

General dynamical sharp-interface conditions for phase transformations in viscous heat-conducting fluids

By DANIEL M. ANDERSON,¹ PAOLO CERVELLI,²
ELIOT FRIED,³ MORTON E. GURTIN,⁴
AND GEOFFREY B. MCFADDEN⁵

¹Department of Mathematical Sciences, George Mason University
Fairfax, VA 22030-4422, USA

²Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Torino
Via Carlo Alberto 10, 10123 Torino, Italy

³Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Washington University in St. Louis,
St. Louis, MO 63130-4899, USA

⁴Department of Mathematical Sciences, Carnegie Mellon University,
Pittsburgh, PA 15213-3890, USA

⁵Mathematical and Computational Sciences Division, National Institute of Standards and
Technology, Gaithersburg, MD 20899-8910, USA

(Received)

We develop a complete set of equations governing the evolution of a sharp interface separating two fluid phases undergoing transformation. In addition to the conventional balances for mass, linear momentum, and energy these equations include also a counterpart of the Gibbs–Thomson equation familiar from theories for crystal growth. This additional equation arises from a consideration of configurational forces within a thermodynamical framework. While the notion of configurational forces is well-developed and understood for the description of materials, like crystalline solids, that possess natural reference configurations, very little has been done regarding their role in materials, such as viscous fluids, that do not possess preferred reference states. We therefore provide a comprehensive discussion of configurational forces, the balance of configurational momentum, and configurational thermodynamics that does not require a choice of reference configuration. The general evolution equations arising from our theory account for the thermodynamic structure of the bulk phases and the interface and for viscous and thermal dissipation in the bulk phases and for viscous dissipation on the interface. Due to the complexity of these equations, we provide a reduced system of equations based on simplified constitutive assumptions and approximations common in the literature on phase transformations.

1. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to develop, from basic considerations, a complete set of equations governing the evolution of a sharp interface separating two fluid phases undergoing transformation.† For situations in which a phase transformation does *not* occur,

† The dynamics of two fluid phases and the evolution of the interface separating them has been a problem of scientific and industrial interest for centuries. Such problems range from those of geophysics involving large length scales, where inertial and gravitational effects prevail, to

so that the interface is a material surface,[‡] the governing bulk and interfacial equations are well-developed and agreed upon (Slattery 1990; Edwards, Brenner & Wassan 1991; Joseph & Renardy 1993). Focusing on the interface, apart from appropriate kinematical conditions, the relevant equations are the conventional balances for mass, linear momentum, and energy, augmented by suitable constitutive equations. But — and what is most relevant to our discussion —

- *when a phase transformation does occur there is an additional kinematical degree of freedom represented by the motion of the interface relative to the material; because of this the interfacial expressions for balance of mass, momentum, and energy fail to provide a closed description: an additional interface condition is needed to account for the microphysics associated with the exchange of material between phases.*

The need for a supplemental equation at a sharp phase-interface was recognized early on by Lamé & Clapeyron (1831) and, somewhat later, by Stefan (1889) who, in their works on the solidification of a pure substance, not only balanced energy in the bulk phases and on the interface but also required that, on the interface, the temperature ϑ be equal to the melting temperature ϑ_0 :

$$\vartheta = \vartheta_0. \quad (1.1)$$

Despite its intuitive appeal, the physical basis of (1.1) is ambiguous: Is it a balance, a constitutive equation, or neither?

To address this question, we consider not (1.1) but a familiar generalization, the Gibbs–Thomson equation, in which the interfacial temperature is allowed to depend also on the curvature of the interface. Writing \mathcal{S} for the interface, \mathbf{n} for its unit normal, $K = -\operatorname{div}_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbf{n}$ for its total (twice the mean) curvature, $\psi^x = \hat{\psi}^x(\vartheta)$ for the interfacial free-energy (density), and ℓ for the latent heat, and introducing a *dimensionless temperature*

$$\theta = \frac{\vartheta - \vartheta_0}{\vartheta_0}, \quad (1.2)$$

the Gibbs–Thomson equation (when the phases are of equal density ϱ and flow is neglected) reads

$$\varrho \ell \theta = \psi^x K. \quad (1.3)$$

The Gibbs–Thomson equation is typically derived using a variational argument. Specifically, suppose that the medium occupies a fixed region \mathcal{R} and that the interface \mathcal{S} remains disjoint from the boundary $\partial\mathcal{R}$. Let $\psi = \psi^\pm(\vartheta)$ denote the specific free-energy of phase \pm . Since the interface is not material, its configuration can be varied independently of the temperature field. Requiring that the variation of the net free-energy

$$\int_{\mathcal{R}} \varrho \psi \, dv + \int_{\mathcal{S}} \psi^x \, da \quad (1.4)$$

with respect to the configuration of \mathcal{S} be stationary then yields the requirement

$$\psi^x K + \varrho \llbracket \psi \rrbracket = 0, \quad (1.5)$$

where $\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket = \Phi^+ - \Phi^-$ denotes the jump of a bulk quantity Φ across the interface. Let $\eta = \eta^\pm$ denote the specific entropy of phase \pm and assume (as is classical) that those involving small length scales, where surface tension and other interfacial phenomena are important.

[‡] It is important to emphasize the distinction between nonmaterial and material interfaces: whereas nonmaterial interfaces allow for exchanges of mass between adjacent phases, fluid particles cannot cross a material interface.

$\eta^\pm = -d\psi^\pm(\vartheta)/d\vartheta$. Assume that $\psi^+(\vartheta)$ and $\psi^-(\vartheta)$ are defined so that

$$\psi^+(\vartheta_0) = \psi^-(\vartheta_0), \quad \eta^+(\vartheta_0) \neq \eta^-(\vartheta_0). \quad (1.6)$$

The Gibbs–Thomson equation (1.3) then follows from (1.5) on stipulating that the temperature difference $\vartheta - \vartheta_0$ deviates only infinitesimally from the melting temperature ϑ_0 and making the identification $\ell = \vartheta_0(\eta^+(\vartheta_0) - \eta^-(\vartheta_0))$.

Using the terminology of Nabarro (1985), the foregoing argument, involving as it does a variation of the configuration of the interface, distinguishes the quantity $\psi^\times K + \varrho[[\psi]]$ as the *configurational force* acting on \mathcal{S} .[†] In equilibrium, this force vanishes. Nontrivial values of this force thus signal that the configuration of \mathcal{S} is energetically suboptimal. In this vein, (1.5) and its specialization the Gibbs–Thomson equation (1.3) can be interpreted as constitutively augmented statements of *configurational force balance*.[‡] This answers the question posed after (1.1).

That additional configurational forces may be needed to describe *solid-state phenomena* involving evolving defect structures such as phase interfaces and grain boundaries that *migrate* relative to the material is clear from the groundbreaking works of Eshelby (1951, 1956, 1970, 1975), Peach & Koehler (1950), and Herring (1951). But, as with our derivation of (1.3), these studies are based on variational arguments and

- *by their very nature, variational arguments cannot characterize dissipation.*

This drawback is particularly limiting when dealing with fluids, because of the prominent role played by viscous stresses. Finally, we note that any variationally-based introduction of configurational forces must necessarily be predicated on an underlying constitutive framework and, therefore, restricted to a particular class of materials.

That configurational forces are distinct from the standard (Newtonian) forces associated with the motion of material particles should be clear from the derivation of (1.5), which involves a variation that does not allow the fluid to move. On the other hand, variations of positions of the fluid particles — holding the interface fixed — yield the conventional balance laws for standard forces.

In the dynamics of defect structures with general forms of dissipation there is no encompassing variational principle. Nevertheless, experience demonstrates the need for an additional balance associated with the kinematics of the defect. An additional balance of this sort is the relation that ensues when one formally sets the variationally derived expression for the configurational force on a defect equal to a linear function of the velocity of that defect. In particular, for the solidification of a pure substance this procedure leads to a kinetic Gibbs–Thomson equation (Voronkov 1964)[¶]

$$\varrho\ell\theta = \hat{\psi}^\times(\vartheta)K - \kappa(\vartheta)V, \quad (1.7)$$

where V denotes the scalar normal velocity of \mathcal{S} and $\kappa(\vartheta) \geq 0$ is the reciprocal mobility of the interface.

[†] We use the adjective *configurational* to differentiate these forces from classical Newtonian forces, which we refer to as *standard*.

[‡] Statements like (1.5) actually represent the normal component of a vectorial configurational force balance (Gurtin 2000, p. 6). Indeed, on defining $\mathbf{C} = \varrho\psi\mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbb{C} = \psi^\times\mathbb{P}$, with $\mathbb{P} = \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{n}\otimes\mathbf{n}$ the projection onto \mathcal{S} (cf. (4.2)), a straightforward calculation relying on the identity $\text{div}_\mathcal{S}\mathbb{P} = K\mathbf{n}$ (cf. (4.7)) shows that (1.5) is the normal component of the vectorial equation $\text{div}_\mathcal{S}\mathbb{C} + [[\mathbf{C}]]\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{0}$. In this context, \mathbf{C} and \mathbb{C} are bulk and interfacial configurational stress tensors.

[¶] See also Gurtin (1988), who uses configurational forces to derive (1.7) and its anisotropic generalization.

A completely different point of view is taken by Gurtin & Struthers (1990),^{||} who use an argument based on invariance under observer changes to conclude that a configurational force balance should join the standard (Newtonian) force balance as a basic law of continuum physics. Here the operative word is “basic.” Basic laws are by their very nature independent of constitutive assumptions; when placed within a thermodynamic framework such laws allow one to use the now standard procedures of continuum thermodynamics to develop suitable constitutive theories.

We begin our study by revisiting a familiar topic: the bulk material *away from the interface*. This setting allows for a discussion of the first two laws in a form that accounts *explicitly for power-expended by configurational forces*. In this setting the configurational and standard forms of the first two laws are equivalent; even so, this setting is useful as it provides a vehicle for discussing the basic structure of these laws, a structure not at all transparent when discussing *phase interfaces*. Once this basic framework is established, we turn to the goal stated at the outset of the paper: to develop, from basic considerations, a complete set of equations governing the evolution of a sharp interface separating two fluid phases undergoing transformation.

Our treatment has the following limitations:

- We neglect the mass of the interface.
- We do not allow for heat conduction within the interface.
- We restrict attention to situations in which the absolute *temperature* ϑ is continuous across the interface.
- We require that the tangential component \mathbf{u}_{tan} of the *fluid velocity* \mathbf{u} be continuous across the interface.

Aside from the classical bulk balances for standard forces and energy, the general governing equations consist of interface conditions expressing balance of energy, balance of standard momentum, and balance of configurational momentum; a general system of local interface conditions equivalent to these basic balances is given in §10.

The general equations are complicated and, for that reason, in §12 we consider the equations under simplified constitutive equations and approximative assumptions (common in the literature). In particular, letting $\hat{\psi}(\vartheta)$ denote the specific free-energy in bulk, if we assume, among other hypotheses, that *the interfacial free energy ψ^x is constant and the temperature ϑ is close to its equilibrium value ϑ_0* (cf. (1.6)₁), then the resulting interface conditions consist of:

- (i) the *energy balance*

$$[[\mathbf{q}]] \cdot \mathbf{n} = \ell J, \quad (1.8)$$

in which \mathbf{q} is the bulk heat-flux vector, ℓ is the latent heat, and J is the mass flow across \mathcal{S} ;

- (ii) the *standard momentum balance*

$$[[\mathbf{T}]]\mathbf{n} - J^2[[v]]\mathbf{n} = -\psi^x K\mathbf{n} - \text{div}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ 2\alpha\mathbb{D} + \lambda(\text{tr}\mathbb{D})\mathbb{P} \right\}, \quad (1.9)$$

with \mathbf{T} the stress tensor, v the specific volume, \mathbb{D} the superficial rate of stretch (cf. (4.17)), α and λ interfacial fluid viscosities, assumed constant, and \mathbb{P} the projection onto \mathcal{S} (cf. (4.2));

- (iii) the *normal configurational momentum balance*, which may be expressed in the

^{||} This work is somewhat obscure; better references for the underlying ideas are Gurtin (1995, 2000).

following essentially equivalent forms:[†]

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \ell\theta &= -\mathbf{n}\cdot\llbracket v\mathbf{T}\rrbracket\mathbf{n} + \frac{1}{2}J^2\llbracket v^2\rrbracket - \langle\langle v\rangle\rangle\left\{\kappa V^{\text{mig}} - \beta\Delta_{\mathcal{S}}V^{\text{mig}} + 2\alpha\mathbb{K}:\mathbb{D} + \lambda(\text{tr}\mathbb{D})K\right\}, \\ \ell\theta &= -\llbracket v\rrbracket\mathbf{n}\cdot\langle\langle\mathbf{T}\rangle\rangle\mathbf{n} + \langle\langle v\rangle\rangle\hat{\psi}^x K - \langle\langle v\rangle\rangle\left\{\kappa V^{\text{mig}} - \beta\Delta_{\mathcal{S}}V^{\text{mig}}\right\}. \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (1.10)$$

Here θ is the dimensionless temperature (1.2), $\langle\langle v\rangle\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(v^+ + v^-)$ is the average specific volume at the interface,

$$V^{\text{mig}} = V - \langle\langle\mathbf{u}\rangle\rangle\cdot\mathbf{n}$$

represents the average migrational velocity of the interface relative to the bulk material, κ and β are constant viscosities associated with the migration of the interface, $\mathbb{K} = -\text{grad}_{\mathcal{S}}\mathbf{n}$, and $\Delta_{\mathcal{S}}$ the Laplace–Beltrami operator (surface Laplacian) (12.5).[†]

The basic interface equations (1.8)–(1.10) demonstrate the power of working within a general framework: these balances exhibit the physical nature of — and the interaction between — different physical effects and, in addition, provide a framework within which different physical assumptions may be discussed. For example, if we neglect interfacial and migrational viscosities, the standard momentum balance becomes

$$\llbracket\mathbf{T}\rrbracket\mathbf{n} - J^2\llbracket v\rrbracket\mathbf{n} = -\psi^x K\mathbf{n}, \quad (1.11)$$

and the equivalent statements of the configurational momentum balance have the forms

$$\ell\theta = -\llbracket v\mathbf{n}\cdot\mathbf{T}\rrbracket + \frac{1}{2}J^2\llbracket v^2\rrbracket, \quad \ell\theta = \langle\langle v\rangle\rangle\hat{\psi}^x K - \llbracket v\rrbracket\mathbf{n}\cdot\langle\langle\mathbf{T}\rangle\rangle\mathbf{n}. \quad (1.12)$$

Note that (1.12)₂ generalizes the Gibbs–Thomson equation (1.3) to account for density differences between phases and for the influence of flow. Note also that, because it determines the interfacial temperature solely in terms of interfacial limits of bulk quantities, (1.12)₁ is the simpler of the two equations. In addition, (1.12)₁ shows that the classical vapor recoil effect (Hickman 1952, 1972; Palmer 1976; Burelback, Bankoff & Davis 1988) — which is embodied by the inertial contribution $-J^2\llbracket v\rrbracket\mathbf{n}$ in the standard momentum balance (1.11) — may also influence the interfacial temperature through the term $\frac{1}{2}J^2\llbracket v^2\rrbracket$ in (1.12)₁. Whereas the vapor recoil effect is present in the interfacial momentum balance used in fluid mechanical theories for evaporation–condensation, it does not enter the classical Hertz–Knudsen–Langmuir equation (Schrage 1953) that is typically used (in lieu of the Gibbs–Thomson equation) as an additional interface equation (Burelback, Bankoff & Davis 1988; Danov, Alleborn, Raszillier & Durst 1998).

The challenge of developing accurate and efficient numerical methods for the solution of initial–boundary–value problems arising from sharp–interface theories has spurred the development of regularized diffuse–interface, or phase–field, theories.[‡] This approach has recently become popular for the modeling of fluid–fluid systems (Anderson, McFadden & Wheeler 1998, 2000). Anderson, McFadden & Wheeler (2001) analyze a two–fluid diffuse–interface model in a sharp–interface limit and derive nonequilibrium interfacial conditions for a number of limiting cases. In addition to interfacial statements of mass, momentum, and energy balance, these conditions include a nonequilibrium generalization

[†] More precisely, (1.10)₁ represents the normal configurational momentum balance, while (1.10)₂ represents a combination of the normal configurational and standard momentum balances.

[‡] The term $\beta\Delta_{\mathcal{S}}V^{\text{mig}}$ would seem relevant to applications involving small length scales, applications whose importance lies in the development of micro- and nano-scale fluid devices (e.g., Stone, Stroock & Adjari, 2004).

[§] E.g., Langer (1978), Collins & Levine (1985), Caginalp (1986, 1989), Penrose & Fife (1990), Fried & Gurtin (1993, 1999), and Wang, Sekerka, Wheeler, Murray, Coriell & Braun (1993).

of the Gibbs–Thomson equation. In our notation, that equation reads¶

$$\ell\theta = p^- \llbracket v \rrbracket - \frac{1}{2} J^2 \llbracket v \rrbracket^2 + v^+ \psi^x K - \kappa \langle\langle v \rangle\rangle V^{\text{mig}} \quad (1.13)$$

and can be derived as a specialization of our equations (1.9) and (1.10)₂ by on setting the interfacial fluid viscosities α and λ and the migrational viscosity β to zero, using the identity $\langle\langle \mathbf{T} \rangle\rangle = \mathbf{T}^- + \frac{1}{2} \llbracket \mathbf{T} \rrbracket$, and neglecting viscous contributions to the stresses in the bulk phases. Hence, (1.13) arises in our theory on neglecting all forms of bulk and interfacial dissipation other than that associated with attachment kinetics (as embodied by the migrational viscosity κ). Anderson, McFadden & Wheeler (2001) refer to (1.13) as a *modified Clausius–Clapeyron equation*. We see here that (1.13) can be viewed alternatively as a combined expression of the balances for standard and configurational momenta.† The particular sharp-interface limit obtained by an analysis of the equations arising in a diffuse-interface theory is sensitive both to constitutive and scaling assumptions. As such, a diffuse-interface theory may generally possess a variety of sharp-interface limits. In the absence of a sound sharp-interface theory to serve as a target, the problem of developing a physically-meaningful diffuse-interface theory is ill-posed. Here, we provide a sound target theory upon which to build phase-field based regularizations.

2. Theory for the bulk phases

2.1. Kinematics

We write $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ for the velocity and

$$\mathbf{L} = \text{grad } \mathbf{u}, \quad \mathbf{D} = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{L} + \mathbf{L}^\top), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{W} = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{L} - \mathbf{L}^\top) \quad (2.1)$$

for the *velocity gradient*, *rate of stretch*, and *spin*. We assume that the fluid is incompressible, so that

$$\text{div } \mathbf{u} = \text{tr } \mathbf{D} = 0, \quad (2.2)$$

and denote by

$$\varrho (= \text{constant in each phase}) \quad \text{and} \quad v = \frac{1}{\varrho} \quad (2.3)$$

the *mass density* and *specific volume*.

We use a superposed dot to denote the *material time-derivative*; e.g., for a scalar field $\Phi(\mathbf{x}, t)$,

$$\dot{\Phi} = \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial t} + (\text{grad } \Phi) \cdot \mathbf{u}. \quad (2.4)$$

We consistently write $\mathcal{P}(t)$ for an arbitrarily chosen *region that convects with the fluid*; a consequence of balance of mass is then that, for such a region and any field Φ ,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{P}(t)} \Phi \varrho \, dv = \int_{\mathcal{P}(t)} \dot{\Phi} \varrho \, dv. \quad (2.5)$$

¶ Cf. equation (102) of Anderson, McFadden & Wheeler (2001), whose definition of the mass flow J differs from ours by a sign. In writing (1.13), we set to zero the reference pressure of Anderson, McFadden & Wheeler (2001). The analysis of Anderson, McFadden & Wheeler (2001) provides an expression for κ in terms of the densities and shear viscosities of the phases.

† Importantly, like the expressions (1.10)₁ and (1.10)₂ of normal configurational momentum balance, the equation (1.13) of Anderson, McFadden & Wheeler (2001) exhibits the influence of the recoil effect discussed in the paragraph containing (1.11) and (1.12) through the term $\frac{1}{2} J^2 \llbracket v \rrbracket^2$.

2.2. Standard momentum and moment of momentum balances

We neglect external body forces. Writing \mathbf{T} for the *Cauchy stress*, the *standard momentum and moment of momentum balances* then require that, for any bulk region \mathcal{P} , with \mathbf{m} the outward unit normal to $\partial\mathcal{P}$,

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{P}} \varrho \mathbf{u} \, dv &= \int_{\partial\mathcal{P}} \mathbf{T} \mathbf{m} \, da, \\ \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{P}} (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{0}) \times \varrho \mathbf{u} \, dv &= \int_{\partial\mathcal{P}} (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{0}) \times \mathbf{T} \mathbf{m} \, da = \mathbf{0}. \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (2.6)$$

These imply the local balance

$$\varrho \dot{\mathbf{u}} = \operatorname{div} \mathbf{T} \quad (2.7)$$

and the *symmetry* of \mathbf{T} .

Incompressibility of the fluid requires that the stress \mathbf{T} admit a decomposition

$$\mathbf{T} = -p\mathbf{1} + \mathbf{S} \quad (2.8)$$

into a constitutively *indeterminate pressure* p and an *extra stress* \mathbf{S} ($\operatorname{tr} \mathbf{S} = 0$) available for constitutive prescription.

2.3. Bulk energy balance and entropy imbalance

For $\mathcal{P}(t)$ a region that convects with the fluid, the *first and second laws of thermodynamics*, namely *balance of energy* and the *entropy imbalance*, have the respective forms

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{P}(t)} \varrho \left\{ \varepsilon + \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}|^2 \right\} \, dv &= \int_{\partial\mathcal{P}(t)} \mathbf{T} \mathbf{m} \cdot \mathbf{u} \, da - \int_{\partial\mathcal{P}(t)} \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{m} \, da, \\ \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{P}(t)} \varrho \eta \, dv &\geq - \int_{\partial\mathcal{P}(t)} \frac{\mathbf{q}}{\vartheta} \cdot \mathbf{m} \, da, \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (2.9)$$

where ε and η denote the *specific internal energy* and *specific entropy*, while \mathbf{q} is the *heat flux* and ϑ is the (absolute) *temperature*.

Using (2.2), (2.5), (2.7), and (2.8), we find that

$$\varrho \dot{\varepsilon} = \mathbf{S} : \mathbf{D} - \operatorname{div} \mathbf{q}, \quad \varrho \dot{\eta} \geq -\operatorname{div} \frac{\mathbf{q}}{\vartheta}, \quad (2.10)$$

which are the local forms of the first two laws. If we introduce the *specific free energy*

$$\psi = \varepsilon - \vartheta \eta, \quad (2.11)$$

then, subtracting (2.10)₂ from (2.10)₁, we arrive at the *local free-energy imbalance*

$$\varrho (\dot{\psi} + \eta \dot{\vartheta}) - \mathbf{S} : \mathbf{D} + \frac{1}{\vartheta} \mathbf{q} \cdot \operatorname{grad} \vartheta \leq 0. \quad (2.12)$$

2.4. Bulk constitutive relations

Using the symbols \pm to label the phases, we take as bulk constitutive equations for the individual phases the classical state relations

$$\psi = \psi^\pm(\vartheta), \quad \eta = \eta^\pm(\vartheta) = -\frac{d\psi^\pm(\vartheta)}{d\vartheta}, \quad (2.13)$$

the auxiliary state relation

$$\varepsilon = \varepsilon^\pm(\vartheta) = \psi^\pm(\vartheta) - \vartheta \frac{d\psi^\pm(\vartheta)}{d\vartheta}, \quad (2.14)$$

which follows from (2.11) and (2.13), the viscous flow relation

$$\mathbf{S} = 2\mu^\pm(\vartheta)\mathbf{D}, \quad (2.15)$$

and Fourier's law

$$\mathbf{q} = -k^\pm(\vartheta) \text{grad } \vartheta. \quad (2.16)$$

Here, the viscosities μ^\pm and conductivities k^\pm , are strictly positive. For each phase, the constitutive relations (2.13)–(2.16) are consistent with the free-energy imbalance (2.12).

3. Configurational forces in bulk

When discussing configurational forces in solids, it is natural to employ a referential (or Lagrangian) description. Here, as we are discussing fluids, we recast in a spatial (or Eulerian) setting Gurtin's (1995, 2000) approach to configurational forces.

3.1. Migrating control volumes. Observed and relative velocities

To characterize the manner in which configurational forces expend power, a means of capturing the kinematics associated with the transfer of material is needed. We accomplish this with the aid of *control volumes* $\mathcal{R}(t)$ that *migrate relative to the fluid* and thereby result in the transfer of material to — and the removal of material from — $\mathcal{R}(t)$ at $\partial\mathcal{R}(t)$. Here *it is essential that regions* $\mathcal{P}(t)$ *convecting with the fluid not be confused with control volumes* $\mathcal{R}(t)$ *that migrate relative to the material*.

Unless specified to the contrary, $\mathcal{R}(t)$ is a *migrating control volume* with $V_{\partial\mathcal{R}}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ the (scalar) *normal velocity* of $\partial\mathcal{R}(t)$ in the direction of the outward unit normal $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}, t)$. To describe power expenditures associated with the migration of $\mathcal{R}(t)$, we introduce a *velocity field* $\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ for $\partial\mathcal{R}(t)$. Compatibility then requires that $\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}}$ have $V_{\partial\mathcal{R}}$ as its normal component,

$$\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}} \cdot \mathbf{m} = V_{\partial\mathcal{R}}, \quad (3.1)$$

but $\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}}$ is otherwise arbitrary.

Nonnormal velocity fields, while not intrinsic, are important. For example, given an arbitrary time-dependent parametrization $\mathbf{x} = \hat{\mathbf{x}}(\xi_1, \xi_2, t)$ of $\partial\mathcal{R}$, the field defined by $\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}} = \partial\hat{\mathbf{x}}/\partial t$ (holding (ξ_1, ξ_2) fixed), is a velocity field for $\partial\mathcal{R}$, but $\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}}$ is *generally nonnormal*. We refer to the normal velocity $V_{\partial\mathcal{R}}$ and any choice of the velocity field $\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}}$ for $\partial\mathcal{R}$ as *observed velocities* for $\partial\mathcal{R}$, since they represent velocity fields that characterize the motion of \mathcal{R} through space, independent of the motion of the fluid. While it is important that we allow for the use of non-normal velocity fields,

we require that the theory itself not depend on the particular observed velocity field used to describe a given migrating control volume. (b)

We refer to the hypothesis (b) as *intrinsicity*. Intrinsicity is reminiscent of, but different from, the general requirement that physical theories be independent of the observer.

It is also possible to characterize the motion of \mathcal{R} *relative to the fluid*; in this case we use the *migrational velocity* and the *normal migrational velocity*

$$\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}} - \mathbf{u} \quad \text{and} \quad V_{\partial\mathcal{R}}^{\text{mig}} = V_{\partial\mathcal{R}} - \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{m}, \quad (3.2)$$

as well as the field

$$J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} = \varrho V_{\partial\mathcal{R}}^{\text{mig}}, \quad (3.3)$$

which represents the *migrational mass flow* across $\partial\mathcal{R}$.

Since $\text{div } \mathbf{u} = 0$, we may use (2.4) and (3.3) to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{R}(t)} \varrho \Phi \, dv &= \int_{\mathcal{R}(t)} \varrho \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial t} \, dv + \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}(t)} \Phi \varrho V_{\partial\mathcal{R}} \, da \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{R}(t)} \varrho (\dot{\Phi} - \mathbf{u} \cdot \text{grad } \Phi) \, dv + \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}(t)} \Phi \varrho V_{\partial\mathcal{R}} \, da = \int_{\mathcal{R}(t)} \varrho \dot{\Phi} \, dv + \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}(t)} \Phi J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} \, da. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

3.2. Configurational momentum balance

We begin by rewriting the standard momentum balances (2.6) in a form appropriate to a migrating control volume $\mathcal{R}(t)$:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{R}(t)} \varrho \mathbf{u} \, dv &= \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}(t)} \left\{ \mathbf{T}\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{u} J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} \right\} \, da, \\ \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{R}(t)} (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{0}) \times \varrho \mathbf{u} \, dv &= \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}(t)} (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{0}) \times \left\{ \mathbf{T}\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{u} J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} \right\} \, da. \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (3.5)$$

To describe the configurational counterpart of these balances, we introduce three additional fields: a *specific configurational momentum* \mathbf{p} , a *configurational stress* \mathbf{C} , and an *internal configurational body force* \mathbf{f} .[†] Then, guided by (3.5)₁, we posit a *configurational momentum balance* requiring that, for each migrating control volume \mathcal{R} ,[‡]

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{R}(t)} \varrho \mathbf{p} \, dv = \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}(t)} \left\{ \mathbf{C}\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{p} J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} \right\} \, da + \int_{\mathcal{R}(t)} \mathbf{f} \, dv. \quad (3.6)$$

By (3.4), this balance has the local form

$$\varrho \dot{\mathbf{p}} = \text{div } \mathbf{C} + \mathbf{f}. \quad (3.7)$$

In the balances (3.5) and (3.6), the vector fields $\mathbf{u} J_{\partial\mathcal{R}}$ and $\mathbf{p} J_{\partial\mathcal{R}}$ represent respective flows of linear and configurational momentum across $\partial\mathcal{R}$ induced by its migration. When there is no migration, that is when $J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} = 0$ so that $\partial\mathcal{R}$ convects with the fluid, then these momentum flows vanish.

It is convenient to view the flows $\mathbf{u} J_{\partial\mathcal{R}}$ and $\mathbf{p} J_{\partial\mathcal{R}}$ as *effective tractions associated with the flow of momentum across* $\partial\mathcal{R}$, for then the momentum balances (3.5)₁ and (3.6) each has the form

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left\{ \text{momentum of } \mathcal{R}(t) \right\} = \left\{ \text{effective net force on } \mathcal{R}(t) \right\}. \quad (3.8)$$

This view is essential to our discussion of configurational forces.

[†] *Internal* configurational forces are discussed in detail by Gurtin (2000, p. 10). In bulk such forces are not so important, as they are indeterminate.

[‡] We could introduce an additional balance for moment of configurational momentum, but such a balance would be superfluous, not only in bulk, but, more importantly, in most situations involving a phase interface (cf. (5.12) of Gurtin (2000)).

3.3. *Configurational thermodynamics*

This section discusses forms of the energy balance and entropy imbalance appropriate to migrating control volumes.

Standard form of the first and second laws

As is classical, the global forms of the energy balance and the entropy imbalance for a migrating control volume $\mathcal{R}(t)$ have the form

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{R}(t)} \varrho \left\{ \varepsilon + \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}|^2 \right\} dv - \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}(t)} \left\{ \varepsilon + \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}|^2 \right\} J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} da &= \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}(t)} \mathbf{Tm} \cdot \mathbf{u} da - \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}(t)} \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{m} da, \\ \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{R}(t)} \varrho \eta dv - \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}(t)} \eta J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} da &\geq - \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}(t)} \frac{\mathbf{q}}{\vartheta} \cdot \mathbf{m} da. \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (3.9)$$

In view of (3.3), the basic laws in this form account for the migration of $\mathcal{R}(t)$ through the underlined terms, which represent flows of energy and entropy across $\partial\mathcal{R}$. When $\mathcal{R}(t)$ convects with the fluid, $J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} = 0$ and (3.9) reduce to (2.9).

Configurational form of the first two laws

For a migrating control volume the first two laws in the standard form (3.9) account only *implicitly* for power expended by configurational forces. A thermodynamics better suited to the study of such forces may be based on the first two laws in a form[†]

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{R}(t)} \varrho \left\{ \varepsilon + \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}|^2 \right\} dv \\ &= \underbrace{\int_{\partial\mathcal{R}(t)} \left\{ (\mathbf{Tm} + \mathbf{u} J_{\partial\mathcal{R}}) \cdot \mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}} + (\mathbf{Cm} + \mathbf{p} J_{\partial\mathcal{R}}) \cdot (\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}} - \mathbf{u}) \right\} da}_{W(\mathcal{R}(t))} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\int_{\partial\mathcal{R}(t)} \left\{ \vartheta \eta J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} - \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{m} \right\} da}_{Q(\mathcal{R}(t))} \quad (3.10) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{R}(t)} \varrho \eta dv \geq \underbrace{\int_{\partial\mathcal{R}(t)} \frac{\vartheta \eta J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} - \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{m}}{\vartheta} da}_{H(\mathcal{R}(t))} \quad (3.11)$$

that *accounts explicitly for configurational power expenditures*. Before establishing the precise manner in which this form of the first two laws is equivalent to the standard form (3.9), we discuss the physical ideas underlying (3.10) and (3.11).

[†] Gurtin (1995), neglecting inertia; see also Gurtin (2000), whose discussion of configurational momentum is incorrect. Our treatment of inertia within the context of configurational forces is based on that of Cermelli & Fried (1997).

The abstract structure of, say, (3.10), namely

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \left\{ \text{internal energy plus kinetic energy of } \mathcal{R}(t) \right\} \\ &= \underbrace{\left\{ \text{effective power expended on } \mathcal{R}(t) \right\}}_{W(\mathcal{R}(t))} + \underbrace{\left\{ \text{effective heat flow into } \mathcal{R}(t) \right\}}_{Q(\mathcal{R}(t))}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

treats a migrating control volume as a “thermodynamic entity” in which the inflow of (internal plus kinetic) energy is subsumed by:

- (i) an effective expenditure of power by standard forces, configurational forces, and effective forces associated with the flow of momentum across surfaces;
- (ii) an effective flow of heat.

Note that this abstract structure is consistent with that of (3.8) for momentum.

The physical hypothesis underlying the form we choose for the effective power expenditure $W(\mathcal{R}(t))$ is the presumption that configurational forces expend power in consort with transfers of material. In particular, *we view the tractions \mathbf{Cm} and $\mathbf{p}J_{\partial\mathcal{R}}$ as forces associated with the transfer of material across $\partial\mathcal{R}$* ; since the migrational velocity $\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}} - \mathbf{u}$ represents the velocity with which *material is transferred* across $\partial\mathcal{R}$, we take $\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}} - \mathbf{u}$ to be an appropriate power-conjugate velocity for $\mathbf{Cm} + \mathbf{p}J_{\partial\mathcal{R}}$; we therefore assume that the migration of \mathcal{R} is accompanied by an effective power expenditure

$$\int_{\partial\mathcal{R}(t)} \left\{ \mathbf{Cm} + \mathbf{p}J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} \right\} \cdot (\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}} - \mathbf{u}) \, da. \quad (3.13)$$

In deciding on the appropriate expenditure by standard tractions, it is important to emphasize that material is continually being transferred across $\partial\mathcal{R}$ as a result of its migration through the fluid; hence

- $\partial\mathcal{R}$ has no intrinsic material description.

We therefore take the observed velocity $\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}}$ of $\partial\mathcal{R}$, rather than the material velocity \mathbf{u} , as the appropriate conjugate velocity for $\mathbf{Tm} + \mathbf{u}J_{\partial\mathcal{R}}$, and write the effective standard power expenditure in the form

$$\int_{\partial\mathcal{R}(t)} \left\{ \mathbf{Tm} + \mathbf{u}J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} \right\} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}} \, da.$$

Finally, the configurational body force \mathbf{f} , being internal, is viewed as acting *within* the control volume $\partial\mathcal{R}$; as such \mathbf{f} cannot affect the *external* power expenditure $W(\mathcal{R})$.

For the second law in the form (3.11) to be consistent with its standard form (3.9)₂, the entropy flow $\int_{\partial\mathcal{R}} \eta J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} \, da$ must join the standard entropy flow $-\int_{\partial\mathcal{R}} (\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{m})/\vartheta \, da$ to form the effective entropy flow $H(\mathcal{R})$:

$$H(\mathcal{R}(t)) = \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}(t)} \frac{\vartheta \eta J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} - \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{m}}{\vartheta} \, da. \quad (3.14)$$

Further, if we require that, on $\partial\mathcal{R}$,

$$\text{entropy flow per unit area} = \frac{\text{heat flow per unit area}}{\vartheta},$$

then we are led to consider

$$Q(\mathcal{R}(t)) = \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}(t)} \left\{ \vartheta\eta J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} - \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{m} \right\} da \quad (3.15)$$

as the appropriate choice for the effective heat flow across $\partial\mathcal{R}$. We therefore view $\vartheta\eta J_{\partial\mathcal{R}}$ and $\eta J_{\partial\mathcal{R}}$ as respective flows of heat and entropy induced by the migration of $\partial\mathcal{R}$.

Equivalence of the standard and configurational forms of the first two laws

We now turn to a rigorous justification of our use of the configurational forms of the first two laws. First of all, the configurational and standard forms, (3.11) and (3.9)₂, of the second law are clearly equivalent, and the former trivially satisfies intrinsicity. We may therefore limit our discussion to the first law. Regarding this law in the configurational form (3.10), note that the intrinsicity hypothesis (b) is equivalent to the requirement that

the power $W(\mathcal{R}(t))$ be independent of the choice of observed velocity field $\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}}$ (#) chosen to characterize the migration of $\mathcal{R}(t)$. (#)

EQUIVALENCY THEOREM *The first law in the configurational form (3.10), subject to the intrinsicity hypothesis (#), is equivalent to the first law in the standard form (3.9)₁, supplemented by the Eshelby relation*

$$\mathbf{C} = \varrho \left\{ \psi - \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}|^2 \right\} \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{T} \quad (3.16)$$

and the momentum relation

$$\mathbf{p} = -\mathbf{u}. \quad (3.17)$$

Proof. Consider the first law in the configurational form (3.10). Our first step is to determine the consequences of the invariance requirement (#). Since all observed velocity fields have the same normal component, while the tangential components are arbitrary, (#) requires that $W(\mathcal{R}(t))$ be invariant under all transformations of the form

$$\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}} \mapsto \mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}} + \xi \mathbf{t}, \quad (3.18)$$

with ξ an arbitrary scalar field and \mathbf{t} with $|\mathbf{t}| = 1$ a tangential vector field on $\partial\mathcal{R}$, or, equivalently, by (3.3), that

$$\int_{\partial\mathcal{R}(t)} \xi \mathbf{t} \cdot \left\{ (\mathbf{T} + \mathbf{C}) \mathbf{m} + \varrho (\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{p}) V_{\partial\mathcal{R}}^{\text{mig}} \right\} da = 0$$

for all such transformations. Thus, since \mathcal{R} , ξ , and \mathbf{t} (tangential to $\partial\mathcal{R}$) may be arbitrarily chosen, it follows that

$$\mathbf{t} \cdot \left\{ (\mathbf{T} + \mathbf{C}) \mathbf{m} + \varrho (\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{p}) V_{\partial\mathcal{R}}^{\text{mig}} \right\} = 0$$

for any scalar field $V_{\partial\mathcal{R}}^{\text{mig}}$ and all unit vectors \mathbf{t} and \mathbf{m} with \mathbf{t} orthogonal to \mathbf{m} . Since $V_{\partial\mathcal{R}}^{\text{mig}}$ is arbitrary, $\mathbf{t} \cdot (\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{p}) = 0$ for all unit vectors \mathbf{t} , so that $\mathbf{p} = -\mathbf{u}$, which is (3.17). Thus, letting $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{T} + \mathbf{C}$, it follows that, for each \mathbf{m} , $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{m}$ must lie in the direction of \mathbf{m} , which is possible if and only if \mathbf{A} has the form $\mathbf{A} = \varrho\varphi\mathbf{1}$, with φ a scalar field. Invariance therefore yields the *pre-Eshelby relation*

$$\mathbf{C} = \varrho\varphi\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{T}. \quad (3.19)$$

In view of (3.17) and (3.19), the power expended on \mathcal{R} becomes

$$W(\mathcal{R}(t)) = \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}(t)} \left\{ \mathbf{T}\mathbf{m} \cdot \mathbf{u} + \left\{ \varphi + |\mathbf{u}|^2 \right\} J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} \right\} da. \quad (3.20)$$

Further, since $\psi = \varepsilon - \vartheta\eta$, we may use (3.4) and (3.20) to write (3.10) in the form:

$$\int_{\mathcal{R}(t)} \varrho \left\{ \varepsilon + \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}|^2 \right\} dv = \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}(t)} \mathbf{T}\mathbf{m} \cdot \mathbf{u} da - \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}(t)} \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{m} da + \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}(t)} \left\{ \varphi + \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}|^2 - \psi \right\} J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} da. \quad (3.21)$$

At this point it is important to note that, by (3.2) and (3.3), the sole term in (3.21) involving the normal velocity $V_{\partial\mathcal{R}}$ is the term with integrand $(\psi + \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}|^2 - \varphi) J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} = \varrho(\psi + \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}|^2 - \varphi)(V_{\partial\mathcal{R}} - \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{m})$. Bearing this in mind, we note that, given any time t_0 , we may choose a second migrating control volume that coincides with $\mathcal{R}(t)$ at $t = t_0$, but for which $V_{\partial\mathcal{R}}$ at t_0 is *arbitrary*. Thus for (3.21) to hold for all migrating control volumes, we must have

$$\varphi = \psi - \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}|^2; \quad (3.22)$$

therefore, by (3.19), the Eshelby relation (3.16) holds. Further, by (3.22), we may use (3.4) to reduce (3.21) to the standard form (3.9)₁ of the first law. We have therefore shown that the configurational form of the first law and the intrinsicality hypothesis together imply both the standard form of this law and the Eshelby relation.

To prove the converse assertion, assume that both the standard form (3.9)₁ of the first law, the Eshelby relation (3.16), and the momentum relation (3.17) are satisfied. Choose an arbitrary velocity field $\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}}$ for $\partial\mathcal{R}$ and note that, since $\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}} \cdot \mathbf{m} = V_{\partial\mathcal{R}}$ and $J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} = \varrho(V_{\partial\mathcal{R}} - \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{m})$, it follows, upon appealing to the Eshelby relation (3.16), that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{T}\mathbf{m} \cdot \mathbf{u} &= \mathbf{T}\mathbf{m} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}} - \mathbf{T}\mathbf{m} \cdot (\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}} - \mathbf{u}) \\ &= \mathbf{T}\mathbf{m} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}} + \mathbf{C}\mathbf{m} \cdot (\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}} - \mathbf{u}) - (\mathbf{T} + \mathbf{C})\mathbf{m} \cdot (\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}} - \mathbf{u}), \\ &= \mathbf{T}\mathbf{m} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}} + \mathbf{C}\mathbf{m} \cdot (\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}} - \mathbf{u}) - \left\{ \psi - \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}|^2 \right\} J_{\partial\mathcal{R}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

Further, since $\mathbf{p} = -\mathbf{u}$, it follows that $|\mathbf{u}|^2 = \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}} + \mathbf{p} \cdot (\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}} - \mathbf{u})$, and this equation and (3.23) imply that

$$\left\{ \varepsilon + \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}|^2 \right\} J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} + \mathbf{T}\mathbf{m} \cdot \mathbf{u} = (\mathbf{T}\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{u} J_{\partial\mathcal{R}}) \cdot \mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}} + (\mathbf{C}\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{p} J_{\partial\mathcal{R}}) \cdot (\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}} - \mathbf{u}) + \vartheta\eta J_{\partial\mathcal{R}}.$$

This identity reduces the first law in the standard form (3.9)₁ to its configurational counterpart (3.10). The proof of the Equivalency Theorem is now complete.

We have shown that, granted intrinsicality (b), the configurational and standard forms of the first two laws are equivalent. For that reason, our discussion of configurational forces in *bulk* might seem superfluous, but it is not: this discussion provides a vehicle for introducing the basic structure and central ideas, these are not at all transparent when discussing *phase interfaces*. In fact:

- *Our treatment of phase interfaces is based on thermomechanical laws that are direct counterparts of the configurational laws (3.10) and (3.11) and that lead, via intrinsicality (b), to a interfacial Eshelby relation analogous to the bulk Eshelby relation (3.16).*

3.4. Specific form of the configurational fields

Until this stage in our discussion of configurational forces, no use has been made of constitutive theory. Hence, our results, being independent of constitutive equations, apply

to broad classes of materials. Moreover, since the standard force balance (2.7) requires that $\varrho \dot{\mathbf{u}} = \text{div} \mathbf{T}$, the Eshelby and momentum relations (3.16) and (3.17) yield, for each of the two phases, the relation $\text{div} \mathbf{C} - \varrho \dot{\mathbf{p}} = \varrho \text{grad} \left\{ \psi - \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}|^2 \right\}$, where we have used the assumed constancy of ϱ in each phase. This result, which is independent of constitution, shows that the internal body force \mathbf{f} in the configurational balance (3.7) has the explicit form

$$\mathbf{f} = -\varrho \text{grad} \left\{ \psi - \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}|^2 \right\}. \quad (3.24)$$

Thus, granted (3.24) and the Eshelby relation, the configurational force balance in bulk is a direct consequence of the standard force balance. On the other hand, as we shall see, *the interfacial configurational momentum balance is an independent balance*, not derivable from standard interfacial results.†

As a consequence of (3.24), we see that the internal configurational force \mathbf{f} arises as a response to *an inhomogeneous distribution of free and kinetic energy*.‡ Thus, roughly speaking, internal configurational forces characterize microphysical forces that act within the material as a response to energetic inhomogeneities. This need for internal configurational forces becomes primal when discussing sharp phase-interfaces: the interface in a two-phase system generally represents a surface of *discontinuity* (and hence inhomogeneity) of the free and kinetic energies.

Using (3.24), the Eshelby relation (3.16), the momentum relation (3.17), and the *bulk constitutive relations*, we find that the configurational stress \mathbf{C}^\pm and internal configurational force \mathbf{f}^\pm in the individual bulk phases are determined by the fields \mathbf{u} , ϑ , and p . As we shall see, interfacial counterparts of these fields, which we view as surface excess quantities, do require *independent constitutive specification*.

4. Interfacial kinematics

4.1. The interface \mathcal{S} . Superficial fields

We assume that the interface $\mathcal{S}(t)$ separating the phases is a smoothly evolving surface oriented by a *unit normal field* $\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x}, t)$. We write $V(\mathbf{x}, t)$ for the (scalar) *normal velocity* of $\mathcal{S}(t)$.

A *superficial field* is a smooth field defined on the interface for all time. A superficial vector field \mathbf{g} is *tangential* if $\mathbf{g} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0$. For a superficial tensor field \mathbb{B} we require that¶

$$\mathbb{B} \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{0}; \quad (4.1)$$

if, in addition, $\mathbb{B}^\top \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{0}$, then we say that \mathbb{B} is *fully tangential*, so that \mathbb{B} maps tangent vectors to tangent vectors. An example of a fully tangential tensor field is the *projection*

$$\mathbb{P} = \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{n} \otimes \mathbf{n} \quad (4.2)$$

onto \mathcal{S} ; clearly,

$$\mathbb{P} : \mathbb{P} = 2. \quad (4.3)$$

† Cf. the materials literature, where one often finds interfacial configurational balances determined via a minimum principle, assuming equilibrium, and then used as missing interface conditions for dynamical problems.

‡ And hence — because the free energy depends constitutively on the temperature — as a response to *inhomogeneous temperature and velocity fields*.

¶ A superficial tensor field would generally be defined at each $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}$ as a linear transformation of the tangent space at \mathbf{x} into \mathbb{R}^3 ; the requirement (4.1) allows us to consider \mathbb{B} at each point as a linear transformation of \mathbb{R}^3 into \mathbb{R}^3 .

Each superficial tensor field \mathbb{B} admits a decomposition of the form

$$\mathbb{B} = \mathbb{B}_{\text{tan}} + \mathbf{n} \otimes \mathbf{b}, \quad (4.4)$$

in which $\mathbb{B}_{\text{tan}} = \mathbb{P}\mathbb{B}$ is fully tangential and $\mathbf{b} = \mathbb{B}^\top \mathbf{n}$ is tangential. (The verification of this decomposition is straightforward: simply expand $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{B}$ using (4.2).)

4.2. Surface gradient and divergence

We write grad_S and div_S for the surface gradient and surface divergence on \mathcal{S} .

The curvature tensor \mathbb{K} defined by

$$\mathbb{K} = -\text{grad}_S \mathbf{n} \quad (4.5)$$

is fully tangential and symmetric, and

$$K = \text{tr} \mathbb{K} = \mathbb{P} : \mathbb{K} = -\text{div}_S \mathbf{n} \quad (4.6)$$

is the *total* (twice the mean) *curvature*. Then, by (4.2), we have the identity

$$\text{div}_S \mathbb{P} = K \mathbf{n}. \quad (4.7)$$

Further, the product rule yields the useful identities

$$\text{grad}_S (V \mathbf{n}) = \mathbf{n} \otimes \text{grad}_S V - V \mathbb{K} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{div}_S (V \mathbf{n}) = -KV \quad (4.8)$$

involving the interfacial normal, normal velocity, and curvature.

Let \mathbb{B} be a fully tangential tensor field. Then

$$\mathbf{n} \cdot \text{div}_S \mathbb{B} = \text{div}_S (\underbrace{\mathbb{B}^\top \mathbf{n}}_{= \mathbf{0}}) - \mathbb{B} : \text{grad}_S \mathbf{n},$$

and (4.5) yields the important identity

$$\mathbf{n} \cdot \text{div}_S \mathbb{B} = \mathbb{B} : \mathbb{K} \quad \text{for } \mathbb{B} \text{ fully tangential.} \quad (4.9)$$

We assume that each bulk field is smooth up to the interface from either side. We write

$$[[\Phi]] \quad \text{and} \quad \langle\langle \Phi \rangle\rangle$$

for the *jump* and *average* of a bulk field Φ across \mathcal{S} : $[[\Phi]]$ is the interfacial limit of Φ from the (+) phase (the phase into which \mathbf{n} points) minus its limit from the (-) phase; $\langle\langle \Phi \rangle\rangle$ is the average value of these two limits. Then, given bulk fields Φ and Λ , we have the important identity:

$$[[\Phi \Lambda]] = \langle\langle \Phi \rangle\rangle [[\Lambda]] + \langle\langle \Lambda \rangle\rangle [[\Phi]]. \quad (4.10)$$

4.3. Mass balance. Mass flow across the interface

The fields

$$\varrho^\pm (V - \mathbf{u}^\pm \cdot \mathbf{n}) \quad (4.11)$$

represent flows of mass at the two sides of the interface in the direction \mathbf{n} , and balance of mass requires that these be equal:

$$[[\varrho(V - \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n})]] = 0. \quad (4.12)$$

Thus, we may define the *mass flow* J across the interface (in the direction \mathbf{n}) by the relation $J = \varrho^\pm (V - \mathbf{u}^\pm \cdot \mathbf{n})$, so that

$$J = \langle\langle v \rangle\rangle^{-1} V^{\text{mig}}, \quad [[v]] J = -[[\mathbf{u}]] \cdot \mathbf{n}, \quad (4.13)$$

with

$$V^{\text{mig}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} V - \langle\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle\rangle \cdot \mathbf{n} \quad (4.14)$$

the *average migrational velocity* of the interface relative to the bulk material.

4.4. Smoothness of \mathbf{u} at the interface

We allow for the possibility that the densities of the phases differ and therefore, by (4.12) we must allow for the possibility that the normal components $\mathbf{u}^\pm \cdot \mathbf{n}$ of the interfacial limits \mathbf{u}^\pm of \mathbf{u} differ. On the other hand, we assume that

$$\mathbb{P}[\langle\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle\rangle] = \mathbf{0}, \quad (4.15)$$

so that the tangential components $\mathbb{P}\mathbf{u}^\pm$ of the interfacial limits \mathbf{u}^\pm of \mathbf{u} coincide. In addition, we assume that \mathbf{u} is smooth up to the interface from either side.

We write

$$\mathbb{L} = \text{grad}_{\mathcal{S}} \langle\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle\rangle = \langle\langle \mathbb{L} \rangle\rangle \mathbb{P} = \langle\langle \mathbb{D} + \mathbb{W} \rangle\rangle \mathbb{P} \quad (4.16)$$

for the *superficial velocity gradient* and

$$\mathbb{D} = \frac{1}{2} \{ \mathbb{P}\mathbb{L} + \mathbb{L}^\top \mathbb{P} \} = \mathbb{P} \langle\langle \mathbb{D} \rangle\rangle \mathbb{P} \quad (4.17)$$

the *superficial rate of stretch*. Then, for \mathbb{B} a tangential and symmetric superficial tensor field,

$$\mathbb{B} : \mathbb{L} = \mathbb{B} : \mathbb{D}. \quad (4.18)$$

Further, since \mathbb{D} is tangential,

$$\mathbb{P} : \mathbb{D} = \text{tr} \mathbb{D}. \quad (4.19)$$

4.5. Velocity fields

We let $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ denote a *velocity field* for \mathcal{S} ; that is, a velocity field describing the evolution of \mathcal{S} . Then the normal component of \mathbf{v} must satisfy

$$V = \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n}, \quad (4.20)$$

but the tangential part, $\mathbb{P}\mathbf{v}$, which is not intrinsic, *may be arbitrarily chosen*. The fields

$$\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}^\pm \quad \text{and} \quad V - \mathbf{u}^\pm \cdot \mathbf{n} \quad (4.21)$$

represent *migrational velocities of the interface relative to the material in each of the bulk phases*.

Consider an arbitrary migrating subsurface $\mathcal{A}(t)$ of $\mathcal{S}(t)$. To describe the migration of $\mathcal{A}(t)$, we introduce a field $\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ defined over $\partial\mathcal{A}(t)$ for all t . Compatibility then requires that

$$\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} \cdot \mathbf{n} = V \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} = V_{\partial\mathcal{A}}, \quad (4.22)$$

where $V_{\partial\mathcal{A}}$, which is intrinsic, is the scalar normal velocity of $\partial\mathcal{A}$ in the direction of its normal $\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}}$.

The motion of $\partial\mathcal{A}$ relative to the bulk material is described by the *migrational velocities* $\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} - \mathbf{u}^\pm$ and *average migrational velocity* $\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} - \langle\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle\rangle$. Further, bearing in mind that $\mathbf{u}^+ \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} = \mathbf{u}^- \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}}$,

$$V_{\partial\mathcal{A}}^{\text{mig}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} V_{\partial\mathcal{A}} - \mathbf{u}_{\text{tan}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} = V_{\partial\mathcal{A}} - \langle\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle\rangle \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} = V_{\partial\mathcal{A}} - \mathbf{u}^\pm \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} \quad (4.23)$$

represents the *normal migrational velocity* of $\partial\mathcal{A}$.

The component of $\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{A}}$ tangential to $\partial\mathcal{A}$ is not intrinsic and *may be arbitrarily chosen*. We require that the theory not depend on the velocity field $\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{A}}$ chosen to characterize the migration of $\partial\mathcal{A}$, and therefore that the theory be invariant under transformations of $\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{A}}$ of the form

$$\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} + \mathbf{t}, \quad \mathbf{t} \text{ tangent to } \partial\mathcal{A}. \quad (4.24)$$

4.6. Migrationally normal velocity field for \mathcal{S}

In discussing the formulation of integral balance laws for an interface $\mathcal{S}(t)$ migrating through the fluid, what is needed is a velocity field for \mathcal{S} that characterizes its *migration*. Specifically, we seek a single velocity field \mathbf{v} for \mathcal{S} that renders each of the migrational velocities $\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}^\pm$ normal. With this in mind, we let \mathbf{v}_{tan} and \mathbf{u}_{tan} , respectively, denote the tangential component of \mathbf{v} and the common tangential component of \mathbf{u}^+ and \mathbf{u}^- ,

$$\mathbf{v}_{\text{tan}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{P}\mathbf{v}, \quad \mathbf{u}_{\text{tan}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{P}\mathbf{u}^+ = \mathbb{P}\mathbf{u}^-, \quad (4.25)$$

and note that

$$\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}^\pm = \mathbf{v} - (\mathbf{u}^\pm \cdot \mathbf{n})\mathbf{n} - \mathbf{u}_{\text{tan}} = \underline{(V - \mathbf{u}^\pm \cdot \mathbf{n})\mathbf{n}} + (\mathbf{v}_{\text{tan}} - \mathbf{u}_{\text{tan}}),$$

so that, taking $\mathbf{v}_{\text{tan}} = \mathbf{u}_{\text{tan}}$, we arrive at a choice of velocity field \mathbf{v} for \mathcal{S} with each of its migrational velocities $\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}^\pm$ normal:

$$\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}^\pm = (V - \mathbf{u}^\pm \cdot \mathbf{n})\mathbf{n}. \quad (4.26)$$

Since $\mathbf{u}^\pm - (\mathbf{u}^\pm \cdot \mathbf{n})\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{u}_{\text{tan}}$, the resulting velocity field \mathbf{v} , called the *migrationally normal velocity-field* for \mathcal{S} , has the specific form

$$\mathbf{v} = V\mathbf{n} + \mathbf{u}_{\text{tan}} \quad (4.27)$$

and is important *because it is normal when computed relative to the material on either side of $\mathcal{S}(t)$* .

In view of (4.14), for \mathbf{v} the migrationally normal velocity-field for \mathcal{S} , the migrational velocity $\mathbf{v} - \langle\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle\rangle$ satisfies

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \mathbf{v} - \langle\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle\rangle &= V^{\text{mig}}\mathbf{n}, \\ \text{grad}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{v} - \langle\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle\rangle) &= \mathbf{n} \otimes \text{grad}_{\mathcal{S}}V^{\text{mig}} - V^{\text{mig}}\mathbb{K}, \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (4.28)$$

Further, by (4.22), (4.23), and (4.26), we also have the identity

$$(\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} - \mathbf{v}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} = (\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} - \mathbf{u}^\pm) \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} - \overbrace{(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}^\pm) \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}}}^{=0} = V_{\partial\mathcal{A}}^{\text{mig}}. \quad (4.29)$$

4.7. Migrationally normal time-derivative following \mathcal{S}

Defining a meaningful time-derivative of, say, a superficial scalar field $\gamma(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is a nontrivial matter: note that the standard partial derivative $\partial\gamma/\partial t$ is not well defined, because a point \mathbf{x} on $\mathcal{S}(t_0)$ need not lie on $\mathcal{S}(t)$ for t close to t_0 . For our purposes what is needed is a time-derivative that, in some sense, follows the migration of the interface.

With this in mind, let \mathbf{v} denote a velocity field for \mathcal{S} . Then given any time t_0 and any point \mathbf{x}_0 on $\mathcal{S}(t_0)$, the solution $\mathbf{z}(t)$ of

$$\frac{d\mathbf{z}(t)}{dt} = \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{z}(t), t), \quad \mathbf{z}(t_0) = \mathbf{x}_0 \quad (4.30)$$

represents the trajectory of a “particle” that, at each time, lies on \mathcal{S} and has velocity

\mathbf{v} . In particular, let \mathbf{v} denote the *migrationaly normal velocity field* for \mathcal{S} (cf. (4.27)) and let

$$\overset{\circ}{\gamma}(\mathbf{x}_0, t_0) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left. \frac{d\gamma(\mathbf{z}(t), t)}{dt} \right|_{t=t_0}; \quad (4.31)$$

the field $\overset{\circ}{\gamma}$ defined in this manner is referred to as the *migrationaly normal time-derivative of γ following \mathcal{S}* .[†]

4.8. Two-phase migrating control volumes

Let $\mathcal{R}(t)$ denote an arbitrary *two-phase migrating control volume*; that is, a migrating control volume whose interior intersects the interface, so that the portion of $\mathcal{S}(t)$ in $\mathcal{R}(t)$,

$$\mathcal{A}(t) = \mathcal{R}(t) \cap \mathcal{S}(t),$$

is a smoothly evolving subsurface of $\mathcal{S}(t)$. Let $\mathcal{R}^+(t)$ and $\mathcal{R}^-(t)$ be the portions of $\mathcal{R}(t)$ that lie in the + and - phases, respectively, so that, for \mathbf{m} the outward unit normal to $\partial\mathcal{R}(t)$:

- (i) $\mathcal{R}^+(t)$ and $\mathcal{R}^-(t)$ are migrating control volumes;
- (ii) the boundary $\partial\mathcal{R}^\pm(t)$ of $\mathcal{R}^\pm(t)$ is the union of $\mathcal{A}(t)$ and a surface $\partial\mathcal{R}_{\text{blk}}^\pm(t)$ that does not intersect the interface;
- (iii) the outward unit normals to $\partial\mathcal{R}^+$ and $\partial\mathcal{R}^-$ are

$$\mathbf{m}|_{\partial\mathcal{R}^+} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{m} & \text{on } \partial\mathcal{R}_{\text{blk}}^+, \\ -\mathbf{n} & \text{on } \mathcal{A}, \end{cases} \quad \mathbf{m}|_{\partial\mathcal{R}^-} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{m} & \text{on } \partial\mathcal{R}_{\text{blk}}^-, \\ \mathbf{n} & \text{on } \mathcal{A}; \end{cases} \quad (4.32)$$

- (iv) given a velocity field $\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}}$ for $\partial\mathcal{R}$, the associated velocity fields for $\partial\mathcal{R}^+$ and $\partial\mathcal{R}^-$ are given by

$$\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}^+} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}} & \text{on } \partial\mathcal{R}_{\text{blk}}^+, \\ \mathbf{v} & \text{on } \mathcal{A}, \end{cases} \quad \mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}^-} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}} & \text{on } \partial\mathcal{R}_{\text{blk}}^-, \\ \mathbf{v} & \text{on } \mathcal{A}. \end{cases} \quad (4.33)$$

Note that

$$\mathcal{R}(t) = \mathcal{R}^+(t) \cup \mathcal{R}^-(t) \quad (4.34)$$

represents a *decomposition of $\mathcal{R}(t)$ into single-phase migrating control volumes $\mathcal{R}^+(t)$ and $\mathcal{R}^-(t)$* , because $\mathcal{R}^+(t)$ contains only plus-phase material, and similarly for $\mathcal{R}^-(t)$. The theory for the interface is based on two-phase migrating control volumes $\mathcal{R}(t)$ and — because the intersection of $\partial\mathcal{R}$ with \mathcal{A} is a set of zero area — involves integrals $\int_{\partial\mathcal{R}} \dots da$ no different than their bulk-theoretic counterparts. Our localization of such integrals to the interface is based on decompositions of the form

$$\int_{\partial\mathcal{R}} \dots da = \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}^-} \dots da + \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}^+} \dots da + \int_{\mathcal{A}} \dots da.$$

We refer to any such decomposition as the *distillation* of $\int_{\partial\mathcal{R}} \dots da$, because each of \mathcal{R}^\pm contains only single-phase bulk material. Distillations of this form allow for the application of bulk results to eliminate terms of the form $\int_{\partial\mathcal{R}^\pm} \dots da$ in any given balance (or imbalance), thereby reducing each of the terms $\int_{\partial\mathcal{R}} \dots da$ to an interfacial term $\int_{\mathcal{A}} \dots da$.

[†] This notion as well as that of a migrationaly normal velocity field are introduced by Cermelli, Fried & Gurtin (2004), who show that $\overset{\circ}{\gamma}$ is related to the (standard) normal time derivative $\overset{\square}{\gamma}$ following \mathcal{S} through the relation $\overset{\circ}{\gamma} = \overset{\square}{\gamma} + \mathbf{u}_{\text{tan}} \cdot \text{grad}_{\mathcal{S}} \gamma$; $\overset{\square}{\gamma}$ is based on the use of *normal trajectories* determined via (4.30) using the vector normal-velocity $\mathbf{v} = V\mathbf{n}$.

5. Interfacial mechanics

In this section we introduce basic balances for standard and configurational forces that account for forces within the interface. We also discuss the power expenditures associated with the effective standard and configurational surface tractions on a two-phase migrating control volume. The localization of the standard and configurational force balances to points on the interface uses a tensorial form of the surface divergence theorem. Further, to develop an intrinsic expression for the power, we use the surface divergence theorem in yet another form.

SURFACE DIVERGENCE THEOREM Let \mathbb{B} be a superficial tensor field, and let \mathbf{h} be a superficial vector field. Then the *surface divergence theorem* asserts that, for any subsurface \mathcal{A} of \mathcal{S} ,

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \int_{\partial\mathcal{A}} \mathbb{B}\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} \, ds &= \int_{\mathcal{A}} \operatorname{div}_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{B} \, da, \\ \int_{\partial\mathcal{A}} \mathbb{B}\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} \cdot \mathbf{h} \, ds &= \int_{\mathcal{A}} \left\{ \mathbf{h} \cdot \operatorname{div}_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{B} + \mathbb{B} : \operatorname{grad}_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbf{h} \right\} da. \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (5.1)$$

These forms of the surface divergence theorem are based on the following more standard form in which \mathbf{g} is a *tangential* superficial vector field:

$$\int_{\partial\mathcal{A}} \mathbf{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} \, ds = \int_{\mathcal{A}} \operatorname{div}_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbf{g} \, da. \quad (5.2)$$

To derive the relations in (5.1), we simply let \mathbf{a} be an *arbitrary constant vector* and work with left sides

$$\int_{\partial\mathcal{A}} (\mathbb{B}^{\top} \mathbf{a}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} \, ds \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\partial\mathcal{A}} (\mathbb{B}^{\top} \mathbf{h}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} \, ds,$$

using (5.2).

5.1. Standard momentum and moment of momentum balance

In addition to the bulk Cauchy stress \mathbf{T} , we account for a *standard surface stress* \mathbb{T} , which is a superficial tensor field on \mathcal{S} . Let $\mathcal{R}(t)$ be an arbitrary two-phase migrating control volume, with $\mathcal{A}(t)$ the portion of $\mathcal{S}(t)$ in $\mathcal{R}(t)$. Then the integral of the traction $\mathbb{T}\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}}$ over $\partial\mathcal{A}(t)$ represents the force exerted on $\mathcal{R}(t)$ by the portion of \mathcal{S} exterior to $\mathcal{R}(t)$; therefore the *balances of standard momentum and moment of momentum* for $\mathcal{R}(t)$ have the form[†]

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{R}(t)} \varrho \mathbf{u} \, dv = \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}(t)} \left\{ \mathbf{T}\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{u}J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} \right\} da + \int_{\partial\mathcal{A}(t)} \mathbb{T}\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} \, ds \quad (5.3)$$

and

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{R}(t)} (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{0}) \times \varrho \mathbf{u} \, dv = \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}(t)} (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{0}) \times \left\{ \mathbf{T}\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{u}J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} \right\} da + \int_{\partial\mathcal{A}(t)} (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{0}) \times \mathbb{T}\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} \, ds. \quad (5.4)$$

Consider the momentum balance (5.3). The localization of this balance hinges on the

[†] Bear in mind that we neglect interfacial mass.

distillation of $\int_{\partial\mathcal{R}} \{\mathbf{T}\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{u}J_{\partial\mathcal{R}}\} da$. To achieve this distillation, we first note that, by virtue of (4.32),

$$\int_{\partial\mathcal{R}(t)} \mathbf{T}\mathbf{m} da = \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}^+(t)} \mathbf{T}\mathbf{m} da + \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}^-(t)} \mathbf{T}\mathbf{m} da + \int_{\mathcal{A}(t)} \llbracket \mathbf{T} \rrbracket \mathbf{n} da; \quad (5.5)$$

Next, to distill the term $\int_{\partial\mathcal{R}} \mathbf{u}J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} da$, we note that, by (3.3), (4.13)₁, (4.32), and (4.33),

$$J_{\partial\mathcal{R}^+} = \begin{cases} J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} & \text{on } \partial\mathcal{R}_{\text{blk}}^+, \\ -J & \text{on } \mathcal{A}, \end{cases} \quad J_{\partial\mathcal{R}^-} = \begin{cases} J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} & \text{on } \partial\mathcal{R}_{\text{blk}}^-, \\ J & \text{on } \mathcal{A}, \end{cases} \quad (5.6)$$

so that, bearing in mind (4.13)₂ and (4.15),

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}(t)} \mathbf{u}J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} da &= \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}^+(t)} \mathbf{u}J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} da + \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}^-(t)} \mathbf{u}J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} da + \int_{\mathcal{A}(t)} \llbracket \mathbf{u} \rrbracket J da \\ &= \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}^+(t)} \mathbf{u}J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} da + \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}^-(t)} \mathbf{u}J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} da - \int_{\mathcal{A}(t)} J^2 \llbracket v \rrbracket \mathbf{n} da; \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

Trivially $(d/dt) \int_{\mathcal{R}} \varrho \mathbf{u} dv = (d/dt) \int_{\mathcal{R}^+} \varrho \mathbf{u} dv + (d/dt) \int_{\mathcal{R}^-} \varrho \mathbf{u} dv$; thus, appealing to (5.5) and (5.7), we may rewrite (5.3) in the form

$$\begin{aligned} &\underbrace{\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{R}^+(t)} \varrho \mathbf{u} dv - \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}^+(t)} \{\mathbf{T}\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{u}J_{\partial\mathcal{R}}\} da}_{= \mathbf{0} \text{ by (3.5)}_1} \\ &\quad \underbrace{\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{R}^-(t)} \varrho \mathbf{u} dv - \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}^-(t)} \{\mathbf{T}\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{u}J_{\partial\mathcal{R}}\} da}_{= \mathbf{0} \text{ by (3.5)}_1} \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{A}(t)} \{\llbracket \mathbf{T} \rrbracket \mathbf{n} - J^2 \llbracket v \rrbracket \mathbf{n}\} da + \int_{\partial\mathcal{A}(t)} \mathbb{T} \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} ds; \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

therefore, we have the first of the interfacial balances

$$\left. \begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathcal{A}(t)} \{\llbracket \mathbf{T} \rrbracket \mathbf{n} - J^2 \llbracket v \rrbracket \mathbf{n}\} da + \int_{\partial\mathcal{A}(t)} \mathbb{T} \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} ds = \mathbf{0}, \\ &\int_{\mathcal{A}(t)} (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{0}) \times \{\llbracket \mathbf{T} \rrbracket \mathbf{n} - J^2 \llbracket v \rrbracket \mathbf{n}\} da + \int_{\partial\mathcal{A}(t)} (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{0}) \times \mathbb{T} \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} ds = \mathbf{0}, \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (5.9)$$

and the second follows similarly. Given any migrating subsurface $\mathcal{A}(t)$ of $\mathcal{S}(t)$, there is at least one two-phase migrating control volume $\mathcal{R}(t)$ such that $\mathcal{A}(t) = \mathcal{R}(t) \cap \mathcal{S}(t)$; indeed, choose $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small and let $\mathcal{R}(t) = \mathcal{R}_\delta(t)$ be the δ -pillbox about $\mathcal{A}(t)$:

$$\mathcal{R}_\delta(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y} \pm \lambda \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{y}, t), \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{A}(t), |\lambda| \leq \delta\}. \quad (5.10)$$

Thus the balances (5.9) must be satisfied for all migrating subsurface $\mathcal{A}(t)$ of $\mathcal{S}(t)$.

Localizing (5.9) we are led to the relations

$$\text{div}_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{T} + \llbracket \mathbf{T} \rrbracket \mathbf{n} = J^2 \llbracket v \rrbracket \mathbf{n}, \quad \mathbb{T} = \mathbb{T}^\top, \quad (5.11)$$

and the second of these implies that \mathbb{T} is *fully tangential*.

The first of (5.11) follows on applying the surface divergence theorem in the form (5.1)₁ to (5.9)₁. To derive the second, let \mathbf{a} an *arbitrary constant vector*, let $(\mathbf{a}\times)$ denote the tensor defined by $(\mathbf{a}\times)\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{a}\times\mathbf{b}$ for every vector \mathbf{b} , and note that $\text{grad}_s(\mathbf{a}\times\mathbf{x}) = (\mathbf{a}\times)(\text{grad}\mathbf{x})\mathbb{P} = (\mathbf{a}\times)\mathbb{P}$. Then, by (5.1)₂ and (5.11)₁,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{a}\cdot\int_{\partial\mathcal{A}(t)}\mathbf{x}\times\mathbb{T}\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}}\,ds &= \int_{\partial\mathcal{A}(t)}(\mathbf{a}\times\mathbf{x})\cdot\mathbb{T}\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}}\,ds \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{A}(t)}\left\{\text{div}_s\mathbb{T}\cdot(\mathbf{a}\times\mathbf{x}) + \mathbb{T}:\text{grad}_s(\mathbf{a}\times\mathbf{x})\right\}\,da \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{A}(t)}\left\{\mathbf{a}\cdot(\mathbf{x}\times\text{div}_s\mathbb{T}) + \mathbb{T}:\left((\mathbf{a}\times)\mathbb{P}\right)\right\}\,da \\ &= -\mathbf{a}\cdot\int_{\mathcal{A}(t)}\mathbf{x}\times\left\{\llbracket\mathbb{T}\rrbracket\mathbf{n} - J^2\llbracket v\rrbracket\mathbf{n}\right\}\,da + \int_{\mathcal{A}(t)}\mathbb{T}:\left\{(\mathbf{a}\times)\mathbb{P}\right\}\,da. \end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

Further, since \mathbb{T} is a superficial tensor, $\mathbb{T}:\left\{(\mathbf{a}\times)\mathbb{P}\right\} = (\mathbb{T}\mathbb{P}):(\mathbf{a}\times) = \mathbb{T}:(\mathbf{a}\times)$ and, by (5.9)₂ and (5.12), $\int_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbb{T}:(\mathbf{a}\times)\,da = 0$. Therefore, since \mathcal{A} is arbitrary, $\mathbb{T}:(\mathbf{a}\times) = 0$ for every \mathbf{a} . But any skew tensor may be written in the form $(\mathbf{a}\times)$; thus \mathbb{T} is symmetric and (5.11)₂ is satisfied.

Since \mathbb{T} is fully tangential, (4.9) implies that $\mathbf{n}\cdot\text{div}_s\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{T}:\mathbb{K}$ thereby rendering the normal part of the standard momentum balance (5.11)₁ of the form

$$\mathbb{T}:\mathbb{K} + \mathbf{n}\cdot\llbracket\mathbb{T}\rrbracket\mathbf{n} = J^2\llbracket v\rrbracket. \quad (5.13)$$

5.2. Configurational momentum balance

Next, in addition to the stress tensor \mathbf{C} and the internal body force \mathbf{f} in bulk, we allow for a *configurational surface stress* \mathbb{C} , which is a superficial tensor field on \mathcal{S} , and an internal configurational surface force \mathbf{f}^x , with \mathbf{f}^x a vector field on \mathcal{S} .

We posit a balance law for configurational forces asserting that, for any two-phase migrating control volume,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathcal{R}(t)}\varrho\mathbf{p}\,dv = \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}(t)}\left\{\mathbf{C}\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{p}J_{\partial\mathcal{R}}\right\}\,da + \int_{\mathcal{R}(t)}\mathbf{f}\,dv + \int_{\partial\mathcal{A}(t)}\mathbb{C}\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}}\,ds + \int_{\mathcal{A}(t)}\mathbf{f}^x\,da \quad (5.14)$$

(cf. Footnote †, page 19). Then, arguing as we did in going from (5.5) to (5.9)₁ and making use of the momentum relation (3.17), we obtain

$$\int_{\mathcal{A}(t)}\left\{\llbracket\mathbf{C}\rrbracket\mathbf{n} + J^2\llbracket v\rrbracket\mathbf{n}\right\}\,da + \int_{\partial\mathcal{A}(t)}\mathbb{C}\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}}\,ds + \int_{\mathcal{A}(t)}\mathbf{f}^x\,da = \mathbf{0}, \quad (5.15)$$

for any migrating subsurface $\mathcal{A}(t) \subset \mathcal{S}(t)$. Thus

$$\text{div}_s\mathbb{C} + \mathbf{f}^x + \llbracket\mathbf{C}\rrbracket\mathbf{n} + J^2\llbracket v\rrbracket\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (5.16)$$

We let

$$f = \mathbf{f}^x\cdot\mathbf{n} \quad (5.17)$$

denote the *normal internal configurational force* on the interface. The balance (5.16) may

then be decomposed into a *normal configurational momentum balance*

$$\mathbf{n} \cdot \operatorname{div}_S \mathbb{C} + f + \mathbf{n} \cdot \llbracket \mathbb{C} \rrbracket \mathbf{n} + J^2 \llbracket v \rrbracket = \mathbf{0} \quad (5.18)$$

and a tangential balance that is irrelevant to what follows (cf. Remark (ii) following (6.20)).

Finally, in view of (4.4), the configurational stress admits the decomposition

$$\mathbb{C} = \mathbb{C}_{\text{tan}} + \mathbf{n} \otimes \mathbf{c}, \quad (5.19)$$

in which \mathbb{C}_{tan} , which is fully tangential, characterizes congruational stress within the interface, while the tangential vector \mathbf{c} characterizes *congruational surface shear*; i.e., for any tangent vector $\boldsymbol{\nu}$,

$$\mathbb{C}\boldsymbol{\nu} = \mathbb{C}_{\text{tan}}\boldsymbol{\nu} + (\mathbf{c} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu})\mathbf{n}.$$

Next, since

$$\mathbf{n} \cdot \operatorname{div}_S (\mathbf{n} \otimes \mathbf{c}) = \operatorname{div}_S \mathbf{c} + \underbrace{\mathbf{n} \cdot ((\operatorname{grad}_S \mathbf{n})\mathbf{c})}_{= -\mathbb{K}\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{c} = 0} = \operatorname{div}_S \mathbf{c},$$

we may use (4.9) and (5.19) to write the normal configurational momentum balance (5.18) in the form

$$\operatorname{div}_S \mathbf{c} + \mathbb{C}_{\text{tan}} : \mathbb{K} + f + \mathbf{n} \cdot \llbracket \mathbb{C} \rrbracket \mathbf{n} + J^2 \llbracket v \rrbracket = \mathbf{0}. \quad (5.20)$$

5.3. Power expended by standard and congruational forces

Total power expenditure

Let $\mathcal{A}(t)$ be a migrating subsurface of $\mathcal{S}(t)$. Then guided by the discussion of §3, we take the observed velocity $\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{A}}$ of $\partial\mathcal{A}$ as the power conjugate velocity for the standard traction $\mathbb{T}\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}}$ on $\partial\mathcal{A}$. For the congruational traction $\mathbb{C}\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}}$, a velocity for the migration of \mathcal{A} would be appropriate, but there are two values of the velocity \mathbf{u} at the surface. For that reason it seems reasonable to use the *average* migrational velocity

$$\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} - \langle\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle\rangle$$

of $\partial\mathcal{A}$ as the appropriate power conjugate velocity for $\mathbb{C}\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}}$.

Let $\mathcal{R}(t)$ denote an arbitrary two-phase migrating control volume, with $\mathcal{A}(t)$ the portion of $\mathcal{S}(t)$ in $\mathcal{R}(t)$. The integral that represents $W(\mathcal{R}(t))$ in (3.10) here gives the power expended on that portion of $\partial\mathcal{R}(t)$ that lies in the bulk phases; for that reason we write the power expended on $\mathcal{R}(t)$ in the form[†]

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\text{tot}}(\mathcal{R}(t)) &= \int_{\partial\mathcal{A}(t)} \left\{ \mathbb{T}\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} + \mathbb{C}\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} \cdot (\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} - \langle\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle\rangle) \right\} ds \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\int_{\partial\mathcal{R}(t)} \left\{ (\mathbb{T}\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{u}J_{\partial\mathcal{R}}) \cdot \mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}} + (\mathbb{C}\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{u}J_{\partial\mathcal{R}}) \cdot (\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}} - \mathbf{u}) \right\} da}_{W(\mathcal{R}(t))}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.21)$$

Interfacial power expenditure. Pre-Eshelby relation

We continue to use the notation and terminology of §4.8.

[†] In writing (5.21), we utilize the momentum relation (3.17). Because the congruational surface force \mathbf{f}^x is *internal*, it does not enter the power expenditure (5.21).

The term $W(\mathcal{R}(t))$ leads to interfacial contributions. To determine those contributions we first use (4.32), (4.33), and (5.6) to obtain the distillations

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}(t)} \left\{ \mathbf{T}\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{u}J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} \right\} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}} \, da &= \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}^+(t)} \left\{ \mathbf{T}\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{u}J_{\partial\mathcal{R}^+} \right\} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}^+} \, da \\ &+ \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}^-(t)} \left\{ \mathbf{T}\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{u}J_{\partial\mathcal{R}^-} \right\} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}^-} \, da + \int_{\mathcal{A}(t)} \overbrace{\left\{ \llbracket \mathbf{T} \rrbracket \mathbf{n} - J^2 \llbracket v \rrbracket \mathbf{n} \right\}}^{= -\operatorname{div}_s \mathbb{T} \text{ by (5.11)}_1} \cdot \mathbf{v} \, da \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}(t)} \left\{ \mathbf{C}\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{u}J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} \right\} \cdot (\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}} - \mathbf{u}) \, da &= \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}^+(t)} \left\{ \mathbf{C}\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{u}J_{\partial\mathcal{R}^+} \right\} \cdot (\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}^+} - \mathbf{u}) \, da \\ &+ \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}^-(t)} \left\{ \mathbf{C}\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{u}J_{\partial\mathcal{R}^-} \right\} \cdot (\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}^-} - \mathbf{u}) \, da + \int_{\mathcal{A}(t)} \llbracket (\mathbf{C}\mathbf{n} - \mathbf{u}J) \cdot (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}) \rrbracket \, da \end{aligned}$$

These distillations yield the decomposition

$$W(\mathcal{R}(t)) = W(\mathcal{R}^+(t)) + W(\mathcal{R}^-(t)) - \int_{\mathcal{A}(t)} \left\{ \mathbf{v} \cdot \operatorname{div}_s \mathbb{T} - \llbracket (\mathbf{C}\mathbf{n} - \mathbf{u}J) \cdot (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}) \rrbracket \right\} \, da;$$

(5.21) therefore becomes

$$W_{\text{tot}}(\mathcal{R}(t)) = W(\mathcal{R}^+(t)) + W(\mathcal{R}^-(t)) + w(\mathcal{A}(t)), \quad (5.22)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} w(\mathcal{A}(t)) &= \underbrace{\int_{\partial\mathcal{A}(t)} \left\{ \mathbb{T}\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} + \mathbb{C}\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} \cdot (\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} - \langle\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle\rangle) \right\} \, ds}_{w^*(\mathcal{A}(t))} \\ &\quad - \int_{\mathcal{A}(t)} \left\{ \mathbf{v} \cdot \operatorname{div}_s \mathbb{T} - \llbracket (\mathbf{C}\mathbf{n} - \mathbf{u}J) \cdot (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}) \rrbracket \right\} \, da \quad (5.23) \end{aligned}$$

the *interfacial power expenditure* for the migrating subsurface $\mathcal{A}(t)$.

We assume that the intrinsicity hypothesis (b) (page 8) applies also for two-phase migrating control volumes. In view of the bulk Eshelby relation (3.16) and the momentum relation (3.17), it follows that $W(\mathcal{R}^+)$ and $W(\mathcal{R}^-)$ are independent of the velocity fields $\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}^+}$ and $\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{R}^-}$ for $\partial\mathcal{R}^+$ and $\partial\mathcal{R}^-$. Thus, by (5.22), intrinsicity is equivalent to the stipulation that

$$w(\mathcal{A}(t)) \text{ be independent of the choice of observed velocity field } \mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} \text{ chosen to} \quad (\ddagger)$$

characterize the migration of $\mathcal{A}(t)$

(cf. (#) on page 12). Equivalently, by (5.23), we require that $w^*(\mathcal{A})$ be invariant under all transformations of the form (4.24); thus necessary and sufficient that (\ddagger) be satisfied is that the term $w^*(\mathcal{A})$ have this invariance, or, equivalently, that

$$\int_{\partial\mathcal{A}} \mathbf{t} \cdot \left\{ \mathbb{T}\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} + \mathbb{C}\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} \right\} \, ds = \mathbf{0} \quad (5.24)$$

for all subsurfaces \mathcal{A} of \mathcal{S} and all fields \mathbf{t} tangential to $\partial\mathcal{A}$. Recalling that \mathbb{T} is fully tangential and noting that only the fully tangential part \mathbb{C}_{tan} of \mathbb{C} is affected by (5.24), we see that this requirement is equivalent to the requirement that the superficial field $\mathbb{B} = \mathbb{T} + \mathbb{C}$ satisfy

$$\mathbf{t} \cdot \mathbb{B}\boldsymbol{\nu} = 0$$

at any point \mathbf{x} of \mathcal{S} whenever \mathbf{t} and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ are orthogonal and tangent to \mathcal{S} at \mathbf{x} . Arguing as in the derivation of (3.19), we find that there must exist a superficial scalar field φ such that

$$\mathbb{C}_{\text{tan}} = \varphi\mathbb{P} - \mathbb{T}, \quad (5.25)$$

which represents a *pre-Eshelby relation* for the interface that is analogous to the bulk relation (3.19). In the absence of configurational surface stress $\mathbb{T} = \varphi\mathbb{P}$, so that φ plays the role of surface tension. But this is not the case when both configurational and standard surface stresses are present, for then, by (5.25), φ plays the role of a ‘‘surface tension’’ for the combined stress $\mathbb{T} + \mathbb{C}_{\text{tan}}$.

Using (4.20), (4.22)₁, (5.19), and (5.25) we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{T}\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} + \mathbb{C}\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} \cdot (\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} - \langle\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle\rangle) &= \mathbb{T}\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} \cdot \mathbf{v} + \mathbb{C}\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} \cdot (\mathbf{v} - \langle\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle\rangle) + (\mathbb{T} + \mathbb{C})\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} \cdot (\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} - \mathbf{v}) \\ &= \mathbb{T}\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} \cdot \mathbf{v} + \mathbb{C}\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} \cdot (\mathbf{v} - \langle\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle\rangle) + \varphi(\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} - \mathbf{v}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} + \underbrace{(\mathbf{c} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}})(\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} - \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{n}}_{=0}, \end{aligned}$$

and thus, by (5.1)₂, that

$$\begin{aligned} w^*(\mathcal{A}(t)) - \int_{\partial\mathcal{A}(t)} \varphi(\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} - \mathbf{v}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} \, ds &= \int_{\partial\mathcal{A}(t)} \left\{ \mathbb{T}\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} \cdot \mathbf{v} + \mathbb{C}\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} \cdot (\mathbf{v} - \langle\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle\rangle) \right\} ds \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{A}(t)} \left\{ \mathbf{v} \cdot \text{div}_S \mathbb{T} + (\mathbf{v} - \langle\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle\rangle) \cdot \text{div}_S \mathbb{C} + \mathbb{T} : \text{grad}_S \mathbf{v} + \mathbb{C} : \text{grad}_S (\mathbf{v} - \langle\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle\rangle) \right\} da. \end{aligned} \quad (5.26)$$

Further, noting that, by (4.10), (4.13)₁, and (4.15),

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket (\mathbf{C}\mathbf{n} - \mathbf{u}J) \cdot (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}) \rrbracket &= \llbracket (\mathbf{C}\mathbf{n} - \mathbf{u}J) \cdot (\mathbf{v} - \langle\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle\rangle) + \langle\langle (\mathbf{C}\mathbf{n} - \mathbf{u}J) \cdot [\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}] \rangle\rangle \rrbracket \\ &= \llbracket \mathbf{C}\mathbf{n} - \mathbf{u}J \rrbracket \cdot (\mathbf{v} - \langle\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle\rangle) - \langle\langle \mathbf{C}\mathbf{n} - \mathbf{u}J \rrbracket \cdot [\mathbf{u}] \rangle\rangle \\ &= \llbracket \mathbf{C}\mathbf{n} - \mathbf{u}J \rrbracket \cdot (\mathbf{v} - \langle\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle\rangle) + J \llbracket v \rrbracket (\mathbf{n} \cdot \langle\langle \mathbf{C} \rangle\rangle \mathbf{n} - J \langle\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle\rangle \cdot \mathbf{n}), \end{aligned}$$

and that, by (5.19), (5.25), and (4.16)–(4.18),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{T} : \text{grad}_S \mathbf{v} + \mathbb{C} : \text{grad}_S (\mathbf{v} - \langle\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle\rangle) \\ &= \underbrace{(\mathbb{T} + \mathbb{C}_{\text{tan}}) : \text{grad}_S \mathbf{v}}_{= \varphi \text{div}_S \mathbf{v}} + (\mathbf{n} \otimes \mathbf{c}) : \text{grad}_S (\mathbf{v} - \langle\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle\rangle) - \underbrace{\mathbb{C}_{\text{tan}} : \text{grad}_S \langle\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle\rangle}_{= \mathbb{C}_{\text{tan}} : \mathbb{D}}, \end{aligned}$$

we find, on using (5.26) in (5.23) and appealing to (4.13) and the force balances (5.11)

and (5.16), that

$$\begin{aligned} w(\mathcal{A}(t)) &= \int_{\partial\mathcal{A}(t)} \varphi(\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} - \mathbf{v}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} \, ds + \int_{\mathcal{A}(t)} \left\{ \varphi \operatorname{div}_S \mathbf{v} - \mathbb{C}_{\text{tan}} : \mathbb{D} - \mathbf{f}^x \cdot (\mathbf{v} - \langle \mathbf{u} \rangle) \right\} da \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathcal{A}(t)} \left\{ (\mathbf{n} \otimes \mathbf{c}) : \operatorname{grad}_S (\mathbf{v} - \langle \mathbf{u} \rangle) + J \llbracket v \rrbracket (\mathbf{n} \cdot \langle \mathbf{C} \rangle \mathbf{n} - J \langle \mathbf{u} \rangle \cdot \mathbf{n}) \right\} da. \end{aligned} \quad (5.27)$$

We henceforth require that \mathbf{v} is the migrationally normal velocity-field for \mathcal{S} as defined in (4.27), so that, recalling (4.23), (4.28), and (4.8):

$$(\mathbf{v}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} - \mathbf{v}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial\mathcal{A}} = V_{\partial\mathcal{A}}^{\text{mig}}, \quad \mathbf{v} - \langle \mathbf{u} \rangle = V^{\text{mig}} \mathbf{n}, \quad \operatorname{div}_S \mathbf{v} = \operatorname{div}_S \mathbf{u}_{\text{tan}} - KV. \quad (5.28)$$

Hence, by (4.13) and (4.28)₂,

$$(\mathbf{n} \otimes \mathbf{c}) : \operatorname{grad}_S (\mathbf{v} - \langle \mathbf{u} \rangle) = \mathbf{c} \cdot \operatorname{grad}_S V^{\text{mig}}, \quad \mathbf{f}^x \cdot (\mathbf{v} - \langle \mathbf{u} \rangle) = \langle v \rangle fJ, \quad (5.29)$$

and (5.27) takes the intrinsic form

$$\begin{aligned} w(\mathcal{A}(t)) &= \int_{\partial\mathcal{A}(t)} \varphi V_{\partial\mathcal{A}}^{\text{mig}} \, ds \\ &\quad - \int_{\mathcal{A}(t)} \left\{ \varphi (KV - \operatorname{div}_S \mathbf{u}_{\text{tan}}) + \mathbb{C}_{\text{tan}} : \mathbb{D} - \mathbf{c} \cdot \operatorname{grad}_S V^{\text{mig}} + FJ \right\} da, \end{aligned} \quad (5.30)$$

with

$$F = \langle v \rangle f - \llbracket v \rrbracket \mathbf{n} \cdot (\langle \mathbf{C} \rangle \mathbf{n} - J \langle \mathbf{u} \rangle \cdot \mathbf{n}). \quad (5.31)$$

The relation (5.30) represents the final form of the expended power.

6. Interfacial forms of the first two laws

6.1. Global statements of the first two laws

In this subsection we introduce global statements of the first two laws appropriate to a migrating control volume that contains a portion of the interface. Here we find it most useful to use appropriate generalizations of the bulk laws in configurational form as given in (3.10) and (3.11).

We assume that the temperature ϑ is continuous across the interface, viz.

$$\llbracket \vartheta \rrbracket = 0. \quad (6.1)$$

The restriction of ϑ to \mathcal{S} then represents the temperature of the interface. We endow the interface with *internal energy* and *entropy* (densities) ε^x and η^x , but neglect interfacial heat flux. We write ψ^x for the *interfacial free energy*

$$\psi^x = \varepsilon^x - \vartheta \eta^x. \quad (6.2)$$

Let $\mathcal{A}(t)$ be an arbitrary migrating subsurface of $\mathcal{S}(t)$. Consider the first two laws in bulk as expressed by (3.10) and (3.11), and, in particular, the terms

$$\int_{\partial\mathcal{R}(t)} \vartheta \eta J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} \, da \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}(t)} \eta J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} \, da, \quad (6.3)$$

which represent flows of heat and entropy induced by the migration of $\partial\mathcal{R}$. Guided by (6.3), we view

$$\int_{\partial\mathcal{A}(t)} \vartheta\eta^x V_{\partial\mathcal{A}}^{\text{mig}} ds \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\partial\mathcal{A}(t)} \eta^x V_{\partial\mathcal{A}}^{\text{mig}} ds,$$

respectively, as *flows of heat and entropy induced by the migration of $\partial\mathcal{A}$* . We use $V_{\partial\mathcal{A}}^{\text{mig}}$ (cf. (4.23)) — the normal migrational velocity of $\partial\mathcal{A}$ — because we do not allow for mass flow *within* the interface.

Then, given any two-phase migrating control volume $\mathcal{R}(t)$, with $\mathcal{A}(t)$ the portion of $\mathcal{S}(t)$ in $\mathcal{R}(t)$, the first two laws for $\mathcal{R}(t)$ have the form

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{R}(t)} \varrho \left\{ \varepsilon + \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}|^2 \right\} dv + \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{A}(t)} \varepsilon^x da \\ = W_{\text{tot}}(\mathcal{R}(t)) + \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}(t)} \left\{ \vartheta\eta J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} - \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{m} \right\} da + \int_{\partial\mathcal{A}(t)} \vartheta\eta^x V_{\partial\mathcal{A}}^{\text{mig}} ds \end{aligned} \quad (6.4)$$

(with $W_{\text{tot}}(\mathcal{R}(t))$ defined in (5.22)) and

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{R}(t)} \varrho\eta dv + \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{A}(t)} \eta^x da \geq \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}(t)} \frac{\vartheta\eta J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} - \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{m}}{\vartheta} da + \int_{\partial\mathcal{A}(t)} \eta^x V_{\partial\mathcal{A}}^{\text{mig}} ds. \quad (6.5)$$

6.2. Localizing the first two laws to the interface. Interfacial Eshelby relation

Step 1. Localization to integral laws involving only the interface

We consider first the energy balance and begin with the distillation

$$\int_{\partial\mathcal{R}} \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{m} da = \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}^+} \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{m} da + \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}^-} \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{m} da + \int_{\mathcal{A}} \llbracket \mathbf{q} \rrbracket \cdot \mathbf{n} da. \quad (6.6)$$

Next, we utilize (5.6) to distill the term $\int_{\partial\mathcal{R}} \vartheta\eta J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} da$, giving

$$\int_{\partial\mathcal{R}} \vartheta\eta J_{\partial\mathcal{R}} da = \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}^+} \vartheta\eta J_{\partial\mathcal{R}^+} da + \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}^-} \vartheta\eta J_{\partial\mathcal{R}^-} da + \int_{\mathcal{A}} \vartheta \llbracket \eta \rrbracket J da. \quad (6.7)$$

Decomposing the integral $(d/dt) \int_{\mathcal{R}} \varrho \left\{ \varepsilon + \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}|^2 \right\} dv$ over $\mathcal{R}(t)$ into contributions over $\mathcal{R}^+(t)$ and $\mathcal{R}^-(t)$ and appealing to (5.22) and (6.6)–(6.7), we may then rewrite (6.4) in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \underbrace{\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{R}^+(t)} \varrho \left\{ \varepsilon + \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}|^2 \right\} dv - W(\mathcal{R}^+(t)) - Q(\mathcal{R}^+(t))}_{= \mathbf{0} \text{ by (3.10)}} \\ + \underbrace{\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{R}^-(t)} \varrho \left\{ \varepsilon + \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}|^2 \right\} dv - W(\mathcal{R}^-(t)) - Q(\mathcal{R}^-(t)) + \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{A}(t)} \varepsilon^x da}_{= \mathbf{0} \text{ by (3.10)}} \\ - w(\mathcal{A}(t)) - \int_{\mathcal{A}(t)} \left\{ \vartheta \llbracket \eta \rrbracket J - \llbracket \mathbf{q} \rrbracket \cdot \mathbf{n} \right\} da - \int_{\partial\mathcal{A}(t)} \vartheta\eta^x V_{\partial\mathcal{A}}^{\text{mig}} ds = 0. \end{aligned}$$

which leaves the *interfacial energy balance*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{A}(t)} \varepsilon^x da = w(\mathcal{A}(t)) + \int_{\mathcal{A}(t)} \left\{ \vartheta \llbracket \eta \rrbracket J - \llbracket \mathbf{q} \rrbracket \cdot \mathbf{n} \right\} da + \int_{\partial \mathcal{A}(t)} \vartheta \eta^x V_{\partial \mathcal{A}}^{\text{mig}} ds. \quad (6.8)$$

A strictly analogous argument for the entropy imbalance (6.5) leads to the inequality

$$\underbrace{\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{R}^+(t)} \varrho \eta dv - H(\mathcal{R}^+(t))}_{\text{(I)}} + \underbrace{\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{R}^-(t)} \varrho \eta dv - H(\mathcal{R}^-(t))}_{\text{(II)}} + \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{A}(t)} \eta^x da - \int_{\mathcal{A}(t)} \frac{\vartheta \llbracket \eta \rrbracket J - \llbracket \mathbf{q} \rrbracket \cdot \mathbf{n}}{\vartheta} - \int_{\partial \mathcal{A}(t)} \eta^x V_{\partial \mathcal{A}}^{\text{mig}} ds \geq 0. \quad (6.9)$$

Using the divergence theorem and the transport identity (3.4), the terms (I) and (II) lead to the inequalities

$$\int_{\mathcal{R}^\pm(t)} \left\{ \varrho \dot{\eta} + \text{div} \frac{\mathbf{q}}{\vartheta} \right\} dv \geq 0 \quad (6.10)$$

(cf. (2.10)₂). Given any migrating subsurface $\mathcal{A}(t)$, we may choose the migrating control volumes $\mathcal{R}^\pm(t)$ to be δ -pillboxes $\mathcal{R}_\delta^\pm(t)$ about $\mathcal{A}(t)$ (cf. (5.10)); for this choice the terms (6.10) tend to zero as $\delta \rightarrow 0$ leaving the *interfacial entropy imbalance*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{A}(t)} \eta^x da \geq \int_{\mathcal{A}(t)} \frac{\vartheta \llbracket \eta \rrbracket J - \llbracket \mathbf{q} \rrbracket \cdot \mathbf{n}}{\vartheta} + \int_{\partial \mathcal{A}(t)} \eta^x V_{\partial \mathcal{A}}^{\text{mig}} ds. \quad (6.11)$$

Step 2. Interfacial Eshelby relation. Pointwise localization

To localize the interfacial laws (6.8) and (6.11) it is necessary to, in some sense, take the time derivatives $(d/dt) \int_{\mathcal{A}} \varepsilon^x da$ and $(d/dt) \int_{\mathcal{A}} \eta^x da$ inside the integrals, an operation facilitated by the following result:

SUPERFICIAL TRANSPORT THEOREM[†] For $\gamma(\mathbf{x}, t)$ a superficial scalar field and $\overset{\circ}{\gamma}$ its migrationally normal time-derivative following \mathcal{S} as defined in (4.31),

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{A}} \gamma da = \int_{\mathcal{A}} \left\{ \overset{\circ}{\gamma} - \gamma (KV - \text{div}_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbf{u}_{\text{tan}}) \right\} da + \int_{\partial \mathcal{A}} \gamma V_{\partial \mathcal{A}}^{\text{mig}} ds. \quad (6.12)$$

The interfacial energy balance (6.8) with $w(\mathcal{A})$ by (5.30) and $(d/dt) \int_{\mathcal{A}} \varepsilon^x da$ given by

[†] Cermelli, Fried & Gurtin (2004), based on a transport theorem of Gurtin, Struthers & Williams (1989).

(6.12) with $\gamma = \varepsilon^x$ has the form

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{A}(t)} \left\{ \overset{\circ}{\varepsilon}^x - \varepsilon^x (KV - \operatorname{div}_s \mathbf{u}_{\tan}) \right\} da \\ &= - \int_{\mathcal{A}(t)} \left\{ \varphi (KV - \operatorname{div}_s \mathbf{u}_{\tan}) + \mathbb{C}_{\tan} : \mathbb{D} - \mathbf{c} \cdot \operatorname{grad}_s V^{\text{mig}} + FJ \right\} da, \\ & \quad + \int_{\mathcal{A}(t)} \left\{ \vartheta \llbracket \eta \rrbracket J - \llbracket \mathbf{q} \rrbracket \cdot \mathbf{n} \right\} da + \int_{\underline{\partial \mathcal{A}(t)}} \left\{ \varphi - \varepsilon^x + \vartheta \eta^x \right\} V_{\partial \mathcal{A}}^{\text{mig}} ds. \end{aligned} \quad (6.13)$$

Consider the underlined term, which is the sole term involving an integral over $\partial \mathcal{A}$. Since the migrating subsurface $\mathcal{A}(t)$ is arbitrary, we may, at any given time, vary $V_{\partial \mathcal{A}}$ and (hence) $V_{\partial \mathcal{A}}^{\text{mig}} = V_{\partial \mathcal{A}} - \mathbf{u}_{\tan} \nu_{\partial \mathcal{A}}$ arbitrarily without changing the remaining fields involved in (6.13). Thus for (6.13) to be valid for all choices of the migrating subsurface $\mathcal{A}(t)$, we must have

$$\varphi = \varepsilon^x - \vartheta \eta^x = \psi^x, \quad (6.14)$$

and (5.25) takes the form of an *interfacial Eshelby relation*

$$\mathbb{C}_{\tan} = \psi^x \mathbb{P} - \mathbb{T}. \quad (6.15)$$

The chief difference between (6.15) and its bulk counterpart (3.16) is the absence of a kinetic-energy term in (6.15), an absence brought about by our neglect of interfacial mass.

Next, if we use (6.14) to rewrite (6.13) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{A}(t)} \left\{ \overset{\circ}{\varepsilon}^x - \vartheta \eta^x (KV - \operatorname{div}_s \mathbf{u}_{\tan}) \right\} da \\ &= - \int_{\mathcal{A}(t)} \left\{ \llbracket \mathbf{q} \rrbracket \cdot \mathbf{n} + \mathbb{C}_{\tan} : \mathbb{D} - \mathbf{c} \cdot \operatorname{grad}_s V^{\text{mig}} - (\vartheta \llbracket \eta \rrbracket - F) J \right\} da, \end{aligned}$$

then, since \mathcal{A} is arbitrary, we are led to *local form of the energy balance*:

$$\overset{\circ}{\varepsilon}^x = \vartheta \eta^x (KV - \operatorname{div}_s \mathbf{u}_{\tan}) - \llbracket \mathbf{q} \rrbracket \cdot \mathbf{n} + \vartheta \llbracket \eta \rrbracket J - \mathbb{C}_{\tan} : \mathbb{D} + \mathbf{c} \cdot \operatorname{grad}_s V^{\text{mig}} - FJ. \quad (6.16)$$

Similarly, by (6.11) and (6.12) with $\gamma = \eta^x$, we have the *local form of the entropy imbalance*:

$$\vartheta \overset{\circ}{\eta}^x \geq \vartheta \eta^x (KV - \operatorname{div}_s \mathbf{u}_{\tan}) - \llbracket \mathbf{q} \rrbracket \cdot \mathbf{n} + \vartheta \llbracket \eta \rrbracket J. \quad (6.17)$$

Let

$$f^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle\langle v \rangle\rangle^{-1} F \quad (6.18)$$

so that, by (5.28) and (5.31),

$$FJ = f^* V^{\text{mig}}, \quad f^* = f - \frac{\llbracket v \rrbracket}{\langle\langle v \rangle\rangle} \left\{ \mathbf{n} \cdot \langle\langle \mathbf{C} \rangle\rangle \mathbf{n} - J \langle\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle\rangle \cdot \mathbf{n} \right\}. \quad (6.19)$$

Then, subtracting (6.17) from (6.16) and using (6.2), we arrive at the *interfacial dissipation inequality*

$$\overset{\circ}{\psi}^x + \eta^x \overset{\circ}{\vartheta} + \mathbb{C}_{\tan} : \mathbb{D} - \mathbf{c} \cdot \operatorname{grad}_s V^{\text{mig}} + f^* V^{\text{mig}} \leq 0. \quad (6.20)$$

This inequality is basic to our discussion of constitutive equations. As we shall see, the field f^* represents the *dissipative part* of the normal internal force f .

Remarks

(i) The standard surface stress \mathbb{T} does not appear in the interfacial dissipation inequality (6.20); for that reason, we consider \mathbb{T} to be *constitutively indeterminate*. On the other hand, the term $\mathbb{C}_{\text{tan}}:\mathbb{D}$ in (6.20) would imply the need for a constitutive relation for \mathbb{C}_{tan} , which, with the interfacial Eshelby relation in the form $\mathbb{T} = \psi^x \mathbb{P} - \mathbb{C}_{\text{tan}}$ would yield an auxiliary relation for \mathbb{T} (cf. (9.1)).

(ii) Similarly, by (6.19), $\mathbb{P}\mathbf{f}^x$ — the *tangential* part of the internal configurational force \mathbf{f}^x for the interface — is not restricted by (6.20). We therefore consider $\mathbb{P}\mathbf{f}^x$ to be constitutively indeterminate and hence adjustable to ensure satisfaction of the tangential part of the configurational force balance (5.16). The role of $\mathbb{P}\mathbf{f}^x$ in the theory is analogous to that of the bulk pressure in an incompressible fluid.

(iii) Taking advantage of the bulk and interfacial Eshelby relations (3.16) and (6.15), we may rewrite the energy balance (6.4) for a migrating control volume $\mathcal{R}(t)$ containing a portion $\mathcal{A}(t)$ of the interface $\mathcal{S}(t)$ in a form,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{R}(t)} \varrho \left\{ \varepsilon + \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}|^2 \right\} dv - \int_{\partial \mathcal{R}(t)} \left\{ \varepsilon + \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}|^2 \right\} J_{\partial \mathcal{R}} da + \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{A}(t)} \varepsilon^x da - \int_{\partial \mathcal{A}(t)} \varepsilon^x V_{\partial \mathcal{A}}^{\text{mig}} ds \\ = \int_{\partial \mathcal{R}(t)} \mathbf{T} \mathbf{m} \cdot \mathbf{u} da + \int_{\partial \mathcal{A}(t)} \mathbb{T} \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\partial \mathcal{A}} \cdot \mathbf{u}_{\text{tan}} ds - \int_{\partial \mathcal{R}(t)} \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{m} da, \end{aligned} \quad (6.21)$$

involving only standard forces. Additionally, the entropy imbalance (6.5) can be rewritten as

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{R}(t)} \varrho \eta dv - \int_{\partial \mathcal{R}(t)} \eta J_{\partial \mathcal{R}} da + \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathcal{A}(t)} \eta^x da - \int_{\partial \mathcal{A}(t)} \eta^x V_{\partial \mathcal{A}}^{\text{mig}} ds \geq - \int_{\partial \mathcal{R}(t)} \frac{\mathbf{q}}{\vartheta} \cdot \mathbf{m} da. \quad (6.22)$$

These versions of the first and second laws simply generalize (3.9) to account for flows of energy and entropy across $\partial \mathcal{A}$ as well as the power expended on $\partial \mathcal{A}$ by the standard interfacial traction.

7. Standard and configurational momentum balances revisited

7.1. Standard momentum balance

Using the interfacial Eshelby relation (6.15) and (4.7),

$$\text{div}_s \mathbb{T} = \psi^x K \mathbf{n} + \text{grad}_s \psi^x - \text{div}_s \mathbb{C}_{\text{tan}},$$

and we may rewrite the standard momentum balance (5.11)₁ in the form

$$\psi^x K \mathbf{n} + \text{grad}_s \psi^x - \text{div}_s \mathbb{C}_{\text{tan}} + \llbracket \mathbb{T} \rrbracket \mathbf{n} = J^2 \llbracket v \rrbracket \mathbf{n}. \quad (7.1)$$

7.2. Normal configurational momentum balance

Combining (6.19)₂ and the normal configurational momentum balance in the form (5.20) and making use of the identity (4.13)₂, we find that

$$\langle\langle v \rangle\rangle \text{div}_s \mathbf{c} + \langle\langle v \rangle\rangle \mathbb{C}_{\text{tan}} : \mathbb{K} + \langle\langle v \rangle\rangle f^* + \llbracket v \rrbracket \mathbf{n} \cdot \langle\langle \mathbf{C} \mathbf{n} \rangle\rangle + \langle\langle v \rangle\rangle \mathbf{n} \cdot \llbracket \mathbf{C} \rrbracket \mathbf{n} = J \left\{ \llbracket v \rrbracket \langle\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle\rangle \cdot \mathbf{n} + \langle\langle v \rangle\rangle \llbracket \mathbf{u} \rrbracket \cdot \mathbf{n} \right\},$$

or, equivalently, by (4.10), that

$$\langle\langle v \rangle\rangle \text{div}_s \mathbf{c} + \langle\langle v \rangle\rangle \mathbb{C}_{\text{tan}} : \mathbb{K} + \langle\langle v \rangle\rangle f^* + \llbracket v \rrbracket (\mathbf{C} \mathbf{n} - \mathbf{u} J) \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0.$$

Thus, appealing to the bulk Eshelby relation (3.16) and making use of the identity

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{u}|^2 + (V - \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n})\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rrbracket &= \llbracket \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n})^2 + (V - \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n})\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rrbracket \\ &= \llbracket V\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} - \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n})^2 \rrbracket \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\llbracket (V - \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n})^2 \rrbracket \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}J^2\llbracket v^2 \rrbracket, \end{aligned}$$

we find that

$$\langle\langle v \rangle\rangle(\operatorname{div}_s \mathbf{c} + \mathbb{C}_{\tan} : \mathbb{K} + f^*) + \llbracket \psi \rrbracket - \mathbf{n} \cdot \llbracket v \mathbf{T} \rrbracket \mathbf{n} + \frac{1}{2}J^2\llbracket v^2 \rrbracket = 0. \quad (7.2)$$

Reversing the foregoing steps, we see that (7.2) is equivalent to the normal configurational force balance in the form (5.20). The relation (7.2) represents the *normal configurational force balance, expressed per unit mass*.

7.3. Normal combined momentum balance

The interfacial Eshelby relation couples the standard and configurational stresses \mathbb{T} and \mathbb{C} , a coupling that allows us to obtain a useful combination of the standard and configurational momentum balances. To begin with, using (5.13) to eliminate the term $J^2\llbracket v \rrbracket$ from (5.20) yields a relation,

$$\operatorname{div}_s \mathbf{c} + (\mathbb{T} + \mathbb{C}_{\tan}) : \mathbb{K} + f + \mathbf{n} \cdot \llbracket \mathbf{T} + \mathbf{C} \rrbracket \mathbf{n} = 0,$$

which, when combined with the bulk and interfacial Eshelby relations (3.16) and (6.15) and the identity $\mathbb{P} : \mathbb{K} = K$, has the form

$$\operatorname{div}_s \mathbf{c} + \psi^x K + f + \llbracket \varrho(\psi - \frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{u}|^2) \rrbracket = 0. \quad (7.3)$$

Thus, appealing to (6.19)₂, the bulk Eshelby relation (3.16), and (4.13) and utilizing (4.10) and (4.15), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} f + \llbracket \varrho(\psi - \frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{u}|^2) \rrbracket &= f^* + \frac{\llbracket v \rrbracket}{\langle\langle v \rangle\rangle} \left\{ \mathbf{n} \cdot \langle\langle \mathbf{C} \rangle\rangle \mathbf{n} - J \langle\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle\rangle \cdot \mathbf{n} \right\} + \llbracket \varrho(\psi - \frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{u}|^2) \rrbracket \\ &= f^* + \frac{1}{\langle\langle v \rangle\rangle} \left\{ \llbracket \psi - \frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{u}|^2 \rrbracket + \frac{1}{2}\llbracket (\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n})^2 \rrbracket \right\} - \frac{\llbracket v \rrbracket}{\langle\langle v \rangle\rangle} \mathbf{n} \cdot \langle\langle \mathbf{T} \rangle\rangle \mathbf{n}, \\ &= f^* + \langle\langle v \rangle\rangle^{-1} \llbracket \psi \rrbracket - \frac{\llbracket v \rrbracket}{\langle\langle v \rangle\rangle} \mathbf{n} \cdot \langle\langle \mathbf{T} \rangle\rangle \mathbf{n}, \end{aligned} \quad (7.4)$$

and we are led to the *normal combined momentum balance*

$$\operatorname{div}_s \mathbf{c} + \psi^x K + f^* + \langle\langle v \rangle\rangle^{-1} \llbracket \psi \rrbracket - \zeta \mathbf{n} \cdot \langle\langle \mathbf{T} \rangle\rangle \mathbf{n} = 0, \quad (7.5)$$

with

$$\zeta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\frac{\llbracket \varrho \rrbracket}{\langle\langle \varrho \rangle\rangle} = \frac{\llbracket v \rrbracket}{\langle\langle v \rangle\rangle} \quad (7.6)$$

a dimensionless measure of the density jump across the interface.

Granted (7.1), (7.5) implies (5.20) (with \mathbf{C} and \mathbb{C} as determined by (3.16) and (6.15)).

7.4. Complete set of momentum balances

A complete set of momentum balances for the interface consists of:

- (i) the standard momentum balance in the form (7.1) and

(ii) **either** the normal configurational momentum balance in the form (7.2) **or** the normal combined balance (7.5).

8. Interfacial constitutive relations

Consistent with our treatment of the bulk phases, we suppose that the free energy and entropy of the interface are determined by *state relations*

$$\psi^x = \hat{\psi}^x(\vartheta), \quad \eta^x = -\frac{d\hat{\psi}^x(\vartheta)}{d\vartheta}. \quad (8.1)$$

Granted this, the interfacial dissipation inequality (6.20) reduces to

$$\mathcal{D} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\mathbb{C}_{\text{tan}} \cdot \mathbb{D} + \mathbf{c} \cdot \text{grad}_s V^{\text{mig}} - f^* V^{\text{mig}} \geq 0, \quad (8.2)$$

with \mathcal{D} the interfacial dissipation, per unit area; we refer to (8.2) as the *dissipation inequality*.

Guided by the dissipation inequality, we posit isotropic constitutive equations giving \mathbb{C}_{tan} , \mathbf{c} , and f^* as functions of ϑ , and

$$(\mathbb{D}, V^{\text{mig}}, \text{grad}_s V^{\text{mig}}). \quad (8.3)$$

Assuming, for convenience, that these relations are linear and uncoupled in the arguments (8.3), we are led to a *kinetic relation*

$$f^* = -\kappa(\vartheta) V^{\text{mig}}, \quad (8.4)$$

with modulus $\kappa(\vartheta)$, and *interfacial flow relations*

$$\mathbb{C}_{\text{tan}} = -2\alpha(\vartheta)\mathbb{D} - \lambda(\vartheta)(\text{tr}\mathbb{D})\mathbb{P}, \quad \mathbf{c} = \beta(\vartheta)\text{grad}_s V^{\text{mig}}, \quad (8.5)$$

with moduli $\alpha(\vartheta)$, $\lambda(\vartheta)$, and $\beta(\vartheta)$. Here:

(i) $\alpha(\vartheta)$ and $\lambda(\vartheta)$ represent (interfacial) *fluid viscosities*; $\alpha(\vartheta)$, the *shear viscosity*, is associated with shearing of the interface, while $\lambda(\vartheta) + \alpha(\vartheta)$, the *dilatational viscosity*, is associated with changes in the local area of the interface;

(ii) $\kappa(\vartheta)$ and $\beta(\vartheta)$, which represent *migrational viscosities*, describe dissipative effects in the exchange of atoms between phases.

The constitutive relations (8.3)–(8.5) and the identities (4.3) and (4.19) render the dissipation (8.2) of the form

$$\mathcal{D} = 2\alpha(\vartheta)|\mathbb{D}_0|^2 + \{\lambda(\vartheta) + \alpha(\vartheta)\}(\text{tr}\mathbb{D})^2 + \beta(\vartheta)|\text{grad}_s V^{\text{mig}}|^2 + \kappa(\vartheta)|V^{\text{mig}}|^2, \quad (8.6)$$

with

$$\mathbb{D}_0 = \mathbb{D} - \frac{1}{2}(\text{tr}\mathbb{D})\mathbb{P}$$

the *deviatoric stretch-rate*. Thus, since the tensor fields $\text{tr}\mathbb{D}$ and \mathbb{D}_0 may be specified independently, the dissipation inequality (8.2) is satisfied if and only if the moduli satisfy

$$\alpha(\vartheta) \geq 0, \quad \lambda(\vartheta) + \alpha(\vartheta) \geq 0, \quad \kappa(\vartheta) \geq 0, \quad \beta(\vartheta) \geq 0.$$

In particular, the interface is *inviscid* (and hence dissipationless) if and only if

$$\alpha(\vartheta) = \lambda(\vartheta) = \kappa(\vartheta) = \beta(\vartheta) = 0, \quad (8.7)$$

in which case both the configurational stress \mathbb{C} and the dissipative part f^* of the normal internal force f vanish. Thus, in particular,

- *interfacial configurational stress is not present at an inviscid interface.*

Remark The most general linear, isotropic constitutive equations consist of coupled relations

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{tr} \mathbb{C}_{\tan} &= -2\{\lambda(\vartheta) + \alpha(\vartheta)\} \operatorname{tr} \mathbb{D} - \bar{\zeta}(\vartheta) V^{\text{mig}}, \\ f^* &= -\zeta(\vartheta) \operatorname{tr} \mathbb{D} - \kappa(\vartheta) V^{\text{mig}},\end{aligned}$$

together with uncoupled relations $(\mathbb{C}_{\tan})_0 = -\alpha(\vartheta) \mathbb{D}_0$ and $\mathbf{c} = \beta(\vartheta) \operatorname{grad}_s V^{\text{mig}}$, where $(\mathbb{C}_{\tan})_0$ is the deviatoric part of \mathbb{C}_{\tan} . Here $\bar{\zeta}(\vartheta)$ and $\zeta(\vartheta)$ are constitutive moduli that couple the relations for $\operatorname{tr} \mathbb{C}_{\tan}$ and f^* .

9. Consequences of the interfacial constitutive relations

9.1. Constitutive relation for the standard interfacial stress

An interesting and important consequence of the interfacial flow relation (8.5)₁ supplemented by the interfacial Eshelby relation (6.15) is an auxiliary constitutive relation for the standard interfacial stress:

$$\mathbb{T} = \hat{\psi}^x(\vartheta) \mathbb{P} + 2\alpha(\vartheta) \mathbb{D} + \lambda(\vartheta) (\operatorname{tr} \mathbb{D}) \mathbb{P}. \quad (9.1)$$

Remarks

(i) By (9.1), *the surface tension*

$$\sigma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{tr} \mathbb{T} = \hat{\psi}^x(\vartheta) + \{\lambda(\vartheta) + \alpha(\vartheta)\} \operatorname{tr} \mathbb{D}$$

is a sum of energetic and viscous terms.

(ii) The superficial stretch-rate \mathbb{D} may be written in the alternative form

$$\mathbb{D} = \frac{1}{2} \{ \mathbb{P} \operatorname{grad}_s \mathbf{u}_{\tan} + (\operatorname{grad}_s \mathbf{u}_{\tan})^\top \mathbb{P} \} - \langle \langle \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle \rangle \mathbb{K}.$$

In view of (9.1), if the interface \mathcal{S} is material — so that, necessarily, \mathbf{u} is continuous across \mathcal{S} — then the expression (9.1) with $\hat{\psi}^x \equiv 0$ reduces to an expression due to Scriven (1960).

9.2. Interfacial energy balance

As with the bulk phases, the relation $\psi^x = \varepsilon^x - \vartheta \eta^x$ and the state relations (8.1) yield an auxiliary state relation $\varepsilon^x = \hat{\varepsilon}^x(\vartheta)$, with the consequence that

$$\frac{d\hat{\varepsilon}^x(\vartheta)}{d\vartheta} = -\vartheta \frac{d^2 \hat{\psi}^x(\vartheta)}{d\vartheta^2} = \vartheta \frac{d\hat{\eta}^x(\vartheta)}{d\vartheta}.$$

Thus, bearing in mind (6.14), the energy balance (6.16) becomes

$$\llbracket \mathbf{q} \rrbracket \cdot \mathbf{n} - \vartheta \llbracket \eta \rrbracket J = -\vartheta \{ \hat{\eta}^x - \eta^x (KV - \operatorname{div}_s \mathbf{u}_{\tan}) \} + \mathcal{D}, \quad (9.2)$$

with \mathcal{D} the dissipation (8.6).

9.3. Standard momentum balance

The standard momentum balance in the form (7.1) and the constitutive relations (8.1) and (8.5)₁ for ψ^x and \mathbb{C} yield the balance

$$\llbracket \mathbf{T} \rrbracket \mathbf{n} - J^2 \llbracket v \rrbracket \mathbf{n} = -\hat{\psi}^x(\vartheta) K \mathbf{n} - \operatorname{grad}_s \hat{\psi}^x(\vartheta) - \operatorname{div}_s \{ 2\alpha(\vartheta) \mathbb{D} + \lambda(\vartheta) (\operatorname{tr} \mathbb{D}) \mathbb{P} \}. \quad (9.3)$$

Remark By (4.9), the normal part of the balance (9.3), namely

$$\mathbf{n} \cdot \llbracket \mathbf{T} \rrbracket \mathbf{n} - J^2 \llbracket v \rrbracket = -\hat{\psi}^x(\vartheta) K - 2\alpha(\vartheta) \mathbb{K} : \mathbb{D} - \lambda(\vartheta) (\operatorname{tr} \mathbb{D}) K,$$

represents a generalization of the classical Young–Laplace equation (Young 1805; Laplace 1806) to account for the inertia of the bulk phases and interfacial viscosity. Note the presence of the *full curvature tensor* \mathbb{K} .

9.4. Normal configurational momentum balance

The normal configurational momentum balance, expressed per unit mass as in (7.2), augmented by the constitutive relations (8.4) and (8.5), yield the balance

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \psi \rrbracket - \mathbf{n} \cdot \llbracket v \mathbf{T} \rrbracket \mathbf{n} + \frac{1}{2} J^2 \llbracket v^2 \rrbracket \\ = \langle\langle v \rangle\rangle \left\{ \kappa(\vartheta) V^{\text{mig}} - \text{div}_s (\beta(\vartheta) \text{grad}_s V^{\text{mig}}) + 2\alpha(\vartheta) \mathbb{K} : \mathbb{D} + \lambda(\vartheta) (\text{tr} \mathbb{D}) K \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (9.4)$$

The balance (9.4) depends on the bulk flow via the migrational velocity V^{mig} as defined in (4.14).

Remarks

(i) When inertial effects along with the migrational viscosity β and the interfacial fluid viscosities α and λ are negligible, and when $\mathbf{n} \cdot \llbracket v \mathbf{T} \rrbracket \mathbf{n} = 0$, (9.4) becomes

$$\langle\langle v \rangle\rangle \kappa(\vartheta) V^{\text{mig}} = \llbracket \psi \rrbracket,$$

which has the form of an evolution equation due to Frank (1958) — the differences being in the dependence of κ on the temperature field and a velocity measured relative to the average fluid velocity at the interface.

(ii) An important consequence of (9.4) is that, if inertial effects are negligible and the interface is *inviscid* in the sense of (8.7), then

$$\llbracket \psi \rrbracket = \mathbf{n} \cdot \llbracket v \mathbf{T} \rrbracket \mathbf{n}.$$

When the bulk stress is a pressure, so that $\mathbf{T} = -p\mathbf{1}$, this equation reduces to the classical condition $\llbracket \psi + p v \rrbracket = 0$ underlying the Maxwell (1875) equal-area rule for the equilibrium of two fluid phases. In this sense, the condition $\llbracket \psi \rrbracket = \mathbf{n} \cdot \llbracket v \mathbf{T} \rrbracket \mathbf{n}$ can be viewed as a generalization of the equal area rule to account for the viscosities of the bulk phases. Moreover, the general normal configurational balance (9.4) extends that generalization to account for the migrational and fluid viscosities of the interface.

(iii) When the migrational viscosity β and the interfacial viscosities α and λ are negligible, we may use the identity $J^2 \llbracket v^2 \rrbracket = \llbracket (V - \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n})^2 \rrbracket$ to write (9.4) as

$$\langle\langle v \rangle\rangle \kappa(\vartheta) V^{\text{mig}} = \llbracket \psi + \frac{1}{2} (V - \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n})^2 - v \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{T} \mathbf{n} \rrbracket,$$

which has the form of an equation proposed by Fried (1995).

9.5. Normal combined momentum balance

When supplemented by the constitutive relation for ψ^x and the kinetic relation (8.4), the normal combined momentum balance (7.5) takes the form

$$\llbracket \psi \rrbracket - \llbracket v \rrbracket \mathbf{n} \cdot \langle\langle \mathbf{T} \rangle\rangle \mathbf{n} = -\langle\langle v \rangle\rangle \hat{\psi}^x(\vartheta) K + \langle\langle v \rangle\rangle \left\{ \kappa(\vartheta) V^{\text{mig}} - \text{div}_s (\beta(\vartheta) \text{grad}_s V^{\text{mig}}) \right\}. \quad (9.5)$$

Note that this equation is independent of the interfacial fluid viscosities α and λ .

Remark When the migrational viscosity β is negligible and the two phases have the same density ($\zeta = 0$), (9.5) becomes

$$\hat{\psi}^x(\vartheta) K = \kappa(\vartheta) V^{\text{mig}} - \langle\langle v \rangle\rangle^{-1} \llbracket \psi \rrbracket,$$

an equation that is independent of bulk stress and reminiscent of the *classical curvature-flow equation* (Mullins 1956) driven by a difference in bulk free-energies (Angenent & Gurtin 1989).

10. Summary of general interface conditions

Apart from appropriate kinematical equations, the basic equations for the interface therefore consist of the balances (6.16), (7.1), (7.2), for energy, standard momentum, and normal configurational momentum augmented by the interfacial Eshelby relation (6.15) and the interfacial constitutive relations (8.1), (8.4), and (8.5). These equations combine as shown in §9 to form basic interface conditions consisting of the *energy balance*†

$$[[\mathbf{q}]] \cdot \mathbf{n} - \vartheta [[\eta]] J = -\vartheta \{ \overset{\circ}{\eta}^x - \eta^x (KV - \operatorname{div}_S \mathbf{u}_{\tan}) \} + \mathcal{D}, \quad (10.1)$$

with $\eta^x = -d\psi^x(\vartheta)/d\vartheta$ and \mathcal{D} given by (8.6), the *standard momentum balance*

$$[[\mathbf{T}]] \mathbf{n} - J^2 [[v]] \mathbf{n} = -\hat{\psi}^x(\vartheta) K \mathbf{n} - \operatorname{grad}_S \hat{\psi}^x(\vartheta) - \operatorname{div}_S \{ 2\alpha(\vartheta) \mathbb{D} + \lambda(\vartheta) (\operatorname{tr} \mathbb{D}) \mathbb{P} \}, \quad (10.2)$$

and **either** the *normal configurational momentum balance*

$$\begin{aligned} & [[\psi]] - \mathbf{n} \cdot [[v \mathbf{T}]] \mathbf{n} + \frac{1}{2} J^2 [[v^2]] \\ & = \langle\langle v \rangle\rangle \left\{ \kappa(\vartheta) V^{\text{mig}} - \operatorname{div}_S (\beta(\vartheta) \operatorname{grad}_S V^{\text{mig}}) + 2\alpha(\vartheta) \mathbb{K} : \mathbb{D} + \lambda(\vartheta) (\operatorname{tr} \mathbb{D}) K \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (10.3)$$

or the *normal combined force balance*

$$[[\psi]] - [[v]] \mathbf{n} \cdot \langle\langle \mathbf{T} \rangle\rangle \mathbf{n} = -\langle\langle v \rangle\rangle \hat{\psi}^x(\vartheta) K + \langle\langle v \rangle\rangle \left\{ \kappa(\vartheta) V^{\text{mig}} - \operatorname{div}_S (\beta(\vartheta) \operatorname{grad}_S V^{\text{mig}}) \right\}. \quad (10.4)$$

11. Existence of an equilibrium temperature

11.1. Latent heat. Free-energy theorem

If the interface is flat and at rest, and the bulk fluid is unstressed ($\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{0}$), then the normal combined balance implies that

$$[[\psi]] = 0, \quad (11.1)$$

a condition that represents a *thermal equilibrium*. Since the bulk free-energy depends on temperature, (11.1) is, in essence, a condition on the interfacial temperature. With this as background, we now add the following *constitutive assumption*:

(C1) there is a unique (constant) *equilibrium temperature* ϑ_0 such that

$$\psi^+(\vartheta_0) = \psi^-(\vartheta_0), \quad \varepsilon^+(\vartheta_0) \neq \varepsilon^-(\vartheta_0). \quad (11.2)$$

In what follows a subscripted zero denotes evaluation at ϑ_0 . The scalar constant $\ell = [[\varepsilon_0]]$ represents the *latent heat* at the temperature ϑ_0 ; by (11.2),

$$\ell = \vartheta_0 [[\eta_0]], \quad [[\eta_0]] \neq 0. \quad (11.3)$$

The next theorem is central to what follows. In stating this result, it is useful to define a *dimensionless temperature* θ by

$$\theta = \frac{\vartheta - \vartheta_0}{\vartheta_0}. \quad (11.4)$$

† $\overset{\circ}{\eta}^x$ is related to the (standard) normal time derivative $\overset{\square}{\eta}^x$ following \mathcal{S} through the relation $\overset{\circ}{\eta}^x = \overset{\square}{\eta}^x + \mathbf{u}_{\tan} \cdot \operatorname{grad}_S \eta^x$. Cf. Footnote †, page 18.

FREE-ENERGY THEOREM

(I) *If the bulk specific heat is independent of phase, then the state fields obey the simple jump relations*

$$[[\psi]] = -\ell\theta, \quad [[\eta]] \equiv \frac{\ell}{\vartheta_0}, \quad [[\varepsilon]] \equiv \ell, \quad (11.5)$$

and conversely.

(II) *The jumps in free energy and entropy obey the following estimates:*

$$[[\psi]] = -\ell\theta + \mathcal{O}(\theta^2), \quad [[\eta]] = \frac{\ell}{\vartheta_0} + \mathcal{O}(\theta). \quad (11.6)$$

To verify (I), assume first that

$$\frac{d\varepsilon^+}{d\vartheta} = \frac{d\varepsilon^-}{d\vartheta}, \quad (11.7)$$

so that $[[\varepsilon]] \equiv [[\varepsilon_0]]$. By (2.13), the jumps $[[\psi]]$, $[[\eta]]$, and $[[\varepsilon]]$, considered as functions of ϑ , obey the thermodynamic relations

$$[[\psi]] = [[\varepsilon]] - \vartheta[[\eta]], \quad [[\eta]] = -\frac{d[[\psi]]}{d\vartheta}, \quad (11.8)$$

and these relations, the condition $[[\varepsilon]] \equiv [[\varepsilon_0]]$, and (11.4) yield (11.5). Conversely, (11.5) implies that $[[\varepsilon]] \equiv [[\varepsilon_0]]$ and hence that (11.7) is satisfied. Thus (I) is valid.

Consider (II). Expanding $G(\vartheta) = \psi^+(\vartheta) - \psi^-(\vartheta)$ about $\vartheta = \vartheta_0$, we find that, by (11.8),

$$G(\vartheta) = -[[\eta_0]](\vartheta - \vartheta_0) + \mathcal{O}(\theta^2), \quad \frac{dG(\vartheta)}{d\vartheta} = \mathcal{O}(1);$$

thus, using (11.3), we arrive at the estimates (11.6). This completes the proof of the Free-Energy Theorem.

11.2. Estimates for the temperature

A direct consequence of (10.3) and (10.4) and the Free-Energy Theorem are the following estimates for the temperature:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \ell\theta &= -\mathbf{n} \cdot [[v\mathbf{T}]]\mathbf{n} + \frac{1}{2}J^2[[v^2]] \\ &\quad - \langle\langle v \rangle\rangle \left\{ \kappa(\vartheta)V^{\text{mig}} - \text{div}_s(\beta(\vartheta)\text{grad}_s V^{\text{mig}}) + 2\alpha(\vartheta)\mathbb{K}:\mathbb{D} + \lambda(\vartheta)(\text{tr}\mathbb{D})K \right\} + \mathcal{O}(\theta^2), \\ \ell\theta &= -[[v]]\mathbf{n} \cdot \langle\langle \mathbf{T} \rangle\rangle\mathbf{n} + \langle\langle v \rangle\rangle \hat{\psi}^x(\vartheta)K - \langle\langle v \rangle\rangle \left\{ \kappa(\vartheta)V^{\text{mig}} - \text{div}_s(\beta(\vartheta)\text{grad}_s V^{\text{mig}}) \right\} + \mathcal{O}(\theta^2); \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (11.9)$$

(11.9) represent respective estimates for the normal configurational and normal combined momentum balances. If the interface is *inviscid* in the sense of (8.7), then (11.9) simplify to

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \ell\theta &= -\mathbf{n} \cdot [[v\mathbf{T}]]\mathbf{n} + \frac{1}{2}J^2[[v^2]] + \mathcal{O}(\theta^2), \\ \ell\theta &= -[[v]]\mathbf{n} \cdot \langle\langle \mathbf{T} \rangle\rangle\mathbf{n} + \langle\langle v \rangle\rangle \hat{\psi}^x(\vartheta)K + \mathcal{O}(\theta^2). \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (11.10)$$

Finally, if the bulk specific heat is independent of phase, then the term $\mathcal{O}(\theta^2)$ may be dropped from (11.9) and (11.10).

Remarks

(i) Granted the standard momentum balance (10.2), the two estimates in (11.9) are equivalent, as are the two estimates in (11.10).

(ii) When $[[v]] = 0$, the second of the estimates (11.10) yields the classical Gibbs–Thomson equation (1.3).

12. Conditions at an interface whose free energy and viscosities are constant

The general equations (10.1)–(10.4) expressing energy balance, standard momentum balance, normal configurational momentum balance, and normal combined momentum balance on the interface are complicated. We now consider a simplification afforded by (C1) and the following additional *constitutive assumptions*:

(C2) the interfacial fluid and migrational viscosities α , λ , κ , and β are constant.

(C3) the interfacial free energy ψ^x is constant, so that $\eta^x = 0$ and $\varepsilon^x = \psi^x$.

Assumption (C3) reduces the energy balance (10.1) to

$$[[\mathbf{q}]] \cdot \mathbf{n} - \vartheta [[\eta]] J = \mathcal{D}. \quad (12.1)$$

By (8.6), the dissipation \mathcal{D} is quadratic in the interfacial fields \mathbb{D} , V^{mig} , and $\text{grad}_s V^{\text{mig}}$, and it would seem reasonable to limit our discussion to situations in which this dissipation is small compared to the remaining terms in (12.1), which involve only bulk fields. Therefore,

(C4) we neglect the term \mathcal{D} in the energy balance (12.1).

Granted (C2)–(C4) and using (7.6), the interface conditions discussed in §10 take the form

$$\left. \begin{aligned} & [[\mathbf{q}]] \cdot \mathbf{n} = \vartheta [[\eta]] J, \\ & [[\mathbf{T}]] \mathbf{n} - J^2 [[v]] \mathbf{n} = -\psi^x K \mathbf{n} - \text{div}_s \left\{ 2\alpha \mathbb{D} + \lambda (\text{tr} \mathbb{D}) \mathbb{P} \right\}, \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (12.2)$$

and **either**

$$[[\psi]] - \mathbf{n} \cdot [[v \mathbf{T}]] \mathbf{n} + \frac{1}{2} J^2 [[v^2]] = \langle\langle v \rangle\rangle \left\{ \kappa V^{\text{mig}} - \beta \Delta_s V^{\text{mig}} + 2\alpha \mathbb{K} : \mathbb{D} + \lambda (\text{tr} \mathbb{D}) K \right\} \quad (12.3)$$

or

$$[[\psi]] - [[v]] \mathbf{n} \cdot \langle\langle \mathbf{T} \rangle\rangle \mathbf{n} = -\langle\langle v \rangle\rangle \psi^x K + \langle\langle v \rangle\rangle \left\{ \kappa V^{\text{mig}} - \beta \Delta_s V^{\text{mig}} \right\}. \quad (12.4)$$

Here Δ_s , the *Laplace–Beltrami operator*, is defined on any superficial field φ by

$$\Delta_s \varphi = \text{div}_s (\text{grad}_s \varphi). \quad (12.5)$$

The next three subsections greatly simplify these interface conditions.

12.1. Inviscid interface

The equations are further simplified if we *replace* (C4) by the constitutive assumption

(C4)* $\kappa = \alpha = \lambda = \beta = 0$ (so that the interface is inviscid).

(By (8.6), (C4)* is stronger than (C4).) Then the interface conditions (12.2)–(12.4) become

$$[[\mathbf{q}]] \cdot \mathbf{n} = \vartheta [[\eta]] J, \quad [[\mathbf{T}]] \mathbf{n} - J^2 [[v]] \mathbf{n} = -\psi^x K \mathbf{n}, \quad (12.6)$$

and **either**

$$[[\psi]] - \mathbf{n} \cdot [[v \mathbf{T}]] \mathbf{n} + \frac{1}{2} J^2 [[v^2]] = 0 \quad (12.7)$$

or

$$[[\psi]] - [[v]] \mathbf{n} \cdot \langle\langle \mathbf{T} \rangle\rangle \mathbf{n} = -\langle\langle v \rangle\rangle \psi^x K. \quad (12.8)$$

12.2. Bulk specific heats independent of phase

If, in addition to (C1)–(C4), we assume that the bulk specific heats are independent of phase, then, by (11.5), the balance (12.6)₁ for energy becomes

$$[[\mathbf{q}]] \cdot \mathbf{n} = \frac{\ell\vartheta}{\vartheta_0} J, \quad (12.9)$$

the standard force balance remains (12.6)₂, and the normal configurational and normal combined balances — which are equivalent, granted (12.6)₂ — may be written in the form (11.9) with the arguments (ϑ) removed and with the $O(\theta^2)$ terms omitted.

If we further assume that the interface is *inviscid*, then the interface conditions are

$$[[\mathbf{q}]] \cdot \mathbf{n} = \frac{\ell\vartheta}{\vartheta_0} J, \quad [[\mathbf{T}]]\mathbf{n} - J^2[[v]]\mathbf{n} = -\psi^\times K\mathbf{n}, \quad (12.10)$$

and **either**

$$\ell\theta = -\mathbf{n} \cdot [[v\mathbf{T}]]\mathbf{n} + \frac{1}{2}J^2[[v^2]] \quad (12.11)$$

or

$$\ell\theta = -[[v]]\mathbf{n} \cdot \langle\langle \mathbf{T} \rangle\rangle\mathbf{n} + \langle\langle v \rangle\rangle\psi^\times K. \quad (12.12)$$

Remark The hypotheses (C1)–(C3) and (C4)* represent additional constitutive assumptions consistent with the constitutive frameworks set out in §2.4 and §9.2. For that reason the simplified theory based on (C1)–(C3) and (C4)* and resulting in the interface conditions (12.10)–(12.12) is *consistent with the standard and configurational force balances and the first two laws* as discussed in §5 and §6. In this sense the interface conditions (12.10)–(12.12) are *exact*. (Of course, to be exact when coupled to the bulk equations, the specific heats of the two phases must coincide.)

12.3. Temperature close to its equilibrium value

If, in addition to (C1)–(C4), we assume that the temperature is close to its equilibrium value and, consequently, consider: (i) the energy balance (12.2)₁ with ϑ replaced by ϑ_0 in conjunction with (11.6)₂ neglecting the order $O(\theta)$ term; and (ii) the normal configurational and normal combined momentum balances in the form (11.9), neglecting the order $O(\theta^2)$ term. The resulting interface conditions then consist of the balances

$$\left. \begin{aligned} & [[\mathbf{q}]] \cdot \mathbf{n} = \ell J, \\ & [[\mathbf{T}]]\mathbf{n} - J^2[[v]]\mathbf{n} = -\psi^\times K\mathbf{n} - \operatorname{div}_s \left\{ 2\alpha\mathbb{D} + \lambda(\operatorname{tr}\mathbb{D})\mathbb{P} \right\}, \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (12.13)$$

and **either**

$$\ell\theta = -\mathbf{n} \cdot [[v\mathbf{T}]]\mathbf{n} + \frac{1}{2}J^2[[v^2]] - \langle\langle v \rangle\rangle \left\{ \kappa V^{\operatorname{mig}} - \beta\Delta_s V^{\operatorname{mig}} \right\} + 2\alpha\mathbb{K}:\mathbb{D} + \lambda(\operatorname{tr}\mathbb{D})K \quad (12.14)$$

or

$$\ell\theta = -[[v]]\mathbf{n} \cdot \langle\langle \mathbf{T} \rangle\rangle\mathbf{n} + \langle\langle v \rangle\rangle\psi^\times K - \langle\langle v \rangle\rangle \left\{ \kappa V^{\operatorname{mig}} - \beta\Delta_s V^{\operatorname{mig}} \right\}. \quad (12.15)$$

The *approximate* equations (12.13) and (12.14) reduce further when the interface is *inviscid* to give

$$[[\mathbf{q}]] \cdot \mathbf{n} = \ell J, \quad [[\mathbf{T}]]\mathbf{n} - J^2[[v]]\mathbf{n} = -\psi^\times K\mathbf{n}, \quad (12.16)$$

and **either**

$$\ell\theta = -\mathbf{n} \cdot [[v\mathbf{T}]]\mathbf{n} + \frac{1}{2}J^2[[v^2]] \quad (12.17)$$

or

$$\ell\theta = \langle\langle v \rangle\rangle \psi^x K - \llbracket v \rrbracket \mathbf{n} \cdot \langle\langle \mathbf{T} \rangle\rangle \mathbf{n}. \quad (12.18)$$

Remark Although the assumptions underlying their derivations differ, the sole difference between the interface conditions (12.10)–(12.12) and (12.16)–(12.18) is that the latent heat ℓ in (12.11)₁ is replaced by $\ell\vartheta/\vartheta_0$ in (12.10)₁.

13. Summary

We have developed a complete set of boundary conditions that apply at an interface between two fluid phases undergoing transformation. Our focus has been on those interfacial conditions whose equilibrium forms are well-known but whose extension to settings with even simple fluid flows have not been firmly established. We have employed an approach based on a consideration of configurational forces in the context of non-equilibrium thermodynamics. This approach, which is well-developed in the framework of solid mechanics, is extended here for fluids with both bulk viscosity and interfacial viscosity. Our results thus derived illuminate a number of physical effects that may play key roles for transport during phase transformation and interfacial flows.

Acknowledgment

This work was supported in part by the Italian MIUR project ‘Modelli Matematici per la Scienza dei Materiali’ (P. C.), the U. S. Department of Energy (E. F. and M. G.), the U. S. National Science Foundation (D. M. A.), and the U. S. NASA Microgravity Research Division (G. B. M). The authors thank Xuemei Chen for her careful reading of various drafts of this paper.

REFERENCES

- ANDERSON, D. M., MCFADDEN, G. B. & WHEELER, A. A. 1989 Diffuse-interface methods in fluid mechanics. *Ann. Rev. Fluid Mech.* **30**, 139–165.
- ANDERSON, D. M., MCFADDEN, G. B. & WHEELER, A. A. 2000 A phase-field model of solidification with convection. *PHYSICA D* **135**, 175–194.
- ANDERSON, D. M., MCFADDEN, G. B. & WHEELER, A. A. 2001 A phase-field model with convection: sharp-interface asymptotics. *Physica D* **151**, 305–331.
- ANGENENT, S. & GURTIN, M. E. 1989 Multiphase thermomechanics with interfacial structure 2. Evolution of an isothermal interface. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **108**, 323–391.
- BURELBACH, J. P., BANKOFF, S. G. & DAVIS, S. H. 1988 Nonlinear stability of evaporating/condensing liquid films. *J. Fluid Mech.* **195**, 463–494.
- CAGINALP, G. An analysis of a phase field model of a free boundary. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **92**, 205–245.
- CAGINALP, G. Stefan and Hele-Shaw type models as asymptotic limits of the phase-field equations. *Phys. Rev. A* **39**, 5887–5896.
- CERMELLI, P. & FRIED, E. 1997 The influence of inertia on the configurational forces in a deformable solid. *Proc. Royal Soc. London A* **453**, 1915–1927.
- CERMELLI, P., FRIED, E. & GURTIN, M. E. 2004 Transport relations for surface integrals arising in the formulation of balance laws for evolving fluid interfaces. *J. Fluid Mech.*, submitted.
- COLLINS, J. B. & LEVINE, H. 1985 Diffuse interface model of diffusion-limited crystal growth. *Phys. Rev. B* **31**, 6119–6122.
- EDWARDS, D. A., BRENNER, H. & WASAN, D. T. 1991 *Interfacial Transport Processes and Rheology*, Butterworths-Heinemann, Boston.
- DANOV, K. D., ALLEBORN, N., RASZILLIER, H. & DURST, F. 1998 The stability of evaporating thin liquid films in the presence of surfactant. I. Lubrication approximation and linear analysis. *Phys. Fluids* **10**, 131–143.

- ESHELBY, J. D. 1951 The force on an elastic singularity. *Phil. Trans. Royal Soc. London A* **244**, 87–112.
- ESHELBY, J. D. 1956 The continuum theory of lattice defects. In *Progress in Solid State Physics* 3 (eds. F. Seitz, D. Turnbull), Academic Press, New York.
- ESHELBY, J. D. 1970 Energy relations and the energy-momentum tensor in continuum mechanics. In *Inelastic Behavior of Solids* (eds. M. F. Kanninen, W. F. Alder, A. R. Rosenfield, R. I. Jaffe), McGraw-Hill, New York.
- ESHELBY, J. D. 1975 The elastic energy-momentum tensor. *J. Elasticity* **5**, 321–335.
- FRANK, F. C. 1958 On the kinematic theory of crystal growth and dissolution processes. In *Growth and Perfection of Crystals* (eds. R. H. Doremus, B. W. Roberts & D. Turnbull), Wiley, New York.
- FRIED, E. 1995 Energy release, friction, and supplemental relations at phase interfaces *Continuum Mech. Thermodyn.* **7**, 111–121.
- FRIED, E., GURTIN M. E. 1993 Continuum theory of thermally induced phase transitions based on an order parameter. *Physica D* **68**, 326–342.
- FRIED, E., GURTIN M. E. 1999 Coherent solid-state phase transitions with atomic diffusion: a thermomechanical treatment. *J. Statistical Phys.* **95**, 1361–1427.
- GURTIN, M. E. 1988 Multiphase thermomechanics with interfacial structure 1. Heat conduction and the capillary balance law. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **104**, 185–221.
- GURTIN, M. E. 1995 The nature of configurational forces. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **131**, 67–100.
- GURTIN, M. E. 2000 *Configurational Forces as Basic Concepts of Continuum Physics*, Springer-Verlag, New York.
- GURTIN, M. E. & STRUTHERS, A. 1990 Multiphase thermomechanics with interfacial structure 3. Evolving phase boundaries in the presence of bulk deformation. *Arch. Rational Mech. Analysis* **112**, 97–160.
- GURTIN, M. E., STRUTHERS, A. & WILLIAMS, W. O. 1989 A transport theorem for moving interfaces. *Q. Appl. Math.* **47**, 773–777.
- HERRING, C. 1951 Surface tension as a motivation for sintering. In *The Physics of Powder Metallurgy* (ed. W. E. Kingston), McGraw-Hill, New York.
- HICKMAN, K. C. D. 1952 Surface behavior in the pot still. *Ind. Eng. Chem.* **44**, 1892–1902.
- HICKMAN, K. 1972 Torpid phenomena and pump oils. *J. Vac. Sci. Technol.* **9**, 960–976.
- JOSEPH, D. D. & RENARDY, Y. 1993 *Fundamentals of Two-Fluid Dynamics. Part 1: Mathematical Theory and Applications*, Springer-Verlag, New York.
- LAMÉ, G. & CLAPEYRON, B. P. 1831 Mémoire sur la solidification par refroidissement d'un globe liquide. *Ann. Chim. Physique* **47**, 250–256.
- LANGER, J. S. 1978 Unpublished notes.
- LAPLACE, P. S. 1806 *Mécanique Céleste*, Supplement au X^e Livre, Impresse Imperiale, Paris. (Translated as *Celestial Mechanics*, Volume IV, Chelsea, New York, 1966.)
- MAXWELL, J. C. 1875 On the dynamical evidence of the molecular constitution of matter. *Nature* **11**, 357–359 & 374–377.
- MULLINS, W. W. 1956 Two-dimensional motion of idealized grain boundaries. *J. Appl. Phys.* **27**, 900–904.
- NABARRO, F. R. N. 1985 Material forces and configurational forces in interaction of elastic singularities. In *Proceedings of the International Symposium on the Mechanics of Dislocations* (eds. E. C. Aifantis & J. P. Hirth), American Society of Metals, Metals Park, OH.
- PALMER, H. J. 1976 The hydrodynamic stability of rapidly evaporating liquids at reduced pressure. *J. Fluid Mech.* **75**, 487–511.
- PEACH, M. O. & KOEHLER, J. S. 1950 The forces exerted on dislocations and the stress fields produced by them. *Phys. Rev.* **80**, 436–439.
- PENROSE, O. & FIFE, P. C. 1990 Thermodynamically consistent models of phase-field type for the kinetics of phase-transitions. *Physica D* **43** 44–62.
- SCHRAGE, R. W. 1953 *A Theoretical Study of Interphase Mass Transfer*, Columbia University Press, New York.
- SCRIVEN, L. E. 1960 Dynamics of a fluid interface. *Chem. Eng. Sci.* **12**, 98–108.
- SLATTERY, J. C. 1990 *Interfacial Transport Phenomena*, Springer-Verlag, New York.

- STEFAN, J. 1889 Über einige Probleme der Theorie der Wärmeleitung. *Sb. Kais. Akad. Wiss., Wien, Math.-Naturwiss.* **98**, 473–484.
- STONE, H. A., STROOCK, A. D. & AJDARI, A. 2004 Engineering flows in small devices: Microfluidics toward lab-on-a-chip. *Ann. Rev. Fluid Mech.* **36**, 381–411.
- VORONKOV, V. V. 1964 Conditions for formation of mosaic structure on a crystallization front. *Sov. Phys. Solid State* **6**, 2378–2381.
- WANG, S. L., SEKERKA, R. F., WHEELER, A. A., MURRAY, B. T., CORIELL, S. R., BRAUN, R. J. & MCFADDEN, G. B. 1993 Thermodynamically-consistent phase-field models for solidification. *Physica D* **69**, 189–200.
- YOUNG, T. 1805 An essay on the cohesion of fluids. *Phil. Trans. Royal Soc. London* **95**, 65–87.

List of Recent TAM Reports

No.	Authors	Title	Date
982	Adrian, R. J., and Z.-C. Liu	Observation of vortex packets in direct numerical simulation of fully turbulent channel flow – <i>Journal of Visualization</i> , in press (2002)	Oct. 2001
983	Fried, E., and R. E. Todres	Disclinated states in nematic elastomers – <i>Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids</i> 50 , 2691–2716 (2002)	Oct. 2001
984	Stewart, D. S.	Towards the miniaturization of explosive technology – Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Shock Waves (2001)	Oct. 2001
985	Kasimov, A. R., and Stewart, D. S.	Spinning instability of gaseous detonations – <i>Journal of Fluid Mechanics</i> (submitted)	Oct. 2001
986	Brown, E. N., N. R. Sottos, and S. R. White	Fracture testing of a self-healing polymer composite – <i>Experimental Mechanics</i> (submitted)	Nov. 2001
987	Phillips, W. R. C.	Langmuir circulations – <i>Surface Waves</i> (J. C. R. Hunt and S. Sajjadi, eds.), in press (2002)	Nov. 2001
988	Gioia, G., and F. A. Bombardelli	Scaling and similarity in rough channel flows – <i>Physical Review Letters</i> 88 , 014501 (2002)	Nov. 2001
989	Riahi, D. N.	On stationary and oscillatory modes of flow instabilities in a rotating porous layer during alloy solidification – <i>Journal of Porous Media</i> 6 , 1–11 (2003)	Nov. 2001
990	Okhuysen, B. S., and D. N. Riahi	Effect of Coriolis force on instabilities of liquid and mushy regions during alloy solidification – <i>Physics of Fluids</i> (submitted)	Dec. 2001
991	Christensen, K. T., and R. J. Adrian	Measurement of instantaneous Eulerian acceleration fields by particle-image accelerometry: Method and accuracy – <i>Experimental Fluids</i> (submitted)	Dec. 2001
992	Liu, M., and K. J. Hsia	Interfacial cracks between piezoelectric and elastic materials under in-plane electric loading – <i>Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids</i> 51 , 921–944 (2003)	Dec. 2001
993	Panat, R. P., S. Zhang, and K. J. Hsia	Bond coat surface rumpling in thermal barrier coatings – <i>Acta Materialia</i> 51 , 239–249 (2003)	Jan. 2002
994	Aref, H.	A transformation of the point vortex equations – <i>Physics of Fluids</i> 14 , 2395–2401 (2002)	Jan. 2002
995	Saif, M. T. A, S. Zhang, A. Haque, and K. J. Hsia	Effect of native Al ₂ O ₃ on the elastic response of nanoscale aluminum films – <i>Acta Materialia</i> 50 , 2779–2786 (2002)	Jan. 2002
996	Fried, E., and M. E. Gurtin	A nonequilibrium theory of epitaxial growth that accounts for surface stress and surface diffusion – <i>Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids</i> 51 , 487–517 (2003)	Jan. 2002
997	Aref, H.	The development of chaotic advection – <i>Physics of Fluids</i> 14 , 1315–1325 (2002); see also <i>Virtual Journal of Nanoscale Science and Technology</i> , 11 March 2002	Jan. 2002
998	Christensen, K. T., and R. J. Adrian	The velocity and acceleration signatures of small-scale vortices in turbulent channel flow – <i>Journal of Turbulence</i> , in press (2002)	Jan. 2002
999	Riahi, D. N.	Flow instabilities in a horizontal dendrite layer rotating about an inclined axis – <i>Journal of Porous Media</i> , in press (2003)	Feb. 2002
1000	Kessler, M. R., and S. R. White	Cure kinetics of ring-opening metathesis polymerization of dicyclopentadiene – <i>Journal of Polymer Science A</i> 40 , 2373–2383 (2002)	Feb. 2002
1001	Dolbow, J. E., E. Fried, and A. Q. Shen	Point defects in nematic gels: The case for hedgehogs – <i>Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis</i> , in press (2004)	Feb. 2002
1002	Riahi, D. N.	Nonlinear steady convection in rotating mushy layers – <i>Journal of Fluid Mechanics</i> 485 , 279–306 (2003)	Mar. 2002
1003	Carlson, D. E., E. Fried, and S. Sellers	The totality of soft-states in a neo-classical nematic elastomer – <i>Journal of Elasticity</i> 69 , 169–180 (2003) with revised title	Mar. 2002
1004	Fried, E., and R. E. Todres	Normal-stress differences and the detection of disclinations in nematic elastomers – <i>Journal of Polymer Science B: Polymer Physics</i> 40 , 2098–2106 (2002)	June 2002

List of Recent TAM Reports (cont'd)

No.	Authors	Title	Date
1005	Fried, E., and B. C. Roy	Gravity-induced segregation of cohesionless granular mixtures – <i>Lecture Notes in Mechanics</i> , in press (2002)	July 2002
1006	Tomkins, C. D., and R. J. Adrian	Spanwise structure and scale growth in turbulent boundary layers – <i>Journal of Fluid Mechanics</i> (submitted)	Aug. 2002
1007	Riahi, D. N.	On nonlinear convection in mushy layers: Part 2. Mixed oscillatory and stationary modes of convection – <i>Journal of Fluid Mechanics</i> 517 , 71–102 (2004)	Sept. 2002
1008	Aref, H., P. K. Newton, M. A. Stremler, T. Tokieda, and D. L. Vainchtein	Vortex crystals – <i>Advances in Applied Mathematics</i> 39 , in press (2002)	Oct. 2002
1009	Bagchi, P., and S. Balachandar	Effect of turbulence on the drag and lift of a particle – <i>Physics of Fluids</i> , in press (2003)	Oct. 2002
1010	Zhang, S., R. Panat, and K. J. Hsia	Influence of surface morphology on the adhesive strength of aluminum/epoxy interfaces – <i>Journal of Adhesion Science and Technology</i> 17 , 1685–1711 (2003)	Oct. 2002
1011	Carlson, D. E., E. Fried, and D. A. Tortorelli	On internal constraints in continuum mechanics – <i>Journal of Elasticity</i> 70 , 101–109 (2003)	Oct. 2002
1012	Boyland, P. L., M. A. Stremler, and H. Aref	Topological fluid mechanics of point vortex motions – <i>Physica D</i> 175 , 69–95 (2002)	Oct. 2002
1013	Bhattacharjee, P., and D. N. Riahi	Computational studies of the effect of rotation on convection during protein crystallization – <i>International Journal of Mathematical Sciences</i> , in press (2004)	Feb. 2003
1014	Brown, E. N., M. R. Kessler, N. R. Sottos, and S. R. White	<i>In situ</i> poly(urea-formaldehyde) microencapsulation of dicyclopentadiene – <i>Journal of Microencapsulation</i> (submitted)	Feb. 2003
1015	Brown, E. N., S. R. White, and N. R. Sottos	Microcapsule induced toughening in a self-healing polymer composite – <i>Journal of Materials Science</i> (submitted)	Feb. 2003
1016	Kuznetsov, I. R., and D. S. Stewart	Burning rate of energetic materials with thermal expansion – <i>Combustion and Flame</i> (submitted)	Mar. 2003
1017	Dolbow, J., E. Fried, and H. Ji	Chemically induced swelling of hydrogels – <i>Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids</i> , in press (2003)	Mar. 2003
1018	Costello, G. A.	Mechanics of wire rope – Mordica Lecture, Interwire 2003, Wire Association International, Atlanta, Georgia, May 12, 2003	Mar. 2003
1019	Wang, J., N. R. Sottos, and R. L. Weaver	Thin film adhesion measurement by laser induced stress waves – <i>Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids</i> (submitted)	Apr. 2003
1020	Bhattacharjee, P., and D. N. Riahi	Effect of rotation on surface tension driven flow during protein crystallization – <i>Microgravity Science and Technology</i> 14 , 36–44 (2003)	Apr. 2003
1021	Fried, E.	The configurational and standard force balances are not always statements of a single law – <i>Proceedings of the Royal Society</i> (submitted)	Apr. 2003
1022	Panat, R. P., and K. J. Hsia	Experimental investigation of the bond coat rumpling instability under isothermal and cyclic thermal histories in thermal barrier systems – <i>Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A</i> 460 , 1957–1979 (2003)	May 2003
1023	Fried, E., and M. E. Gurtin	A unified treatment of evolving interfaces accounting for small deformations and atomic transport: grain-boundaries, phase transitions, epitaxy – <i>Advances in Applied Mechanics</i> 40 , 1–177 (2004)	May 2003
1024	Dong, F., D. N. Riahi, and A. T. Hsui	On similarity waves in compacting media – <i>Horizons in World Physics</i> 244 , 45–82 (2004)	May 2003
1025	Liu, M., and K. J. Hsia	Locking of electric field induced non-180° domain switching and phase transition in ferroelectric materials upon cyclic electric fatigue – <i>Applied Physics Letters</i> 83 , 3978–3980 (2003)	May 2003

List of Recent TAM Reports (cont'd)

No.	Authors	Title	Date
1026	Liu, M., K. J. Hsia, and M. Sardela Jr.	In situ X-ray diffraction study of electric field induced domain switching and phase transition in PZT-5H – <i>Journal of the American Ceramics Society</i> (submitted)	May 2003
1027	Riahi, D. N.	On flow of binary alloys during crystal growth – <i>Recent Research Development in Crystal Growth</i> , in press (2003)	May 2003
1028	Riahi, D. N.	On fluid dynamics during crystallization – <i>Recent Research Development in Fluid Dynamics</i> , in press (2003)	July 2003
1029	Fried, E., V. Korchagin, and R. E. Todres	Biaxial disclinated states in nematic elastomers – <i>Journal of Chemical Physics</i> 119 , 13170–13179 (2003)	July 2003
1030	Sharp, K. V., and R. J. Adrian	Transition from laminar to turbulent flow in liquid filled microtubes – <i>Physics of Fluids</i> (submitted)	July 2003
1031	Yoon, H. S., D. F. Hill, S. Balachandar, R. J. Adrian, and M. Y. Ha	Reynolds number scaling of flow in a Rushton turbine stirred tank: Part I – Mean flow, circular jet and tip vortex scaling – <i>Chemical Engineering Science</i> (submitted)	Aug. 2003
1032	Raju, R., S. Balachandar, D. F. Hill, and R. J. Adrian	Reynolds number scaling of flow in a Rushton turbine stirred tank: Part II – Eigen-decomposition of fluctuation – <i>Chemical Engineering Science</i> (submitted)	Aug. 2003
1033	Hill, K. M., G. Gioia, and V. V. Tota	Structure and kinematics in dense free-surface granular flow – <i>Physical Review Letters</i> , in press (2003)	Aug. 2003
1034	Fried, E., and S. Sellers	Free-energy density functions for nematic elastomers – <i>Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids</i> 52 , 1671–1689 (2004)	Sept. 2003
1035	Kasimov, A. R., and D. S. Stewart	On the dynamics of self-sustained one-dimensional detonations: A numerical study in the shock-attached frame – <i>Physics of Fluids</i> (submitted)	Nov. 2003
1036	Fried, E., and B. C. Roy	Disclinations in a homogeneously deformed nematic elastomer – <i>Nature Materials</i> (submitted)	Nov. 2003
1037	Fried, E., and M. E. Gurtin	The unifying nature of the configurational force balance – <i>Mechanics of Material Forces</i> (P. Steinmann and G. A. Maugin, eds.), in press (2003)	Dec. 2003
1038	Panat, R., K. J. Hsia, and J. W. Oldham	Rumpling instability in thermal barrier systems under isothermal conditions in vacuum – <i>Philosophical Magazine</i> , in press (2004)	Dec. 2003
1039	Cermelli, P., E. Fried, and M. E. Gurtin	Sharp-interface nematic-isotropic phase transitions without flow – <i>Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis</i> 174 , 151–178 (2004)	Dec. 2003
1040	Yoo, S., and D. S. Stewart	A hybrid level-set method in two and three dimensions for modeling detonation and combustion problems in complex geometries – <i>Combustion Theory and Modeling</i> (submitted)	Feb. 2004
1041	Dienberg, C. E., S. E. Ott-Monsivais, J. L. Ranchoero, A. A. Rzeszutko, and C. L. Winter	Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Research Conference in Mechanics (April 2003), TAM Department, UIUC (E. N. Brown, ed.)	Feb. 2004
1042	Kasimov, A. R., and D. S. Stewart	Asymptotic theory of ignition and failure of self-sustained detonations – <i>Journal of Fluid Mechanics</i> (submitted)	Feb. 2004
1043	Kasimov, A. R., and D. S. Stewart	Theory of direct initiation of gaseous detonations and comparison with experiment – <i>Proceedings of the Combustion Institute</i> (submitted)	Mar. 2004
1044	Panat, R., K. J. Hsia, and D. G. Cahill	Evolution of surface waviness in thin films via volume and surface diffusion – <i>Journal of Applied Physics</i> (submitted)	Mar. 2004
1045	Riahi, D. N.	Steady and oscillatory flow in a mushy layer – <i>Current Topics in Crystal Growth Research</i> , in press (2004)	Mar. 2004
1046	Riahi, D. N.	Modeling flows in protein crystal growth – <i>Current Topics in Crystal Growth Research</i> , in press (2004)	Mar. 2004
1047	Bagchi, P., and S. Balachandar	Response of the wake of an isolated particle to isotropic turbulent cross-flow – <i>Journal of Fluid Mechanics</i> (submitted)	Mar. 2004

List of Recent TAM Reports (cont'd)

No.	Authors	Title	Date
1048	Brown, E. N., S. R. White, and N. R. Sottos	Fatigue crack propagation in microcapsule toughened epoxy – <i>Journal of Materials Science</i> (submitted)	Apr. 2004
1049	Zeng, L., S. Balachandar, and P. Fischer	Wall-induced forces on a rigid sphere at finite Reynolds number – <i>Journal of Fluid Mechanics</i> (submitted)	May 2004
1050	Dolbow, J., E. Fried, and H. Ji	A numerical strategy for investigating the kinetic response of stimulus-responsive hydrogels – <i>Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids</i> (submitted)	June 2004
1051	Riahi, D. N.	Effect of permeability on steady flow in a dendrite layer – <i>Journal of Porous Media</i> , in press (2004)	July 2004
1052	Cermelli, P., E. Fried, and M. E. Gurtin	Transport relations for surface integrals arising in the formulation of balance laws for evolving fluid interfaces – <i>Journal of Fluid Mechanics</i> (submitted)	Sept. 2004
1053	Stewart, D. S., and A. R. Kasimov	Theory of detonation with an embedded sonic locus – <i>SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics</i> (submitted)	Oct. 2004
1054	Stewart, D. S., K. C. Tang, S. Yoo, M. Q. Brewster, and I. R. Kuznetsov	Multi-scale modeling of solid rocket motors: Time integration methods from computational aerodynamics applied to stable quasi-steady motor burning – <i>Proceedings of the 43rd AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting and Exhibit</i> (January 2005), Paper AIAA-2005-0357 (2005)	Oct. 2004
1055	Ji, H., H. Mourad, E. Fried, and J. Dolbow	Kinetics of thermally induced swelling of hydrogels – <i>International Journal of Solids and Structures</i> (submitted)	Dec. 2004
1056	Fulton, J. M., S. Hussain, J. H. Lai, M. E. Ly, S. A. McGough, G. M. Miller, R. Oats, L. A. Shipton, P. K. Shreeman, D. S. Widrevitz, and E. A. Zimmermann	Final reports: Mechanics of complex materials, Summer 2004 (K. M. Hill and J. W. Phillips, eds.)	Dec. 2004
1057	Hill, K. M., G. Gioia, and D. R. Amaravadi	Radial segregation patterns in rotating granular mixtures: Waviness selection – <i>Physical Review Letters</i> , in press (2004)	Dec. 2004
1058	Riahi, D. N.	Nonlinear oscillatory convection in rotating mushy layers – <i>Journal of Fluid Mechanics</i> (submitted)	Dec. 2004
1059	Okhuysen, B. S., and D. N. Riahi	On buoyant convection in binary solidification – <i>Journal of Fluid Mechanics</i> (submitted)	Jan. 2005
1060	Brown, E. N., S. R. White, and N. R. Sottos	Retardation and repair of fatigue cracks in a microcapsule toughened epoxy composite – Part I: Manual infiltration – <i>Composites Science and Technology</i> (submitted)	Jan. 2005
1061	Brown, E. N., S. R. White, and N. R. Sottos	Retardation and repair of fatigue cracks in a microcapsule toughened epoxy composite – Part II: <i>In situ</i> self-healing – <i>Composites Science and Technology</i> (submitted)	Jan. 2005
1062	Berfield, T. A., R. J. Ong, D. A. Payne, and N. R. Sottos	Residual stress effects on piezoelectric response of sol-gel derived PZT thin films – <i>Journal of Applied Physics</i> (submitted)	Apr. 2005
1063	Anderson, D. M., P. Cermelli, E. Fried, M. E. Gurtin, and G. B. McFadden	General dynamical sharp-interface conditions for phase transformations in viscous heat-conducting fluids – <i>Journal of Fluid Mechanics</i> (submitted)	Apr. 2005
1064	Fried, E., and M. E. Gurtin	Second-gradient fluids: A theory for incompressible flows at small length scales – <i>Journal of Fluid Mechanics</i> (submitted)	Apr. 2005