
Direct numerical simulations of finite Reynolds number flows

In this chapter and the following three, we discuss numerical methods that have been used for direct numerical simulations of multiphase flow. Although direct numerical simulations, or DNS, mean slightly different things to different people, we shall use the term to refer to computations of complex unsteady flows where all continuum length and time scales are fully resolved. Thus, there are no modeling issues beyond the continuum hypothesis. The flow within each phase and the interactions between different phases at the interface between them are found by solving the governing conservation equations, using grids that are finer and time steps that are shorter than any physical length and time scale in the problem.

The detailed flow field produced by direct numerical simulations allows us to explore the mechanisms governing multiphase flows and to extract information not available in any other way. For a single bubble, drop, or particle, we can obtain integrated quantities such as lift and drag and explore how they are affected by free stream turbulence, the presence of walls, and the unsteadiness of the flow. In these situations it is possible to take advantage of the relatively simple geometry to obtain extremely accurate solutions over a wide range of operating conditions. The interactions of a few bubbles, drops, or particles is a more challenging computation, but can be carried out using relatively modest computational resources. Such simulations yield information about, for example, how bubbles collide or whether a pair of buoyant particles, rising freely through a quiescent liquid, orient themselves in a preferred way. Computations of one particle can be used to obtain information pertinent to modeling of dilute multiphase flows, and studies of a few particles allow us to assess the importance of rare collisions. It is, however, the possibility of conducting DNS of thousands of freely interacting particles that holds the greatest promise. Such simulations can yield data for not only the collective lift and drag of dense systems, but

also about how the particles are distributed and what impact the formation of structures and clusters has on the overall behavior of the flow. Most industrial size systems, such as fluidized bed reactors or bubble columns, will remain out of reach of direct numerical simulations for the foreseeable future (and even if they were possible, DNS is unlikely to be used for routine design). However, the size of systems that *can* be studied is growing rapidly. It is realistic today to conduct DNS of fully three-dimensional systems resolved by several hundred grid points in each spatial direction. If we assume that a single bubble can be adequately resolved by 25 grid points (sufficient for clean bubbles at relatively modest Reynolds numbers), that the bubbles are, on the average, one bubble diameter apart (a void fraction of slightly over 6%), and that we have a uniform grid with 1000^3 grid points, then we would be able to accommodate 8000 bubbles. High Reynolds numbers and solid particles or drops generally require higher resolution. Furthermore, the number of bubbles that we can simulate on a given grid obviously depends strongly on the void fraction. It is clear, however, that DNS has opened up completely new possibilities in the studies of multiphase flows which we have only started to explore.

In addition to relying on explosive growth in available computer power, progress in DNS of multiphase flows has also been made possible by the development of numerical methods. Advecting the phase boundary poses unique challenges and we will give a brief overview of such methods below, followed by a more detailed description in the next few chapters. In most cases, however, it is also necessary to solve the governing equations for the fluid flow. For body-fitted and unstructured grids, these are exactly the same as for flows without moving interfaces. For the “one-fluid” approach introduced in Chapter 3, we need to deal with density and viscosity fields that change abruptly across the interface and singular forces at the interface, but otherwise the computations are the same as for single-phase flow. Methods developed for single-phase flows can therefore generally be used to solve the fluid equations. After we briefly review the different ways of computing multiphase flows, we will therefore outline in this chapter a relatively simple method to compute single-phase flows using a regular structured grid.

2.1 Overview

Many methods have been developed for direct numerical simulations of multiphase flows. The oldest approach is to use one stationary, structured grid for the whole computational domain and to identify the different fluids by markers or a marker function. The equations expressing conservation of

mass, momentum and energy hold, of course, for any fluid, even when density and viscosity change abruptly and the main challenge in this approach is to accurately advect the phase boundary and to compute terms concentrated at the interface, such as surface tension. In the marker-and-cell (MAC) method of Harlow and collaborators at Los Alamos (Harlow and Welch, 1965) each fluid is represented by marker points distributed over the region that it occupies. Although the MAC method was used to produce some spectacular results, the distributed marker particles were not particularly good at representing fluid interfaces. The Los Alamos group thus replaced the markers by a marker function that is a constant in each fluid and is advected by a scheme specifically written for a function that changes abruptly from one cell to the next. In one dimension this is particularly straightforward and one simply has to ensure that each cell fills completely before the marker function is advected into the next cell. Extended to two and three dimensions, this approach results in the volume-of-fluid (VOF) method.

The use of a single structured grid leads to relatively simple as well as efficient methods, but early difficulties experienced with the volume-of-fluid method have given rise to several other methods to advect a marker function. These include the level-set method, originally introduced by Osher and Sethian (1988) but first used for multiphase flow simulations by Sussman, Smereka, and Osher (1994), the CIP method of Yabe and collaborators (Takewaki, Nishiguchi and Yabe, 1985; Takewaki and Yabe, 1987), and the phase field method used by Jacqmin (1997). Instead of advecting a marker function and inferring the location of the interface from its gradient, it is also possible to mark the interface using points moving with the flow and reconstruct a marker function from the interface location. Surface markers have been used extensively for boundary integral methods for potential flows and Stokes flows, but their first use in Navier–Stokes computations was by Daly (1969a,b) who used them to calculate surface tension effects with the MAC method. The use of marker points was further advanced by the introduction of the immersed boundary method by Peskin (1977), who used connected marker points to follow the motion of elastic boundaries immersed in homogeneous fluids, and by Unverdi and Tryggvason (1992) who used connected marker points to advect the boundary between two different fluids and to compute surface tension from the geometry of the interface. Methods based on using a single structured grid, identifying the interface either by a marker function or connected marker points, are discussed in some detail in Chapter 3 of this book.

The attraction of methods based on the use the “one-fluid” formulation

on stationary grids is their simplicity and efficiency. Since the interface is, however, represented on the grid as a rapid change in the material properties, their formal accuracy is generally limited to first order. Furthermore, the difficulty that the early implementations of the “one-fluid” approach experienced, inspired several attempts to develop methods where the grid lines were aligned with the interface. These attempts fall, loosely, into three categories. Body-fitted grids, where a structured grid is deformed in such a way that the interface always coincides with a grid line; unstructured grids where the fluid is resolved by elements or control volumes that move with it in such a way that the interface coincides with the edge of an element; and what has most recently become known as sharp interface methods, where a regular structured grid is used but something special is done at the interface to allow it to stay sharp.

Body-fitted grids that conform to the phase boundaries greatly simplify the specification of the interaction of the phases across the interface. Furthermore, numerical methods on curvilinear grids are well developed and a high level of accuracy can be maintained both within the different phases and along their interfaces. Such grids were introduced by Hirt, Cook, and Butler (1970) for free surface flows, but their use by Ryskin and Leal (1983, 1984) to find the steady state shape of axisymmetric buoyant bubbles brought their utility to the attention of the wider fluid dynamics community. Although body-fitted curvilinear grids hold enormous potential for obtaining accurate solutions for relatively simple systems such as one or two spherical particles, generally their use is prohibitively complex as the number of particles increases. These methods are briefly discussed in Chapter 4. Unstructured grids, consisting usually of triangular (in two-dimensions) and tetrahedral (in three-dimensions) shaped elements offer extreme flexibility, both because it is possible to align grid lines to complex boundaries and also because it is possible to use different resolution in different parts of the computational domain. Early applications include simulations of the breakup of drops by Fritts, Fyre, and Oran (1983) but more recently unstructured moving grids have been used for simulations of multiphase particulate systems, as discussed in Chapter 5. Since body-fitted grids are usually limited to relatively simple geometries and methods based on unstructured grids are complex to implement and computationally expensive, several authors have sought to combine the advantages of the single-fluid approach and methods based on a more accurate representation of the interface. This approach was pioneered by Glimm and collaborators many years ago (Glimm, 1982; Glimm and McBryan, 1985) but has recently re-emerged in methods that can be referred to collectively as “sharp interface” methods. In these methods the

fluid domain is resolved by a structured grid, but the interface treatment is improved by, for example, introducing special difference formulas that incorporate the jump across the interface (Lee and LeVeque, 2003), using “ghost points” across the interface (Fedkiw *et al.*, 1999), or restructuring the control volumes next to the interface so that the face of the control volume is aligned with the interface (Udaykumar *et al.*, 1997). While promising, for the most part these methods have yet to prove that they introduce fundamentally new capabilities and that the extra complication justifies the increased accuracy. We will briefly discuss “sharp interface methods” for simulations of the motion of fluid interfaces in Chapter 3 and in slightly more detail for fluid–solid interactions in Chapter 4.

2.2 Integrating the Navier–Stokes equations in time

For a large class of multiphase flow problems, including most of the systems discussed in this book, the flow speeds are relatively low and it is appropriate to treat the flow as incompressible. The unique role played by the pressure for incompressible flows, where it is not a thermodynamic variable, but takes on whatever value is needed to enforce a divergence-free velocity field, requires us to pay careful attention to the order in which the equations are solved. There is, in particular, no explicit equation for the pressure and therefore such an equation has to be found as a part of the solution process. The standard way to integrate the Navier–Stokes equations is by the so called “projection method,” introduced by Chorin (1968) and Yanenko (1971). In this approach, the velocity is first advanced without accounting for the pressure, resulting in a field that is in general not divergence-free. The pressure necessary to make the velocity field divergence-free is then found and the velocity field corrected by adding the pressure gradient.

We shall first work out the details for a simple first-order explicit time integration scheme and then see how it can be modified to generate a higher order scheme. To integrate equations (1.2) and (1.7) (or 1.8) in time, we write

$$\frac{\mathbf{u}^{n+1} - \mathbf{u}^n}{\Delta t} + \mathbf{A}_h(\mathbf{u}^n) = -\frac{1}{\rho} \nabla_h p + \nu \mathbf{D}_h(\mathbf{u}^n) + \mathbf{f}_b^n \quad (2.1)$$

$$\nabla_h \cdot \mathbf{u}^{n+1} = 0. \quad (2.2)$$

The superscript n denotes the variable at the beginning of a time step of length Δt and $n + 1$ denotes the new value at the end of the step. \mathbf{A}_h is a numerical approximation to the advection term, \mathbf{D}_h is a numerical approximation to the diffusion term, and \mathbf{f}_b is a numerical approximation to any

other force acting on the fluid. ∇_h means a numerical approximation to the divergence or the gradient operator.

In the projection method the momentum equation is split into two parts by introducing a temporary velocity \mathbf{u}^* such that $\mathbf{u}^{n+1} - \mathbf{u}^n = \mathbf{u}^{n+1} - \mathbf{u}^* + \mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{u}^n$. The first part is a predictor step, where the temporary velocity field is found by ignoring the effect of the pressure:

$$\frac{\mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{u}^n}{\Delta t} = -\mathbf{A}_h(\mathbf{u}^n) + \nu \mathbf{D}_h(\mathbf{u}^n) + \mathbf{f}_b^n. \quad (2.3)$$

In the second step – the projection step – the pressure gradient is added to yield the final velocity at the new time step:

$$\frac{\mathbf{u}^{n+1} - \mathbf{u}^*}{\Delta t} = -\frac{1}{\rho} \nabla_h p^{n+1}. \quad (2.4)$$

Adding the two equations yields exactly equation (2.1).

To find the pressure, we use equation (2.2) to eliminate \mathbf{u}^{n+1} from equation (2.4), resulting in Poisson's equation:

$$\frac{1}{\rho} \nabla_h^2 p^{n+1} = \frac{1}{\Delta t} \nabla_h \cdot \mathbf{u}^* \quad (2.5)$$

since the density ρ is constant. Once the pressure has been found, equation (2.4) is used to find the projected velocity at time step $n + 1$. We note that we do not assume that $\nabla_h \cdot \mathbf{u}^n = 0$. Usually, the velocity field at time step n is not exactly divergence-free but we strive to make the divergence of the new velocity field, at $n + 1$, zero.

As the algorithm described above is completely explicit, it is subject to relatively stringent time-step limitations. If we use standard centered second-order approximations for the spatial derivatives, as done below, stability analysis considering only the viscous terms requires the step size Δt to be bounded by

$$\Delta t < C_\nu \frac{h^2}{\nu} \quad (2.6)$$

where $C_\nu = 1/4$ and $1/6$ for two- and three-dimensional flows, respectively, and h is the grid spacing. The advection scheme is unstable by itself, but it is stabilized by viscosity if the step size is limited by

$$\Delta t < \frac{2\nu}{q^2}, \quad (2.7)$$

where $q^2 = \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{u}$. More sophisticated methods for the advection terms, which are stable in the absence of viscosity and can therefore also be used to

integrate the Euler equations in time, are generally subject to the Courant–Friedrichs–Lewy (CFL) condition¹. For one-dimensional flow,

$$\Delta t < \frac{h}{(|u|)}. \quad (2.8)$$

Many advection schemes are implemented by splitting, where the flow is sequentially advected in each coordinate direction. In these cases the one-dimensional CFL condition applies separately to each step. For fully multidimensional schemes, however, the stability analysis results in further reduction of the size of the time step. General discussions of the stability of different schemes and the resulting maximum time step can be found in standard textbooks, such as Hirsch (1988), Wesseling (2001), or Ferziger and Perić (2002). In an unsteady flow, the CFL condition on the time step is usually not very severe, since accuracy requires the time step to be sufficiently small to resolve all relevant time scales. The limitation due to the viscous diffusion, equation (2.6), can be more stringent, particularly for slow flow, and the viscous terms are frequently treated implicitly, as discussed below. For problems where additional physics must be accounted for, other stability restrictions may apply. When surface tension is important, it is generally found, for example, that it is necessary to limit the time step in such a way that a capillary wave travels less than a grid space in one time step.

The simple explicit forward-in-time algorithm described above is only first-order accurate. For most problems it is desirable to employ at least a second-order accurate time integration method. In such methods the nonlinear advection terms can usually be treated explicitly, but the viscous terms are often handled implicitly, for both accuracy and stability. If we use a second-order Adams–Bashforth scheme for the advection terms and a second-order Crank–Nicholson scheme for the viscous term, the predictor step is (Wesseling, 2001)

$$\frac{\mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{u}^n}{\Delta t} = -\frac{3}{2}\mathbf{A}_h(\mathbf{u}^n) + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{A}_h(\mathbf{u}^{n-1}) + \frac{\nu}{2}(\mathbf{D}_h(\mathbf{u}^n) + \mathbf{D}_h(\mathbf{u}^*)), \quad (2.9)$$

and the correction step is

$$\frac{\mathbf{u}^{n+1} - \mathbf{u}^*}{\Delta t} = -\nabla_h \phi^{n+1}. \quad (2.10)$$

¹ Lewy is often spelled Levy. This is incorrect. Hans Lewy (1904–1988) was a well-known mathematician.

Here, ϕ is not exactly equal to the pressure, since the viscous term is not computed at the new time level but at the intermediate step. It is easily seen that

$$-\nabla\phi^{n+1} = -\nabla p^{n+1} + \frac{\nu}{2} \left(\mathbf{D}_h(\mathbf{u}^{n+1}) - \mathbf{D}_h(\mathbf{u}^*) \right). \quad (2.11)$$

The intermediate velocity \mathbf{u}^* does not satisfy the divergence-free condition, and a Poisson equation for the pseudo-pressure is obtained as before from Eq. (2.10) as

$$\nabla_h^2 \phi^{n+1} = \frac{\nabla_h \cdot \mathbf{u}^*}{\Delta t}. \quad (2.12)$$

This multidimensional Poisson's equation must be solved before the final velocity, \mathbf{u}^{n+1} , can be obtained. Since the viscous terms are treated implicitly, we must rearrange equation (2.9) to yield a Helmholtz equation for the intermediate velocity \mathbf{u}^*

$$\mathbf{D}_h(\mathbf{u}^*) - \frac{2\nu}{\Delta t} \mathbf{u}^* = \frac{3\Delta t}{2} \mathbf{A}_h(\mathbf{u}^n) - \frac{\Delta t}{2} \mathbf{A}_h(\mathbf{u}^{n-1}) - \mathbf{D}_h(\mathbf{u}^n) - \frac{2\nu}{\Delta t} \mathbf{u}^n = \text{RHS} \quad (2.13)$$

which needs to be solved with the appropriate boundary conditions. Considerable effort has been devoted to the solution of Poisson's and Helmholtz's equations and several packages are available (see www.mgnet.org, for example), particularly for rectangular grids. For curvilinear body-fitted grids the solution of Helmholtz's equation can sometimes be simplified by using implicit time advancement of the viscous term selectively only along certain directions. The viscous term in the other directions can be treated explicitly along with the nonlinear terms. Usually, the wall-normal viscous term is treated implicitly, while the tangential viscous terms can be treated explicitly (Mittal, 1999; Bagchi and Balachandar, 2003b). The resulting viscous time-step limitation, arising only from the tangential contributions to (2.13), is usually not very stringent.

The above two-step formulation of the time-splitting scheme is not unique; another variant is presented in Chapter 9. We refer the reader to standard textbooks, such as Ferziger and Perić (2002) and Wesseling (2001) for further discussions.

2.3 Spatial discretization

Just as there are many possible time integration schemes, the spatial discretization of the Navier–Stokes equations – where continuous variables are replaced by discrete representation of the fields and derivatives are approximated by relations between the discrete values – can be accomplished in many ways. Here we use the finite-volume method and discretize the

governing equations by dividing the computational domain into small control volumes of finite size. In the finite-volume method we work with the average velocity in each control volume, and approximate each term in equations (2.3) and (2.4) by its average value over the control volume. To derive numerical approximations to the advection and the viscous terms, we first find the averages over each control volume:

$$\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{u}^n) = \frac{1}{\Delta V} \int_V \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{u}^n \mathbf{u}^n) dv = \frac{1}{\Delta V} \oint_S \mathbf{u}^n (\mathbf{u}^n \cdot \mathbf{n}) ds \quad (2.14)$$

and

$$\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{u}^n) = \frac{1}{\Delta V} \int_V \nabla^2 \mathbf{u}^n dv. \quad (2.15)$$

Here, ΔV is the volume of the control volume, S is the surface of the control volume, and we have used the divergence theorem to convert the volume integral of the advection term to a surface integral. It is also possible to rewrite the viscous term as a surface integral, but for constant-viscosity fluids it is generally simpler to work with the volume integral. Numerical approximations to these terms, \mathbf{A}_h and \mathbf{D}_h , are found by evaluating the integrals numerically.

Similarly, a numerical approximation to the continuity equation (2.2), $\nabla_h \cdot \mathbf{u}^{n+1} = 0$, is found by first integrating over the control volume and then rewriting the integral as a surface integral:

$$\frac{1}{\Delta V} \int_V \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^{n+1} dv = \frac{1}{\Delta V} \oint_S \mathbf{u}^{n+1} \cdot \mathbf{n} ds. \quad (2.16)$$

The surface integral is then evaluated numerically. While we started here with the differential form of the governing equations, averaging over each cell, the discrete approximations could just as well have been obtained by starting with the conservation principles in integral form.

To carry out the actual computations, we must specify the control volumes to be used, and how the surface and volume integrals are approximated. Here, we will take the simplest approach and use square or cubic control volumes, defined by a regular array of grid points, separated by a distance h . For simplicity, we assume a two-dimensional flow as the extension to three dimensions involves no new concepts. We start by picking a control volume around a point where the pressure is stored and identify it by the integer pair (i, j) . The control volumes to the left and the right are given by $(i - 1, j)$ and $(i + 1, j)$, respectively. Similarly, $(i, j - 1)$ and $(i, j + 1)$ refer to the control volumes below and above. The locations of the edges are identified by half-indices $(i \pm 1/2, j)$ and $(i, j \pm 1/2)$. The pressure




Fig. 2.1. The notation used for a standard staggered MAC mesh. The pressure control volume, centered at the (i, j) node, is outlined.

control volume, centered at (i, j) , is shown by a thick line in Fig. 2.1. To derive a discrete approximation for the incompressibility condition, we evaluate equation (2.16) for the pressure control volume centered at (i, j) . The integrals along the edges of the control volume are approximated by the mid-point rule, using the normal velocities at the edges. The normal velocities on the right and the left boundaries are $u_{i+1/2,j}$ and $u_{i-1/2,j}$, respectively. Similarly, $v_{i,j+1/2}$ and $v_{i,j-1/2}$ are the normal velocities on the top and the bottom boundary. The discrete approximation to the incompressibility condition is therefore:

$$u_{i+1/2,j}^{n+1} - u_{i-1/2,j}^{n+1} + v_{i,j+1/2}^{n+1} - v_{i,j-1/2}^{n+1} = 0 \quad (2.17)$$

since the grid spacing is the same in both directions.

The velocities needed in equation (2.17) are the normal velocities to the boundary of the control volume. Although methods have been developed to allow us to use co-located grids (discussed below and in Section 10.3.4), where the velocities are stored at the same points as the pressures, here we proceed in a slightly different way and to define new control volumes, one for the u velocity, centered at $(i + 1/2, j)$ and another one for the v velocity, centered at $(i, j + 1/2)$. Such *staggered* grids result in a very robust numerical method that is – in spite of the complex looking indexing – relatively easily implemented. The control volume for $u_{i+1/2,j}$ is shown in the left frame of Fig. 2.2 and the control volume for $v_{i,j+1/2}$ in the right frame.

Continuing with the first-order method described above, the discrete forms of equations (2.3) and (2.4) for the u velocity in a control volume centered at




Fig. 2.2. The control volumes for the velocities on a staggered grid. The u -velocity control volume, centered at $(i+1/2, j)$, is shown on the left and the v -velocity control volume, centered at $(i, j+1/2)$, is shown on the right.

$(i+1/2, j)$ and the v velocity in a control volume centered at $(i, j+1/2)$ are:

$$\begin{aligned} u_{i+1/2,j}^* &= u_{i+1/2,j}^n + \Delta t \left(-(A_x)_{i+1/2,j}^n + \nu (D_x)_{i+1/2,j}^n + (f_x)_{i+1/2,j} \right) \\ v_{i,j+1/2}^* &= v_{i,j+1/2}^n + \Delta t \left(-(A_y)_{i,j+1/2}^n + \nu (D_y)_{i,j+1/2}^n + (f_y)_{i,j+1/2} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (2.18)$$

for the predictor step, and

$$\begin{aligned} u_{i+1/2,j}^{n+1} &= u_{i+1/2,j}^* - \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\Delta t}{h} (p_{i+1,j}^{n+1} - p_{i,j}^{n+1}) \\ v_{i,j+1/2}^{n+1} &= v_{i,j+1/2}^* - \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\Delta t}{h} (p_{i,j+1}^{n+1} - p_{i,j}^{n+1}) \end{aligned} \quad (2.19)$$

for the projection step.

To find an equation for the pressure, we substitute the expression for the correction velocities at the edges of the pressure control volume, equations (2.19), into the continuity equation (2.17). When the density is constant, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{p_{i+1,j}^{n+1} + p_{i-1,j}^{n+1} + p_{i,j+1}^{n+1} + p_{i,j-1}^{n+1} - 4p_{i,j}^{n+1}}{h^2} \\ &= \frac{\rho}{\Delta t} \left(\frac{u_{i+1/2,j}^* - u_{i-1/2,j}^* + v_{i,j+1/2}^* - v_{i,j-1/2}^*}{h} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.20)$$

The pressure Poisson equation, (2.20), can be solved by a wide variety of methods. The simplest one is iteration, where we isolate $p_{i,j}^{n+1}$ on the left-hand side and compute it by using already estimated values for the

surrounding pressures. Once a new pressure is obtained everywhere, we repeat the process until the pressure does not change any more. This iteration (Jacobi iteration) is very robust but converges very slowly. It can be accelerated slightly by using the new values of the pressure as soon as they become available (Gauss–Seidel iteration) and even more by extrapolating toward the new value at every iteration. This is called successive over-relaxation (SOR) and was widely used for a while although now its value is mostly its simplicity during code development. For “production runs”, much more efficient methods are available. For constant-density flows in regular geometries, solvers based on fast Fourier transforms or cyclic reduction (Sweet, 1974) have been used extensively for over two decades, but for more complex problems, such as variable-density or nonsimple domains or boundary conditions, newer methods such as multigrid iterative methods are needed (Wesseling, 2004). Solving the pressure equation is generally the most time-consuming part of any simulation involving incompressible flows.

Now that we have determined the layout of the control volumes, we can write explicit formulas for the advection and diffusion terms. The simplest approach is to use the midpoint rule to approximate the integral over each edge in equation (2.14) and to use a linear interpolation for the velocities at those points where they are not defined. This results in:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (A_x)_{i+1/2,j}^n &= \frac{1}{h} \left\{ \left(\frac{u_{i+3/2,j}^n + u_{i+1/2,j}^n}{2} \right)^2 - \left(\frac{u_{i+1/2,j}^n + u_{i-1/2,j}^n}{2} \right)^2 \right. \\
 &\quad + \left(\frac{u_{i+1/2,j+1}^n + u_{i+1/2,j}^n}{2} \right) \left(\frac{v_{i+1,j+1/2}^n + v_{i,j+1/2}^n}{2} \right) \\
 &\quad \left. - \left(\frac{u_{i+1/2,j}^n + u_{i+1/2,j-1}^n}{2} \right) \left(\frac{v_{i+1,j-1/2}^n + v_{i,j-1/2}^n}{2} \right) \right\} \\
 (A_y)_{i,j+1/2}^n &= \frac{1}{h} \left\{ \left(\frac{u_{i+1/2,j}^n + u_{i+1/2,j+1}^n}{2} \right) \left(\frac{v_{i,j+1/2}^n + v_{i+1,j+1/2}^n}{2} \right) \right. \\
 &\quad - \left(\frac{u_{i-1/2,j+1}^n + u_{i-1/2,j}^n}{2} \right) \left(\frac{v_{i,j+1/2}^n + v_{i-1,j+1/2}^n}{2} \right) \\
 &\quad \left. + \left(\frac{v_{i,j+3/2}^n + v_{i,j+1/2}^n}{2} \right)^2 - \left(\frac{v_{i,j+1/2}^n + v_{i,j-1/2}^n}{2} \right)^2 \right\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

The viscous term, equation (2.15), is approximated by the Laplacian at the center of the control volume, found using centered differences and by

assuming that the average velocities coincide with the velocity at the center of the control volume:

$$\begin{aligned} (D_x)_n^{i+1/2,j} &= \frac{u_{i+3/2,j}^n + u_{i-1/2,j}^n + u_{i+1/2,j+1}^n + u_{i+1/2,j-1}^n - 4u_{i+1/2,j}^n}{h^2} \\ (D_y)_n^{i,j+1/2} &= \frac{v_{i+1,j+1/2}^n + v_{i-1,j+1/2}^n + v_{i,j+3/2}^n + v_{i,j-1/2}^n - 4v_{i,j+1/2}^n}{h^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.21)$$

The staggered grid used above results in a very robust method, where pressure and velocities are tightly coupled. The grid does, however, require fairly elaborate bookkeeping of where each variable is and, for body-fitted or unstructured grids, the staggered grid arrangement can be cumbersome. Considerable effort has therefore been devoted to the development of methods using *co-located* grids, where all the variables are stored at the same spatial locations. The simplest approach is probably the one due to Rhie and Chow (1983), where we derive the pressure equation using the predicted velocities interpolated to the edges of the basic control volume. Thus, after we find the temporary velocities at the pressure points, $u_{i,j}^*$ and $v_{i,j}^*$, we interpolate to find

$$\begin{aligned} u_{i+1/2,j}^* &= \frac{1}{2}(u_{i+1,j}^* + u_{i,j}^*) \\ v_{i,j+1/2}^* &= \frac{1}{2}(v_{i,j+1}^* + v_{i,j}^*). \end{aligned} \quad (2.22)$$

We then “pretend” that we are working with staggered grids and that the edge velocities at the new time step are given by

$$\begin{aligned} u_{i+1/2,j}^{n+1} &= u_{i+1/2,j}^* - \frac{\Delta t}{\rho h}(p_{i+1,j}^{n+1} - p_{i,j}^{n+1}) \\ v_{i,j+1/2}^{n+1} &= v_{i,j+1/2}^* - \frac{\Delta t}{\rho h}(p_{i,j+1}^{n+1} - p_{i,j}^{n+1}), \end{aligned} \quad (2.23)$$

which is identical to equation (2.19), except that the temporary edge velocities are found by interpolation (equation 2.22).

The continuity equation for the pressure control volume is still given by equation (2.17), and substitution of the velocities given by equation (2.23) yields exactly equation (2.20), but with the velocities on the right-hand side now given by equation (2.22), rather than equations (2.19). Although we enforce incompressibility using the corrected edge velocities so that the pressure gradient is estimated using pressure values next to each other, the new

cell-centered velocities are found using the average pressure at the edges. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} u_{i,j}^{n+1} &= u_{i,j}^* - \frac{\Delta t}{\rho h} (p_{i+1,j}^{n+1} - p_{i-1,j}^{n+1}) \\ v_{i,j}^{n+1} &= v_{i,j}^* - \frac{\Delta t}{\rho h} (p_{i,j+1}^{n+1} - p_{i,j-1}^{n+1}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.24)$$

The Rhie–Chow method has been successfully implemented by a number of authors and applied to a range of problems. For regular structured grids it offers no advantage over the staggered grid, but for more complex grid layouts and for cut-cell methods (discussed in Chapter 4) it is easier to implement. A different approach for the solution of the fluid equations on co-located grids is described in Section 10.3.4.

The method described above works well for moderate Reynolds number flows and short enough computational times, but for serious computational studies, particularly at high Reynolds numbers, it usually needs to be refined in various ways. In early computations the centered difference scheme for the advection terms was sometimes replaced by the upwind scheme. In this approach, the momentum is advected through the left boundary of the $(i + 1/2, j)$ control volume in Fig. 2.2 using $u_{i-1/2,j}$ if the flow is from the left to right and using $u_{i+1/2,j}$ if the flow is from the right to left. While this resulted in much improved stability properties, the large numerical diffusion of the scheme and the low accuracy has all but eliminated it from current usage. By using more sophisticated time integration schemes, such as the Adams–Bashforth method described above or Runge–Kutta schemes, it is possible to produce stable schemes based on centered differences for the advection terms that are subject to the time-step limit given by (2.8), rather than equation (2.7). However, for situations where the velocity changes rapidly over a grid cell this approach can produce unphysical oscillations. These oscillations do not always render the results unusable, and the problem only shows up in regions of high gradients. However, as the Reynolds number becomes higher the problem becomes more serious. To overcome these problems, many authors have resorted to the use of higher order upwind methods. These methods are almost as accurate as centered difference schemes in regions of fully resolved smooth flows and much more robust in regions where the solution changes rapidly and the resolution is marginal. The best-known approach is the quadratic upstream interpolation for convective kinematics (QUICK) method of Leonard (1979), where values at

the cell edges are interpolated by upstream biased third-order polynomials. Thus, for example, the u velocity at (i, j) in Fig. 2.2 is found from

$$u_{i,j} = \begin{cases} (1/8)(3u_{i+1/2,j} + 6u_{i-1/2,j} - u_{i-3/2,j}), & \text{if } u_{i,j} > 0; \\ (1/8)(3u_{i-1/2,j} + 6u_{i+1/2,j} - u_{i+3/2,j}), & \text{if } u_{i,j} < 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.25)$$

While QUICK and its variants are not completely free of “wiggles” for steep enough gradients, in practice they are much more robust than the centered difference scheme and much more accurate than first-order upwind. Other authors have used the second-order ENO (essentially nonoscillatory) scheme described in Chapter 3 (for the advection of the level set function) to find the edge velocities.

2.4 Boundary conditions

At solid walls the boundary conditions for the Navier–Stokes equations are well defined. As we saw in Section 1.3, the velocity is simply equal to the wall velocity. When staggered grids are used to resolve a rectangular geometry, the grid is arranged in such a way that the boundaries coincide with the location of the normal velocities. In the discrete version of the equations, the relative normal velocity is then simply zero on the side of the control volume that coincides with the wall. Since the location of the tangent velocity component is, however, half a grid space away from the wall, imposing the tangent wall velocity is slightly more complicated. Usually, this is done by the introduction of “ghost points” on the other side of the wall, half a grid space away from the wall. The tangent velocity at this point is specified in such a way that linear interpolation gives the correct wall velocity. Thus, if the wall velocity is u_b and the velocity at the first point inside the domain (half a cell from the wall) is $u_{1/2}$, the velocity at the ghost point is $u_{-1/2} = 2u_b - u_{1/2}$. Figure 2.3 shows a ghost point near a solid boundary.

While the enforcement of the tangential velocity boundary conditions is perhaps a little kludgy, it is in the implementation of the boundary conditions for the pressure where the true elegance of the staggered grid manifests itself best. As seen before, the pressure equation is derived by substituting the discrete equations for the correction velocities into the discrete continuum equation. For cells next to the boundary the normal velocity at the wall is known and there is no need to substitute the correction velocity for the boundary edge. The pressure equation for the cell will therefore only contain pressures for nodes inside the domain. This has sometimes led to declarations to the effect that on staggered grids no boundary conditions are needed for the pressure. This is, of course, not correct. The discrete




Fig. 2.3. A cell next to a solid wall. To impose the tangent velocity u_w , a “ghost” point is introduced half a grid cell outside the boundary.

pressure equation for cells next to the boundary is different than for interior nodes since the boundary conditions are incorporated during the derivation of the equation. For the pressure cell in Fig. 2.4 the inflow on the left is given $(u_{b,j})$, so that we only substitute equations (2.19) for the right, top, and bottom boundaries, yielding:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{p_{i+1,j}^{n+1} + p_{i,j+1}^{n+1} + p_{i,j-1}^{n+1} - 3p_{i,j}^{n+1}}{h^2} \\ &= \frac{\rho}{\Delta t} \left\{ \frac{u_{i+1/2,j}^* - u_{b,j} + v_{i,j+1/2}^* - v_{i,j-1/2}^*}{h} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (2.26)$$

which does not include a pressure to the left of the control volume. Similar equations are used for the other boundaries. At corner nodes, the velocity is known at two edges of the control volume. This expression can also be derived by substituting equation (2.19), written for $u_{i-1/2,j}^*$, into equation (2.20) and using that $u_{i-1/2,j}^{n+1} = u_{b,j}$.

For co-located grids, it is necessary to specify boundary conditions for the intermediate velocity in terms of the desired boundary conditions to be satisfied by the velocity at the end of the time step. For the simple case where a Dirichlet boundary condition on velocity, $\mathbf{u}_{n+1} = \mathbf{u}_b$, is specified, the boundary condition for the intermediate velocity can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{u}^* \cdot \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{u}_b \cdot \mathbf{n} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{u}^* \cdot \mathbf{t} = \mathbf{u}_b \cdot \mathbf{t} + \Delta t (2\nabla\phi^n - \nabla\phi^{n-1}) \cdot \mathbf{t}, \quad (2.27)$$

where \mathbf{n} is the unit vector normal to the surface on which the boundary condition is applied and \mathbf{t} represents the unit vector(s) parallel to the surface. From equation (2.10) the corresponding boundary condition for ϕ^{n+1} is the homogeneous Neumann condition: $\nabla\phi^{n+1} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0$.




Fig. 2.4. A cell next to an inflow boundary. The normal velocity $u_{b,j}$ is given.

While the discrete boundary conditions for solid walls are easily obtained, the situation is quite different for inflow and outflow boundaries. Generally the challenges are to obtain as uniform (or at least well-defined) inflow as possible and to design outflow boundary conditions that have as little effect on the upstream flow as possible. Thus, the numerical problem is essentially the same as the one faced by the experimentalist and just as the experimentalist installs screens and flow straighteners, the computationalist must use *ad hoc* means to achieve the same effect.

The inclusion of a well-defined inflow, such as when a flow from a long pipe enters a chamber, is relatively easy, particularly in computations using staggered grids. Usually the normal and the tangential velocities are specified and once the normal velocity is given, the pressure equation can be derived in the same way as for rigid walls. Although a given velocity is easily implemented numerically, the inflow must be carefully selected and placed sufficiently far away from the region of interest in order to avoid imposing artificial constraints on the upstream propagation of flow disturbances. In many cases, however, such as for flow over a body, the upstream boundary condition does not represent a well-defined inflow, but rather a place in the flow where the modeler has decided that the influence of the body is sufficiently small so that the disturbance can be ignored there. For multiphase flow such situations arise frequently in studies of the flow over a single particle and we shall defer the discussion of how these are handled to Chapter 4. Although the specification of the inflow velocity conditions is by far the most common approach to simulations of internal flow, many practical situations call for the specification of the overall pressure drop. For discussions of how to handle such problems we refer the reader to standard references such as Wesseling (2001).

The outflow is a much more difficult problem. Ideally, we want the domain to be sufficiently long so that the outflow boundary has essentially no effect

on the flow region of interest. Practical considerations, however, often force us to use relatively short computational domains. In reality the flow continues beyond the boundary and we accommodate this fact by assuming that the flow is relatively smooth. Thus, the trick is to do as little as possible to disturb the flow. Below we list a few of the proposals that have been put forward in the literature to allow the flow to exit the computational domain as gently as possible:

Convective (e.g. Kim and Choi, 2002):

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}^*}{\partial t} + c \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}^*}{\partial n} = 0 \quad (2.28)$$

Parabolic (e.g. Magnaudet, Rivero, and Fabre, 1995):

$$\frac{\partial^2 u_n^*}{\partial n^2} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial u_\tau^*}{\partial n} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial^2 p}{\partial n \partial \tau} = 0 \quad (2.29)$$

Zero gradient (e.g. Kim, Elghobashi, & Sirignano, 1998):

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}^*}{\partial n} = 0 \quad (2.30)$$

Zero second gradient (e.g. Shirayama, 1992):

$$\frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{u}^*}{\partial n^2} = 0 \quad (2.31)$$

In the above, n and τ indicate directions normal and tangential to the outer boundary and c is a properly selected advection velocity. Many other boundary conditions have been proposed in the literature to account for outflows in a physically plausible, yet computationally efficient way. The outflow boundary conditions are generally imposed for the velocity and an equation for the pressure is then derived in the same way as for solid boundaries. While the straightforward treatment of pressure for solid walls on staggered grids carries over to both in and outflow boundaries, co-located grids generally require us to come up with explicit approximations for the pressure at in and outflow boundaries. A more extensive discussion of outflow boundary conditions can be found in Section 6.5 in Wesseling (2001) and Johansson (1993), for example. Spectral simulations, owing to their global nature, place a more stringent nonreflection requirement at the outflow boundary. A buffer domain or viscous sponge technique is often used to implement a nonreflecting outflow boundary condition as discussed in Chapter 4.

References

- Y. Abe, H. Akimoto, H. Kamo, and Y. Murao, 1993. Elimination of numerical pressure spikes induced by two-fluid model. *J. Nucl. Sci. Technol.*, **30**:1214–1224.
- R. Abgrall, 1996. How to prevent pressure oscillations in multicomponent calculations: a quasi-conservative approach. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **125**:150–160.
- F. L. Addessio, J. R. Baumgardner, J. K. Dukowicz, N. L. Johnson, B. A. Kashiwa, R. M. Rauenzhan, and C. Zemach, 1992. CAVEAT: A computer code for fluid dynamics problems with large distortion and internal slip. Technical Report LA-10613-MS, Rev. 1, Los Alamos National Laboratory.
- N. Adrianov, R. Saurel, and G. Warnecke, 2003. A simple method for compressible multiphase mixtures and interfaces. *Int. J. Num. Meth. Fluids*, **41**:109–131.
- K. Agrawal, P. N. Loezos, M. Syamlal, and S. Sundaresan, 2001. The role of meso-scale structures in rapid gas–solid flows. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **445**:151–185.
- G. Agresar, J. J. Linderman, G. Tryggvason, and K. G. Powell, 1998. An adaptive, cartesian, front-tracking method for the motion, deformation and adhesion of circulating cells. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **43**:346–380.
- B. Aktas and J. H. Mahaffy, 1996. A two-phase level tracking method. *Nucl. Eng. Des.*, **162**:271–280.
- I. Aleinov, E. G. Puckett, and M. Sussman, 1999. Formation of droplets in microscale jetting devices, fedsm99-7106. In *Proceedings of the 3rd ASME/JSME Joint Fluids Engineering Conference*, San Francisco, CA.
- F. Alexander, S. Chen, and D. W. Grunau, 1993. Hydrodynamic spinodal decomposition: growth kinetics and scaling. *Phys. Rev. B*, **48**:634.
- A. S. Almgren, J. B. Bell, P. Colella, and T. Marthaler, 1997. A cartesian grid projection method for the incompressible euler equations in complex geometries. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, **18**:1289.
- D. A. Anderson, J. C. Tannehill, and R. H. Pletcher, 1984. *Computational Fluid Mechanics and Heat Transfer*. New York, Hemisphere Publishing.
- K. Anderson, S. Sundaresan, and R. Jackson, 1995. Instabilities and the formation of bubbles in fluidized beds. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **303**:327–366.
- G. B. Arfken and H. J. Weber, 2000. *Mathematical Methods for Physicists*. New York, Academic Press.
- E. S. Asmolov, 1999. The inertial lift on a spherical particle in a plane Poiseuille flow at large channel Reynolds number. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **381**:63–87.
- E. S. Asmolov and J. B. McLaughlin, 1999. The inertial lift on an oscillating sphere in a linear shear flow. *Int. J. Multiphase Flow*, **25**:739–751.
- E. S. Asmolov, 2002. The inertial lift on a small particle in a weak-shear parabolic flow. *Phys. Fluids*, **14**:15–28.
- J. M. Augenbaum, 1989. An adaptive pseudospectral method for discontinuous problems. *Appl. Numer. Math.*, **5**:459–480.
- T. R. Auton, 1987. The lift force on a spherical body in rotational flow. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **183**:199–218.
- T. R. Auton, J. C. R. Hunt, and M. Prud’homme, 1988. The force exerted on a body in inviscid unsteady non-uniform rotational flow. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **197**:241–257.

- S. Balachandar and M. R. Maxey, 1989. Methods for evaluating fluid velocities in spectral simulations of turbulence. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **83**:96–125.
- P. Bagchi and S. Balachandar, 2002a. Effect of free rotation on the motion of a solid sphere in linear shear flow at moderate Re. *Phys. Fluids*, **14**:2719–2737.
- P. Bagchi and S. Balachandar, 2002b. Shear versus vortex-induced lift force on a rigid sphere at moderate Re. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **473**:379–388.
- P. Bagchi and S. Balachandar, 2002c. Steady planar straining flow past a rigid sphere at moderate Reynolds numbers. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **466**:365–407.
- P. Bagchi and S. Balachandar, 2003a. Effect of turbulence on the drag and lift of a particle. *Phys. Fluids*, **15**:3496–3513.
- P. Bagchi and S. Balachandar, 2003b. Inertial and viscous forces on a rigid sphere in straining flows at moderate Reynolds numbers. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **481**:105–148.
- P. Bagchi and S. Balachandar, 2004. Response of a particle wake to isotropic turbulent flow. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **518**:95–123.
- G. Balzer, A. Boelle, and O. Simonin, 1995. Eulerian gas–solid flow modelling of dense fluidized beds. In *Fluidization VIII*, pages 1125–1135.
- F. Barre and M. Bernard, 1990. The CATHARE code strategy and assessment. *Nucl. Eng. Des.*, **124**:257–284.
- F. Barre, M. Parent, and B. Brun, 1993. Advanced numerical methods for thermal-hydraulics. *Nucl. Eng. Des.*, **145**:147–158.
- A. B. Basset, 1888. *Treatise on Hydrodynamics*. Deighton, Bell & Co., London, reprinted by Dover, 1961.
- I. B. Bazhlekov, 2003. Non-singular boundary-integral method for deformable drops in viscous flows. PhD thesis, Technische Universiteit Eindhoven.
- I. B. Bazhlekov, P. D. Anderson, and H. E. H. Meijer, 2004a. Boundary integral method for deformable interfaces in the presence of insoluble surfactants. *Lect. Notes Comput. Sci.*, **2907**:355–62.
- I. B. Bazhlekov, P. D. Anderson, and H. E. H. Meijer, 2004b. Nonsingular boundary integral method for deformable drops in viscous flows. *Phys. Fluids*, **16**:1064–81.
- R. C. Beach, 1991. *An Introduction to the Curves and Surfaces of Computer-Aided Design*. New York, Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- M. Behr and T. E. Tezduyar, 1994. Finite element solution strategies for large-scale flow simulations. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engng.*, **112**:3–24.
- C. R. Bell, P. B. Bleiweis, J. E. Boudreau, F. R. Parker, and L. L. Smith, 1977. SIMMER-I: An S_n , implicit multifield multicomponent Eulerian recriticality code. Technical Report LA-NUREG-6467-MS, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory.
- K. H. Bendiksen, D. Maines, R. Moe, and S. Nuland, May 1991. The dynamic two-fluid model OLGA: Theory and application. *SPE Prod. Eng.*, pages 171–180.
- D. Bestion, 1990. The physical closure laws in CATHARE code. *Nucl. Eng. Des.*, **124**:229–245.
- D. Bhaga and M. E. Weber, 1981. Bubbles in viscous liquids: Shapes, wakes and velocities. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **105**:61–85.
- A. Biesheuvel and S. Spoelstra, 1989. The added mass coefficient of a dispersion of spherical gas bubbles in liquid. *Int. J. Multiphase Flow*, **15**:911–924.
- R. B. Bird, R. C. Armstrong and O. Hassager, 1987. *Dynamics of Polymeric Liquids*, Vol. 1. New York: Wiley-Interscience.

- T. D. Blake, J. Deconinck and U. Dortona, 1995. Models of wetting: immiscible lattice Boltzmann automata versus molecular kinetic theory. *Langmuir*, **11**: 4588–92.
- C. Bodart and M. J. Crochet, 1994. The time-dependent flow of a viscoelastic fluid around a sphere. *J. Non-Newtonian Fluid Mech.*, **54**:303–329.
- A. Boelle, G. Balzer, and O. Simonin, 1995. Second-order prediction of the particle-phase stress tensor of inelastic spheres in simple shear dense suspensions. In D. E. Stock, M. W. Reeks, Y. Tsuji, E. E. Michaelides, and M. Gautam, editors, *Gas-Particle Flows, Proceedings of the ASME Fluids Engineering Division Summer Meeting*, pages 9–18, New York, ASME.
- W. Böhm, G. Farin, and J. Kahmann, 1984. A survey of curve and surface methods in CAGD. *Comput. Aided Geom. Des.*, **1**:1–60.
- M. Boivin, O. Simonin, and K. D. Squires, 1998. Direct numerical simulation of turbulence modulation by particles in isotropic turbulence. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **375**:235–263.
- J. Boussinesq, 1885. *Application de Potentiels à l'Étude de l'Équilibre et de Mouvement des Solides Élastiques*. Gauthier-Villars, Paris, reprinted by Blanchard, Paris 1969.
- M. Bouzidi, D. d'Humières, P. Lallemand, and L.-S. Luo, 2001. Lattice Boltzmann equation on a two-dimensional rectangular grid. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **172**:704–717.
- M. Bouzidi, M. Firdaouss, and P. Lallemand, 2002. Momentum transfer of a lattice-Boltzmann fluid with boundaries. *Phys. Fluids*, **13**:3452–3459.
- J. P. Boyd, 1989. *Chebyshev and Fourier Spectral Methods*. New York, Springer-Verlag.
- J. U. Brackbill, D. B. Kothe, and C. Zemach, 1992. A continuum method for modeling surface tension. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **100**:335–354.
- J. F. Brady and G. Bossis, 1988. Stokesian dynamics. *Ann. Rev. Fluid Mech.*, **20**:111–157.
- J. F. Brady, 1993. Stokesian dynamics simulation of particulate flows, in *Particulate Two-Phase Flow* (M. C. Roco, ed.), pp. 971–998. London: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- F. P. Bretherton, 1962. The motion of rigid particles in a shear flow at low Reynolds number. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **14**:284–304.
- D. L. Brown, R. Cortez, and M. L. Minion, 2001. Accurate projection methods for the incompressible Navier–Stokes equations. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **168**:464–499.
- A. Brucato, F. Grisafi, and G. Montante, 1998. Particle drag coefficients in turbulent fluids. *Chem. Eng. Sci.*, **53**:3295–3314.
- J. Buckles, R. Hazlett, S. Chen, K. G. Eggert, D. W. Grunau, and W. E. Soll, 1994. Flow through porous media using lattice Boltzmann method. *Los Alamos Sci.*, **22**:112–121.
- A. J. Bulpitt and N. D. Efford, 1996. An efficient 3D deformable model with a self-optimizing mesh. *Image Vision Comput.*, **14**:573–580.
- B. Bunner, 2000. *Numerical Simulations of Gas-Liquid Bubbly Flows*. The University of Michigan.
- B. Bunner and G. Tryggvason, 2002a. Dynamics of homogeneous bubbly flows. Part 1. Rise velocity and microstructure of the bubbles. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **466**:17–52.

- B. Bunner and G. Tryggvason, 2002b. Dynamics of homogeneous bubbly flows. Part 2. Fluctuations of the bubbles and the liquid. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **466**:53–84.
- B. Bunner and G. Tryggvason, 2003. Effect of bubble deformation on the stability and properties of bubbly flows. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **495**:77–118.
- T. M. Burton and J. K. Eaton, 2002. Analysis of a fractional-step method on overset grids. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **177**:336–364.
- B. L. Buzbee, F. W. Dorr, J. A. George and G. H. Golub, 1971. The direct solution of the discrete Poisson equation on irregular regions. *SIAM J. Num. Anal.*, **8**:722–736.
- J. W. Cahn and J. E. Hilliard, 1958. Free energy of a nonuniform system. I. Interfacial free energy. *J. Chem. Phys.*, **28**:258.
- D. Calhoun and R. J. LeVeque, 2000. A cartesian grid finite-volume method for the advection-diffusion equation in irregular geometries. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **157**:143–180.
- C. Canuto, M. Y. Hussaini, A. Quarteroni, and T. A. Zang, 1988 (second revised printing 1990). *Spectral methods in fluid dynamics*. Berlin, Springer-Verlag.
- M. Carlson, P. Mucha, and G. Turk, 2004. Rigid fluid: Animating the interplay between rigid bodies and fluid. *ACM Siggraph*.
- M. B. Carver, 1982. A method of limiting intermediate values of volume fraction in iterative two-fluid computations. *J. Mech. Eng. Sci.*, **24**:221–224.
- C. A. Catlin, 2003. The lift force on an arbitrarily shaped body in a steady incompressible inviscid linear shear flow with weak strain. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **484**:113–142.
- E. J. Chang and M. R. Maxey, 1994. Unsteady flow about a sphere at low to moderate Reynolds number. Part 1. Oscillatory motion. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **277**:347–379.
- Y. C. Chang, T. Y. Hou, B. Merriman, and S. Osher, 1996. Eulerian capturing methods based on a level set formulation for incompressible fluid interfaces. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **124**:449–464.
- S. Chapman and T. G. Cowling, 1970. *The Mathematical Theory of Non-Uniform gases*. Cambridge Mathematical Library, third edition.
- H. Chen, S. Chen, G. D. Doolen, Y. C. Lee, and H. A. Rose, 1989. Multithermodynamic phase lattice-gas automata incorporating interparticle potentials. *Phys. Rev. A*, **40**:2850.
- H. Chen, S. Chen, and W. H. Matthaeus, 1992. Recovery of the Navier–Stokes equations using a lattice-gas Boltzmann method. *Phys. Rev. A.*, **45**:R5339.
- H. D. Chen, B. M. Boghosian, P. V. Coveney, and M. Nekovee, 2000. A ternary lattice Boltzmann model for amphiphilic fluids. *Proc. Royal Soc. of London, Series A*, **456**:2043.
- S. Chen, H. Chen, D. Martinez, and W. Matthaeus, 1991. Lattice Boltzmann model for simulation of magnetohydrodynamics. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **67**:3776.
- S. Chen and G. D. Doolen, 1998. Lattice Boltzmann method for fluid flows. *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.*, **30**:329–64.
- H. Cheng, L. Greengard, and V. Rokhlin, 1999. A fast adaptive multipole algorithm in three dimensions. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **155**:468–98.
- I.-L. Chern, J. Glimm, O. McBryan, B. Plohr, and S. Yaniv, 1986. Front tracking for gas dynamics. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **62**:83–110.

- A. J. Chorin, 1968. Numerical solutions of the Navier–Stokes equations. *Math. Comput.*, **22**:745–762.
- B. Cichocki, B. U. Felderhof, and R. Schmitz, 1988. Hydrodynamic interactions between two spherical particles. *PhysicoChem. Hyd.*, **10**:383–403.
- B. Cichocki and B. U. Felderhof, 1989. Periodic fundamental solution of the linear Navier–Stokes equations. *Physica A*, **159**:19–27.
- R. Clift, J. R. Grace, and M. E. Weber, 1978. *Bubbles, Drops, and Particles*. Academic Press.
- P. Colella and P. R. Woodward, 1984. The piecewise parabolic method (PPM) for gas dynamical simulations. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **54**:174–201.
- S. Corrsin and J. L. Lumley, 1956. On the equation of motion of a particle in a turbulent fluid. *Appl. Sci. Res.*, **A6**:114–116.
- J. Cortes, A. Debussche, and I. Tounsi, 1998. A density perturbation method to study the eigenstructure of two-phase flow equation systems. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **147**:463–484.
- J. Cortes, 2002. On the construction of upwind schemes for non-equilibrium transient two-phase flows. *Comput. Fluids*, **31**:159–182.
- V. Cristini, J. Bławdziewicz, and M. Loewenberg, 1998. Drop breakup in three-dimensional viscous flows. *Phys. Fluids.*, **10**:1781–1784.
- V. Cristini, J. Bławdziewicz, and M. Loewenberg, 2001. An adaptive mesh algorithm for evolving surfaces: Simulations of drop breakup and coalescence. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **168**:445–463.
- V. Cristini, J. Bławdziewicz, M. Loewenberg, and L. R. Collins, 2003. Breakup in stochastic Stokes flows: Sub-Kolmogorov drops in isotropic turbulence. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **492**:231–50.
- C. Crowe, M. Sommerfeld, and Y. Tsuji, 1998. *Multiphase Flows with Droplets and Particles*. Boca Raton FL, CRC Press.
- G. Dal Maso, P. LeFloch, and P. Murat, 1995. Definition and weak stability of a non-conservative product. *J. Math. Pure Appl.*, **74**:483–548.
- B. J. Daly, 1967. Numerical study of two fluid Rayleigh–Taylor instability. *Phys. Fluids*, **10**:297.
- B. J. Daly, 1969a. Numerical study of the effect of surface tension on interface instability. *Phys. Fluids*, **12**:1340–1354.
- B. J. Daly, 1969b. A technique for including surface tension effects in hydrodynamic calculations. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **4**:97–117.
- D. S. Dandy and H. A. Dwyer, 1990. A sphere in shear flow at finite Reynolds number: effect of shear on particle lift, drag and heat transfer. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **216**:381–410.
- M. Darwish, F. Moukalled, and B. Sekar, 2001. A unified formulation of the segregated class of algorithms for multifluid flow at all speeds. *Numer. Heat Transfer*, **B40**:99–137.
- J. Davidson, 1961. Discussion. In *Symposium on Fluidization*, volume 39, pages 230–232. *Trans. Inst. Chem. Eng.*
- C. de Boor, 1978. *A Practical Guide to Splines*. New York, Springer-Verlag.
- J. E. Dennis Jr. and R. E. Schnabel, 1983. *Numerical Methods for Unconstrained Optimization and Nonlinear Equations*. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, Reprinted by SIAM, 1996.

- M. Deserno and C. Holm, 1998. How to mesh up Ewald sums. I. A theoretical and numerical comparison of various particle mesh routines. *J. Chem. Phys.*, **109**:7678–93.
- E. Deutsch and O. Simonin, 1991. Large eddy simulation applied to the modeling of particulate transport coefficients in turbulent two-phase flows. In *Proceedings of the 8th International Symposium on Turbulent Shear Flows, Volume 1*, page 1011. University of Munich.
- V. Dhir, 2001. Numerical simulations of pool-boiling heat transfer. *A.I.Ch.E. Journal*, **47**:813–834.
- D. d’Humières, 1992. Generalized lattice-Boltzmann equations. In B. D. Shizgal and D. P. Weaver, editors, *Rarefied Gas Dynamics: Theory and Simulations Progress in Astronautics and Aeronautics*, Volume 159 of *AIAA*, pages 450–458. Washington, DC.
- D. d’Humières, M. Bouzidi, and P. Lallemand, 2001. Thirteen-velocity three-dimensional lattice Boltzmann model. *Phys. Rev. E*, **63**:066702.
- D. d’Humières, I. Ginzburg, M. Krafczyk, P. Lallemand, and L.-S. Luo, 2002. Multiple-relaxation-time lattice Boltzmann models in three-dimensions. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A*, **360**:437–451.
- A. Diaz, N. Pelekasis, and D. Barthès-Biesel, 2000. Transient response of a capsule subjected to varying flow conditions: Effect of internal fluid viscosity and membrane elasticity. *Phys. Fluids*, **12**:948–57.
- A. Diaz, D. Barthès-Biesel, and Pelekasis N, 2001. Effect of membrane viscosity on the dynamic response of an axisymmetric capsule. *Phys. Fluids*, **13**:3835–8.
- U. Dortona, 1995. Models of wetting: immiscible lattice Boltzmann automata versus molecular kinetic theory. *Langmuir*, **11**:4588.
- D. A. Drew, L. Y. Cheng, and R. T. Jr. Lahey, 1979. The analysis of virtual mass effects in two-phase flow. *Int. J. Multiphase Flow*, **5**:233–242.
- D. A. Drew, 1983. Mathematical modeling of two-phase flow. *Ann. Rev. Fluid Mech.*, **15**:261–291.
- D. A. Drew and R. T. Jr. Lahey, 1993. Analytical modeling of multiphase flow. In Roco M. C., editor, *Particulate Two-Phase Flow*, pages 509–566. Boston. Butterworth-Heinemann.
- J. K. Dukowicz and J. W. Kodis, 1987. Accurate conservative remapping (rezoning) for arbitrary Lagrangian–Eulerian computations. *SIAM J. Sci. Stat. Comput.*, **8**:305–321.
- J. K. Dukowicz and A. S. Dvinsky, 1992. Approximate factorization as a high-order splitting for the implicit incompressible flow equations. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **102**:336–347.
- A. R. Edwards and F. P. O’Brien, 1970. Studies of phenomena connected with the depressurization of water reactors. *J. Brit. Nucl. Soc.*, **9**:125–135.
- D. A. Edwards, H. Brenner, and D. T. Wasan, 1991. *Interfacial Transport Processes and rheology*. Boston, Butterworth-Heinemann.
- J. R. Edwards and M.-S. Liou, 1998. Low-diffusion flux-splitting methods for flows at all speeds. *AIAA Journal*, **36**:1610–1617.
- J. R. Edwards, R. K. Franklin, and M.-S. Liou, 2000. Low-diffusion flux-splitting methods for real fluid flows with phase transitions. *AIAA Journal*, **38**:1624–1633.

- J. Eggers, 1995. Theory of drop formation. *Phys. Fluids*, **7**:941–953.
- A. Elcrat, B. Fornberg, and K. Miller, 2001. Some steady axisymmetric vortex flows past a sphere. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **433**:315–328.
- S. E. Elghobashi and G. C. Truesdell, 1993. On the two-way interaction between homogeneous turbulence and dispersed solid particles. I. Turbulence modification. *Phys. Fluids*, **5**:1790–1801.
- B. Engquist and S. Osher, 1980. Stable and entropy-satisfying approximations for transonic flow calculations. *Math. Comp.*, **34**:45–75.
- B. Engquist and S. Osher, 1981. One sided difference approximations for nonlinear conservation laws. *Math. Comp.*, **36**:321–351.
- A. Esmaeeli and G. Tryggvason, 1998. Direct numerical simulations of bubbly flows. Part I. Low Reynolds number arrays. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **377**:313–345.
- A. Esmaeeli and G. Tryggvason, 1999. Direct numerical simulations of bubbly flows. Part II. Moderate Reynolds number arrays. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **385**:325–358.
- A. Esmaeeli and G. Tryggvason, 2005. A direct numerical simulation study of the buoyant rise of bubbles at $O(100)$ reynolds number. *Phys. Fluids*, **17**:093303.
- V. Eswaran and S. B. Pope, 1988. An examination of forcing in direct numerical simulations of turbulence. *Comput. Fluids*, **16**(3):257–278.
- S. Evje and K. K. Fjelde, 2002. Hybrid flux-splitting schemes for a two-phase flow model. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **175**:674–701.
- S. Evje and K. K. Fjelde, 2003. On a rough AUSM scheme for a one-dimensional two-phase flow model. *Comput. Fluids*, **32**:1497–1530.
- S. Evje and T. Flåtten, 2003. Hybrid flux-splitting schemes for a common two-fluid model. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **192**:175–210.
- E. A. Fadlun, R. Verzicco, P. Orlandi, and J. Mohd-Yusof, 2000. Combined immersed-boundary finite-difference methods for three-dimensional complex flow simulations. *J. Comp. Phys.*, **161**:35–60.
- I. Faille and E. Heintze, 1999. A rough finite volume scheme for modeling two-phase flow in a pipeline. *Comput. Fluids*, **28**:213–241.
- L. S. Fan and C. Zhu, 1998. *Principles of Gas–Solid Flows*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- G. Farin, 1988. *Curves and Surfaces for Computer Aided Geometric Design. A Practical Guide*. New York, Academic Press.
- R. Fedkiw, T. Aslam, B. Merriman, and S. Osher, 1999. A non-oscillatory eulerian approach to interfaces in multimaterial flows (the ghost fluid method). *J. Comput. Phys.*, **152**:457–492.
- B. U. Felderhof and R. B. Jones, 1989. Displacement theorems for spherical solutions of the linear Navier–Stokes equations. *J. Math. Phys.*, **30**:339–42.
- J. Feng, H. H. Hu and D. D. Joseph, 1994a. Direct simulation of initial value problems for the motion of solid bodies in a Newtonian fluid. Part 1: sedimentation. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **261**:95–134.
- J. Feng, H. H. Hu and D. D. Joseph, 1994b. Direct simulation of initial value problems for the motion of solid bodies in a Newtonian fluid. Part 2: Couette and Poiseuille flows. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **277**:271–301.
- J. Feng, P. Y. Huang and D. D. Joseph, 1995. Dynamic simulation of the motion of capsules in pipelines. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **282**:233–245.

- J. Feng, P. Y. Huang and D. D. Joseph, 1996. Dynamic simulation of sedimentation of solid particles in an Oldroyd-B fluid. *J. Non-Newtonian Fluid Mech.*, **63**: 63–68.
- B. Ferreol and D. H. Rothman, 1995. Lattice-Boltzmann simulations of flow-through fontainebleau sandstone. *Transp. Por. Med.*, **20**:3.
- M. L. Ferrer, R. Duchowicz, B. Carrasco, J. G. García de la Torre, and A. U. Acuña, 2001. The conformation of serum albumin in solution: a combined phosphorescence depolarization-hydrodynamic modeling study. *Biophys. J.*, **80**:2422–30.
- J. H. Ferziger and M. Perić, 2002. *Computational Methods for Fluid Dynamics*. New York, Springer, 3rd edn.
- J. H. Ferziger, 2003. Interfacial transfer in Tryggvason’s method. *Int J. Numerical Methods in Fluids*, **41**:551–560.
- P. Fevrier, O. Simonin, and K. D. Squires, 2005. Partitioning of particle velocities in two-phase turbulent flows into a continuous field and a quasi-Brownian distribution: theoretical formalism and numerical study. *J. Fluid Mech.*, in press.
- P. F. Fischer, G. K. Leaf, and J. M. Restrepo, 2002. Forces on particles in oscillatory boundary layers. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **468**:327–347.
- K. K. Fjelde and K. H. Karlsen, 2002. High-resolution hybrid primitive-conservative upwind schemes for the drift flux model. *Comput. Fluids*, **31**:335–367.
- R. Fletcher, 1976. Conjugate gradient methods for indefinite systems. In *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, **506**. Berlin, Springer-Verlag.
- B. Fornberg, 1988. Steady viscous flow past a sphere at high Reynolds numbers. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **190**:471.
- B. Fornberg, 1996. *A Practical Guide to Pseudospectral Methods*. Cambridge University Press.
- L. P. Franca, S. L. Frey and T. J. R. Hughes, 1992a. Stabilized finite element methods: I. Application to the advective–diffusive model. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engng.*, **95**:253–276.
- L. P. Franca and S. L. Frey, 1992b. Stabilized finite element methods: II. The incompressible Navier–Stokes equations. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engng.*, **99**:209–233.
- D. Frenkel and B. Smit, 2002. *Understanding Molecular Simulation. From Algorithms to Simulations*. New York, Academic Press.
- C. Frepoli, J. H. Mahaffy, and K. Ohkawa, 2003. Notes on the implementation of a fully-implicit numerical scheme for a two-phase three-field flow model. *Nucl. Eng. Des.*, **225**:191–217.
- U. Frisch, B. Hasslacher, and Y. Pomeau, 1986. Lattice-gas automata for the Navier–Stokes equations. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **56**:1505.
- U. Frisch, D. d’Humières, B. Hasslacher, P. Lallemand, Y. Pomeau, and J. P. Rivet, 1987. Lattice gas hydrodynamics in two and three dimensions. *Complex Syst.*, **1**:649.
- M. J. Fritts, D. E. Fyre, and E. S. Oran, 1983. Numerical simulations of fuel droplet flows using a Lagrangian triangular mesh. In *NASA CR-168263*.
- I. J. Galea, 2004. *Permeability of foams with surfactant-covered interfaces*. PhD thesis, Yale University.
- S. Ganapathy and J. Katz, 1995. Drag and lift forces on microscopic bubbles entrained by a vortex. *Phys. Fluids*, **7**:389–399.

- P. R. Garabedian, 1998. *Partial Differential Equations*. American Mathematical Society, Providence RI, 2nd revised edition.
- P. L. George, 1991. *Automatic Mesh Generation: Application to Finite Element Methods*. New York: John Wiley.
- J. M. Ghidaglia, A. Kumbaro, and G. Le Coq, 2001. On the numerical solution to two fluid models via a cell centered finite volume method. *Eur. J. Mech. B-Fluids*, **20**:841–867.
- D. Gidaspow, 1994. *Multiphase Flow and Fluidization*. Academic Press.
- M. M. Giles, G. A. Jayne, S. Z. Rouhani, R. W. Shumway, G. L. Singer, D. D. Taylor, and W. L. Weaver, 1992. TRAC-BF1: An advanced best-estimate computer program for BWR accident analysis. Technical Report NUREG/CR-4356, U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
- I. Ginzbourg and P. M. Alder, 1994. Boundary flow condition analysis for the three-dimensional lattice Boltzmann model. *J. Phys. II France*, **4**:191–214.
- I. Ginzbourg and D. d’Humières, 1996. Local second-order boundary method for lattice Boltzmann models. *J. Stat. Phys.*, **84**:927–971.
- I. Ginzbourg and D. d’Humières, 2003. Multi-reflection boundary conditions for lattice Boltzmann models. *Phys. Rev. E*, **68**:066614.
- I. Ginzbourg, J.-P. Carlier, and C. Kao, 2004. Lattice Boltzmann approach to Richard’s equation. pages 15–23.
- I. Ginzbourg, 2005. Variable saturated flow with the anisotropic lattice Boltzmann methods.
- B. J. Glasser, I. G. Kevrekidis, and S. Sundaresan, 1996. One- and two-dimensional traveling wave solutions in gas-fluidized beds. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **306**:183–221.
- B. J. Glasser, I. G. Kevrekidis, and S. Sundaresan, 1997. Fully developed travelling wave solutions and bubble formation in fluidized beds. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **334**:157–188.
- J. Glimm, 1982. Tracking of interfaces in fluid flow: Accurate methods for piecewise smooth problems, transonic shock and multidimensional flows. *Advances in Scientific Computing*, R. E. Meyer, ed., New York, Academic Press.
- J. Glimm and O. McBryan, 1985. A computational model for interfaces. *Adv. Appl. Math.*, **6**:422–435.
- J. Glimm, O. McBryan, R. Menikoff, and D. H. Sharp, 1986. Front tracking applied to Rayleigh–Taylor instability. *SIAM J. Sci. Stat. Comput.*, **7**:230.
- R. Glowinski, T. Hesla, D. D. Joseph, T.-W. Pan and J. Periaux, 1997. Distributed Lagrange multiplier methods for particulate flows, in *Computational Science for the 21st Century* (M.-O. Bristeau, G. Etgen, W. Fitzgibbon, J. L. Lions, J. Periaux, M. F. Wheeler, eds.), pp. 270–279. Chichester: John Wiley.
- R. Glowinski, T.-W. Pan, T. I. Hesla and D. D. Joseph, 1999. A distributed Lagrange multiplier/fictitious domain method for particulate flows. *Int. J. Multiphase Flow*, **25**:755–794.
- T. G. Goktekin, A. W. Bargteil, and J. F. O’Brien, 2004. A method for animating viscoelastic fluids. *ACM Siggraph*.
- D. Goldstein, R. Handler, and L. Sirovich, 1993. Modeling a no-slip flow boundary with an external force field. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **105**:354–366.

- R. A. Gore and C. T. Crowe, 1990. Discussion of particle drag in a dilute turbulent two-phase suspension flow. *Int. J. Multiphase Flow*, **16**:359–361.
- D. Gottlieb and S. A. Orszag, 1977. *Numerical Analysis of Spectral Methods: Theory and Applications*. SIAM.
- W. G. Gray and P. C. Lee, 1977. On the theorem for local volume averaging for multiphase systems. *Int. J. Multiphase Flow*, **3**:333–340.
- L. Greengard and V. Rokhlin, 1987. A fast algorithm for particle simulations. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **73**:325–48.
- C. Guenther and M. Syamlal, 2001. The effect of numerical diffusion on isolated bubbles in a gas–solid fluidized bed. *Powder Tech.*, **116**:142–154.
- A. K. Gunstensen, D. H. Rothman, S. Zaleski, and G. Zanetti, 1991. Lattice Boltzmann model of immiscible fluids. *Phys. Rev. A*, **43**:4320.
- A. K. Gunstensen and D. H. Rothman, 1993. Lattice Boltzmann studies of immiscible two phase flow through porous media. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **98**:6431.
- W. L. Haberman and R. M. Sayre, 1958. Motion of rigid and fluid spheres in stationary and moving liquids inside cylindrical tubes. David Taylor Model Basin Report No. 1143.
- E. Hairer and G. Wanner, 1996. *Solving Ordinary Differential Equations II. Stiff and Differential-Algebraic Problems*. New York, Springer.
- G. Hall and J. M. Watt, 1976. *Modern Numerical Methods for Ordinary Differential Equations*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- B. Halle and M. Davidovic, 2003. Biomolecular hydration: From water dynamics to hydrodynamics. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, **100**:12135–40.
- P. Hansbo 1992. The characteristic streamline diffusion method for the time-dependent incompressible Navier–Stokes equations. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engng.*, **99**:171–186.
- J. Happel and H. Brenner, 1983. *Low-Reynolds Number Hydrodynamics*. Noordhoff International Publishing, Leyden, The Netherlands.
- S. E. Harding, 1995. On the hydrodynamic analysis of macromolecular conformation. *Biophys. Chem.*, **55**:69–93.
- F. H. Harlow and J. E. Welch, 1965. Numerical calculation of time-dependent viscous incompressible flow of fluid with a free surface. *Phys. Fluid*, **8**:2182–2189.
- F. H. Harlow and J. E. Welch, 1966. Numerical study of large-amplitude free-surface motions. *Phys. Fluid*, **9**:842–851.
- F. H. Harlow and A. A. Amsden, 1971. Numerical fluid dynamics calculation method for all flow speeds. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **8**:197–231.
- F. H. Harlow and A. A. Amsden, 1975. Numerical calculation of multiphase flow. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **17**:19–52.
- S. Harris, 1971. *An Introduction to the Theory of the Boltzmann Equation*. New York, Dover.
- A. Harten, P. D. Lax, and B. van Leer, 1983. On upstream differencing and Godunov-type schemes for hyperbolic conservation laws. *SIAM Review*, **25**:35–61.
- H. Hasimoto, 1959. On the periodic fundamental solutions of the Stokes equation and their application to viscous flow past a cubic array of spheres. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **5**:317–328.

- X. He, L.-S. Luo, and M. Dembo, 1996. Some progress in lattice Boltzmann method. Part I. Nonuniform mesh grids. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **129**:357–363.
- X. He and G. D. Doolen, 1997a. Lattice Boltzmann method on a curvilinear coordinate system: Vortex shedding behind a circular cylinder. *Phys. Rev. E*, **56**:434–440.
- X. He and G. D. Doolen, 1997b. Lattice Boltzmann method on curvilinear coordinates system: Flow around a circular cylinder. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **134**:306–315.
- X. He and L.-S. Luo, 1997a. Lattice Boltzmann model for the incompressible Navier–Stokes equation. *J. Stat. Phys.*, **88**:927–944.
- X. Y. He and L.-S. Luo, 1997b. *A priori* derivation of the lattice Boltzmann equation. *Phys. Rev. E*, **55**:R6333.
- X. Y. He and L.-S. Luo, 1997c. Theory of the lattice Boltzmann method: From the Boltzmann equation to the lattice Boltzmann equation. *Phys. Rev. E*, **56**:6811.
- X. He, L.-S. Luo, and M. Dembo, 1997a. Some progress in lattice Boltzmann method: Enhancement of reynolds number in simulations. *Physica A*, **239**:276–285.
- X. He, Q. Zou, L.-S. Luo, and M. Dembo, 1997b. Analytic solutions and analysis on non-slip boundary condition for the lattice Boltzmann BGK model. *J. Stat. Phys.*, **87**:115–136.
- X. Y. He, X. W. Shan, and G. D. Doolen, 1998. Discrete Boltzmann equation model for non-ideal gases. *Phys. Rev. E*, **57**:R13.
- X. Y. He, S. Y. Chen, and R. Y. Zhang, 1999a. A lattice Boltzmann scheme for incompressible multiphase flow and its application in simulation of Rayleigh–Taylor instability. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **152**:642.
- X. Y. He, R. Y. Zhang, S. Y. Chen, and G. D. Doolen, 1999b. On the three-dimensional Rayleigh–Taylor instability. *Phys. Fluids*, **11**:1143.
- X. Y. He and G. D. Doolen, 2002. Thermodynamic foundation of kinetic theory and lattice Boltzmann models for multiphase flows. *J. Stat. Phys.*, **107**:309–328.
- T. I. Hesla, A. Y. Huang, and D. D. Joseph, 1993. A note on the net force and moment on a drop due to surface forces. *J. Colloid Interface Sci.*, **158**:255–257.
- T. Hibiki and M. Ishii, 2000. One-group interfacial area transport of bubbly flows in vertical round tubes. *Int. J. Heat Mass Transfer*, **43**:2711–2726.
- T. Hibiki and M. Ishii, 2002. Distribution parameter and drift velocity of drift-flux model in bubbly flow. *Int. J. Heat Mass Transfer*, **45**:707–721.
- T. Hibiki and M. Ishii, 2003. One-dimensional drift-flux model for two-phase flow in a large diameter pipe. *Int. J. Heat Mass Transfer*, **46**:1773–1790.
- F. B. Hildebrand, 1956. *Introduction to Numerical Analysis*. New York, McGraw-Hill.
- R. J. Hill, D. L. Koch, and A. J. C. Ladd, 2001a. The first effects of fluid inertia on flows in ordered and random arrays of spheres. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **448**:213–241.
- R. J. Hill, D. L. Koch, and A. J. C. Ladd, 2001b. Moderate-Reynolds-number flows in ordered and random arrays of spheres. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **448**:243–278.
- R. J. Hill and D. L. Koch, 2002. The transition from steady to weakly turbulent flow in a close-packed ordered array of spheres. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **465**:59–97.
- M. Hilpert, J. F. McBride, and C. T. Miller, 2001. Investigation of the residual-funicular nonwetting-phase-saturation relation. *Adv. Water Res.*, **2**:157–177.

- M. Hilpert and C. T. Miller, 2001. Pore-morphology-based simulation of drainage in totally wetting porous media. *Adv. Water Res.*, **24(3/4)**:243–255.
- J. O. Hinze, 1975. *Turbulence*. New York, McGraw-Hill.
- C. Hirsch, 1988. *Numerical Computations of Internal and External Flows*, Vol. I. New York, Wiley.
- J. O. Hirschfelder, C. F. Curtiss, and R. B. Bird, 1954. *Molecular Theory of Gases and Liquids*. New York, Wiley.
- C. W. Hirt, J. L. Cook, and T. D. Butler, 1970. A Lagrangian method for calculating the dynamics of an incompressible fluid with a free surface. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **5**:103–124.
- C. W. Hirt, A. A. Amsden, and J. L. Cook, 1974. Arbitrary Lagrangian–Eulerian computing method for all flow speeds. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **14**:227–253.
- C. W. Hirt and B. D. Nichols, 1981. Volume of fluid (VOF) method for the dynamics of free boundaries. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **39**:201–226.
- D. J. Holdych, D. Rovas, J. G. Geogiadis, and R. O. Buckius, 1998. An improved hydrodynamics formulation for multiphase flow lattice Boltzmann methods. *Int. J. Mod. Phys. C*, **9**:1393.
- S. L. Hou, X. W. Shan, Q. S. Zou *et al.*, 1997. Evaluation of two lattice Boltzmann models for multiphase flows. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **138**:695–713.
- T. Y. Hou and P. LeFloch, 1994. Why non-conservative schemes converge to the wrong solutions: Error analysis. *Math. Comput.*, **62**:497–530.
- H. H. Hu, D. D. Joseph and M. J. Crochet, 1992. Direct simulation of fluid particle motions. *Theor. Comput. Fluid Dynam.*, **3**:285–306.
- H. H. Hu, A. Fortes and D. D. Joseph, 1993. Experiments and direct simulations of fluid particle motions. *Intern. Video J. Engng Res.*, **2**:17–24.
- H. H. Hu, 1995. Motion of a circular cylinder in a viscous liquid between parallel plates. *Theor. Comput. Fluid Dynam.*, **7**:441–455.
- H. H. Hu, 1996. Direct simulation of flows of solid–liquid mixtures. *Int. J. Multiphase Flow*, **22**:335–352.
- H. H. Hu, N. Patankar and M. Zhu, 2001. Direct numerical simulations of fluid–solid systems using the Arbitrary-Lagrangian-Eulerian technique. *J. of Comp. Phys.*, **169**:427–462.
- K. Huang, 2001. *Introduction to Statistical Physics*. Science.
- P. Y. Huang, J. Feng and D. D. Joseph, 1994. The turning couples on an elliptic particle settling in a vertical channel. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **271**:1–16.
- P. Y. Huang, J. Feng, H. H. Hu and D. D. Joseph, 1997. Direct simulation of the motion of solid particles in Couette and Poiseuille flows of viscoelastic fluids. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **343**:73–94.
- P. Y. Huang, H. H. Hu and D. D. Joseph, 1998. Direct simulation of the sedimentation of elliptic particles in Oldroyd-B fluids. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **362**:297–325.
- A. Huerta and W. K. Liu, 1988. Viscous flow with large free surface motion. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engng.*, **69**:277–324.
- T. J. R. Hughes, W. K. Liu and T. K. Zimmerman, 1981. Lagrangian–Eulerian finite element formulation for incompressible viscous flows. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engng.*, **29**:329–349.
- T. J. R. Hughes and G. M. Hulbert, 1988. Space-time finite element methods

- for elasto-dynamics: formulations and error estimates. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engng.*, **66**:339–363.
- K. Hui, P. K. Haff, and R. Jackson, 1984. Boundary conditions for high-shear grain flows. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **145**:223–233.
- G. J. Hwang and H. H. Shen, 1989. Modeling the solid phase stress in a fluid–solid mixture. *Int. J. Multiphase Flow*, **15**:257–268.
- Y.-H. Hwang, 2003. Upwind scheme for non-hyperbolic systems. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **192**:643–676.
- M. A. Hyman, 1952. Non-iterative numerical solution of boundary-value problems. *Appl. Sci. Res. Sec.*, **B2**:325–351.
- T. Inamuro, T. Ogata, S. Tajime *et al.*, 2004. A lattice Boltzmann method for incompressible two-phase flows with large density differences. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **198**:628–644.
- M. Ishii, 1975. *Thermo-Fluid Dynamic Theory of Two-Phase Flow*. Eyrolles, Paris.
- M. Ishii and S. Kim, 2004. Development of one-group and two-group interfacial area transport equation. *Nucl. Sci. Eng.*, **146**:257–273.
- M. Ishii and N. Zuber, 1979. Drag coefficient and relative velocity in bubbly, droplet or particulate flows. *A. I. Ch. E. J.*, **25**:843–855.
- M. Ishii, T. C. Chawla, and N. Zuber, 1976. Constitutive equation for vapor drift velocity in two-phase annular flow. *AIChE J*, **22**:283–289.
- M. Ishii, Sun X. D., and S. Kim, 2003. Modeling strategy of the source and sink terms in the two-group interfacial area transport equation. *Ann. Nucl. En.*, **30**:1309–1331.
- M. Ishii, S. S. Paranjape, S. Kim, and J. Kelly, 2004. Interfacial structures and interfacial area transport in downward two-phase bubbly flow. *Int. J. Multiphase Flow*, **30**:779–801.
- R. I. Issa and P. J. Oliveira, 1994. Numerical prediction of phase separation in two-phase flow through T-junctions. *Comput. Fluids*, **23**:347–372.
- R. I. Issa and M. H. W. Kempf, 2003. Simulation of slug flow in horizontal and nearly horizontal pipes with the two-fluid model. *Int. J. Multiphase Flow*, **29**:69–95.
- R. Jackson, 2000. *The Dynamics of Fluidized Particles*. Cambridge U.K., Cambridge University Press.
- W. D. Jackson, 1999. *Classical Electrodynamics*. New York, Wiley.
- D. Jacqmin, 1999. Calculation of two-phase Navier–Stokes flows using phase-field modeling. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **155**:96–127.
- D. Jacqmin, 2000. Contact-line dynamics of a diffuse fluid interface. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **402**:57–88.
- D. Jamet, O. Lebaigue, N. Coutris, and J. M. Delhay, 2001. Feasibility of using the second gradient theory for the direct numerical simulations of liquid-vapor flows with phase-change. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **169**:624–651.
- D. Jamet, D. Torres, and J. U. Brackbill, 2002. On the theory and computation of surface tension: The elimination of parasitic currents through energy conservation in the second-gradient method. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **182**:262–276.
- H. Jeffreys and B. S. Jeffreys, 1988. *Methods of Mathematical Physics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 3rd edn.
- J. T. Jenkins and M. W. Richman, 1986. Boundary conditions for plane flows of smooth, nearly elastic circular disks. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **171**:53–69.

- J. T. Jenkins, 1992. Boundary conditions for rapid granular flow: Flat, frictional wall. *J. Appl. Mech.*, **114**:120–127.
- J. Jimenez and P. Moin, 1991. The minimal flow unit in near-wall turbulence. *J. Fluid. Mech.*, **225**:213–240.
- B. C. V. Johansson, 1993. Boundary conditions for open boundaries for the incompressible Navier–Stokes equation. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **105**:233–251.
- P. C. Johnson and R. Jackson, 1987. Frictional-collisional constitutive relations for granular materials, with applications to plane shearing. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **130**:187–202.
- T. A. Johnson and V. C. Patel, 1999. Flow past a sphere up to a Reynolds number of 300. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **378**:19–70.
- A. V. Jones and A. Prosperetti, 1985. On the suitability of first-order differential models for two-phase flow prediction. *Int. J. Multiphase Flow*, **11**:133–148.
- A. V. Jones and A. Prosperetti, 1987. The linear stability of general two-phase flow models – II. *Int. J. Multiphase Flow*, **13**:161–171.
- A. Johnson, 1994. Mesh generation and update strategies in parallel computation of flow problems with moving boundaries and interfaces. Ph. D. thesis, University of Minnesota.
- A. Johnson and T. E. Tezduyar, 1996. Simulation of multiple spheres falling in a liquid-filled tube. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engng.*, **134**:351–373.
- A. Johnson and T. E. Tezduyar, 1997. 3D simulation of fluid–particle interactions with the number of particles reaching 100. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engng.*, **145**:301–321.
- A. Johnson and T. E. Tezduyar, 1999. Advanced mesh generation and update methods for 3D flow simulations. *Computational Mech.*, **23**:130–143.
- D. D. Joseph, 1996. Flow induced microstructure in Newtonian and viscoelastic fluids, in *Proc. 5th World Congress of Chem. Engng, Particle Technology Track*, San Diego, July 14–18. *AIChE*, **6**:3–16.
- W. Kalthoff, S. Schwarzer, and H. J. Herrmann, 1997. Algorithm for the simulation of particle suspensions with inertia effects. *Phys. Rev.*, **E56**:2234–2242.
- Q. H. Kang, D. X. Zhang, and S. Y. Chen, 2002a. Lattice Boltzmann simulation of chemical dissolution in porous media. *Phys. Rev. E*, **65**:Art. No. 036318.
- Q. H. Kang, D. X. Zhang, and S. Y. Chen, 2002b. Unified lattice Boltzmann method for flow in multiscale porous media. *Phys. Rev. E*, **66**:Art. No. 056307.
- H. Karema and S. Lo, 1999. Efficiency of interphase coupling algorithms in fluidized bed conditions. *Comput. Fluids*, **28**:323–360.
- S. Karni, 1994. Multi-component flow calculations by a consistent primitive algorithm. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **112**:31–43.
- G. E. Karniadakis, M. Israeli and S. A. Orszag, 1991. High-order splitting methods for the incompressible Navier–Stokes equations. *J. Comp. Phys.*, **97**:414–443.
- G. E. Karniadakis and G. S. Triantafyllou, 1992. Three-dimensional dynamics and transition to turbulence in the wake of bluff objects. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **238**:1–30.
- G. E. Karniadakis and S. J. Sherwin, 1999. *Spectral/HP Element Methods for CFD*. New York, Oxford University Press.
- A. Karnis, H. L. Goldsmith and S. G. Mason, 1966. The flow of suspensions through tubes, V. Inertial effects. *Can. J. Chem. Engng.*, **44**:181–193.

- H. Kato, M. Miyanaga, H. Yamaguchi, and M. M. Guin, 1995. Frictional drag reduction by injecting bubbly water into turbulent boundary layer and the effect of plate orientation. In *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Multiphase Flow 95, ICMF95*, pages 31–38.
- M. R. Kennedy, C. Pozrikidis, and R. Skalak, 1994. Motion and deformation of liquid drops and the rheology of dilute emulsions in simple shear flow. *Comput. Fluids*, **23**:251–278.
- D. Kim and H. Choi, 2002. Laminar flow past a sphere rotating in the streamwise direction. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **461**:365–386.
- I. Kim, S. Elghobashi, and W. A. Sirignano, 1993. 3-dimensional flow over 3-spheres placed side by side. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **246**:465–488.
- I. Kim, S. Elghobashi, and W. A. Sirignano, 1998. On the equation for spherical-particle motion: effect of Reynolds and acceleration numbers. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **367**:3221–254.
- J. Kim and P. Moin, 1985. Application of a fractional step method to incompressible Navier–Stokes equations. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **59**:308–323.
- J. Kim, D. Kim, and H. Choi, 2001. An immersed-boundary finite-volume method for simulations of flow in complex geometries. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **171**:132–150.
- S. Kim and S. J. Karrila, 1991. *Microhydrodynamics: Principles and Selected Applications*. London, Butterworth-Heinemann.
- D. L. Koch, 1990. Kinetic theory for a monodisperse gas–solid suspension. *Phys. Fluids*, **A2**:1711–1723.
- D. L. Koch and A. S. Sangani, 1999. Particle pressure and marginal stability limits for a homogeneous monodisperse gas fluidized bed: Kinetic theory and numerical simulations. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **400**:229–263.
- Y. Kodama, A. Kakugawa, T. Takahashi, S. Nagaya, and K. Sugiyama, 2003. Microbubbles: Drag reduction and applicability to ships. In *Twenty-Fourth Symposium on Naval Hydrodynamics*, Naval Studies Board (NSB). Available at: <http://books.nap.edu/books/NI000511/html/>.
- D. B. Kothe, R. C. Mjolsness, and M. D. Torrey, 1991. Ripple: A computer program for incompressible flows with free surfaces. Tech. Rep. LA-12007-MS, Los Alamos National Laboratory.
- A. G. Kravchenko and P. Moin, 1997. On the effect of numerical errors in large eddy simulations of turbulent flows. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **131**:310–322.
- A. M. Kraynik and Reinelt D. A., 1992. Extensional motions of spatially periodic lattices. *Int. J. Multiphase Flow*, **18**:1045–59.
- R. F. Kunz, B. W. Siebert, W. K. Cope, N. F. Foster, S. P. Antal, and S. M. Ettore, 1998. A coupled phasic exchange algorithm for three-dimensional multi-field analysis of heated flows with mass transfer. *Comput. Fluids*, **27**:741–768.
- R. F. Kunz, W. K. Cope, and S. Venkateswaran, 1999. Development of an implicit method for multi-fluid flow simulations. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **152**:78–101.
- R. F. Kunz, D. A. Boger, D. R. Stinebring, S. Chyczewski, J. W. Lindau, H. J. Gibeling, S. Venkateswaran, and T. R. Govindan, 2000. A preconditioned Navier–Stokes method for two-phase flows with application to cavitation prediction. *Comput. Fluids*, **29**:849–875.

- R. Kurose and S. Komori, 1999. Drag and lift forces on a rotating sphere in a linear shear flow. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **384**:183–206.
- S. Kwak and C. Pozrikidis, 1998. Adaptive triangulation of evolving, closed, or open surfaces by the advancing-front method. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **145**:61–88.
- A. J. C. Ladd, 1994a. Numerical simulations of particulate suspensions via a discretized Boltzmann equation. Part 1. Theoretical foundation. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **271**:285–309.
- A. J. C. Ladd, 1994b. Numerical simulations of particulate suspensions via a discretized Boltzmann equation. Part 2. Numerical results. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **271**:311–339.
- B. Lafaurie, C. Nardone, R. Scardovelli, S. Zaleski, and G. Zanetti, 1994. Modelling merging and fragmentation in multiphase flows with surfer. *J. Comp. Phys.*, **113**:134–147.
- M.-C. Lai and C. S. Peskin, 2000. An immersed boundary method with formal second-order accuracy and reduced numerical viscosity. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **160**:705–719.
- P. Lallemand and L.-S. Luo, 2000. Theory of the lattice Boltzmann method: Dispersion, dissipation, isotropy, Galilean invariance, and stability. *Phys. Rev. E*, **61**:6546–6562.
- P. Lallemand and L.-S. Luo, 2003. Lattice Boltzmann method for moving boundaries. *J. Computat. Phys.*, **184**(2):406–421.
- H. Lamb, 1932. *Hydrodynamics*. New York, Dover.
- L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, 1987. *Fluid Mechanics*. Oxford, Pergamon.
- J. Langford, 2000. Towards ideal large-eddy simulation. PhD. thesis, Department of Theoretical & Applied Mechanics, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL.
- M. Larsen, E. Hustvedt, P. Hedne, and T. Straume, 1997. PeTra: A novel computer code for simulation of slug flow. Paper 3884 1, SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition, San Antonio Texas, 5–8 October.
- C. J. Lawrence and S. Weinbaum, 1988. The unsteady force on a body at low Reynolds number; the axisymmetric motion of a spheroid. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **189**:463–489.
- C. J. Lawrence and R. Mei, 1995. Long-time behaviour of the drag on a body in impulsive motion. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **283**:307–327.
- L. Lee and R. J. LeVeque, 2003. An immersed interface method for incompressible Navier–Stokes equations. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, **25**:832–856.
- T. Lee and C. Lin, 2005. A stable discretization of the lattice Boltzmann equation for simulation of incompressible two-phase flows at high density ratio. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **206**:16–47.
- D. Legendre and J. Magnaudet, 1998. The lift force on a spherical bubble in a viscous linear shear flow. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **368**:81–126.
- B. P. Leonard, 1979. A stable and accurate convective modelling procedure based on quadratic upstream interpolation. *Comput. Meth. Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, **19**:59–98.
- B. P. Leonard and S. Mokhtari, 1990. Beyond 1st-order upwinding – The ultra-sharp alternative for nonoscillatory steady-state simulation of convection. *Int. J. Numer. Meth. Eng.*, **30**:729–766.
- R. J. LeVeque, 1992. *Numerical Methods for Conservation Laws*. Birkhäuser, Basel.

- R. J. LeVeque and Z. Li, 1994. The immersed interface method for elliptic equations with discontinuous coefficients and singular sources. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, **31**:1019.
- R. J. LeVeque, 2002. *Finite Volume Methods for Hyperbolic Problems*. Cambridge U. P, Cambridge University Press.
- J. Li and Kuipers J. A. M., 2003. Gas-particle interactions in dense gas-fluidized beds. *Chem. Eng. Sci.*, **58**:711–718.
- X. L. Li, B. X. Jin, and J. Glimm, 1996. Numerical study for the three-dimensional Rayleigh–Taylor instability through the TVD/AC scheme and parallel computation. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **126**:1904.
- D. R. Liles and W. H. Reed, 1978. A semi-implicit method for two-phase fluid dynamics. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **26**:390–407.
- M.-S. Liou and C. Steffen, 1993. A new flux-splitting scheme. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **107**:23–39.
- M.-S. Liou, 1996. A sequel to AUSM: AUSM+. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **129**:364–382.
- L. Little and Y. Saad, 1999. Block LU preconditioners for symmetric and nonsymmetric saddle point problem. University of Minnesota Supercomputing Institute Research report UMSI 99/104.
- X. Liu, R. P. Fedkiw, and M. Kang, 2000. A boundary condition capturing method for Poisson’s equation on irregular domains. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **160**:151–178.
- M. Loewenberg and E. J. Hinch, 1996. Numerical simulations of a concentrated emulsion in shear flow. *J. Fluid. Mech.*, **321**:395–419.
- M. Loewenberg and E. J. Hinch, 1997. Collision of two deformable drops in shear flow. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **338**:299–315.
- H. Lomax, T. H. Pulliam, and D. W. Zingg, 2001. *Fundamentals of Computational Fluid Dynamics*. Springer-Verlag.
- P. M. Lovalenti and J. F. Brady, 1993a. The force on a bubble, drop, or particle in arbitrary time-dependent motion at small Reynolds number. *Phys. Fluids*, **5**:2104–2116.
- P. M. Lovalenti and J. F. Brady, 1993b. The force on a sphere in a uniform flow with small-amplitude oscillations at finite Reynolds number. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **256**:607–614.
- P. M. Lovalenti and J. F. Brady, 1993c. The hydrodynamic force on a rigid particle undergoing arbitrary time-dependent motion at small Reynolds number. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **256**:561–605.
- P. M. Lovalenti and J. F. Brady, 1995. The temporal behaviour of the hydrodynamic force on a body in response to an abrupt change in velocity at small but finite Reynolds number. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **293**:35–46.
- J. Lu, A. Fernandez and G. Tryggvason, 2005. The effect of bubbles on the wall shear in a turbulent channel flow. *Phys. Fluids*, **17**:095102.
- C. K. K. Lun, S. B. Savage, D. J. Jeffrey, and N. Chepuruiy, 1984. Kinetic theories of granular flows: inelastic particles in Couette flow and slightly inelastic particles in a general flow field. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **140**:223–256.
- T. S. Lund, 1993. Private communication.
- L.-S. Luo, 1997. Analytic solutions of linearized lattice Boltzmann equation for simple flows. *J. Stat. Phys.*, **88**:913–926.

- L. S. Luo, 1998. Unified theory of lattice Boltzmann models for nonideal gases. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **81**:1618.
- L. S. Luo, 2000. Theory of the lattice Boltzmann method: lattice Boltzmann models for nonideal gases. *Phys. Rev. E.*, **62**:4982.
- D. Ma and G. Ahmadi, 1988. A kinetic model for rapid granular flows of nearly elastic particles including interstitial fluid effects. *Powder Technol.*, **56**:191–207.
- R. Macian-Juan and J. H. Mahaffy, 1998. Numerical diffusion and the tracking of solute fields in system codes. Part I. One-dimensional flows. *Nucl. Eng. Des.*, **179**:297–319.
- J. Magnaudet, M. Rivero, and J. Fabre, 1995. Accelerated flows past a rigid sphere or a spherical bubble. 1. Steady straining flow. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **284**:97–135.
- J. Magnaudet, 2003. Small inertial effects on a spherical bubble, drop or particle moving near a wall in a time-dependent linear flow. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **485**:115–142.
- J. H. Mahaffy, 1982. A stability-enhancing two-step method for fluid flow calculations. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **46**:329–341.
- J. H. Mahaffy, 1993. Numerics of codes: Stability, diffusion, and convergence. *Nucl. Eng. Des.*, **145**:131–145.
- J. H. Mahaffy, 2004. Purpose of simulation. Lecture Notes for Course NucE 470 “Power Plant Simulation”, Pennsylvania State University, <http://www.personal.psu.edu/faculty/j/h/jhm/470/lectures/1.html>.
- N. S. Martyts and H. D. Chen, 1996. Simulation of multicomponent fluids in complex three-dimensional geometries by the lattice Boltzmann method. *Phys. Rev. E.*, **53**:743.
- B. Maury, 1997. A many-body lubrication model. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, **325**, Serie I, 1053–1058.
- B. Maury, 1999. Direct simulations of 2D fluid–particle flows in biperiodic domains. *J. Comp. Phys.*, submitted.
- D. J. Mavriplis, 1997. Unstructured grid techniques. *Ann. Rev. Fluid. Mech.*, **29**:473–514.
- M. R. Maxey and J. J. Riley, 1983. Equation of motion for a small rigid sphere in a nonuniform flow. *Phys. Fluids*, **26**:883–889.
- M. R. Maxey, 1987. The gravitational settling of aerosol particles in homogeneous turbulence and random flow fields. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **174**:441–465.
- J. B. McLaughlin, 1991. Inertial migration of a small sphere in linear shear flows. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **224**:261–274.
- J. B. McLaughlin, 1993. The lift on a small sphere in wall-bounded linear shear flows. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **246**:249–265.
- J. B. McLaughlin, 1994. Numerical computation of particle–turbulent interaction. *Int. J. Multiphase Flow*, **20**:211–232.
- G. McNamara and G. Zanetti, 1988. Use of the Boltzmann equation to simulate lattice-gas automata. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **61**:2332.
- J. S. McNown, H. M. Lee, M. B. McPherson and S. M. Ebgez, 1948. *Proc. 7th Int. Congr. Appl. Mech.*, **2**:17.
- D. M. McQueen and C. S. Peskin, 1989. A three-dimensional computational method for blood flow in the heart: (ii) contractile fibers. *Comput. Phys.*, **82**:289–297.
- R. Mei and R. J. Adrian, 1992. Flow past a sphere with an oscillation in the

- free-stream and unsteady drag at finite Reynolds number. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **237**:133–174.
- R. Mei, 1994. Flow due to an oscillating sphere and an expression for unsteady drag on the sphere at finite Reynolds number. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **270**:133–174.
- P. E. Merilees, 1973. The pseudospectral approximation applied to the shallow water equations on a sphere. *Atmosphere*, **11**:13–20.
- C. L. Merkle and S. Deutsch, 1990. Drag reduction in liquid boundary layers by gas injection. *Prog. Astronaut. Aeronaut.*, **123**:351–412.
- E. E. Michaelides, 1992. A novel way of computing the Basset term in unsteady multiphase flow computations. *Phys. Fluids*, **A4**:1579–1582.
- E. Michaelides, 1997. The transient equation of motion for particles, bubbles, and droplets. *J. Fluids Eng.*, **119**:233–247.
- T. F. Miller and F. W. Schmidt, 1988. Use of a pressure-weighted interpolation method for the solution of the incompressible Navier–Stokes equations on a non-staggered grid system. *Numer. Heat Transfer*, **14**:213–233.
- T. F. Miller and D. J. Miller, 2003. A Fourier analysis of the IPSA/PEA algorithms applied to multiphase flows with mass transfer. *Comput. Fluids*, **32**:197–221.
- R. Mittal and S. Balachandar, 1996. Direct numerical simulations of flow past elliptic cylinders. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **124**:351–367.
- R. Mittal, 1999. A Fourier–Chebyshev spectral collocation method for simulating flow past spheres and spheroids. *Int. J. Numer. Meth. Fluids*, **30**:921–937.
- R. Mittal and G. Iaccarino, 2005. Immersed boundary methods. *Ann. Rev. Fluid Mech.*, **37**:239–261.
- R. Moe and K. H. Bendiksen, 1993. Transient simulation of 2D and 3D stratified and intermittent two-phase flows. Part I: Theory. *Int. J. Numer. Meth. Fluids*, **16**:461–487.
- J. Mohd-Yusof, 1996. Interaction of massive particles with turbulence. PhD. thesis, Department of Mechanical Engineering, Cornell University.
- J. Mohd-Yusof, 1997. Combined immersed boundaries b-spline methods for simulations of flows in complex geometries. CTR Annual Research Briefs, NASA Ames, Stanford University.
- J. Montagnat, H. Delingette, and N. Ayache, 2001. A review of deformable surfaces: topology, geometry and deformation. *Image Vision Comput.*, **19**:1023–40.
- F. Moukalled and M. Darwish, 2002. The performance of geometric conservation-based algorithms for incompressible multifluid flow. *Numer. Heat Transfer*, **B45**:343–368.
- V. A. Mousseau, 2004. Implicitly balanced solution of the two-phase flow equations coupled to nonlinear heat conduction. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **200**:104–132.
- W. Mulder, S. Osher, and J. A. Sethian, 1992. Computing interface motion in compressible gas dynamics. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **100**:449.
- M. A. Naciri, 1992. Contribution à l'Étude des Forces Exercées par un Liquide sur un Bulle de Gaz. PhD thesis, École Centrale de Lyon.
- R. Natarajan and A. Acrivos, 1993. The instability of the steady flow past spheres and disks. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **254**:323–344.
- M. B. Nemer, X. Chen, D. H. Papadopoulos, J. Bławdziewicz, and M. Loewenberg, 2004. Hindered and enhanced coalescence of drops in Stokes flow. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **11**:4501–1–4.

- R. I. Nigmatulin, 1979. Spatial averaging in the mechanics of heterogeneous and dispersed systems. *Int. J. Multiphase Flow*, **5**:353–385.
- Y.-Y. Niu, 2000. Simple conservative flux splitting for multi-component flow calculations. *Num. Heat Transfer*, **B38**:203–222.
- Y.-Y. Niu, 2001. Advection upwinding splitting method to solve a compressible two-fluid model. *Int. J. Numer. Meth. Fluids*, **36**:351–371.
- W. F. Noh and P. Woodward, 1976. SLIC (simple line interface calculation). In A. I. van de Vooren and P. J. Zandbergen, editors, *Proceedings, Fifth International Conference on Fluid Dynamics*, Volume 59 of *Lecture Notes in Physics*, pages 330–340, Berlin, Springer.
- T. Nomura and T. J. R. Hughes, 1992. An Arbitrary Lagrangian–Eulerian finite element method for interaction of fluid and a rigid body. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engng.*, **95**:115–138.
- M. Nordsveen and R. Moe, 1999. Preconditioned Krylov subspace methods used in solving two-dimensional transient two-phase flows. *Int. J. Numer. Meth. Fluids*, **31**:1141–1156.
- Nuclear Safety Analysis Division, Information Systems Laboratories, 2001. RELAP5/MOD3.3 Code Manual, Revision 1. Technical Report NUREG/CR-5535, U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
- M. Ohta, S. Haranaka, Y. Yoshida, and M. Sussman, 2004. Three dimensional numerical simulations of the motion of a gas bubble rising in viscous liquids. *J. Chem. Eng. Japan*, **37**:968–975.
- S. A. Orszag, 1974. Fourier series on spheres. *Mon. Weather Rev.*, **102**:56–75.
- W. R. Osborn, E. Orlandini, M. R. Swift, J. M. Yeomans, and J. R. Banavar, 1995. Lattice Boltzmann study of hydrodynamic spinodal decomposition. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **75**:4031.
- C. W. Oseen, 1927. *Neuere Methoden und Ergebnisse in der Hydrodynamik*. Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft M. B. H., Leipzig.
- S. Osher and F. Solomon, 1982. Upwind difference schemes for hyperbolic conservation laws. *Math. Comput.*, **38**:339–374.
- S. Osher and R. Fedkiw, 2003. *Level Set Methods and Dynamic Implicit Surfaces*. Berlin, Springer Verlag.
- S. Osher and J. A. Sethian, 1988. Fronts propagating with curvature-dependent speed: Algorithms based on Hamilton–Jacobi formulations. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **79**(1):12–49.
- M. R. Overholt and S. B. Pope, 1998. A deterministic forcing scheme for direct numerical simulations of turbulence. *Comput. Fluids*, **27**:11–28.
- H. Paillere, A. Kumbaro, C. Viozat, S. Clerc, A. Broquet, and S. Corre, 2001. A comparison of Roe, VFFC, and AUSM+ schemes for two-phase water/steam flows. In E. F. Toro, editor, *Godunov Methods: Theory and Applications*, pages 677–683. Dordrecht, Kluwer.
- B. J. Palmer and D. R. Rector, 2000. Lattice Boltzmann algorithm for simulating thermal two-phase flow. *Phys. Rev. E*, **61**:5295.
- C. Pan, M. Hilpert, and C. T. Miller, 2001. Lattice-Boltzmann simulation of multiphase flow in water-wet porous media. In *In EOS Transactions No. 82(47)*, AGU Fall Meeting, page F395. AGU, Washington, DC.
- C. Pan, L.-S. Luo, and C. T. Miller, 2006. An evaluation of lattice Boltzmann

- methods for porous medium flow simulation. *Comput. Fluids* (to appear)
- N. A. Patankar and H. H. Hu, 1996. Two-dimensional periodic mesh generation, in *Proc. 5th Int. Conf. on Numerical Grid Generation in Computational Field Simulations*, 1175–1184.
- N. A. Patankar, 1997. Numerical simulation of particulate two-phase flow. Ph. D. thesis, University of Pennsylvania.
- N. A. Patankar and H. H. Hu, 1997. Chain snapping in Newtonian and viscoelastic fluids. *Proc. 6th International Symposium on Liquid-Solid Flows*, ASME-FEDSM 97-3185, 1–7.
- N. A. Patankar, P. Singh, D. D. Joseph, R. Glowinski and T.-W. Pan, 1999. A new formulation of the distributed Lagrange multiplier/fictitious domain method for particulate flows. *Int. J. Multiphase Flow*, submitted.
- S. V. Patankar, 1980. *Numerical Heat Transfer and Fluid Flow*. *Comput. Fluids* (to appear), London, Taylor & Francis.
- P. D. Patel, E. S. G. Shaqfeh, J. E. Butler, V. Cristini, J. Bławdziewicz, and M. Loewenberg, 2003. Drop breakup in the flow through fixed fiber beds: An experimental and computational investigation. *Phys. Fluids*, **15**:1146–57.
- R. B. Pember, J. Bell, P. Colella, W. Y. Crutchfield, and M. L. Welcome, 1995. An adaptive Cartesian grid method for unsteady compressible flow in irregular regions. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **120**:278.
- M. Perić, R. Kessler, and G. Scheuerer, 1988. Comparison of finite-volume numerical methods with staggered and colocated grids. *Computers Fluids*, **16**:389–403.
- J. B. Perot, 1993. An analysis of the fractional step method. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **108**:51–58.
- C. S. Peskin, 1977. Numerical analysis of blood flow in the heart. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **25**:220.
- L. Piegl and W. Tiller, 1997. *The NURBS Book*. New York, Springer.
- J. E. Pilliod and E. G. Puckett, 1997. Second-order accurate volume-of-fluid algorithms for tracking material interfaces. Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory Technical Report No. LBNL-40744 (submitted to *J. Comput. Phys.*).
- H. Pokharna, M. Mori, and V. H. Ransom, 1997. Regularization of two-phase flow models: a comparison of numerical and differential approaches. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **134**:282–295.
- C. Pozrikidis, 1992. *Boundary Integral and Singularity Methods for Linearized Viscous Flow*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- C. Pozrikidis, 1997. *Introduction to Theoretical and Computational Fluid Dynamics*. New York, Oxford University Press.
- W. H. Press, B. P. Flannery, S. A. Teukolsky, and W. T. Vetterling, 1992. *Numerical Recipes in FORTRAN: The Art of Scientific Computing*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2nd edn.
- A. Prosperetti and A. V. Jones, 1984. Pressure forces in disperse two-phase flows. *Int. J. Multiphase Flow*, **10**:425–440.
- A. Prosperetti and J. V. Satrape, 1990. Stability of two-phase flow models. In D. D. Joseph and D. G. Schaeffer, editors, *Two Phase Flows and Waves*, pages 98–117. New York, Springer.
- A. Prosperetti and D. Z. Zhang, 1996. Disperse phase stress in two-phase flow. *Chem. Eng. Comm.*, **141–142**:387–398.

- L. Proudman and J. R. A. Pearson, 1957. Expansions at small Reynolds numbers for the flow past a sphere and a circular cylinder. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **2**:237–262.
- R. J. Pryor, D. R. Liles, and J. H. Mahaffy, 1978. Treatment of water packing effects. *Trans. Amer. Nucl. Soc.*, **30**:208–209.
- Y. Qian, D. d’Humières, and P. Lallemand, 1992. Lattice BGK models for Navier–Stokes equation. *Europhys. Lett.*, **17**:479.
- W. C. Reade and L. R. Collins, 2000. Effect of preferential concentration on turbulent collision rates. *Phys. Fluids*, **12**:2530–2540.
- L. E. Reichl, 1998. *A Modern Course in Statistical Physics*. New York, Wiley.
- RELAP5-3D Code Development Team, 2003. RELAP5-3D Code Manual, Revision 2.2. Technical Report INEEL-EXT-98-00834, INEEL.
- M. Renardy and R. C. Rogers, 1993. *An Introduction to Partial Differential Equations*. New York, Springer, 2nd edition.
- Y. Renardy and M. Renardy, 2002. PROST: A parabolic reconstruction of surface tension for the volume-of-fluid method. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **183**:400–421.
- C. M. Rhie and W. L. Chow, 1983. Numerical study of the turbulent flow past an airfoil with trailing edge separation. *AIAA J.*, **21**:1525–1532.
- J. F. Richardson and W. N. Zaki, 1954. Sedimentation and fluidization. I. Fundamental equations and wave propagation. *Trans. Inst. Chem. Eng.*, **32**:35–53.
- W. J. Rider and D. B. Kothe, 1995. Stretching and tearing interface tracking methods. In *AIAA Paper 95-1717*.
- A. M. Roma, C. S. Peskin, and M. J. Berger, 1999. An adaptive version of the immersed boundary method. *J. Comput Phys.*, **153**:509–534.
- J. E. Romate, 1998. An approximate Riemann solver for a two-phase flow model with numerically given slip relation. *Comput. Fluids*, **27**:455–477.
- J. E. Romate, 2000. Aspects of a numerical procedure for two-phase flow models. In H. Freistühler and G. Warnecke, editors, *Hyperbolic Problems: Theory, Numerics, Applications*, volume 2, pages 801–810, Basel, Birkhäuser.
- D. Rothman and J. Keller, 1988. Immiscible cellular-automaton fluids. *J. Stat. Phys.*, **52**:1119.
- D. Rothman and S. Zaleski, 2004. *Lattice-Gas Cellular Automata*. Cambridge University Press.
- J. S. Rowlinson and B. Widom, 1982. *Molecular Theory of Capillarity*. Oxford University Press.
- M. Rudman, 1997. Volume-tracking methods for interfacial flow calculations. *Int. J. Numer. Meth. Fluids*, **24**:671–691.
- R. R. Rudolph and W. D. Bachalo, 1988. Measurement of droplet drag coefficients in polydispersed turbulent flow fields. *AIAA Paper*, 88-0235.
- G. Ryskin and L. G. Leal, 1983. Orthogonal mapping. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **50**:71–100.
- G. Ryskin and L. G. Leal, 1984. Numerical solution of free-boundary problems in fluid mechanics. Part 2. Buoyancy-driven motion of a gas bubble through a quiescent liquid. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **148**:19–35.
- Y. Saad and M. H. Schultz, 1986. GMRES: A generalized minimal residual algorithm for solving nonsymmetric linear systems. *SIAM J. Sci. Stat. Comput.*, **7**:856–69.
- Y. Saad, 1996. *Iterative Methods for Sparse Linear Systems*. PWS.

- Y. Saad, 1996, *Iterative Methods for Sparse Linear Systems*. PWS Publishing.
- P. G. Saffman, 1965. The lift on a small sphere in a slow shear flow. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **22**:385–400.
- P. G. Saffman, 1968. Corrigendum to “The lift on a small sphere in a slow shear flow”. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **31**:624.
- P. G. Saffman, 1973. On the settling speed of free and fixed suspension. *Stud. Appl. Math.*, **52**:115–127.
- E. M. Saiki and S. Biringen, 1994. Numerical simulation of particle effects on boundary layer flow, in *Transition, Turbulence and Combustion*, ed. M. Y. Hussaini, T. B. Gatski, and T. L. Jackson. Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic.
- E. M. Saiki and S. Biringen, 1996. Numerical simulation of a cylinder in uniform flow: application of a virtual boundary method. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **123**:450–465.
- A. S. Sangani and A. Acrivos, 1982. Slow flow through a periodic array of spheres. *Int. J. Multiphase Flow*, **8** (4):343–360.
- A. S. Sangani, D. Z. Zhang, and A. Prosperetti, 1991. The added mass, Basset, and viscous drag coefficients in nondilute bubbly liquids undergoing small-amplitude oscillatory motion. *Phys. Fluids*, **A3**:2955–2970.
- A. S. Sangani and A. K. Didwania, 1993. Dynamic simulations of flows of bubbly liquids at large Reynolds numbers. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **250**:307–337.
- A. S. Sangani and A. Prosperetti, 1993. Numerical simulation of the motion of particles at large Reynolds numbers, in *Particulate Two-Phase Flow* (M. C. Roco, ed.), 971–998. London: Butterworth–Heinemann.
- S. Sankagiri and G. A. Ruff, 1997. Measurement of sphere drag in high turbulent intensity flows. *Proc. ASME FED*, FED-Vol **244**:277–282.
- K. Sankaranarayanan, X. Shan, I. G. Kevrekidis, and S. Sundaresan, 1999. Bubble flow simulations with the lattice Boltzmann method. *Chem. Eng. Sci.*, **54**:4817.
- V. Sarin and A. Sameh, 1998. An efficient iterative method for the generalized Stokes problem. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, **19**:206–226.
- V. K. Saul’ev, 1963. On solving boundary-value problems on high-performance computers by fictitious-domain methods. *Sib. Math. J.*, **4**:912–925.
- R. Saurel and R. Abgrall, 1999. A multiphase Godunov method for compressible multifluid and multiphase flow. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **150**:425–467.
- S. B. Savage, 1987. Personal communication to S. Sundaresan.
- R. Scardovelli and S. Zaleski, 1999. Direct numerical simulation of free-surface and interfacial flow. *Ann. Rev. Fluid Mech.*, **31**:567–603.
- D. G. Schaeffer, 1987. Instability in the evolution equations describing incompressible granular flow. *J. Diff. Eq.*, **66**:19–50.
- L. Schiller and Z. Naumann, 1935. A drag coefficient correlation. *Z. Ver. Deutsch. Ing.*, **77**:318.
- J. A. Sethian, 1999. *Level Set Methods and Fast Marching Methods*. Cambridge University Press, 2nd edition.
- X. W. Shan and H. D. Chen, 1993. Lattice Boltzmann model for simulating flows with multiple phases and components. *Phys. Rev. E*, **47**:1815.
- X. W. Shan and H. D. Chen, 1994. Simulation of non ideal gases and liquid-gas phase transitions by the lattice Boltzmann equation. *Phys. Rev. E*, **49**:2941.

- K. Shariff, 1993. Comment on “Coordinate singularities” by P. R. Spalart. Unpublished.
- J. Shen and D. Yoon, 2004. A freeform shape optimization of complex structures represented by arbitrary polygonal or polyhedral meshes. *Int. J. Numer. Meth. Engng*, **60**:2441–66.
- W. Z. Shen, J. A. Michelsen, and J. N. Sørensen, 2001. Improved Rhie–Chow interpolation for unsteady flow computations. *AIAA J.*, **39**:2406–2409.
- W. Z. Shen, J. A. Michelsen, N. N. Sørensen, and J. N. Sørensen, 2003. An improved SIMPLEC method on collocated grids for steady and unsteady flow computations. *Numer. Heat Transfer*, **B43**:221–239.
- S. Shin, S. I. Abdel-Khalik, V. Daru, and D. Juric, 2005. Accurate representation of surface tension using the level contour reconstruction method. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **203**:493–516.
- S. Shirayama, 1992. Flow past a sphere: topological transitions of the vorticity field. *AIAA J.*, **30**:349–358.
- C. W. Shu and S. Osher, 1989. Efficient implementation of essentially non-oscillatory shock capturing schemes, II. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **83**:32–78.
- A. Sierou and J. F. Brady, 2001. Accelerated Stokesian dynamics simulations. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **448**:115–46.
- O. Simonin, 1996. *Continuum Modeling of Dispersed Two-Phase Flows*. Combustion and Turbulence in Two-Phase Flows, VKI Lecture Series, Vol. 2. von Kármán Institute for Fluid Dynamics, Bruxelles.
- P. Singh, D. D. Joseph, T. I. Hesla, R. Glowinski and T.-W. Pan, 1999. A distributed Lagrange multiplier/fictitious domain method for viscoelastic particulate flows. *J. Non-Newtonian Fluid Mech.*, submitted.
- J. C. Slattery, 1967. Flow of viscoelastic fluids through porous media. *A. I. Ch. E. J.*, **13**:1066–1071.
- P. Smereka. Level set methods for two-fluid flows. Lecture notes; INRIA short course.
- L. L. Smith *et al.*, 1980. SIMMER-II: A Computer Program for LMFBR Disrupted Core Analysis. Technical Report LA-7515-M, NUREG/CR-0453, Rev. 1, Los Alamos National Laboratory.
- Y. Sone, 2002. *Kinetic Theory and Fluid Dynamics*. Birkhäuser, Boston.
- D. B. Spalding, 1979. Calculation of two-dimensional two-phase flows. In F. Durst *et al.*, editor, *Heat and Mass Transfer in Chemical Process and Energy Engineering Systems*, Hemisphere.
- D. B. Spalding, 1983. Developments in the IPSA procedure for numerical computation of multiphase flow phenomena. In T. M. Shi, editor, *Proceedings of the Second National Symposium on Numerical Methodologies in Heat Transfer*, pages 421–436. Hemisphere.
- J. W. Spore, S. J. Jolly-Woodruff, T. K. Knight, R. A. Nelson, K. O. Pasamehmetoglu, R. G. Steinke, and C. Unal, 1993. TRAC-PF1/MOD2 code manual. Technical Report NUREG/CR-5673, U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
- P. G. Squire and M. E. Himmel, 1979. Hydrodynamics and protein hydration. *Arch. Biochem. Biophys.*, **196**:165–77.
- K. D. Squires and J. K. Eaton, 1990. Particle response and turbulence modification in isotropic turbulence. *Phys. Fluids*, **2**:1191–1203.

- K. D. Squires and J. K. Eaton, 1991. Preferential concentration of particles by turbulence. *Phys. Fluids*, **3**:1169–1179.
- H. Staedke, G. Francehlo, B. Worth, U. Graf, P. Romstedt, A. Kumbaro, J. García-Cascales, H. Paillère, H. Deconinck, M. Richhiuto, B. Smith, F. De Cachard, E. F. Toro, E. Romenski, and S. Mimouni, 2005. Advanced three-dimensional two-phase flow simulation tools for application to reactor safety (ASTAR). *Nucl. Eng. Des.*, **235**:379–400.
- J. Sterling and S. Chen, 1996. Stability analysis of lattice Boltzmann methods. *J. Comp. Phys.*, **123**:196.
- H. B. Stewart and B. Wendroff, 1984. Two-phase flow: models and methods. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **56**:363–409.
- H. A. Stone, 1994. Dynamics of drop deformation and breakup in viscous fluids. *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.*, **26**:65–99.
- G. Strang, 1968. On the construction and comparison of difference schemes. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, **5**:506–517.
- C. L. Streett and M. Macaraeg, 1989. Spectral multi-domain for large-scale fluid dynamics simulations. *Appl. Numer. Math.*, **6**:123–140.
- S. Succi, 2001. *Lattice Boltzmann Equation for Fluid Dynamics and Beyond*. Oxford University Press.
- S. Sundaram and L. R. Collins, 1997. Collision statistics in an isotropic particle-laden turbulent suspension. Part 1. Direct numerical simulations. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **335**:75–109.
- S. Sundaram and L. R. Collins, 1999. A numerical study of the modulation of isotropic turbulence by suspended particles. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **379**:105–143.
- S. Sundaresan, 2000. Perspective: Modeling the hydrodynamics of multiphase flow reactors: Current status and challenges. *A. I. Ch. E. J.*, **46**:1102–1105.
- M. Sussman, P. Smereka, and S. Osher, 1994. A level set approach for computing solutions to incompressible two-phase flows. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **114**:146–159.
- M. Sussman, A. S. Almgren, J. B. Bell, P. Colella, L. H. Howell, and M. L. Welcome, 1999. An adaptive level set approach for incompressible two-phase flows. *J. Comput Phys.*, **148**:81–124.
- M. Sussman and E. Fatemi, 1999. An efficient, interface preserving level set re-distancing algorithm and its application to interfacial incompressible fluid flow. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, **20**(4):1165–1191.
- M. Sussman, 2003. A second order coupled levelset and volume of fluid method for computing growth and collapse of vapor bubbles. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **187**:110–136.
- M. Sussman and M. Y. Hussaini, 2003. A discontinuous spectral element method for the level set equation. *J. Sci. Comput.*, **19**(1-3):479–500.
- M. Sussman, 2005. A parallelized, adaptive algorithm for multiphase flows in general geometries. *Comput. Struct.*, **83**:435–444.
- B. Swartz, 1999. Good neighborhoods for multidimensional Van Leer limiting. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **154**:237–241.
- P. K. Sweby, 1984. High resolution schemes using flux limiters for hyperbolic conservation laws. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, **21**:995–1011.
- R. A. Sweet, 1974. A generalized cyclic reduction algorithm. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, **11**:506–520.

- M. R. Swift, W. R. Osborn, and J. M. Yeomans, 1995. Lattice Boltzmann simulation of nonideal fluids. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **75**:830.
- M. R. Swift, E. Orlandini, W. R. Osborn, and J. M. Yeomans, 1996. Lattice Boltzmann simulation of liquid-gas and binary fluid system. *Phys. Rev. E.*, **54**:5041.
- M. Syamlal, W. Rogers, and T. J. O'Brien, 1993. *MFIX* Documentation: Theory Guide. Technical Report DOE/METC-94/1004 (DE9400087), Morgantown Energy Technology Center, Morgantown WV, Available from <http://www.mfix.org>.
- M. Syamlal, 1998. *MFIX* Documentation: Numerical Technique. Technical Report DOE/MC31346-5824 (DE98002029), Morgantown Energy Technology Center, Morgantown WV, Available from <http://www.mfix.org>.
- S. Takagi, H. N. Oguz, Z. Zhang, and A. Prosperetti, 2003. Physalis: A new method for particle simulation. Part II. Two-dimensional Navier-Stokes flow around cylinders. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **187**:371–390.
- H. Takewaki, A. Nishiguchi, and T. Yabe, 1985. Cubic interpolated pseudo-particle method (CIP) for solving hyperbolic-type equations. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **61**:261–268.
- H. Takewaki and T. Yabe, 1987. The cubic-interpolated pseudo particle (CIP) method: application to nonlinear and multi-dimensional hyperbolic equations. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **70**:355–372.
- H. S. Tang and D. Huang, 1996. A second-order accurate capturing scheme for 1-D inviscid flows of gas and water with vacuum zones. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **128**:301–318.
- C. M. Tchen, 1947. Mean values and correlation problems connected with the motion of small particles suspended in a turbulent fluid. PhD thesis, Technical University of Delft.
- A. Ten Cate and S. Sundaresan, 2005. Analysis of unsteady forces in ordered arrays. *J. Fluid Mech.*, submitted.
- S. Teng, Y. Chen, and H. Ohashi, 2000. Lattice Boltzmann simulation of multiphase fluid flows through the total variation diminishing with artificial compression scheme. *Int. J. Heat and Fluid Flow*, **21**:112–121.
- T. E. Tezduyar, J. Liou, and M. Behr, 1992a. A new strategy for finite element computations involving moving boundaries and interfaces – the DSD/ST procedure: I. The concept and the preliminary numerical tests. *Comput. Meths. Appl. Mech. Engng.*, **94**:339–351.
- T. E. Tezduyar, J. Liou, M. Behr and S. Mittal, 1992b. A new strategy for finite element computations involving moving boundaries and interfaces – the DSD/ST procedure: II. Computation of free-surface flows, two-liquid flows, and flows with drafting cylinders. *Comput. Meths. Appl. Mech. Engng.*, **94**:353–371.
- J. W. Thomas, 1995. *Numerical Partial Differential Equations*. Berlin, Springer.
- P. J. Thomas, 1992. On the influence of the Basset history force on the motion of a particle through a fluid. *Phys. Fluids*, **A4**:2090–2093.
- I. Tiselj and S. Petelin, 1997. Modelling of two-phase flow with second-order accurate scheme. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **136**:503–521.
- I. Tiselj and S. Petelin, 1998. First and second-order accurate schemes for two-fluid models. *J. Fluids Engng.*, **120**:363–368.

- A. G. Tomboulides and S. A. Orszag, 2000. Numerical investigation of transitional and weak turbulent flow past a sphere. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **416**:45–73.
- A. Tomiyama, T. Matsuoka, T. Fukuda, and T. Sakaguchi, 1995. A simple numerical method for solving an incompressible two-fluid model in general curvilinear coordinate system. In A. Serizawa, T. Fukano, and J. Bataille, editors, *Multiphase Flow '95*, pages NU-23–NU-30, Kyoto.
- A. Tomiyama and N. Shimada, 2001. A numerical method for bubbly flow simulation based on a multi-fluid model. *J. Press. Vessel. Technol.*, **123**:510–516.
- E. F. Toro, 1998. Primitive, conservative and adaptive schemes for hyperbolic conservation laws. In E. F. Toro and J. F. Clarke, editors, *Numerical Methods for Wave Propagation*, pages 323–385. Dordrecht, Kluwer.
- E. F. Toro, 1999. *Riemann Solvers and Numerical Methods for Fluid Dynamics*. Berlin, Springer, 2nd edition.
- I. Toumi, 1992. A weak formulation of Roe's approximate Riemann solver. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **102**:360–373.
- I. Toumi, 1996. An upwind numerical method for two-fluid two-phase flow models. *Nucl. Sci. Eng.*, **123**:147–168.
- I. Toumi and A. Kumbaro, 1996. An approximate linearized Riemann solver for a two-fluid model. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **124**:286–300.
- I. Toumi, A. Bergeron, D. Gallo, E. Royer, and D. Caruge, 2000. Flica-4: a three-dimensional two-phase flow computer code with advanced numerical methods for nuclear applications. *Nucl. Eng. Des.*, **200**:139–155.
- L. B. Tran and H. S. Udaykumar, 2004. A particle-level set-based sharp interface Cartesian grid method for impact, penetration, and void collapse. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **193**:469–510.
- J. A. Trapp and R. A. Riemke, 1986. A nearly implicit hydrodynamic numerical scheme for two-phase flows. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **66**:62–82.
- G. Tryggvason, 1988. Numerical simulations of the Rayleigh–Taylor instability. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **75**:253.
- G. Tryggvason and S. O. Unverdi, 1990. Computations of three-dimensional Rayleigh–Taylor instability. *Phys. Fluids A*, **2**:656.
- G. Tryggvason, B. Bunner, A. Esmaeeli, D. Juric, N. Al-Rawahi, W. Tauber, J. Han, S. Nas, and Y.-J. Jan, 2001. A front tracking method for the computations of multiphase flow. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **169**:708–759.
- H. S. Udaykumar, H. C. Kan, W. Shyy, and R. Tran-Son-Tay, 1997. Multiphase dynamics in arbitrary geometries on fixed Cartesian grids. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **137**:366–405.
- H. S. Udaykumar, R. Mittal, and W. Shyy, 1999. Computation of solid–liquid phase fronts in the sharp interface limit on fixed grids. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **153**:535–574.
- H. S. Udaykumar, R. Mittal, P. Rampunggoon, and A. Khanna, 2001. A sharp interface Cartesian grid method for simulating flows with complex moving boundaries. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **174**:345–380.
- P. H. T. Uhlherr and C. G. Sinclair, 1970. The effect of freestream turbulence on the drag coefficients of spheres. *Proc. Chemca.*, **1**:1–12.
- S. O. Unverdi and G. Tryggvason, 1992. A front-tracking method for viscous, incompressible, multi-fluid flows. *J. Comput Phys.*, **100**:25–37.

- B. van Leer, 1977. Toward the ultimate conservative difference scheme. IV. A new approach to numerical convection. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **23**:276–299.
- B. van Leer, 1982. Flux vector splitting for the Euler equations. In H. Araki, J. Ehlers, K. Hepp, R. Kippenhahn, H. A. Weidenmüller, and J. Zittarz, editors, *8th International Conference on Numerical Methods in Fluid Dynamics. Lecture Notes in Physics*, Vol. 170, pages 507–512, Berlin, Springer.
- W. B. VanderHeyden and B. A. Kashiwa, 1998. Compatible fluxes for van Leer advection. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **146**:1–28.
- O. Vermorel, B. Bédard, O. Simonin, and T. Poinsot, 2003. Numerical study and modelling of turbulence modulation in a particle-laden slab flow. *J. Turbulence*, **4**: Paper No. 025, <http://jot.iop.org>.
- M. Verschueren, F. N. van de Vosse, and H. E. H. Meijer, 2001. Diffuse-interface modelling of thermo-capillary flow instabilities in a hele-shaw cell. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **434**:153–166.
- P. Vlahovska, J. Bławdziewicz, and M. Loewenberg, 2005. Deformation of surfactant-covered drops in linear flows. In review.
- D. J. Vojir and E. E. Michaelides, 1994. Effect of the history term on the motion of rigid spheres in a viscous fluid. *Int. J. Multiphase Flow*, **20**:547–556.
- G. W. Wallis, 1969. *One-Dimensional Two-Phase Flow*. New York, McGraw-Hill.
- L. P. Wang, A. S. Wexler, and Y. Zhou, 2000. Statistical mechanical description and modelling of turbulent collision of inertial particles. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **415**:117–153.
- L. P. Wang and M. R. Maxey, 1993. Settling velocity and concentration distribution of heavy particles in homogeneous isotropic turbulence. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **256**:27–68.
- W. D. Warnica, M. Renksizbulut, and A. B. Strong, 1994. Drag coefficient of spherical liquid droplets. *Exp. Fluids*, **18**:265–270.
- C. Y. Wen and Y. H. Yu, 1966. Mechanics of fluidization. *Chem. Engng. Prog. Symp. Ser.*, **62**:100–111.
- P. Wesseling, 2001. *Principles of Computational Fluid Dynamics*. New York, Springer.
- P. Wesseling, 2004. *An Introduction to Multigrid Methods—Corrected Reprint*. R. T. Edwards, Philadelphia.
- S. Whitaker, 1969. Advances in the theory of fluid motion in porous media. *Ind. Engng. Chem.*, **61**:14–28.
- G. B. Whitham, 1974. *Linear and Nonlinear Waves*. New York, Wiley.
- L. van Wijngaarden, 1976. Hydrodynamic interaction between gas bubbles in liquid. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **77**:27–44.
- R. C. Wilson and E. R. Hancock, 2000. Bias-variance analysis for controlling adaptive surface meshes. *Comput. Vision Image Understanding*, **77**:25–47.
- J.-S. Wu and G. M. Faeth, 1994a. Effect of ambient turbulence intensity on sphere wakes at intermediate Reynolds numbers. *AIAA J.*, **33**:171–173.
- J.-S. Wu and G. M. Faeth, 1994b. Sphere wakes at moderate Reynolds numbers in a turbulent environment. *AIAA J.*, **32**:535–541.
- Q. Wu, S. Kim, M. Ishii, and S. G. Beus, 1999. One-group interfacial area transport in vertical bubbly flow. *Int. J. Heat Mass Transfer*, **41**:1103–1112.
- T. Yabe, F. Xiao, and T. Utsumi, 2001. The constrained interpolation profile (CIP) method for multi-phase analysis. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **169**:556–593.

- N. N. Yanenko, 1971. *The Method of Fractional Steps for Solving Multi-Dimensional Problems of Mathematical Physics in Several Variables*. Berlin, Springer-Verlag.
- A. Yang, C. T. Miller, and L. D. Turcoliver, 1996. Simulation of correlated and uncorrelated packing of random size spheres. *Phys. Rev. E*, **53**:1516–1524.
- B. Yang, A. Prosperetti, and S. Takagi, 2003. The transient rise of a bubble subject to shape or volume changes. *Phys. Fluids*, **15**:2640–2648.
- T. Ye, R. Mittal, H. S. Udaykumar, and W. Shyy, 1999. An accurate Cartesian grid method for viscous incompressible flows with complex immersed boundaries. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **156**:209–240.
- S. Y. K. Yee, 1981. Solution of Poisson's equation on a sphere by double Fourier series. *Mont. Weather Rev.*, **109**:501–505.
- P. K. Yeung and S. B. Pope, 1989. Lagrangian statistics from direct numerical simulations of isotropic turbulence. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **207**:531–586.
- S. Yon and C. Pozrikidis, 1998. A finite-volume/boundary-element method for flow past interfaces in the presence of surfactants, with application to shear flow past a viscous drop. *Comput. Fluids*, **27**:879–902.
- D. L. Youngs, 1982. Time dependent multimaterial flow with large fluid distortion. In K. M. Morton and M. J. Baines, editors, *Numerical Methods for Fluid dynamics*, pages 27–39, New York, Academic Press. Institute of Mathematics and its Applications.
- D. L. Youngs, 1984. Numerical simulation of turbulent mixing by Rayleigh–Taylor instability. *Physica D*, **12**:32.
- D. Yu, R. Mei, W. Shyy, and L.-S. Luo, 2002. Force evaluation in the lattice Boltzmann method involving curved geometry. *Phys. Rev. E*, **65**:041203.
- H. Yu, L.-S. Luo, and S. S. Girimaji, 2005. MRT lattice Boltzmann method for LES of turbulence: Computation of square jet flow. *Comput. Fluids* (to appear).
- S. T. Zalesak, 1979. Fully multidimensional flux-corrected transport algorithms for fluids. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **31**:335–362.
- N. A. Zarin and J. A. Nicholls, 1971. Sphere drag in solid rockets – non-continuum and turbulence effects. *Comb. Sci. Tech.*, **3**:273–280.
- E. Zauderer, 1989. *Partial Differential Equations of Applied Mathematics*. New York, Wiley, 2nd edition.
- D. Zhang, R. Zhang, and S. Chen, 2000. Pore scale study of flow in porous media: Scale dependency, REV, and statistical REV. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, **27**:1195.
- D. Z. Zhang and W. B. VanderHeyden, 2002. The effects of mesoscale structures on the macroscopic momentum equations for two-phase flows. *Int. J. Multiphase Flow*, **28**:805–822.
- D. Z. Zhang and A. Prosperetti, 1994. Averaged equations for inviscid disperse two-phase flow. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **267**:185–219.
- Q. Zhang and M. J. Graham, 1998. A numerical study of Richtmyer–Meshkov instability driven by cylindrical shocks. *Phys. Fluids*, **10**:974.
- Y. Zhang and J. M. Reese, 2003. The drag force in two-fluid models of gas–solid flows. *Chem. Engng. Sci.*, **58**:1641–1644.
- Z. Zhang and A. Prosperetti, 2003. A method for particle simulations. *J. Appl. Mech.*, **70**:64–74.
- Z. Zhang and A. Prosperetti, 2005. A second-order method for three-dimensional particle simulation. *J. Comput. Phys.*, To appear.

- H. Zhao and A. J. Pearlstein, 2002. Stokes-flow computation of the diffusion coefficient and rotational diffusion tensor of lysozyme, a globular protein. *Phys. Fluids*, **14**:2376–87.
- X. Zheng, J. Lowengrub, A. Anderson, and V. Cristini, 2005. Adaptive unstructured volume remeshing. II. Application to two- and three-dimensional level-set simulations of multiphase flow. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **208**:626–650.
- H.-X. Zhou, 2001. A unified picture of protein hydration: prediction of hydrodynamic properties from known structures. *Biophys. Chem.*, **93**:171–9.
- M.-Y. Zhu, 1999. Direct Numerical simulation of particulate flow of Newtonian and viscoelastic fluids. Ph. D. thesis, University of Pennsylvania.
- A. Z. Zinchenko and R. H. Davis, 2000. An efficient algorithm for hydrodynamical interaction of many deformable drops. *J. Comput. Phys.*, **157**:539–87.
- A. Z. Zinchenko and R. H. Davis, 2002. Shear flow of highly concentrated emulsions of deformable drops by numerical simulations. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **455**:21–62.
- A. Z. Zinchenko, M. A. Rother, and R. H. Davis, 1997. A novel boundary-integral algorithm for viscous interaction of deformable drops. *Phys. Fluids*, **9**:1493–1511.
- A. Z. Zinchenko, M. A. Rother, and R. H. Davis, 1999. Cusping, capture, and breakup of interacting drops by a curvatureless boundary-integral algorithm. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **391**:249–92.
- N. Zuber, 1964. On the dispersed two-phase flow in the laminar flow regime. *Chem. Eng. Sci.*, **19**:897–917.