Nontrivial Causality and Theory of Particle Collision, Relative Motion and Clustering in Turbulence.
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The aimless meandering of tiny particles in mid-air is a phenomenon we encounter daily but rarely pay attention to; unless perhaps when it is a key mechanism that spreads a deadly disease. But for a band of atmospheric-scientists and astrophysicists, the motion of particles in turbulence is never a trivial matter, since it is behind the mechanism for growth of cloud-droplets (planetesimal) into rain[1–3] (protoplanets[4]) via turbulent induced collision-coagulation of particles. F or engineers pondering the design of future, greener, combustion engines, this is a scenario they wish to understand and control[5]. Simple causality prompted most works in the past decades to investigate how turbulent-enhanced particle density and/or relative velocity could augment collision-coagulation rate. However, our work has two major results: 1) The surprising fact that collision-coagulation dramatically suppresses the radial-distribution-function (RDF) which quantifies the enhancement of local particle-density and also strongly affect their relative velocities, thus challenging the simple causality; 2) A complete stochastic theory that link particle collision rate to relative velocity and RDF is presented and shown to be accurate and explain the preceding result. The theory also accounts for the role of turbulent-fluctuation missing in earlier mean-field theories and predicts a strong coupling between particle clustering and mean inter-particle radial-velocity (MRV). We also present a phenomenological model for MRV which is accurate when suitably calibrated. We uncover a paradox: the unjustified accuracy of the differential form of the theory. Our results call for a paradigm-shift in how we understand this subject.

As mentioned, the motion and interactions of small particles has fundamental implications for atmospheric clouds, planet formation and efficiency of combustion engines[6]. Particles, due to their inertia, are known to be ejected from turbulent vortices and thus form clusters[6–8] i.e. regions of enhanced particle-density; this together with collision of droplets is also of direct relevance for those systems. Beside these, particle-turbulence interaction also plays a significant role in industrial reactors and nanoparticle generation[9]. Up until now, we do not have definitive answers to basic questions such as how to calculate particle collision rate from basic turbulence-particle parameters; and what is the exact relation between collision and particle clustering and/or motions. As we shall see, our work reveals that collision-coagulation causes profound changes in both MRV and RDF, questioning earlier understanding of the problem. The difficulty of this problem is in part related to the fact that turbulence is, even by itself, virtually theoretically intractable due to its nonlinear and complex nature.

The quest for a theory of particle collision in turbulence started in 1956, when Saffman and Turner[10] derived a mean-field formula for collision rate of finite size, inertialess, particles. In another landmark work[11], a general relation among collision-rate \( R_c \), particle clustering and mean particle relative radial velocity was presented: \( R_c / (n_1 n_2 V) = 4 \pi d^2 g(d) \langle w_r(d) | w_r \leq 0 \rangle \), where \( g(r) \) is the radial distribution function (RDF), a metric of the degree of particle clustering, and \( \langle w_r(d) | w_r \leq 0 \rangle \), the conditional mean of relative radial velocity (MRV) between two particles, \( n_i \) are global mean particle number densities, \( V \) is the spatial volume of the domain, \( d \) the particle diameter. The remarkable simplicity of this finding inspired a "separation paradigm", which is basically the idea that one could study the RDF or MRV separately (which would be technically easier), the independent results from the dual may be combined to accurately predicts \( R_c \) (an idea that we will subsequently challenge).

Another work of special interest here is the drift-diffusion model by Chun, Koch et al.[12] (hereafter: CK theory) (note: there are other equivalent theories[13, 14]). The CK theory, derived for collision-less particles in the limit of vanishing particle Stokes number \( St \), (a quantity that reflects the importance of the particle’s inertia in dictating its motion in turbulence), correctly predicted the power-law form of the RDF[8, 15] and have seen remarkable successes over the years including the accurate account of the modified RDF of particles interacting electrically[16] and hydrodynamically[17].

Here, we first present results on RDF and MRV for particle undergoing collision-coagulation[31]. The data is obtained via direct numerical simulation (DNS), which is the gold-standard computational method in term of accuracy and completeness for solving the most challenging fluid dynamics problem i.e. turbulent flows. DNS solves the fundamental equation of fluid dynamics, the
Navier-Stokes Equation, with full resolution and without turbulence modeling, a feat that analogs the ab-initio methods in quantum-physics/chemistry with respect to the Schrödinger equation. The accuracy of DNS for various turbulent-flows have been experimentally validated for decades (see e.g. the compilation of results in [18]); while for simulating dynamics of small heavy particles, experimental validation of its accuracy could be found in [19, 22].

Analysis of the DNS results is then followed by a theoretical account of the relations between collision-rate, RDF and MRV that includes mean-field contributions [10, 11] and contributions from turbulent fluctuations (absent from earlier theories [10, 11]). The theory is derived from the Fokker-Planck (drift-diffusion) framework first introduced in the CK theory [12]. We shall see that the main effect of collision-coagulation is the enhanced asymmetry in the particle relative velocity distribution [32] and that this enhanced asymmetry leads to nontrivial outcomes.

We now briefly describe the DNS. It is a standard pseudo-spectral algorithm [18, 22, 24] that solves the Navier-Stokes Equations with brute force giving fully resolved isotropic turbulent flow field (more in "Methods"). The flow has Taylor-scaled Reynolds number $R_\lambda = 133$. The particles are moved via Stokes drag: $\dot{v} = (u - v)/\tau_p$, where $u, v$ is the local fluid and particle velocity, $\tau_p$ is the particle inertia respond time. Exponential integrator method [24] is employed to give accurate particle trajectories even at very small $St$, (note: $St = \frac{1}{18}(\rho_p/\rho)(d/\eta)^2$, where $\rho_p/\rho$ is the particle-to-fluid mass-density ratio, $\eta$ is the Kolmogorov length-scale). The particles collide when their (spherical) volume overlap and a new particle is formed conserving volume and momenta. We continuously, randomly, inject new particles into the flow so that the system is in a steady-state after some time. Statistical analyses are done at steady-state on monodisperse particles (involving particles with the same $St$).

We compute the RDF via $g(r) = N_{pp}(r)/[4\pi(N - 1)\delta V_r/V]$, where $N_{pp}(r)$ is the number of particle pairs found to be separated by distance $r$, $\delta V_r$ is the volume of a spherical shell of radius $r$ and infinitesimal thickness $\delta r$, $V$ is defined earlier. Figure 1 shows $g(r)$ obtained for particles with Stokes number $St = 0.22, 0.54$ and of two sizes (also, cases of $St = 0.054, 0.001$ are shown in panel-b). It is clear that RDF for these colliding-coagulating particles has a dramatic fall-off at $r \sim d$ not seen for non-colliding ones [8, 12] (which increase monotonically as $r \to 0$). The fall-off is so dramatic [33] that it is unclear from simple inspection if the RDFs are still finite at particle contact ($r = d$). However, by re-plotting using $r - d$ as the x-axis (inset), we see compelling reason (at resolution of order $\sim 10^{-3}d$) for a finite $g(d)$. This implies that the mean-field formula of [11] still contributes towards $R_c$; otherwise, a finite $R_c$ is possible only via fluctuations. The strong effects particle collision has on the RDF (also on MRV as we shall we later) challenges the validity of the "separation paradigm". We note that similar fall-off of RDF was previously observed [11] but a complete analysis of its relation to other quantities and its implications was lacking; also, a study on multiple collisions [20] had hinted at the potential problem with the separation paradigm.

To theoretically account for the new findings, we begin our derivations similarly as CK [12] but under the new constraint due to coagulations: at particle contact ($r = d$), two-particle radial velocities ($w_r$) can only be negative or zero [34], while with increasing $r$, the constraint is gradually relaxed. The first consequence is that the distribution of the radial component of the relative particle velocity ($W_r$) is highly asymmetric for $r \approx d$, i.e. the probability of positive $W_r$’s are very small (this

FIG. 1: Note: $d_\ast = 9.49 \times 10^{-4}$. a) RDFs for particles that coagulate upon collision. $\circ$: $St = 0.54, d = d_\ast$; $\triangle$: $St = 0.54, d = 2d_\ast$; $\square$: $St = 0.22, d = d_\ast$. Inset: $g(r)$ versus $r - d$ for the $\circ$ case. b) RDFs versus $r - d_1$ for case of $St = 0.054, d = d_\ast$, (note: $d_1 = 0.099d$). $\diamond$: $g(r)$; red-line: power-law fit to $\circ$ in the large-r regime (outcome: $0.890r^{-0.035}$), equivalent to $g_0(r)$ in the ansatz $g_d(r) = g_0(r)g_s(r)$; $\diamond$: compensated RDF, i.e. $\circ$ divided by $g_s(r)$; cyan-line: the $g_0(r)$ part of the ansatz, obtained via dual power-law fits to $\circ$ in the small and large $r - d_1$ limits (outcomes: $4.17(r - d_1)^{0.212}, 1.00(r - d_1)^{-2 \times 10^{-3}}$). Inset: RDFs plotted versus $r - d$. $\circ$: compensated RDF for $St = 0.054, d = d_\ast$, same as in the main figure; $\Delta$: $g(r)$ for the case of $St = 0.001, d = d_\ast$, i.e. almost zero-$St$ particles.
constitute the "enhanced asymmetry" mentioned earlier. Thus for \( r \approx d \), the mean of \( W_r \), i.e. \( \langle W_r \rangle \), must be negative. (Note: this will lead to a nonzero mean-field contribution to \( R_e \)). From this one could derive, in the limit of \( St \ll 1 \), a master equation (details in Methods or \[12\]):

\[
\frac{\partial \langle P \rangle}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial r_i} \left( q_i^d + q_i^D \right) + \frac{\partial \langle (W_r) \langle P \rangle \rangle}{\partial r_i} = 0, \tag{1}
\]

where \( P(r) \) is the probability density of finding another particle at position \( r \) from a 'primary' particle \([35]\). \( \langle . \rangle \) implies averaging over all primary particle trajectories \([12]\). \( q_i^d \) is the drift flux (of probability due to turbulent fluctuation) and \( q_i^D \) the diffusive flux.

After some derivations (see "Methods") which is partially similar to CK\[12\] but with key differences that account for the various non-trivial effects of the coagulation constraint such as the enhanced asymmetry in the particle relative velocity distribution, the change in the order and values of the drift flux and the lower integration limit in the definition of the non-local diffusive flux, we arrive at:

\[
c_{st} r^3 \int d\Omega \int_0^\infty dt_f F(t_f) \int_{d/r}^\infty dR_0 R_0^2 g(r R_0) f_f(R_0, \mu, t_f) + g(r) r^2 \langle W_r \rangle - Ar^3 \rangle = -R_c^*, \tag{2}
\]

where, from the left, we have the diffusive flux \( (q_i^D) \), the mean-field flux, the drift flux \( (q_i^d) \) and the total flux at contact \( (r = d) \) which is equivalent to the negative of the (always positive) normalized collision rate: \( R_c^* \equiv R_c / (4\pi [N(N-1)/2]/V) \); \( r \) is the radial distance between two particles; \( c_{st} \) is a function of \( St \) (always positive and of order \( \leq 1 \), (more in \[27\])); definitions of \( \Omega, t_f, F, R_0, f_f, \mu \) can be found in "Methods". The coefficient of the drift-flux \( A \) is a perturbative series with \( St \) as the small parameter \[12\], to leading orders: \( A \approx \int_{-\infty}^{t_f} A_{ik}^{(1)} dt' \approx 3.1 \). Thus in the \( r \sim d \) regime, the drift flux is positive (negative) for \( St \) less (larger) than a value of order 0.01; and in the limit of \( St \rightarrow 0 \), it is dominated by the first-order term.

Closed form analytical solution to Eq. \(2\) may be elusive due to its integral nature (a consequence of the non-locality of the diffusive-flux). However, one could gain insights into its implications and test its accuracy via numerical solution. Hence, we begin with a simple ansatz for \( g(r) \) and show that \(2\) could numerically predict \( \langle W_r \rangle \) with reasonable accuracy. The ansatz has the form \( g_0(r) = g_0(r) g_0(r) \), with \( g_0(r) = c_0 r^{-c_1} \) and \( g_0(r) = c_0 (r - d_1)^{-c_2} \). The former is just the RDF for the collision-less case \[12\]. To keep things simple (as a first order analysis), we let the \( g_0 \) take the simplest form that could still capture the main features of the RDF as seen in Fig. 1. In words, \( g_0 \) is a two-piece power-law of \( r - d_1 \), where \( c_{00}(r), c_{01}(r) \) are piece-wise constants that switch from one constant value to another at a crossover-scale \( r_c \) (of the order of \( d \)). The values of \( c_{00} \) and \( c_{01} \) are determined from the RDF resulting from the DNS by fitting power-laws to the small and large \( r \) regimes (\( r_c \) results naturally from the intersection of the two power-law fits). In general, \( d_1 \) should be dependent on \( St \) but we shall see that it is almost constant when \( St \) is small. An example of \( d_1 \) is shown Fig. 1b for the case of \( St = 0.05 \).

FIG. 2: Mean radial component of relative velocity (MRV) between particles. a) \( \bigcirc \) : \( St = 0.054 \); \( \square \) : \( St = 0.11 \); \( \triangle \) : \( St = 0.001 \). The lines are numerical predictions based on the ansatz (see text). From the top, orange-line: \( \langle W_r \rangle_{r < d} \) numerical predictions using \[2\] and ansatz \( g_0(r), A \); with \( A \) equals its small-\( r \) limit \( (-2.3 \times 10^{-3}) \); black-line: \( \langle W_r \rangle_{r > d} \) same as the previous but with \( A \) equals its large-\( r \) limit \( (8.3 \times 10^{-3}) \); green-line: numerical predictions using \[5\] and ansatz, \( A = 8.3 \times 10^{-3} \). Inset) Same plots in log-log axes.

b) \( \triangle \) : \( St = 0.001 \); \( \bigcirc \) : \( St = 0.054 \). Dotted lines are model predictions of \( \langle W_r \rangle_{St = 0} \) using \[2\] and \[5\] with variance \( K \) obtained by matching (between model and DNS) the ratio of transverse to longitudinal structure functions (TLR) at the 2nd-order (yellow, top); 4th-order (green, middle); 6th-order (cyan).

Since we are working in the small \( St \) limit, we may approximate \( g(r, St) \) in the integral in \[2\] to the first order, using \( g(r, St \rightarrow 0) \) \[12\]. We thus numerically integrate the first term in \[2\] using the ansatz fitted to \( g(r, St = 0.001) \); using the DNS data, we estimate \( A \), obtain \( R^* \) and \( c_{st} \) (it can be shown that \( c_{st} = |c_1| \) (more in \[27\])).
parison of the predicted $\langle W_r \rangle_r$ (with the ones calculated directly from the DNS data is shown in Fig. 2
As shown earlier, for $r \sim d$, $A$ is negative (positive) if $St$ is less (larger) than a value of order 0.01. However, with increasing $r$, the asymmetry induced by coagulation is gradually washed out by local isotropy of turbulence and $A$ relaxes to its collision-less values, i.e.
\[
\lim_{r \to d} A = St^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} A_k^2(t, t') dt' \approx St^2 A_k^2(t, t) \tau_\eta \quad [27].
\]
For this reason, we show two versions of the predicted $\langle W_r \rangle_r$, i.e. $\langle W_r \rangle_{r<d}$ and $\langle W_r \rangle_{r>d}$ which are obtained by setting $A$ to its small and large $r$ limits respectively. The agreement is remarkable, especially for small $r$. At $r \approx 2d$, the DNS result shows a weak tendency to first follow the upward trend of $\langle W_r \rangle_{r<d}$ and then falls off significantly (at $r \gtrsim 2.5d$) with a rate that might be slightly sharper than that predicted by $\langle W_r \rangle_{r>d}$.

Alternatively, if MRV for the fluid i.e. $\langle W_r \rangle_{St=0}$, is known, one could assume that in the small $St$ limit, particle velocity statistics are given by their fluid counterparts [12], thus [2] may be used, with $\langle W_r \rangle_{St=0}$, to predict the RDF in that limit. Fig. 2 shows that $\langle W_r \rangle$ from the DNS does not change significantly for $St \in [0.001, 0.1]$, corroborating such an approach. Here we provide a simple, first order model for $\langle W_r \rangle_{St=0}$. We limit ourselves to the regime of small particles i.e. $d \ll \eta$, and anticipate that $\langle W_r \rangle$ is non-trivial (nonzero) only for $r \sim d$. We further assume that the relative trajectories of particles are rectilinear at such small scales. It then follows from the coagulation constraint that: in the rest frame of a particle, a second nearby particle must move in such a manner that either $\theta > \frac{\pi}{2}$ or $\sin(\theta) \geq d/r$, where $\theta \in [0,\pi]$ is the angle between its velocity and vector position in the rest frame of the 1st particle (more in [27]). We can thus write (for $St \ll 1$):
\[
\langle W_r \rangle = \langle w_r \rangle_\ast = p_- \langle w_r \rangle_{|w_r| < 0} + p_+ \langle w_r \rangle_{|w_r| \geq 0} \\
\approx -p_- \xi - r + p_+ \xi + r \left[ 1 + \int_0^{\pi} P^+_\theta(\theta') \cos(\theta') d\theta' \right],
\]
(details in [27]), where $\langle \cdot \rangle_\ast$ represents averaging over all particle pairs, $p_+$ ($p_-$) is the probability of an instance of $w_r$ being positive (negative), and $P^+_\theta$ is a conditional probability density function such that $P^+_\theta \equiv \int P(\theta, \phi, \tau_\eta) d\phi d\tau_\eta / \int P(\theta, \phi, \tau_\eta) d\phi d\tau_\eta$. For a first order account, we neglect skewness in the distribution of particle relative velocities and set $p_\pm = 0.5$, $\xi \pm = 0.76 \sqrt{\varepsilon / (15 \nu)}$ (the ‘0.76’ is so that $\xi \sim r$ matches the order-1 fluid velocity structure function seen in the DNS). A simple phenomenological model for $P(\theta)$ may be constructed using the statistical central limit theorem by assuming that the angle of approach $\theta$ at any time is the sum of many random, additive, incremental rotations in the past, such that one may write:
\[
P(\theta) = \frac{N}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\{K \cos(\theta - \mu)\} \sin(\theta),
\]
where $N \exp[\ldots]$ is the circular normal distribution, i.e. analog of normal distribution for angular data; $\sin(\theta)$ results from integration over azimuthal angles ($\phi$). We set $\mu = \pi/2$ (neglect skewness in particle relative velocity distribution) and obtain $K$ by matching the ratio of transverse to longitudinal structure functions (TLR) of the particle relative velocities with the ones found DNS data ($N$ is determined via normalization of $P(\theta)$). Fig. 2 shows the $\langle w_r \rangle_\ast$ derived via [3] and [1], using $K$ calibrated using TLR of 2nd, 4th, 6th order structure functions respectively. The results have correct qualitative trend of vanishing values at large $r$ that increases sharply as $r$ approach $d$; the result calibrated by the 4th-order TLR gives the best overall agreement with DNS data. Currently we do not have a satisfactory rationale to single out the 4th-order. That the TLR of different orders give differing results may imply that the first order model may be incomplete, possibly due to over-simplification in [3] or to the inaccuracy of the rectilinear assumption ($d/\eta$ in the DNS may be insufficiently small).

We now discuss an important but precarious theoretical issue that should be resolved in near future. It is clear from the work of [12] that the non-local diffusion integral in [2] may be converted to a differential form only for specific ansatze for the RDF (e.g. power law). However both [16] and [17] obtained apparently accurate outcomes using the differential form of the drift-diffusion model, with resultant RDF that we have found to be inconsistent with a differential form of the diffusion term. If we take the same leap of faith and replace (2) with:
\[
- \tau_\eta^{-1} B_{nl} r^4 \frac{d}{dr} g(r) + g(r) [r^2 \langle W_r \rangle - Ar^3] = -R_c^\ast,
\]
and set $B_{nl} = 0.0397$ ($B_{nl}$ is expected to depend on $P_s$), this value is computed using $\tau_\eta$ of our DNS (more in [27]); in general, when RDF is not a power-law, $B_{nl}$ may also be $r$-dependent), we could make another prediction (using the same $g_0, \eta_0$ ansatz for $\langle W_r \rangle$ which is also plotted in Fig. 2. This new prediction is still not far from the rest (the jump correspond to the kink in the ansatz). Finally, we give here a general solution for [4], with $\langle w_r \rangle_\ast$ given by [3] & [1]:
\[
g(r) = \frac{1}{\beta(r)} \left[ \int \beta(r) q(r) dr + C \right],
\]
with $q(r) = R_c^\ast \tau_\eta / (B_{nl} r^4); \beta(r) = \exp \left[ \int p(r) dr \right]; p(r) = \left[ Ar - \langle w_r \rangle_\ast \right] \tau_\eta / (B_{nl} r^4)$; more in [27].

To conclude, we observed that collision strongly affects the RDF and MRV and imposes strong coupling between them. This challenges the efficacy of a "separation paradigm" and suggests that results from any
studies that preclude particle collision has limited relevance for predicting collision statistics\cite{36}. We have presented a theory for particle collision-coagulation in turbulence (based on a Fokker-Planck framework) that explains the above observations and verified its accuracy by showing that $\langle W_r \rangle$ could be accurately predicted using a sufficiently accurate RDF. The theory account for the full collision-coagulation rate which include contributions from mean-field and fluctuations; and as such, our work complements and completes earlier mean-field theories \cite{10, 11}. We showed that a simple model of particle approach-angles could capture the main features of $(W_r)$. We uncovered the unexplained accuracy of the differential drift-diffusion equation. Our findings provide a new understanding of particle collision and its relation with clustering and relative motion, which has implications for any studies involving colliding particles in unsteady flows.

**METHODS**

**Details of the Direct Numerical Simulation.**

To observe how particle collision-coagulation affects RDF and MRV, we performed direct numerical simulation (DNS) of steady-state isotropic turbulence embedded with particles of finite but sub-Kolmogorov size. We solve the incompressible Navier-Stokes Equations using the standard pseudo-spectral method inside a triplicate periodic cubic-box of size $2\pi$. The velocity field is discretized on a $256^3$ grid. Aliasing resulting form Fourier transform \cite{23}. Steady-state and isotropy is achieved by randomly forcing the lowest wave-numbers yielding a Taylor-scaled Reynolds number $R_\lambda = 133$. The 2nd-order Runge-Kutta time stepping was employed. Further details of such standard turbulent flow solver can be found elsewhere \cite{15, 23, 24}. In the DNS, particles are advected via a viscous Stokes drag: $dv/dt = (u - v)/\tau_p$, where $u, v$ is the local fluid and particle velocity respectively, $\tau_p$ is the particles’ inertia respond time. Time-stepping of the particle motion is done using a 2nd-order modified Runge-Kutta method with exponential integrator \cite{23} that is accurate even for $\tau_p$ much smaller than the fluid’s timestep \cite{23}. Particles, assumed spherical, collide when their volume overlap and a new particle is formed conserving volume and momenta. We continuously, randomly, inject new particles into the flow so that the system is in a steady-state after some time. Statistical analysis is done at steady-state on monodisperse particles (involving particles with the same $St$).

Key parameters of the DNS: $R_\lambda = 133$; kinetic energy dissipation rate, $\varepsilon = 0.117$; fluid kinematic viscosity, $\nu = 0.001$; Kolmogorov length-scale, $\eta = 0.000962$; Kolmogorov time-scale, $\tau_\eta = 0.0925$. Particles have the initial diameter of $d = 9.49 \times 10^{-8}$ unless otherwise specified (in one case particles are initialized at $2d$, in order to observe the effect of size variation); particle Stokes number is defined as: $St = \tau_p/\tau_\eta = \frac{1}{12}(\rho_p/\rho)(d/\eta)^2$, where $\rho_p/\rho$ is the particle to fluid mass-density ratio, $d$ is the particle diameter.

**Origin of the Master Equation.**

As in \cite{12}, under the assumption that $St \ll 1$, particle motions are closely tied to the fluid’s and, to leading order, completely specified by the particle position and the velocity gradient, we start with the fundamental Fokker-Planck equation which is closed and deterministic (see e.g. Appendix J in Pope (2000) \cite{18}):

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial(W_i P)}{\partial r_i} = 0, \quad (7)$$

where given two particles, $P \equiv P(r_i, t | \Gamma_i(t))$ is the (per volume) probability density (PDF) that the second particle is at vector position $r_i$ relative to a primary particle at time $t$, conditioned on a fixed and known history of the velocity gradient tensor along the primary particle’s trajectory $\Gamma_i(t)$. $W_i$ is the mean velocity of secondary particles, relative to the primary, under the same assumption.

From this, one could derive an equation for $\langle P \rangle (r)$:

$$\frac{\partial \langle P \rangle}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \langle W_i P \rangle}{\partial r_i} (\langle W_i \rangle + \langle W_i P \rangle) = 0, \quad (8)$$

which is un-closed due to correlation between the fluctuating terms $W_i$ and $P \equiv P - \langle P \rangle$, $\langle . \rangle$ implies ensemble averaging over primary particles. $(\langle W_i P \rangle)$ can be written in terms of a drift and diffusive fluxes (details can be found in \cite{12}, we do not see the value of repeating here), hence:

$$\frac{\partial \langle P \rangle}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \langle q_i^d + q_i^D \rangle}{\partial r_i} + \frac{\partial \langle W_i \rangle}{\partial r_i} (\langle P \rangle) = 0, \quad (9)$$

where the drift flux is:

$$q_i^d = - \int_{-\infty}^{t} \int_{-\infty}^{t} \langle W_i(r, t) \partial W_i(r', t') \rangle \langle P \rangle(r', t') dt',$$

and the diffusive flux is:

$$q_i^D = - \int_{-\infty}^{t} \int_{-\infty}^{t} \langle W_i(r, t) W_j(r', t') \rangle \frac{\partial \langle P \rangle}{\partial r_j} (r', t') dt',$$

where $r'$ satisfies a characteristic equation:

$$\frac{\partial r_i}{\partial t'} = W_i(r', t'),$$

with boundary condition: when $t' = t, r_i = r_i$.  

Theoretical Derivations from Eqn. (1) to (2).

As in CK, the definition of the drift flux is \[ q_i^d = -\int_{-\infty}^{t} \left\langle P_i(r, t) \frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial t'}(r', t') \right\rangle dt', \] the diffusive flux is \[ q_i^D = -\int_{-\infty}^{t} \left\langle W_i(r, t) W_j(r', t') \right\rangle \frac{\partial (f_i)}{\partial t'}(r', t') dt', \] where \[ r' \] satisfies a characteristic equation \[ \frac{\partial r_t}{\partial t'} = W_i(r', t'). \] We then expand \[ W_i \] and \[ \frac{\partial W_i}{\partial r_t} \] (and consequently also the fluxes) as perturbation series with \[ St \] as the small parameter (details in [27] or [12]). The coagulation constraint has nontrivial effects on the coefficients of these series. For the drift flux, the leading order terms are:

\[ q_i^d = -\left\langle P_i(r) \right\rangle r_k \int_{-\infty}^{t} \left[ A_{ik}^{(1)} St + A_{ik}^{(2)} St^2 \right] dt', \]

with \[ A_{ik}^{(1)} = \tau_i (\Gamma_{ik}(t) \Gamma_{lm}(t') \Gamma_{ml}(t')) \] and \[ A_{ik}^{(2)} = \tau_i^2 (\Gamma_{ij}(t) \Gamma_{jk}(t) \Gamma_{lm}(t') \Gamma_{ml}(t')). \] The new constraint enhances the asymmetry of relative particle velocities, thus \[ A_{ik}^{(1)} \] is no longer zero for \[ r \sim d \]. Under the constraint, DNS gives \[ \int_{-\infty}^{t} A_{ik}^{(1)} dt' \approx -0.21 \] and \[ \int_{-\infty}^{t} A_{ik}^{(2)} dt' \approx 3.1 \] (more in [27]). Thus for \[ r \sim d \], the drift flux is positive (negative) for \[ St \] less (larger) than a value of order 0.01; and in the limit of \[ St \rightarrow 0 \], it is dominated by the first-order term.

\[ q_i^D \] is a ‘nonlocal’ diffusion caused by fluctuations and can be estimated using a model that assumes the particle relative motions are controlled by a series of random strains. In general, the resulting \[ q_i^D \] has an integral form (due to nonlocality), and only in the special case where \[ g(r) \] is a power-law, may it be cast into a differential form (similar to a local diffusion). In view of the nontrivial \[ g(r) \] observed here, we must proceed with the integral form:

\[ q_i^d = c_{st} r \int d\Omega \int_{0}^{\infty} dt F(t) \int_{d/r}^{\infty} dR_{0} R_{0}^2 \left\langle P(r, R_{0}) f(t, \mu, t) \right\rangle, \]

where \[ R_{0} \equiv \eta_0 / r \] with \[ \eta_0 \] as the initial separation distance of a particle pair before a straining event; \[ F \] the probability density function for the duration of each event; \[ f(t) \] is determined by relative prevalence of extensional versus compressional strain events (details in [27] or [12]); note: due to coagulation, the \[ R_{0} \]-integral starts from \( d/r \). We have differ from the CK theory via the introduction of the factor \( c_{st} \), of order \( \lesssim 1 \), always positive and may vary with \( St \) (more in [27]).

In general, \( g(r) \equiv \alpha \langle P \rangle \) by definition; if periodic boundaries applies (as in our DNS) then \( \alpha = V \), (more in [27]). Using this and the fact that the problem has only radial (r) dependence, we may rewrite (11) as:

\[ r^2 \frac{\partial g(r, t)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left[ r^2 \alpha \left( q_i^d + q_i^D \right) + r^2 \langle W_r \rangle g(r, t) \right] = 0, \]
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[27] See supplementary material at... for arxiv version, it is attached as a 203 supplementary material.
[31] Coagulation is, in a sense, the simplest outcome of collision. In the sequel we shall argue that the major qualitative conclusions of our work also applies to cases with other collisional outcome.
[32] In the collision-less case, the asymmetry is much weaker and is related to viscous dissipation of energy in turbulence.
[33] We note that the abscissa is logarithmic, thus the RDFs are falling with decreasing r with exponentially increasing steepness.
[34] In other words particle may approach each other (collision) but no particles can be created at contact and then move away from another particle.
[35] borrowing the notation of CK-theory, W1, P are ensemble-averages over trajectories of satellite (secondary) particles around a primary particle whose history (including the fluid’s velocity gradient tensor around it) is known and fixed.
[36] The current statement also holds for other types of collisional outcomes (not only for collision-coagulation), but the specific outcomes should be qualitatively different from the current case.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Estimation of Leading Order Terms in the Drift Flux, e.g. $A_{ik}^{(1)}$

Using the DNS data, we estimate e.g. the value of

$$\int_{-\infty}^{t} A_{ik}^{(1)} dt'$$

Note: the averaging is done over fluid particles (the theory assumed $St \ll 1$ limit, such that all velocity statistics is tight to the fluid’s), the integrand is non-vanishing only for $t'$ in the vicinity of $t - \tau_i$ to $t$ (where the turbulent velocity gradient $\Gamma_{ij}$ retains correlation, thus this quantity may be approximated as: $\tau_i^2 (\Gamma_{ik}(t)\Gamma_{ml}(t'))$. As shown in [12], $(\Gamma_{ik}(t)\Gamma_{ml}(t))$ is by definition zero in fully developed turbulence due to the fact that the small scale statistics of turbulent flow is almost isotropic. However, the coagulation constraint dictates that.
at \( r = d \), such averages must be taken with the condition that only fluid-particle pairs with negative radial velocity \( (w_r < 0) \) are taken into account (that the inertial particles’ motion being tight to the fluid’s does not imply that inertial pairs sample the fluid particle pairs’ motion uniformly). Under this condition, the DNS data gives \( \tau_{st}^3 M^3 \equiv -0.2 \times 10^{-3}/d_s \); here, it is of value to point out that without such constraint or condition, the result for this quantity from the DNS is two orders of magnitude smaller. Similarly, we found \( f_{\pm}^\ast \equiv 0 \).

**Derivation and Role of \( c_{st} \)**

In this work, we deviate from the CK theory [12] by introducing an extra factor \( c_{st} \) (positive, of order unity or less) in the model of non-local diffusion:

\[
q_r^D = c_{st} \tau_{nl}^{-1} r^2 \frac{\partial \langle P \rangle}{\partial r}, \tag{14}
\]

where \( B_{nl} = \tau_{nl}^{-1} r^3 \frac{\partial \langle P \rangle}{\partial r} \).

This, together with: \( q_r^D = -A_{ck} \tau_{nl}^{-1} r \langle P \rangle \), eventually leads to the first order equation differential equation for the RDF \( g(r) \equiv V \langle P \rangle \), that has (only) power-law solutions: \( g(r) = V Cr^{-c_{1}} \). This result (i.e. \( g(r) \) equivalently \( \langle P \rangle(r) \) are power-laws) has seen compelling validations from both experiments (e.g. [16 17 20]) and DNS (e.g. [3,12 21]). We now begin from this experimentally validated result and work backward to derive an expression for \( c_{st} \). We plug the power-law form for \( \langle P \rangle \) into
\[ q_r^D = -B_{nl} \tau_n^{-1} r^2 \frac{\partial (C r^{-c_1})}{\partial r} \]
\[ = -B_{nl} \tau_n^{-1} r^2 C(-c_1) r^{-c_1-1} \]
\[ = B_{nl} \tau_n^{-1} r c_1 C r^{-c_1} \]
\[ = \tau_n^{-1} r c_1 C r^{-c_1} \int \Omega \int_0^\infty dt_f F(t_f) \int_{d/r}^\infty dR_0 R_0^{-2-c_1} f_1(r_0, \mu, t_f) \]
\[ = r c_1 \int \Omega \int_0^\infty dt_f F(t_f) \int_{d/r}^\infty dR_0 R_0^{-2} C(rR_0)^{-c_1} f_1(r_0, \mu, t_f) \]
\[ = c_1 r \int \Omega \int_0^\infty dt_f F(t_f) \int_{d/r}^\infty dR_0 R_0^{-2} \langle P \rangle(rR_0) f_1(r_0, \mu, t_f) . \]

Comparing with \[13\], we have:
\[ c_{st} = | - c_1 | \equiv | c_1 | , \]
which is found in experiments (and theories) to be of order 0 to 1 and a function of particle Stokes number \( St \); in words, this means \( c_{st} \) is given by the modulus of the power-law exponent of the RDF that would arise in the collision-less case; in the case with collision and sufficiently small particle \((d/\eta \ll 1)\), such as in this study, \( c_{st} \) equals the modulus of the power-law exponent of the RDF the range of \( d \ll r \ll 20\eta \) (note: power-laws RDF are empirically observed for \( r \ll 20\eta \) \[8, 29\]). Note: we have chosen to define \( c_{st} \) using the ‘modulus’ (instead of the ‘negative’ of the power-law exponent) since it guarantees that \( q_r^D \) is negative (positive) when \( g(r) \) is an increasing (decreasing) function of \( r \), so that we are consistent with the fact that \( q_r^D \) is a diffusion flux. We note that both the CK theory and the current modified version assume \( St \ll 1 \).

Chun et al. \[12\] went further to provide a solution for \( c_1 \) (for collision-less particles, in the \( St \ll 1 \) limit):
\[ c_1 = \frac{A_{ck}}{B_{nl}} = \frac{A(St, r \gg d) \tau_n}{B_{nl}} , \] (16)
where have made explicit the dependence of \( A \) in this work and that it has a different definition (and dimension) compared to its counterpart in \[12\]. In the current context, \( c_1 \) maybe obtained via \[10\] or alternatively directly from the power-law exponent of \( g(r) \) in the range \( d \ll r \ll 20\eta \) as discussed above. Using values of the relevant parameters in our DNS, we found \( A_{ck} = \frac{A(St, r \gg d) \tau_n}{B_{nl}} \approx 5.6 St^2 \), which is 15\% smaller than the one found in \[12\], i.e. \( A_{ck} \approx \frac{0.397}{0.397} = 6.6 St^2 \). However, we have observed in our DNS that the direct method (by fitting power-laws to the RDFs in the suitable \( r \)-range) gives \( c_1 \) which is 3.2 \((1.9)\) times larger than the one obtained using \[10\] for the case of \( St = 0.054 \)(0.11).

A plausible interpretation of the discrepancy described just above is that there may be another missing dimensionless factor (of order unity, possibly weakly dependent on Reynolds-number) in the correct definition of \( q_r^D \). This could be a good subject for a detailed future study, here we close by noting that, by inspection, we found that if we further include a factor of \( 1/3.2 \) in the definition of \( q_r^D \), then the predicted \((W_r)\) using the integro-differential version of the theory (cf. main text, case \( St = 0.054 \)) is detectably closer to the DNS result in the \( r \sim d \) regime, but the agreement is strikingly better in the \( r \gg d \) limit (the latter should not come as a surprise as this is the regime of power-law RDFs and the factor-3.2 is exactly designed to reproduce the correct \( c_1 \)); for the differential version of the theory, the improvement is decisively strong for all \( r \).

**Relation Between \( g(r) \) and \( \langle P \rangle \).**

In the main text, we state that \( g(r) \equiv \langle P \rangle \), where \( V \) is the spatial volume of the full domain of the problem i.e. \((2\pi)^3 \) in the DNS. Justification: let \( g(\vec{r}) \) be the ratio of probability of finding a second particle at \( \vec{r} \) from a particle, to the probability of such finding in a perfectly random distributed particle population, thus:
\[ g(\vec{r}) \equiv \frac{\langle P(\delta x \delta y \delta z) \rangle}{\langle \delta x \delta y \delta z \rangle \langle P \rangle} = \langle P \rangle V \]. Further, since system is isotropic, \( g(\vec{r}) \equiv g(r) \).

** Lowest Order Phenomenological Model for Distribution of Particle Approach Angles \( P(\theta) \).**

We imagine the particles are small i.e. \( d \ll \eta \) and \( St \ll 1 \). The latter implies their trajectories are almost like fluid particles’, while the former implies that, viewed at the scale of interest \( r \sim d \), their trajectories are almost rectilinear (since the radii of curvature should proportional to \( \eta \)). Thus in the reference frame of a primary
particles, no secondary particle could have a trajectory, being straight-line, that has a history of collision with the volume of the primary (otherwise coagulation would have occurred and the secondary particle in question would cease to exist). In trigonometric terms, let \( \theta \) be the angle between the secondary particle’s velocity and its vector position in the rest frame of the primary particle, then we must have: 
\[
\sin^{-1}(d/r) \leq \theta \leq \pi, \text{ with condition that } \sin^{-1}(x) \in \left[-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}\right].
\]

From the above, we could then compute the MRV, \( \langle w_r \rangle_s \), as a sum of the positive (i.e. \( w_r > 0 \)) and negative branches (with proper statistical weights \[28\], i.e. \( p \) for possible skewness of the probability distribution of \( w_r \), being straight-line, that has a history of collision with the volume of the primary (otherwise coagulation would have occurred and the secondary particle in question would cease to exist). In trigonometric terms, let \( \theta \) be the angle between the secondary particle’s velocity and its vector position in the rest frame of the primary particle, then we must have: 
\[
\sin^{-1}(d/r) \leq \theta \leq \pi, \text{ with condition that } \sin^{-1}(x) \in \left[-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}\right].
\]

From the above, we could then compute the MRV, \( \langle w_r \rangle_s \), as a sum of the positive (i.e. \( w_r > 0 \)) and negative branches (with proper statistical weights \[28\], i.e. \( p \) for possible skewness of the probability distribution of velocity): 
\[
\langle w_r \rangle_s = p_- \langle w_r | w_r < 0 \rangle_s + p_+ \langle w_r | w_r \geq 0 \rangle_s.
\]

The negative branch \( p_- \langle w_r | w_r < 0 \rangle_s \) is unaffected by collision-coagulation and we thus express it as a simple linear function of \( r \) that follows from the Kolmogorov (1941) phenomenology \[28\], i.e. \( p_- \xi - r \), where \( \xi \sim \sqrt{\varepsilon/(15\nu)} \).

**Prediction of the Peak Location of the RDF Using the Differential Form of the Drift-Diffusion Equation.**

\[
\begin{align*}
p_+ \langle w_r | w_r \geq 0 \rangle_s &= p_+ \int_0^\infty dw_r P_w(w_r) w_r \int_0^\pi d\theta P_\theta^+(\theta) \cos(\theta) \\
&= p_+ \int_0^\infty dw_r P_w(w_r) w_r \left[ \int_0^\pi d\theta P_\theta^+(\theta) \cos(\theta) + \int_\theta_m^0 d\theta P_\theta^+(\theta) \cos(\theta) \right] \\
&= p_+ \int_0^\infty dw_r P_w(w_r) w_r \int_0^\pi d\theta P_\theta^+(\theta) \cos(\theta) \left[ 1 + \frac{\int_\theta_m^0 d\theta P_\theta^+(\theta) \cos(\theta)}{\int_0^\pi d\theta P_\theta^+(\theta) \cos(\theta)} \right] \\
&= p_+ \xi + r \left[ 1 + \frac{\int_\theta_m^0 d\theta P_\theta^+(\theta) \cos(\theta)}{\int_0^\pi d\theta P_\theta^+(\theta) \cos(\theta)} \right],
\end{align*}
\]

where in the last line, we have replaced the first two integrals, combined, with the Kolmogorov (1941) estimate, where \( \xi \sim \sqrt{\varepsilon/(15\nu)} \).

A finite \( R_x^* \) inhibit us from locating the peak of the RDF using \[17\] à la \[16\] i.e. without knowing \( g(r) \), since \( g(r) \) could no longer be factored out when \( \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \) was 0. However, we argue that \[17\] could still give a reasonably accurate account of the peak location. For the case of \( St = 0.05 \), at \( r = 3d \) (the approximate peak location), we found the DNS data gives:
\[
-\tau_\eta B_{nl} r^4 \frac{\partial g}{\partial r} + g(r) \left[ r^2 \langle W_r \rangle - Ar^3 \right] = -R_x^*, \quad (17)
\]

The general solution for the first-order non-homogenous ordinary differential equation (see \[30\]), with \( \langle w_r \rangle_s \) given by the model in the main text, is:
\[
g(r) = \frac{1}{\beta(r)} \left[ \int \beta(r) q(r) dr + C \right], \quad (18)
\]
with \( q(r) = R^*_c / (\tau_B n r^4) \); \( \beta(r) = \exp \left[ \int p(r) dr \right] \) and \( p(r) = [A r - \langle w_r \rangle] / (\tau_B n r^2) \). For the current model described in the main text, the integral in (18) could not be expressed in terms of simpler canonical functions. Hence, for specific applications, we currently anticipate that some sort of power-law expansion or asymptotic reduction (if not numerical integration) would be needed to produce problem specific analytical approximations.