

## Finite-Difference Lattice Boltzmann Methods for Binary Miscible Fluids

Aiguo Xu

Department of Physics, Yoshida-South Campus, Kyoto University, Sakyo-ku, Kyoto, 606-8501, Japan

Based on a discrete velocity model, two multispeed finite-difference lattice Boltzmann methods for binary miscible fluids are formulated. One is for simulating isothermal systems at the Navier-Stokes level. The other is for simulating thermal and compressible systems at the Euler level. Since the latter method satisfies higher rank of isotropy, it can also be used to simulate the former systems. The formulated models are based on a two-fluid kinetic theory. For binary mixtures the used finite-difference scheme overcomes defects, in existing method, resulted from the splitting scheme where an evolution step is separated as a propagation and a collision ones. The validity of the proposed methods is verified by investigating (i) the Couette flow and (ii) the uniform relaxation process of the differences of flow velocity and temperature of the two components.

PACS numbers: 47.11.+j, 51.10.+y, 05.20.Dd

## I. INTRODUCTION

Kinetic theory studies change rates and corresponding mechanisms of material properties. Gas kinetic theory plays a fundamental role in understanding many complex processes. To make solutions possible, many of the kinetic models for gases are based on the linearized Boltzmann equation, especially based on the BGK approximation [1]. Since only in very limited cases analytic solutions of Boltzmann equation are available, designing discrete kinetic methods to simulate complex systems at microscopic and/or mesoscopic level(s) is becoming a promising and viable approach. Basically speaking, there are two options to simulate Boltzmann equation systems. First, one can design procedures based on the fundamental properties of rarefied gas alone, like free flow, the mean free path, and collision frequency. Such schemes do not need an a priori relationship to Boltzmann equation, but the schemes themselves will reject many ideas and/or concepts used in the derivation of Boltzmann equation. In the best cases, such simulations will produce results that are consistent with and converge to solutions of the Boltzmann equation. The second option is to start from the Boltzmann equation and design simulation schemes as accuracy as possible [2]. To discretize the Boltzmann equation, the first scheme that one can intuitively want to use may be the general finite-difference scheme. This scheme is referred to as the finite-difference lattice Boltzmann method (FDLBM). A big question here is "How to treat with in finite velocities?". The second scheme is the so-called special form of the finite-difference scheme [3] { the splitting scheme where one evolution step is treated as a propagation and a collision ones. This idea is extensively used in the lattice gas cellular automata (LGCA) [4] and the standard lattice Boltzmann method (SLBM). Historically, the latter was developed from the former by overcoming some well-known defects. A big question here is "Whether or not are the simulation results practical or physical?"

Since the Euler and Navier-Stokes equations also have their basis in Boltzmann equation { the former can be derived from the latter under the hydrodynamic limit

by using the Chapman-Enskog analysis [5], an appropriately designed LBM (SLBM or FDLBM) can be regarded as a useful tool to simulate hydrodynamic equations from the microscopic or mesoscopic level, which is different from the conventional methods which start directly from the hydrodynamic equations. Various merits can be expected from appropriately designed LBMs: (i) simple schemes, (ii) linear advective terms, (iii) high resolution for shock wave computation [6], (iv) interparticle interactions can be easily incorporated if needed [7], etc. In systems involving interfaces [8, 9, 10], the interfaces separating different components/domains are difficult for the conventional Navier-Stokes solver to track due to the complex geometry and possible phase change. Additionally, for some systems such as those involving pollutant dispersion, chemical processing, combustor mixing, it is difficult to construct continuum-based models from the first principle [1]. In such cases, LBM is expected to be a convenient tool. Due to the historical reason, the SLBM has been studied more extensively [12] than the FDLBM.

In this study our interest is focused on binary mixtures. In fact various LBMs have been proposed and developed. We study again because of the fact: (i) The FDLBM and SLBM are expected to be complementary in the LBM studies. Comparison between them will tell that in which kind of cases the SLBM or the FDLBM is better. While most existing LBMs [7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21] belong to the SLBM; (ii) Most existing LBMs for multicomponent fluids are somewhat heuristic and based on the single-fluid theory [22], while a two-fluid theory is generally expected to give more exact description of the hydrodynamics for binary fluids. At the same time, for some multicomponent systems, for example, granular mixture systems, the above cited LBMs are not expected to be successfully used; (iii) In Ref. [11] a SLBM based on a two-fluid kinetic theory was proposed and developed. It is a pity that within this model mass conservation does not hold for each individual species at the Navier-Stokes level. The basic reason is that in the SLBM the "propagation" step (particle or distribution functions hopping between neighboring cells) produces an artificial diffusion term between the two components. (For single-component fluid this term becomes zero.) In

summary, developing LBMs which are based on two-fluid kinetic theory is still opening. We expect that the investigation on FDLBM can, at least partly, fill this gap and overcome the defects of SLBM for binary mixtures.

The implementation of the FDLBM depends on designing of appropriate discrete velocity models (DVM). The continuous Boltzmann equation has infinite velocities. So the rotational symmetry is automatically satisfied. Recovering rotational symmetry from finite discrete velocities impose constraints on the DVM used. The FDLBM was proposed to improve the numerical stability and to apply to nonuniform grids[23]. Recently, finite-difference lattice Boltzmann methods have been paid more attention [24, 25, 26, 27]. For single-component fluids FDLBMs have been designed to simulate thermal fluids at the Euler and the Navier-Stokes levels[6]. For two-component fluids FDLBM s[28] based on the one-fluid theory[22] have been investigated.

In this paper, we extend the FDLBM to study two-dimensional binary miscible gas mixtures. The study is based on a two-fluid kinetic theory and a discrete octagonal velocity model which has up to seventh rank of isotropy. The formulated DVMs, combined with an appropriate finite-difference scheme, are designed to simulate thermal and compressible Euler equations and isothermal Navier-Stokes equations. In Section II we discuss the BGK kinetic theory for binary mixtures. Two FDLBMs are formulated and numerically verified in Section III. Section IV concludes and remarks the present paper.

## II. BGK KINETIC THEORY

In a multicomponent gas system, there are a number of competing equilibration processes occurring simultaneously. Roughly speaking, the approach to equilibrium can be divided into two processes. The first one is that each species equilibrates within itself so that its local distribution function approaches the local Maxwellian distribution. The second one is that the entire system equilibrates so that the differences among different species eventually vanishes. Correspondingly, the interparticle collisions can be divided into collisions within the same species (self-collision) and collisions among different species (cross-collision) [11, 29].

### A. Formulation of the theoretical model

Following Gross and Krook [30], Sirovich [29], Morse [31], Hamel [32], Burgers [33], Vahala et al [34], Sofonea and Sekerka [22], Luo and Girimaji [11], we will use the BGK model for binary mixtures. We use superscripts,  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , to denote the two kinds of components. The D-dimensional BGK kinetic equation for species

reads,

$$\partial_t f + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{r}} f + \mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} f = J + J^{\beta} \quad (1)$$

where

$$J = \frac{1}{h} \int f f^{(0)} d\mathbf{v}, \quad J^{\beta} = \frac{1}{h_{\beta}} \int f f^{\beta(0)} d\mathbf{v}, \quad (2)$$

$$f^{(0)} = \frac{n}{(2\pi)^{D/2}} \exp \left[ -\frac{(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u})^2}{2} \right], \quad (3)$$

$$f^{\beta(0)} = \frac{n_{\beta}}{(2\pi)^{D/2}} \exp \left[ -\frac{(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}_{\beta})^2}{2} \right], \quad (4)$$

$$= \frac{k_B T}{m}, \quad \mathbf{u}_{\beta} = \frac{k_B T_{\beta}}{m}. \quad (5)$$

$f^{(0)}$  and  $f^{\beta(0)}$  are corresponding Maxwellian distribution functions.  $n, \mathbf{u}, T$  are the local density, hydrodynamic velocity and local temperature of the species  $\alpha$ .  $n_{\beta}, \mathbf{u}_{\beta}, T_{\beta}$  are the hydrodynamic velocity and local temperature of the mixture after equilibration process.

For species  $\alpha$ , we have

$$n = \int d\mathbf{v} f, \quad (6)$$

$$n \mathbf{u} = \int d\mathbf{v} \mathbf{v} f, \quad (7)$$

$$\frac{D}{2} n k_B T = \int d\mathbf{v} \frac{1}{2} m (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u})^2 f, \quad (8)$$

$$= n m, \quad (9)$$

$$e_{\text{int}} = \frac{D}{2} n k_B T, \quad (10)$$

where  $e_{\text{int}}$  is the local internal energy of species  $\alpha$ . For species  $\beta$ , we have similar relations. For the mixture, we have

$$n = n^{\alpha} + n^{\beta}, \quad = n^{\alpha} + n^{\beta}, \quad (11)$$

$$\mathbf{u} = \frac{n^{\alpha} \mathbf{u}^{\alpha} + n^{\beta} \mathbf{u}^{\beta}}{n}, \quad (12)$$

$$\frac{D}{2} n k_B T = \int d\mathbf{v} \frac{1}{2} m (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u})^2 (m^{\alpha} f^{\alpha} + m^{\beta} f^{\beta}). \quad (13)$$

It is easy to find the following relations,

$$\mathbf{u}^{\beta} = \mathbf{u}^{\alpha}, \quad T^{\beta} = T^{\alpha}, \quad (14)$$

$$\mathbf{u}^{\alpha} - \mathbf{u} = -\frac{\alpha}{n^{\alpha}} (\mathbf{u}^{\alpha} - \mathbf{u}), \quad (15)$$

$$T^{\alpha} - T = \frac{n^{\alpha}}{n} (T^{\alpha} - T) + \frac{\alpha}{D n k_B} (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^{\alpha})^2. \quad (16)$$

There are three sets of hydrodynamic quantities (mass, velocity and temperature) involved. But only two sets of them are independent. So this is a two-fluid theory. We assume that the local equilibrium distribution function  $f^{\alpha(0)}$  can be calculated through expanding around  $f^{(0)}$  to the first order. Then, the cross-collision term becomes

$$\begin{aligned} J^{\alpha} = & -\frac{1}{\alpha} \frac{h}{f} f^{(0)} \frac{1}{f} \\ & \frac{f^{(0)}}{f_D} (v - u) \cdot (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^{\alpha}) \\ & + T \frac{D}{2} \frac{(v - u)^2}{D} \frac{1}{T} (T - T^{\alpha}) \\ & + M^{\alpha} \frac{(v - u)^2}{D} \frac{1}{M^{\alpha}} (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^{\alpha})^2 g \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where

$$D = \frac{\alpha}{n^{\alpha}}, \quad T = \frac{n^{\alpha}}{n k_B}, \quad M^{\alpha} = n \frac{\alpha}{2 n^{\alpha}}. \quad (18)$$

Here one should note a relation  $n^{\alpha} = n^{\alpha} \alpha$  [11] from which one obtains

$$\frac{D}{\alpha} = \frac{T}{T} = \frac{n}{n^{\alpha}}, \quad \frac{M^{\alpha}}{M^{\alpha}} = \frac{n}{n^{\alpha}}. \quad (19)$$

So we can rewrite the BGK model (1-5) as

$$\partial_t f + \mathbf{v} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{r}} f + \mathbf{a} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{v}} f = Q + Q^{\alpha} \quad (20)$$

$$Q = -\frac{1}{\alpha} + \frac{1}{\alpha} \frac{h}{f} f^{(0)} \frac{1}{f} \quad (21)$$

$$\begin{aligned} Q^{\alpha} = & \frac{f^{(0)}}{f_D} (v - u) \cdot (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^{\alpha}) \\ & + T \frac{D}{2} \frac{(v - u)^2}{D} \frac{1}{T} (T - T^{\alpha}) \\ & + M^{\alpha} \frac{(v - u)^2}{D} \frac{1}{M^{\alpha}} (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^{\alpha})^2 g \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Please note that the difference of this result from those of Sirovich [29] and of Luo and Grimmaji [11]. The treatment here is clearer and simpler.

## B. Relaxation theory

To indicate the equilibration behavior of the mixture, we consider the relaxation theory of  $f^{\alpha}$  and  $f^{\beta}$ . For simplicity we disregard the terms resulted from the external forces and consider only an uniform relaxation theory ( $\partial f / \partial \mathbf{r} = 0$ ).

The mass conservation and uniformity of the system ensure that  $n^{\alpha}, n^{\beta}$  are constants. The velocity integrals of (20) for the two species give

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^{\alpha}) = -\frac{D}{\alpha} + \frac{\alpha}{n^{\alpha}} (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^{\alpha}). \quad (23)$$

So,

$$\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^{\alpha} = C_1 \exp \left( -\frac{\alpha}{n^{\alpha}} + \frac{D}{\alpha} \right) \frac{t}{\alpha} \quad (24)$$

where  $C_1$  is a vector having the same dimension as the velocity. Energy integrals of (20) for the two species give

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (T - T^{\alpha}) = & \frac{1}{k_B} \frac{T}{n} + \frac{\alpha}{n^{\alpha}} (T - T^{\alpha}) \\ & + \frac{2}{D k_B} \frac{M^{\alpha}}{n} \frac{M^{\alpha}}{n^{\alpha}} (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^{\alpha})^2 \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

So the equilibration of temperature difference follows the following relation,

$$\begin{aligned} T - T^{\alpha} = & C_2 \exp \left( -\frac{n^{\alpha}}{\alpha} + \frac{n}{\alpha} \right) \frac{t}{n} \\ & + \frac{C_1^2 \alpha (\alpha - \alpha)}{D k_B [(n^{\alpha} \alpha + n^{\alpha}) - 2n (\alpha \alpha + \alpha \alpha)]} \\ & \exp \left( -2 \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} + \frac{t}{\alpha} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where  $C_2$  is an arbitrary constant. The second term of Eq. (26) decreases more quickly with time than first one. The velocity and temperature differences of the two species vanish exponentially in time. They approach the mean gas properties. The relaxation times depend on both  $\alpha$  and  $\alpha$ .

## III. TWO-DIMENSIONAL FINITE-DIFFERENCE LATTICE BOLTZMANN METHODS

The  $n$ th rank tensor for a velocity group of  $m$  component is defined as

$$T_{1 \dots m}^{(n)} = \sum_{i=1}^N v_{i1} v_{i2} \dots v_{in} v \quad (27)$$

where  $i, j, \dots, n$  indicate either x or y component. The tensor is isotropic if it is invariant for the coordinate rotation and the reflection. As for being isotropic, the odd rank tensors should vanish and the even rank tensors should be the sum of all possible products of Kronecker delta. In this study, we use the following discrete velocity model,

$$\begin{aligned} v_{ki} &= v_k \cos \frac{i}{4}, \sin \frac{i}{4}, i = 1, 2, \dots, 8 \\ v_{k0} &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

which is isotropic up to the seventh rank [6].

#### A. DVM for thermal and compressible Euler equations

Under the condition of without external force, the general description of the multi-speed finite-difference lattice Boltzmann equation reads

$$\frac{\partial f_{ki}}{\partial t} + v_{ki} \frac{\partial f_{ki}}{\partial r} = Q_{ki} + Q_{ki}^{\varepsilon} \quad (29)$$

where

$$Q_{ki} = \frac{1}{h} f_{ki} f_{ki}^{(0)i}$$

$$\frac{1}{h} = \frac{1}{h_1} + \frac{1}{h_2}$$

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{ki}^{\varepsilon} &= \frac{f_{ki}^{(0)}}{f_D} f_D (v_{ki} - u) (u - u^{\varepsilon}) \\ &+ T \frac{(v_{ki} - u)^2}{2} \frac{1}{h} (T - T^{\varepsilon}) \\ &+ M^{\varepsilon} \frac{(v_{ki} - u)^2}{2} \frac{1}{h} (u - u^{\varepsilon})^2 g \quad (30) \end{aligned}$$

$$f_{ki}^{(0)} = n \frac{m}{2 k_B T} \exp \left[ -\frac{m (v_{ki} - u)^2}{2 k_B T} \right], \quad (31)$$

where subscript k indicates the kth set of particle velocities and i indicates the direction of the particle speed. For species  $\alpha$ ,

$$n = \sum_{ki} f_{ki} \quad (32)$$

$$n u = \sum_{ki} v_{ki} f_{ki} \quad (33)$$

$$n k_B T = \sum_{ki} \frac{1}{2} m (v_{ki} - u)^2 f_{ki}. \quad (34)$$

The discrete equilibrium distribution function has to be satisfy the following requirements:

$$\sum_{ki} f_{ki}^{(0)} = n \quad (35)$$

$$\sum_{ki} v_{ki} f_{ki}^{(0)} = n u \quad (36)$$

$$\sum_{ki} \frac{1}{2} m (v_{ki})^2 f_{ki}^{(0)} = n k_B T + \frac{1}{2} n m (u)^2 \quad (37)$$

$$\sum_{ki} m v_{ki} v_{ki} f_{ki}^{(0)} = P + u u \quad (38)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{ki} m v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} f_{ki}^{(0)} \\ = P u + u + u + u u u \quad (39) \end{aligned}$$

$$\sum_{ki} \frac{1}{2} m (v_{ki})^2 v_{ki} f_{ki}^{(0)} = 2 n k_B T u + \frac{1}{2} (u)^2 u \quad (40)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{ki} \frac{1}{2} m (v_{ki})^2 v_{ki} v_{ki} f_{ki}^{(0)} \\ = 2P + \frac{P}{2} (u)^2 \\ + 3P u u + \frac{1}{2} (u)^2 u u \quad (41) \end{aligned}$$

where P is the local pressure

$$P = n k_B T. \quad (42)$$

By using the Chapman-Enskog analysis [5], we can get the Euler equations described by the above discrete kinetic model system,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial r} (u) = 0, \quad (43)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (u) + \frac{\partial}{\partial r} u u + \frac{\partial P}{\partial r} \\ + \frac{\varepsilon}{h} (u - u^{\varepsilon}) = 0, \quad (44) \end{aligned}$$

$$\frac{\partial e}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left[ (e + P) u \right] + \frac{1}{\epsilon} (u)^2 u = 0, \quad (45)$$

where  $e$  is the local total energy of species ,

$$e = e_{\text{int}} + \frac{1}{2} (u)^2. \quad (46)$$

The Euler equations (43)-(45) can also be rewritten equivalently as,

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = -u \frac{\partial u}{\partial r} - \frac{\partial u}{\partial r}, \quad (47)$$

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( \frac{1}{\epsilon} (u)^2 \right) - \frac{\partial u}{\partial r}, \quad (48)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} = -u \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \frac{\partial u}{\partial r}. \quad (49)$$

In the second form of the Euler equations, (47)-(49), the binary effects only appear in Eq. (48).

The energy diffusion equation (41) contains up to fourth order of the flow velocity  $u$ . So it is reasonable to expand the local equilibrium distribution function  $f_{ki}^{(0)}$  as the polynomial form of the flow velocity up to the fourth order:

$$\begin{aligned} f_{ki}^{(0)} = n F_k & \left[ 1 - \frac{(u)^2}{2} + \frac{(u)^4}{8(\epsilon)^2} \right. \\ & + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \frac{(u)^2}{2} v_{ki} u \\ & + \frac{1}{2(\epsilon)^2} \frac{(u)^2}{2} v_{ki} v_{ki} u u \\ & + \frac{1}{6(\epsilon)^3} v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} u u u \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{24(\epsilon)^4} v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} u u u u \right] \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

where

$$F_k = \frac{1}{2} \exp \left( -\frac{(v_k)^2}{2} \right) \quad (51)$$

is a function of temperature  $T$  and particle velocity  $v_k$ . The local equilibrium distribution function  $f_{ki}^{(0)}$  contains

the fourth rank tensor and the momentum diffusion equation (39) contains the third rank tensor. Thus, an appropriate discrete velocity model should have an isotropy up to seventh rank. So DVM (28) is an appropriate choice.

To numerically calculate the local equilibrium distribution function  $f_{ki}^{(0)}$ , one needs first to calculate the parameter  $F_k$ . It should be noted that  $F_k$  can not be calculated directly from its definition (51). We first require that it takes values in such a way that the discretized equilibrium distribution function satisfies (5) - (41). Then the isotropic properties of the discrete velocity model will be used to make the choices more specified.

To satisfy (35), we require

$$\sum_{ki} F_k = 1, \quad (52)$$

$$\sum_{ki} F_k v_{ki} v_{ki} u u = (u)^2, \quad (53)$$

$$\sum_{ki} F_k v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} u u u u = 3(\epsilon)^2 (u)^4. \quad (54)$$

To satisfy (36), we require

$$\sum_{ki} F_k v_{ki} v_{ki} u = u, \quad (55)$$

$$\sum_{ki} F_k v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} u u u u = 3(\epsilon)^2 (u)^2 u. \quad (56)$$

To satisfy (37), we require

$$\sum_{ki} F_k \frac{1}{2} (v_k)^2 = 1, \quad (57)$$

$$\sum_{ki} F_k \frac{1}{2} (v_k)^2 v_{ki} v_{ki} u u = 2(\epsilon)^2 (u)^2, \quad (58)$$

$$\sum_{ki} F_k \frac{1}{2} (v_k)^2 v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} u u u u = 9(\epsilon)^3 (u)^4. \quad (59)$$

To satisfy (38), we require

$$\sum_{ki} F_k v_{ki} v_{ki} = 0, \quad (60)$$

$$\sum_{ki} F_k v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} u u = (\epsilon)^2 (u)^2 + 2u u, \quad (61)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{ki} F_k v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} u u u u \\ &= 3 \left( \right)^3 (u)^2 (u)^2 + 4u u^i. \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

To satisfy (39), we require

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{ki} F_k v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} u \\ &= \left( \right)^2 u + u + u, \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{ki} F_k v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} u u u \\ &= 3 \left( \right)^3 (u)^2 u + u + u \\ &+ 6 \left( \right)^3 u u u. \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

To satisfy (40), we require

$$\sum_{ki} F_k \frac{(v_k)^2}{2} v_{ki} v_{ki} u = 2 \left( \right)^2 u, \quad (65)$$

$$\sum_{ki} F_k \frac{(v_k)^2}{2} v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} u u u = 9 \left( \right)^3 (u)^2 u. \quad (66)$$

To satisfy (41), we require

$$\sum_{ki} F_k \frac{(v_k)^2}{2} v_{ki} v_{ki} = 2 \left( \right)^2, \quad (67)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{ki} F_k \frac{(v_k)^2}{2} v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} u u \\ &= 3 \left( \right)^3 (u)^2 + 2u u^i, \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{ki} F_k \frac{(v_k)^2}{2} v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} u u u u \\ &= 12 \left( \right)^4 (u)^4 + 4(u)^2 u u^i. \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

If further consider the isotropic properties of the discrete velocity model, the above 18 requirements reduce to the following five ones.

Requirement (52) gives

$$\sum_{ki} F_k = 1. \quad (70)$$

Requirements (53), (55), (57), (60) give

$$\sum_k F_k (v_k)^2 = \frac{1}{4}. \quad (71)$$

Requirements (54), (56), (58), (61) give

$$\sum_k F_k (v_k)^4 = \left( \right)^2. \quad (72)$$

Requirements (59), (62), (64), (66) give

$$\sum_k F_k (v_k)^6 = 6 \left( \right)^3. \quad (73)$$

Requirements (69) gives

$$\sum_k F_k (v_k)^8 = 48 \left( \right)^4. \quad (74)$$

To satisfy the above five requirements, five particle velocities are necessary. We choose a zero speed,  $v_0 = 0$ , and other four nonzero ones,  $v_k$  ( $k = 1, 2, 3, 4$ ). From (71)–(74) it is easy to find the following solution,

$$F_k = \frac{k}{k}, \quad (75)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} k &= 192 \left( \right)^4 - 24 \left( \right)^3 \sum_{j=1}^3 v_{k+j}^2 \\ &+ 4 \left( \right)^2 \sum_{j=1}^3 v_{k+j} v_{k+j+1}^2 - \sum_{j=1}^3 v_{k+j}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

$$k = 4 (v_k)^2 \sum_{j=1}^3 (v_k)^2 v_{k+j}^2, \quad (77)$$

$k = 1, 2, 3, 4$ , and  $v_{4+j} = v_j$ , ( $j = 1, 2, 3$ ). From (70) and (28) we get

$$F_0 = 1 - \sum_{k=1}^4 F_k. \quad (78)$$

Only if the simulation can be stably conducted, the specific values of  $v_k$  ( $k = 1, 2, 3, 4$ ) do not affect the accuracy itself. This flexibility can be used to simulate a temperature range as wide as possible. For the convenience of description later, this FD-LBM will be referred to as method A.

## B. DVM for isothermal Navier-Stokes equations

Regarding a system as isothermal is a kind of ideal treatment. We expect that such a treatment can grasp the main basic behaviors of the system when it approaches such a limiting case. Energy transport phenomena will be neglected, although, during the diffusion

process, energy may be exchanged with the environment to keep the system isothermal [22]. For isothermal case,

$$Q_{ki} = \frac{f_{ki}^{(0)}}{D} (v_{ki} - u) (u - u^k). \quad (79)$$

To get the Euler and Navier-Stokes equations, the following requirements on the discrete equilibrium distribution function are necessary..

$$\sum_{ki} f_{ki}^{(0)} = n \quad (80)$$

$$\sum_{ki} v_{ki} f_{ki}^{(0)} = n u \quad (81)$$

$$\sum_{ki} m v_{ki} v_{ki} f_{ki}^{(0)} = P + \rho u u \quad (82)$$

$$\sum_{ki} m v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} f_{ki}^{(0)} = P u + \rho u u + \rho u u u \quad (83)$$

The Chapman-Enskog analysis gives them an equation at any level,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial r} (u) = 0, \quad (84)$$

the momentum equation at the Euler level,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (u) + \frac{\partial}{\partial r} u u + \frac{\partial P}{\partial r} \\ + \frac{\rho}{\rho} (u - u^k) \\ = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (85)$$

and the momentum equation at the Navier-Stokes level,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (u) + \frac{\partial}{\partial r} u u + \frac{\partial P}{\partial r} \\ + \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial r} + \frac{\partial u}{\partial r} \right) + \frac{\partial u}{\partial r} \\ + \frac{\partial}{\partial r} (u + 1) \frac{\rho}{\rho} 2u u - u u^k - u u^k \\ + \frac{\rho}{\rho} (u - u^k) \\ = 0; \end{aligned} \quad (86)$$

where

$$= P \quad (87)$$

and the terms in  $\frac{\rho}{\rho}$  correspond to formal effects of the cross-collision. (It should be noted that  $\frac{\rho}{\rho}$  also contains the cross-collision effects.)

The energy diffusion equation (83) contains up to third order of the flow velocity  $u$ . So it is reasonable to expand the local equilibrium distribution function  $f_{ki}^{(0)}$  as the polynomial form of the flow velocity up to the third order,

$$\begin{aligned} f_{ki}^{(0)} = n F_k \left[ 1 - \frac{(u)^2}{2} \right. \\ + \frac{1}{2} \frac{(u)^2}{2} v_{ki} u + \frac{1}{2 ( )^2} v_{ki} v_{ki} u u \\ + \frac{1}{6 ( )^3} v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} u u u \\ \left. + \dots \right] \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

Due to the same reason, up to sixth rank tensor should be isotropic to recover the correct fluid equations. So model (28) is, again, an appropriate choice.

To satisfy (80), we require

$$\sum_{ki} F_k = 1, \quad (89)$$

$$\sum_{ki} F_k v_{ki} v_{ki} u u = (u)^2, \quad (90)$$

To satisfy (81), we require

$$\sum_{ki} F_k v_{ki} v_{ki} u = u \quad (91)$$

$$\sum_{ki} F_k v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} u u u = 3 ( )^2 (u)^2 u. \quad (92)$$

To satisfy (82), we require

$$\sum_{ki} F_k v_{ki} v_{ki} = \quad (93)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{ki} F_k v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} u u \\ = ( )^2 (u)^2 + 2u u^i \end{aligned} \quad (94)$$

To satisfy (83), we require

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{ki} F_k v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} u \\ = ( )^2 u + u + u \end{aligned} \quad (95)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{ki} F_k v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} v_{ki} u u u \\ = 3 ( )^3 (u)^2 u + u + u \\ + 6 ( )^3 u u u \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

If further consider the isotropic properties of the discrete velocity model, the above 8 requirements reduce to the following four ones.

Requirement (89) gives

$$\sum_{ki} F_k = 1. \quad (97)$$

Requirements (90), (91), (93) give

$$\sum_k F_k (v_k)^2 = \frac{1}{4}. \quad (98)$$

Requirements (92), (94), (95) give

$$\sum_k F_k (v_k)^4 = \left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^2. \quad (99)$$

Requirement (96) give

$$\sum_k F_k (v_k)^6 = 6 \left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^3. \quad (100)$$

To satisfy the above four requirements, four particle velocities are necessary.. We choose a zero speed,  $v_0 = 0$ , and other three nonzero ones,  $v_k$  ( $k = 1, 2, 3$ ). From (98)–(100) it is easy to find the following solution,

$$F_k = \frac{1}{k} \quad (101)$$

$$v_k = \frac{n}{v_{k+1} v_{k+2}} \quad \frac{h}{4} \quad v_{k+1}^2 + v_{k+2}^2 \quad \frac{i}{2} \quad + 24 \left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^2 \quad (102)$$

$$v_k = 4 (v_k)^2 \quad \frac{n}{v_{k+1} v_{k+2}} \quad \frac{h}{(v_k)^2} \quad v_{k+1}^2 + v_{k+2}^2 \quad \frac{i}{2} \quad + (v_k)^4 \quad \frac{o}{4} \quad (103)$$

where  $k = 1; 2; 3$  and  $v_4 = v_1, v_5 = v_2$ . From (97) we get

$$F_0 = 1 - \sum_{k=1}^3 F_k. \quad (104)$$

Similarly, we will refer to this FD LBM as method B.

### C. Finite-difference scheme

Now, let us go to the finite-difference implementation of the discrete kinetic model. There are more than one choices[28] at this step. One possibility is to solve the evolution equation (29) by using the Euler and the second

upwind difference schemes. In this case, the distribution function  $f_{ki}^{(n+1)}$  is calculated in the following way,

$$f_{ki}^{(n+1)} = f_{ki}^{(n)} + v_{kix} \frac{\partial f_{ki}^{(n)}}{\partial x} + v_{kiy} \frac{\partial f_{ki}^{(n)}}{\partial y} \Delta t + Q_{ki}^{(n)} + Q_{ki}^{(n)} \Delta t, \quad (105)$$

where the second superscripts  $n, n+1$  indicate the consecutive two iteration steps,  $\Delta t$  the time step; the spatial derivatives are calculated as

$$\frac{\partial f_{ki}^{(n)}}{\partial x} = \begin{cases} \frac{3f_{k,i;I}^{(n)} - 4f_{k,i;I+1}^{(n)} + f_{k,i;I+2}^{(n)}}{2} & \text{if } v_{ki} > 0 \\ \frac{3f_{k,i;I}^{(n)} - 4f_{k,i;I-1}^{(n)} + f_{k,i;I-2}^{(n)}}{2} & \text{if } v_{ki} < 0 \end{cases}, \quad (106)$$

where  $x = x; y$ , the third subscripts  $I-2, I-1, I, I+1, I+2$  indicate consecutive mesh nodes in the  $x$  direction.

### D. Numerical verifications of the two FD LBM s

In the procedure of formulating method A the equilibrium distribution function is expanded to higher order in the low velocity. Correspondingly, method A possesses higher rank of isotropy than method B. So it can also be used to simulate isothermal binary systems at the Navier-Stokes level.

After the formulation process one generally expects several numerical verifications which will tell (i) whether or not the discrete methods A and B can describe the correct physical processes and (ii) how accurate they are. In this section we first perform several preliminary numerical verifications on the two discrete methods by investigating shear flow between two parallel plates (Couette flow). The distance between the two walls is  $D$ . The upper and the lower walls possess temperatures  $T_{up}, T_{low}$  and at time  $t = 0$  start to move at velocities  $U, -U$ , respectively. Then we study the uniform relaxation process. We work at the unit where the Boltzmann constant  $k_B = 1$ . Since only the hydrodynamical quantities are involved, the component species will be labelled by the subscripts in this section.

In real physical systems, the values of  $\rho_{11}, \rho_{22}, \rho_{12}, \rho_{21}$  may change with the local density of the two species. While the main purpose of our numerical verifications is to show that the two FD LBM s can recover exactly what the continuous kinetic BGK equations describe, instead of discussing how to choose values for  $\rho_{11}, \rho_{22}, \rho_{12}, \rho_{21}$ . We do not mind the variations of  $\rho_{11}, \rho_{22}, \rho_{12}, \rho_{21}$  with the local densities and use fixed values in the numerical verifications.

We first check the simulation results of the methods A and B for the simplest case where the system is isothermal and two components have the same properties. We study the horizontal velocity profiles along a vertical line for the two species, 1 and 2, from methods A and B. The simulation results exactly agree with the following



analytical value,

$$u = \sum_j \frac{X_j}{(1+j)^2} \frac{D}{j} \exp\left(-\frac{4j^2}{D^2}t\right) \sin\left(\frac{2j}{D}y\right), \quad (107)$$

where  $\dot{\gamma} = 2U/D$  is the imposed shear rate,  $j$  is an integer, the two walls locate at  $y = \pm D/2$ . For the example shown in Fig. 1, the time  $t = 2.9$ . The parameters used in simulation are  $m_1 = m_2 = 1$ ,  $T_1 = T_2 = T_{up} = T_{low} = T = 1$ ,  $n_1 = n_2 = 1$ ,  $\tau_{11} = \tau_{22} = \tau_{12} = \tau_{21} = 0.1$ ,  $\tau = 0.001$ , the space steps  $\Delta x = \Delta y = 0.1$  and the time step  $\Delta t = 0.0001$ ; the parameters used in Eq. (107) are  $\dot{\gamma} = 0.05$  and  $\tau = 1$ .

Secondly, we still check the isothermal case but the particle masses of the two components are different. The low velocity of the heavier species has a phase delay with respect to that of the lighter one and the difference of the low velocities eventually vanishes. When  $\tau_{12} (\tau_{21})$  is much larger than  $\tau_{11} (\tau_{22})$ , the cross-collisions make only slight effects. The velocity profiles of the two components can be approximately described by Eq. (107) with corresponding kinematic viscosities  $\nu_1 = \nu_2 = \nu$  ( $\nu = 1, 2$ ). The equilibration process of the velocity difference is very long. Here  $\tau_{11} = n_1 k_B T / m_1$ ,  $\tau_{12} = n_1 k_B T / m_1$ ,  $\tau_{21} = n_2 k_B T / m_2$ ,  $\tau_{22} = n_2 k_B T / m_2$ ,  $\tau_{12} = \tau_{21} = (\tau_{11} + \tau_{22})/2$  and  $\tau_{11} = \tau_{22} = (\tau_{11} + \tau_{22})/2$ . In the case shown in Fig. 2 (a),  $\tau_{11} = \tau_{22} = 0.1$ ,  $\tau_{12} = \tau_{21} = 100$ ,  $m_1 = 1$ ,  $m_2 = 2$ ,  $n_1 = n_2 = 1$ ,  $T = 1$ ,  $t = 12$ . When  $\tau_{12} (\tau_{21})$  and  $\tau_{11} (\tau_{22})$  are comparable, the difference between the velocity profiles of the two components decreases quickly with time. The simulated velocity profiles for two components asymptotically approach to the line of Eq. (107) with  $\nu = (n_1 m_1 + n_2 m_2) k_B T$ ,  $\nu = n_1 m_1 + n_2 m_2$ . For numerical example shown in Fig. 2 (b),  $\tau_{11} = \tau_{22} = \tau_{12} = \tau_{21} = 0.1$ ,  $m_1 = 1$ ,  $m_2 = 2$ ,  $n_1 = n_2 = 1$ ,  $T = 1$ ,  $t = 12$ . The solid line in Fig. 2 (b) is from Eq. (107) with  $\nu = 0.1$ ,  $\dot{\gamma} = 3$ ,  $t = 12$ . The space and time steps are the same as those used in Fig. 1.

Thirdly, we check the thermal case where only the method A works. We will show that when the two components are same, method A presents results which are the same as those given by the FDLBM for single-component fluid. The latter has been shown to be strictly accurate [6]. Figure 3 shows a comparison of simulation results from method A and from FDLBM for single-component fluid. Parameters for method A are  $m_1 = m_2 = 1$ ,  $T_{up} = 2$ ,  $T_{low} = 1$ ,  $\tau_{11} = \tau_{22} = \tau_{12} = \tau_{21} = 0.2$ ,  $\tau = 0.001$ . The initial state is uniform with  $n_1 = n_2 = 1$ ,  $T_1 = T_2 = 1$ ,  $u_1 = u_2 = 0$ . Three parameters used in the FDLBM for single-component fluid are  $m = 1$ ,  $n = 1$ , and  $\tau = 0.1$ , where  $m$  is the particle mass,  $n$  is local number density, and  $\tau$  is the relaxation time in the BGK kinetic equation. The other parameters are same as those for method A. The profiles of horizontal velocity, local density, local temperature and local pressure at time  $t = 13$  are shown, respectively, in (a)–(d). It should be noted that this is not a verification for Euler equations systems for binary mixtures, but an example




FIG. 1: Horizontal velocity profiles along a vertical line for the two species, 1 and 2, from simulations and theory for a given time  $t = 2.9$ . The symbols denote results from methods A and B. The used parameters are  $m_1 = m_2 = 1$ ,  $T_1 = T_2 = T_{up} = T_{low} = T = 1$ ,  $n_1 = n_2 = 1$ ,  $\tau = 0.001$ . The solid line corresponds to Eq. (107) with  $\dot{\gamma} = 0.05$ ,  $\tau = 1$ .




FIG. 2: Horizontal velocity profiles along a vertical line for the two species, 1 and 2, from simulations and theory for an isothermal case at time  $t = 12$ . The symbols denote results from methods A and B. The common parameters for (a) and (b) are  $m_1 = 1$ ,  $m_2 = 2$ ,  $T = 1$ ,  $n_1 = n_2 = 1$ ,  $\tau = 0.001$ ,  $\tau_{11} = \tau_{22} = 0.1$ . The different parameters are  $\tau_{12} = \tau_{21} = 100$  in (a) and  $\tau_{12} = \tau_{21} = 0.1$  in (b). The solid line corresponds to Eq. (107) with  $\dot{\gamma} = 0.1$ ,  $\tau = 3$ .




FIG. 3: Profiles of horizontal velocity, number density, temperature, and pressure along a vertical line for a thermal and compressible case at time  $t = 13$ . The symbols denote simulation results for the two species, 1 and 2, from method A. The solid lines denote the simulation results from FDLBM for single-component fluid [6]. The parameters for method A are  $m_1 = 1 = m_2 = 1$ ,  $T_{up} = 2$ ,  $T_{low} = 1$ ,  $\tau = 0.001$ ,  $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 0.2$ . The parameters for single-component fluid are  $m = 1$ ,  $n = 1$ ,  $\tau = 0.1$ , and other parameters are the same as those for method A.

to show that the discrete method A can recover what the continuous kinetic equations describe in the limiting case.

The fourth verification is the uniform relaxation process. When the two components have the same flow velocities, the second term in left-hand-side of Eq. (25) becomes zero. The first term of Eq. (26) shows the exact relaxation time of the temperature difference. (See Fig. 4 (a).) For a general case where the initial flow velocities and initial temperatures of the two components are different, Eq. (24) shows the exact relaxation time of the velocity difference. (See Fig. 4 (b).) The relaxation process of temperature difference is mainly determined by and will asymptotically approach to the first term of Eq. (26). (See Fig. 4 (c).) The common parameters for Figs. 4 (a)–4 (c) are  $n_1 = 2$ ,  $n_2 = 1$ ,  $m_1 = 1$ ,  $m_2 = 2$ ,  $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 1$ ,  $\tau_3 = 1$ ,  $\tau_4 = 2$ . Specific parameters are in (a)  $u_1 = u_2 = 0$  and  $T_2^{(0)} = 1.1$ ,  $T_1^{(0)} = 0.9$ ; in (b) and (c)  $u_2^{(0)} = u_1^{(0)} = 0.3$  and  $T_2^{(0)} = 1.3$ ,  $T_1^{(0)} = 0.7$ . The superscript  $\backslash (0)$  denotes the corresponding initial value. The slope of the solid lines in (a)–(c) are  $\tau_2 = 3$ ,  $\tau_3 = 4$  and  $\tau_2 = 3$ , respectively. The figures. For Fig. 4 (c), the slope of the simulation results changes from 0.630 to 0.666.

Now we come to a summary: (i) The two FDLBM s recover, with high-precision, what the continuous BGK kinetic equations (20)–(22) describe under corresponding conditions; (ii) The choosing of values for the relaxation times  $\tau$ ,  $\tau_1$ ,  $\tau_2$ , and  $\tau_3$  depends on the system considered; (iii) In the simulation process one can improve the numerical accuracy and stability by adjusting the space and time steps under the Courant-Friedrichs-Lewy condition.




FIG. 4: Uniform relaxation processes. (a) Pure relaxation of temperature difference; (b) Relaxation of velocity difference; (c) Relaxation of temperature difference. The common parameters for (a)–(c) are  $n_1 = 2$ ,  $n_2 = 1$ ,  $m_1 = 1$ ,  $m_2 = 2$ ,  $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 1$ ,  $\tau_3 = 1$ ,  $\tau_4 = 2$ . In (a)  $u_1^{(0)} = u_2^{(0)}$  and  $T_2^{(0)} = 1.1$ ,  $T_1^{(0)} = 0.9$ ; In (b) and (c)  $u_2^{(0)} = u_1^{(0)} = 0.3$  and  $T_2^{(0)} = 1.3$ ,  $T_1^{(0)} = 0.7$ . In (a) and (b) the solid lines fit the simulation results exactly. In (c) the slope of the simulation results approaches asymptotically to  $\tau_2 = 3$ .

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS AND REMARKS

In the hydrodynamic limit the Euler and Navier-Stokes equations can be derived from the Boltzmann equation by using the Chapman-Enskog analysis. When the Knudsen number is not small, the derivation of the hydrodynamic equations breaks down, while the Boltzmann equation is still valid. The Boltzmann equation is more than Euler and Navier-Stokes equations. Correspondingly, LBM (SLBM and FDLBM) is more than an Euler or Navier-Stokes solver. It simulates systems from the microscopic or mesoscopic level. Its extensive studies are meaningful even if one has various conventional Euler

or Navier-Stokes solvers. SLBM and FDLBM stands for two different ways to discretize the Boltzmann equation. Investigations on SLBM and FDLBM are expected to be complementary.

Based on a two-uid kinetic theory and a discrete octagonal velocity model, two multispeed finite-difference lattice Boltzmann methods for binary gas mixtures are formulated. One is for simulating thermaland compressible systems at the Euler level. The other is for simulating isothermal systems at the Navier-Stokes level. The former FDLBM satisfies an isotropy up to seventh rank, while the latter one satisfies an isotropy only up to sixth rank. The former one can also be used to simulate the isothermal Navier-Stokes systems without any modification. For binary mixtures the used finite-difference scheme overcomes defects, in existing SLBM, resulted from the splitting scheme where an evolution step is treated as a propagation and a collision ones. Both the self-collision and cross-collision contribute to the viscosity, which is clearly shown in the present study.

The performance of this study is under the fact that developing LBM s which are based on two-uid kinetic theories is still opening, even for the case of isothermal systems. The two formulated FDLBM s work for systems which can be described by the BGK kinetic theory and where the difference of particle masses of the two components are not very large. For binary mixtures with disparate-mass components, say  $m_1 \ll m_2$ , the barycentric velocity  $u^* = u^{\bar{c}}$  and the mean temperature of the binary mixture  $T^* = T^{\bar{c}}$ . So it is not exact enough to expand the local Maxwellian distribution for the mixtures,  $f^{(0)}$ , around that for species ,

$f^{(0)}$ , to the first order in  $u$  and  $T$ . In such a case, the two proposed FDLBM s can still present qualitatively reasonable results, but are less accurate. The same defect also exists in the pre-existing SLBM [11] where mass conservation for each species does not hold at the Navier-Stokes level. There are several directions along which the research is going on: (i) the stability analysis of the two FDLBM s, (ii) to construct a FDLBM for the complete Navier-Stokes equations, including the energy equation, (iii) to extend the studies to binary mixtures with disparate-mass components. As for the based kinetic theory, no interaction between component particles (except for collisions) are considered, which means that the two components are completely miscible ideal gases and surface tension is not present when the system is not homogeneous. So extending the studies to nonideal fluids is meaningful and the FDLBM for non-ideal fluids are expected to simulate more realistic systems, for example multiphase flows with droplets and particles, etc.

#### Acknowledgments

Aiguo Xu acknowledges Prof. G. Gonnella for guiding him into the LBM field and thanks Prof. H. Hayakawa, V. Sofonea, M. Watarai, and L. S. Luo for helpful discussions. This work is partially supported by Grant-in-Aids for Scientific Research (Grant No. 15540393) and for the 21st Century COE "Center for Diversity and Universality in Physics" from the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) of Japan.

- 
- [1] P. L. Bhatnagar, E. P. Gross, and M. Krook, *Phys. Rev.* **94**, 511 (1954).
  - [2] C. Cercignani, R. Illner and M. Pulvirenti, *The mathematical theory of dilute gases*, *Applied Mathematical Sciences*, Vol. 106, edited by F. John, J. E. Marsden, and L. Sirovich (Springer-Verlag, 1994).
  - [3] X. He, L. S. Luo, *Phys. Rev. E* **55**, 6333(R) (1997); **56**, 6811 (1997).
  - [4] U. Frisch, B. Hasslacher, and Y. Pomeau, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **56**, 1505 (1986).
  - [5] S. Chapman and T. G. Cowling, *The Mathematical Theory of Non-Uniform Gases*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1970).
  - [6] M. Watarai, M. Tsutahara, *Phys. Rev. E* **67**, 36306 (2003); T. Kataoka, M. Tsutahara, *Phys. Rev.* **69**, 56702 (2004); T. Kataoka, M. Tsutahara, *Phys. Rev.* **69**, R35701 (2004).
  - [7] Z. Guo, T. S. Zhao, *Phys. Rev. E* **68**, 35302(R) (2003).
  - [8] Aiguo Xu, G. Gonnella, A. Lamura, *Phys. Rev. E* **67**, 56105 (2003); *Physica A* **331**, 10 (2004).
  - [9] Aiguo Xu, *Commun. Theor. Phys.* **39**, 729 (2003).
  - [10] Aiguo Xu, G. Gonnella, A. Lamura, *cond-mat/0404205*.
  - [11] L. S. Luo and S. S. Girimaji, *Phys. Rev. E* **66**, 35301(R) (2002); *ibid.* **67**, 36302 (2003).
  - [12] For example, see (i) *Lattice Gas Methods for PDE: Theory, Applications and Hardware*, *Physica D* Vol. 47, No. 1-2, edited by G. Doolen (Elsevier Science, Amsterdam, 1991); (ii) S. Succi, *The Lattice Boltzmann Equation* (Oxford University Press, New York, 2001).
  - [13] A. K. Gunstensen, D. H. Rothman, S. Zaleski, and G. Zanetti, *Phys. Rev. A* **43**, 4320 (1991).
  - [14] E. G. Flekkoy, *Phys. Rev. E* **47**, 4247 (1993).
  - [15] D. Grunau, S. Chen, and K. Eggert, *Phys. Fluids A* **5**, 2557 (1993).
  - [16] X. Shan and G. Doolen, *J. Stat. Phys.* **81**, 379 (1995); *Phys. Rev. E* **54**, 3614 (1996).
  - [17] E. Orlandini, W. R. Osborn, and J. M. Yeomans, *Europhys. Lett.* **32**, 463 (1995); W. R. Osborn, E. Orlandini, M. R. Swift, J. M. Yeomans, and J. R. Banavar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 4031 (1995); M. R. Swift, E. Orlandini, W. R. Osborn, and J. M. Yeomans, *Phys. Rev. E* **54**, 5041 (1996).
  - [18] A. Lamura, G. Gonnella, and J. M. Yeomans, *Europhys. Lett.* **45**, 314 (1999).
  - [19] V. M. Kendon, J. C. Desplat, P. Bladon, and M. E. Cates, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 576 (1999); V. M. Kendon, M. E. Cates, I. Pagonabarrage, J. C. Desplat, and P. Bladon, *J. Fluid Mech.* **440**, 147 (2001).
  - [20] H. Yu, L. S. Luo, S. S. Girimaji, *Int. J. Comp. Eng. Sci.* **3**, 73 (2002).

- [21] P.C. Facin, P.C. Philippi, and L.O.E. dos Santos, in P.M.A. Sobot et al. (Eds.): ICCS 2003, LNCS 2657, pp. 1007-1014, 2003.
- [22] Victor Sofonea, Robert F. Sekerka, *Physica A* 299, 494 (2001).
- [23] N. Cao, S. Chen, S. Jin and D. Martinez, *Phys. Rev. E* 55, R21 (1997).
- [24] T. Seta and R. Takahashi, *J. Stat. Phys.* 107, 557 (2002).
- [25] V. Sofonea and R.F. Sekerka, *J. Comp. Phys.* 184, 422 (2003).
- [26] A. Cristea and V. Sofonea, *Proceedings of the Romanian Academy, Series A: Mathematics, Physics, Technical Sciences, Information Science*, 3, 87 (2002); *ibid.* 4, 59 (2003); *arXiv: nlin.CG/0305013*.
- [27] V. Sofonea and R.F. Sekerka, submitted to *J. Comp. Phys.*; submitted to *Phys. Rev. E*.
- [28] A. Cristea and V. Sofonea, *Central European J. Phys.* 2, 382 (2004).
- [29] L. Sirovich, *Phys. Fluids* 5, 908 (1962); *ibid.* 9, 2323 (1966); E. Goldman and L. Sirovich, *Phys. Fluids* 10, 1928 (1967).
- [30] E.P. Gross and M. Krook, *Phys. Rev.* 102, 593 (1956).
- [31] T.F. Morse, *Phys. Fluids* 6, 1420 (1963).
- [32] B.B. Hamel, *Phys. Fluids* 8, 418 (1965); *ibid.* 9, 12 (1966).
- [33] J.M. Burgers, *Flow Equations for Composite Gases*, Academic Press, New York, 1969.
- [34] L. Vahala, D. Wah, G. Vahala, J. Carter, P. Pavlo, *Phys. Rev. E* 62, 507 (2000).