

Comment on "Capillary attraction of charged particles at a curved liquid interface" by A. Würger

## Absence of logarithmic attraction between colloids trapped at the interface of droplets

A. Domínguez<sup>1</sup>, M. Oettel<sup>2</sup> and S. Dietrich<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Física Teórica, U. Sevilla, Apdo. 1065, E-41080 Sevilla, Spain (email: dominguez@us.es)

<sup>2</sup> Institut für Physik, W A 331, U. Mainz, D-55099 Mainz, Germany

<sup>3</sup> MPI für Metallforschung, Heisenbergstr. 3, D-70569 Stuttgart, Germany and ITAP, U. Stuttgart, Pfaffenwaldring 57, D-70569 Stuttgart, Germany

PACS 82.70.Dd { Colloids

PACS 68.03.Cd { Surface tension and related phenomena

Abstract. - \*\*\* Missing author \*\*\*

The possibility of long-ranged attractions between colloids trapped at fluid interfaces is a topic of current interest. Ref. 1 proposes an intriguing mechanism of geometrical nature for the appearance of a logarithmic capillary attraction between colloids on a droplet. In this respect we note that such an attraction was already proposed in Ref. 2 with essentially the same physical interpretation as the one given in Ref. 1, i.e., an unbalance between the forces on the particle and on the curved interface, respectively. However, following a different approach it was shown that such an unbalance does not arise [3]. Without being exhaustive, here we correct only those mistakes in Ref. 1 which affect the main conclusion. We demonstrate that there is no logarithmically varying interfacial deformation and consequently no logarithmic capillary attraction. Incidentally, this Comment provides an independent confirmation of the conclusions obtained in Ref. 3<sup>1</sup>.

(a) The definition of  $\gamma_1$ : For an isolated droplet in equilibrium, the electrical force  $K = K n_0$  acting on the particle is compensated by tension exerted by the interface at the contact line  $\gamma_0$ . In Ref. 1, the effect of this line tension is modelled by a pressure term  $\gamma_1$  acting along the normal  $n_0$  of the undeformed interface. The value  $\gamma_1$  of this model must be determined by Eq. (9), i.e., Newton's law of action-reaction. Exploiting rotational symmetry, Eq. (9) can be projected onto the unit vector  $e_z (= n_0)$  and evaluated with Eq. (11):

$$0 = \int_0^Z d(n \cdot \hat{e}) P(n) = 2 \int_0^Z d \sin \theta \cos(\theta) \gamma_1 \cos \theta_0: \quad (I)$$

This corrects the definition of  $\gamma_1$  in Eq. (10) by a factor  $1 = \cos^2 \theta_0$ . The origin for this discrepancy is that the force-balance condition (9) actually means that the projection of  $\gamma_1$  onto  $n_0 (= e_z)$  must equal  $K$ , whereas Ref. 1 imposes that the projection of  $K$  onto  $n_0$  must equal  $\gamma_1$ , which violates the action-reaction principle.

(b) A useful intermediate result: Given the rotational symmetry, Eq. (5) can be rewritten as

$$u(\gamma) = \frac{R^2}{2} \int_0^Z d \sin^2 \theta g(\gamma; \theta) P(\theta); \quad \text{with} \quad g(\gamma; \theta) = \int_0^Z d' G(n; n^0): \quad (II)$$

<sup>1</sup> Roman equation numbers will refer to this Comment and arabic equation numbers to Ref. 1.

For  $\theta > 0$  the Green function  $g(\theta; \theta_0)$  is given by

$$g(\theta; \theta_0) = \frac{1}{2} \cos \theta [1 - \cos \theta_0 \ln(1 + \cos \theta_0)] - \frac{1}{2} \cos \theta_0 [1 + \cos \theta \ln(1 - \cos \theta)] + \frac{\ln 2}{2} \cos \theta \cos \theta_0; \quad (\text{III})$$

while for  $\theta < 0$  it has this same form but with  $\theta$  and  $\theta_0$  exchanged.

(c) The solution  $u_L(\theta)$  is given by Eq. (II) with  $P_L(\theta)$  defined in Ref. 1 above Eq. (12):

$$u_L(\theta) = \frac{R^2(\theta_0 - 1)}{2} g(\theta; \theta_0) = \frac{R^2(\theta_0 - 1)}{4} \cos \theta_0 [\cos \theta \ln(1 - \cos \theta) + 1] + A \cos \theta; \quad (\text{IV})$$

where  $\theta_0 < \pi$  and the constant  $A$  depends on  $\theta_0$ . This expression corrects Eq. (12) in two aspects: (i) the presence of a term  $\theta / \cos \theta$ , which however does not affect the amplitude of a possible logarithm in the range  $\theta_0 < \pi$ , and (ii) the amplitude of the logarithm, which has an additional factor  $\cos \theta_0$  as well as the opposite sign as the one given in Ref. 1.<sup>2</sup>

(d) The solution  $u_A(\theta)$ : Applying again Eq. (II) with the stress  $P = P_L$ , we find

$$u_A(\theta) = \frac{R^2}{2} \int_0^Z d\theta_0 \sin \theta_0 g(\theta; \theta_0) - \frac{R^2}{2} \theta_0 g(\theta; \theta_0); \quad (\text{V})$$

In the integral term, a logarithmic dependence is given by

$$\frac{R^2}{2} \int_0^Z d\theta_0 \sin \theta_0 g(\theta; \theta_0) - \frac{R^2}{2} \theta_0 g(\theta; \theta_0) = \frac{1}{2} \cos \theta \ln(1 - \cos \theta) \int_0^Z d\theta_0 \sin \theta_0 \cos \theta_0 - \frac{R^2}{2} \theta_0 \cos \theta_0 + \dots; \quad (\text{VI})$$

All other contributions are either manifestly unimportant or do not yield logarithmic terms if  $\theta(\theta)$  decays rapidly enough. To leading order in  $\theta_0$ , the amplitude of the logarithm is canceled by the term  $\theta / \cos \theta$  in Eq. (V), but there still remains a logarithm with an amplitude  $O(\theta_0^2)$ . The key point is that the amplitude of the logarithm in Eq. (IV) is also  $O(\theta_0^2)$ , so that the solution  $u_A(\theta)$  has to be expanded up to and including  $O(\theta_0^2)$  in order to compare it with  $u_L(\theta)$  consistently. Therefore Eq. (17) is missing a logarithmic term with an amplitude which is comparable to that of the logarithm in Eq. (12).

(e) The total deformation is given by Eqs. (IV), (V), and (VI):

$$u = u_L + u_A = \frac{R^2}{4} \cos \theta \ln(1 - \cos \theta) - \frac{1}{2} \cos \theta \int_0^Z d\theta_0 \sin \theta_0 \cos \theta_0 - \frac{R^2}{2} \theta_0 \cos \theta_0 + \dots; \quad (\text{VII})$$

ignoring terms which do not contribute to a logarithmic dependence for  $\theta \rightarrow 0$ . From Eq. (I) we conclude that the amplitude of the logarithm vanishes. This is a general, exact result which holds to all orders in  $\theta_0$ , in agreement with Ref. 3.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Wurger A., Europhys. Lett., 75 (2006) 978
- [2] Oettel M., Domínguez A. and Dietrich S., Phys. Rev. E, 71 (2005) 051401
- [3] Domínguez A., Oettel M. and Dietrich S., J. Phys.: Condensed Matter, 17 (2005) S3387

<sup>2</sup>The sign can be guessed already from the comparison with the asymptotic limit of the solution  $g(\theta; \theta_0)$ : if  $\theta_0 - 1 > 0$  (interface is pulled up), it follows that  $u^0(\theta) < 0$ .