

The physics of dense suspensions

Christopher Ness,¹ Ryohei Seto,^{2,3} and Romain Mari⁴

¹School of Engineering, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH9 3FG, United Kingdom; email: chris.ness@ed.ac.uk

²Wenzhou Institute, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Wenzhou, Zhejiang 325000, China; email: seto@wiucas.ac.cn

³Oujiang Laboratory, Wenzhou, Zhejiang 325000, China

⁴Université Grenoble Alpes, CNRS, Laboratoire Interdisciplinaire de Physique (LIPhy), 38000 Grenoble, France; email: romain.mari@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr

Keywords

soft matter, dense suspensions, rheology, non-Newtonian fluids, jamming

Abstract

Dense suspensions of particles are relevant to many applications and are a key platform for developing a fundamental physics of out-of-equilibrium systems. They present challenging flow properties, apparently turning from liquid to solid upon small changes in composition or, intriguingly, in the driving forces applied to them. The emergent physics close to the ubiquitous jamming transition (and to some extent the glass and gelation transitions) provides common principles with which to achieve a consistent interpretation of a vast set of phenomena reported in the literature. In light of this, we review the current state of understanding regarding the relation between the physics at the particle scale and the rheology at the macroscopic scale. We further show how this perspective opens new avenues for the development of continuum models for dense suspensions.

1. INTRODUCTION

Suspensions of particles in liquid are found throughout nature and industry, with examples ranging from mud, magma and blood to cement, paint and molten chocolate. Often solid and fluid are mixed in roughly equal proportion, leading to a thick or “pasty” consistency, see Figure 1 **a**. The widespread use of these dense suspensions is enabled by extensive experimental characterization and empirical modelling of their mechanical behavior, or *rheology*, allowing one to estimate e.g. the thickness of a poured coating, the energy required to stir a slurry, or the extent of a mudslide. Nonetheless, there are so far no accepted continuum theories; we have not yet identified the dense suspension analog of the Navier–Stokes equations. Doing so requires us to understand the relationship between composition and material properties, that is, to develop a physics of suspensions.

This effort has a rich and extensive history, dating back at least to Einstein (1). The physics of suspensions has long been seen primarily as a fluid mechanical problem, in which the dynamics are dominated by viscous stresses induced by the presence of particles. This perspective led to Batchelor’s successful theory for dilute suspensions of solid volume fraction $\phi \lesssim 0.1$ (2). More concentrated suspensions, however, display behaviors that have proven elusive to the fluid mechanical approach, in particular their tendency to transition reversibly from liquid to solid depending on the applied stress. Ketchup, for instance, will only flow out of the bottle under *large* stresses, whereas cornstarch suspensions (c.f. Dr. Seuss’s Oobleck) will only flow smoothly under *small* stresses.

The reminiscence of phase transitions motivated the development of near-equilibrium statistical mechanics approaches (notably mode-coupling theory) to some of these problems in the 2000s, often attributing the emergence of solidity to a glass transition (see for instance (3)). While this approach proved a powerful tool for *colloidal* suspensions, in many cases the particles are too large to be significantly influenced by Brownian motion; these suspensions are far from equilibrium. More recently, researchers started to explore an analogy between dense suspensions and dry granular materials, which at the macroscopic scale led to a highly influential constitutive law, the “ $\mu(J)$ ” rheology (4). This further triggered intense interest in the microscopic parallels between these two materials, in particular in the role of particle contact forces and associated friction in the stress of dense *granular* suspensions. The present review centers mostly on the recent developments of this approach, and how a coherent physics of dense suspensions is emerging from it. As we will see, the rheology of a dense suspension is intimately linked to an underlying out-of-equilibrium transition known as jamming, occurring when the solid volume fraction ϕ reaches a critical value ϕ_J . By accounting for the proximity of ϕ to this critical value, which, crucially, is stress-dependent through many aspects of particle-level physics, one can understand broad spectra of rheology in a consistent way.

Dense suspensions are a mainstay of soft matter science: understanding their physics is crucial in many industrial settings and is of fundamental relevance. This (necessarily short and incomplete) review aims to equip the reader with an intuitive starting point from which to tackle the vast and varied physics of dense suspensions. Each of the topics covered deserves its own detailed review—indeed many of these have been written and will be cited (see e.g. (5, 6, 7, 8)). In what follows, we first outline the pertinent features of dense suspensions. We then introduce jamming in Section 2, before discussing in Section 3 how the macroscopic rheology is governed by microscopic physics that set the proximity to the transition. In Section 4 we show how microscopic physics can be encoded in continuum models, before introducing some aspects of the fluid mechanics of dense suspensions.




Figure 1

Dense suspensions. **a** A particle-laden film comprising $250\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ – $450\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ glass beads in glycerol (9). Figure reprinted with permission from Zhou et al., *Physical Review Letters* 94:117803 (2005); copyright (2005) the American Physical Society; **b** a model system of $1.4\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ monodisperse silica spheres (10). Figure reprinted with permission from Fusier et al., *Journal of Rheology* 62(3):753–771 (2018); copyright (2018) The Society of Rheology; **c** calcium carbonate particles of approximately $5\text{ }\mu\text{m}$, with irregular shape (11). Figure adapted with permission from Bossis et al., *Rheologica Acta* 56:415–430 (2017); copyright (2017) Rheologica Acta;

1.1. What are dense suspensions?

Dense suspensions represent a large subset of complex fluids and can vary considerably in their physical and chemical composition. Here we briefly list the main sources of physical variability and the characteristics that make a comprehensive description of their physics challenging.

The particles may be stiff solids of arbitrary shape (see Figure 1 **b, c**) with crystalline or amorphous structure, or may instead be soft materials such as hydrogel particles or red blood cells. We focus here on particles that can, to a first approximation, be considered rigid, Figure 2 **a**. While there are no strict bounds on the particle size a , we restrict the discussion to $\mathcal{O}(100)\text{nm} \lesssim a \lesssim \mathcal{O}(1)\text{mm}$. Such particles are orders of magnitude larger than their molecular constituents and can, in principle, be characterized using continuum mechanics concepts such as their Young modulus. Crucially, though, they are usually not *macroscopic* bodies, and nanometre scale physics remain relevant. The marriage of macroscopic and microscopic physics distinguishes their interactions from those between molecules.

Surface effects in particular play a major role in the interactions between particles (12). Often surfaces are “dressed”, either by adsorbed molecules such as polymer brushes or by ion/counterion double layers, providing repulsion (Figure 2 **b**) at length scales typically in the nm to μm range (5). At this scale surface roughness is also present, as are Van der Waals forces (5). The former may allow the lubrication singularity to be violated; the latter may introduce particle attraction (Figure 2 **c**). To complicate matters further, concepts from the physics of dry granular contacts, for instance friction (Figure 2 **d**), adhesion and force chains (13) (Figure 2 **e**), appear relevant (14). Sliding friction in particular has been observed at particle level in systems varying considerably in their composition (15, 16), though its origin may differ from that between macroscopic bodies. In both cases, surface morphology probably plays a central role, but whereas for large bodies this creates multi-contact interfaces with statistics leading to Amontons–Coulomb law (17), for small particles contact through one or few asperities may be the norm (dependent on the extent of contact deformation), giving rise to load-weakening friction (18, 19). Combining all of these effects,




Figure 2

Schematics of dense suspension microphysics. **a** A suspension of rigid particles; **b** repulsive interactions; **c** attractive interactions; **d** particle-particle friction, showing inhibited sliding (rough particles highlighting surface asperities, green arrows) and inhibited rolling (faceted particles, red arrows); **e** a jammed state (force chains in orange); **f** hydrodynamics, showing lubrication (short arrows) and drag (long arrows); **g** Brownian motion; **h** shear induced structure showing particle contact forces (orange lines) under a shear flow (streaming velocity shown in blue arrows); **i** particle migration (red arrows), under a shear rate gradient (blue arrows) with a gradient in the magnitude of particle contact forces (orange lines); **j** free surface, showing curvature of the interface on the scale of the particle size a , leading to capillary forces.

the situation is sufficiently complex that there are no established force models applicable across the size range of interest: understanding how particles interact is a challenge.

The fluid, or solvent, is the main factor differentiating suspensions from dry granular media. It mediates hydrodynamic interactions, Figure 2f, and can be a simple liquid (e.g. water), a polymeric fluid (e.g. filled thermoplastics), or a complex, multiphase fluid (e.g. the cement paste in fresh concrete). In general these may have dissolved ions and molecules that influence the interactions described above, via e.g. a change of pH or dielectric constant. Here we focus on Newtonian suspending fluids with constant viscosity η_f and density ρ_f . The fluid contributes a dissipative stress scale $\eta_f \dot{\gamma}$ (for shear rate $\dot{\gamma}$) and ensures incompressibility of the system, which plays a major role at macroscopic scales (e.g. (20)). Additionally, thermal fluctuations in the fluid velocity generate Brownian forces on particles, which is especially relevant at the lower end of particle size range considered here, Figure 2g.

Crowded conditions. Although it has no formal definition, a ‘dense’ suspension is usually taken to be one with solid and liquid mixed in roughly equal proportion. Under these conditions, the typical particle separation is smaller than the particle size and small strains may bring their surfaces into contact (or near-contact). Short-range interactions such as pairwise repulsion/attraction are therefore important. Meanwhile long-range, many-body hydrodynamics are screened by intervening particles, and the emerging consensus is that these are negligible in dense systems. Lubrication forces also remain relevant at a quantitative level only (21). Increasing ϕ , suspensions generically undergo a *jamming* transition, described later, from a flowable state to a solid state in which particle contact forces span the system. The exact nature of jamming is sensitive to particle-level details, but, as we will see below, it bears some features of a continuous transition. We define a dense suspension as one for which the macroscopic behaviour is governed by physics associated with the

proximity to this jamming transition.

Out-of-equilibrium. For the particle size range of interest here, the restoring force towards equilibrium, Brownian motion, may act over timescales comparable to, or longer than, a typical observation period. This can be quantified by the Stokes–Einstein relation for the diffusion coefficient $\mathcal{D} \equiv k_B T / 6\pi\eta_f a$ (with k_B the Boltzmann constant and T the temperature), leading to a diffusive timescale $a^2/\mathcal{D} = 6\pi\eta_f a^3/k_B T$. For a small molecule this is $\approx 10^{-10}$ s and the local state is always very near equilibrium. Meanwhile for a particle of radius $a = 1\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ in water at room temperature it is ≈ 1 s. The a^3 dependence ensures that in many practical conditions, where typical timescales are indeed of order 1 s, Brownian forces can be neglected when $a > 1\text{ }\mu\text{m}$. Suspensions of such particles—these are called non-Brownian, athermal, or granular suspensions and will be the focus of much of this article—are thus practically always out of equilibrium. The exploration of configuration space therefore occurs not by thermal motion but only as a result of external driving. Consequently there is strong history dependence, and statements about macroscopic phenomena must be associated with a characterization of the prior strain protocol. Without this, there is no reference (equilibrium-like) state.

This out-of-equilibrium nature leads to non-Newtonian macroscopic stresses. For simple fluids, which are Newtonian, normal and shear stresses are dominated by distinct physical mechanisms: the former come from the stiffness of molecular interactions; the latter come from molecular diffusion inducing momentum diffusion. For suspensions, when describing the stress Σ , one can distinguish the fluid stress Σ_f coming from the solvent (often a simple fluid for which the above considerations hold) from the particle stress Σ_p due to mechanical forces transmitted through the solid phase. With diffusion suppressed (or at least as slow as the shear itself), both normal and shear particle stresses originate in particles’ inability to follow the fluid streamlines and their tendency to adopt a shear-induced structure, Figure 2h. The particle (and, hence, the total) stress components are thus not independent of each other as they are for a simple liquid.

These distinguishing features make dense suspensions not amenable to an equilibrium description. We therefore proceed by first giving an overview of the out-of-equilibrium phase transitions necessary to understand their behavior.

2. OUT-OF-EQUILIBRIUM PHASE BEHAVIOUR

Borrowing concepts from dry granular physics, we first address the phase transition of major relevance to much of the discussion that will follow on non-Brownian suspensions, jamming. We then give brief overviews of two transitions associated with Brownian suspensions (the glass transition), and suspensions of attractive particles, acknowledging that separate reviews should be consulted for these important topics (22, 23).

2.1. Jamming transition

We consider non-Brownian, neutrally buoyant, repulsive particle suspensions, which generically transition from being flowable at low ϕ to being solid (and having a yield stress) at large ϕ . These limits are separated by a jamming transition, occurring at a critical volume fraction ϕ_J (≈ 0.64 for monodisperse frictionless spheres) beyond which all motion is blocked due to widespread particle-particle contacts (as sketched in Figure 2e). Above ϕ_J , a (quasi-static) strain can only occur by deforming the particles, which is not possible when

Stress: tensorial quantity Σ describing the force per unit area acting on the suspension. We write a general shear stress as σ and pressure as $p \equiv -\text{Tr}(\Sigma)/3$

Strain rate: tensorial quantity $\mathbf{E}$ defined as the symmetric part of a velocity gradient tensor $\nabla \mathbf{u}$: $\mathbf{E} \equiv (\nabla \mathbf{u} + \nabla \mathbf{u}^T)/2$. We write a general scalar strain rate $\dot{\gamma}$.

Viscosity: Relation between $\mathbf{E}$ and the deviatoric part of Σ . For a Newtonian fluid at hydrostatic pressure p , the viscosity η is a (single) scalar parameter, reflecting the material character: $\Sigma = -p\mathbf{I} + 2\eta\mathbf{E}$

they are rigid. Jamming is not specific to suspensions: it occurs in dry granular matter, emulsions and other amorphous materials (24). It shares some features with equilibrium continuous phase transitions, especially diverging length scales, though other quantities, such as the number of contacts, may (dependent upon the protocol c.f. the preparation dependence mentioned above) vary discontinuously across the transition (25).

The location of the transition, i.e. the value of ϕ_J , is sensitive to many microscopic details and also depends on the history of the sample (26). Most importantly, inter-particle friction (quantified with dimensionless coefficients), which constrains rotational as well as translational particle motion, strongly affects jamming. All friction modes (sliding, rolling and twisting) contribute to a decrease in ϕ_J (27), as does increasing the value of the friction coefficients. It is particle-shape (28, 29) and size-distribution dependent: broadening the particle size distribution from monodisperse to polydisperse leads to a larger ϕ_J (30, 31).

These observations can be understood in a unified way by considering the appearance of isostaticity. The suspension jams when just enough particle contacts form to constrain all degrees of freedom in the system (32). This happens when the average number of contacts per particle z reaches a critical isostatic value z_c . In general the value of z_c can be inferred from apparently simple Maxwellian constraint counting arguments (33), though this rapidly becomes involved for cases more complicated than frictionless spheres, as each contact may constrain multiple degrees of freedom (34). Below jamming, i.e. $\delta z \equiv z_c - z > 0$, the system is underconstrained, and there are $N\delta z/2$ floppy modes in a system of N particles. These modes represent collective degrees of freedom along which the system can be deformed without elastic cost. Floppy modes are spatially extended; due to the crowded conditions, moving a particle requires cooperative motion of other particles in the vicinity.

Jamming has some features consistent with a continuous transition. Structural and mechanical properties behave singularly as a function of the distance to jamming $\delta\phi \equiv \phi_J - \phi$ (or equivalently as a function of δz), and the associated exponents are often nontrivial (35, 36). In particular, several lengthscales diverge at the transition. Their identification and role is slowly emerging, with frictionless systems being better understood. The most relevant for this review is the correlation length of the velocity field (37) (or the non-affine velocity field in the case of a sheared system), quantifying the cooperativity of motion in crowded conditions. Velocity correlations decay to zero on a typical length scale $l \sim \delta\phi^{-\lambda}$, with numerical results for frictionless spheres giving $\lambda \approx 0.6 - 1$ (38). They can be quantitatively linked to the statistics of floppy modes, and scaling theory predicts that $l \sim 1/\sqrt{\delta z}$ and $\lambda \approx 0.43$ (36).

This diverging length scale is central to the rheology close to jamming, and is argued to be the origin of a divergence in the suspension viscosity η , occurring at ϕ_J (38). The physical picture is that correlated motion leads to non-affine velocities via a “lever” effect, which results in enhanced viscous dissipation (39). The exact scaling relation (if any) between l and η is obscure, however, even for frictionless spheres. In a caricature of correlated motion where particles are grouped in clusters of size l rotating as rigid bodies (40), equating for a cluster the injected power $\propto \eta_f \dot{\gamma}^2 l^d$ to the dissipated power $\propto n \eta_f \dot{\gamma}^2 l^{d+2}$ (with n the particle number density), one finds that $\eta \propto l^2$. This is certainly too simplistic, however, as reaching ϕ_J from below the zero-shear viscosity (i.e. measured with infinitesimal shear stress) indeed diverges as $\eta \sim (\phi_J - \phi)^{-\beta}$, but with β significantly larger than 2λ , as we will see in Section 3. Indeed, while eddies following approximately a rigid-body motion have a size of order l and lead to the dominant decay of velocity correlations, there may be a secondary decay on a much longer length scale due to flow-induced contact anisotropy (41).

The associated correlation length, diverging faster than l at jamming, would account for the viscosity divergence.

The jamming transition is thus key to understanding the rheology of dense suspensions and will form a central part of our discussion in what follows, but it is not the only relevant transition.

2.2. Glass transition

Brownian systems similarly undergo a transition from a flowable to a non-flowable state when increasing ϕ . This is the colloidal glass transition, occurring at ϕ_G (42), above which particles are trapped in cages formed by their neighbors. The glass transition is distinct from jamming (43), and we refer to other reviews for details about its phenomenology (44). The most relevant aspects for Brownian suspensions in this review are that (i) the transition occurs before frictionless jamming, $\phi_G < \phi_J$ (for low polydispersity rigid spheres $\phi_G \approx 0.58$), (ii) below ϕ_G the zero-shear viscosity diverges in a super-exponential fashion, typically fitted with $\eta \sim \exp\{A/(\phi_G - \phi)^\delta\}$ (to be contrasted with the algebraic divergence at jamming), and (iii) at ϕ_G a finite yield stress proportional to $k_B T$ (43) appears discontinuously (whereas at jamming the yield stress appears continuously).

2.3. A note about attractive interactions

In the presence of attractive interactions, particles can stick together into clusters that eventually span the system forming an elastic network with a yield stress (45). For Brownian systems, competition between $k_B T$ and attraction leads to complex ϕ -dependence (46). The resulting colloidal glass and gelation behaviour is an extensive and challenging topic and is reviewed elsewhere, see e.g. (23). Meanwhile in non-Brownian systems the role of attraction near jamming is still emerging (47).

In what follows, we replace our labels for ϕ_J and ϕ_G with a more general, stress-dependent limiting volume fraction $\phi_m(\sigma)$, representing the value of ϕ at which the suspension viscosity η diverges. This is often still a *jamming* point, but in the presence of Brownian or attractive forces the divergence may have contributions from multiple physics.

3. RHEOLOGY AND MICROSCOPIC PHYSICS

Having introduced the transitions that occur as ϕ approaches ϕ_m , we now discuss how the proximity to them is relevant in determining the macroscopic response, in particular the rheology under uniform flow (conditions in which the strain rate is spatially uniform). In general the suspension viscosity η diverges at $\phi = \phi_m$, and complex rheology can be understood as stress- or rate-controlled changes to the dominant microphysics, in many circumstances leading to stress dependence in ϕ_m itself. Such a scheme is sketched in Figure 3a. Here we illustrate how a monotonic $\phi_m(\sigma)$ (the physics of which we consider below) leads naturally to distinct stress-dependent viscosity divergences (whose form may follow e.g. $\eta \sim [\phi_m(\sigma) - \phi]^{-\beta}$) and thus to rate-dependent rheology $\eta(\sigma, \phi)$. Rather than following a top-down approach to addressing macroscopic phenomenology, we instead consider systematically the microscale physics sketched in Figure 2. Our focus is not on the origin of microscopic forces *per se* but rather on their effect on the rheology. For experimental and computational methodologies — rheometry — we refer the reader to other reviews (see e.g.

(48, 49)). We take as our starting point the idealised case of *rate-independent* suspensions (for which ϕ_m is independent of σ), before addressing rheology that arises in more complex cases, systematically examining physics that are *one dimensionless parameter* away from the rate-independent case.

3.1. A reference point: rate-independent suspensions

Consider a dense suspension of non-Brownian, neutrally buoyant, rigid particles in a Newtonian fluid, subject to a steady deformation slow enough that fluid and particle inertia can be neglected. In practice this can be approximated with a suspension of $\approx 10 \mu\text{m}$ glass particles in an appropriate solvent under typical rheometric conditions. Such a system plays a special model role that has proven to be hugely influential in understanding many other classes of suspensions, as we will see in what follows.

Dimensional analysis. The microscopic quantities involved in the problem are the typical particle size a and density ρ_p , and the fluid viscosity η_f and density ρ_f (with $\rho_p = \rho_f$). For rigid particles there is no microscopic energy or force scale. The macroscopic quantities are the control volume size L (this is taken to be sufficiently larger than a so that we consider bulk phenomena) and the solid fraction ϕ therein. Finally the deformation is characterized by its rate $\dot{\gamma}$, the applied stress σ , and the time for which it was applied, t . (This notation is conventional for simple shear, but the following argument applies generally.) Buckingham π implies that there are 4 dimensionless numbers besides ϕ . Appropriate choices are the Stokes number $St \equiv \rho_p \dot{\gamma} a^2 / \eta_f$, the Reynolds number $Re \equiv \rho_f \dot{\gamma} L^2 / \eta_f$, the relative suspension viscosity $\eta_r \equiv \eta / \eta_f = \sigma / \eta_f \dot{\gamma}$, and the strain $\gamma = \dot{\gamma} t$.

As stated earlier, we take as our reference point suspensions for which particle and fluid inertia can be neglected, corresponding, respectively, to $St = 0$ and $Re = 0$. We then conclude that η_r must be a function of ϕ and γ only. This is a strong statement: it implies that the stress is linear in the deformation rate, as for a Newtonian fluid, and that the proportionality factor, the suspension viscosity η , only depends on ϕ and γ . Furthermore, in steady state (the $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$ limit, in practice typically achieved for $\gamma = \mathcal{O}(1)$), η_r is function of ϕ only.

This analysis (which follows Krieger (50)) can be extended to any component of the stress tensor, though these do not each necessarily share the same parity with $\dot{\gamma}$. While shear stresses (or more generally the dissipative part of the stress tensor (51)) are linear in $\dot{\gamma}$, normal stresses, which for a rate-independent suspension are always negative (pushing outward), are linear in $|\dot{\gamma}|$. Depending on the system, the list of dimensionless numbers will be augmented, most notably by the particle friction coefficient(s). Recent measurements show that friction is indeed a generic feature of direct contacts among μm (and larger) sized particles (15, 16), though the non-dimensionality of the coefficient ensures (assuming friction is Coulombic) that this alone does not introduce rate dependence. This *quasi-Newtonian* result will form the basis for our discussion of more complex, rate-dependent, suspensions in what follows.

Rheology under steady flow. Under a steady imposed deformation rate tensor, rate-independent suspensions can thus be characterized by a set of material functions (51) all depending on ϕ only. As expected from the discussion in Section 2.1, these are all singular at jamming, typically behaving asymptotically as $(\phi_m - \phi)^{-\beta}$ (4).

Here ϕ_m typically represents a frictional jamming point (but see Section 3.4 below). Many experiments (4, 52) as well as simulations of spherical particle suspensions (39, 53) are consistent with $\beta \approx 2$, although quite different values have also been reported, with a possible dependence on the sliding friction coefficient μ_p (54, 55, 56). In a simplified model of frictionless sphere flow, for which the exponent can be determined with higher precision thanks to efficient numerical methods and to scaling theory linking β to other independently measurable exponents, one finds $\beta \approx 2.8$ (57). For long rodlike particles, it has been experimentally measured as $\beta \approx 1$ (58).

This rheology can also be formulated from an alternative (but equivalent), particle-pressure-imposed, perspective. Boyer et al (4) demonstrated (and verified experimentally) that in simple shear the stress anisotropy, or macroscopic friction coefficient, μ (which in simple shear is $\mu \equiv \sigma/P_p$, with P_p a measure of the particle pressure) and ϕ are functions of the so-called viscous number $J \equiv \eta \dot{\gamma}/P_p$ only. Knowing $\mu(J)$ and $\phi(J)$, we can use that $\eta/\eta_f = \mu(J)/J$ and invert the $\phi(J)$ relation to recover the volume-imposed rheology, that is, a rate-independent viscosity depending on ϕ only. Here jamming corresponds to $J \rightarrow 0$. In this limit, $\phi(J) \sim \phi_m - aJ^{1/\beta}$ and $\mu(J) \sim \mu^* + bJ^\xi$ (4), such that $\eta \sim (\phi_m - \phi)^{-\beta}$. Importantly, μ^* is finite, implying that particle normal and shear stresses share the same asymptotics close to jamming. As with ϕ_m , μ^* depends on microscopic details. For frictionless ($\mu_p = 0$) spheres, $\mu^* \approx 0.1$ (59), whereas for $\mu_p \gtrsim 0.1$, $\mu^* \approx 0.3\text{--}0.4$ (60). Interestingly, the large friction limits for μ^* and ϕ_m occur at quite distinct values of μ_p (60).

Microstructure evolution and flow history dependence. For rate-independent suspensions, statements about the macroscopic rheology must be associated with a description of their strain history (though the *rate* at which this history was explored is unimportant). An initial transient of a few strain units ($\gamma = \mathcal{O}(1)$) (64) is generally observed upon flow start-up, after which the memory of initial conditions is lost and particles have, thanks to shear-induced diffusion (65), sampled a statistically representative part of the configuration space. Steady states (with $\gamma \gg 1$) are thus unambiguously defined, independent of the prior sample history, and are the usual reference points for characterising rate-independent rheology.

Dense suspensions usually exhibit microstructural anisotropy, details of which depend on the deformation being applied, see e.g. Figure 2h. This is often characterized at the level of the statistics of some particle interaction director $\mathbf{n}$, usually via its averaged second moment, referred to as the structure, texture or fabric tensor $\langle \mathbf{n}\mathbf{n} \rangle$ (see also Section 4). During steady state flow, this tensor is often found to be aligned with the deformation rate tensor (66, 67). The microstructural anisotropy is mirrored at the macroscopic level by the stress anisotropy μ , although their exact relation remains elusive. For frictionless spheres near jamming, microstructural anisotropies bias the floppy mode statistics in favor of flow-resisting modes, leading to larger μ (36). Meanwhile, first and second normal stress differences quantify, respectively, stress anisotropy in and out of the flow plane (51, 54, 68).

Together, the finite transient in the strain (64, 69) and the shear-induced structure give rise to an anisotropic stress response: the viscosity of a rate-independent suspension is largest when the strain rate and microstructure tensors align. This is readily illustrated under unsteady flow conditions such as shear reversal (64) and oscillatory shear (70). When the direction of the applied flow changes more rapidly than a steady microstructure can establish (i.e. accumulating strains $\gamma < 1$ before reversal), the result is a systematically lower




Figure 3

Dense suspension rheology, showing schematics (**a**, **b** and top panels of **c**, **d**, **e**) and experimental data (bottom panels of **c**, **d**, **e**, with $\eta_r \equiv \eta/\eta_f$). **a** Schematic relating the viscosity $\eta(\sigma, \phi)$ to $\phi_m(\sigma)$; **b** schematic showing qualitative $\phi_m(\sigma)$ behaviour in the presence of one (blue and green) and two (red to magenta) characteristic stress scales, σ_1 and σ_2 . **c** Top: Schematic showing decreasing $\phi_m(\sigma)$; Bottom: Experimental data showing shear thickening in a suspension of $a \approx 260$ nm silica particles in a polyethylene glycol solvent at three different ϕ (61). Figure adapted with permission from Cwalina and Wagner, *Journal of Rheology* 58(4):949–967 (2014); copyright (2014) The Society of Rheology; **d** Top: Schematic showing increasing $\phi_m(\sigma)$; Bottom: Experimental data showing shear thinning in a suspension of $a \approx 4$ μm ground calcium carbonate particles in a glycerol-water mixture at a range of ϕ (62). Figure adapted with permission from Richards et al, *Rheologica Acta* 60:97–106 (2021); copyright (2021) Rheologica Acta; **e** Top: Schematic showing $\phi_m(\sigma)$ for (top to bottom) increasing attraction. Bottom: Experimental data for a suspension of $a \approx 90$ μm soda-lime glass spheres in mineral oil at $\phi = 0.56$. Shown (bottom to top) are increasing applied electric field strengths, controlling attractive interactions (63). Figure adapted with permission from Brown et al, *Nature Materials* 9:220–224 (2010); copyright (2010) Springer Nature.

viscosity than in steady shear. An extreme case of this is the remarkable phenomenon of shear jamming (13, 71), in which a suspension is jammed under a previously applied deformation, but not jammed with respect to others. Separately, the behaviour under repeated reversals reveals, for sufficiently small strain amplitude, contact-free states (72), indicating the presence of a nearby absorbing state (73).

3.2. Particle Inertia

At the upper end of our size range ($a \approx 1$ mm), particle inertia can be significant, i.e. $St = \mathcal{O}(1)$, even at modest $\dot{\gamma}$. Dimensional analysis then implies an inertial stress that scales with $\rho_p a^2 \dot{\gamma}^2 g(\phi)$, the so-called Bagnold scaling (74), consistent with experimental (75, 76)

and numerical (77, 78, 79) observation. Assuming that viscous ($\propto \dot{\gamma}$) and inertial ($\propto \dot{\gamma}^2$) stresses are additive, one concludes that the former will dominate at low shear rates and the latter at high rates, with a crossover occurring at $\dot{\gamma}_{\text{in}}$. Above $\dot{\gamma}_{\text{in}}$, the rate-independence described above thus gives way to a stress that is quadratic in $\dot{\gamma}$ (leading to $\eta \propto \dot{\gamma}$), a form of continuous shear thickening.

As with rate-independent flow, inertial rheology can be expressed in constant pressure terms. Whereas J characterises the rheology under purely viscous conditions, the appropriate dimensionless shear rate under purely inertial conditions is the inertial number $I \equiv a\dot{\gamma}\sqrt{\rho_p/P_p}$ with μ and ϕ now functions of I only (80, 81). Generally, a viscous regime is expected for $St = I^2/J \ll 1$, and an inertial one for $St \gg 1$ (79).

A central and unresolved question is that of the dependence (if any) of $\dot{\gamma}_{\text{in}}$ on ϕ when approaching ϕ_m . The inertial and viscous stresses are expected to scale, respectively, as $\dot{\gamma}^2(\phi_m - \phi)^{-\beta_i}$ and $\dot{\gamma}(\phi_m - \phi)^{-\beta_v}$ (81), with ϕ_m usually considered the same for both since inertia shouldn't affect the isostaticity condition (though a stringent test of this is absent). Equating the stress contributions at the crossover leads to $\dot{\gamma}_{\text{in}} \sim (\phi_m - \phi)^{-\beta_v + \beta_i}$. Several numerical works report $\beta_v = \beta_i = 2$, or equivalently that μ and ϕ are functions of a composite number $K = J + \alpha I^2$ with $\phi_m - \phi \sim K^{1/2}$ (53, 79). Meanwhile others (82, 83, 84), as well as experiments (85), report $\beta_i > \beta_v$ (usually $\beta_i \approx 2\beta_v \approx 4-5$, compatible with scaling theory for flow near jamming (36, 56), which predicts $\beta_i = 2\beta_v \approx 5.7$), implying that inertia is relevant down to a Stokes number vanishing with proximity to jamming. However, the stress below which inertia can be neglected is $\eta\dot{\gamma}_{\text{in}} \sim (\phi_m - \phi)^{-2\beta_v + \beta_i}$, which remains finite at jamming if $\beta_i = 2\beta_v$.

3.3. Brownian motion

Following the *rule of thumb* in Section 1, Brownian forces become important for particles with $a < 1\mu\text{m}$, leading to the characteristic stress scale $k_B T/a^3$ (86) becoming relevant. Thermal fluctuations allow such Brownian particles to explore configuration space in the absence of external driving, so that an underlying 'equilibrium' phase diagram might be defined (42) (though often in practice the system will not reach equilibrium over typical observable time scales).

Under flow, the competition between characteristic timescales for particle diffusion, which acts to re-disperse any shear-induced microstructure and restore equilibrium, and convection, which drives the system out-of-equilibrium, is quantified by a dimensionless shear rate, the Péclet number $Pe \equiv 6\pi\eta_f a^3 \dot{\gamma}/k_B T$. This controls a crossover between the relative importance of the Brownian and viscous stresses. The former is sublinear in $\dot{\gamma}$ due to Pe dependence of the microstructure (87), and thus Brownian suspensions typically shear thin (88, 89). There may be a high shear (in practice this means $Pe \gg 1$) viscosity plateau, where rate-independence is recovered (unless other physics intervene, see below).

An alternative perspective may be to consider Brownian shear thinning as the consequence of a Pe -controlled change in the limiting volume fraction ϕ_m (90). It is established that the viscosities of Brownian and non-Brownian suspensions diverge at distinct points (5, 89), and these may be associated with the glass ϕ_G and jamming ϕ_J transitions respectively (recalling that $\phi_J > \phi_G$). Hence, increasing Pe at a given ϕ leads to ϕ_m increasing from ϕ_G to ϕ_J , resulting in shear thinning (or indeed yielding if $\phi_G < \phi < \phi_J$ (90)).

3.4. Repulsive interactions

In reality particles usually have repulsive interactions acting over a finite range, stabilising them against clustering, inhibiting contact formation, and setting a force scale that is absent in the rigid particles considered so far. These interactions may originate in electrostatics, polymer coatings, or from other physics (Brownian motion may provide an effective repulsion (91)). Importantly, a characteristic repulsive stress F_r/a^2 competes with the viscous one $\propto \eta_f \dot{\gamma}$, and a dimensionless shear rate can be defined e.g. as $\dot{\gamma}/(F_r/\eta_f a^2)$. Details, including the range of the repulsive force, control how this quantity governs the effective proximity to ϕ_m and the consequent rate-dependence that emerges.

As mentioned in Section 3.1, direct contacts among μm (and larger) sized particles are typically frictional. The short range repulsive interactions described above act to inhibit the formation of such contacts between particles, maintaining lubrication layers and thus limiting (in a stress-controlled manner) the role played by friction. The implications of this are profound and far-reaching (for a review, see (7)). As the applied stress σ is increased relative to an *onset* stress $\sigma^* \propto F_r/a^2$, the repulsive barrier is overcome and particle contacts increasingly transition from the lubricated to the frictional contact state. (The $1/a^2$ dependence ensures that particles larger than a few microns are persistently frictional.) With friction present, fewer contacts are required for mechanical equilibrium i.e. z_c is reduced (34). ϕ_m will consequently *reduce*, from a frictionless limit $\phi_m^{(0)} \equiv \phi_m(\sigma/\sigma^* \rightarrow 0)$ to a lower, frictional value $\phi_m^{(1)} \equiv \phi_m(\sigma/\sigma^* \rightarrow \infty)$, as illustrated by the solid light blue line in Figure 3. Under fixed ϕ , therefore, increasing σ brings the suspension closer to jamming, by reducing $\phi_m(\sigma) - \phi$. This “frictional transition” mechanism (encoded in a popular constitutive model (92), described later) provides a generic route to shear thickening, distinct from the inertial Bagnoldian rheology described above (93). (When present, inertia may nonetheless contribute to mediation of particle contacts, thereby playing a role in a dynamic transition mechanism and enabling repulsionless frictional shear thickening (83, 15).) It was proposed based on theory and simulation (14, 92, 40) and has been confirmed by a series of experiments, see (15, 94, 95) among many others. Example experimental flow curves $\eta(\sigma, \phi)$ are shown in Figure 3c (61).

The extent of shear thickening increases as ϕ approaches $\phi_m^{(1)}$. Close to this value, the viscosity increase becomes discontinuous (indeed theory predicts that $\dot{\gamma}$ becomes non-monotonic in σ), while above it flow stops at stresses of order σ^* . Shear thickening by this mechanism bears some hallmarks of a phase transition: increasing correlation lengths; stress fluctuations (96); separation into lubricated and frictional states (97, 98, 99).

The above discussion applies generally to repulsive particles, while increasing the *range* of repulsion can introduce a separate effect. There exists a characteristic particle separation h for which the repulsive force balances the typical viscous force $\propto \eta_f \dot{\gamma} a^2$. Here, $a_{\text{eff}} \equiv (a + h/2)$ acts as the *effective* radius of a larger, soft particle, leading to an effective $\phi_{\text{eff}} > \phi$. The viscosity, now set by e.g. $\eta \sim (\phi_m - \phi_{\text{eff}})^{-\beta}$, is thus enhanced by the presence of the repulsive force (there may even be a finite yield stress if $\phi_{\text{eff}} > \phi_m$). As $\dot{\gamma}$ increases, the force balance (assuming the repulsive force increases with decreasing separation) dictates that h decreases, as do a_{eff} and ϕ_{eff} (though this must remain $\geq \phi$). The system consequently moves further from ϕ_m , leading to reduced η . Low- $\dot{\gamma}$ shear thinning arising by this simple argument is a common feature of experimental rheology data (100).

3.5. Attractive interactions

When present and sufficiently large, van der Waals (or other, for instance depletion) forces lead to attraction between particles. This introduces a competition between aggregation processes (sticking particles together and providing elasticity (101)) and shearing processes (breaking particles apart). Steady shear generically breaks attractive bonds between particles, destroying larger flocs or clusters and leading to shear thinning (102, 103, 104), a typical characteristic of *pastes* (105). For Brownian particles, aggregation processes are well-understood in the context of colloidal gelation (23) and their influence on the rheology is well-established (5).

For non-Brownian particles, however, aggregation is instead driven by external forces, often shear itself (106). There is some evidence that the same general picture of shear thinning due to breaking aggregates applies both for weakly attractive particles (107) and rods (108), and more strongly attractive systems (109, 110). In the absence of shear, meanwhile, numerical evidence (47) suggests that attraction reduces ϕ_m in non-Brownian, frictionless systems. Recent experimental measurements support the fact that weak attraction can enhance particle contacts (111) and even stabilise them against rolling (62). The combination of attraction and restricted tangential motion, *adhesion* (or *cohesion* if the particles are identical), generates a yield stress at lower volume fractions still, details of which are heavily protocol dependent (112). Shearing at sufficiently large σ is argued to break adhesive contacts and relieve tangential constraints on particles, contrary to stress-induced friction which introduces sliding constraints as the stress is increased. Under steady shear, therefore, ϕ_m is reported to increase with σ (solid green line in Figure 3), providing evidence that the yielding and shear-thinning rheology of attractive, non-Brownian suspensions (an example experimental flow curve $\eta(\sigma, \phi)$ is shown in Figure 3d (62)) might be characterised within the same framework of stress controlled changes to ϕ_m (113) (see also (114)). It is not yet clear whether the few numerical works on attractive, frictional suspensions corroborate this (115, 116), in part due to the challenge of precisely defining particle contact models comprising attraction, rolling and sliding friction.

3.6. More complex suspensions

Most suspensions will, in practice, have more than one relevant stress scale, with various physics from the Sections above being important under typical operating conditions. For example, the combined effects of increasing and decreasing ϕ_m due to, respectively, an adhesive stress (62) (or indeed a Brownian stress (117)) and a repulsive stress, can lead to non-monotonic rheology. We show such an example in Figure 3e, taking experimental data from (63) (other examples include (118)). By tuning the relative importance of one of the dimensionless groups (in the example shown this is achieved by manipulating the attraction), one tunes between shear thinning and thickening rheology. This might be characterised as a transition, as a function of σ , across a multidimensional ϕ_m map, Figure 3b. Here we plot such a surface (following (113), see Section 4.2) comprising both ϕ_m -reducing and ϕ_m -increasing physics. Besides the limiting cases depending on only one stress scale (in blue is a typical shear-thickening suspension; in green is an adhesive, shear thinning one), a more general scenario with two (or more) stress scales ($\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots$) that lead to much richer $\phi_m(\sigma)$ may be useful to interpret the rheology of more complex suspensions. For instance, Figure 3e links complex experimental rheological data to the putative $\phi_m(\sigma)$ map sketched in Figure 3b. It is, however, still too early to assert this scenario, and more experimental,

numerical, and theoretical works in this direction are needed.

Dense suspensions with a broad particle size distribution present more complexity still. Although polydispersity is known to increase ϕ_m and consequently decrease the viscosity of rate-independent suspensions (30), the effect of broad polydispersity on rate-dependent rheology is not well understood. Whereas for roughly monodisperse suspensions the microscopic stress scales described above map to macroscopic ones, for polydisperse suspensions this is more involved. In practice particle radii a may span 6 orders of magnitude (105). In such cases it is not clear how to define bulk dimensionless control parameters, which have, for instance, $St \propto a^2$, $Pe \propto a^3$ and contact friction onset $\sigma^* \propto 1/a^2$. Extending the descriptions above to such systems poses a challenge (119), as do numerous other sources of complexity (we list a few as Future Issues below).

4. CONTINUUM MODELS AND FLUID MECHANICS

The above insights can be utilised to make predictions of suspension behaviour in practical scenarios. Doing so requires continuum models, giving the time evolution of the velocity field, driven by the stress field through the Cauchy equation, and other macroscopically relevant fields (the list of which is itself a modelling challenge), such as microstructure and volume fraction. Such models must combine conservation laws with closures for the coupling terms relating the different fields.

We first address constitutive equations, i.e. closures relating the stress tensor to the (history of) deformation. These should describe both steady and transient phenomena, the latter encoding the relative slowness (dictated by the shear rate) of the microstructural evolution. We limit the discussion to *local* models, acknowledging that non-local phenomena, relatively well-studied in dry granular matter (see e.g. (120, 121)), likely play a role in suspensions near ϕ_m . We then give a brief introduction to two-phase continuum equations, necessary for describing flows involving migration, relative motion between solid and liquid phases (Figure 2i). We conclude with a brief overview of some relevant aspects of the fluid mechanics of dense suspensions.

4.1. Rate-independent microstructural constitutive models

As briefly introduced in Sec. 3.1, the stress is strongly coupled to the anisotropy of the microstructure. The mathematical nature of the stress (being a 2nd order, symmetric tensor) naturally calls for a coupling with a suitably defined fabric tensor. The main approach for rate-independent suspensions thus follows the anisotropic fluid theory of Hand (122). This addresses the time evolution of a fabric tensor $\langle \mathbf{nn} \rangle$ under a velocity gradient tensor $\nabla \mathbf{u}$. The director $\mathbf{n}$ represents, for instance, the orientation of particle contacts. If $\mathbf{n}$ is not uniformly distributed, its typical orientation is given by the eigenvector of $\langle \mathbf{nn} \rangle$ associated to the largest eigenvalue. Such a theory then consists of an expression for the stress tensor Σ as a function of $\langle \mathbf{nn} \rangle$ and the symmetric part of the deformation rate tensor $\mathbf{E} \equiv (\nabla \mathbf{u} + \nabla \mathbf{u}^T)/2$, and a dynamics for $\langle \mathbf{nn} \rangle$. The latter depends on $\nabla \mathbf{u}$ and is constrained by frame indifference when particle inertia is negligible (see Sec. 4.3 in (123)), and for a homogeneous system is:

$$\Sigma = \Sigma(\langle \mathbf{nn} \rangle, \mathbf{E}), \quad \frac{D\langle \mathbf{nn} \rangle}{Dt} = \mathcal{F}(\langle \mathbf{nn} \rangle, \mathbf{E}), \quad 1.$$

with $D\langle \mathbf{nn} \rangle / Dt \equiv d\langle \mathbf{nn} \rangle / dt + \langle \mathbf{nn} \rangle \cdot \boldsymbol{\Omega} - \boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \langle \mathbf{nn} \rangle$ the co-rotational (or Jaumann) derivative and $\boldsymbol{\Omega} \equiv (\nabla \mathbf{u} - \nabla \mathbf{u}^T)/2$. There are two routes to such a theory. The first is a phenomenological one, where one keeps the structural form of these equations as general as permitted by symmetries (e.g. (124, 125, 126)), which keeps the theory flexible at the cost of having many free parameters and little understanding of their microscopic origin. The other route is microstructural, with $\mathcal{F}(\langle \mathbf{nn} \rangle, \nabla \mathbf{u})$ derived from particle dynamics using simplifying assumptions (127, 128, 129). This limits the number of free parameters but involves (often uncontrolled) approximations, in particular the closure of higher moments of $\mathbf{n}$, such as $\langle \mathbf{nnnn} \rangle$ in terms of $\langle \mathbf{nn} \rangle$ (130, 125). While phenomenological models can achieve quantitative agreement with experimental data regarding the transient behavior of the shear stress in simple shear (126), their predictions for normal stresses (when tested) are usually poorer (131, 125) (although some aspects of the steady state behavior can be captured (132)).

Recent works revisited the microstructural route based on the physical picture of a nearby jamming transition, giving a quantitative agreement with simulations for shear stresses and a qualitative one for normal stresses (129). The key assumption is that due to the one-sidedness of rigid particle contacts (which dominate the rheology close to jamming), the microstructure reacts in a strikingly different manner to compressive and extensional strains. This motivates a phenomenological theory where, defining a decomposition $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{E}_c + \mathbf{E}_e$ one gives distinct roles to the compressive $\mathbf{E}_c$ and extensional $\mathbf{E}_e$ strain rate tensors in the dynamics of $\langle \mathbf{nn} \rangle$ and in the stress–structure relation (133).

These rate-independent equations may constitute a basis for the development of constitutive models for suspensions with more complex interactions, as we will discuss in the next subsection. It should however be noted that so far, even for works following the microstructural route, the stress–structure relation is phenomenological, and not derived from the microscopic dynamics. In particular, the viscosity divergence at jamming, when considered, is assumed to follow the algebraic form discussed in Section 3. Microscopically derived tensorial stress–structure relations are still lacking, even though real progress has been achieved for scalar relations in model suspensions (36, 56).

4.2. Constitutive models for rate-dependent suspensions

A typical approach in writing steady state rheological models is to define (for fixed ϕ) limiting $\eta_0 \equiv \eta(\dot{\gamma} \rightarrow 0)$ and $\eta_\infty \equiv \eta(\dot{\gamma} \rightarrow \infty)$ (in principle these can be measured experimentally) and then specify a smooth transition between them as a function of, e.g. $\dot{\gamma}_c/\dot{\gamma}$ or σ_c/σ (134). Such “rheological interpolation” models are widely used for the fitting of data (5), and in some instances $\dot{\gamma}_c$ (or σ_c) may provide microstructural insight (102).

As discussed in Section 3, the physics and rheology of several important classes of dense suspensions can be described as the result of an alteration of ϕ_m under flow due to the competition between applied stress and microscopic interparticle forces at work. This basic mechanism can be formalized with rheological interpolation models that *do* have a microscopic grounding, as shown initially by Wyart and Cates (92) in the context of shear thickening, and later extended by others (113).

These models address the activation and release, under stress, of particle-level *constraints*. These are pairwise interactions that reduce the number of degrees of freedom along which particle motion can occur (e.g. through friction or adhesion), thus altering ϕ_m . A measure of the degree of constraint is encoded in a fraction of activated constraints f ,

which is a function of some component of the applied stress, say the shear stress σ (some models instead use the particle pressure (92)). This function is usually given a sigmoidal shape around the typical stress σ_c needed to switch a microscopic constraint, such that $f(\sigma \ll \sigma_c) \rightarrow 0$ and $f(\sigma \gg \sigma_c) \rightarrow 1$. In turn, ϕ_m depends on f . In the absence of the microscopic constraint (for instance, absence of frictional contacts in the discussion in Sec. 3.4), $\phi_m(f = 0) = \phi_m^{(0)}$, whereas when the constraints are fully mobilized $\phi_m(f = 1) = \phi_m^{(1)}$ (for frictional contacts, $\phi_m^{(1)} < \phi_m^{(0)}$). As sketched in Figure 3 **a**, ϕ_m controls the viscosity through the divergence of η as, say, $\eta \sim (\phi_m - \phi)^{-2}$ (but this specific form is not a requirement). η is then an implicit function of σ , interpolating between $\eta = (\phi_m^{(0)} - \phi)^{-2}$ for $\sigma \ll \sigma_c$ to $\eta = (\phi_m^{(1)} - \phi)^{-2}$ for $\sigma \gg \sigma_c$. These models have been quite successful at predicting steady state rheology (94, 135) and also inhomogeneous flows and instabilities (99, 69) (see also (136) for an independent model with similar structure).

This mechanism can be extended to arbitrary numbers of constraint types and activation (or release) stresses, leading to a wide range of possible predicted rheologies (113), see examples in Figure 3 **b–e**. Such Wyart–Cates like interpolation models can also be extended to tensorial constitutive laws (137, 138), and constant particle pressure rheology (92, 139). While these models are motivated by a microscopic mechanism, they are in practice still phenomenological: in addition to the phenomenological viscosity divergence law, the relation $f(\sigma)$ is usually postulated, although it is suggested that it is controlled by force chain physics (94, 135, 93). This opens the possibility of deriving $f(\sigma)$ from microscopic statistical models (140).

4.3. Two-phase description

Many flows involve inhomogeneous deformation, sedimentation or particle migration (Figure 2 **i**), and one cannot describe the suspension as a single phase continuum. A two-phase description, coupling velocity, stress, and volume fraction fields for each phase, is necessary. Such a model consists of conservation laws written separately for the solid and fluid phases, which one can obtain via local volumetric averages (141). These involve a decomposition of the suspension stress into solid and fluid phase contributions (which are independently measurable (142, 143)), as well as a coupling term in the form of an interphase drag.

These equations do not however form a closed system, as the stresses and interphase drag have no exact expression in terms of phase velocities or volume fraction. Stresses are closed with a constitutive model, as discussed in the previous subsections. A popular drag closure is the suspension balance model (144, 145), which consists of expressing the drag term as proportional to the relative velocity between the two phases. This is in essence closely related to the approximation behind Darcy’s law for fluid flow through a porous solid phase. These aspects and their implications are addressed in a recent review (6).

4.4. Fluid mechanics

Most flows of dense suspensions—especially in nature and in engineering—are not well-approximated by spatially homogeneous, rheometric conditions. Instead, they typically involve spatial and temporal inhomogeneities in the stress, strain rate and volume fraction. These situations are currently the focus of a significant research effort, drawing attention to several subtle aspects introduced below.

The bulk effective fluid description of dense suspensions presented in the previous sections is certainly a key tool to understand fluid mechanical phenomena, but it is not suf-

ficient in itself. Flows involving non-uniform conditions require a two-phase description as described above, and raise the question of the non-locality of constitutive models (146). Non-uniform systems can also be the result of instabilities, due to underlying non-monotonic flow curves, leading to banding (147), or dynamic instabilities (20, 96, 99, 136, 148, 149, 150). Shear-induced migration is also important in non-uniform conditions (7, 151, 152, 153). Remarkably, there is a growing body of evidence that these instabilities are coupled to macroscopic deformation of the free surface, when present (98, 149, 154, 155).

The free surface poses a challenge as it represents a deformable confinement, constrained by both capillary forces and the incompressibility of the solvent. This is in striking contrast to dry granular systems, which are free to dilate. The role of the free surface in the flow of dense suspensions is in general subtle, as the large particle size makes it easy for them to individually deform the solvent-air interface. Curving a free surface on a particle radius scale a requires a stress scaling as $1/a$ to counteract the effect of capillary forces, see Figure 2j. For micron-sized particles, this is easily achieved even in a rheometer, and particle-poking through the interface or a visible mattification of the surface are often reported (9). The free surface is then a nontrivial boundary condition for the fluid mechanical problem, in practice not well approximated by either constant volume nor constant pressure conditions (156). The crucial role of the grain scale deformation of the free surface is highlighted by situations where the interface slowly recedes, like unwetting or drying, which often leads to interface instabilities, particle deposition patterns and granulation (157, 158, 159, 160). All these phenomena call for a careful modelling of the suspension free surface at the microscale, which is little-explored thus far, at least in the context of dense suspension rheology.

5. CLOSING REMARKS

We have presented a perspective on the physics of dense suspensions. Interpreting the macroscopic phenomenology of ‘real’ suspensions and constructing continuum descriptions on the basis of the simple microscopic arguments introduced here will clearly be nontrivial in most cases. Nonetheless, what we have presented are foundational concepts from which descriptions of more complex systems can be assembled. Doing so will require further study in many areas, some of which we propose below as Future Issues. Given the ubiquity of dense suspensions both as a model system in condensed matter physics and as an engineering material, there is no doubt that they will remain a topic of research and debate in future.

FUTURE ISSUES

1. Can suspensions of non-idealized particles (aggregates, fibres, rods, with arbitrary polydispersity) be approached by analogy to nearly monodisperse spheres, that is, only adjusting the values of key parameters like ϕ_m and the exponent β ?
2. How far can the insights presented here be carried to the physics of suspensions with non-Newtonian solvents? Recent work suggests that in some cases the rheology can be captured by an effective local shear rate in the solvent, controlled by geometry close to jamming (161).
3. The sensitivity of the jamming transition to the nature of particle contacts calls for more attention to, in particular, the physics of contacts with a few surface asperities (as opposed to the multi-contact interface paradigm of friction between macroscopic particles) (19).

4. The statistical physics connecting microscopic details to flow close to jamming is limited to frictionless spheres (41, 36). Is the floppy mode paradigm relevant with friction present (56)?
5. Suspensions with non-rigid constraints often have elastic structures. Can viscous continuum models such as those described above be augmented to account for these?
6. The boundary condition provided by free surfaces plays a major role but is poorly understood because it often involves particle-size curvature. What aspects of interfacial physics (such as contact angle and roughness anchoring) matter most at the boundary?
7. More generally, to what extent do the simplifications made here (limited role of hydrodynamics, rheometric conditions, etc.) need to be relaxed in order to describe real flows which may involve instabilities and secondary structures?

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The authors are not aware of any affiliations, memberships, funding, or financial holdings that might be perceived as affecting the objectivity of this review.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank M. Cates and E. Guazzelli for commenting on the manuscript. C.N. acknowledges support from the Royal Academy of Engineering under the Research Fellowship scheme. R.S. acknowledges the support from the Wenzhou Institute, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, under Grant No. WIUCASQD2020002.

LITERATURE CITED

1. Einstein A. 1911. *Annalen der Physik* 339:591–592
2. Batchelor GK. 1970. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 41:545–570
3. Fuchs M, Cates ME. 2002. *Physical Review Letters* 89:248304
4. Boyer F, Guazzelli É, Pouliquen O. 2011. *Physical Review Letters* 107:188301
5. Mewis J, Wagner NJ. 2012. *Colloidal suspension rheology*. Cambridge University Press
6. Guazzelli É, Pouliquen O. 2018. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 852
7. Morris JF. 2020. *Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics* 52:121–144
8. Denn MM, Morris JF. 2014. *Annual Review of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering* 5:203–228
9. Zhou J, Dupuy B, Bertozzi A, Hosoi A. 2005. *Physical Review Letters* 94:117803
10. Fusier J, Goyon J, Chateau X, Toussaint F. 2018. *Journal of Rheology* 62:753–771
11. Bossis G, Boustingorry P, Grasselli Y, Meunier A, Morini R, et al. 2017. *Rheologica Acta* 56:415–430
12. Israelachvili JN. 2011. *Intermolecular and surface forces*. Academic Press
13. Cates ME, Wittmer JP, Bouchaud JP, Claudin P. 1998. *Physical Review Letters* 81:1841–1844
14. Seto R, Mari R, Morris JF, Denn MM. 2013. *Physical Review Letters* 111:218301
15. Fernandez N, Mani R, Rinaldi D, Kadau D, Mosquet M, et al. 2013. *Physical Review Letters* 111:108301
16. Comtet J, Chatté G, Niguès A, Bocquet L, Siria A, Colin A. 2017. *Nature Communications* 8:15633

17. Johnson KL. 1985. Contact mechanics. Cambridge University Press
18. Chatté G, Comtet J, Niguès A, Bocquet L, Siria A, et al. 2018. *Soft Matter* 14:879–893
19. Lobry L, Lemaire E, Blanc F, Gallier S, Peters F. 2019. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 860:682–710
20. Nagahiro Si, Nakanishi H. 2016. *Physical Review E* 94:062614
21. Maiti M, Heussinger C. 2014. *Physical Review E* 89:052308
22. Berthier L, Biroli G. 2011. *Reviews of Modern Physics* 83:587–645
23. Zaccarelli E. 2007. *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* 19:323101
24. Liu AJ, Nagel SR. 1998. *Nature* 396:21–22
25. Liu AJ, Nagel SR. 2010. *Annual Reviews of Condensed Matter Physics* 1:347–369
26. Torquato S, Truskett TM, Debenedetti PG. 2000. *Physical Review Letters* 84:2064–2067
27. Santos AP, Bolintineanu DS, Grest GS, Lechman JB, Plimpton SJ, et al. 2020. *Physical Review E* 102:032903
28. Donev A, Cisse I, Sachs D, Variano EA, Stillinger FH, et al. 2004. *Science* 303:990–993
29. Hsiao LC, Jamali S, Glynos E, Green PF, Larson RG, Solomon MJ. 2017. *Physical Review Letters* 119:158001
30. Shapiro AP, Probst RF. 1992. *Physical Review Letters* 68:1422–1425
31. Hopkins AB, Stillinger FH, Torquato S. 2013. *Physical Review E* 88:022205
32. Alexander S. 1998. *Physics Reports* 296:65–236
33. Maxwell JC. 1864. *The London, Edinburgh, and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science* 27:294–299
34. Shundyak K, van Hecke M, van Saarloos W. 2007. *Physical Review E* 75:010301
35. Liu AJ, Nagel SR, Saarloos Wv, Wyart M. 2011. The jamming scenario—an introduction and outlook. Oxford University Press
36. DeGiuli E, Düring G, Lerner E, Wyart M. 2015. *Physical Review E* 91:062206
37. Olsson P, Teitel S. 2007. *Physical Review Letters* 99:178001
38. Heussinger C, Barrat JL. 2009. *Physical Review Letters* 102:218303
39. Andreotti B, Barrat JL, Heussinger C. 2012. *Physical Review Letters* 109:105901
40. Heussinger C. 2013. *Physical Review E* 88:050201
41. Düring G, Lerner E, Wyart M. 2014. *Physical Review E* 89:022305
42. Pusey PN, Van Megen W. 1986. *Nature* 320:340–342
43. Ikeda A, Berthier L, Sollich P. 2012. *Physical Review Letters* 109:018301
44. Hunter GL, Weeks ER. 2012. *Reports on Progress in Physics* 75:066501
45. Trappe V, Prasad V, Cipelletti L, Segre PN, Weitz DA. 2001. *Nature* 411:772–775
46. Larson RG. 1999. The structure and rheology of complex fluids. Oxford University Press
47. Koeze DJ, Tighe BP. 2018. *Physical Review Letters* 121:188002
48. Coussot P. 2016. Rheophysics. Springer
49. Maxey M. 2017. *Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics* 49:171–193
50. Krieger IM. 1963. *Transactions of the Society of Rheology* 7:101–109
51. Giusteri GG, Seto R. 2018. *Journal of Rheology* 62:713–723
52. Ovarlez G, Bertrand F, Rodts S. 2006. *Journal of Rheology* 50:259–292
53. Ness C, Sun J. 2015. *Physical Review E* 91:012201
54. Zarraga IE, Hill DA, Leighton DT. 2000. *Journal of Rheology* 44:185–220
55. Gallier S, Lemaire E, Lobry L, Peters F. 2014. *Journal of Computational Physics* 256:367–387
56. Trulsson M, DeGiuli E, Wyart M. 2017. *Physical Review E* 95:012605
57. Lerner E, Düring G, Wyart M. 2012. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 109:4798–4803
58. Tapia F, Shaikh S, Butler JE, Pouliquen O, Guazzelli E. 2017. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 827
59. da Cruz F, Emam S, Prochnow M, Roux JN, Chevoir Fmc. 2005. *Physical Review E* 72:021309
60. Chèvremont W, Chareyre B, Bodiguel H. 2019. *Physical Review Fluids* 4:064302

61. Cwalina CD, Wagner NJ. 2014. *Journal of Rheology* 58:949–967
62. Richards JA, O'Neill RE, Poon WC. 2020. *Rheologica Acta* :1–10
63. Brown E, Forman NA, Orellana CS, Zhang H, Maynor BW, et al. 2010. *Nature Materials* 9:220–224
64. Gadala-Maria F, Acrivos A. 1980. *Journal of Rheology* 24:799–814
65. Leighton D, Acrivos A. 1987. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 177:109–131
66. Parsi F, Gadala-Maria F. 1987. *Journal of Rheology* 31:725–732
67. Brady JF, Morris JF. 1997. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 348:103–139
68. Seto R, Giusteri GG. 2018. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 857:200–215
69. Han E, Wyart M, Peters IR, Jaeger HM. 2018. *Physical Review Fluids* 3:073301
70. Blanc F, Lemaire E, Peters F. 2014. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 746
71. Seto R, Singh A, Chakraborty B, Denn MM, Morris JF. 2019. *Granular Matter* 21:82
72. Pine DJ, Gollub JP, Brady JF, Leshansky AM. 2005. *Nature* 438:997–1000
73. Tjhung E, Berthier L. 2015. *Physical Review Letters* 114:148301
74. Bagnold RA. 1954. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences* 225:49–63
75. Savage SB, Mckeown S. 1983. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 127:453–472
76. Madraki Y, Oakley A, Nguyen Le A, Colin A, Ovarlez G, Hormozi S. 2020. *Journal of Rheology* 64:227–238
77. Verberg R, Koch DL. 2006. *Physics of Fluids* 18:083303
78. Kulkarni PM, Morris JF. 2008. *Physics of Fluids* 20:040602
79. Trulsson M, Andreotti B, Claudin P. 2012. *Physical Review Letters* 109:118305
80. Jop P, Forterre Y, Pouliquen O. 2006. *Nature* 441:727–730
81. Lemaitre A, Roux JN, Chevoir F. 2009. *Rheologica Acta* 48:925–942
82. Otsuki M, Hayakawa H. 2009. *Progress of Theoretical Physics* 121:647–655
83. Otsuki M, Hayakawa H. 2011. *Physical Review E* 83:051301
84. Vågberg D, Olsson P, Teitel S. 2016. *Physical Review E* 93:052902
85. Fall A, Lemaitre A, Bertrand F, Bonn D, Ovarlez G. 2010. *Physical Review Letters* 105:268303
86. Batchelor GK. 1977. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 83:97–117
87. Foss DR, Brady JF. 2000. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 407:167–200
88. Woods ME, Krieger IM. 1970. *Journal of Colloid and Interface Science* 34:91–99
89. de Kruif Cd, Van Iersel E, Vrij A, Russel W. 1985. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 83:4717–4725
90. Ikeda A, Berthier L, Sollich P. 2012. *Physical Review Letters* 109:018301
91. Trulsson M, Bouzid M, Kurchan J, Clément E, Claudin P, Andreotti B. 2015. *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* 111:18001
92. Wyart M, Cates M. 2014. *Physical Review Letters* 112:098302
93. Ness C, Sun J. 2016. *Soft Matter* 12:914–924
94. Guy B, Hermes M, Poon WC. 2015. *Physical Review Letters* 115:088304
95. Lin NY, Guy BM, Hermes M, Ness C, Sun J, et al. 2015. *Physical Review Letters* 115:228304
96. Rathee V, Blair DL, Urbach JS. 2017. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 114:8740–8745
97. Fall A, Bertrand F, Ovarlez G, Bonn D. 2009. *Physical Review Letters* 103:178301
98. Hermes M, Guy BM, Poon WC, Poy G, Cates ME, Wyart M. 2016. *Journal of Rheology* 60:905–916
99. Chacko RN, Mari R, Cates ME, Fielding SM. 2018. *Physical Review Letters* 121:108003
100. Maranzano BJ, Wagner NJ. 2001. *Journal of Rheology* 45:1205–1222
101. Rueb C, Zukoski C. 1997. *Journal of Rheology* 41:197–218
102. Cross MM. 1965. *Journal of Colloid Science* 20:417–437
103. Woutersen ATJM, De Kruif C. 1991. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 94:5739–5750
104. Rueb C, Zukoski C. 1998. *Journal of Rheology* 42:1451–1476

105. Roussel N, Lemaître A, Flatt RJ, Coussot P. 2010. *Cement and Concrete Research* 40:77–84
106. Guery J, Bertrand E, Rouzeau C, Levitz P, Weitz D, Bibette J. 2006. *Physical Review Letters* 96:198301
107. Snabre P, Mills P. 1996. *Journal de Physique III* 6:1811–1834
108. Chaouche M, Koch DL. 2001. *Journal of Rheology* 45:369–382
109. Zhou JZ, Uhlherr PH, Luo FT. 1995. *Rheologica Acta* 34:544–561
110. Kurokawa A, Vidal V, Kurita K, Divoux T, Manneville S. 2015. *Soft Matter* 11:9026–9037
111. Park N, Rathee V, Blair DL, Conrad JC. 2019. *Physical Review Letters* 122:228003
112. Richards JA, Guy BM, Blanco E, Hermes M, Poy G, Poon WCK. 2020. *Journal of Rheology* 64:405–412
113. Guy B, Richards J, Hodgson D, Blanco E, Poon W. 2018. *Physical Review Letters* 121:128001
114. Wildemuth C, Williams M. 1984. *Rheologica Acta* 23:627–635
115. Pednekar S, Chun J, Morris JF. 2017. *Soft Matter* 13:1773–1779
116. Singh A, Pednekar S, Chun J, Denn MM, Morris JF. 2019. *Physical Review Letters* 122:098004
117. Laun HM. 1984. *Die Angewandte Makromolekulare Chemie: Applied Macromolecular Chemistry and Physics* 123:335–359
118. Gopalakrishnan V, Zukoski C. 2004. *Journal of Rheology* 48:1321–1344
119. Guy BM, Ness C, Hermes M, Sawiak LJ, Sun J, Poon WCK. 2019. *Soft Matter* 16:229–237
120. Bouzid M, Izzet A, Trulsson M, Clément E, Claudin P, Andreotti B. 2015. *The European Physical Journal E* 38:125
121. Kamrin K, Koval G. 2012. *Physical Review Letters* 108:178301
122. Hand GL. 1962. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 13:33–46
123. Phan-Thien N, Mai-Duy N. 2017. *Understanding viscoelasticity—an introduction to rheology*. Springer International Publishing
124. Goddard J. 2006. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 568:1–17
125. Chacko RN, Mari R, Fielding SM, Cates ME. 2018. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 847:700–734
126. Ozenda O, Saramito P, Chambon G. 2018. *Journal of Rheology* 62:889–903
127. Hinch EJ, Leal LG. 1976. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 76:187–208
128. Phan-Thien N. 1995. *Journal of Rheology* 39:679–695
129. Gillissen JJJ, Ness C, Peterson JD, Wilson HJ, Cates ME. 2019. *Physical Review Letters* 123:214504
130. Szeri AJ, Leal LG. 1994. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 262:171–204
131. Stickel JJ, Phillips RJ, Powell RL. 2007. *Journal of Rheology* 51:1271–1302
132. Ozenda O, Saramito P, Chambon G. 2020. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 898
133. Gillissen JJJ, Wilson HJ. 2018. *Physical Review E* 98:033119
134. Carreau PJ. 1972. *Transactions of the Society of Rheology* 16:99–127
135. Royer JR, Blair DL, Hudson SD. 2016. *Physical Review Letters* 116:188301
136. Nakanishi H, Nagahiro Si, Mitarai N. 2012. *Physical Review E* 85:011401
137. Singh A, Mari R, Denn MM, Morris JF. 2018. *Journal of Rheology* 62:457–468
138. Baumgarten AS, Kamrin K. 2019. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 116:20828–20836
139. Dong J, Trulsson M. 2017. *Physical Review Fluids* 2:081301
140. Mari R, Seto R. 2019. *Soft Matter* 15:6650–6659
141. Jackson R. 1997. *Chemical Engineering Science* 52:2457–2469
142. Deboeuf A, Gauthier G, Martin J, Yurkovetsky Y, Morris JF. 2009. *Physical Review Letters* 102:108301
143. Dbouk T, Lemaire E, Lobry L, Moukalled F. 2013. *Journal of Non-Newtonian Fluid Mechanics* 198:78–95
144. Nott PR, Brady JF. 1994. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 275:157–199
145. Nott PR, Guazzelli E, Pouliquen O. 2011. *Physics of Fluids* 23:043304
146. Gillissen JJJ, Ness C. 2020. *Physical Review Letters* 125:184503

147. Besseling R, Isa L, Ballesta P, Petekidis G, Cates ME, Poon WCK. 2010. *Physical Review Letters* 105:268301
148. Saint-Michel B, Gibaud T, Manneville S. 2018. *Physical Review X* 8:031006
149. Ovarlez G, Le AVN, Smit WJ, Fall A, Mari R, et al. 2020. *Science Advances* 6:eaay5589
150. Rathee V, Blair DL, Urbach JS. 2020. *Journal of Rheology* 64:299–308
151. Leighton D, Acrivos A. 1987. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 181:415–439
152. Altobelli SA, Givler RC, Fukushima E. 1991. *Journal of Rheology* 35:721–734
153. Medhi BJ, Reddy MM, Singh A. 2019. *Advanced Powder Technology* 30:1897–1909
154. Balmforth N, Bush J, Craster R. 2005. *Physics Letters A* 338:479–484
155. Darbois Texier B, Lhuissier H, Forterre Y, Metzger B. 2020. *Communications Physics* 3:1–7
156. Brown E, Jaeger HM. 2012. *Journal of Rheology* 56:875–923
157. Tang H, Grivas W, Homentcovschi D, Geer J, Singler T. 2000. *Physical Review Letters* 85:2112
158. Eriksen JA, Toussaint R, Måløy KJ, Flekkøy E, Galland O, Sandnes B. 2018. *Physical Review Fluids* 3:013801
159. Iveson SM, Litster JD, Hapgood K, Ennis BJ. 2001. *Powder Technology* 117:3–39
160. Cates ME, Wyart M. 2014. *Rheologica Acta* :1–10
161. Dagois-Bohy S, Hormozi S, Guazzelli É, Pouliquen O. 2015. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 776