

Double diffusive miscible viscous fingering

M. Mishra, P.M.J. Trevelyan, C. Almarcha and A. De Wit

Nonlinear Physical Chemistry Unit and Center

for Nonlinear Phenomena and Complex Systems,

Faculté des Sciences, Université Libre de Bruxelles (ULB), CP231, 1050 Brussels, Belgium

(Dated: March 25, 2010)

Abstract

Miscible viscous fingering classically occurs when a less viscous fluid displaces a miscible more viscous one in a porous medium. We analyze here how double diffusive effects between a slow diffusing S and a fast diffusing F component, both influencing the viscosity of the fluids at hand, affect such fingering, and, most importantly, can destabilize the classically stable situation of a more viscous fluid displacing a less viscous one. Various instability scenarios and the conditions under which diffusive effects destabilize otherwise stable viscosity profiles can be classified in a parameter space spanned by the log-mobility ratios R_s and R_f of the slow and fast component respectively and parametrized by the ratio of diffusion coefficients δ . Numerical simulations of the full nonlinear problem confirm the existence of the predicted instability scenarios and highlight the influence of differential diffusion effects on the nonlinear fingering dynamics.

PACS numbers: 47.20.Gv, 47.56.+r, 44.30.+v, 47.55.pd, 47.15.gp, 47.20.-k, 47.54-r,

Miscible viscous fingering (VF) occurs classically in porous media when a fluid of given viscosity displaces another miscible more viscous fluid leading to a deformation of the corresponding interface into finger-like patterns [1]. This paradigmatic pattern-forming instability has been the focus of numerous works devoted to study petroleum recovery [1], polymer processing [2], pollution spreading in soils [3] or efficiency of engineering separation techniques [3, 4] to name a few. In all cases, VF is expected to occur only if the viscosity increases along the direction of propagation, the situation of a more viscous fluid displacing a less viscous one being classically understood as a stable situation. We show here that this intuitive picture is fundamentally modified if the fluid at hand contains two different components influencing the viscosity and diffusing at different rates.

Viscosity differences between miscible fluids can be related to temperature or composition changes and studies of such VF can therefore be performed by analyzing the fingering properties of an interface between two miscible solutions at different temperatures [5–11] or containing a given viscosity-changing solute in variable concentration [1–4]. In some cases, like in the displacement of oils by hot water [6] in enhanced oil recovery techniques for instance, viscosity changes occur due to coupled thermal and solutal effects. As heat diffuses faster than mass, differential diffusion effects can influence the stability properties of viscous fingering patterns [7, 11]. In parallel, there is also currently renewed interest for miscible chemically-driven viscous fingering [12–16] in which chemical reactions modify viscosity gradients across an interface between miscible solutions containing different reactants. If the reaction is exothermic, viscosity changes are here again possible due to both thermal and solutal effects [12]. Even in isothermal conditions, reactive systems typically involve several chemical species diffusing at different rates and which can influence the viscosity of the solution and hence affect stability with regard to viscous fingering [11]. The influence on nonlinear fingering of differential diffusion between two species both influencing the viscosity of a given solution, even in the absence of a reaction, remains however still unclear. The heat/mass problem and the two solutes one bear the similarity that, for both cases, the viscosity may depend on two scalars, say S and F, with one of them diffusing faster than the other one. Defining D_s and D_f as the diffusion coefficient of the respectively slow S and fast F species, it is of interest to understand how differential diffusion effects obtained when $\delta = D_f/D_s > 1$ can affect the problem.

In this context, this letter discusses the generic influence on miscible VF of differential

diffusion between two different scalars S and F each of them influencing independently the viscosity of a given solution. Using a quasi-steady state approximation (QSSA), a time-dependent linear stability analysis (LSA) is performed to classify all possible VF instability scenarios of a two-species problem in a parameter space spanned by the log-mobility ratio R_s and R_f of the respectively slow and fast diffusing species for variable values of the diffusion ratio δ . Differential diffusion effects are seen to destabilize in time a large part of the (R_s, R_f) parameter space otherwise stable when $\delta = 1$. We moreover perform simulations to highlight the influence of double diffusive effects on nonlinear fingering dynamics and suggest experimental conditions prone to demonstrate destabilization of a more viscous fluid pushing a less viscous one by differential diffusion. A discussion of similarities and differences between double-diffusion effects on VF with those classically known in buoyancy-driven flows [17] is conducted.

We consider a 2D horizontal porous medium or Hele-Shaw cell initially filled with a liquid solvent containing the scalars S and F in quantity S_2 and F_2 and of viscosity μ_2 . The same liquid solvent where the scalars are present with a value S_1 and F_1 giving a viscosity μ_1 is injected uniformly into the system at an average velocity U in the longitudinal direction x . Following earlier studies [18], the viscosity is assumed to depend exponentially on S and F as $\mu = \mu_1 \exp [R_s(S - S_1)/(S_2 - S_1) + R_f(F - F_1)/(F_2 - F_1)]$ where μ_1 is the viscosity of the injected solution and $R_s = (S_2 - S_1)d(\ln\mu)/dS$ and $R_f = (F_2 - F_1)d(\ln\mu)/dF$. If $R_s > 0$, then for $R_f = 0$, we have $\mu_1 < \mu_2$ i.e. a less viscous solution of S displaces a more viscous one which is an unstable situation. If S stands for temperature, this would be the case of a hot fluid displacing a cold fluid for instance while if S stands for a viscosity increasing solute, this would correspond to a less concentrated solution of S displacing a more concentrated one. Similarly, $R_f > 0$ for $R_s = 0$ leads to instability with regard to the F component. When both S and F related effects are coupled and $\delta = 1$, $\mu_1 < \mu_2$ and thus the system is classically VF unstable when $R_s + R_f > 0$. We seek here to obtain destabilization conditions for $R_s + R_f < 0$ when $\delta > 1$.

The evolution equations are the continuity equation, Darcy's law and transport equations for S and F in a coordinate system moving at the injection speed U . Considering the characteristic velocity U , length $L_c = D_s/U$ and time $t_c = D_s/U^2$, the scalar values S and F , pressure, velocity and viscosity are nondimensionalised as $\hat{s} = (S - S_1)/(S_2 - S_1)$, $\hat{f} = (F - F_1)/(F_2 - F_1)$, $\hat{p} = K(p - p_0)/(\mu_1 D_s)$, $\hat{\underline{u}} + \hat{\underline{i}} = \underline{u}/U$ and $\mu = \hat{\mu}/\mu_1$, respectively,




FIG. 1: Sketch in the (R_s, R_f) plane for $\delta > 1$ of the six different base state viscosity profiles $\bar{\mu}$, denoted by I-VI, where L_n ($n = 1, 2, 3$) denotes the line $R_f = -\delta^{n/2} R_s$. Regions I_a, I_b, II, IV_d, V and VI are initially unstable. Regions III and IV_c become unstable in the course of time. The two shaded regions IV_a and IV_b are always stable.

where p_0 is an arbitrary reference pressure. K is the permeability and \underline{i} is the unit vector in the x -direction. Dropping hats for convenience, the dimensionless governing equations with $\nabla \cdot \underline{u} = 0$ are

$$\nabla p = -\mu(\underline{u} + \underline{i}), \quad (1a)$$

$$\mu = e^{R_s s + R_f f}, \quad (1b)$$

$$s_t + \underline{u} \cdot \nabla s = \nabla^2 s, \quad (1c)$$

$$f_t + \underline{u} \cdot \nabla f = \delta \nabla^2 f. \quad (1d)$$

The domain length is assumed infinite and the initial conditions are $\underline{u} = \underline{0}$, $s = f = H(x)$, where H is a Heaviside function and $x = 0$ is the initial interface. In the absence of any transverse instabilities there are no disturbances to the flow, $\underline{u} = \underline{0}$, and the one-dimensional s , f and viscosity base states are given analytically by $\bar{s} = \text{erfc}(-x/2\sqrt{t})/2$, $\bar{f} = \text{erfc}(-x/2\sqrt{\delta t})/2$ and $\bar{\mu} = \exp[R_s \bar{s} + R_f \bar{f}]$.

If $\delta = 1$, $\bar{s} = \bar{f}$ and $R_s + R_f > 0$ corresponds to a monotonously increasing $\bar{\mu}$ i.e. to the unstable situation of a less viscous fluid invading a more viscous fluid, the reverse case $R_s + R_f < 0$ being stable as we have then a more viscous fluid pushing a less viscous one. If $\delta > 1$, depending on the relative values of R_s and R_f , six different $\bar{\mu}$ profiles can

be constructed (Fig.1) [16, 19] with differential diffusion effects triggering non-monotonous viscosity profiles [20] in time in zones II, III, V and VI. The boundaries of these various zones [11] can be found by noting that $\bar{\mu}_x$, the derivative of $\bar{\mu}$ with regard to x , changes sign at the two points satisfying $x^2 = \frac{4t\delta}{\delta-1} \ln\left(-\sqrt{\delta}\frac{R_s}{R_f}\right)$ which exist when $\sqrt{\delta}R_s/R_f < -1$. Further, the viscosity gradient at $x = 0$ is locally positive if and only if $\sqrt{\delta}R_s + R_f > 0$. Thus, a monotonically decreasing viscosity profile occurs when $R_f < \min(0, -\sqrt{\delta}R_s)$ which is region IV in Fig.1. Although regions III and V are within the domain $R_s + R_f < 0$, they both have non-monotonic viscosity profiles which could trigger VF instabilities locally in the zones where $\bar{\mu}_x > 0$.

To understand how these non-monotonic effects develop in time and more strikingly how instabilities can also be obtained in regions IV_{c,d} where the viscosity increases monotonically, a time-dependent LSA must be performed. At $t = 0$, the stability problem can be solved analytically to yield $R_s(1 - k/\sqrt{k^2 + \sigma}) + R_f(1 - k/\sqrt{k^2 + (\sigma/\delta)}) = 2\sigma/k$ where σ is the instantaneous growth rate for a disturbance of wavenumber k . This reveals that the system is stable at $t_0 = 0$ in regions III, IV_{a,b,c} in Fig.1 which is defined by $R_f < \min(-R_s, -\delta R_s)$ while it is right away unstable in IV_d and V. For $t_0 > 0$, the LSA is performed numerically using a QSSA [16, 18]. As t_0 increases, the unstable regions expand across the (R_s, R_f) plane until in the large time asymptotic limit the only stable regions are IV_{a,b} whose combined regions are defined by $R_f > \min(0, -\delta^{3/2}R_s)$. This condition has been also obtained analytically by applying the method of [21] where the base state solutions are approximated by linear profiles at large times with $\bar{s}_x/\bar{f}_x = \delta^{1/2}$. This condition predicts that region IV_c eventually becomes unstable in time while region IV_b remains stable (in contradiction with the prediction made in [11]). This suggests that, beyond destabilization due to the build-up of non-monotonic viscosity profiles in time, differential diffusion is able to destabilize a monotonic increasing viscosity profile as is the case in zones IV_{c,d}.

To test these predictions and analyze the influence of differential diffusion on nonlinear fingering, we performed numerical simulations of the full nonlinear problem. A stream function-vorticity formulation of eq. (1) is solved using a pseudo-spectral method [22] with periodic boundary conditions on both axial x and transverse y directions on a 2D finite domain of size $L_x \times L_y$. The initial conditions are chosen as $s = f = H(x) - H(x - L_x/2)$ with a sufficiently large period L_x so that the dynamics at each interface do not affect each other. Here we focus on the left interface initially located at $x = 0$.




FIG. 2: Fingering dynamics of s for $L_y = 4096$ and $(R_s, R_f, \delta) =$ (a) $(1,1,1)$, (b) $(1,1,10)$, (c) $(-1,3,4)$, (d) $(-1,3,10)$. (e) and (f) are the viscosity fields corresponding to (c) and (d), respectively. The frame number is $t/10^3$.

Fig.2 shows various VF cases for $R_s + R_f > 0$ and various δ i.e. for a globally less viscous fluid displacing a more viscous one. Fig.2(a) depicts classical VF for $\delta = 1$ occurring in quadrant I_a of Fig.1 and characterized by tip splitting [1, 22, 23]. In this case, for a given constant λ , the resulting fingering pattern is the same for each point in the parameter space on the line $R_s + R_f = \lambda$. If now $\delta > 1$ in zone I_a , differential diffusion leads to a mushroom structured head as seen at the tip of the fingers in Fig.2(b). The tip splitting mechanism is not observed any longer as the steep viscosity gradient at their origin is faded away by the faster diffusion of F. Clear mushroom structures in both forward and reverse fingers are observed in region I_b of Fig.1, as shown in Fig.2(c,d). For $R_f > 0$, it is observed that an increase of δ at fixed (R_s, R_f) increases a non-monotonic change of μ transversely across the head of a finger favoring the mushroom shape as seen on Fig.2(c-f).




FIG. 3: Dynamics of s for (a) DNS VF, $R_s = 3, R_f = -3.6, \delta = 10, L_y = 4096$, (b) DD VF obtained for $R_s = 1, R_f = -3.2, \delta = 10, L_y = 2048$. The frame number is $t/10^3$.




FIG. 4: DNF-VF dynamics of s (left) and of viscosity μ (right) for $R_s = -6.1, R_f = 6, \delta = 10, L_y = 8192$. The frame number is $t/10^3$.

The most striking effect of differential diffusion is however to be able to destabilize the situation of a more viscous fluid pushing a less viscous one in the zone $R_s + R_f < 0$ (Fig.3 and 4). Let us first examine the case when the contribution of the slow and fast diffusing scalars is respectively destabilizing and stabilizing i.e. when $R_s > 0$ while $R_f < 0$. This corresponds for instance to cold water invading a hot enough viscous glycerol solution such that the global viscosity decreases along the direction of displacement. In region V of Fig.1, the overall viscosity gradient is stable, however, a locally unstable zone develops in time across the interface as the fast diffusing component (heat in the above example) moves quickly towards the more viscous zone. Fingers grow around the interface in the zone where locally $\bar{\mu}_x > 0$ however they eventually fade away far from it when they encounter the two stable zones where $\bar{\mu}_x < 0$ across the localized unstable centered region (Fig.3a). Fingers elongate more along the flow than against it [23] leading in that case to an asymmetry in

the pattern with regard to the initial position of the interface. This kind of destabilization, occurring in region V of Fig.1, and due to a Differential diffusion induced Non-monotonic viscosity profile when the Slow component is destabilizing, will be referred to as DNS VF. However such non-monotonicity is not necessary for an instability as seen in Fig.3(b), where the associated base state viscosity profile is strictly monotonically decreasing (zone IV_d of Fig.1). Such a destabilization that will be referred to as Double Diffusive viscous fingering (DD VF) is due to a pure diffusive effect like in buoyancy-driven double-diffusion where salt fingers develop around a stable density profile when the slow (fast) diffusing species is destabilizing (stabilizing) [17].

We next examine the case when the fast diffusing scalar is the destabilizing component, the slow one being stabilizing i.e. when $R_f > 0$ while $R_s < 0$ as is the case when a hot solution of glycerol invades cold water for instance. If $R_s + R_f < 0$ as in region III of Fig.1, the base state viscosity profile consists of two locally unstable regions (one with a viscosity maximum, the other one with a minimum) developing in time at a symmetric increasing distance from the interface. This kind of destabilization, illustrated in Fig.4, will be referred to as DNF VF as here we have a Differential diffusion induced Non-monotonic viscosity profile with the Fast component being destabilizing. The interface where $\bar{\mu}_x < 0$ remains stable while VF occurs in the two zones where $\bar{\mu}_x > 0$ at equal distances on either side of the interface. Forward fingers are seen to travel further away than the reverse fingers as they develop along the flow while reverse fingers have to fight against it [23]. Here again, fingers have a mushroom type structure as $R_f > 0$. Such an instability is reminiscent of diffusive layer convection induced by buoyancy effects when a lighter solution containing a fast diffusing component overlies a heavier solution of the slow species [24, 25].

It is interesting to note that, although the mechanisms of DD, DNS and DNF VF triggered by differential diffusion bear similarities with those encountered in buoyancy problems [17], there is a fundamental difference between them: buoyancy-driven patterns develop symmetrically around the unstable interface while in VF, triggered by the presence of a flow, asymmetric effects exist because fingers develop more easily along the flow than against it [23]. Let us note that analogous asymmetric effects can also be triggered by the presence of chemical reactions for instance [25].

We have here studied how differential diffusion of two components each contributing to the viscosity of a solvent can profoundly affect the stability and nonlinear dynamics

of viscous fingering. In the situation of a less viscous fluid pushing a more viscous one (i.e. when $R_s + R_f > 0$), double diffusion modifies the nonlinear dynamics and favors mushroom shaped fingers when the fast diffusing species is destabilizing. The most striking effects appear however when destabilization by differential diffusion of a more viscous fluid pushing a less viscous one is obtained. This occurs either due to the build up in time of non-monotonous viscosity profiles like in DNS (region V) or DNF (zone III) VF where locally unstable zones develop leading to spatially constrained nonlinear fingering. More interestingly, this also happens on a strictly monotonously decreasing viscosity profile (zone IV) because of a DD VF mechanism leading to smooth fingers. These various instability scenarios can be obtained by identifying the slow and fast component as mass and heat typically as given in examples above. Another way to experimentally look for the new instability scenarios predicted here is to use two different non reacting chemical species both influencing the viscosity of the solution but having sufficiently different diffusion coefficients. The wealth of available long chain chemical molecules of increasing length and thus tunable molecular weight and diffusion coefficients offers itself naturally to the experimentalist as a tool kit to test the various proposed VF instability scenarios.

We acknowledge Prodex and FNRS for financial support.

-
- [1] G.M. Homsy, *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.* **19**, 271 (1987).
 - [2] K.V. McCloud, J.V. Maher, *Phys. Rep.* **260**, 139 (1995).
 - [3] A. De Wit, Y. Bertho and M. Martin, *Phys. Fluids* **17**, 054114 (2005).
 - [4] W. De Malsche, J. Op De Beeck, H. Gardeniers and G. Desmet, *J. Chromat. A*, **1216**, 5511 (2009).
 - [5] X. Kong, M. Haghghi, Y. Yortsos, *Fuel* **71**, 1465 (1992).
 - [6] T. Sheorey and K. Muralidhar, *Int. J. Thermal Sci.*, **42**, 665 (2003).
 - [7] D. Pritchard, *J. Fluid Mech.* **508** 133 (2004).
 - [8] K.E. Holloway and J.R. de Bruyn, *Can. J. Phys.*, **83**, 551 (2005); **84**, 273 (2006).
 - [9] M.N. Islam and J. Azaiez, *Soc. Pet. Eng.* 103243 (2006).
 - [10] Y. Nagatsu, N. Fujita, Y. Kato and Y. Tada, *Expt. Thermal Fluid Sci.*, **33** 695 (2009).
 - [11] D. Pritchard, *European J. Mech. B/Fluids* **28**, 564 (2009).

- [12] S. Swernath and S Pushpavanam, J. Chem. Phys **127** 204701 (2007).
- [13] Y. Nagatsu, K. Matsuda, Y, Kato and Y. Tada, J. Fluid Mech., **571**. 475 (2007).
- [14] T. Podgorski, M. Sostarecz, S. Zorman, and A. Belmonte, Phys. Rev. E, **76**, 016202 (2007).
- [15] T. Gérard and A. De Wit, Phys. Rev. E, **79**, 016308 (2009).
- [16] S.H. Hejazi, P.M.J. Trevelyan, J. Azaiez and A. De Wit, J. Fluid Mech., in press (2010).
- [17] J. S. Turner, *Buoyancy effects in fluids*, Cambridge University Press (1979).
- [18] C.T. Tan and G.M. Homsy, Phys. Fluid **29**, 3549 (1986).
- [19] L. Rongy, P.M.J. Trevelyan and A. De Wit, Phys. Rev. Lett., **101**, 084503 (2008).
- [20] O. Manickam and G.M. Homsy, Phys. Fluids **6**, 95 (1994).
- [21] D.A. Nield, Water Resources Research, **4** 553 (1968).
- [22] C.T. Tan and G.M. Homsy, Phys. Fluids **31**, 1330 (1988).
- [23] M. Mishra, M. Martin and A. De Wit, Phys. Rev. E, **78**, 066306 (2008).
- [24] R. W. Griffiths, J. Fluid Mech. **102**, 221 (1981).
- [25] C. Almarcha, P.M.J. Trevelyan, P. Grosfils and A. De Wit, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 044501 (2010).