Blast in the one-dimensional cold gas: From Newton to Euler and Navier-Stokes
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It is known that a gas composed of a large number of atoms following Newtonian dynamics can be described by the continuum laws of hydrodynamics. Proving this rigorously is one of the outstanding open problems in physics and mathematics. Surprisingly, precise numerical demonstrations of the equivalence of the hydrodynamic and microscopic descriptions are rare. We test this equivalence in the context of the classic problem of the evolution of a blast-wave, a problem that is expected to be at the limits where hydrodynamics would work. We study a one-dimensional gas for which the hydrodynamic Euler equations for the conserved fields of density, momentum and energy are known to have self-similar scaling solutions. Our microscopic model consists of hard point particles with alternate masses, which is a non-integrable system with strong mixing dynamics. Our extensive microscopic simulations find a remarkable agreement with hydrodynamics, with deviations in a small core region that are understood as arising due to heat conduction.

The Navier-Stokes-Fourier (NSF) equations [1] describing the evolution of the density, velocity and temperature apply to an enormous range of phenomena, e.g., to atmospheric flows. At the same time we know that there is a different description for air where we view it as a collection of molecules which follow Newton’s equations of motion. How accurate is the hydrodynamic description and what are the limits of its applicability? Here we address this question, which is of fundamental as well as practical importance. A rigorous derivation of the continuum hydrodynamics description from the atomistic one is an open problem [2–4]. Much progress has been made towards a partial solution where one starts from the Boltzmann kinetic theory equation for the single particle distribution function and derives the equations of hydrodynamics as a systematic expansion in a small parameter [5–7]. This still leaves one with the problem of deriving the Boltzmann equation from Newton’s equation which has been achieved only for the case of a dilute gas. For the case where one adds a weak noise to the Newtonian dynamics (still satisfying the same conservation laws) a rigorous derivation of the Euler equations for the hydrodynamic fields has been achieved [8].

Somewhat surprisingly, there appears to be no direct numerical verification of the fact that the equations of hydrodynamics accurately reproduce the evolution of the conserved fields following from the microscopic dynamics. The present work provides such a detailed comparison in the context of the classic blast-wave problem for which a self-similar scaling solution of the Euler equations was obtained more than sixty years back, independently by Taylor [9, 10], von Neumann [11] and Sedov [12, 13], and is referred to as the TVNS solution. The evolution of a blast wave emanating from an intense explosion was first studied to understand the mechanical effect of bombs. The rapid release of large amount of energy in a localized region produces a surface of discontinuity beyond which the quantities concerned like density, velocity and temperature fields change discontinuously [14, 15]. The blast-wave problem thus presents an extreme case to test the validity of the hydrodynamic description. From the point of view of microscopic models, the hard sphere system would be the natural candidate since much is known analytically (equation of state in terms of virial expansions and kinetic theory via the Chapman-Enskog expansion). Secondly, this system can be simulated very efficiently using event driven simulations. However, large scale molecular dynamics (MD) simulations [16–23] have so far not found clear and complete agreement with the TVNS solution from hydrodynamics. It was suggested that possible reasons for the differences could be the lack of local equilibration or due to the contribution of viscosity and heat conduction in the hydrodynamic equations (not included in the TVNS analysis).

In this Letter, we address this question by studying hard point particles with binary mass distribution — in one dimension, particles with equal masses just exchange velocities, so mass dispersion is necessary for relaxation, and the binary mass distribution is thus the simplest setting where relaxation is possible. Furthermore, we assume that adjacent particles have different masses (say \(m_1\) and \(m_2\)). This alternating hard particle (AHP) gas has been extensively investigated in the context of the breakdown of Fourier’s law of heat conduction in 1D [24–32]. The hard particle (and hard rod) system has been investigated earlier in the context of breakdown of the hydrodynamic description in 1D [33, 34] and more recently it has also been used to study the so-called Riemann problem [35] and thermalization [36]. Compared to the hard sphere system in higher dimensions, the 1D gas has several advantages — the equation of state is known exactly and is that of an ideal gas and simulations are faster since collisions occur only with nearest neighbors. Note that while the equilibrium physics is that of an ideal gas, the dynamics is non-integrable and known to have good ergodic properties (while being non-chaotic) [37].

We provide here a detailed study of the evolution of the blast wave initial condition in a 1D gas with an ideal gas equation of state. From extensive molecular dynamics simulations of the AHP gas we compute the evolution of the profiles of density, velocity and temperature fields and thereby extract the scaling forms obtained in the...
long time limit. We make comparisons with the scaling solution predicted from the TvNS solution of the Euler equations for which we provide an exact solution. We find that a complete explanation of the simulation of the blast requires us to go beyond the Euler equation and include the effect of heat conduction. We thus discuss the NSF equations, for which we present results from a numerical solution as well as a scaling analysis.

The Taylor-von Neumann-Sedov solution — We consider a 1D ideal gas at zero temperature, ambient density $\rho_\infty$ and we inject an amount of energy $E$ in a localized region of extent $\sigma$. The hydrodynamic Euler equations for the density field, $\rho(r,t)$, velocity field, $v(r,t)$, and the temperature field, $T(r,t)$ are given by

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \rho v}{\partial x} = 0,$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}(\rho v) + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \rho v^2 + P \right) = 0,$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}(\rho e) + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (\rho ve + P v) = 0,$$

where for an ideal gas we have $e = v^2/2 + T/(2\mu)$, $P = \rho k_B T/\mu$ while $\mu = (m_1 + m_2)/2$ for our binary mass system. We set Boltzmann’s constant $k_B = 1$. From dimensional analysis one can show [14] that at long times the solution of these equations develop discontinuities at a distance

$$R(t) = \left( \frac{Et^2}{A\rho_\infty} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}},$$

where $A$ is a dimensionless constant factor which, quite remarkably, can be determined exactly [38]. From dimensional analysis one can further show [14] that the fields will take the following self-similar scaling form

$$\rho(x,t) = \rho_\infty G(\xi),$$

$$v(x,t) = \frac{2}{3t} V(\xi) = \frac{2\alpha}{3\xi^{1/3}} \xi V(\xi),$$

$$T(x,t) = \frac{4\mu x^2}{27 t^2} Z(\xi) = \frac{4\mu \alpha^2}{27\xi^{2/3}} \xi^2 Z(\xi),$$

where $\xi = x/R(t)$ is the scaled position, $\alpha = [E/(A\rho_\infty)]^{1/3}$ and the scaling functions $G, V, Z$ need to be determined. The factors $2/3, 4/27$ are inserted for convenience, e.g. from Eq. (2) one finds that the velocity of the shock wave is $(2/3)R/t$ and this suggests the use of the factor $2/3$. Plugging these into Eqs. (8a-8c) we find that the scaling functions satisfy a set of coupled first order ordinary differential equations in the variable $\xi$. Using the condition of conservation of energy and the so-called Rankine-Hugoniot conditions, specifying the field discontinuities at the shock front, allows one to obtain a complete closed-form solution of the problem, i.e. the functions $G, V, Z$ and the constant $A$ [39]. In [38] and [40] we describe some details of the solution.

Microscopic dynamics and initial conditions — Our system is a 1D gas of $N$ hard point particles moving inside a box $(-L/2, L/2)$. The only interactions between particles is through point collisions between nearest neighbors which conserve energy and momentum and also the ordering of the particles. In between collisions the particles move ballistically with constant speeds while the post-collision velocities follow from Newton’s laws (see [38]). If we choose all particles to have equal mass then the particles simply exchange velocities on collision and the dynamics becomes effectively that of a non-interacting system. For our binary mass model, we choose all even numbered particles to have mass $m_1$ and all odd ones $m_2$. In this case the only known conserved quantities are particle number, total momentum and energy and we expect a hydrodynamic description in terms of the corresponding conserved fields. The hydrodynamic fields are obtained from the microscopic variables using the following standard relations:

$$\rho(x,t) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} m_j \langle \delta(q_j(t) - x) \rangle,$$

$$p(x,t) = \rho(x,t)v(x,t) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} m_j \langle v_j \delta(q_j(t) - x) \rangle,$$

$$E(x,t) = \rho(x,t)e(x,t) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{m_j}{2} \langle v_j^2 \delta(q_j(t) - x) \rangle.$$
We now present the results of the microscopic simulations of the AHP macrostate. For a non-integrable system, it is expected that the evolving system is in local thermal equilibrium and the three fields should contain the local thermodynamic information at any space-time point \( x, t \). Using thermodynamics we obtain the other local fields in terms of \( \rho, v, e \). Thus the internal energy per unit mass is given by \( e(x, t) = e - v^2/2 \) while ideal gas thermodynamics gives us \( T(x, t) = 2e(x, t), \quad P(x, t) = 2\rho(x, t)e(x, t) \).

We consider an initial macrostate where the gas has a finite uniform density \( \rho_\infty \), zero flow velocity \( v \), and is at zero temperature everywhere except in a region of width \( \sigma \) centred at \( x = 0 \). This is the region of the blast and we take a smooth Gaussian profile \( E(x, 0) = \frac{E}{2\pi \sigma^2} e^{-x^2/2\sigma^2} \). We have verified that our long-time results are independent of the initial profile as long as it is localized and the total energy \( E \) is fixed [40]. The procedure to realize this macrostate in the microscopic simulations of the AHP gas and other details of our numerics are given in [38].

**Comparison of simulations with the TvNS solution** — We now present the results of the microscopic simulations for the evolution of the hydrodynamic fields \( \rho(x, t), v(x, t), \) and \( T(x, t) \) starting from the blast-wave initial conditions. In Fig. (6) we show the spatio-temporal evolution of the three fields (for individual particle trajectories see [38]). We see a sharp shock-front that evolves sub-ballistically. The mass density and flow velocity of the gas are peaked around the blast front while the temperature has an additional peak at the centre. In Fig. (2a,b,c) we plot the evolution of the blast wave at long times. In Figs. (2d,e,f) we show the scaled fields \( \tilde{\rho} = \rho_\infty G - \rho_\infty, \tilde{v} = \frac{1}{\mu_2}v(x, t) = (2\alpha/3)\xi v \) and \( \tilde{T} = \frac{1}{\mu_2}T(x, t) = (4\mu_2^2/27)\xi^2 Z \) as functions of the scaling variable \( \xi \). We find an excellent collapse of the data everywhere except near the blast centre. In the region where there is a collapse of data, we find a perfect agreement with the exact TvNS scaling solution (plotted as black dashed lines). Close to the origin, the TvNS solution predicts the singular forms [40] \( G(\xi) \sim \xi^{1/2} \) and \( Z(\xi) \sim \xi^{-5/2} \) which implies that near the origin the density vanishes as \( \rho \sim x^{1/2} \) and the temperature diverges as \( T \sim x^{-1/2} \). These are unphysical and clearly the simulations do not observe this. The reason for this deviation is that the effect of dissipation terms, specifically heat conductivity, become important in the core region and we need to use the NSF equations. We now discuss this.

**Comparison of simulations with numerical solution of the NSF equations.** — We now compare our simulation results and the TvNS solution with those from the full dissipative hydrodynamic equations. We re-write the Euler part from Eqs. (8a-8c) in a slightly different form and, after including dissipation, get the NSF equations:

\[
\begin{align}
\partial_t \rho + \partial_x (\rho v) &= 0, \quad (5a) \\
\rho (\partial_t + v \partial_x) v + \partial_x (\rho T/\mu) &= \partial_x (\zeta \partial_x v), \quad (5b) \\
\frac{\rho^3}{2\mu} (\partial_t + v \partial_x) \left( \frac{T}{\rho^2} \right) &= \partial_x (\zeta v \partial_x v + \kappa \partial_x T), \quad (5c)
\end{align}
\]

where \( \zeta \) denotes the bulk viscosity and \( \kappa \) is the thermal conductivity of the system. These transport coefficients can depend on the fields and, based on the Green-Kubo relations, we expect their temperature dependence to be \( \zeta \sim T^{1/2} \) and \( \kappa \sim T^{1/2} \). A recent numerical study [30] suggests the density dependence \( \kappa \sim \rho^{1/3} \). In our numerical study we have thus used the forms \( \zeta = D_1 T^{1/2} \) and \( \kappa = D_2 \rho^{1/3} T^{-1/2} \), where \( D_1 \) and \( D_2 \) are constants.

We solve Eqs. (5a-5c) numerically [38] for the same initial conditions as considered in the microscopic simulations, namely \( \rho(x, 0) = \rho_\infty, v(x, 0) = 0 \) and \( E(x, 0) = 0 \) given by the Gaussian form with total energy \( E \). The numerical results are plotted in Figs. (redoscopeHyndewa,b,c) which shows the profiles of the fields, \( \rho(x, t), v(x, t), T(x, t) \) at different times. In Figs. (3d,e,f) we plot the scaled fields \( \tilde{\rho}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{T} \) and verify the expected agreement with the TvNS solution everywhere except in the core. In the core region the NSF numerical solution does not have any singularities, unlike the TvNS solution. In Fig. (4) we plot together the long time microscopic simulation results and the NSF results and it can be seen that in the core region, the NSF solution is in better qualitative agreement with simulations as compared to the TvNS solution.
We proceed to estimate the size of the core and the corresponding scaling solution. Using Eq. (5c) we see that the heat conduction term becomes important at a length scale \(X\) such that \(\rho \frac{T}{X} \sim \frac{x^{3/2}}{4} \rho^{1/3}\), where we neglect constant factors. Using the \(\xi \rightarrow 0\) TvNS forms, \(\rho \sim \xi \sim |x|^{1/2} / t^{1/3}\) and \(T \sim \xi^{-1/2} \sim t^{1/3} / |x|^{1/2}\), leads to the estimate

\[X \sim t^{38/39}\]  

for the size \(X\) of the hot core where heat conduction is important. The outer core solution (TvNS) and the inner core solution are comparable at \(|x| = X\) and this allows us to determine the inner core scaling laws. Thus, the temperature at the centre of the explosion is estimated from \(T_0 \sim X^{-4/7} t^{-3/7}\) and Eq. (6). Similarly, the density at the centre of the explosion can be estimated from \(\rho_0 \sim X^{1/2} / t^{1/3}\) and Eq. (6). We then arrive at the asymptotic decay laws \(\rho_0 \sim t^{-\pi/3}\), \(T_0 \sim t^{-\pi/3}\) while the velocity in the hot core scales as \(X/t \sim t^{-55/93}\).

The hydrodynamic fields in the hot core where dissipative effects play the dominant role should therefore exhibit scaling behaviors in terms of the scaled spatial coordinate \(\eta = x/X\). For large \(x, t\), in a region with \(\eta \sim O(1)\), we expect the self-similar forms

\[
\rho = t^{-\pi/3} \tilde{G}(\eta), \quad v = t^{-55/93} \tilde{V}(\eta), \quad T = t^{-55/93} \tilde{Z}(\eta).
\]

In Fig. (5) we show that the data from the numerical solution of the NSF equations approximately satisfy this scaling form, though it appears that the convergence is somewhat slow. For comparison we also plot the simulation data at the last two times under the same scaling. A more detailed discussion of the inner-core scaling solution and its “matching” with the outer-core solution can be found in Ref. [40].

Conclusions. — A detailed comparison was made of the predictions of hydrodynamics for a compressible one-dimensional gas with results from microscopic dynamics of a many body interacting gas, for the physical example of energy expanding into a cold environment. As our main results, the front position \(R(t) \sim t^{2/3}\) and the scaling functions were obtained in closed form (TvNS solution) and a remarkable agreement was observed between these and microscopic simulations. Deviations were seen in a core region whose width vanishes if measured in units of the TvNS scaling variable \(\xi = x/t^{2/3}\). Thus we numerically establish that the Euler equations completely describing the hydrodynamic behavior of the AHP gas. Earlier attempts in two- and three-dimensional systems [18–23] have not been able to obtain the unambiguous agreement as reported here—this is because the 1D hard point gas is an ideal model for this study. It’s
equilibrium properties including the equation of state are known exactly which allows us to obtain the TvNS scaling functions exactly. In contrast, in higher dimensions one relies on a virial expansion to get the equation of state and then the TvNS solution has to be numerically found. Secondly our system is non-integrable and known to have good ergodicity properties and can be simulated very efficiently for large systems and long times.

The deviation at the core was understood as arising from the contribution of thermal conduction terms in the energy conservation equation. This then leads us to go beyond Euler and examine carefully the full Navier-Stokes-Fourier equation for our 1D gas. For an accurate comparison with the simulation results, we need the precise form of the thermal conductivity, \( \kappa \), and in particular its dependence on temperature and density. For the AHP gas it is known that \( \kappa \sim T^{1/2} \) and earlier studies suggest \( \kappa \sim \rho^{1/3} \). Our analysis of the resulting NSF equations gives us the estimate \( |X| \sim t^{38/93} \) for the core size as well as scaling forms for the fields which we verified in the numerical solution of the NSF equations. The inclusion of the dissipative terms leads to a qualitative agreement between the microscopic simulation results and hydrodynamics even in the core region, in particular it cures one of the chief problem of the TvNS solution — the divergence of the temperature at the centre of explosion. An open and challenging problem that remains is to obtain quantitative agreement between simulations and hydrodynamics at the core centre which would however require more information on the precise form of the thermal conductivity of our 1D gas. Although we focused on 1D where we can provide detailed numerical comparison, our approach can be extended to higher dimensions where we find a similar growing core region where thermal conductivity plays a role. The application of hydrodynamics to quantum systems is also of much recent interest \[41, 42\] and exploring this would be another interesting direction.
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A. Exact TvNS scaling solution of Euler equations

We start with the equations

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \rho + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \rho v \right) &= 0, \\
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\rho v) + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \rho v^2 + P \right) &= 0, \\
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\rho e) + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \rho ve + P v \right) &= 0,
\end{align*}
\]

where we recall that \( e = \frac{v^2}{2} + \frac{T}{\mu} \) and \( P = \rho T/\mu \) and look for a self-similar scaling solution of these equations with a shock at the location \( R(t) \). At the shock the condition of weak solutions lead to the the following Rankine-Hugoniot boundary conditions

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\rho(R)v(R)}{\rho(R) - \rho_{\infty}} &= U, \\
\frac{\rho(R)v^2(R) + P(R)}{\rho(R)v(R)} &= U, \\
\frac{\rho(R)v(R)e(R) + P(R)v(R)}{\rho(R)e(R)} &= U,
\end{align*}
\]

where \( U = \dot{R} \). In addition, we need to use the condition of energy conservation:

\[
\int_0^R dx \rho(v^2 + T/\mu) = E. \tag{12}
\]

We look for scaling solutions of the following form

\[
\rho = \rho_{\infty} G(\xi), \quad v = \frac{2x}{3t} V(\xi), \quad T = \frac{4\mu}{27} \frac{x^2}{t^2} Z(\xi). \tag{13}
\]

where the fields now depend on the single dimensionless variable

\[
\xi = \frac{x}{R} \text{ where } R(t) = \left( \frac{E t^2}{A \rho_{\infty}} \right)^{1/3}. \tag{14}
\]

Using the scaling form and after some simplification, the Rankine-Hugoniot boundary conditions lead to

\[
G(1) = 2, \quad V(1) = \frac{1}{2}, \quad Z(1) = \frac{3}{4}. \tag{15}
\]

Plugging the scaling forms (13)–(14) into Eq. (8a) and Eq. (8b) and, defining \( \ell = \ln \xi \), we obtain

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{dV}{d\ell} + (V - 1) \frac{d \ln G}{d\ell} &= -V, \\
\frac{d \ln Z}{d\ell} - 2 \frac{d \ln G}{d\ell} &= 3 - 2V \frac{V}{V - 1}.
\end{align*}
\]

Using the fact that energy is conserved in the region \((-\xi R(t) < x < \xi R(t))\), one can obtain the following relation between \( Z \) and \( V \) as \[14, 40\]

\[
Z = \frac{\gamma (\gamma - 1)(1 - V)V^2}{2(\gamma V - 1)}. \tag{18}
\]
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The total energy conservation condition in Eq. (12) gives
\[ E = \rho \infty \frac{4}{9} \frac{R^3}{T^2} \int_0^1 d\xi \xi^2 \frac{2V^3}{2(3V - 1)} G, \] (19)
where we have used (18). Combining (19) with (14) we obtain
\[ A = \frac{4}{9} \int_0^1 d\xi \xi^2 \frac{V^3}{3V - 1} G. \] (20)
As shown in [40] it is possible to obtain an explicit solution of the set of equations (16,17,18) with the boundary conditions in Eq. (15) and the value of \( A \) given by Eq. (20).

We find [40] \( A = 152/1071 \) while \( V \) is obtained by solving the implicit equation
\[ \xi^5 = 2^{-\frac{4}{3}} (3V - 1)^2 V^{-\frac{4}{3}} (3 - 4V)^{-\frac{4}{3}}. \] (21)
\( Z \) is then given by Eq. (18), and finally,
\[ G = 2^\frac{4}{3} (1 - V)^2 (3V - 1)^{\frac{1}{3}} (3 - 4V)^{-\frac{1}{3}}. \] (22)
Thus we have a completely closed form expression for the TvNS solution for the 1D ideal gas.

B. Specification of microscopic dynamics and initial conditions

Let \( q_i, p_j, \) and \( m_j \) be respectively the position, momentum, and mass of the \( j^{th} \) particle with \( j = 1, 2, \ldots, N \). In between collisions the particles move ballistically with constant speeds. On collision between particles \( i \) and \( i + 1 \), their post-collisional velocities follow from conservation of energy and momentum and are given by
\[ v_i' = \frac{[2m_{i+1}v_{i+1} + v_i(m_i - m_{i+1})]}{(m_i + m_{i+1})}, \] (23)
\[ v_{i+1}' = \frac{[2m_iv_i + v_{i+1}(m_{i+1} - m_i)]}{(m_i + m_{i+1})}. \] (24)

In our numerical simulations we consider the following Gaussian profile for the initial energy:
\[ E(x, 0) = \frac{E}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma^2} e^{-x^2/2\sigma^2}. \] (25)
The total energy of the blast is \( E \).

To obtain this in the particle model, we first distribute \( N \) ordered particles numbered say as \( i = -N/2 + 1, -N/2 + 2, \ldots, N/2 \) uniformly between \( x = -L/2 \) to \( L/2 \), so that the number density is \( n_\infty = N/L = \rho_\infty / \mu \), where \( \mu = (m_1 + m_2)/2 \) is the mean mass and \( \rho_\infty \) the ambient mass density of the gas. For the \( N_c \) centre particles with \( i = -N_c/2 + 1, -N_c/2 + 2, \ldots, N_c/2 \), we choose their velocities from the Maxwell distribution, \( \text{Prob}(v_i) = \frac{m_i}{(2\pi T_i)^{\frac{3}{2}}} e^{-m_i v_i^2/(2T_i)} \), where \( T_i = 2E/N_c \). Set the velocities of all other particles to zero. The size of the initial blast is thus approximately \( s = N_c/n_\infty \).

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig6}
\caption{This plot shows the trajectories of \( N = 1000 \) particles, starting from initial conditions corresponding to a Gaussian initial temperature profile and \( p(x, 0) = \rho_\infty = 1.5, v(x, 0) = 0 \). The expected shock front position \( R(t) \) is shown as a dashed line. The stationary particles are not shown.}
\end{figure}

We note that \( E(x, 0) = (\sum_{i=1}^N m_i v_i(0)/2\delta(x - q_i(0))) \). Since, for large \( N \), each particle’s position is a Gaussian with mean \( \bar{q}_i = i/n_\infty \) and variance \( \sigma^2 = L/(4n_\infty) \), we then get:
\[ E(x, 0) = \frac{N_c/2}{2\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma^2} e^{-(x - \bar{q}_i)^2/(2\sigma^2)} \]
\[ \approx \frac{n_\infty T_i}{4} \int_{-s/2}^{s/2} dy \frac{e^{-(x - y)^2/(2\sigma^2)}}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma^2} \]
\[ = \frac{n_\infty T_i}{4} \left[ \text{erf} \left( \frac{s - 2x}{2\sqrt{2}\sigma} \right) + \text{erf} \left( \frac{s + 2x}{2\sqrt{2}\sigma} \right) \right]. \] (26)

When \( s \ll \sigma \) this simplifies to
\[ E(x, 0) \approx E \frac{e^{-x^2/(2\sigma^2)}}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma^2}. \] (27)

C. Details of numerical techniques

**Molecular dynamics simulations:** In all our simulations we took \( m_1 = 1, m_2 = 2 \) (so that \( \mu = (m_1 + m_2)/2 = 1.5 \), \( \rho_\infty = 1.5 \) and \( E = 32, N_c = 32 \). In our largest simulations we took \( N = 24000, L = 24000 \) and averaged over an ensemble of \( N \) in \( 10^4 \) initial conditions.

For each microscopic initial condition, we evolved the system with the Hamiltonian dynamics. The molecular dynamics for this system was done using an event-driven algorithm which updates the system between successive collisions.

**Solution of Euler equations with Navier-Stokes terms:** The numerical solution used the MacCormack method [43], which is second order in both space and time and used a discretization \( dx = 0.1 \) and \( dt = 0.001 \).
The diffusion constants in the dissipative terms were set to the values $D_1 = D_2 = 1$ and the system size was taken as $L = 4000$. We have evolved up to time $t = 6400$ which is before the energy reaches the boundary.


[38] See supplemental material.


