

Fluctuating Hydrodynamics and Brownian Motion. II. Note on the Slip Boundary Condition

M. G. Velarde¹ and E. H. Hauge²

Received May 2, 1973

Previous work by Hauge and Martin-Löf discussing the generalized Langevin equation for Brownian motion as a contraction from the more fundamental but still phenomenological description of a particle immersed in an incompressible fluid governed by fluctuating hydrodynamics with stick boundary condition is extended to the case of a Brownian particle with arbitrary shape and with *slip* boundary condition. The motivation for this extension is the fact that the latter condition naturally arises in a treatment of the problem from first principles.

KEY WORDS: Fluctuating hydrodynamics; boundary conditions; Brownian motion; generalized Langevin equation; fluctuation-dissipation theorem.

In a recent paper⁽¹⁾ (referred to as I below) Hauge and Martin-Löf discussed the contraction from the Markovian description of a Brownian particle (*B*) immersed in an incompressible fluid governed by fluctuating hydrodynamics, to the (in general) non-Markovian description in terms of a generalized Langevin equation [see I, Eq. (59)] for the dynamic variables of *B* alone. They

¹ Departamento de Física, Universidad autónoma de Madrid, Canto Blanco, Spain.

² Institutt for teoretisk fysikk, Universitetet i Trondheim, Trondheim-NTH, Norway.

proved: (i) The (time-dependent) friction tensor is symmetric for arbitrary shape of B . (ii) The (nonwhite) spectrum of the noise and the friction tensor are related by the appropriate fluctuation-dissipation theorem. These statements were proved strictly within the chosen phenomenological framework, and mechanical time reversibility was not invoked.³

On the other hand, the very restriction to macroscopic reasoning emphasizes the need for a derivation from first principles. The importance of a microscopic justification is, in particular, due to the fact that the phenomenological theory shows the ratio ρ/ρ_B (mass density of the fluid/mass per unit volume of B) to be crucial in determining whether the Langevin equation can be considered as Markovian to a sufficient approximation. This basic parameter has not emerged as such from previous work on the microscopic derivation of the Langevin equation.

Before one embarks on such a program, however, one minor point must be settled. In the proofs of I the stick boundary condition was used, i.e., both normal and tangential components of the fluid velocity field were assumed to coincide with the velocity of B at the surface. In a microscopic theory, however, one would like to consider the simplest case and describe the interaction between B and a fluid particle by a potential energy function $\Phi(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R})$ corresponding to a smooth Brownian particle of reasonable shape. But in any collision governed by Φ no tangential forces will appear. The macroscopic manifestation of this simple fact is the so-called slip condition: Tangential stresses vanish at the surface of B . It is the purpose of the present note to point out that, with slight modifications, the arguments in I carry over to the case of slip boundary condition.

The boundary condition is used explicitly in I for a single purpose only [see I, Eqs. (60)–(62) and (B.2)], namely the proof of the relation

$$-\int dS \mathbf{u}(t) \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}(t') \cdot \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{U}(t) \cdot \mathbf{F}(t') + \boldsymbol{\Omega}(t) \cdot \mathbf{M}(t') \quad (1)$$

Here $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ are the velocity and stress tensor fields of the fluid, $\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x})$ is a unit vector normal to, and pointing into, the surface of B at \mathbf{x} . The integration extends over the surface of B . The dynamic variables of B are the translational and angular velocities \mathbf{U} and $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$, and the force \mathbf{F} and the torque \mathbf{M} exerted on B by the fluid are given as

$$\mathbf{F} = -\int dS \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n} \quad (2)$$

$$\mathbf{M} = -\int dS \mathbf{x} \times \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n} \quad (3)$$

³ The two levels of reasoning are often mixed; see, e.g., Ref. 2.

The stick boundary condition reads

$$\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t) = \mathbf{U}(t) + \boldsymbol{\Omega}(t) \times \mathbf{x} \quad \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in S \tag{4}$$

and the proof of (1) follows immediately by insertion of (4) into the left-hand side and appeal to (2) and (3).

The slip condition, on the other hand, reads

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t) \cdot \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x}) &= [\mathbf{U}(t) + \boldsymbol{\Omega}(t) \times \mathbf{x}] \cdot \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x}) \\ \sigma_{n1} = \sigma_{n2} &= 0 \end{aligned} \right\} \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in S \tag{5}$$

The normal component of (4) is a boundary condition needed already for nonviscous fluids and is of course also valid with slip. The indices in σ_{n1} and σ_{n2} refer to a local Cartesian system where n denotes the direction parallel to \mathbf{n} and 1 and 2 stand for orthogonal tangential directions.

We note that with slip $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n} = \sigma_{nn} \mathbf{n}$ ($\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ is symmetric), and thus only the normal component $\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}$ is needed on the left of (1). Insertion of (5) then yields \mathbf{U} and $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ dotted into integrals that are nothing else than the definitions (2) and (3) with $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n} = \sigma_{nn} \mathbf{n}$. Thus Eq. (1) is proved to be valid for the case of slip as well as stick.

The remaining arguments of I can be taken over verbatim and one has thus proved, on the basis of fluctuating hydrodynamics, the symmetry of the friction tensor appearing in the generalized Langevin equation [I, Eq. (59)] for $(\mathbf{U}, \boldsymbol{\Omega})$, and the fluctuation-dissipation theorem relating the auto-correlation of the random forces to this tensor.

It is curious to note that for the usual “linear combination” of stick and slip

$$u_i - [\mathbf{U} + \boldsymbol{\Omega} \times \mathbf{x}]_i = \beta \sigma_{ni}$$

where i denotes a tangential direction and β is a constant, a proof along the lines presented here does not seem to work. The fact that it *does* work for stick ($\beta \rightarrow 0$) and slip ($\beta \rightarrow \infty$) appears to be a result of accidental features of these limiting cases.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

One of us (M.G.V.) gratefully acknowledges financial support from Norges Almenvitenskapelige Forskningsråd, and the kind atmosphere within Prof. Wergeland’s group.

REFERENCES

1. E. H. Hauge and A. Martin-Löf, *J. Stat. Phys.* 7(3):259 (1973).
2. L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Fluid Mechanics*, Pergamon Press, London (1959), p. 67.