. Thus the average number of distinct particles in the vicinity of the spherocylinder trying to rotate is larger in (ii) as compared to (i), and similarly the average number of inter-particle contacts for the spherocylinder is larger in (ii) as compared (i), as shown in Fig. 64. For the system (i), motion of a neighboring particle necessarily results in a density fluctuation on the length scale $\ell$, because that neighbor is itself a spherocylinder. But for system (ii), motion of a neighboring particle results in a density fluctuation only on the length scale $2R_d$, the diameter of a disk; to create a density fluctuation on the length scale $\ell$ would thus require the correlated motion of several disks, and that is unlikely, thus frustrating the rotation of the spherocylinder.

For systems with $N_{\text{sp}}$ spherocylinders embedded in a sea of circular disks, the rotation of a spherocylinder seems to be facilitated by its proximity to another spherocylinder. Indeed, in animations of such systems, available in our Supplemental Material [56], one sees that clusters of parallel spherocylinders tend to form as the system is sheared. To illustrate this, in Fig. 65 we show snapshots of typical configurations in the steady-state with $N_{\text{sp}} = 64$ spherocylinders at packings (a) $\phi = 0.60$, and (b) $\phi = 0.80$.

To quantify this assertion, we compute the following. We define $Z_{\text{side}}$ as the average number of side-to-side contacts that a given spherocylinder has with other spherocylinders. A side-to-side contact is when two spherocylinders make contact along their respective flat sides (see Ref. [7] for the more precise criterion that we use). Note, when counting constraints as in Ref. [7] we count each
side-to-side contact with a double weight since it constrains both the rotational and the perpendicular translational motions; here we will simply count it with unit weight. We define $Z_{sp}$ as the average total number of contacts of any type on a spherocylinder. We then consider the ratio $Z_{side}/Z_{sp}$ as the system is sheared.

Recall, we start our system off in a random initial configuration in which there may be considerable particle overlaps and hence a large pressure. As we begin to shear, the first way in which the system responds is to quickly relax these overlaps to small values; the large contact forces of overlapping particles push the particles away from each other, spreading them out more evenly over the area of the system. We can regard the configurations just after this initial relaxation of overlaps as ones in which particles are placed so as to avoid overlaps, but otherwise without any spatial correlations. As the system is further sheared, the particles evolve into configurations representative of the sheared steady-state ensemble, in which there may be local correlations.

In Figs. 66(a) and 66(b) we plot the pressure $p$ vs the net strain $\gamma$, at packings $\phi = 0.60$ and $0.80$ respectively, for systems with $N_{sp} = 64, 128, 256,$ and $512$ spherocylinders embedded in a sea of bidisperse circular disks; there are $N = 2048$ particles in total. The system is sheared at $\dot{\gamma} = 10^{-5}$. To reduce the size of fluctuations, each data point in Fig. 66 represents an average of the instantaneous values over a strain window of $\Delta \gamma = 1$. The horizontal dashed lines represent the average values in the steady-state, obtained by averaging over the last half of the run from $\gamma = 50$ to 100. The vertical dashed lines indicate roughly the strain over which the system relaxes to the steady-state. The systems are sheared at the strain rate $\dot{\gamma} = 10^{-5}$.

As $\gamma$ increases, $Z_{side}/Z_{sp}$ first takes a sharp drop, from the value of the random initial configuration, to a small...
value characteristic of the configuration in which the initial large overlaps between particles have relaxed, particles are more evenly spread throughout the system, but no correlations have yet been introduced by the shearing. Then, as the shearing continues, we see that $Z_{\text{side}}/Z_{\text{sp}}$ increases significantly, saturating to the constant value of the steady-state after a strain of roughly $\gamma \approx 10$, the same strain needed to relax the pressure to steady-state.

Thus shearing acts to introduce a clustering among the spherocylinders embedded in a sea of circular disks. We believe the reason for this effect is simple. Just as a system of only spherocylinders develops an orientational nematic ordering that allows particles to pack more efficiently, so too in a mixture of spherocylinders and disks the clustering of spherocylinders with side-to-side contacts allows a better packing of the system and a resulting decrease in the system pressure. Thus the decrease of $p$ as it relaxes to its steady-state value occurs over the same strain interval as the increase of $Z_{\text{side}}/Z_{\text{sp}}$ as it approaches its steady-state value. Once the shearing leads to the clustering of spherocylinders, the sliding of one spherocylinder over another is a relatively low energy fluctuation that facilitates spherocylinder rotation; as $N_{\text{sp}}/N$ increases, $Z_{\text{side}}/Z_{\text{sp}}$ increases, leading to the increase in $-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle/\dot{\gamma}$ observed in Fig. 62(a).

C. Polydispersity of Shape and the $\alpha \to 0$ Limit

In this section we consider a system in which particle sizes are bidisperse as in the main part of this work (i.e., half big and half small in the ratio $R_b/R_s = 1.4$), but the asphericity $\alpha_i$ of particle $i$ is sampled from a polydisperse distribution. Here we use a gamma distribution, determined by two parameters $k$ and $\vartheta$,

$$P(\alpha) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(k)\vartheta^k} \alpha^{k-1}e^{-\alpha/\vartheta}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (72)

The average and variance of $\alpha$ are given by,

$$\langle \alpha \rangle = k\vartheta, \quad \text{var}[\alpha] = k\vartheta^2.$$  \hspace{1cm} (73)

The relative width of the distribution is,

$$\sigma_\alpha \equiv \sqrt{\text{var}[\alpha]/\langle \alpha \rangle} = 1/\sqrt{k}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (74)

We choose $k$ to get the desired relative width, and then choose $\vartheta$ to get the desired $\langle \alpha \rangle$. We consider two cases: $k = 100$ corresponding to $\sigma_\alpha = 0.1$, and $k = 1$ corresponding to $\sigma_\alpha = 1$. The later case is just an ordinary exponential distribution with a finite probability density at $\alpha \to 0$ (circles).

We have done simulations with $N = 1024$ particles at a single slow strain rate $\dot{\gamma} = 4 \times 10^{-7}$, for a range of packings $\phi$ near the peak in $S_2$. We choose $\vartheta$ so that the average $\langle \alpha \rangle$ is equal to the four smallest values of $\alpha = 0.001, 0.003, 0.01,$ and $0.03$ used in the main part of this paper. In particular, we are interested to see if the singular behavior we found as $\alpha \to 0$ persists once there is polydispersity in the particle shape.

In Fig. 67 we show the resulting nematic order parameter $S_2$ vs packing $\phi$ for our smallest $\langle \alpha \rangle = 0.001$ as well as $\langle \alpha \rangle = 0.03$. We compare results from the distributions with $\sigma_\alpha = 0.1$ and $\sigma_\alpha = 1$ to our original monodisperse (in $\alpha$) simulations, i.e., $\sigma_\alpha = 0$. We see that a relative width of $\sigma_\alpha = 0.1$ (i.e., 10% dispersity) produces no noticeable change from the monodisperse case. For the exponential distribution with $\sigma_\alpha = 1$, the peak height $S_{2\text{max}}$ decreases, and the location of the peak $\phi_{S_{2\text{max}}}$ slightly increases.

In Fig. 68 we show the average angular velocity $-\langle \dot{\theta}_i \rangle/\dot{\gamma}$ vs packing $\phi$. We see results similar to those found for $S_2$. For $\sigma_\alpha = 0.1$ there is no noticeable change from the monodisperse case $\sigma_\alpha = 0$. For $\sigma_\alpha = 1$ we see that the depth of the minimum decreases while the location of the minimum shifts to slightly larger $\phi$.

In Fig. 69(a) we plot $S_{2\text{max}}$ vs $\langle \alpha \rangle$ for these same three values of $\sigma_\alpha = 0, 0.1,$ and $1$. Again we see that there is no difference between $\sigma_\alpha = 0$ and $\sigma_\alpha = 0.1$. A 10% dispersity results in no noticeable change. For $\sigma_\alpha = 1$ we see that $S_{2\text{max}}$ is smaller than for the other two cases, but still we find that $S_{2\text{max}}$ seems to be approaching a finite constant as $\langle \alpha \rangle \to 0$. In contrast to $\sigma_\alpha = 0$, for which we
found \( \lim_{\alpha \to 0} [S_{2\text{max}}] = 0.28 \), fitting to the form \( a + b\gamma^c \) for \( \sigma = 1 \) gives \( \lim_{\alpha \to 0} [S_{2\text{max}}] = 0.22 \).

In Fig. 69(b) we plot \( \Delta \theta_{\text{max}}^\alpha = 1/2 - \langle \theta_i \rangle_{\text{min}} / \gamma \) vs average asphericity \( \langle \alpha \rangle \). As with \( S_2 \) we see no difference between \( \sigma = 0 \) and \( \sigma = 0.1 \), while results for \( \sigma = 1 \) are somewhat smaller, but still appear to be approaching a finite constant as \( \langle \alpha \rangle \to 0 \). In contrast to \( \sigma = 0 \), for which we found \( \lim_{\alpha \to 0} [\Delta \theta_{\text{max}}^\alpha] = 0.084 \), fitting to the form \( a + b\gamma^c \) for \( \sigma = 1 \) gives \( \lim_{\alpha \to 0} [\Delta \theta_{\text{max}}^\alpha] = 0.046 \). Thus, even with considerable dispersity in particle shape, our conclusion, that \( \lim_{\alpha \to 0} [S_{2\text{max}}] \) and \( \lim_{\alpha \to 0} [\Delta \theta_{\text{max}}^\alpha] \) remain finite, appears to remain valid, and so the \( \alpha \to 0 \) limit continues to be singular.

**D. Shearing Highly Ordered Rods**

In the main part of this work we begin our shearing simulations from a random initial configuration, and shear to large total strains \( \gamma \) so as to reach the steady state. The assumption is that by shearing long enough, one creates a well defined ensemble of states that is independent of the initial configuration. In contrast, one can wonder whether the same steady-state ensemble will result if one starts from an initial configuration of locally well ordered particles. Will such a system remain ordered as it shears, or will it revert to the same ensemble obtained from the random initial configurations? Here we investigate this question for spherocylinders of asphericity \( \alpha = 4 \). We consider, for systems of both size bidisperse and size monodisperse particles, several different initial configurations designed to be locally ordered in such a way that we can pack particles to high density without any particle overlaps.

**1. Size Bidisperse**

We start by constructing a locally ordered, close packed, configuration constructed as follows. We take a stack of 5 big spherocylinders, all oriented parallel to the flow direction \( \hat{x} \) and lying perfectly one on top of another so that their centers of mass align vertically. We then take a stack of 7 small spherocylinders in the same fashion; the heights of these two stacks are equal (recall, \( R_b/R_s = 1.4 = 7/5 \)). We then randomly place 7 stacks of the big particles and 5 stacks of the small particles next to each other in a horizontal row, so that there are the same number of big and small particles in this row of stacks. We then construct 16 such rows of stacks, each row being constructed in an independent random fashion, so that we have a total of \( N = 1120 \) particles. We then affinely expand the system to the desired packing fraction \( \phi \), and introduce a small length scale disorder by making a random displacement of each particle uniformly over its Voronoi cell. The resulting configuration contains no particle overlaps. An example of such an initial configuration at the packing \( \phi = 0.75 \) is shown in Fig. 70(a).

Shearing such initial, locally ordered, configurations at a strain rate \( \dot{\gamma} = 10^{-5} \) we compute the instantaneous pressure \( p(\gamma) \), as well as the magnitude \( S_2(\gamma) \) and orientation \( \theta_2(\gamma) \) of the nematic order parameter. Because fluctuations in these instantaneous values can be large, we choose to smooth out the fluctuations by averaging the instantaneous values over a strain window of width \( \Delta \gamma = 5 \). We plot the resulting strain averaged values of \( p \), \( S_2 \) and \( \theta_2 \) in Figs. 70(b), 70(c), and 70(d), respectively, for a range of packings \( \phi \). The dotted horizontal lines in these figures give the ensemble averaged values of these quantities, when starting from a random initial configuration, as obtained from the simulations in the main section of this work and from Ref. 7.

For all \( \phi \) we see that \( p \) starts from zero in the initial configuration with no particle overlaps, but then rises to saturate at the same value as obtained from a random initial configuration. Similarly the nematic order parameter starts from an initial \( S_2 = 1 \) and \( \theta_2 = 0 \), but then evolves to saturate at the same values of \( S_2 \) and \( \theta_2 \) found when shearing from a random initial configuration. Shearing an initial, locally ordered, size bidisperse configuration constructed as in Fig. 70(a) thus results in the same spatially disordered steady-state ensemble as obtained from an initial random configuration. This disordering is readily seen in animations of the shearing at \( \phi = 0.90 \) and 0.95, which are available in our Supplemental Material 60. From Figs. 70(b), 70(c) and 70(d) we see that this disordering takes place fairly quickly, except for \( \phi = 0.95 \) which is considerably above the jamming \( \phi_j = 0.906 \); in that latter case the system stays ordered up to some considerable strain \( \gamma \approx 60 \), but then disorders just as at the lower \( \phi \).

We next consider an initial configuration that is even more ordered than that of Fig. 70(a). We start with

![Fig. 69](image-url)
FIG. 70. (a) Snapshot of a size bidisperse configuration of locally ordered stacks of particles at a packing φ = 0.75; big spherocylinders are shown in blue hues, while small spherocylinders are shown in red hues. Shearing initial configurations as in (a) at the strain rate $\dot{\gamma} = 10^{-5}$, we show (b) pressure $p$, and (c) magnitude $S_2$ and (d) orientation $\theta_2$ of the nematic order parameter vs net strain $\gamma$ at different packings $\phi$. The data points in (b), (c), and (d) represent averages of the instantaneous values over strain windows of $\Delta \gamma = 5$. The dotted horizontal lines in (b), (c) and (d) give the ensemble averaged values when starting from a random initial configuration. A reduced set of $\phi$ are shown in (c) and (d) for clarity. Animations of the shearing at $\phi = 0.90$ and 0.95 are available in our Supplemental Material [54].

Stacks of ordered big and small spherocylinders as described above, but now we phase separate the particles so that the big particles are all on the bottom of the system while the small particles are all on the top of the system. At each of the two horizontal interfaces between big and small particles (there are two interfaces due to our periodic Lees-Edwards boundary conditions) we put a randomly ordered row consisting of 7 stacks of 5 big particles and 5 stacks of 7 small particles, as in the case previously discussed. We then affinely expand the system to the desired packing fraction $\phi$, and make a random displacement of each particle uniformly over its Voronoi cell, so that the resulting configuration has no particle overlaps. An example of such an initial configuration at the packing $\phi = 0.75$ is shown in Fig. 71(a).

Shearing configurations as in Fig. 71(b) at a strain rate $\dot{\gamma} = 10^{-5}$, in Figs. 71(b), 71(c), and 71(d) we plot the resulting $p$, $S_2$, and $\theta_2$ vs $\gamma$, obtained by averaging over strain windows of $\Delta \gamma = 10$, for a range of packings $\phi$. We see from Fig. 71(a) that for all packings, except the largest $\phi = 0.95$, the pressure $p$ increases and appears to saturate at the same value found for the ensemble average starting from a random initial configuration. This suggests that the phase separated initial configurations are disordering as they are sheared. However, considering Figs. 71(c) and 71(d), it is less clear whether $S_2$ and $\theta_2$ are saturating to the same values as when shearing from a random initial configuration.

To see what is happening, in Fig. 72 we show snapshots of the final configurations obtained after shearing the initial configurations as in Fig. 71(a) to a total shear strain $\gamma = 500$. While the system at $\phi = 0.95$, shown in Fig. 72(c), stays orientationally highly ordered and phase separated, we see that for $\phi = 0.70$ and 0.90, shown in Figs. 72(a) and 72(b), the system remains phase separated to a large degree, but each of the regions of big and small particles has separately decreased its orientational ordering. Because the values of $S_2$ and $\theta_2$ are different comparing bidisperse and monodisperse systems, as shown in Fig. 72, it is thus not surprising that the $S_2$ and $\theta_2$ that we find here for our phase separated system is not quite in agreement with what is found when shearing from a bidisperse random initial configuration.

Comparing the configurations shown in Figs. 72(a) and
Considering now the dependence of $Z_{b-s}/Z$ on the net strain $\gamma$, we see that as the system begins to shear, $Z_{b-s}/Z$ initially decreases. This is because in the initial configuration of non-overlapping particles there are no contacts of any type; as the system first starts to shear, it is the particles within the interfaces between the regions of big and small particles that first come into contact, and so a large fraction of the particles that have any contacts at all have contacts with particles of a different size. As shearing continues, however, particles in the bulk of the system form contacts as well; these are generally with particles of the same size, and so $Z_{b-s}/Z$ decreases. Finally, as the system shears further, the width of the interface region increases, and penetration of one phase into the other increases, so $Z_{b-s}/Z$ now increases. In this latter region we see that $Z_{b-s}/Z$ appears to steadily grow as $\gamma$ increases.

We can speculate that if we could shear to even larger $\gamma$, we might find that the regions of big and small particles become completely mixed. Animations of the shearing of these phase separated systems at $\phi = 0.90$ and $0.95$ are available in our Supplemental Material [56].

2. Size Monodisperse

For size monodisperse systems we have already seen, in connection with Fig. 56(c), that at large packings the system can get locked into a spatially inhomogeneous flowing state, even when starting from an initial random configuration. Here we consider what happens if the initial configuration is well ordered. All our systems in this section are sheared at the rate $\dot{\gamma} = 10^{-4}$.

Since particles are monodisperse in size, it is easy to construct highly ordered configurations. We start first with an ordered rectangular lattice of particles, all oriented along the flow direction $\hat{x}$. We then affinely expand the system to the desired packing fraction $\phi$, and introduce a small length scale disorder by making a random displacement of each particle uniformly over its Voronoi cell. The resulting configuration has no particle overlaps. An example of such an initial configuration at the packing $\phi = 0.75$ is shown in Fig. 74(a).

In Figs. 74(b), 74(c), and 74(d) we show the resulting $p$, $S_2$, and $R_2$ vs $\gamma$ for a range of packings $\phi$, obtained by averaging the instantaneous values over strain windows of $\Delta \gamma = 10$. The dotted horizontal lines in these figures give the ensemble averaged values of these quantities when starting from a random initial configuration. The configuration at $\phi = 0.70$ is seen to quickly disorder.
FIG. 74. (a) Snapshot of a size monodisperse, locally ordered, configuration of particles at a packing \( \phi = 0.75 \); colors are used to help distinguish different particles and have no other meaning. Shearing initial configurations as in (a) at the strain rate \( \gamma = 10^{-4} \), we show (b) pressure \( p \), and (c) magnitude \( S_2 \) and (d) orientation \( \theta_2 \) of the nematic order parameter vs net strain \( \gamma \) at different packings \( \phi \). The data points in (b), (c), and (d) represent averages of the instantaneous values over strain windows of \( \Delta \gamma = 10 \). The dotted horizontal lines in (b), (c) and (d) give the ensemble averaged values when starting from a random initial configuration. Animations of the shearing at \( \phi = 0.75 \) and 0.85 are available in our Supplemental Material [50].

FIG. 75. Variation of the instantaneous (a) pressure \( p \), and (b) magnitude \( S_2 \) and (c) orientation \( \theta_2 \) of the nematic order parameter, with shear strain \( \gamma \), for the system of Fig. 74 at packing \( \phi = 0.80 \). The periodic behavior seen in these quantities illustrates the periodic wagging of the nematic order parameter in this highly ordered configuration. The period of oscillation is \( \gamma = 5 \), corresponding to the relative displacement of particles in adjacent rows by one particle length.

upon shearing, reaching the same steady-state as found from a random initial configuration. At \( \phi = 0.75 \) we see the system disordering, but over a much longer strain interval; only towards the end of our simulation, after a strain of \( \gamma = 400 \), does it appear to be converging to the steady-state values found from a random initial configuration. For \( \phi = 0.80 \) and larger, the system remains in an ordered state for as long as we have sheared. In such ordered states the particles show a periodic wagging of the nematic order parameter; the particles in a given row coherently rotate clockwise to negative angles \( \theta_i < 0 \) below the flow direction, where they hit the particles in the row below them and then bounce back to start another cycle of oscillation. This wagging is manifest in the periodic behavior of the instantaneous \( p, S_2 \), and \( \theta_2 \), as shown in Fig. 77 for the packing \( \phi = 0.80 \). The period of these oscillations is \( \gamma = 5 \), corresponding to the relative displacement of particles in adjacent rows by one particle length.

To see how stable the ordered configurations of Fig. 74 are to preserving their order upon shearing at high density, we next construct an initial configuration, starting just as before, but now introducing a new localized defect by rotating a group of 5 stacked particles by \( 90^\circ \), so that these are oriented perpendicular to the flow. An example of such an initial configuration at the packing \( \phi = 0.75 \) is shown in Fig. 76(a); the rotated particles are in the lower left corner of the image. In Figs. 76(b), 76(c), and 76(d) we show the resulting \( p, S_2 \) and \( \theta_2 \) as such configurations are sheared at different packings \( \phi \). The plotted values
are obtained by averaging the instantaneous values over strain windows of $\Delta \gamma = 10$.

In contrast to the behavior seen in Fig. 74(b) for the defect free configuration, in Fig. 76(b) we see for all packings $\phi = 0.70$ to 0.92 that the system disorders as it shears, with the pressure rising from its initial small value to the same steady-state value found from a random initial configuration. Interestingly, it is the larger $\phi$ that disorder more quickly than the smaller $\phi$. In Figs. 76(c) and 76(d), although the data is more scattered, we see that $S_2$ and $\theta_2$ similarly reach the same values found from shearing from a random initial configuration; the only exception is for $\phi = 0.85$ where $S_2$ remains larger and $\theta_2$ remains smaller, indicating that the initial configuration has not yet disordered to the extent found when shearing from a random initial configuration. Looking at animations of the shearing, available in our Supplemental Material [56], we see that the localized defect of rotated particles, introduced in the initial configuration, induces a region of nearby disorder, that grows and eventually fills the system as the system is sheared. For our higher packing $\phi = 0.95$, however, we find that after a strain of $\gamma \approx 260$, the defect of rotated particles disappears, the particles all become aligned parallel to the flow, and the system persists in an ordered state for the remainder of the simulation up to $\gamma = 500$.

We have also considered other particular initial configurations. In one case we take the same configurations as in Fig. 74(a) and then randomly displace the rows of particles in the horizontal direction, with all the particles in a given row displacing the same amount. Such configurations behave qualitatively the same as the ones without the row displacements; large packings $\phi$ remain ordered while low packings $\phi$ disorder, although the disordering takes place somewhat sooner and extends to a slightly larger $\phi$ than without the row displacements. We have similarly taken the same configurations as in Fig. 74(a) but now randomly displace the columns of particles in the vertical direction, with all the particles in a given column displacing the same amount. In this case we find that all $\phi \leq 0.88$ disorder by roughly $\gamma = 50$, but higher $\phi \geq 0.90$ remain ordered out to $\gamma = 200$.

From our results in this section we conclude that, for both size bidisperse and size monodisperse systems, even highly ordered initial configurations will disorder upon shearing, and result in the same steady-state ensemble as found when starting from a random initial configuration, if the packing $\phi$ is low or moderate; for our spherocylinders with $\alpha = 4$ we find this to be the case whenever $\phi < 0.80$. However, even for more dense systems, we find in many cases that the initial highly ordered configuration will also disorder and result in the same ensemble as found from a random initial configuration. The initial configurations that remain highly ordered out to large total strains $\gamma$ seem to be those in which the particles are able to flow over each other in well defined channels, resulting only in a coherent wagging of the nematic order parameter. However, when the initial configuration


[56] See Supplemental Material for animations of various sheared systems. Available at: https://www.pas.rochester.edu/~stte/shearOrder/