

Using NMR to Measure Fractal Dimensions

D. Candela and Po-zen Wong

Physics Department, University of Massachusetts, Amherst MA 01003

(dated: 19 April 2002 v3)

PACS numbers: 61.43.Hv, 61.43.Gt, 91.65.-n

In a recent Letter [1], Stallmach et al. reported pulsed field gradient (PFG) NMR measurements of the time-dependent diffusion constant $D(t)$ in packings of water saturated sands. According to theory [2], $D(t)$ decreases from the bulk water value D_0 with increasing observation time t due to restrictions imposed by the pore surface:

$$\frac{D(t)}{D_0} = 1 - \frac{4S}{9} \frac{r^2}{V} \frac{1}{D_0 t} + \text{higher order terms.} \quad (1)$$

Here $S=V_p$ is the surface-to-volume ratio of the pore space and $r = \frac{4}{3} \frac{V_p}{A_p}$ is the diffusion length. Stallmach et al. studied samples with different grain diameters d_g and found that $S=V_p \propto d_g^{-0.7}$, which they interpreted with a fractal picture. If d_g is identified as the upper cut-off scale L for a fractal surface of dimension D_s , one expects $S=V_p \propto d_g^{3-D_s}$. In this Comment, we argue that the analysis of Ref. 1 is flawed and we propose an alternative.

The key point is that Eq. 1 was derived for a nonfractal surface such that $S=V_p$ is constant as the length scale r varies. In Ref. 1, Eq. 1 is used for $2 \mu\text{m} < r < 10 \mu\text{m}$ while d_g is in the range 100-1000 μm . For the analysis to be valid, the surface would have to be smooth below 10 μm and abruptly turn into a fractal above this

scale. This is implausible as sands and rocks are known to have fractal surfaces below 1 μm [3]. For example, BET measurements on rocks (for which the measurement scale is $r \approx 0.4 \text{ nm}$) yield $S=V_p$ values one to two orders of magnitude greater than PFG NMR results [4].

To show how Eq. 1 is modified for fractal surfaces, we note that the term $\frac{4S}{9} \frac{r^2}{V_p}$ arises because molecules within a layer of volume $V_B = S r$ can on average reach the pore surface within time t . Following Ref. 5 and allowing for $d_g > L$, it is easy to see that $V_B = (d_g=L)^2 (L=r)^{D_s} r^3 = (3-D_s)$. Hence Eq. 1 becomes

$$\frac{D(t)}{D_0} = 1 - \frac{A}{3-D_s} \frac{L}{d_g} \frac{L^{D_s-2}}{r} \frac{d_g^{D_s}}{r} \frac{r^3}{d_g} + \dots \quad (2)$$

where A is a constant. This expression makes it clear that the analysis of Ref. 1 requires $L \propto d_g$, but also r to be independent of d_g . For a given sample with fixed d_g and L , the limiting form of $D(t)$ at short times is

$$1 - D(t)/D_0 \propto r^{3-D_s} \propto t^{(3-D_s)/2}. \quad (3)$$

To illustrate this method, we show some preliminary PFG NMR data on Indiana limestone and a packing of plastic beads; experimental details are given elsewhere [6]. Figure 1 shows a log-log plot of $1 - D(t)/D_0$ vs. r . For a fractal surface, the data should fall on a straight line with slope $3 - D_s$. As seen in previous studies, the data for smooth plastic beads are consistent with $D_s = 2$. However, the limestone data fall on a line with distinctly smaller slope, giving $D_s = 2.58 \pm 0.14$. Optical micrographs of this limestone reveal that the pore surface has a wide range of features on scales above 1 μm . Although these data span less than a decade of length scales, the difference in slope between limestone and plastic beads is unmistakable. If the grain surfaces studied in Ref. 1 were truly fractal, they would show $D(t)$ time dependence similar to the limestone data in Fig. 1.




FIG. 1: Time-dependent diffusion data for water-saturated samples of Indiana limestone (squares) and unconsolidated 15 μm dia. polystyrene beads (circles). The lines show least-squares fits to Eq. 3. For the dashed line D_s was fixed at 2. For the solid lines D_s was allowed to vary, yielding $D_s = 2.58 \pm 0.14$ for Indiana limestone and $D_s = 2.2 \pm 0.4$ for polystyrene beads. To accurately determine these power laws it was necessary to separately measure D_0 on a bulk water sample in the same apparatus, at the same temperature.

- [1] F. Stallmach, C. Vogt, J. Karger, K. Helbig, and F. Jacobs, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 105505 (2002).
- [2] P. P. Mitra, P. N. Sen, and L. M. Schwartz, Phys. Rev. B 47, 8565 (1992).
- [3] P.-z. Wong, Physics Today 41, 24 (1988).
- [4] M. D. Hurlmann, K. G. Helmer, L. L. Latour, and C. H. Sotak, J. Magn. Reson. A 111, 169 (1994).

- [5] P.-z. Wong and A. J. Bray, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60, 1344 (1988).
- [6] A. Ding and D. Candela, Phys. Rev. E 54, 656 (1996).