Collective Dynamics in Suspensions of Swimmers

Igor Aranson With: Argonne National Laboratory

Andrey Sokolov, ANL Raymond Goldstein, Cambridge, Falko Ziebert ANL/ESPCI Leonid Berlyand, Shawn Ryan, Brian Haines, PennState



Supported by US Department of Energy

Self-Propelled BioParticles

swimming bacteria Bacillus Subtilis length 5 μ m, speed 20 μ m/sec collective flows up to 100 μ m/sec







2

Large-Scale Coherence: "Flat" Sessile Drop

Bugs concentrate at the contact line





Dombrowski, Cisneros, Chatkaew, Goldstein, Kessler, PRL (2004)

Schematics of Experimental Setup

Concept: Andrey Sokolov, ANL





Inelastic collisions between bacteria





Andrey Sokolov & Igor Aranson, ANL Ray Goldstein & John Kessler, U Arizona

Collective swimming transition





Velocity-Orientation Correlation Lost

Velocity Field V

Orientation Field τ







Transition to Collective Swimming





Single particles (Jeffery orbits): Slender body in viscous fluid



• Planar shear flow: $v=(0, \gamma y, 0)$, γ strain rate, or pure shear

Slender body dynamics in shear flow



Kim and Karilla, Microhydrodynamics, 2005

Illustration of Jeffery orbits, planar shear flow





Velocity field: Bacteria are force dipoles

force exerted by flaggelum on swimmer



Bacteria are low Reynolds number creatures: Re=V L/n~10-4

'Bacteria motion is overdamped: no acceleration, zero net force



Bacterium acts as a force dipole: force of self-propulsion and force opposing drag act on water in opposite directions

Michael Graham et al, PRL 2005

velocity of point monopole in 3D (stokeslet)

velocity of point dipole u0 in 3D (stresslet)



velocity fields of pushers and pullers



algae





Theoretical Model

Microscopic interaction rules: -self-propulsion; hydrodynamically-induced inelastic collision -flow advection; direction realignment in shear flow

Inelastic collision of two bacteria





Spatial Localization of Interaction

W- interaction kernel, interaction between rods decay with the distance Dij,Dr -translational and rotational diffusion of rods v0 - propulsion velocity V, Ω – hydrodynamic velocity and vorticity E – strain rate tensor

$$\partial_{t}P + \nabla \cdot \left[\left(v_{0}\mathbf{n} + \mathbf{v} \right) P \right] + \frac{1}{2}\Omega \partial_{\phi}P = D_{r}\partial_{\phi}^{2}P + \partial_{i}D_{ij}\partial_{j}P + \int \int d\mathbf{r}_{1}d\mathbf{r}_{2}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} d\phi_{2}$$
$$\times \quad W(\mathbf{r}_{1}, \mathbf{r}_{2})P(\mathbf{r}_{1}, \phi_{1})P(\mathbf{r}_{2}, \phi_{2}) \left[\delta \left(\bar{\mathbf{r}} - \mathbf{r}, \bar{\phi} - \phi \right) - \delta \left(\mathbf{r}_{2} - \mathbf{r}, \phi_{2} - \phi \right) \right] - \gamma \left(\mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{n} \cdot \frac{\partial P}{\partial \mathbf{n}} \right)$$



The Diffusion Matrix in Kirkwood Approximation



l – length of the rod, *d*- diameter, ηs – viscosity of solvent *18*

Theoretical Model

Microscopic interaction rules:

-self-propulsion; hydrodynamically-induced inelastic collision -flow advection; direction realignment in shear flow



Results of Modeling

•Instability of uniform flow •Mechanism: coupling between selfpropulsion and shear-induced alignment







wavenumber

Experiment and Theory









Mean-Field Hydrodynamic Theory Saintillan & Shelley

Kinetic equation for probability distribution



Saintillan and Shelley, PRL 2008

Meanfield Hydrodynamic Theory





Hydrodynamic Coarse-Grained Theory

eqs for concentration, orientation, nematic tensor
long-wave linear stability analysis





Baskaran & Marchetti, PNAS 2009

Rheology: apparent viscosity



Viscosity of Passive Suspensions: (Albert) Einstein theory

Dilute suspensions of impenetrable spheres, zero Reynolds number (Stokes limit)

 $\eta 0$ – viscosity of the background fluid, ϕ – volume fraction of spheres



Self-propulsion and Viscosity

When dipole is aligned with flow, dipole increases rate of strain without changing forces at the boundary

Non-spherical particles tend to align with stable axis of flow

Increase of background (bg) flow, decrease of viscosity

[.]For passive suspensions and pullers , viscosity increases with concentration of inclusions





Probing Micro-Rheology of Active Suspensions Experiment #1



Microrheology is studied in thin free-standing film geometry Experiment performed in closed chamber in air and in Nitrogen Control of activity: N2 \rightarrow no swimming, O2 \rightarrow swimming Viscosity is extracted from decay time (T) of a large vortex (L)

Sokolov & Aranson, PRL 2009 and also Physics World

ATIONAL

Viscosity vs. Concentration



viscosity:

Concentration: <u>10-20 times stationary growth conditions</u>

NATIONAL

29

Viscosity vs Swimming Speed



a)**n=1.8·1010 cm-3**



_{b)}n=1010 cm-3

Slender body dynamics in shear flow



Effective Viscosity via Dissipation Rate



Stress Tensor for Dipoles



Particles rotation: Jeffery orbits

- $\cdot \Omega$ and vorticity and rate of strain of the background flow
- $\cdot \xi \alpha, \beta$ fluctuations (tumbling) with the strength D

 $\alpha = \Omega t$ for $\varepsilon < < 1$ – pure rotation

 $B \sim (b2-a2)/(a2+b2)$, a,b - semiaxis



Linear Fokker-Planck Equation

 $P(\alpha,\beta)$ – probability distribution function for bacteria orientations κ – angular velocity vector



Leal & Hinch, JFM 1971

Bulk Stress

Contribution due to passive spheroid
Contribution due to tumbling (noise)(Kim & Karilla, 1991)
(Leal & Hinch, 1971)
(Haines et al, PRE 2009)K, YH – resistance functions (depend on aspect ratio and position of
flagella)

$$\begin{split} \Sigma_{ij} =& 2\eta E_{ij} + \frac{5b}{a} \phi \eta \int_{S^2} \Lambda_{ijkl} P^{\infty} dS E_{kl} \\ &+ 3\eta \phi Y^H \frac{b}{a} \int_{S^2} (\epsilon_{ikl} d_j + \epsilon_{jkl} d_i) d_l (\Omega_k - \omega_k^D - \omega^R) P^{\infty} dS \\ &+ \frac{1}{16\pi b^2} \phi K \int_{S^2} (\delta_{ij} - 3d_i d_j) P^{\infty} dS + \mathcal{O}(\phi^2), \end{split}$$



Effective Viscosity in 3D (almost spheres, $B \rightarrow 0$)

- · VO swimming speed, F -propulsion force
- \cdot small fluctuations limit ($D \ll -$) is singular
- Decrease of viscosity due to swimming (for pushers, $\lambda > 0$)
- ·Also strain rate $\rightarrow 0$ limit is singular limit



Haines et al, 2009; Saintillan 2010

Flow without Vorticity

Negative contribution to viscosity for small stain rates



³⁸ $\mu \sim \epsilon \gamma/D << 1 - weak tendency to align; \mu >> 1 - strong alignment$

Planar Shear Flow



Counter-Intuitive Conclusion:

No viscosity reduction without tumbling for planar shear flow

However, experiments show almost no tumbling for Bacillus subtilis



Simulations

Bacteria are modeled by swimming point dipoles No tumbling Short-range repulsion to account for finite particle size 3D simulation domain Lee-Edwards boundary conditions in the direction of shear >100,000 particles Simulations are implemented on GPU



Lees-Edwards Boundary Conditions



Equations



Typical simulation

Full 3D, up to 483 particles Fermi GTX480 GPU, 2-3 hours Range of velocities, concentrations, strains



ATIONAL

44

Stress Tensor



Viscosity vs Concentration

Simulations

Experiment





Viscosity vs Swimming Speed

Simulations

Experiment



Orientation Distribution Functions $P(\alpha,\beta)$



low concentration, max at $\pi/2$

Dilute limit with tumbling



high concentration, max at $\pi/4$

Analytical Results



Conclusions

Equations are derived from microscopic interaction rules Reasonable agreement with experiment Applications for biological and non-biological systems: -bacterial colonies -cytoskeleton dynamics -self-propelled particles (vibrated rods, etc)

