

Vector Formalism for Active Nematics in Two Dimensions

L. M. Pismen

Department of Chemical Engineering, Technion – Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa 32000, Israel

Specific features of two-dimensional nematodynamics give rise to shortfalls of the tensor representation of the nematic order parameter commonly used in computations, especially in theory of active matter. The alternative representation in terms of the vector order parameter follows with small adjustments the classical director-based theory, but is applicable to 2D problems where both nematic alignment and deviation from the isotropic state are variable. Stability analysis of nematic alignment in flow is used as a testing ground, proving limits of the allowed range of the tumbling parameter and essential effects of distinctions between the splay and bend elasticities.

I. INTRODUCTION

Studies of active nematics commonly deal with 2D patterns in thin layers with tangential alignment on containing walls [1], as well as in thin elastic sheets [2] and cellular layers [3, 4]. Tensor representation is commonly viewed as necessary when not only the orientation but the modulus of the nematic director is variable. The tensor description has been pioneered by Doi [5] and extended to include spatial inhomogeneities [6] and interactions between the nematic alignment and flow [7–9]. The tensor order parameter $Q_{ij} = \rho(n_i n_j - \delta_{ij}/d)$ contains the modulus ρ and is made traceless by adding the last term, where d is the number of dimensions. The immediate advantage of the tensor order parameter over the director \mathbf{n} is, besides the presence of the modulus, its invariance to rotation by π stemming from its dependence on twice the inclination angle.

Although computational models are commonly restricted to 2D, they are often based on the Beris–Edwards 3D model [7] adjusted to 2D just by setting $d = 2$ in the above definition. In this way, one does not take advantage of substantial simplifications brought about by a lower dimensionality. Moreover, as argued below, a simpler approach based on a vector order parameter not only allows for full description of the nematic state in 2D, but has a preference over the tensor-based theory by avoiding the loss of distinction between splay and bend elasticity.

II. SPECIFICS OF TWO DIMENSIONS

A. A missing elastic constant

The tensor-based Landau–de Gennes Lagrangian (LdGL) in 2D is

$$\mathcal{L} = -\alpha_1 Q_{ij} Q_{ij} + \alpha_2 (Q_{ij} Q_{ij})^2 + \mathcal{L}_d. \quad (1)$$

Summation over repeated indices is implied throughout. The two constituents of the distortion Lagrangian \mathcal{L}_d are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_1 &= \frac{1}{2} K_1 |\partial_k Q_{ij}|^2 = \frac{1}{4} K_1 (|\nabla q_1|^2 + |\nabla q_2|^2), \\ \mathcal{L}_2 &= \frac{1}{2} K_2 |\partial_j Q_{ij}|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{4} K_2 [(\partial_1 q_1 + \partial_2 q_2)^2 + (\partial_2 q_1 - \partial_1 q_2)^2]. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Another possible construction, $|\varepsilon_{jk} \partial_k Q_{ij}|^2$, where ε is the antisymmetric tensor, leads to the expression identical to \mathcal{L}_1 . Varying the distortion energy $\mathcal{F}_d = \int \mathcal{L}_d dx$ defines the molecular field tensor

$$H_{ij} = -\partial \mathcal{L} / \partial Q_{ij} + \partial_k \Pi_{ijk}, \quad \Pi_{ijk} = \partial \mathcal{L} / \partial (\partial_k Q_{ij}). \quad (3)$$

The tensor \mathbf{Q} is conveniently parametrized as

$$\mathbf{Q} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} q_1 & q_2 \\ q_2 & -q_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{aligned} q_1 &= \rho \cos 2\theta, \\ q_2 &= \rho \sin 2\theta, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where θ is the inclination angle and $\rho = \sqrt{q_1^2 + q_2^2}$ is the modulus. The molecular field is a vector when expressed through the vector \mathbf{q} but still based on the tensor LdGL

$$h_k = -\partial \mathcal{L} / \partial q_k + \partial_i \pi_{ik}, \quad \pi_{ik} = \partial \mathcal{L}_d / \partial (\partial_i q_k). \quad (5)$$

Two independent constants are sufficient in 2D, but extra terms in \mathcal{L}_2 , $\partial_1 q_1 \partial_2 q_2 - \partial_2 q_1 \partial_1 q_2$ vanish upon variation, so that they do not contribute to the molecular field, so that its distortion part is expressed as $h_i^d = \frac{1}{2} K \nabla^2 q_i$ with $K = \frac{1}{2}(K_1 + K_2)$ or, equivalently, $H_{ij}^d = K \nabla^2 Q_{ij}$. Similarly, in 3D there are only two independent elastic constants in the leading order. A third constant could be only obtained by adding a higher-order term $Q_{ij} \partial_i Q_{kl} \partial_j Q_{kl}$. It does not look contentious that different terms in the classical director-base expression of the distortion energy, $(\text{div } \mathbf{n})^2$, $(\mathbf{n} \cdot \text{curl } \mathbf{n})^2$, $(\mathbf{n} \cdot \text{curl } \mathbf{n})^2$ contain different powers of the \mathbf{n} . But the tensor order parameter, unlike \mathbf{n} , has a physical reality, and it is an apparent drawback that elastic anisotropies cannot be fully captured in the framework of a standard Landau model restricted to the fourth combined order in \mathbf{Q} and spatial derivatives.

Most commonly, the “one-constant approximation” is used in simulations, assuming all elastic coefficients to be equal. Since LdGL is, in any case, a crude approximation allowing for qualitative insights, equality of bend and splay elasticities may appear to be not quite disturbing: the distinction would be certainly restored in higher orders. However, this turns out to be an artifact of the tensor formalism in 2D.

B. Vector Nematodynamics

The tensor \mathbf{Q} can be constructed by merging two vectors, $\mathbf{q}/\sqrt{2}$ and $\mathbf{q}'/\sqrt{2}$, where $q'_i = \varepsilon_{ij}q_j$. Hence, the vector \mathbf{q} , which is invariant under rotation by π , alone carries all necessary information. Moreover, the distinction between bend and splay elasticities is restored in the vector-based description. In 2D, curl \mathbf{q} is a pseudoscalar, and LdGL is expressed, without involving higher orders of \mathbf{q} , as

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{4}|\mathbf{q}|^2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{q}|^2\right) + \frac{1}{4}K_1(\text{div } \mathbf{q})^2 + \frac{1}{4}K_2(\text{curl } \mathbf{q})^2, \quad (6)$$

where the coefficients in the algebraic part are set to unity, so that in a homogeneous state $\varrho = 1$.

Constructing the Lagrangian based on the vector \mathbf{q} in lieu of the Q-tensor enables extending to 2D systems with variable modulus the classical Ericksen–Leslie (EL) formalism [10] with minimal adjustments. Unlike the director-based theory, the distortion energy does not depend on \mathbf{q} , and there is no need for normalization, so that the molecular field obtained defined by (5) is expressed explicitly as $h_i = q_i(1 - \varrho^2) + h_i^d$ with

$$\begin{aligned} h_1^d &= \frac{1}{2}K_1(\partial_1^2 q_1 + \partial_1 \partial_2 q_2) + \frac{1}{2}K_2(\partial_2^2 q_1 - \partial_1 \partial_2 q_2), \\ h_2^d &= \frac{1}{2}K_1(\partial_2^2 q_2 + \partial_1 \partial_2 q_1) + \frac{1}{2}K_2(\partial_1^2 q_2 - \partial_1 \partial_2 q_1), \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

or, setting $K = \frac{1}{2}(K_1 + K_2)$, $K' = \frac{1}{2}(K_1 - K_2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} h_1^d &= \frac{1}{2}K\nabla^2 q_1 + \frac{1}{2}K'[(\partial_1^2 - \partial_2^2)q_1 + 2\partial_1 \partial_2 q_2], \\ h_2^d &= \frac{1}{2}K\nabla^2 q_2 + \frac{1}{2}K'[(\partial_2^2 - \partial_1^2)q_2 + 2\partial_1 \partial_2 q_1]. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The simple expression $\mathbf{h}^d = \frac{1}{2}K\nabla^2 \mathbf{q}$ is obtained at $K' = 0$, but generally this constant does not vanish. This kind of rank reduction is specific to 2D, since the bend and twist terms in 3D would require a higher power of \mathbf{q} , but it testifies of an advantage of the vector, compared to tensor, formalism in 2D.

As in the standard director-based theory, the acceleration of the fluid is determined by the generalized Navier–Stokes equation

$$\rho D_t v_i = \partial_j (\sigma_{ij}^s + \sigma_{ij}^d - p\delta_{ij}) \quad (9)$$

where $D_t = \partial_t + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla$ denotes the substantial derivative accounting for advection with flow velocity \mathbf{v} , σ^s is the viscous stress tensor, $\sigma_{ij}^d = -\pi_{ik}\partial_j q_k$ is the distortion stress, ρ is density, and p is pressure. The dynamics of the order parameter \mathbf{q} stems from the change of entropy S at a constant temperature T , which is expressed in an incompressible fluid as

$$TD_t S = \int (\sigma_{ij}^s s_{ij} + \mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{N} - p\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}) \, d\mathbf{x}, \quad (10)$$

where pressure serves as a Lagrange multiplier enforcing the continuity equation $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0$ and s_{ij} is the shear

tensor, further separated into the symmetric and anti-symmetric parts:

$$s_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_i v_j + \partial_j v_i), \quad \Omega_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_i v_j - \partial_j v_i) = \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{ij}\omega, \quad (11)$$

where $\omega = \nabla \times \mathbf{v}$ is the vorticity pseudoscalar. The vector \mathbf{N} represents the rate of the advection and rotation of the order parameter by fluid flow. At this point, another slight modification is due. Rotation does not affect the modulus, and the distortion energy does not change when both the nematic alignment and the fluid as a whole are rotated with the same angular velocity. Since \mathbf{q} rotates with twice director speed, the standard energy-conserving relation is modified to

$$\partial_t q_i = \frac{1}{2}\omega\varepsilon_{ij}q_j, \quad \partial_t x_i = \omega\varepsilon_{ij}x_j. \quad (12)$$

Accordingly, the antisymmetric part of σ^s is halved to $\frac{1}{4}\mathbf{q} \times \mathbf{h}$. We also take note that, since the 2D vorticity is a pseudoscalar, the expression $\omega \times \mathbf{q}$ makes no sense in 2D, and the change of \mathbf{q} due to advection and rotation is presented by vector $\mathbf{N} = D_t \mathbf{q} - \frac{1}{2}\Omega \cdot \mathbf{q}$.

The contributions to the entropy source are presented as products of fluxes and conjugate forces with coefficients having the dimension of viscosity. Based on (10), σ_{ij}^s is identified as the force conjugate to s_{ij} and \mathbf{h} as the force conjugate to \mathbf{N} . The forces are tied to the fluxes by linear relations with coefficients having the dimension of viscosity arranged into tensors of an appropriate rank. In the EL theory, higher-rank tensors accounting for viscous anisotropies are composed by adding higher powers of \mathbf{n} , up to $n_i n_j n_k n_l s_{kl}$ with respective viscosities. A similar construction with higher powers of \mathbf{q} would add higher powers of the modulus, and therefore may be viewed as incompatible with the restriction of LdGL to lower powers of the order parameter. Therefore it is appropriate to restrict to the lowest-order expression

$$\sigma_{ij}^s = \mu s_{ij} + \frac{1}{2}\gamma'_2(q_i N_j + q_j N_i), \quad (13)$$

$$h_i = \gamma_2 q_j s_{ij} + \gamma_1 N_i. \quad (14)$$

where $\mu = \nu\rho$ is the common dynamic viscosity. The Onsager reciprocity relations determine require the relation between the parameters $\gamma'_2 = \gamma_2$. The dynamic equations of the vector \mathbf{q} follows from (14):

$$D_t q_i = \Omega_{ij}q_j - \chi s_{ij}q_j + \Gamma h_i, \quad (15)$$

where $\Gamma = 1/\gamma_1$ is the mobility parameter and $\chi = \gamma_2/\gamma_1$ is the dimensionless alignment parameter, commonly viewed as arbitrary, which determines the response of the director to local shear. The system (9), (14), (15) determines the combined evolution of the order parameter and flow. In the theory of active dynamics, $\sigma^s + \sigma^d$ are called passive stress, and are supplemented by the active stress $\sigma_{ij}^a = -\zeta Q_{ij} = -\zeta q_i q'_j$ with the parameter ζ positive for extensile and negative for contractile activity.

III. STABILITY ANALYSIS

A. Stability test

We first test a passive system, where a perfectly ordered state must be stable. Consider perturbations of an ordered state $\mathbf{q}_0 = \{\cos 2\theta, \sin 2\theta\}$ in an unbounded 2D domain with a constant background velocity directed along the x_1 coordinate, and expand the deviations $\epsilon \tilde{q}_i$ from the base state in the Fourier series $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} = \epsilon \tilde{\mathbf{q}} e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}}$, where $\mathbf{k} = k\{\cos \varphi, \sin \varphi\}$ is the wave vector. The algebraic part of the molecular field $q_i(1 - \rho^2)$ vanishes upon linearization, and its distortion part (??) is transformed as $\mathbf{h} = -\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{q}$ with

$$\mathbf{H} = \begin{pmatrix} K_1 \cos^2 \varphi + K_2 \sin^2 \varphi & \frac{1}{2}(K_1 - K_2) \sin 2\varphi \\ \frac{1}{2}(K_1 - K_2) \sin 2\varphi & K_1 \sin^2 \varphi + K_2 \cos^2 \varphi \end{pmatrix}. \quad (16)$$

It is advantageous to express the perturbation velocity $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}$ through the stream function, $\tilde{v}_1 = \partial_2 \Psi$, $\tilde{v}_2 = -\partial_1 \Psi$ and expand the latter as $\Psi = \epsilon \tilde{\Psi} e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}}$. The distortion stress vanishes upon linearization, and taking the curl of (9) leads to the Fourier-transformed hydrodynamic equation

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(D_t + \nu k^2)\hat{\Psi} &= \frac{1}{2}\zeta(\hat{q}_2 \cos 2\varphi + \hat{q}_1 \sin 2\varphi) - \frac{1}{8}k^2 \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{q}, \\ \mathbf{f} &= \begin{pmatrix} \kappa_1 \cos \varphi + \kappa_2 \sin \varphi \\ \kappa_1 \sin \varphi + \kappa_2 \cos \varphi \end{pmatrix}, \\ \boldsymbol{\kappa} &= \begin{pmatrix} K_1(2\chi + 1) \sin(2\theta - \varphi) \\ K_2(2\chi - 1) \cos(2\theta - \varphi) \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

The Fourier transform of (11) is

$$\hat{\mathbf{s}} = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon k^2 \hat{\Psi} \begin{pmatrix} -\sin 2\varphi & \cos 2\varphi \\ \cos 2\varphi & \sin 2\varphi \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}} = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon k^2 \hat{\Psi} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \quad (18)$$

and the linearized equation of the perturbed vector order parameter (15) is transformed as

$$D_t \hat{\mathbf{q}} = \Gamma \hat{\mathbf{h}} + \frac{1}{2}k^2 \mathbf{g} \hat{\Psi}, \quad \mathbf{g} = \begin{pmatrix} \sin 2\theta - \chi \sin 2(\theta - \varphi) \\ \cos 2\theta + \chi \cos 2(\theta - \varphi) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (19)$$

Stability requires the eigenvalues λ defined by the following matrix to have negative real parts:

$$\mathbf{J} = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda + \nu k^2 & -\frac{1}{8}k^2 \rho^{-1} f_1 & -\frac{1}{8}k^2 \rho^{-1} f_2 \\ -\frac{1}{2}k^2 g_1 & \lambda + \frac{1}{2}k^2 H_{11} & \frac{1}{2}k^2 H_{12} \\ -\frac{1}{2}k^2 g_2 & \frac{1}{2}k^2 H_{21} & \lambda + \frac{1}{2}k^2 H_{22} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (20)$$

According to the Routh–Hurwitz criterion, stability requires $a_0 > 0$, $a_1 a_2 > 0$, where a_j are the coefficients of $\text{Det}(\mathbf{J}) = \sum_0^3 a_j k^{2(3-j)} \lambda^j$. These conditions are computed as

$$a_0 = \frac{\Gamma K_1 K_2}{64\rho} (1 - 4\chi^2 + 16\nu\rho\Gamma), \quad (21)$$

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 a_2 &= \frac{2\nu + \Gamma(K_1 + K_2)}{256\rho} \{32\rho\Gamma(K_1 + K_2) + 16\rho\Gamma^2 K_1 K_2 \\ &+ 2(1 - 4\chi^2)[(K_1 \sin^2(2\theta - \varphi) + K_2 \cos^2(2\theta - \varphi))\}. \end{aligned}$$

It turns out that the range of the alignment parameter χ is restricted, since stability is ensured only at $|\chi| \leq \frac{1}{2}$, which lies within the flow tumbling range.

B. Instability in an active nematic fluid

Activity disturbs monotonic relaxation to equilibrium. Onsager reciprocity relations do not apply to active media, so that, strictly speaking, the entire nematodynamic theory based on these relations should be revised. Current studies do not go this far but only add the active stress σ^a . This is sufficient for creating a feedback loop: hydrodynamic instabilities give rise to distortions in the nematic alignment field, which, in their turn, drive flow. A positive feedback makes the ordered state of an active nematic intrinsically unstable [11]. Full analysis in confined geometry in the framework of the EL theory with $\sigma_{ij}^a = -\zeta n_i n_j$ has been carried out numerically by Edwards and Yeomans [12].

Adding activity modifies the entries to the first row of (20) to $-\frac{1}{2}\rho^{-1}(\zeta \sin 2\varphi + \frac{1}{4}k^2 f_1)$, $\frac{1}{2}\rho^{-1}(\zeta \cos 2\varphi - \frac{1}{4}k^2 f_2)$. Since the terms containing ζ come with a lower power of k , an arbitrary small activity induces instability in an infinite domain. In a realistic case of a region bounded by two walls at $x_2 = \pm l$ with no-slip boundary conditions [12], both the stream function and its normal derivative have to vanish, so that the spectrum of transverse perturbations is discretized by requiring $\varphi = m\pi$ with an integer m implying $\cos 2\varphi = 1$, $\sin 2\varphi = 0$. In the lowest mode $m = 1$, $k = \pi/l$, and the critical value of ζ at the point where the determinant vanishes is

$$\zeta^* = \left(\frac{\pi}{l}\right)^2 \frac{K_2(1 - 4\chi^2 + 16\nu\rho\Gamma)}{4(2\chi + 1) \cos 2\theta}. \quad (22)$$

The instability sets on in the extensile mode $\zeta > 0$ when the unperturbed alignment angle θ is less than $\pi/4$ and in the contractile mode $\zeta < 0$ at $\pi/4 < \theta \leq \pi/2$. At this value of ζ , $a_1 a_2 / a_0 > 1$, so that the threshold of the oscillatory instability is always larger by its absolute value. The splay elasticity turns out to be irrelevant. The contours in Fig.1 show the levels of $(l/\pi)^2 K_2^{-1} |\zeta^*| \cos 2\theta$ depending on χ and the combination $\nu\rho\Gamma$.

The no-slip boundary conditions induce a parabolic velocity profile, and a distortion of the nematic alignment field by non-uniform advection makes the analysis possible only in the special case of a stationary unperturbed fluid $\mathbf{v}_0 = 0$. This limitation is lifted in the case of free boundary conditions, which may be realized in a suspended film. In the case of a undeformable boundaries, only the normal velocity $v_2 = -\partial_1 \Psi$ should vanish, and the discretization condition is $\varphi = (m + \frac{1}{2})\pi$. In this case, the instability threshold is

$$\zeta^* = \left(\frac{\pi}{l}\right)^2 \frac{K_1(1 - 4\chi^2 + 16\nu\rho\Gamma)}{4(2\chi - 1) \cos 2\theta}. \quad (23)$$

and it is the bend elasticity that becomes irrelevant. Fig.1 is retained after switching the sign of χ . In both




FIG. 1: The levels of $(l/\pi)^2 K_2^{-1} |\zeta^*| \cos 2\theta$ at the point of marginal instability depending on χ and the combination $\Gamma\nu\rho$.

cases, the bifurcation takes place at the zero eigenvalue, and generically will lead to hexagonal patterns of alignment, flow, and activity near the bifurcation point.

A more abstract setup eliminating boundary conditions but retaining a discretized spectrum is a toroidal surface. In this arrangement it is possible to follow the dependence of the instability threshold of the ratio $\kappa = K_2/K_1$ at different original orientations. The general formula is

$$\zeta^* = \left(\frac{\pi}{l}\right)^2 \frac{\kappa K_1 (1 - 4\chi^2 + 16\nu\rho\Gamma)}{2[f_+(\kappa, \chi) \cos 2\theta + f_-(\kappa, \chi) \cos 2\tau]},$$

$$f_{\pm}(\kappa, \chi) = 2\chi + 1 \pm \kappa(2\chi - 1), \quad (24)$$

where $\tau = \varphi - \theta$. The function $f_+(\kappa, \chi)$ is positive in the allowed range $|\chi| < \frac{1}{2}$, while $f_-(\kappa, \chi)$ is positive at $\kappa < (2\chi + 1)/(2\chi - 1)$ and negative above this limit. Accordingly, the wave vector of incipient instability is directed at any particular value of χ either along or normal to the original orientation, depending on the ratio of elasticities.

C. Frictional motion

A quasi-2D formulation of a problem in the 3D world is possible in a thin layer $0 < z < 1$ with tangential alignment on the upper and lower boundaries. The nematic alignment is constant across a thin layer, but the velocity

is constant only in the case of free-slip boundary conditions. The above analysis, as well as a majority of simulations, concentrate on this case, which may be realized in a suspended film, and only then the Navier–Stokes equation (9) is applicable. In the most common case of solid confining walls, no-slip boundary conditions apply, leading to the parabolic velocity profile $\mathbf{v}(z) = \frac{1}{6}\mathbf{v}_0 l^{-2} z(z-l)$, where v_0 is the average in-plane velocity. The momentum flux to the walls $-2\mu\partial_z v_{z=0} = \frac{1}{3}\mu v_0 l^{-1}$ is compensated by the force $\mathbf{F} = -\nabla \cdot (p + \boldsymbol{\sigma})$ driving fluid’s motion. This defines the average velocity $\mathbf{v}_0 = 3\mathbf{F}l/\mu$ and the total flux is $\mathbf{j} = \mathbf{F}/\mu'$, which is equivalent to Darcy’s law. Accordingly, (9) is replaced by the frictional equation

$$\rho D_t v_i = -\mu' v_i - \partial_i p - \partial_j \sigma_{ij}^p \quad (25)$$

containing the effective friction coefficient $\mu' = \frac{1}{3}\mu/l^2$. The frictional dynamics with a friction coefficient dependent on properties of the particles and the substrate is also observed in an adsorbed nematic layer.

For frictional dynamics, the left-hand side of (17) is replaced by $\rho(D_t + \nu')\hat{\Psi}$, where $\nu' = \mu'/\rho$. In this case, the instability sets on at the longest available wavelength in the monotonic mode at

$$\zeta^* = \frac{8K_1 K_2 \Gamma}{K_1(1 + 2\chi)f_1(\theta, \varphi) + K_2(1 - 2\chi)f_2(\theta, \varphi)},$$

$$f_1(\theta, \varphi) = \cos(2\theta - \varphi) \cos \varphi,$$

$$f_2(\theta, \varphi) = \sin(2\theta - \varphi) \sin \varphi, \quad (26)$$

and in the oscillatory mode at

$$\zeta^* = \frac{8(K_1 + K_2)\Gamma\nu'\rho}{2\chi \cos 2\theta + \cos 2(\theta - \varphi)}. \quad (27)$$

Either mode can prevail at either contractile or extensile activity at fixed values of parameters, dependent on the original orientation.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The vector-based description of two-dimensional dynamics adjusts the director-based theory to problems involving changes of the modulus of the order parameter. It not only enables easier computation, compared to commonly used routines based on flattening the 3D tensor representation, but evades degeneracy of elastic constants and reveals the influence of their ratio on the character of instability. This approach also points out a dimension-specific limitation of the allowed range of the alignment parameter.

[1] S. P. Thampi, R. Golestanian, J. M. Yeomans, Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A 372, 20130366 (2014).

[2] A. P. Zakharov and L. M. Pismen, Eur. Phys. J. E, **38**, 75 (2015).

- [3] A. Doostmohammadi, J. Ignés-Mullol, J. M. Yeomans, F. Sagués, *Nat. Comm.* **9**, 3246 (2018).
- [4] T. B. Saw, W. Xi, B. Ladoux, C. T. Lim, *Adv. Mater.* **30**, 1802579 (2018).
- [5] M. Doi, *Polym. Sci.: Polym. Phys. Ed.* **19**, 229 (1981).
- [6] B. J. Edwards and A. N. Beris, *J. Rheol.* **33**, 1189 (1989).
- [7] A. N. Beris and B. J. Edwards, *Thermodynamics of Flowing Systems: With Internal Microstructure*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1994.
- [8] T. Qian and P. Sheng, *Phys. Rev. E* **58**, 7475 (1998).
- [9] H. Stark and T. C. Lubensky, *Phys. Rev. E* **72**, 051714 (2005).
- [10] P. G. de Gennes and Prost J, *The Physics of Liquid Crystals*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1993.
- [11] R.A. Simha and S. Ramaswamy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 058101 (2002).
- [12] S. Edwards and J. Yeomans, *Europhys. Lett.* **85**, 18008 (2009).