Viscous flows in hyperelastic chambers

Eran Ben-Haim, Dotan Ilssar, Yizhar Or and Amir D. Gat†

Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, Technion - Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa 3200003, Israel

(Received xx; revised xx; accepted xx)

Viscous flows in hyperelastic chambers are relevant to many biological phenomena such as inhalation into the lung’s acinar region and medical applications such as the inflation of a small balloon in minimally invasive procedures. In this work, we analytically study the viscous flow and elastic deformation created due to inflation of such spherical chambers from one or two inlets. Our investigation considers the constitutive hyperelastic law coupled with the flow dynamics inside the chamber. We derive a closed-form expression for the inflation dynamics, accounting for the effect of elastic bi-stability. Interestingly, the obtained pressure distribution shows that the maximal pressure on the chamber’s surface is greater than the pressure at the entrance to the chamber. The analytically calculated velocity- and pressure-fields during inflation are compared to a fully coupled finite element scheme, showing excellent agreement. Our results allow capturing the balloon’s viscous resistance to inflation/deflation, thus enabling us to model the process of inflation/deflation and the induced stress fields.
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1. Introduction

The inflation of elastic balloons has been extensively investigated in the past, mainly because the corresponding dynamics depend on both the flow and the balloon’s material elasticity model. The inflation of a toy balloon or a spherical membrane was studied thoroughly by Beatty (1987). In his work, Beatty (1987) has presented an analysis of an incompressible, isotropic hyperelastic spherical pressurized membrane. According to his work, and similar results by Treloar (1975), the Mooney-Rivlin elasticity model successfully captures most of the overall physical effect. The majority of the research done so far considered hydrostatic uniform pressure distribution within the chamber and the determination of pressure as a constant parameter that uniformly affects the elastic walls (Needleman 1977; Treloar 1975; Beatty 1987; Vandermarlière 2016; Hines et al. 2017; Mangan & Destrade 2015).

Balloons with controlled inflation are used in medical applications such as pleural pressure assessments (Milic-Emili et al. 1964), and enteroscopy (Yamamoto et al. 2001). A recent study by Manfredi et al. (2019) shows a promising biomedical application of a soft robot for a colonoscopy, which utilizes a double-balloon system for achieving inchworm-like crawling while bracing against the colonic walls. Haber et al. (2000) investigated alternating shear flow over a self-similar, rhythmically expanding hemispherical depression. Quasi-steady creeping flow in models of small airway units of the lung was
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investigated by Davidson & Fitz-Gerald (1972). Issar & Gat (2020) studied the inflation and deflation dynamics of a liquid-filled hyperelastic balloon, focusing on inviscid laminar flow. In those systems, the characteristic time it takes for the pressure to reach a constant uniform value in a chamber is assumed to be much shorter than the time it takes for the fluid to pass through the tubes (based on the viscous resistance). However, to assess the fluid and elastic shell’s dynamics, a complete mathematical model describing the system’s fluid-structure interaction at Low-Reynolds numbers is needed. The study of the fluid-structure interaction dynamics of low-Reynolds-number incompressible liquid flows and elastic structures may help introduce a new level of control in fluid-structure based autonomous systems due to the presence of viscous force (Elbaz & Gat 2014, 2016).

In the Soft-Robotics field, recent studies show the propulsion of elastic structures embedded with internal cavities while controlling pressures or flow rates at the network’s inlets (Ben-Haim et al. 2020; Salem et al. 2020; Gamus et al. 2017; Siefert et al. 2019; Fei & Gao 2014; Fei & Pang 2016; Overvelde et al. 2013; Gorissen et al. 2019). In the case of fluidic actuation, several works study variations of the well-known ‘two-balloon system’, whereas others study networks of multiple connected chambers (Ben-Haim et al. 2020; Dreyer et al. 1982; Treloar 1975; Glozman et al. 2010). As shown by these studies, the main effect that enables state transitions in a pressurized thin hyperelastic chamber, namely its bi-stability, which induces multiple solutions of possible volumes for a given pressure. Since the hyperelastic spherical membranes are multi-stable systems, it allows to selectively inflate each balloon to one of its stable states by varying the input according to a particular carefully synthesized profile. Consequently, it can pave the way toward manufacturing soft robots that utilize minimal actuation to produce highly complex locomotion.

In this work, we examine the effect of elasticity on transient creeping flow in the bi-stable hyperelastic chambers. The chamber is assumed to be an ideal sphere. The flow field is modeled by a fourth-order bi-harmonic differential equation with an implicit time variable, while the elastic chamber is modeled by thin hyperelastic Mooney-Rivlin constitutive law. In our work, the balloon’s pressure distribution has been derived without assuming the uniform pressure. This distribution has a pronounced effect on the stress in the elastic material. Moreover, it is necessary to formulate the flow’s dynamic equations to investigate particles’ dynamics within the flow.

This work’s structure is as follows: in §2 the geometry, relevant parameters and physical assumptions are defined. In §3 the hyperelastic Mooney-Rivlin constitutive law is presented. The strain energy function is analyzed in order to present the bi-stable phenomena. Section §4 presents closed-form solutions of the governing equations, described the flow field within an expanding chamber. In §5 three different physical cases are described. The degenerated case of forced motion of chamber walls with given inlet pressure is described in §5.1 where we obtained the chamber’s stretch as a function of time and the pressure distribution in the chamber. The case of dictated inlet mass rate coupled by the hyperelastic model is described in §5.2 where numerical verification of the fully coupled model is presented. In §5.3 we present the third case where dictated inlet pressure and hyperelastic model is governed the flow dynamics. Section §6 examines the dynamic behavior of two interconnected bi-stable chambers. Concluding remarks are presented in §7.

2. Problem formulation

In this section, we present the problem definition, along with the physical parameters relevant to the analysis and the small non-dimensional parameters. The examined liquid-
Filled chamber is illustrated in Figure 1. Here, a spherical geometry is assumed (this assumption will be verified by numerical simulation in §5.2). A spherical hyperelastic chamber with a stress-free radius of $r_0$, is connected to two rigid tubes with radius $a$ and length $\ell$. For simplicity, we assume identical tubes in the inlet and the outlet. Here, the flow-field inside the chamber and tubes is considered incompressible, Newtonian, and with negligible inertial effects. The fluid’s axial velocity inside the tube is $u_z$, and the volumetric flux rate is denoted $q(t)$ (where $q_{in}(t)$ refers to the flow entering the body from the inlet tube and $q_{out}(t)$ refers to the flow moving from the body through the outlet tube). The relevant variables and parameters are the time $t$, the axial coordinate and symmetry axis $z$, and the radial coordinate $\tilde{r}$ of the cylindrical system used to describe the tubes. Axisymmetry allows to eliminate the polar angle of the cylindrical system. Furthermore, the pressure and flow velocity fields of the entrapped fluid are $p(t)$ and $\mathbf{v}(t, \tilde{r})$, while its constant density and dynamic viscosity are denoted $\rho$ and $\mu$. The chamber’s dynamics are approximated by a single degree of freedom, represented here by the chamber’s instantaneous radius, denoted $\eta(t)$. For spherical geometry, a coordinate system is chosen so that one of the coordinates remains constant on the boundary. Here, $\{r, \theta, \phi\}$ are the coordinates of a non-inertial spherical system, located at the center of the chamber, where $\theta$ is the polar angle, measured from the axis of symmetry to the radial coordinate $r$, and $\phi$ is the azimuthal angle, revolving around the axis of symmetry, $z$. The Cauchy-stress tensor of the flow denoted as $\sigma_f$. The stress-free shell’s thickness is $w_0$, which is considered to be much smaller than the stress-free chamber’s radius, namely $w_0 \ll r_0$.

The following analysis utilizes three small parameters, including the ratio between the radius of the tube and the radius of the stress-free chamber,

$$\epsilon_a = \frac{a}{r_0} \ll 1,$$  

(2.1)
the slenderness of the tube,
\[ \epsilon_t = \frac{a}{\ell} \ll 1, \quad (2.2) \]
and the last small parameter in the analysis is taken as the ratio between the viscous stresses and the hydrostatic stresses flow defined by
\[ \varepsilon = \frac{\mu v^*}{r_0 p^*} \ll 1, \quad (2.3) \]
where \( v^* \) and \( p^* \) are the characteristic flow velocity and pressure, respectively. For the following analysis, we shall normalize the physical variables by considering the characteristic values of the problem as follows:
\[ V = \frac{v}{v^*}, \quad \nabla = \frac{r_0}{r} \nabla, \quad \sigma_f = \frac{\sigma_f}{p^*}, \quad R = \frac{r}{r_0}, \quad \lambda = \frac{\eta}{r_0}, \quad P = \frac{p}{p^*}, \quad T = \frac{t}{r_0/v^*}, \quad (2.4) \]
where \( \lambda(T) \) denote the stretch of the chamber, and \( R \) is the normalized radial coordinate.

3. Formulation of a constitutive model for bi-stable thin membrane made of hyperelastic material

This section presents the constitutive law that governs the spherical shell dynamics. We consider a thin-shelled, spherical chamber made of incompressible hyperelastic isotropic material. Finite elasticity theory dictates a known form of the elastic strain energy density, which depends only on the relative stretch, \( \psi(\lambda) \). Different types of hyperelastic models differ in the type of material and the elastic strains experienced without failing. Some most common models are neo-Hookean, Mooney-Rivlin, Ogden, Gent and Biological tissue (Ogden 1972; Beatty 1987). It is assumed that the material’s elastic strain energy density functions depend only on the chamber’s stretch, \( \lambda(T) \). Moreover, the elastic strain energy density satisfies \( \psi(1) = 0 \). The material is assumed to be incompressible, which leads to the relation between the pressurized and the stress-free states, given by \( r^2 w \approx r_0^2 w_0 \). Thanks to this relation, the chamber’s instantaneous thickness is eliminated.

To capture the chambers’ bi-stability, we use the two-parameter Mooney-Rivlin model. Under the above assumptions, and considering incompressibility, the normalized solid’s Mooney-Rivlin strain energy function is given by (Ogden 1972; Beatty 1987),
\[ \hat{\psi}(\lambda) = 2\lambda^2 + \frac{1}{\lambda^4} - 3 + \alpha \left( \lambda^4 + \frac{2}{\lambda^2} - 3 \right) \quad (3.1) \]

where \( \alpha = s_2/s_1 \) is the ratio between the empirically determined constants, chosen here as \( s_1 \approx 1.5\text{[MPa]} \) and \( s_2 \approx 0.15\text{[MPa]} \) (Beatty 1987; Treloar 1975). From (3.1), it is clear that the strain energy density function must be normalized by \( \psi^* = s_1 \), and the magnitude of the parameter \( \alpha \) is \( O(10^{-1}) \).

We first study the chamber’s static behavior, where the pressure (without flow) is dictated. In this case, both the stretch and the pressure are constant, denoted here by \( \lambda_{SS} \) and \( P_{SS} \), respectively. The behavior mentioned above can be demonstrated by the overall effective potential energy of the system,
\[ U(\lambda_{SS}; P_{SS}) = \int_{\lambda_{SS}} \left( \frac{d\psi}{d\xi} - \xi^2 P_{SS} \right) d\xi = \hat{\psi}(\lambda_{SS}) - \frac{1}{3} \lambda_{SS}^3 P_{SS}. \quad (3.2) \]

Based on (3.2), Figure 2(a) shows a curve of the potential energy function where the
constant pressure is $P_{SS} = 2.75$. The Mooney-Rivlin relation (3.1), along with the steady version of the leading order energy balance (3.2), formulated as $\partial U / \partial \lambda_{SS} = 0$ at constant pressure $P_{SS}$, yields a relation between stretch, $\lambda_{SS}$, and pressure, $P_{SS}$, in equilibrium condition,

$$P_{SS} = \left( \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \frac{d\psi}{d\lambda} \right)_{\lambda_{SS}} = 4 \left[ \frac{1}{\lambda_{SS}} - \frac{1}{\lambda_{SS}^2} + \alpha \left( \lambda_{SS} - \frac{1}{\lambda_{SS}} \right) \right]; \quad 0 < \alpha \ll 1. \tag{3.3}$$

This well-known relation was extensively leveraged to describe the quasi-static inflation of spherical balloons (Beatty 1987; Treloar 1975; Ben-Haim et al. 2020) for spatially uniform pressures. As seen from Figure 2(a), showing the relation in (3.3) with $\alpha = 0.1$, the uniform pressure of the chamber is not monotonic with respect to the radius. Therefore, the inverse relation, describing the chamber’s radius as a function of the pressure, cannot be directly extracted. The curve $P_{SS}(\lambda_{SS})$ in Figure 2(b) has two bifurcation points, described by a local maximum point at $(\lambda_A, P_A)$, and a local minimum point at $(\lambda_B, P_B)$. This figure shows a bifurcation, which occurs when the pressure enters or exits the range between the local extrema, $P_A < P_{SS} < P_B$, illustrated in grey. An asymptotic approximations for the bifurcation points of the equilibrium curve, $P_A, P_B, \lambda_A$ and $\lambda_B$, appears in Appendix A. The evolution of those extrema as a function of the small parameter $\alpha$ is presented in Figure 2(d).

Analyzing the strain energy function $U(\lambda_{SS}; P_{ss})$ in Equation (3.2), using the second derivative with respect to $\lambda_{SS}$, it can be proven that the right and left branches of $P_{SS}(\lambda_{SS})$ where $1 < \lambda < \lambda_A$ or $\lambda_B < \lambda$ are stable equilibria and satisfy,

$$\frac{\partial^2 U}{\partial \lambda_{SS}^2} |_{P_{ss}} = \frac{dP_{SS}}{d\lambda_{SS}} > 0. \tag{3.4}$$

Conversely, the intermediate branch $\lambda_A < \lambda_{SS} < \lambda_B$ is an unstable region satisfying $\partial^2 U / \partial \lambda_{SS}^2 < 0$. This is precisely the bi-stability phenomenon.

The next curve we examine is the solution of the equilibrium equation (3.3). Since the equation has no analytical solution, we shall find an asymptotic approximation by separating the solution into three main regions, as shown in Figure 2(c). In the first region, (I), the pressure in the chamber is lower than the minimum point, $0 < P_{SS} < P_B$. In the second region, (II), the pressure in the chamber is between the minimum and maximum points of the graph, $P_B < P_{SS} < P_A$. In the third region, (III), the pressure in the chamber is higher than the maximum point on the graph, $P_{SS} > P_A$. In the first case (where $P < P_B$), the equilibrium point will be close to $\lambda_{SS} = 1$, and Illissar & Gat (2020) represent the following approximation to describe this branch by $\lambda_{SS} = 1 + \delta_1 + \delta_2^2 + O(\delta_3)$, where $\delta_1$ is formulated by,

$$\delta_1(P_{SS}; \alpha) = \frac{-7P_{SS} + 24 + 24\alpha - \sqrt{3[64\alpha P_{SS} + 192(\alpha + 1)^2 - 21P_{SS}^2]}}{8(7P_{SS} - 33\alpha - 21)}. \tag{3.5}$$

Next, the second stable equilibrium radius, which exists when the pressure is higher than the local minimum ($P > P_B$), is considered significantly larger than unity. Thus, in order to formulate an approximation for this equilibrium stretch, $\lambda_{SS} = \delta_2^{-1}(\alpha) \gg 1$ is substituted into (3.3). After some regular algebraic manipulation, a second-order algebraic equation in terms of $\lambda_{SS}$ is provided. The solution is given by

$$\delta_2(P_{SS}; \alpha) = \frac{P_{SS} \pm \sqrt{P_{SS}^2 - 64\alpha}}{8}. \tag{3.6}$$

The more comprehensive solution, having a positive sign in front of the square root of the
Figure 2: (a) - The solid blue curve is a characteristic stretch–pressure curve of a single elastic chamber with $\alpha = 0.1$. The solid orange curve is the effective potential energy function $P_{SS} = 2.75$, illustrated by the dashed black line; Green and red dots are the stable and unstable equilibrium radii. (b) - Characteristic normalized stretch–pressure curve of a single elastic chamber according to (3.3) with $\alpha = 0.1$. The extrema are marked, and the bi-stable region is marked in grey. Solid curves are stable branches and dashed curves are unstable ones. (c) - The solid blue line is the exact solution of (3.3) calculated numerically. The dashed curves are the approximated solutions obtained in (3.5)-(3.6). (d) - The evolution of the extremum values of pressure $P_A, P_B$ and stretch $\lambda_A, \lambda_B$ as a function of the small parameter $\alpha$. The solid curves are the exact values, and the dashed curves are the asymptotic approximations given in appendix (A 4),(A 7).

discriminant, is suitable for the solution of the third case in which $P_{SS} > P_B$, while the solution with the negative sign in front of the square root of the discriminant, is suitable for solution of the unstable branch in which $P_B < P_{SS} < P_A$. Those approximations are also plotted in Figure 2(c) in dash-lines on the solid curve representing the exact solution.

4. Solution of the flow-field within an expanding chamber

In this section, the governing equations of the flow within the chamber will be formulated. An analytical series solution will then be presented, describing the velocity field and the flow’s pressure distribution inside the spherical chamber. Under the assumptions discussed above, the momentum and continuity equations governing the fluid’s behavior
expressed in the non-inertial spherical frame:

\[ \rho \left( \frac{\partial v}{\partial t} + v \cdot \nabla v + \frac{d^2 \Omega}{dt^2} \sqrt{\eta^2 - a^2} \right) = -\nabla p + \mu \nabla^2 v - \rho g \hat{z}, \quad (4.1a) \]

\[ \nabla \cdot v = 0, \quad (4.1b) \]

where the third term in the left expression in the momentum equation (4.1a) describes the acceleration of the non-inertial spherical frame, located at the sphere’s moving center, relative.

Assuming the flow in tubes is fully developed and axisymmetric, the Hagen-Poiseuille well-known relation can be used to determine the flow in tubes. Hence, the volumetric flux is given by,

\[ q(t) = \frac{\pi a^4}{8 \mu} \frac{\partial p_t}{\partial z}, \quad (4.2) \]

where \( \frac{\partial p_t}{\partial z} \) is the pressure gradient along the tube. Since \( \epsilon_t \ll 1 \) we shall assume a constant pressure gradient. Normalization of (4.2) yield the characteristic flow rate as \( q^* = \pi a^2 u^*_z \) where \( u^*_z = a^2 p^*/\mu \ell \) is the characteristic axial of the fluid velocity in the tube. An integral flow balance yields the relation between the characteristic velocity in the tube and the characteristic velocity of the flow within the chamber, as \( v^* = \epsilon^2 u^*_z \).

substituting the characteristic values into the small parameter (2.3), relates it to the other small parameters representation, as follows

\[ \epsilon = \frac{a^4}{r^3_0 \ell} = \epsilon_a \epsilon_t \ll 1. \quad (4.3) \]

The flow passing through the tube is equal to the flow entering the chamber, and the problem’s characteristic pressure is commonly defined by the values in both the tube and chamber. Thus, the chamber’s viscous resistance, defined as the ratio between the characteristic pressure and the volumetric flux, is taken as the tube’s viscous resistance, given by \( R_{\mu} = \mu \ell/\pi a^4 \). This definition differs from the standard notation typically used to describe creeping flows. However, it enables us to obtain new insights into the chamber’s dynamics without assuming uniform pressure.

From equation (4.3) it is clear that \( \epsilon \) is dependent merely on the geometry of the system, providing a simple relation between the hydrostatic and deviatoric stresses. Hence, appropriate geometry can be defined in order to design an efficient and controllable system. We consider negligible gravity, i.e., \( \rho g r_0/p^* \ll 1 \) (where \( g \) is the gravitational acceleration), and define a Reynolds number in chamber as \( Re = \rho v^* r_0 / \mu \ll 1 \). Since Reynolds number is small, the flow’s inertia may be neglected. Therefore, the fluid’s motion (4.1) is governed by Stokes equations for creeping flow with an implicit time variable,

\[ \hat{\nabla} \cdot V = 0, \quad \hat{\nabla} P = \epsilon \hat{\nabla}^2 V + O(\epsilon Re). \quad (4.4) \]

The validity of these equations is weakened at the vicinity of the connections to the tubes since in those regions, the characteristic velocity is approximately \( u^*_z \) rather than \( v^* \). Renormalization utilizing \( u^*_z \) yields the following form of the momentum equation, describing the flow close to the connection with the tube,

\[ \epsilon \frac{\rho u^*_z r_0}{\mu} \frac{dV}{dT} = \epsilon \hat{\nabla}^2 V - \epsilon^2_a \hat{\nabla} P. \quad (4.5) \]

Since \( \epsilon^2_a / \epsilon = \epsilon_a^{-1} \epsilon_t^{-1} \gg 1 \), a consistency requirement for the neglect of inertia forces in the vicinity of the connection to the tubes is also necessary. This requirement is given
In order to get a better understanding of the small parameters physical meaning, we may use the dynamical stress tensor in the fluid domain defined by the constitutive relation $\sigma_f = -pI + \mu[\nabla v + (\nabla v)^T]$ where $I$ is the $3 \times 3$ unit matrix. In the most general constitutive equation, $\sigma_f$ is consistent of the linear and instantaneous dependence of the deviatoric stress, plus the hydrostatic stress, $-pI$, stemmed from the static pressure. Normalization of the total stress tensor yield,

$$\hat{\sigma}_f = -pI + \varepsilon \left[ \nabla \mathbf{V} + (\nabla \mathbf{V})^T \right].$$

As one can notice from equation (4.7) the velocity field is not included at the leading-order. Thus, the leading-order velocity effects are of $O(\varepsilon)$. Mainly, the leading-order of the problem is a case of fully developed uniform pressure without any velocities. Suppose the flow is dictated by controlled pressure or flux at the inlet, the velocity is generated, and additional small deviatoric stress is created, which quasi-statically leads the system to another hydrostatic state.

The equations (4.4) have been extensively studied, and a general solution was admitted (Happel & Brenner 2012). Consider the non-dimensional Stokes stream function, $\Psi(R, \theta, T)$, the flow velocity components $V_R$ and $V_\theta$ are related to the Stokes stream function $\Psi(R, \theta, T)$ through

$$V_R = \frac{1}{R^2 \sin \theta} \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial \theta}, \quad V_\theta = -\frac{1}{R \sin \theta} \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial R},$$

where $V_R$ and $V_\theta$ are the radial and tangential velocity components, respectively. By applying the curl operator to the momentum equation (4.4) and using several simple algebraic manipulations, the Stokes equation can be reduced to a fourth-order bi-harmonic equation obtained in terms of the Stokes stream function as follows:

$$E^2(E^2 \Psi) = 0,$$

$$\nabla P = -\varepsilon \frac{\hat{\phi}}{R \sin \theta} \times \nabla (E^2 \Psi),$$

where

$$E^2 = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial R^2} + \frac{\sin \theta}{R^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \left( \frac{1}{\sin \theta} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \right)$$

is known as the bi-harmonic differential operator. Equation (4.9a) is solved by separation of variables, and equation (4.9b) is solved by integration with respect to the radial and tangential directions. However, for brevity we will not present the full development for the general solution here. A solution for the stream function in spherical coordinate is of the form,

$$\Psi(R, \theta; T) = A_0(T) + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \left[ A_n(T) R^n + C_n(T) R^{n+2} \right] J_n(\cos \theta),$$

where $A_n(T)$ and $C_n(T)$ are unknown functions, determined by the boundary conditions, and $J_n(\xi)$ are the Gegenbauer functions of the first kind. Happel & Brenner (2012) have exhaustively investigated the properties of these Gegenbauer functions in connection with the hydrodynamic application. For our present purposes, their properties can be deduced
most readily from their relation with the corresponding Legendre functions of the first kind \( P_n(\xi) \) as,

\[
J_n(\xi) = \frac{P_{n-2}(\xi) - P_n(\xi)}{2n - 1} = -\frac{1}{(n - 1)!} \left( \frac{d}{d\xi} \right)^{n-2} \left( \frac{\xi^2 - 1}{2} \right)^{n-1}; \quad n \geq 2. \tag{4.12}
\]

In the degenerate cases \( n = 0, 1 \) we define \( J_0(\xi) = 1 \) and \( J_1(\xi) = -\xi \), respectively. Using the definition of the Stokes stream function \( \Phi \), we describe the general solution of the velocity field and pressure distribution as,

\[
V_R(R, \theta; T) = -\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \left[ A_n(T)R^{n-2} + C_n(T)R^n \right] P_{n-1}(\cos \theta), \tag{4.13a}
\]

\[
V_{\theta}(R, \theta; T) = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \left[ nA_n(T)R^{n-2} + (n + 2)C_n(T)R^n \right] \frac{J_n(\cos \theta)}{\sin \theta}, \tag{4.13b}
\]

\[
P(R, \theta; T) = P_0(T) - \varepsilon \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \left[ \frac{2(2n + 1)}{n - 1} R^{n-1}C_n(T) \right] P_{n-1}(\cos \theta), \tag{4.13c}
\]

where \( P_0(T) \) should be determined through the physical boundary conditions defined by pressure at the chamber’s inlet and outlet. The unknown functions, \( A_n(T) \) and \( C_n(T) \), should be determined by requiring the kinematic boundary conditions of the flow.

Next, we are interested in finding the unknown functions, \( A_n(T) \) and \( C_n(T) \) by requiring two boundary conditions. The first boundary condition is obtained from the assumption that there is no penetration into the chamber’s boundaries, and the second boundary conditions is obtained from the is the no-slip condition, which is defined in vector form as,

\[
v(r = \eta(t), \theta; t) = \hat{r} \frac{d\eta}{dt} + \hat{\theta} \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\kappa u_z^{(out)}(\tilde{r}_{\text{out}} = \eta \sin \theta) , & 0 \leq \theta \leq \theta_i \\
0 , & \theta_i < \theta < \theta_f \\
u_z^{(in)}(\tilde{r}_{\text{in}} = \eta \sin \theta) , & \theta_f \leq \theta \leq \pi
\end{array} \right\} \tag{4.14}
\]

Here, \( \kappa \) indicates whether there are both inlet and outlet tubes (when \( \kappa = 1 \)), or only an inlet tube (when \( \kappa = 0 \)). Moreover, the \( \theta_i(t) \) and \( \theta_f(t) \) are angles corresponding to the connections between the tubes and the chamber (see Figure I). By simple geometric considerations, we get,

\[
\theta_i(t) = \sin^{-1} \left( \frac{a}{\eta(t)} \right), \quad \theta_f(t) = \pi - \sin^{-1} \left( \frac{a}{\eta(t)} \right). \tag{4.15}
\]

Here, we assumed a spherical surface at the connection between the tubes and the chamber. The first component in equation \( 4.14 \) is the radial component that displays the radial inflation of the whole chamber, while the second component adds the fluid’s velocity into or out of the tube. The wall’s elasticity is expressed in the body’s ability to increase the volume according to the material’s constitutive laws (hyper-elasticity). A simple investigation of the boundary condition’s derivative shows singularities at \( \theta_i \) and \( \theta_f \) where the known parabolic Hagen-Poiseuille relation is used to describe the flow inside the tube. Since the pressure distribution represented by the Legendre series \( 4.13 \) is the solution of the second-order differential equation, singularities are leading to a divergent series.

In order to avoid the singularities, we assume a different flow profile in the tubes, \( u_z^{(m)}(t, \tilde{r}) \). The chosen flow profile must have four physical properties: the first requirement
is symmetry around the tube’s radial coordinate, \( \tilde{r} \), which means that the function should be even in \( \tilde{r} \), which is consistent with the assumption that the flow does not depend on the tube’s tangential component. The second requirement is the non-penetration conditions represented mathematically by zero velocity on the tube boundaries, \( u_z^{(m)}(t, a) = 0 \). The third requirement nulls the radial velocity gradient at the boundaries, \( \partial u_z^{(m)}/\partial \tilde{r} = 0 \) where \( \tilde{r} = a \). This requirement does not exist in the classical parabolic profile; however, it is necessary to assure the boundary conditions’ differentiability even at \( \theta_i \) and \( \theta_f \). The fourth requirement is to keep the total flow through the tube equal to the Hagen-Poiseuille model’s value. The most simplistic non-dimensional flow profile that can be obtained which meets all four physical requirements is a fourth-degree polynomial, defined as,

\[
U_z^{(m)} = \left[ 3(1 - 2\tilde{R}^2 + \tilde{R}^4)Q(T) \right] \tilde{Z}, \tag{4.16}
\]

where \( U_z^{(m)} = u_z^{(m)}/u_z^* \) is the normalized modified axial velocity field in tube, and \( \tilde{R} = \tilde{r}/a \) is the normalized radial coordinate in tube. Using non-dimensional parameters and the modified velocity field (4.16), the boundary conditions become

\[
V_R(R = \lambda) = \frac{d\lambda}{dT} + \frac{3 \cos \theta}{\lambda^2 \tilde{\varepsilon}^2} \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\kappa U_z^{(m)} \bigg|_{\tilde{R} = \tilde{\varepsilon}^{-1} \sin \theta} , & 0 \leq \theta \leq \sin^{-1}(\tilde{\varepsilon}) \\
0 , & \sin^{-1}(\tilde{\varepsilon}) < \theta < \pi - \sin^{-1}(\tilde{\varepsilon}) \\
U_z^{(m)} \bigg|_{\tilde{R} = \tilde{\varepsilon}^{-1} \sin \theta} , & \pi - \sin^{-1}(\tilde{\varepsilon}) \leq \theta \leq \pi
\end{array} \right. \tag{4.17a}
\]

\[
V_\theta(R = \lambda) = -\frac{3 \sin \theta}{\lambda^2 \tilde{\varepsilon}^2} \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\kappa U_z^{(m)} \bigg|_{\tilde{R} = \tilde{\varepsilon}^{-1} \sin \theta} , & 0 \leq \theta \leq \sin^{-1}(\tilde{\varepsilon}) \\
0 , & \sin^{-1}(\tilde{\varepsilon}) < \theta < \pi - \sin^{-1}(\tilde{\varepsilon}) \\
U_z^{(m)} \bigg|_{\tilde{R} = \tilde{\varepsilon}^{-1} \sin \theta} , & \pi - \sin^{-1}(\tilde{\varepsilon}) \leq \theta \leq \pi
\end{array} \right. \tag{4.17b}
\]

where \( \tilde{\varepsilon}(T) = \tilde{\varepsilon}_a/\lambda(T) \ll 1 \).

The time-dependent unknown functions, \( A_n(T) \) and \( C_n(T) \), are calculated by imposing the boundary conditions (4.17), where the latter are developed into a generalized Fourier series of Legendre or Gegenbauer polynomials,

\[
V_R(R = \lambda, \theta; T) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n(T)P_n(\cos \theta) \tag{4.18a}
\]

\[
V_\theta(R = \lambda, \theta; T) = \frac{1}{\sin \theta} \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \varphi_n(T)J_n(\cos \theta). \tag{4.18b}
\]

with the following general Fourier coefficients,

\[
A_n(T) = \frac{2n + 1}{2} \int_{-1}^{1} V_R(\lambda, \cos^{-1}(\xi); T)P_n(\xi)d\xi = \frac{1}{\lambda^2 \tilde{\varepsilon}^6} \left[ \hat{A}_n^{(in)}Q_{in} + \hat{A}_n^{(out)}Q_{out} \right]
\]

\[
\varphi_n(T) = \frac{n(n - 1)(2n - 1)}{2} \int_{-1}^{1} V_\theta(\lambda, \cos^{-1}(\xi); T)J_n(\xi)d\xi = \frac{1}{\lambda^2 \tilde{\varepsilon}^6} \left[ \hat{\varphi}_n^{(in)}Q_{in} + \hat{\varphi}_n^{(out)}Q_{out} \right]
\]
where
\[ A_n^{(\cdot)} = \frac{3(2n + 1)}{2} \left[ (\epsilon^2 - 1)^2 \mathcal{P}_{1,n}^{(\cdot)} + 2(\epsilon^2 - 1) \mathcal{P}_{3,n}^{(\cdot)} + \mathcal{P}_{5,n}^{(\cdot)} \right] \]
\[ \varphi_n^{(\cdot)} = -\frac{3n(n - 1)(2n - 1)}{2} \left[ (\epsilon^2 - 1)^2 \mathcal{J}_{0,n}^{(\cdot)} + 2(\epsilon^2 - 1) \mathcal{J}_{2,n}^{(\cdot)} + \mathcal{J}_{4,n}^{(\cdot)} \right] \]
and \( \mathcal{P}_{k,n}^{(\cdot)}, \mathcal{J}_{k,n}^{(\cdot)} \) are the \( k \)-th moment of \( \mathcal{P}_n(\xi) \) and \( \mathcal{J}_n(\xi) \) about an origin, defined as
\[ \mathcal{P}_{k,n}^{(\text{in})} = \int_{-1}^{-\sqrt{1-\epsilon^2}} \xi^k \mathcal{P}_n(\xi) \, d\xi, \quad \mathcal{P}_{k,n}^{(\text{out})} = \int_{1}^{1} \xi^k \mathcal{P}_n(\xi) \, d\xi; \]
\[ \mathcal{J}_{k,n}^{(\text{in})} = \int_{-1}^{-\sqrt{1-\epsilon^2}} \xi^k \mathcal{J}_n(\xi) \, d\xi, \quad \mathcal{J}_{k,n}^{(\text{out})} = \int_{1}^{1} \xi^k \mathcal{J}_n(\xi) \, d\xi. \] (4.21)

Substitution of (4.20) and (4.18) into (4.13a-b) where \( R = \lambda \) yields two linear equations that define the unknown function \( A_n(T) \) and \( \mathcal{C}_n(T) \). This provides the solution for the velocity field and the general solution is rewritten as,
\[ V_R = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \left[ (n + 2) \chi^{-2} - n \right] A_{n-1} + (\chi^2 - 1) \varphi_n \chi^n \mathcal{P}_{n-1}(\cos \theta), \] (4.22a)
\[ V_\theta = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \left[ (\chi^2 - 1)n(n + 2) A_{n-1} + (n(1 - \chi^2) + 2) \varphi_n \right] \chi^n \frac{\mathcal{J}_n(\cos \theta)}{\sin \theta}. \] (4.22b)

where \( \chi(R; T) := R/\lambda(T) \in [0, 1] \). The general solution of the pressure distribution can also be rewritten as follow,
\[ P(R, \theta; T) = P_0(T) - \varepsilon \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(2n + 3)((n + 1)A_n + \varphi_{n+1})}{n} \chi^n \mathcal{P}_n(\cos \theta). \] (4.23)

This expression represents the pressure distribution inside the chamber, with unknown time-dependent functions. \( P_0(T) \) may be determined according to the physical boundary conditions of the pressures acting on the flow - at the inlet and outlet. The stretch, \( \lambda(T) \), (and therefore also \( A_n(\lambda) \) and \( \varphi_{n+1}(\lambda) \)), may be determined by the wall’s hyperelastic constitutive model. In the next sections, we present four analyses describing different physical cases, including the specific hyperelastic constitutive model we used.

5. Results - Case studies

In this section we obtain the full solution under different boundary conditions. We present three analyses which describe different physical cases. In the first case, we present a chamber whose inlet pressure and volumetric flow rate are both given. In the second case, we present a chamber whose volumetric flow rate is dictated while the pressure is governed by the chamber’s hyperelastic shell. Finally, in the third case, we present a chamber whose input pressure is dictated while the wall’s hyperelastic law governs the time-varying chamber’s radius.
5.1. Case I - Forced motion of chamber walls and given inlet pressure

In this case, we dictate the motion of the chamber walls by controlling the inlet and the outlet flow rate, and thus the chamber’s stretch $\lambda(T)$ is a known function. The input pressure $P_{in}(T)$ is another known boundary condition. Thus, this limit represents a chamber which changes its dictated volume without being affected by the flow-field. Therefore, this degenerate limit does not require an elastic model.

The integral mass conservation equation is given by,

$$q_{in} - q_{out} = \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\phi=0}^{2\pi} \int_{\theta=\theta_i(t)}^{\theta_f(t)} \int_{r=r_0}^{r_2} r^2 \sin \theta dr d\theta d\phi,$$

(5.1)

we neglect $O(\tilde{G}^2)$ terms, related to the inlet and the outlet section, by the approximation,

$$\int_{\theta_i(t)}^{\theta_f(t)} \sin \theta d\theta = (1 - \kappa) + (1 + \kappa) \sqrt{1 - \tilde{G}^2} = 2 + O(\tilde{G}^2),$$

(5.2)

where $\kappa = 0$ for single input case and $\kappa = 1$ for inlet and outlet case. Thus, equation (5.1) is simplified to

$$\lambda(T) = \left[ 1 + \frac{3}{4} \int_0^T (Q_{in}(\tau) - Q_{out}(\tau)) d\tau \right]^{1/3}.$$

(5.3)

Next, we solve for unknown function pressure $P_0(T)$. The normalized relation between the pressure gradient along the inlet tube and the volumetric flow rate which mentioned in (4.2) is,

$$Q_{in}(T) = -\frac{1}{8} \frac{\partial P}{\partial Z}.$$

(5.4)

Thus, integration with respect to the axial coordinate, $Z$, along the inlet tube, describes the pressure at the connection between the tube and the chamber, $P_C(T)$, as:

$$P_C(T) \approx P_{in}(T) - 8Q_{in}(T).$$

(5.5)

Therefore, the unknown function $P_0(T)$ can be calculated by substituting $(R, \theta) = (\lambda, \pi)$ in the expression obtained into (4.13c), and equating to $P_C(T)$. Since $P_n(-1) = (-1)^n$ the fully defined pressure distribution in the chamber is obtained,

$$P_{(T)}(R, \theta; T) = P_{in}(T) - 8Q_{in}(T) +$$

$$+ \varepsilon \cdot \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(2n + 3)(n + 1)A_n + \varphi_{n+1}}{n} \left[ (-1)^n - \chi^n P_n(\cos \theta) \right].$$

(5.6)

The analytical expression mentioned above, which was obtained for the chamber’s pressure distribution, can be split into two parts. The first part (which consists of two first terms) depends only on time and represents the uniform pressure profile obtained by the known models that assume a uniform pressure profile (Beatty, 1987). The second term, which consists of the series multiplied by the small parameter $\varepsilon$, is the extra part of the pressure profile, depending on the angle and radius. This part is a key contribution of our work.
Figure 3: Analytical Solution of single inlet chamber: Right - pressure distribution. The colors describe the magnitude of the flow velocity, and the white dashed lines produce the stream-lines of the flow in the body. Left - velocity field and stream-lines. There are sharp gradients both in pressures and at a velocity near the inlet of the chamber.

It is worth noting that this is a degenerate case in which both the pressure and the volumetric mass rate are determined. We continue to more realistic and complex configurations in the following sections based on prescribed time-profile of the chamber’s radius or inlet pressure.

5.2. Case II - Dictated inlet flux and hyperelastic wall model

In this case we dictate the volumetric rate into an elastic chamber. Thus, the stretch function $\lambda(T)$ is again known, as described in (5.3). However, inlet pressure is not dictated and additional data regarding the pressure distribution is obtained from the hyper-elastic constitutive relations. Here, it is worth emphasizing that any general constitutive elastic law can serve as a basis for subsequent development, even if it is not bi-stable or hyperelastic.

Integrating the strain density function, $\psi(\lambda)$, over the volume of the chamber’s spherical shell and keeping only leading-order terms yields the leading-order chamber’s strain energy,

$$\int_V \psi(\lambda) dV = 4\pi r_0^2 w_0 \psi^* \cdot \hat{\psi}(\lambda), \quad (5.7)$$

where $V \approx w \cdot S$ is the material (constant) volume of the thin shell, $\psi^*$ is characteristic value of $\psi$, and $\hat{\psi}$ is the normalized strain energy density function $\hat{\psi}(\lambda) = \psi(\lambda)/\psi^*$. The work done by the surface traction acting between two states without body force is,

$$\int_S \int_0^{\eta} (p(\xi, \theta) dS) \cdot d\xi = 2\pi r_0^3 p^* \int_{\theta=0}^{\theta_f} \int_{\xi=1}^\lambda \xi^2 P(\xi, \theta) \sin \theta d\theta d\xi. \quad (5.8)$$

Substitution of the pressure’s general solution $4.23$ into $5.8$, and using the mechanical energy principle which states that the work done by the surface tractions acting between
Table 1: Summary of physical parameters values used for plotting the analytical solutions of the dynamic cases. The density and the kinematic viscosity are related to Glycerol which is known as a viscous liquid. The geometric parameters are chosen as the typical value of hyperelastic small chambers used in Ben-Haim et al. (2020).

From order of magnitude analysis in (5.7) and (5.8), we obtain the characteristic pressure, which depends on the specific hyper-elastic model we use,

$$ p^* = \frac{w_0}{r_0} \psi^*. $$

(5.10)

According to the solution obtained in (5.9), the pressure distribution inside the chamber consists of two parts. The first part is the well-known isotropic pressure obtained by Beatty (1987). This expression represents the isotropic pressure in the leading order, which is experienced by the chamber’s elastic wall, assuming that the pressure is uniform and equal to \( P_S(\lambda) = \lambda^{-2} \cdot d\psi/d\lambda \). The second expression is the transient developing pressure profile, \( \epsilon P_1(R, \theta; T) \), which varies spatially and temporally.

Figure 3 presents the analytical solution of the flow velocity magnitude with streamlines and the pressure distribution, based on equations (4.22) - (5.9), and utilizing the param-
Figure 4: A numerical verification of the fully coupled model. (a) Contour curves of the pressure distribution obtained from the simulation (red curves) and the same contour curves obtained from the analytical solution (dashed blue curves). The black non-spherical (pear-shaped) boundary describes the elastic chamber wall obtained from the simulation. (b) The non-dimensional dynamic pressure along the symmetry axis $z$. (c) The non-dimensional dynamic pressure at the chamber wall as a function of the angle $\theta$.

Figure 5: Analytical solution of a double inlet chamber: right - pressure distribution, left - velocity field magnitude (color-map) and stream-lines (white dotted curves). In this case, each streamline is directed to the chamber’s wall; thus, the inflation rate is maximal and the pressure gradient is extremely high.
Figure 6: Analytical solution of a double inlet chamber: right - pressure distribution, left - velocity field magnitude (color-map) and stream-lines (white dotted curves). In this case, all streamlines connect the two tubes without intersecting with the chamber’s wall; therefore, the chamber’s volume is kept constant. The pressure distribution is coming from an initial transient to developed distribution that varies in space and not in time.

Parameters in Table 1. The expected characteristic pressure is $p^* = O(1 \text{KPa})$, the characteristic flow velocity within the chamber is $v^* = O(1 \text{mm/s})$ and $Re \approx 0.01$. The results are based on summation of $10^5$ terms in the series solution in (5.9). A remarkable and non-intuitive result was obtained from the pressure solution on the chamber’s wall. There is a maximum pressure in an inner point on the wall and not at the domain’s boundaries. The maximum pressure obtained on the elastic wall is not obtained near the inlet tube. In order to validate the theoretical model, we have utilized commercially available software (COMSOL multiphysics) in order to conduct finite element simulations considering the fully-coupled dynamics of the system. In these simulations, the entrapped fluid is modeled according to Navier-Stokes equations, assuming that the flow is incompressible and isothermal. Moreover, the shell is modeled according to the Mooney-Rivlin model, wherein contrary to the theoretical model, it is not restricted to a spherical shape. All the parameters used in the simulations are elaborated in Table 1. Figure 4, which compares the theoretical and the numerically-simulated pressure-distribution, shows an excellent correlation, thus validating the analytical model and its underlying assumptions.

The theoretical solution also readily allows analyzing chambers with two inlets, both with controlled volumetric flow rates. In the first case, whose typical flow velocity magnitude and pressure distributions are presented in Figure 5, the chamber is inflated by equal flow rates from both inlets, whereas in the second case, whose behavior is presented in Figure 6, the flow rate in one of the inlets is reversed, meaning that the chamber is inflated and deflated simultaneously. In the first case, each streamline is directed to the chamber’s wall; thus, the inflation rate is maximal. In the second case, even though the rate of the inlet and outlet are equal, and thus the volume are constant, a pressure distribution is developed that varies in space and not in time.
5.3. **Case III - Dictated inlet pressure and hyper-elastic wall model**

In this case, we dictate only the inlet pressure, and solve for the fluidic pressure distribution, as well as the chamber’s stretch, \( \lambda(T) \). We use integral mass conservation in order to calculate the pressure at the location in which the tube connects with the chamber,

\[
P_C(T) \approx P_{in}(T) - 32\lambda^2 \frac{d\lambda}{dT} \tag{5.11}
\]

Similarly to the previous case, we substitute \((R, \theta) = (\lambda, \pi)\) in the pressure distribution solution (4.23) and equate it to \(P_C(T)\) in order to solve for the function \(P_0(T)\). The pressure distribution obtained by these means is

\[
P_{(III)}(R, \theta; T) = P_{in}(T) - 32\lambda^2 \frac{d\lambda}{dT} + 4\varepsilon \frac{d\lambda}{dT} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(2n+3)((n+1)\tilde{A}_n^{(in)} + \tilde{\varphi}_n^{(in)})}{n} \left( (-1)^n - \chi^n \varphi_n^{(cos \theta)} \right). \tag{5.12}
\]

Finally, using the mechanical energy principle (5.8), we derive a nonlinear ordinary differential equation governing the time-dependent stretch of the chamber,

\[
\left[ 32\lambda^2 - \frac{2\varepsilon \lambda}{\chi \tilde{\psi}} \cdot T(\tilde{\epsilon}) \right] \frac{d\lambda}{dT} = P_{in}(T) - \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \frac{d\tilde{\psi}}{d\lambda}, \tag{5.13}
\]

where

\[
T(\tilde{\epsilon}) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(2n+3)((n+1)\tilde{A}_n^{(in)} + \tilde{\varphi}_n^{(in)})}{n} \left[ 2(-1)^n + \chi^n \varphi_n^{(in)} \right]. \tag{5.14}
\]

We seek an asymptotic simplification of \(T(\tilde{\epsilon})\) based on \(\tilde{\epsilon} \ll 1\). The function \(T(\tilde{\epsilon})\) was estimated numerically by calculating the series range for several values of \(\tilde{\epsilon}\) corresponding to \(\tilde{\epsilon} \in [0.002, 0.5]\). Each computation considers the first \(10^5\) harmonics, yielding the following approximated expression,

\[
T(\tilde{\epsilon}) \approx -33.25\tilde{\epsilon}^3. \tag{5.15}
\]

The approximated closed-form function obtained from (5.15) shows maximal relative errors of 0.3%, compared to those achieved from (5.14). By substituting the asymptotic approximation of \(T\), into the differential equation that governs the chamber’s stretch (5.13), we obtain its approximated explicit form given by

\[
\frac{d\lambda}{dT} = \frac{1}{32 + 67.5\epsilon_t} \cdot \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \left[ P_{in}(T) - \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \frac{d\tilde{\psi}}{d\lambda} \right]. \tag{5.16}
\]

We thus observe from the above results that the transient fluidic effects on the inflation of the chamber depends only on \(\epsilon_t\) - the slenderness parameter of the connecting tube.

Next, we investigate the system’s behavior in (5.16), whose motion is governed by a controlled pressure inlet. In order to validate this model, we have compared its solution obtained utilizing the parameters in table II to finite element simulations carried out in COMSOL Multiphysics. The numerical scheme used here is similar to the one utilized in the previous section, where the dictated flow rate is replaced with dictated piece wise steps profile pressure. Figure 7 compares the stretch of the chamber in time, as achieved theoretically from the asymptotic equation (5.16) and numerically from the simulation.
Figure 7: A numerical verification of the fully coupled model describing a chamber’s dynamic responses with a single pressure inlet of pulses input, as shown in the red line. The continuous blue curve represents the solution obtained in the numerical CFD simulation, and the dashed black line represents the solution obtained by the equation (5.16), developed in our analysis. An excellent match between the results can be observed.

Since the chamber is not restricted to be spherical in the numerical simulations, it is taken as its effective value given in Ilssar & Gat (2020) as $\eta(t) = \sqrt{S(t)/4\pi}$. Here, $S(t)$ is the body’s surface area obtained in simulation without sphere assumption, and $\eta(t)$ is the effective radius of an ideal sphere having the same surface area as the non-spherical body. This figure shows an excellent agreement.

We formulate a linear approximation describing the system’s dynamic response, close to an equilibrium point given by $(\lambda_{SS}, P_{SS})$, when the pressure at the inlet is dictated and equals to $P_{ext}(\tau)$. For this, we utilize a first-order Taylor expansion for the dynamical equation (5.16), leading to the following formulation:

$$\frac{d\Delta \lambda_L}{d\tau} + \beta_I \cdot \Delta \lambda_L = \frac{1}{4\lambda_{SS}^2} \Delta P_{in}(\tau)$$

(5.17)

where

$$\beta_I = \frac{1}{4\lambda_{SS}^2} \frac{dP_{SS}}{d\lambda_{SS}} = \frac{P_{SS}}{2\lambda_{SS}^3} - \frac{3}{\lambda_{SS}^4} + \frac{9}{\lambda_{SS}^5} - \alpha \left( \frac{1}{\lambda_{SS}^2} - \frac{7}{\lambda_{SS}^8} \right),$$

(5.18)

$\Delta \lambda_L = \lambda_L(\tau) - \lambda_{SS}$ is a small stretch variation around its nominal value $\lambda_L$ and $\Delta P_{in}(\tau) = P_{in}(\tau) - P_{SS}$ is the pressure variation from its nominal value. To approximate the characteristic time constant of the system, enabling us to estimate the period it takes to reach a steady-state, equation (5.17) is solved analytically, leading to the following solution:

$$\lambda_L(\tau) = \lambda_{SS} + \left( \lambda(0) - \lambda_{SS} + \frac{1}{4\lambda_{SS}^2} \int_0^{\tau} e^{\beta_I \tau'} \Delta P_{in}(\tau') d\tau' \right) e^{-\beta_I \tau}.$$  

(5.19)

From (5.18), it is clear that the solution branches of $P_{SS}$ in (3.3) are stable equilibria if and only if $dP_{SS}/d\lambda_{SS} > 0$. The stability criterion obtained from the equation’s linearization (5.17) is identical to the stability criterion obtained from energetic considerations in (3.4). Moreover, from the linear solution, the relaxation time can
be approximated as \( R.T = (32 + 133\epsilon_t/2)/\beta_I \). Since the derivative \( dP_{SS}/d\lambda_{SS} \) in the first branch (I) of the typical pressure-stretch curve, which is plotted in Figure 2, is significantly higher than in the third branch (III), the relaxation time in (I) is much lower than in (III). Thus, the dynamic response in the third region is much slower.

In order to achieve a better approximation, equation (5.16) is approximated by a quadratic equation around the general equilibrium point. This is done by the second-order Taylor approximation, yielding the following ordinary differential equation:

\[
\frac{d\Delta\lambda_Q}{d\tau} + \beta_I \Delta\lambda_Q + \beta_{II} (\Delta\lambda_Q)^2 = \frac{1}{4\lambda_{SS}^2} \Delta P_{in}(\tau),
\]

(5.20)

where

\[
\beta_{II} = -\frac{3P_{SS}}{4\lambda_{SS}^4} + \frac{6}{\lambda_{SS}^6} - \frac{45}{\lambda_{SS}^{11}} + \alpha \left( \frac{1}{\lambda_{SS}^3} - \frac{28}{\lambda_{SS}^9} \right).
\]

(5.21)

When the pressure at the inlet equals the steady-state pressure, \( \Delta P_{in}(\tau) = 0 \), the solution of this equation under small initial perturbation from equilibrium \( \lambda_Q(T) \) is given by:

\[
\lambda_Q(\tau) = \lambda_{SS} + \frac{\beta_I}{-\beta_{II} + \left( \beta_{II} + \frac{\beta_I}{\lambda(0) - \lambda_{SS}} \right)e^{\beta_I\tau}}.
\]

(5.22)

In Figure 8, the linear and the second-order approximations were displayed alongside the exact numerical solution of equation (5.16). The excellent agreement between the ex-
act dynamic response and both approximations indicates that these two approximations are suitable for the prediction of the chamber’s evolution.

In section 3, we have shown that in the pressure range spanning between $P_A$ and $P_B$, there are three possible equilibrium radii for each constant pressure value. Multiple solutions can be exploited to switch from one equilibrium state to another under the same steady-state pressure while passing through the unstable, middle branch. An example of such a transition is shown in Figure 8, where after increasing the input pressure and decreasing it back to its initial value, the chamber’s radius does not return to its initial radius. Instead, it retains a larger radius, corresponding to the higher equilibrium state. Initially, the system converges to the equilibrium point $\lambda_{SS}^I$ which corresponding to $P_{SS}$, in the first branch (I) which is closer to the initial conditions; then, the inlet pressure rises to a value higher than $P_A$ to move the chamber to another equilibrium point in the third branch (III). Finally, we decrease the pressure again to the same level as the initial step, $P_{SS}$, so that the system will converge to the second equilibrium point in the third branch (III). This results is consistent with the insights raised in our previous work [Ben-Haim et al. 2020].

It is worth emphasizing at the end this section that the general solutions obtained in equations (4.22), (5.6),(5.9) and (5.12), are parametrically dependent on the dictated strain energy density function $\psi(\lambda)$, based on the chosen constitutive law. Here, we have chosen to present the results using Mooney-Rivlin’s hyperelastic constitutive law to illustrate the phenomenon of bi-stability and to compare our results with some other works which have assumed uniform pressure. However, any other constitutive law for the elastic shell can be used in order to derive the solution for the pressure distribution and velocity field in the three cases illustrated in the section.

6. The dynamic behavior of two interconnected bi-stable chambers

In this section, we analyze the behavior of a system consisting of two chambers, serially connected through slender tubes to a single inlet, whose flow rate is dictated and equal to $Q_{in}(T) \equiv Q(T)$. This system is instrumental for understanding the behavior of interconnected bi-stable elements, and it sheds light on the capability to govern the constituent elements by employing a single input [Ben-Haim et al. 2020]. In many works in which flow-controlled bi-stable elastic systems have been examined, the main assumption is uniform pressure within the elastic element [Ben-Haim et al. 2020; Dreyer et al. 1982; Trelost 1975; Glozman et al. 2010]. Here, we shall analyze the dynamics of such systems using the solution we developed in the previous sections, which considers the pressure distribution in the elastic element’s inner space. This system’s physics is described utilizing the analyses presented above, where we study identical tubes and chambers. The system under investigation combines two of the cases analyzed in the previous section, as the flow from the inlet to the first chamber is dictated.

We denote the stretch of the first and the second chambers as $\lambda_1(T), \lambda_2(T)$, respectively. From the integral mass rate balance,

$$Q(T) = 4\lambda_1^2 \frac{d\lambda_1}{dT} + 4\lambda_2^2 \frac{d\lambda_2}{dT}. \quad (6.1)$$

The stretch $\lambda_2(T)$ of the second chamber is governed by (5.16), where $P_{in}(T)$ is related to the pressure in the point in the tube relative to the connection with the (second) chamber. In our case $P_{in}^{(eff)}(T) = P_{in}(T)$ is the effective external pressure, where $P(R, \theta; T)$ is given by (5.9). Recalling that the Fourier coefficients $A_n$ and $\phi_n$ are linear combinations of the inlet the outlet flow rates (4.20), the effective external pressure is
Figure 9: (a) - Equilibrium curves of the two-chamber system in \( \{ \lambda_1; \lambda_2 \} \) plane. Black solid curves are stable branches, and black dashed curves are unstable ones for \( \alpha = 0.1 \). The evolution of the equilibrium curves by the \( \alpha \) parameter is described in the grey curves. The red and green points describe the moments in which the flux is changed. (b) Time plots of chambers’ stretch \( \lambda_i(T) \) obtained by numerical integration of the nonlinear dynamical system. (c) - Time plot of inlet flow \( Q \) for inflation and deflation in the case of two chambers.

Rewritten as

\[ P_{in}^{(eff)}(T) = \frac{1}{\lambda_1^2} \frac{d\hat{\psi}}{d\lambda} \bigg|_{\lambda_1} + \frac{\varepsilon}{\lambda_1^2\tilde{\varepsilon}_1} \left( 4\lambda_2^2 \frac{d\lambda_2}{dT} \cdot II^{(\text{out})}(\tilde{\varepsilon}_1) + Q(T) \cdot II^{(\text{in})}(\tilde{\varepsilon}_1), \right) \]

where

\[ II^{(\cdot)}(\tilde{\varepsilon}_1) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( \frac{2n+3}{(n+1)A_n^{(\cdot)} + \phi_n^{(\cdot)}} \right) \left[ -\frac{1}{2} (P_{0,n}^{(\text{in})} + P_{0,n}^{(\text{out})}) - 1 \right], \]

and \( \tilde{\varepsilon}_1(T) = \varepsilon/\lambda_1(T) \).

To simplify (6.3) in order to achieve an insight of the system, we seek an asymptotic approximation considering \( \tilde{\varepsilon}_1 \ll 1 \). The series \( II^{(\cdot)}(\tilde{\varepsilon}_1) \) is estimated numerically, for several values in the range of \( \tilde{\varepsilon}_1 \in [0.002, 0.5] \), where each computation considers the first \( 10^5 \) harmonics. Utilizing curve fitting on the results achieved for the different values yields the following closed form estimation of \( II^{(\text{out})}(\tilde{\varepsilon}_1) \) and an upper bound for \( II^{(\text{in})}(\tilde{\varepsilon}_1) \),

\[ II^{(\text{out})}(\tilde{\varepsilon}_1) \approx -66.4\tilde{\varepsilon}_1^3, \]

\[ II^{(\text{in})}(\tilde{\varepsilon}_1) = O(\tilde{\varepsilon}_1^4). \]

The approximated values obtained from (6.4) show maximal relative errors of 0.1%. Using the governing equation of \( \lambda_2(T) \) in (5.16) after substitution of (6.4) in the effective external pressure (6.2), yields the second equation of motion,

\[ \frac{d\lambda_2}{dT} = \frac{1}{32 + 332\varepsilon_t} \frac{1}{\lambda_2^2} \left( \frac{1}{\lambda_1^2} \frac{d\hat{\psi}}{d\lambda} \bigg|_{\lambda_1} - \frac{1}{\lambda_2^2} \frac{d\hat{\psi}}{d\lambda} \bigg|_{\lambda_2} \right). \]

(6.5)
Figure 10: Analytical solution of a system consisting of two chambers controlled by single inlet: Right - pressure distribution, Left - velocity field and stream-lines. The flow velocity and pressure distribution corresponding to an attractive instance in which the system passes through point A, presented in time and on the $\{\lambda_2, \lambda_1\}$ space, in Figure 9.
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Equations (6.1) and (6.5) are a set of nonlinear coupled first-order differential equations that govern the evolution of the chambers’ stretches $\lambda_i(T)$ under the single input $Q(T)$. In our previous work (Ben-Haim et al. 2020), we have presented an algorithm whose purpose is to bring the system from one equilibrium state to another by a single input. There, it is assumed that the process is quasi-static; thus, the chamber’s pressure is uniform during the process. Thanks to the analysis presented in this work, it is possible to consider the pressure distribution and the chambers’ flow field during the dynamic process.

The equilibrium state of this system is achieved when the flow rate is zero. In this case, the derivatives in time are equal to zero, and the differential equations degenerate into a single algebraic equation that defines the equilibrium curves. The equilibrium curves are defined by,

$$\left( \frac{1}{\lambda_1^2} \frac{d\dot{\psi}}{d\lambda} \right)_{\lambda_1,SS} = \left( \frac{1}{\lambda_2^2} \frac{d\dot{\psi}}{d\lambda} \right)_{\lambda_2,SS}. \quad (6.6)$$

Equation (6.6) describes the equilibrium curves of the system presented in Figure 9(a). This nonlinear equation gives rise to two solutions. One solution is given by $\lambda_{1,SS} = \lambda_{2,SS}$, where the radii of both chambers are equal, whereas the second one the different radii are different, $\lambda_{1,SS} \neq \lambda_{2,SS}$, thanks to the bi-stability of the chambers. When the system is initially placed out of equilibrium (by setting zero input, or response to initial condition), the solution moves along the constant total volume curve, $\lambda_1^3 + \lambda_2^3 = \text{Const}$, and converges toward stable equilibrium branches. Figure 10 show the flow velocity and pressure distribution corresponding to an attractive instance in which the system passes through point A, presented in time and on the $\{\lambda_2, \lambda_1\}$ plane, in Figure 9.

7. Concluding Remarks

In this work, we analyzed the dynamics of creeping flow in a bi-stable hyperelastic spherical chamber by calculated the velocity field and pressure distribution inside the chamber. The analytical results were compared to numerical simulations, which showed an excellent fit. From the normalization of the governing equations (4.1) and (4.2), we obtained the condition $\varepsilon = a^4/r_0^3 \lesssim 1$ which lead to creeping flow inside the chambers. Moreover, we obtained the condition $q \ll \pi \mu a^2/\rho r_0$ for inertial effects to be negligible in the vicinity of the connection to the tubes.

In order to describe the coupled model of viscous-elastic dynamics, we first focused on the non-linear constitutive elastic laws (Mooney-Rivlin model). Next, using the bi-harmonic analytical series solution, we study the dynamic responses for three physical different cases. The first dynamic case was the forced motion of chamber walls with given inlet pressure. The second case was dictated the volumetric flux. Based on the mechanical energy principle, we formulated the chamber’s pressure distribution. We obtained the characteristic pressure in the elastic chambers as $p^* = w_0 (\psi^*)^2/t_0$ which depends on the hyperelastic model we used. In this analysis, we obtained a non-intuitive result - the pressure solution on the chamber’s wall remained a maximum value in the wall’s inner point. In the third physical case, the chamber is dictated by inlet pressure. There we have simplified and reduced the time-varying dynamical equations described by one compact equation depends on the elastic model, dictated pressure, chamber stretch, and inlet tube slenderness $[5,10]$. Although the finite elements simulation showed that the chamber undergoes a slightly different deformation from an ideal sphere (known as pear-shaped),
the non-spherical boundary does not harm the quality of the solution obtained in this work. However, in order to characterize the obtained geometric shape, more extensive analysis is required, which goes beyond the scope of this work. In the last part of this work, we present an investigation of a system consisting of two interconnected coupled chambers controlled by the flow at the chamber’s inlet. This system demonstrates the bi-stability feature through which the chambers can display controlled transitions between different multi-stable states using a single input of controlled flow rate.

These results allow modeling of flows in applications such as the inflation of balloons in medical procedures and pulmonary drug delivery optimization to target specific regions of the lung. Moreover, the results might be leveraged to analyze the dynamics of particles inside spherical elastic chambers in low-Reynolds flow as future work.
Appendix A. Asymptotic approximations for the bifurcation points of the equilibrium curve $P_{SS}(\lambda_{SS})$

In section 3 the relation between stretch, $\lambda_{SS}$, and pressure, $P_{SS}$, in equilibrium condition has been presented. This well-known relation was extensively leveraged to describe the quasi-static inflation of spherical balloons (Beatty 1987; Treloar 1975; Ben-Haim et al. 2020) for spatially uniform pressures. As seen from Figure 2(a), showing the relation in (3.3) with $\alpha = 0.1$, the uniform pressure of the chamber, $P_{SS}(\lambda_{SS})$ has two bifurcation points, described by a local maximum point at $(\lambda_A, P_A)$, and a local minimum point at $(\lambda_B, P_B)$. This figure shows a bifurcation, which occurs when the pressure enters or exits the range between the local extrema, $P_A < P_{SS} < P_B$, illustrated in grey. Here, we shall obtain an asymptotic approximations for the bifurcation points of the equilibrium curve, $P_A, P_B, \lambda_A$ and $\lambda_B$.

Since the static behavior of the system is dependent on the value of the uniform pressure, the bifurcation points $(\lambda_A, P_A)$ and $(\lambda_B, P_B)$ may be computed. These extrema are the roots of the derivative of the system energy, given by the roots of the quartic polynomial equation,

$$x^3 - 7 = \alpha(x^4 + 5x),$$ \hspace{1cm} (A 1)

where $x = \lambda_{SS}^2$. Since $\alpha \ll 1$ we use the iterative asymptotics, yielding,

$$x_{i+1} = \sqrt[3]{7 + \alpha(x_i^4 + 5x_i)}.$$ \hspace{1cm} (A 2)

Starting with $x_0 = \sqrt[3]{7}$ which is obtained from the leading-order solution ($\alpha = 0$), after two iterative steps, the approximation is obtained as,

$$\lambda_A = x_2 = \sqrt[3]{7} + \frac{2}{\sqrt[4]{7}} x + \frac{12}{7 \sqrt[5]{7}} \alpha^2 + O(\alpha^3).$$ \hspace{1cm} (A 3)

Substitution of (A 3) into (3.3) and then using the Taylor series approximation, yields the regular approximation for the local maximum point as,

$$P_A = \frac{24}{7 \sqrt[5]{7}} + \frac{24}{7 \sqrt[5]{7}} \alpha + \frac{48}{7 \sqrt[7]{7}} \alpha^2 + O(\alpha^3).$$ \hspace{1cm} (A 4)

In order to approximate the local minimum point, we use another singular asymptotic method. We consider $y = \alpha x$ and rewrite the equation (A 1) as

$$y^4 - y^3 + \alpha^3(5y + 7) = 0.$$ \hspace{1cm} (A 5)

Since the new equation is regular, we approximate the minimum point by asymptotic expansion with regard to the small parameter $\alpha$,

$$y(\alpha) = 1 + \alpha y_1 + \alpha^2 y_2 + \alpha^3 y_3 + O(\alpha^4).$$ \hspace{1cm} (A 6)

This expansion is formally substituted into the algebraic equation (A 5), and the coefficients of the powers of $\alpha$ are compared. Then, the approximation of $\lambda_B$ and $P_B$ are obtained,

$$\lambda_B = \frac{1}{\sqrt[3]{\alpha}} + 6\alpha^3 \sqrt[3]{\alpha} + O(\alpha^6),$$ \hspace{1cm} (A 7)

$$P_B = 8\sqrt[3]{\alpha} - 8\sqrt[3]{\alpha^3} + O(\sqrt[3]{\alpha^{15}}).$$

The evolution of those extrema as a function of the small parameter $\alpha$ is presented in
Figure 2(d). This figure shows a further bifurcation, implying that only when $0 < \alpha < 0.214$, a region where three equilibria exist. Those parameters are considered to lie within the physical domain of rubber-like materials, as well as for biological tissues.
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