

Electroviscous drag on squeezing motion in sphere-plane geometry

Marcela Rodríguez Matus^{1*}, Zaicheng Zhang^{1*}, Zouhir

Benrahl¹, Arghya Majee², Abdelhamid Maali¹, Alois Würger¹

¹*Université de Bordeaux & CNRS, Laboratoire Ondes et Matière d'Aquitaine, 33405 Talence, France*

²*Max Planck Institute for Intelligent Systems, Stuttgart, Germany & IV. Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Stuttgart, Germany*

Theoretically and experimentally, we study electroviscous phenomena resulting from charge-flow coupling in a nanoscale capillary. Our theoretical approach relies on Poisson-Boltzmann mean-field theory and on coupled linear relations for charge and hydrodynamic flows, including electro-osmosis and charge advection. With respect to the unperturbed Poiseuille flow, we define an electroviscous coupling parameter ξ , which turns out to be maximum where the film thickness h_0 is comparable to the screening length λ . We also present dynamic AFM data for the visco-elastic response of a confined water film in sphere-plane geometry; our theory provides a quantitative description for the electroviscous drag coefficient and the electrostatic repulsion as a function of the film thickness, with the surface charge density as the only free parameter. Charge regulation sets in at even smaller distances.

I. INTRODUCTION

Solid surfaces in contact with water are mostly charged, resulting in intricate interactions of the diffuse layer of counterions with liquid flow along the solid boundary [1–3]. Charge-flow coupling is at the origin of various electro-kinetic and electric-viscous effects [4]. Besides classical applications of capillary electrophoresis ranging from microfluidics to medical analysis, recently AC charge-induced electro-osmosis has been used for the assembly of active materials from micron-size colloidal building blocks [5], surface osmotic effects have been discussed in view of energy applications and desalinization of sea water [6].

If these phenomena cover the range from micro to macroscale, the underlying physical mechanisms operate on nanoscopic distances [7], most often the Debye screening length which is of the order of a few tens of nanometers. Following the derivation of the electroosmotic coefficient by Helmholtz [8] and Smoluchowski [9], electrokinetic effects have been extensively studied in the limit of thin double layers, where the screening length is much smaller than the depth of the liquid phase. Thus Bikerman [10] and Dukhin [3] derived the surface contribution to the electric conductivity of a salt solution, and Hückel [11] and Henry [12] showed the colloidal electrophoretic mobility to depend on the ratio of particle size and screening length. Gross and Osterle studied charged membranes separating two electrolyte solutions at different pressure and electro-chemical potentials, and numerically calculated the transport coefficients of nanopores comparable to the screening length [13]. By recording the Brownian motion of a colloidal particle along a solid boundary, Alexander and Prieve observed an electrokinetic lift force in normal direction [14].

More recently, much work was devoted to the electroviscous force on the squeezing motion of colloidal spheres, vibrating with amplitude Z with respect to a solid surface, as shown schematically in Fig. 1. For uncharged

surfaces, the only force at work is the hydrodynamic drag $-\gamma_0 V$, opposite to the velocity $V = dZ/dt$. The presence of electric double layers gives rise to several electrokinetic force components,

$$K - kZ - \gamma V, \quad (1)$$

where the screened repulsion K is well known from static AFM experiments [15]. For a driven system, there is in addition a restoring force $-kZ$ with an effective spring constant k , whereas the coupling of the charged diffuse layers to the radial flow profile, results in an electroviscous force $-\gamma V$ with an enhanced drag coefficient γ [16, 17]. Bike and Prieve perturbatively calculated the charge contribution $\gamma - \gamma_0$, in terms of the ratio of the screening length λ and the sphere-plane distance h_0 [18]. Subsequent numerical studies discussed the enhancement factor for both narrow and wide channels, and found a maximum to occur at $\lambda/h_0 \approx 1$ [19, 20]. The first unambiguous experimental observation of the electroviscous effect was reported very recently by Liu et al, who performed dynamic AFM experiments in weak electrolyte solutions [17].




FIG. 1. Schematic view of charge-flow coupling in the film between solid surfaces.

In this paper we derive the electrokinetic sphere-plane interactions and in particular the drag coefficient γ , without resorting to the linearization approximation in the electroviscous figure of merit, used in previous work. Section II provides a brief reminder of Poisson-Boltzmann theory and the static repulsive force. In Section III we develop the formal apparatus for charge-flow coupling, derive the electroviscous drag coefficient γ , and compare various analytical approximations with the numerical computation. Section IV is devoted to a discussion of the effect of charge regulation on both electrostatic and electroviscous properties. In Sect. V we present dynamic-AFM measurements and compare with our theoretical findings.

II. ELECTROSTATICS

Solid materials in contact with water in general carry charges, which are screened by the counterions confined to a diffuse layer of charge density ρ , which is given by Gauss's law

$$\nabla^2 \psi = -\frac{\rho}{\epsilon}, \quad (2)$$

with the permittivity ϵ and the electrostatic potential ψ .

In the framework of Poisson-Boltzmann mean-field theory the concentrations of monovalent ions read $n_{\pm} = n_0 e^{\mp e\psi/k_B T}$, with the bulk value n_0 . The resulting expression for the charge density

$$\rho = e(n_+ - n_-) = 2en_0 \sinh \frac{e\psi}{k_B T} \quad (3)$$

then closes Gauss's law.

A. 1D Poisson-Boltzmann theory

Electrostatic and hydrodynamic properties in sphere-plane geometry with $h_0 \ll R$ are relevant only in the lubrication area. This is valid for the sphere-plane geometry of Fig. 1, as long as the radial coordinate r is much smaller than the radius R of the sphere. Then the thickness h of the aqueous film is a slowly varying function of r . For notational convenience we define the vertical coordinate with respect to "midplane" (which in fact is a spherical segment rather than a sphere), such that the solid boundaries are at $z = \pm h/2$.

Throughout this paper we use the 1D Poisson-Boltzmann equation where ψ and ρ depend on the vertical coordinate z only.

$$\frac{e}{k_B T} \frac{d^2 \psi}{dz^2} = \lambda^{-2} \sinh \frac{e\psi}{k_B T}, \quad (4)$$

where we use the screening length

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{\sqrt{8\pi n_0 \ell_B}}, \quad (5)$$

and the Bjerrum length

$$\ell_B = \frac{e^2}{4\pi\epsilon k_B T}. \quad (6)$$

For fixed surface charge density $e\sigma$, the potential satisfies the boundary condition

$$\frac{e\sigma}{\epsilon} = \mp \left. \frac{d\psi}{dz} \right|_{z=\pm h/2}. \quad (7)$$

For fixed surface potential one has $\psi(\pm h/2) = \zeta$. Note that the potential $\psi(z)$ and its surface value ζ depends on the film width h and thus on r .

B. Disjoining pressure and repulsive force

For the sake of notational simplicity we assume a symmetric system with the same charge density σ on the two opposite surfaces. Then the disjoining pressure is given by the excess osmotic pressure of the mobile ions at midplane, $\Pi = (n_m - 2n_0)k_B T$. With the excess number density $n_m = 2n_0 \cosh(\psi(0)/k_B T)$, one readily finds

$$\Pi = 2n_0 k_B T \left(\cosh \frac{e\psi(0)}{k_B T} - 1 \right). \quad (8)$$

The dependence of the osmotic pressure on the film thickness h arises from the midplane potential $\psi(0)$ [21]. At distances h larger than the screening length λ , this potential vanishes, and so does the disjoining pressure.

The repulsive force K between the two surfaces, is obtained as the surface integral the osmotic pressure. The film thickness being much smaller than the curvature radius, we use the Derjaguin approximation [22]. For distances much smaller than the radius of the oscillating sphere, the vertical width of the water film $h = h_0 + R - \sqrt{R^2 - r^2}$ is well approximated by

$$h(r) = h_0 + \frac{r^2}{2R}, \quad (r \ll R). \quad (9)$$

Rewriting the surface element as $dS = 2\pi dr r = 2\pi R dh$, one readily obtains

$$K(h_0) = \int dS \Pi = 2\pi R \int_{h_0}^{\infty} dh \Pi(h). \quad (10)$$

The disjoining pressure gives rise to a static restoring force $-kZ$, with spring constant

$$k(h_0) = -\frac{dK}{dh_0} = 2\pi R \Pi(h_0). \quad (11)$$

The discussion and numerical evaluation of the force K and the rigidity k are postponed to Sect. IV below.

III. CHARGE-FLOW COUPLING

We consider charged surfaces in sphere-plane geometry, in contact with a weak electrolyte solution, as shown schematically in Fig. 1. The vertical distance varies with time according to $h_0 + Z(t)$, with a small sinusoidal amplitude $|Z| \ll h_0$ and frequency ω , resulting in the velocity $V = dZ/dt$. Experimentally, this is realized by a vibrating sphere of radius R mounted on the cantilever of an AFM.

A. Lubrication approximation

The vertical oscillation modulates the hydrodynamic pressure P in the film and imposes a flow J_V . For an incompressible fluid, there is a simple geometrical relation between the vertical velocity V of the cantilever and the volume flow carried by the radial fluid velocity v ,

$$\pi r^2 V = 2\pi r J_V = 2\pi r \int dz v(z, r). \quad (12)$$

Here and in the following, $\int dz(\dots)$ indicates integration from $-h/2$ to $h/2$.

The fluid mechanical problem simplifies significantly when resorting to the lubrication approximation [23]. In the range of validity of Eq. (9), the vertical component of the velocity field is negligible, and the radial component v obeys a simplified Stokes equation,

$$\eta \partial_z^2 v = \partial_r P - \rho E, \quad (13)$$

with the viscosity η and where only the vertical component of the Laplace operator $\nabla^2 v$ has been retained. The right-hand side comprises the radial pressure gradient $\partial_r P$ and the force exerted by a radial electric field E and the charge density ρ of the diffuse layer.

B. Non-equilibrium fluxes and forces

Similarly, using the Derjaguin approximation, the electrostatic properties can be calculated with the 1D Poisson-Boltzmann equation (4) with slowly varying distance h . Yet this equilibrium state is perturbed by charge-flow coupling. Indeed, advection of counterions by the radial velocity v , resulting in a radial charge distribution and an electric field E . Through the electro-osmotic force in (13), the latter acts back on the flow properties.

For an axisymmetric geometry, both E and the pressure P depend on the radial coordinate r only, and the velocity field $v = v_P + v_E$ and charge current $j = j_P + j_E$ point in radial direction. Integrating over the vertical variable z we obtain the fluxes of volume and charge,

$$J_V = \int dz (v_P + v_E) = -L_{vv} \nabla P + L_{vc} E, \quad (14)$$

$$J_C = \int dz (j_P + j_E) = -L_{cv} \nabla P + L_{cc} E, \quad (15)$$

in terms of generalized forces $-\nabla P = -dP/dr$ and eE and where the second identity defines the linear transport coefficients L_{ij} .

The first term in eq. (14) arises from the pressure driven flow profile $v_P(z)$. Assuming no-slip boundary conditions $v_P(\pm h/2) = 0$, the Stokes equation (13) with $E = 0$ is readily integrated,

$$v_P = -\frac{h^2 - 4z^2}{8\eta} \nabla P, \quad (16)$$

resulting in

$$L_{vv} = \frac{h^3}{12\eta}. \quad (17)$$

The second term in (14) accounts for the electro-osmotic velocity profile [24]

$$\begin{aligned} v_E(z) &= -\frac{1}{\eta} \int_z^{h/2} dz' \int_0^{z'} dz'' \rho(z'') E \\ &= \frac{\epsilon}{\eta} (\psi(z) - \zeta) E, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where the second identity follows from twice integrating Gauss' law $\epsilon \partial_z^2 \psi = -\rho$. This leads to the electro-osmotic transport coefficient

$$L_{vc} = \frac{1}{E} \int dz v_E(z). \quad (19)$$

The electric current (15) consists of advection of counterions in the Poiseuille flow profile v_P ,

$$L_{cv} = \frac{1}{\eta} \int dz \rho(z) \frac{h^2 - 4z^2}{8}, \quad (20)$$

and Ohm's law with the conductivity L_{cc} . This latter coefficient reads as

$$L_{cc} = \int dz \left(\rho \frac{\epsilon}{\eta} (\psi - \zeta) + \mu e^2 (n_+ + n_-) \right) \quad (21)$$

where the first term accounts for advection by the electro-osmotic velocity field v_E , and the second one for electrophoresis of salt ions [25]. The excess conductivity with respect to the bulk value $2\mu n_0 h$ are often expressed in terms of the Dukhin number [3]. We assume identical mobilities, $\mu_{\pm} \equiv \mu$; the general case would require to add a "chemical" contribution to the electric field, proportional to $(\mu_+ - \mu_-) \nabla \ln n$, with the salinity n [24].

Electrokinetic phenomena in a channel between two electrolyte reservoirs at different electrochemical potential, are characterized by a constant streaming current $J_C \neq 0$ [6, 13, 14]. Contrary to this open geometry, the periodically driven squeezing motion of Fig. 1 does not allow for a steady current but gives rise to the electric field E . Strictly speaking, there is a small current which

develops the space charges related to the electric field, $\delta\rho = \epsilon \text{div} \cdot E$, and which vanishes when averaged over one cycle. Because of the strong electric interactions, the space charges develop almost instantaneously such that the electric field is in phase with the pressure gradient, and that advection and conduction currents cancel each other in (15),

$$J_C = 0. \quad (22)$$

This relation holds true as long as the charge relaxation time τ is much shorter than the period of the external driven, $\omega\tau \ll 1$.

C. Electroviscous drag force

With the above condition of zero charge current, eq. (15) implies a relation between the radial electric field and the pressure gradient,

$$E = \frac{L_{cv}}{L_{cc}} \nabla P. \quad (23)$$

Inserting this in the volume current (14) and solving for the pressure gradient, we find

$$\nabla P = -\frac{6\eta r V}{h^3} \frac{1}{1-\xi}, \quad (24)$$

where the coupling of the double layer to the flow is accounted for by the ratio of off-diagonal and diagonal transport coefficients L_{ij} ,

$$\xi = \frac{L_{vc} L_{cv}}{L_{vv} L_{cc}}. \quad (25)$$

From (24) it is clear that the dimensionless parameter ξ describes the effect of charge-flow coupling on the hydrodynamic pressure. For $\xi = 0$ one recovers the well-known expression for the pressure gradient in capillary. The stability of the dynamic equations (14) and (15) requires a positive determinant of the transport matrix, $\det \mathbf{L} > 0$ or $\xi < 1$.

When integrating the excess hydrodynamic pressure in the capillary, it turns out convenient to use the variable h instead of r . In lubrication approximation (9) one has $dh = dr r / R$ and

$$P(h) = 6\eta V \int_h^\infty \frac{dh'}{h'^3} \frac{1}{1-\xi(h')}. \quad (26)$$

Finally, the viscous force on the cantilever is given by the surface integral of the pressure. With $dS = 2\pi dr r = 2\pi R dh$ one finds for the drag coefficient

$$F(h_0) = -2\pi R \int_{h_0}^\infty dh P(h). \quad (27)$$

In eq.(1) we have defined the electroviscous drag coefficient through $F = -\gamma V$; the above relations give

$$\gamma = 12\pi\eta R \int_{h_0}^\infty dh \int_h^\infty \frac{dh'}{h'^3} \frac{1}{1-\xi(h')}. \quad (28)$$

In the absence of electro-viscous coupling, one readily obtains the pressure

$$P_0(h) = \frac{3\eta V R}{h^2}, \quad (\xi = 0), \quad (29)$$

which is maximum at the centre of the film and vanishes as $P_0 \propto r^{-4}$ at large radial distance. The corresponding lubrication drag coefficient [26],

$$\gamma_0 = \frac{6\pi\eta R^2}{h_0}, \quad (\xi = 0), \quad (30)$$

is by a factor R/h_0 larger than the Stokes drag coefficient $6\pi\eta R V$ on a sphere of radius R in a bulk liquid.

D. Wide-channel approximation

If a width of the water film is much larger than the Debye length, $h \gg \lambda$, the electrostatic potential is given by [21]

$$\psi = -\frac{4k_B T}{e} \text{arctanh}(\beta e^{-z/\lambda}), \quad (31)$$

with

$$\beta = \frac{\sqrt{1 + (2\pi\ell_B \lambda \sigma)^2} - 1}{2\pi\ell_B \lambda \sigma}. \quad (32)$$

In this case, there are analytical expressions for the transport coefficients L_{ij} . The off-diagonal terms are given by the Helmholtz-Smoluchowski electrophoretic mobility,

$$L_{vc} = -\frac{h\epsilon\zeta}{e\eta} = -\frac{h\hat{\zeta}}{4\pi\eta\ell_B}, \quad (33)$$

where in the second identity we define the dimensionless zeta potential in units of the thermal energy $\hat{\zeta} = e\zeta/k_B T$. The electrical conductivity reads as

$$L_{cc} = \frac{\sinh(\hat{\zeta}/4)^2}{\pi^2\eta\lambda\ell_B^2} + \mu(2\sigma + 2n_0 h). \quad (34)$$

The last term $2\mu n_0 h$ is the bulk conductivity of the electrolyte solution, whereas the first two terms account for surface corrections, which comprise counterion electrophoresis $\propto \sigma$ and electro-osmotic advection.

For wide channels, the conductivity is dominated by ion electrophoresis, $2\mu(\sigma + n_0 h_0)$, such the electroosmotic term may be discarded. With the definition of the screening length (4), the coupling parameter defined in (25) simplifies to

$$\xi = \frac{\lambda_*^2}{2h^2} \frac{1}{1 + \sigma/h_0 n_0}, \quad (35)$$




FIG. 2. Electroviscous enhancement of the drag coefficient $\gamma(h_0)$, in units of the purely viscous coefficient γ_0 at $h_0 = \lambda_*$. In the absence of charge-flow coupling as in (30), the dotted line “0” gives $\gamma_0(h_0)/\gamma_0(\lambda_*) = \lambda_*/h_0$. Dashed lines are calculated from the perturbation series (38) for γ , truncated at $(\lambda_*/h_0)^{2n}$ with $n = 1, 2, 3, 100$. The full line represents the complete series (37), which is defined for $h > \lambda_*$ only.

where we have expressed the ion mobility as $\mu = 1/6\pi\eta a$ with the hydrodynamic radius a , and defined the length scale

$$\lambda_* = 6\hat{\zeta}\sqrt{\frac{a}{\ell_B}}\lambda. \quad (36)$$

Anticipating the range of validity of the result, we may even discard the second factor in expression for ξ , which accounts for surface conductivity. Then the pressure and the viscous force can be integrated in closed form,

$$\frac{\gamma}{\gamma_0} = \frac{h_0}{\lambda_*} \ln \frac{h_0 + \lambda_*}{h_0 - \lambda_*} + \frac{h_0^2}{\lambda_*^2} \ln \frac{h_0^2 - \lambda_*^2}{h_0^2}. \quad (37)$$

The coefficient γ is plotted in Fig. 2 as a (red) solid line, which stops at the distance $h_0 = \lambda_*$. At this point the electroviscous coupling parameter ξ is equal to unity and, as a consequence, a logarithmic branch point appears in the pressure integral (26), resulting in $\gamma/\gamma_0 = 2\ln 2 \approx 1.39$. At smaller distances the wide-channel approximation for pressure and force integrals is not defined.

It turns out instructive to rewrite (37) as a series in powers of λ_*/h_0 ,

$$\frac{\gamma}{\gamma_0} = 1 + \frac{1}{6} \frac{\lambda_*^2}{h_0^2} + \frac{1}{15} \frac{\lambda_*^4}{h_0^4} + \frac{1}{28} \frac{\lambda_*^6}{h_0^6} + \dots \quad (38)$$

In Fig. 2 we compare γ with the uncoupled lubrication drag coefficient (30). Retaining a few correction terms of the series, suggests a smooth behavior, whereas Eq. (37) is defined for $h_0 \geq \lambda_*$ only. The first correction term, proportional to λ_*^2/h_0^2 , corresponds to the electroviscous coefficient of Bike and Prieve [18].




FIG. 3. Numerical calculation of the electroviscous coupling parameter ξ as a function of h , for surface charge density $\sigma = 0.002$ and 0.02 nm^{-2} , and Debye length $\lambda = 30$ and 90 nm . Dotted and dashed lines correspond to the approximations of narrow and wide channels, respectively, whereas the solid lines give the numerical solution.

Noting that the ion radius is usually smaller than the Bjerrum length $\ell_B = 0.7 \text{ nm}$, and $\hat{\zeta}$ of the order of unity, one finds that λ_*/λ takes values between 1 and 10.

E. Narrow-channel approximation

In the case of a narrow channel, $h \ll \lambda$, the overlapping double layers of the surfaces result in a constant charge density

$$\rho = \epsilon \partial_z^2 \psi = 2\sigma/h, \quad (39)$$

in other words, the counterions form a homogeneous gas [21]. The electrostatic potential is readily integrated,

$$\psi(z) = \frac{k_B T}{e} \left(\ln m - \frac{4\pi\ell_B \sigma}{h} z^2 \right), \quad (40)$$

where the parameter m describes the finite potential at mid-plane $\psi(0) = (k_B T/e) \ln m$.

With these expressions for ρ and ψ the transport coefficients are readily calculated. Retaining contributions




FIG. 4. Electroviscous drag enhancement $\gamma/\gamma_0 - 1$ as a function of h_0 , for different values of surface charge density σ and Debye length λ .

up to first order in h only, we find

$$L_{vc} = \frac{e\sigma h^2}{6\eta}, \quad L_{cc} = \frac{e^2\sigma^2 h}{3\eta} + \frac{e^2(\sigma + n_0 h)}{3\pi a\eta}, \quad (41)$$

resulting in the coupling parameter

$$\xi = \frac{\pi\sigma^2 a h}{\pi\sigma^2 a h + (\sigma + n_0 h)}. \quad (42)$$

Note that ξ is independent of the Debye length. For narrow channels, the denominator takes the value 4σ , and ξ decreases linearly with h .

F. Numerical evaluation of ξ and Γ

In the general case, the electrostatic potential is obtained in terms of the Jacobi elliptic function $\text{cd}(u|m^2)$ [27],

$$\psi(z) = \frac{k_B T}{e} \left[\ln m + 2 \ln \text{cd} \left(\frac{z}{2\lambda\sqrt{k}} \middle| m^2 \right) \right]. \quad (43)$$

Because of $\text{cd}(0|m^2) = 1$, the second term vanishes at $z = 0$, and the potential at mid-plane is given by $\ln m$. The parameter m depends on the ratio of the channel width and the Debye length: For $h \gg \lambda$ one has $m = 1$ and recovers the analytic expression (31) for a charged surface limiting an infinite half-space. In the narrow-channel limit one finds

$$m = \frac{h n_0}{2\sigma}, \quad (h n_0 \ll \sigma), \quad (44)$$

and expanding the Jacobi function to second order in z , one recovers the potential defined in eq. (40) above.

The electric potential is calculated numerically from (43) with the boundary condition (7). Then the electroviscous coupling parameter ξ defined in (25), is obtained by performing the integrals (20) and (21) for a given film distance h .

Fig. 3 shows the variation of ξ as a function of h for different values of surface charge concentration σ and Debye length λ , and compares with narrow-channel and wide-channel approximations. As a surprising feature, ξ is roughly linear in σ . The log-log plot shows the power laws $\xi \propto h$ and $\xi \propto h^{-2}$, in the limits of narrow and wide channels, respectively. The maximum occurs at $h_{\text{max}} \approx 3\lambda$. The narrow-channel result (42) provides a good description for $h \leq \lambda$, whereas the wide-channel expression (VIA) converges for $h \gg \lambda_*$ only. In the intermediate range, which covers at least one decade in h , neither of them is valid.

In Fig. 4 we plot the enhancement factor $\gamma/\gamma_0 - 1$ of the viscous force (27), with parameters as in Fig. 3. As expected for the electroviscous coupling parameter ξ , there is a maximum at $h \approx \lambda$. The enhancement factor depends equally strongly on the surface charge and the Debye length. The upper curve exceeds unity, which means that the force is more than twice F_0 .

IV. CHARGE REGULATION

So far we have assumed that the surface charge density σ remains constant upon varying the film thickness h_0 . This is not the case, however, for weakly dissociating acidic groups HA which release and recover protons according to [28]



For narrow channels the potential (43) takes a finite value at midplane, $\psi(0) = (k_B T/e) \ln k$, which favors recombination of the surface groups, thus reducing the effective charge density σ and surface potential ζ .

A simple and widely studied model relies on the dissociation constant

$$\mathcal{Z} = \frac{[\text{H}^+][\text{A}^-]}{[\text{HA}]} = n_s \frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha}, \quad (46)$$

where we have defined the dissociated fraction α and the hydronium concentration at the surface $n_s = e^{-e\zeta/k_B T} [\text{H}^+]_\infty$. Solving for α one finds the fraction of dissociated sites

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{1 + n_s/\mathcal{Z}}, \quad (47)$$

and the number density of surface charges,

$$\sigma = \frac{\alpha}{S}. \quad (48)$$

The electrostatic potential is obtained by closing the above relations with the boundary condition (7). The area per site S is chosen such that at large distance (where $\zeta = \zeta_\infty$), σ takes the value indicated for the case of constant charge.

An alternate approach, which is often used for systems with more complex charging procedure but essentially




FIG. 5. Electroviscous coupling parameter ξ as a function of the distance h , for constant charge (cc), charge regulation (cr), and constant potential (cp).

leads to the same results, is via a proper minimization of the relevant thermodynamic potential [29].

In the following we compare the electrostatic and electroviscous properties calculated at constant charge (cc) with the charge-regulated case (cr), and also with that of constant potential (cp), where the boundary condition (7) is replaced with

$$\psi(\pm h/2) = \zeta_\infty. \quad (49)$$

Here ζ_∞ is the surface potential at large distance, calculated with the surface charge σ according to (31). All curves labelled “cr” are calculated with $\mathcal{Z} = 10^{-3}$ M.

A. Electroviscous coupling

In Fig. 5 we plot the coupling parameter ξ for the cases of constant charge and constant surface potential, and observe a behavior similar to what has been reported previously for the disjoining pressure [30]: At distances smaller than the screening length, $h < \lambda$, the curves of ξ for different boundary conditions diverge significantly. Yet note that the electroviscous coupling is strongest in the range $\lambda < h < 10\lambda$, where charge regulation is of little importance.

The electroviscous enhancement of the drag force γ with respect to the uncoupled expression γ_0 is shown in Fig. 6. The maximum occurs at a distance slightly below the screening length. For the given electrostatic parameters, it reaches the value $\gamma/\gamma_0 \approx 2$, which depends little on the electrostatic boundary condition. The electroviscous drag component disappears at much higher distances of about 10λ , as shown in Fig. 4 above.

B. Disjoining pressure and static repulsion

Now we consider the static repulsive force arising from the overlap of the diffuse layers on the opposite sur-




FIG. 6. Electroviscous enhancement $\gamma/\gamma_0 - 1$, as a function of the distance h_0 for different boundary conditions.

faces, and which is independent of the external driving. According to (43) the potential at midplane reads as $\psi(0) = (k_B T/e) \ln m$, and the disjoining pressure (8) is determined by the parameter m ,

$$\Pi = n_0 k_B T \left(m + \frac{1}{m} - 2 \right). \quad (50)$$

In Fig. 7 we plot Π calculated for constant charge (cc), constant potential (cp), and charge regulation (cr). For distances shorter than the screening length, these different boundary conditions result in significant differences. In agreement with previous work, we find a constant pres-




FIG. 7. Disjoining pressure between charged surfaces as a function of the distance h_0 . The solid curves give the numerical solution (8) for constant surface charge $\sigma = 0.018 \text{ nm}^{-2}$ (cc), constant potential ζ (cp), and the charge-regulated intermediate case (cr) with dissociation constant $\mathcal{Z} = 10^{-3}$ M. The approximative expression (51) is plotted as dashed line. The inset shows the ratio Π/Π_s , highlighting the deviation of the disjoining pressure Π from the approximate expression Π_s , which sets in well above 200 nm.




FIG. 8. Static force between charged surfaces as a function of the distance h_0 . The solid curves give the numerical solution (10) for constant charge (upper red), constant potential (lower blue), and charge regulation (middle green). The approximative expression (53) is plotted as dashed line. The inset shows the ratio K/K_s ; note that all curves coincide at large distance, which is not visible in the main figure.

sure for cp [21] and power laws $\Pi \propto h^s$ with $s = -1$ and $-\frac{1}{2}$ for cc and cr, respectively [30].

The dashed line corresponds to the widely used approximation [1]

$$\Pi_s(h) = 64\beta^2 n_0 k_B T e^{-h/\lambda}, \quad (h \gg \lambda), \quad (51)$$

which relies on the linear superposition of the double layers at the opposite surfaces, and where the parameter $\beta = \tanh(e\zeta_\infty/4k_B T)$ is given by the surface potential ζ_∞ at $h_0 \rightarrow \infty$, as defined in eq. (32).

The repulsive force (10) between the two surfaces is calculated in Derjaguin approximation, in analogy to (27), resulting in

$$K = 2\pi R \int_{h_0}^{\infty} dh \Pi(h). \quad (52)$$

For the pressure in superposition approximation we obtain $K_s = 2\pi R \lambda \Pi_s(h_0)$ and, after expressing the salt content through the Debye length,

$$K_s = \frac{16R\beta^2 k_B T}{\lambda \ell_B} e^{-h/\lambda}, \quad (h_0 \gg \lambda). \quad (53)$$

A comparison of the numerically exact force K with the exponential approximation K_s is given in Fig. 8. Both expressions agree beyond 200 nm, or $h_0 > 7\lambda$. The inset shows that the force calculated for constant potential (cp) remains about 10% below K_s , whereas those for constant or regulated charge (cc or cr) show a more complex behavior: they first decrease below K_s yet at even smaller h_0 by far exceed the analytic approximation K_s [1].




FIG. 9. Static repulsion K between the AFM sphere and the solid surface, as a function of the distance h_0 . The squares give experimental data. The blue and red curves are calculated from (52) for constant potential and constant surface charge, respectively, with the parameter values $R = 55 \mu\text{m}$, surface charge density $\sigma = 0.025 \text{ nm}^{-2}$ and screening length $\lambda = 40 \text{ nm}$.

V. AFM FORCE MEASUREMENT

A. Experimental detail

We performed a dynamic AFM measurement with colloidal probe following the method described in [31]. A spherical borosilicate particle (MO-Sci Corporation) with a radius of $R = 55 \pm 0.5 \mu\text{m}$ was glued at the end of a cantilever (CSG30, NT-MDT) using epoxy (Araldite, Bostik, Coubert). The stiffness of the ensemble of cantilever and particle was calibrated by the drainage method [32], resulting in $k_c = 0.8 \pm 0.1 \text{ N/m}$. The resonance frequency and bulk quality factor were obtained from the thermal spectrum as $\omega_0/2\pi = 3340 \text{ Hz}$ and $Q = 4.7$, respectively.

The experiment was performed using an AFM (Bioscope, Bruker, USA) equipped with a liquid cell (DTFML-DD-HE) which allows us to work in liquid environment. The mica surface was driven by a piezo (Nano T225, MCL Inc., USA) to approach the particle with a very small velocity such that the drainage force can be neglected, and meanwhile the probe was also driven with a base oscillation amplitude $A_b = 3.5 \text{ nm}$ and frequency of $\omega/2\pi = 100 \text{ Hz}$. The amplitude A and phase φ of the cantilever deflection were measured by a Lock-in Amplifier (Signal recovery, Model:7280), and the DC component of the cantilever deflection was also recorded, from which the separation distance h_0 and electrostatic force F_{el} between the sphere and the mica surface were extracted. The mica surface and cantilever probe are immersed in a weak electrolyte solution. We also performed control experiments at large salinity. All measurements




FIG. 10. Real and imaginary parts k and $\omega\gamma$ of the response function, measured at $\omega/2\pi = 100$ Hz in strong and weak electrolytes, as a function of the distance h_0 . The solid line gives $\omega\gamma_0$ with the viscous drag coefficient (30).

were done at room temperature 21°C.

B. Static force

Fig. 9 shows the electrostatic repulsive force between the mica surface and the colloidal probe. The data roughly show an exponential behavior, as expected for a screened double-layer interaction. The upper (red) curve is calculated from eq. (52) for constant charge number density $\sigma = 0.025 \text{ nm}^{-2}$, and the lower (blue) one for constant surface potential $\zeta = -95 \text{ mV}$. In the range where both curves coincide, $h_0 > \lambda$, the best fit is obtained with a screening length $\lambda = 40 \text{ nm}$, corresponding to an electrolyte strength of $60 \mu\text{M}$.

C. Visco-elastic response function

Driving of the probe induces an oscillation of the tip-surface distance according to $h_0 + Z(t)$. Modelling the cantilever as a damped harmonic oscillator [17] and solving its equation of motion for the force F exerted by the surrounding liquid, we obtain in complex notation

$$F = -k_c Z \left(1 - \left(\frac{\omega}{\omega_0} \right)^2 + i \frac{\omega}{\omega_0 Q} \right) \frac{A e^{i\varphi} - A_\infty e^{i\varphi_\infty}}{A e^{i\varphi} + A_b}, \quad (54)$$

with amplitude A and phase φ of the mica surface. The values A_∞ and φ_∞ are measured far from the surface, where the viscoelastic force F is negligible. The tip-surface distance reads as $Z(t) = e^{i\omega t} (A e^{i\varphi} + A_b)$. All




FIG. 11. Elastic response k measured in a weak electrolyte at $\omega/2\pi = 100$ Hz (open symbols) and for the static case (full symbols), as a function of h_0 . The solid line gives the static rigidity k , calculated from eq. (11) for constant potential. The experimental data are binned, such that each point corresponds to the mean value of 100 measured values.

measurements are done in the linear-response regime $|Z| \ll h_0$.

In view of eq. (1) we split F/Z in its real and imaginary components. Writing the velocity as $V = i\omega Z$, we readily obtain the complex response function,

$$F = -(k + i\omega\gamma)Z, \quad (55)$$

where the “spring constant” k and the drag coefficient γ account for the elastic and viscous components of the tip-surface interactions.

In Fig. 10 we plot the measured real and imaginary coefficients as a function of the separation distance h_0 for weak and strong electrolyte solution, at the oscillation frequency of $\omega/2\pi = 100$ Hz. At large salinity electrokinetic effects disappear because of electrostatic screening, and the spring constant k vanishes accordingly. The drag coefficient reduces to the viscous contribution $\gamma_0 = 6\pi\eta R^2/h_0$, as expected from (30). The solid line, given by $\omega\gamma_0$, provides a good fit to the data.

Quite a different behavior occurs in a weak electrolyte, where we observe a strong elastic component k and a strong enhancement of the drag coefficient γ . Fig. 11 compares the elastic response function $k(\omega)$ at finite frequency $\omega/2\pi = 100$ Hz (open symbols) and the static stiffness $-dK/dh_0$ (full symbols). The curve represents the spring constant (11), which is related to the variation of the disjoining pressure with distance and which is calculated from (8) at constant potential (cp). This curve agrees rather well with the static measurement. These data provide unambiguous evidence that the dynamic elastic response $k(\omega)$ comprises a frequency dependent contribution which is most significant at small distances, $h_0 < \lambda$ and which is not captured by the electrostatic disjoining pressure Π .




FIG. 12. Relative enhancement of the drag coefficient due to electroviscous coupling. The points are measured AFM data, and the solid curve gives the theoretical expression calculated from eqs. (28) and (30).

Finally, in Fig. 12 we plot the electroviscous enhancement of the drag coefficient, $\gamma/\gamma_0 - 1$, and compare with the theoretical expression calculated numerically from eq. (28), using the same values for σ and λ as in Figs. 9 and 11. At distances larger than the Debye length, the theory curve agrees well with the measured data, yet it underestimates the drag coefficient at smaller h_0 .

VI. DISCUSSION

A. Validity of the wide channel approximation

If the double layers on either side of the water film don't overlap, their properties are given by the Poisson-Boltzmann potential (31) calculated for an infinite half-space. As the surfaces get closer, their diffuse layers start to interact, resulting in electrostatic repulsion and electroviscous coupling. In the range where the distance h_0 is moderately larger than the Debye length λ , widely used approximations result in an exponentially screened electrostatic repulsion [33] and in a power-law dependence of the electroviscous drag [18].

Its range of validity is obviously related to the Debye length λ , yet our analysis shows that in reality it is limited by a significantly larger distance λ_* , as defined in (36). With typical values of the reduced potential $\hat{\zeta}$ ranging from 1 to 4, the parameter λ_* may be up to 20 times larger than the actual screening length λ . This is clearly displayed by the electroviscous coupling parameter plotted in Fig. 3. The wide-channel approximation converges only at $h_0 > 20\lambda$. As a consequence, at distances below λ_* the force can be calculated only numerically.




FIG. 13. The parameter m of the electrostatic potential (43) as a function of reduced channel width h/λ , for three values of the surface charge density σ , and for constant charge (cc, red), constant potential (cp, blue), and charge regulation (cr, green). There are two different length scales: The onset of electrostatic coupling of the two diffuse layers, where m starts to decrease below 1, occurs at a distance $h_* = 2\pi\sigma\ell_B\lambda^2$ which increases with σ . On the other hand, the electrostatic boundary condition and charge regulation (cc, cr, cp) are relevant at shorter distances, and their onset occurs at a distance which is inversely proportional to the surface charge density.

B. The effect of charge regulation

There are two length scales indicating a qualitative change of the electrostatic properties, as illustrated by the parameter m of the Jacobi elliptic function $\text{cd}(u|m^2)$ in eq. (43), which is plotted in Fig. 13. For very large channels one has $m = 1$, which means that the double layers at opposite surfaces don't interact. The onset of the electrostatic coupling occurs at a film width λ_* which is of the order of the Debye length but increases with the surface charge density σ . Indeed, the curves of Fig. 13 show that the decrease of m occurs at $h = \lambda$ for $\sigma = 0.001\text{nm}^{-2}$ and at a significantly larger distance for $\sigma = 0.1\text{nm}^{-2}$.

On the other hand, the electrostatic boundary conditions (cc or cp) and charge regulation are relevant at smaller distances, and their onset shows the opposite behavior as a function of the surface charge density. Indeed, for $\sigma = 0.001\text{nm}^{-2}$ the curves for cc, cp, cr, start diverging at $h = \lambda$, whereas for $\sigma = 0.1\text{nm}^{-2}$ this occurs at much smaller distances.

These features can be observed for both the electrostatic repulsion and electroviscous effects. Regarding the former, the two length scales for the onset of non-exponential behavior and charge regulation effects, are clearly visible in the inset of Fig. 8. Similarly, the electroviscous coupling parameter ξ in Fig. 5 and the enhancement of the drag coefficient in Fig. 6 show characteristic wide-channel power laws for $h \gg \lambda$, whereas charge regulation effects occur at distances shorter than the screening length.




FIG. 14. Numerical calculation of the electroviscous enhancement of the drag coefficient $\gamma/\gamma_0 - 1$ as a function of h , for $\sigma = 0.02 \text{ nm}^{-2}$ and $\lambda = 30 \text{ nm}$. The solid line is calculated with the full pressure (24), and the dashed line that with the linearized expression (56).

C. Comparison with previous work

Electroviscous effects on squeezing motion have been studied in several previous papers [17–20]. All of these works start, more or less explicitly, from the volume and charge currents (14) and (15). Yet when calculating the charge current J_C , they use the unperturbed pressure gradient $\nabla P_0 = -6\eta rV/h^3$ instead of ∇P . This perturbative approach corresponds to a linearization of the pressure gradient in the coupling parameter ξ ,

$$\nabla P_1 = \nabla P_0(1 + \xi), \quad (56)$$

instead of the exact expression (24).

As a consequence, electroviscous effects appear as an additive correction to the unperturbed drag force F_0 . Thus the wide-channel force of Bike and Prieve [18] is identical to the first two terms of (38), whereas our expression (37) corresponds to the full series in λ_*/h_0 . Similarly, the numerical calculations of Chun and Ladd [19] and Zhao *et al.* [20], are done with the linearized pressure gradient P_1 .

In Fig. 14 we compare the electroviscous enhancement of the drag force, calculated with the numerically exact pressure gradient (24) and with the linearized form P_1 . For the parameters $\lambda = 30 \text{ nm}$ and $\sigma = 0.02 \text{ nm}^{-2}$, the linearized drag coefficient is by about 40% larger than γ_0 , whereas the increase of the full expression exceeds 100%. This difference is not surprising in view of the coupling parameters shown in Fig. 3; in the intermediate range where ξ reaches values of the order of unity, one expects a significant nonlinear behavior.

VII. SUMMARY

We have studied the electroviscous and electrostatic forces exerted on a vibrating AFM tip across a nanoscale

water film. We briefly summarize the main findings.

(i) In the framework of Onsager relations for generalized fluxes and forces, we derive the drag coefficient (28) in terms of the electroviscous coupling parameter ξ , and find a quantitative agreement with experimental data (Fig. 12). As the only parameters, the surface charge σ and the screening length λ are taken from the electrostatic repulsion shown in Fig. 9.

(ii) This analysis relies on a quasistatic approximation (22), where the radial charge distribution in the water film is assumed to follow instantaneously the external driving. The fits of the viscous and elastic components of the response function (55), measured at $\omega/2\pi = 100 \text{ Hz}$ and shown in Figs. 11 and 12, indicate that this approximation is justified at distances larger than the screening length, yet ceases to be valid for $h_0 < \lambda$. Our experimental data strongly suggest that in this range both the spring constant k and the drag coefficient γ vary with frequency. The nature of the underlying relaxation process is not clear at present.

(iii) Previous work relied on the linearization approximation (56) for the hydrodynamic pressure gradient. For experimental parameters, this linearization underestimates the enhancement of the drag coefficients by more than hundred percent (Fig. 14).

(iv) Charge regulation turns out to be of minor importance in the experimentally most relevant range. Indeed, the electroviscous coupling sets in at large distances and is maximum at $h_0 \sim 3\lambda$ (Fig. 3), whereas the electrostatic boundary conditions and charge regulation effects are significant in narrow channels only, as shown in Figs. 5–9.

VIII. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project was supported by the French National Research Agency through Grant No. ANR-19-CE30-0012. MRM acknowledges funding support from the Mexican Council for Science and Technology (CONACYT) Grant No. CVU 625862. ZZ acknowledges funding support from the China Scholarship Council.

*MRM and ZZ contributed equally to this work.

-
- [1] J. N. Israelachvili, *Intermolecular and surface forces*, 2nd ed. (Academic Press London, San Diego, 1991).
 - [2] J. Israelachvili and H. Wennerström, *Nature* **379**, 219 (1996).
 - [3] J. Lyklema, *Fundamentals of Interface and Colloid Science* (Academic Press, New York, 1995).
 - [4] H. A. Stone, A. D. Stroock, and A. Ajdari, *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.* **36**, 381 (2004).
 - [5] J. Yan, M. Han, J. Zhang, C. Xu, E. Luijten, and S. Granick, *Nature materials* **15**, 1095 (2016).
 - [6] S. Marbach and L. Bocquet, *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **48**, 3102 (2019).
 - [7] L. Bocquet and E. Charlaix, *Chemical Reviews* **39**, 1073 (2010).
 - [8] H. Helmholtz, *Annalen der Physik* **243**, 337 (1879).
 - [9] M. von Smoluchowski, *Bull. Akad. Sci. Cracovie.* **8**, 182 (1903).
 - [10] J. J. Bikerman, *Zeitschrift für Elektrochemie und angewandte physikalische Chemie* **39**, 526 (1933).
 - [11] E. Hückel, *Physik. Z.* **25**, 97 (1924).
 - [12] D. C. Henry and A. Lapworth, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A* **133**, 106 (1931).
 - [13] R. J. Gross and J. F. Osterle, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **49**, 228 (1968).
 - [14] B. M. Alexander and D. C. Prieve, *Langmuir* **3**, 788 (1987).
 - [15] R. Raiteri, M. Grattarola, and H.-J. Butt, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry* **100**, 16700 (1996).
 - [16] F. Liu, C. Zhao, F. Mugele, and D. van den Ende, *Nanotechnology* **26**, 385703 (2015).
 - [17] F. Liu, A. Klaassen, C. Zhao, F. Mugele, and D. van den Ende, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry B* **122**, 933 (2018), pMID: 28976197.
 - [18] S. G. Bie and D. C. Prieve, *Journal of Colloid and Interface Science* **136**, 95 (1990).
 - [19] B. Chun and A. Ladd, *Journal of Colloid and Interface Science* **274**, 687 (2004).
 - [20] C. Zhao, W. Zhang, D. van den Ende, and F. Mugele, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **888**, A29 (2020).
 - [21] D. Andelman, in *Soft Condensed Matter Physics in Molecular and Cell Biology*, edited by W. Poon and D. Andelman (Taylor & Francis, New York, 2006) pp. 97–122.
 - [22] B. Derjaguin, *Kolloid-Zeitschrift* **69**, 155 (1934).
 - [23] J. Happel and H. Brenner, *Low Reynolds Number Hydrodynamics* (Martinus Nijhoff, 1963).
 - [24] J. L. Anderson, *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.* **21**, 61 (1989).
 - [25] D. Stein, M. Kruithof, and C. Dekker, *Physical Review Letters* **93**, 035901 (2004).
 - [26] H. Brenner, *Chem. Eng. Sci.* **16**, 242 (1961).
 - [27] M. Abramowitz and I. A. Stegun, *Handbook of Mathematical Functions* (Dover, New York, 1964).
 - [28] B. W. Ninham and V. A. Parsegian, *J. Theor. Biol.* **31**, 405 (1971).
 - [29] A. Majee, M. Bier, and R. Podgornik, *Soft Matter* **14**, 985 (2018).
 - [30] T. Markovich, D. Andelman, and R. Podgornik, *Europhys. Lett.* **113**, 26004 (2016).
 - [31] A. Maali and R. Boisgard, *Journal of Applied Physics* **114**, 144302 (2013).
 - [32] V. S. J. Craig and C. Neto, *Langmuir* **17**, 6018 (2001).
 - [33] J. Israelachvili, *Journal of Colloid and Interface Science* **110**, 263 (1986).