Effect of insoluble surfactants on a thermocapillary flow

Cite as: Phys. Fluids **33**, 072106 (2021); <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0055373>

Submitted: 28 April 2021 . Accepted: 16 June 2021 . Published Online: 14 July 2021

Franco N. Piñan Basualdo, R. Terrazas Mallea, B. Scheid, A. Bolopion, M. Gauthier, and P. Lambert

[View Online](#)

[Export Citation](#)

[CrossMark](#)

Physics of Fluids

SPECIAL TOPIC: Flow and Acoustics of Unmanned Vehicles

Submit Today!

Effect of insoluble surfactants on a thermocapillary flow

Cite as: Phys. Fluids **33**, 072106 (2021); doi: [10.1063/5.0055373](https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0055373)

Submitted: 28 April 2021 · Accepted: 16 June 2021 ·

Published Online: 14 July 2021

View Online

Export Citation

CrossMark

Franco N. Piñan Basualdo,^{1,2,a)} R. Terrazas Mallea,³ B. Scheid,¹ A. Bolopion,² M. Gauthier,²
and P. Lambert¹

AFFILIATIONS

¹Transfers, Interfaces and Processes (TIPs), Ecole Polytechnique de Bruxelles (CP 165/67), Université Libre de Bruxelles, Avenue Franklin Roosevelt 50, 1050 Brussels, Belgium

²FEMTO-ST Institute, Université Bourgogne Franche-Comté, CNRS, 24 rue Savary, F-25000 Besançon, France

³Institute of Physical Chemistry, Polish Academy of Sciences, Kasprzaka 44/52, 01-224 Warsaw, Poland

^{a)}Author to whom correspondence should be addressed: Franco.Pinan.Basualdo@ulb.be

ABSTRACT

The thermocapillary effect, arising flow due to a temperature gradient along a fluid interface, is the dominant effect in some industrial and microfluidic processes and must be studied in order to optimize them. In this work, we analyze how insoluble surfactants adsorbed at the interface can affect such a flow. In particular, we analyze the case where the thermocapillary flow is induced at the air–water interface by locally heating it with an infrared laser, setup that is used to manipulate floating particles through the generated flow. Since water is a polar fluid, the air–water interface is easily polluted by surfactants. We developed a numerical model considering the uncontrolled presence of surfactants, which evidences that the effect of the surface contamination cannot be neglected, even for small surfactants concentration. The results of this numerical model were compared with different experimental measurements: particle tracking velocimetry, convection cell radius measurements, and thermography of the surface. All the experimental observations agree with the numerical model with the initial surface contamination being a fitting parameter. The model was then validated comparing its results with measurements for which a known quantity of surfactant was added to the interface. Finally, an analytical model was developed to explain the effects of the governing parameters, which agrees with the simulations and the experimental results. The developed models give us insight toward the miniaturization of the manipulation platform.

Published under an exclusive license by AIP Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0055373>

I. INTRODUCTION

Whenever a gradient of temperature exists along a fluid interface, an interfacial flow will arise due to the resulting surface stress.¹ This effect, known as thermocapillary effect, has a strong impact on industrial processes, like welding² and solidification.³ More recently, several applications have been developed in the field of microfluidics: a thermocapillary pump,⁴ droplets generation⁵ and migration,^{6,7} bubbles migration,^{8,9} and particles manipulation.¹⁰ These applications require understanding and controlling the thermocapillary flow. Experimentally, it can be difficult to obtain a perfectly clean fluid interface. Adsorbed impurities act like surfactants that rigidify the interface,^{11,12} effect known as surface elasticity, and can affect the thermocapillary flow. The presence of such an adsorbed layer of surfactants has been observed to cause symmetry breaking instabilities^{13,14} under some conditions. The stable regime has also been studied¹⁵ in a thin water layer under 2D configuration. Therefore, in this manuscript we close the gap and study the effect

of an adsorbed layer of surfactants on the symmetric thermocapillary flow in a cylindrical configuration and a thick water layer.

In particular, we analyze the case where an infrared (IR) laser is used to generate a localized temperature increase at an air–water interface, inducing a thermocapillary flow. Such a configuration has been previously used to manipulate particles at the air–water interface.^{16,17} Water was selected as a fluid due to its high surface tension and low viscosity, giving place to high fluid velocities (≈ 30 mm/s). However, since water is a polar fluid, impurities can easily be trapped at the interface, which makes it almost impossible to have a completely pure air–water interface. In Sec. II, we first introduce the theoretical frame and our particular problem. Then, in Sec. III, we present the developed numerical model and compare its results with three experimental measurements: particle tracking velocimetry (PTV), convection cell radius, and thermography measurements. Finally, in Sec. IV, we present the developed analytical model and compare its predictions with the simulation and experimental results. We find that no matter how small the

amount of impurities, the induced surface elasticity always has an effect on the flow, similar to how a low fluid viscosity can completely change the flow profile compared to the inviscid case. The developed models help us to better understand the flow generation and give us insights toward the miniaturization of the thermocapillary manipulation platform.

II. PHYSICAL CONSIDERATIONS

In this section, we first introduce the theoretical frame of the work. Then, we present the particular problem we focus on, and we introduce the non-dimensional parameters governing the system.

A. Theoretical frame

Surface tension (σ) can be defined as the required energy to increase the area of an interface per unit area ($\sigma = \partial E / \partial A$). It is known that surface tension depends on the temperature and on the concentration of some species.¹⁸ In particular, some big molecules, known as surfactants, that have a hydrophobic tail and a hydrophilic head, adsorb at air–water or oil–water interfaces. They adsorb with their heads in the water phase and their tails in the other one, and reduce the surface tension.¹⁹ When a gradient of surface tension exists along the interface, whether it is due to a temperature or concentration gradient, a surface stress arises ($\tau_\sigma = \nabla_s \sigma$). This stress is balanced by the viscous shear stress of each phase, resulting in

$$\mu_1 \frac{\partial \mathbf{U}_1}{\partial \mathbf{n}} - \mu_2 \frac{\partial \mathbf{U}_2}{\partial \mathbf{n}} = \nabla_s \sigma, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{U}_i$ and μ_i are the velocity vector and the dynamic viscosity of the fluid i , respectively, and $\mathbf{n}$ is the interface normal vector pointing from phase 1 to phase 2. The operator ∇_s is the surface gradient operator [$\nabla_s \sigma = \nabla \sigma - \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla \sigma)$]. In the case of a liquid–gas interface, the gas' phase viscous stress can be neglected in (1). If we also assume that there is only one species of surfactant, we can write

$$\mu \frac{\partial \mathbf{U}}{\partial \mathbf{n}} = -(\gamma_T \nabla_s T + \gamma_\Gamma \nabla_s \Gamma), \quad (2)$$

where T is the temperature, Γ is the surface surfactant concentration, $\gamma_T = -\partial \sigma / \partial T$ and $\gamma_\Gamma = -\partial \sigma / \partial \Gamma$ are positive values hereby assumed constant. This last approximation is valid for low surfactant concentrations (for higher concentrations $\partial \sigma / \partial \Gamma = -E_s / \Gamma$ where E_s is the surface elasticity¹²). It can be seen that, through (2), the momentum equation gets coupled with the energy and the surfactant transport equations at the interface. The surfactant transport equation can be complex for soluble surfactants, due to adsorption dynamics, or deformable interfaces,²⁰ but in the case of an insoluble surfactant and a non-deformable interface, this equation is reduced to

$$\frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial t} + \nabla_s \cdot (\mathbf{U} \Gamma) = D_s \nabla_s^2 \Gamma, \quad (3)$$

where D_s is a surface diffusion coefficient.

B. Particular problem

In our case,^{16,17} we study the geometry shown in Fig. 1. A cylindrical volume of water whose top surface, in contact with air and where a layer of insoluble surfactants is adsorbed, is heated from above by an infrared laser beam pointed at the center of the water–air interface. Qualitatively, once the laser is turned on, the temperature at the

FIG. 1. Schematics of the system. An infrared laser (Keopsys Fiber Raman Laser CRFL-01-1455-OM1-B130-FA, wavelength $\lambda = 1455$ nm, output power of up to 1 W) is collimated and used to heat the air–water interface of a cylindrical volume of water (radius $R_r = 25$ mm and height $H_r = 7.5$ mm) from above. The laser waist diameter is $2R_L = 1.26$ mm (at the interface), and it is assumed to be constant (collimated beam).

center increases, creating a positive radial surface tension gradient, giving place to a positive radial flow. Because of mass conservation, a negative radial flow arises deep below the surface, generating a toroidal convection cell as shown by the arrows in Fig. 2(a) (Multimedia view). The radial flow at the free surface generates a depletion of surfactants around the laser spot, increasing the surface tension and counteracting the effect of the temperature increase.

In addition to the insolubility of the surfactants, we make further assumptions to simplify the modeling in the explored range of parameters (Table I): the interface deformations, the heat transfer to the air phase, and the buoyancy forces are neglected.

Indeed, surface deformations are considerable only for thin fluid layers.^{21,22} The vertical deformation of the interface in a similar configuration²³ has been predicted to be $\Delta H / R_L = \gamma_T \Delta T / \sigma_0$. If we consider $\Delta T \approx 2$ K (the measured temperature increase for a laser power $P_L = 40$ mW), we obtain $\Delta H / R_L \approx 0.004$, thus validating our assumption.

On the other hand, the heat transfer toward the air phase can be compared to the heat conduction in the water phase through the Biot number $Bi = h R_L / \kappa$, where h is the heat transfer coefficient to the air phase. Typical values for free convection of air²⁴ are $h < 25$ W/m² K, thus obtaining $Bi < 0.03$ and validating our assumption.

Finally, the strength of buoyancy forces can be compared to thermocapillary forces through the dynamic Bond number $Bo_d = \rho \beta g R_L^2 / \gamma_T = 0.005$, where $\beta = 200 \times 10^{-6}$ K⁻¹ is the thermal expansion coefficient of water, and $g = 9.8$ m/s² is the gravitational acceleration.

In order to explain the absorption of the energy provided by the laser, we consider the light attenuation coefficient of water $\alpha = 3280$ m⁻¹ defined for the used wavelength ($\lambda = 1455$ nm). Assuming a collimated Gaussian beam with a waist radius R_L , the absorbed volumetric power $\dot{q}_L$ (energy per unit volume and unit time) is²³

$$\dot{q}_L = \frac{2P_L \alpha}{\pi R_L^2} \exp \left(-2 \left(\frac{r}{R_L} \right)^2 + \alpha z \right), \quad (4)$$

where P_L is the laser power, r the radial coordinate, and z the vertical coordinate, with origin at the interface. Finally, (3) and (4) together

FIG. 2. Simulation results in the convective regime for $C_T = 1 \times 10^4$, $C_S = 30$, and $\tilde{t} = 25$. (a) Non-dimensional velocity $\tilde{u}$ result. (b) Surface non-dimensional velocity $\tilde{u}$, temperature $C_T \Theta$, and surfactant concentration $C_S \tilde{\Gamma}$. The non-dimensional radius $R_{\text{cell}} = 7$ is the point where the non-dimensional radial velocity vanishes. Multimedia views: <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0055373.1>; <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0055373.2>

with the mass, momentum (Navier–Stokes), and energy conservation complete the set of equations. Zero velocity, homogeneous temperature ($T = T_0$), and homogeneous surfactant concentration ($\Gamma = \Gamma_0$) are used as initial conditions. Regarding boundary conditions, we considered no slip, thermal insulation, and zero surfactant flux boundary conditions on the lateral recipient walls, no slip and constant temperature on the bottom wall, and zero vertical velocity (2), and thermal insulation at the air–water interface. For the detailed set of equations in cylindrical coordinates under the assumption of a flat interface, see the [supplementary material](#).

These equations can be made non-dimensional by using R_L as the characteristic length, $\tilde{t} = t\mu/\rho R_L^2$ as the non-dimensional time, $\tilde{U} = U\rho R_L/\mu$ as the non-dimensional velocity, $\tilde{P} = P\rho R_L^2/\mu^2$ as the non-dimensional pressure, $\Theta = (T - T_0)\kappa R_L/P_L$ as the non-dimensional temperature, and $\tilde{\Gamma} = \Gamma/\Gamma_0$ as the non-dimensional surfactant concentration. The resulting set of equations is

TABLE I. Parameters' values used in this work.

Density	ρ	997 kg/m ³
Dynamic viscosity	μ	1.002 mPa s
Thermal conductivity	κ	0.607 W/m K
Specific heat capacity	c_p	4181 J/kg K
Surface tension ($T = 20^\circ\text{C}$)	σ_0	72.9 mN/m
Thermocapillary coeff.	γ_T	155 $\mu\text{N/m K}$
Laser wavelength	λ	1455 nm
Light attenuation coeff.	α	3280 m ⁻¹
Laser waist radius	R_L	630 μm
Recipient radius	R_r	25 mm
Recipient height	H_r	7.5 mm
Laser power	P_L	20 to 200 mW
Surfactant surface pressure	$\gamma_\Gamma \Gamma_0$	0 to 150 $\mu\text{N/m}$
Surfactant diffusion coeff.	D_S	1×10^{-7} m ² /s

$$\tilde{\nabla} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{U}} = 0, \quad (5)$$

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{\mathbf{U}}}{\partial \tilde{t}} + \tilde{\mathbf{U}} \cdot \tilde{\nabla} \tilde{\mathbf{U}} = -\tilde{\nabla} \tilde{P} + \tilde{\nabla}^2 \tilde{\mathbf{U}}, \quad (6)$$

$$\frac{\partial \Theta}{\partial \tilde{t}} + \tilde{\mathbf{U}} \cdot \tilde{\nabla} \Theta = \frac{1}{Pr} (\tilde{\nabla}^2 \Theta + \dot{\tilde{q}}_L), \quad (7)$$

where $\dot{\tilde{q}}_L = 2\psi \exp(-2\tilde{r}^2 + \psi\tilde{z})/\pi$ is the dimensionless absorbed volumetric power, $\psi = \alpha R_L$ describes the aspect ratio of the heated volume, and $Pr = \mu c_p/\kappa$ is the Prandtl number. At the interface, (3) and (2) result

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{\Gamma}}{\partial \tilde{t}} + \tilde{\nabla}_s \cdot (\tilde{\mathbf{U}} C) = \frac{1}{Sc} \tilde{\nabla}_s^2 \tilde{\Gamma}, \quad (8)$$

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{\mathbf{U}}}{\partial \tilde{\mathbf{n}}} = -(C_T \tilde{\nabla}_s \Theta + C_S \tilde{\nabla}_s \tilde{\Gamma}), \quad (9)$$

where $Sc = \mu/\rho D_S$ is the surface Schmidt number, $C_T = \rho \gamma_T P_L/\mu^2 \kappa$ is the thermocapillary number, and $C_S = \rho \gamma_\Gamma \Gamma_0 R_L/\mu^2$ is the solutocapillary number. For the numerical values of these non-dimensional parameters, see [Table II](#). For the detailed set of non-dimensional equations in cylindrical coordinates under the assumption of a flat interface, see the [supplementary material](#).

III. RESULTS

In this section, we first present our numerical model and its results, observing three different regimes. Second, we compare the

TABLE II. Governing non-dimensional parameters and the values used in this work.

Heated volume aspect ratio	$\psi = \alpha R_L$	2
Prandtl number	$Pr = \mu c_p/\kappa$	7
Schmidt number	$Sc = \mu/\rho D_S$	10
Thermocapillary number	$C_T = \rho \gamma_T P_L/\mu^2 \kappa$	5×10^3 to 5×10^4
Solutocapillary number	$C_S = \rho \gamma_\Gamma \Gamma_0 R_L/\mu^2$	20 to 80

simulation results with three different experimental measurements (with an uncontrolled initial surfactant surface pressure): particle tracking velocimetry (PTV), convection cell radius, and thermography measurements. Finally, a controlled quantity of surfactants was added to the interface and the thermography measurements was repeated, validating our numerical model without any fitting parameter.

A. Simulation results

Finite elements, axisymmetric, time-dependent simulations were performed using Comsol multiphysics with the parameters shown in Table II, $\tilde{H}_r = 10$ and $\tilde{R}_r = 40$. For more details on the geometry discretization, see the [supplementary material](#). The results have been observed to be independent of the recipient height $\tilde{H}_r$ and its radius $\tilde{R}_r$ provided they are larger than a minimum threshold value ($\tilde{H}_r > 7.5$, $\tilde{R}_r > 30$, respectively) for the standard case ($C_T = 1 \times 10^4$ and $C_S = 30$).

Depending on the values of C_S and C_T , three regimes were observed: the convective, the transition, and the conductive regime.

If C_S is small enough and C_T large enough, we observe the convective regime. In this regime, a central area with no surfactant and a positive radial flow is obtained as shown in Fig. 2. Beyond a given radius, the surface tension gradients induced by temperature and concentration cancel each other and, according to (9), the shear stress at the surface vanishes. This radius coincides with R_{cell} , the radius at which the surface radial velocity vanishes [see the non-dimensional $\tilde{R}_{\text{cell}} = R_{\text{cell}}/R_L$ in Fig. 2(b) (Multimedia view)]. In addition, in this regime the maximum fluid velocity and temperature increase have been found to be independent of C_S . This is the regime we observe experimentally without added surfactant.

The transition regime is obtained for intermediate values of C_S and C_T . In this regime, $\tilde{R}_{\text{cell}}$ approaches unity and the maximum fluid velocity and temperature were found to depend on C_S (the first one decreases and the second one increases with C_S).

Finally, for large enough values of C_S and small enough values of C_T , we obtain the conductive regime. In this regime, the effect of the temperature is not strong enough to create a complete depletion of

surfactants at the laser spot. The stable state is a zero fluid velocity in the whole domain, since the surfactants completely counteract the temperature gradient. Therefore, the temperature profile is governed by heat conduction alone. We can find the limiting value for this regime as the point where the maximum temperature surface pressure is equal to the surfactant surface pressure: $C_{\text{slim}} = C_T \Theta_c$ where Θ_c is the value of Θ at the center of the interface for a conduction only case. By performing a conduction only simulation to estimate Θ_c , we find $C_{\text{slim}} \approx 0.2 C_T$.

B. Experimental results

The experimental validation of the above described numerical results was performed through three experimental observations (with an unknown surface contamination): particle tracking velocimetry (PTV), convection cell radius, and thermography measurements. All this measurements were performed in the convective regime. The PTV measurement allowed us observe the effect of contamination, but it could not be performed exactly at the interface. The convection cell radius measurement could be performed at the interface, but it does not allow us to observe the radial distribution. Finally, the thermography measurement allowed us to obtain the temperature distribution at the interface. Then, a controlled quantity of surfactant was added to the interface and the thermography measurements was repeated to validate our numerical model without any fitting parameter. However, with the added surfactant, the system was in the transient regime.

1. PTV measurements

To measure the flow velocity close to the air/water interface, the particle tracking velocimetry (PTV) method^{25,26} was used. A sketch of the setup is shown in Fig. 3(a). The optical system is composed of a green laser (MGL-III-532 200 mW), which is coupled to a fiber (Thorlabs P5-460B-PCAPC-1). Following the design methodology presented in Ref. 27, a set of convex and concave lenses was used to generate a thin collimated laser sheet, which was then used to illuminate the air–water interface. Polyamide seeding particles with a diameter of 50 μm (Dantec Dynamics PSP-50) were submerged in the water

FIG. 3. PTV measurement. (a) Setup schematics. A green laser (MGL-III-532 200 mW) sheet is pointed toward the recipient. Only the illuminated tracers (50 μm diameter polyamide seeding particles) are seen by the camera. (b) Measurements and simulations for $C_T = 1 \times 10^4$. The maximum velocity was used to fit the immersion depth at $h = 80 \mu\text{m}$. Then, the point at which the velocity vanishes was used to fit $C_S = 30$ to 75.

bulk and stirred before each measurement. Because the seeding particles were only slightly denser than water ($\rho = 1030 \text{ kg/m}^3$), the convective flow was strong enough to move them along. The laser sheet was placed so that it would be as close as possible to the interface but ensuring that enough particles could be detected by the camera to reconstruct the flow velocity around the laser spot using the software presented in Ref. 28. As the exact experimental immersion depth of the laser sheet is unknown and due to its strong influence on the fluid velocity, it was decided to turn it into a fitting parameter. The immersion depth mainly affects the maximum value for the radial velocity, while C_S mainly affects the point at which the velocity becomes zero. First, an immersion depth of $80 \mu\text{m}$ (comparable with the size of the particles) was fitted using the maximum velocity value. Then, C_S was fitted between 30 and 75 to rationalize the measurements. The process is shown in Fig. 3(b). The variation between each experimental measurement can be explained by a different initial surfactant concentration in each water sample. Our model considering an initial surface contamination succeeds in predicting a limited range of the laser effect, in contrast with the model that did not consider the surface contamination. Moreover, our model can explain the difference between measurements as the result of different contamination levels among different water samples.

2. Convection cell radius at the surface

To eliminate the immersion depth dependence, we decided to look directly at the interface. Some aluminum flakes (typical size $71 \mu\text{m}$) were deposited on the water surface, where they float thanks to the surface tension.²⁹ They are used as tracers to observe the surface flow since their inertia is low (Stokes number $St < 0.3$). Then, the laser was pointed toward a cluster of these floating flakes for at least 10 s, where the generated thermocapillary flow repelled the flakes from the laser. The mean radius R_{cell} of the area without flakes was estimated using the area entrapped by the dashed line shown in Fig. 4(a) (Multimedia view) where the central circle represents the laser spot. For the simulations results, since the surface velocity never becomes exactly zero, the non-dimensional radius $\tilde{R}_{\text{cell}}$ was defined as the point at which the non-dimensional radial velocity at the surface $\tilde{u}$ becomes lower than 0.3. The obtained $\tilde{R}_{\text{cell}}$ value is not very sensitive to the

threshold value in the range 0.3 to 1, but quickly increases for lower values (for more details, see the [supplementary material](#)). The comparison between experimental measurements and simulations can be seen in Fig. 4(b) where the measurements agree with the results obtained with a fitting parameter $C_S = 25$ (which is comparable to the lower value used to fit the PTV measurement $C_S = 30$). In this case, we did not observe a considerable variation among different water samples.

3. Thermography of the surface

An experimental temperature measurement was obtained imaging the interface from above with an infrared camera Gobi-384. This eliminates both the immersion depth effect and the aluminum flakes distortions of the flow. On the other hand, thermography measurements at the fluid interface are not easy,³⁰ since the expected temperature increase are quite small (2 and 8 K for 40 and 300 mW laser power, respectively). Such a technique has been successfully used to study the evaporation of sessile water droplets.³¹ A thermal image is taken before turning on the laser and another one 30 s after the laser has been turned on. The temperature map shown in Fig. 5(a) was obtained as the difference between both images. The temperature reading depends on both the camera sensor and ambient temperature, and these can change during the measurement. Therefore, sometimes it was necessary to add a constant offset ($< 0.5 \text{ K}$) to the temperature map to make the temperature increase vanish at large distances from the laser spot. Then, the point with the maximum temperature is defined as the laser center, and the temperature and distance from that center are computed for each pixel. The results are compared to the simulations' results as shown in Fig. 5(b), fitting C_S to 60. The same experiment was repeated for C_T varying from 1×10^4 to 4×10^4 , and the fitting parameter C_S resulted always between 25 and 60. It is worth mentioning that while the convection cell radius strongly depends on C_S , in the conductive regime the maximum temperature does not.

4. Controlled surfactants

Finally, we added a controlled quantity of a known insoluble surfactants to the interface to compare simulations and experiments without any fitting parameter. Oleic acid (OA) was chosen as a surfactant

FIG. 4. Convection cell superficial radius measurement. (a) Measurement for $C_T = 1 \times 10^4$. The dashed ellipse represents the convection cell and the red circle, the laser spot. (b) Measurements compared with simulations for different thermocapillary number C_T . Multimedia view: <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0055373.3>.

FIG. 5. Thermography measurement. (a) Difference between a first image taken before turning the laser on, and a second one 30 s after. (b) Comparison with simulations. The distance to the center and the temperature were computed for each pixel of a single measurement.

since it has been used in previous works.¹⁵ First, a Langmuir trough (MicroTrough XS, Kibron Inc.) was used to measure the change of surface tension as a function of the surface concentration of OA. The corresponding C_S value as a function of the surface concentration is shown in Fig. 6. Two different regimes are clearly observed. For concentrations below a threshold value ($\Gamma_e = 1.37$ molecule/nm²), the variation of surface pressure with the OA concentration is very low. Meanwhile, for concentrations larger than Γ_e , the surface pressure quickly increases until reaching a saturation.

5 and 10 nL of OA, corresponding to a surface concentration $\Gamma_a = 0.62$ molecule/nm² and $\Gamma_b = 1.24$ molecule/nm² ($C_{Sa} = 220$ and $C_{Sb} = 440$), respectively, were added to the interface. Smaller concentrations produce results that are hard to distinguish from those produced with no added surfactants, and at larger concentrations (above Γ_e), the surface pressure becomes large enough to almost stop

the flow. These molecules, besides surface elasticity, could also induce surface shear and dilatational viscosity.^{32,33} In our configuration, like in many other experimental setups, the effect of surface elasticity and surface dilatational viscosities cannot be distinguished.

Then, the previously described procedure was followed to perform the thermography measurement. The results agree with the simulation using the corresponding C_S value. When the effect of surfactant is much weaker than the thermocapillary flow, there is a good agreement with simulations as shown in Fig. 7(a). On the other hand, when the surfactant concentration becomes higher, there is an agreement with the simulations in the maximum temperature increase as shown in Fig. 7(b), but the plateau observed in the simulation is not observed in our experimental measurement. This can be due to second-order effects not accounted for in our model, like the induced surface viscosity, or the fact that the added surface surfactant concentration is close to Γ_e from where the relationship between surface concentration and surface tension stops being linear as shown in Fig. 6. Moreover, we cannot guarantee that the initial surfactant concentration was homogeneous over the entire workspace.

We would like to mention that with the added OA, we observe some instabilities at higher laser powers ($C_T > 4 \times 10^4$). These instabilities can be explained by the competition between the thermocapillary and solutocapillary effects.^{13,14} We will not discuss these instabilities here since they are out of the scope of this article.

IV. DISCUSSION

In this section, we present an analytical model we have developed to explain our simulations and experimental results. Similar configurations have been analytically analyzed³⁴ under the assumption of negligible momentum and thermal convection could be neglected ($Re \ll 1$ and $Pe_T \ll 1$), decoupling the temperature and momentum equations. In such a case, both the fluid velocity and the temperature increase turn out to be proportional to the laser power (P_L). However, for the case of water and a convection dominated scenario like ours (local Péclet number $Pe = Pr \tilde{u} \approx 100$), no analytical model has been reported. Therefore, we developed a simple model using the concept of boundary layers as it was done in Ref. 35 for the solutocapillary

FIG. 6. Characterization of oleic acid (OA) as surfactant. Corresponding C_S value as a function of the surface concentration Γ . Isotherm measurements performed with a Langmuir trough with a compression rate of $2.04 \text{ Å}^2/(\text{min. molecule})$. Two regimes are observed with a transition concentration $\Gamma_e = 1.37$ molecule/nm².

FIG. 7. Thermography results with added surfactants. (a) OA concentration of $\Gamma_a = 0.62$ molecule/nm² corresponding to $C_S = 220$ and $C_T = 4 \times 10^4$. (b) OA concentration of $\Gamma_b = 1.24$ molecule/nm² corresponding to $C_S = 4400$ and $C_T = 2 \times 10^4$.

effect. First, we analyze the clean interface case (without surfactant). We assume that away from the laser beam ($\tilde{r} > 1$) there are both a viscous and a thermal boundary layers whose thicknesses are,³⁶ respectively,

$$\tilde{\delta}_\mu \propto \sqrt{\frac{\tilde{r}}{\tilde{u}_S}}, \quad (10a)$$

$$\tilde{\delta}_T = \frac{\tilde{\delta}_\mu}{Pr^{1/2}} \propto \sqrt{\frac{\tilde{r}}{Pr \tilde{u}_S}}, \quad (10b)$$

where $\tilde{u}_S$ is the non-dimensional radial fluid velocity and the sub-index S means at the interface. If we apply (7) to the interface for $\tilde{r} > 1$ ($\tilde{q}_L \approx 0$) under a steady-state condition and neglecting the conduction term in the radial direction, we obtain $\tilde{u}_S \partial \Theta / \partial \tilde{r} = Pr^{-1} \partial^2 \Theta / \partial \tilde{z}^2$. If we approximate at the interface $\partial^2 \Theta / \partial \tilde{z}^2 \propto -\Theta_S / \tilde{\delta}_T^2$, the result is

$$\frac{\partial \Theta}{\partial \tilde{r}} \propto -\frac{\Theta_S}{\tilde{r}}. \quad (11)$$

From a surface stress balance point of view, we can approximate at the interface $\partial \tilde{u} / \partial \tilde{z} \propto \tilde{u}_S / \tilde{\delta}_\mu$ and use (11) in (9) obtaining

$$\Theta_S \propto \frac{\tilde{r}^{1/2} \tilde{u}_S^{3/2}}{C_T}. \quad (12)$$

Then, since most of the energy brought by the laser will be evacuated through the thermal boundary layer by convection, that is, $P_L \propto r \delta_{av} \rho c_p (T_S - T_0) u_S$, where $\delta_{av} = Pr^{-1/4} \delta_\mu$ is the geometric mean between δ_μ and δ_T . In non-dimensional form, this balance results

$$1 \propto \tilde{r} Pr^{3/4} \tilde{\delta}_\mu \Theta_S \tilde{u}_S. \quad (13)$$

Finally, combining (12) and (13) for $\tilde{r} = 1$, and assuming $\tilde{u}_{\max} \approx \tilde{u}_S(\tilde{r} = 1)$ and $\Theta_{\max} \approx \Theta_S(\tilde{r} = 1)$ we obtain

$$\tilde{u}_{\max} = A C_T^{1/2} Pr^{-3/8}, \quad (14)$$

$$\Theta_{\max} = B C_T^{-1/4} Pr^{-9/16}. \quad (15)$$

We can fit the simulations results with $A = 0.43$ and $B = 0.54$ as shown in Figs. 8(a) and 8(b), respectively. Experimental temperature results also agree with both simulations and model results. As a comparison, in the case of a conduction dominated scenario,³⁴ it was found that $\tilde{u}_{\max} \propto C_T$.

If now we consider the presence of surfactants, we assume that in the convective regime ($1 \ll \tilde{R}_{\text{cell}}$), (14) and (15) are still valid. Under this assumption, we find $\tilde{R}_{\text{cell}}$ as the point at which the thermocapillary and solutocapillary effect cancel each other ($C_T \Theta_S \approx C_S$). Therefore, we propose $\tilde{R}_{\text{cell}} = f(C_T \Theta_{\max} / C_S)$. If we assume a power law, we obtain

$$\tilde{R}_{\text{cell}} = E \left(C_T^{3/4} C_S^{-1} Pr^{-9/16} \right)^\xi. \quad (16)$$

The simulation results can be fairly fitted with $E = 1.3$ and $\xi = 2/3$ as shown in Fig. 8(c). The discrepancy between the model and simulations for $\tilde{R}_{\text{cell}} > 20$ can be explained by the fact that we simulated a finite volume of water ($\tilde{R}_r \approx 40$).

We simulated all the combinations of $Pr = 1, 3, 7$, and 14 ; $C_T = (5, 10, 20, \text{ and } 40) \times 10^3$; and $C_S = 10, 20, 40$, and 80 . When $\tilde{R}_{\text{cell}} \approx 1$ (approaching the transition regime), the velocity $\tilde{u}_{\max}$ becomes smaller than the value predicted by the model and $\Theta_{\max}$ becomes larger than the value predicted by the model.

V. CONCLUSION

In this manuscript, we analyzed the effect of an adsorbed layer of surfactants on a laser-induced thermocapillary flow. Qualitatively, an infrared laser is pointed toward a water volume from above, locally heating the air–water interface. The temperature gradient triggers an interfacial thermocapillary flow away from the laser spot. Due to the mass conservation, a flow toward the laser spot arises deep below the surface, generating a toroidal-like convection cell around the laser spot. The interfacial flow generates a depletion of surfactants around the laser spot, increasing the surface tension and counteracting the effect of the temperature. Analyzing the problem, we found four

(a)

(b)

(c)

FIG. 8. Comparison between the simplified model (14), (15), and (16), the simulation results and experimental measurements. For the simulations results, we simulated all the combinations of $Pr = 1, 3, 7$, and 14 , $C_T = (5, 10, 20, \text{ and } 40) \times 10^3$; and $C_S = 10, 20, 40$, and 80 . (a) Maximum surface fluid velocity $\bar{u}_s$. (b) Maximum surface temperature Θ_s . (c) Convection cell radius R_{cell} .

governing non-dimensional parameters (besides geometric ones): $Pr = \mu c_p / \kappa$ is the Prandtl number, $Sc = \mu / \rho D_S$ is the surface Schmidt number, $C_T = \rho \gamma_T P_L / \mu^2 \kappa$ is the thermocapillary number (non-dimensional laser power), and $C_S = \rho \gamma_T \Gamma_0 R_L / \mu^2$ is the soluto-capillary number (non-dimensional surfactant concentration).

A numerical thermo-soluto capillary model was developed and applied to the problem described above. This model suggests that a (no matter how small) surfactant concentration affects the thermocapillary flow, reducing the size of the convection cell. Its results were compared with three different experimental observations (PTV, convection cell radius and thermography). The PTV and convection cell radius measurements are more sensitive to the surface contamination, but they necessarily modify the flow by introducing particles in it. On the other hand, the thermography measurement allowed us to obtain the temperature distribution at the interface, but this measurement is less sensitive to the surface contamination than the convection cell radius. First, we performed these measurements on different water samples with an uncontrolled surface contamination, obtaining good agreement with the same range for C_S between 25 and 75. Then, a known quantity of oleic acid was added as surfactant and the thermography measurements were repeated. The result was in good agreement with the simulations using the corresponding value for $C_S = 220$ and $C_S = 440$, thus validating the numerical model without fitting parameters.

Also, a simplified analytical model was developed for sufficiently low values of C_S . We observed a good agreement between this model and the numerical one in the explored range of parameters (Pr , C_T , and C_S). We are confident that this simple model can be extended to other configurations as long as thermal convection dominates over conduction.

Such a system could be used to determine the level of contamination of an air–water interface. The convection cell radius measurement is very sensitive to the initial surface contamination level and could be used to characterize slightly contaminated interfaces where a simple surface tension measurement would not have enough resolution. On the other hand, the study of the flow gives us insights toward the miniaturization of the manipulation platform¹⁷ giving the parameters defining the range of the thermocapillary flow. For example, we see that by slightly increasing the surface concentration of surfactants, we could reduce the range of the thermocapillary flow without reducing its effect close to the laser spot.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

See the [supplementary material](#) for the expanded governing equations in cylindrical coordinates, details on the geometry discretization, a discussion on the chosen threshold value to define the simulations cell radius, and an analysis of the effect of each governing non-dimensional parameter in the surface velocity and temperature.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was funded by BELSPO (IAP 7/38 MicroMAST), FNRS grant (No. PDR T.0129.18), and the EUR EIPHI program (Contract No. ANR-17-EURE-0002). The authors thank the GRASP laboratory in Université de Liège (ULiège) for lending us the Langmuir trough. B.S. thanks the FRS-FNRS for financial support.

DATA AVAILABILITY

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

REFERENCES

- ¹L. E. Scriven and C. V. Sternling, "The Marangoni effects," *Nature* **187**, 186–188 (1960).
- ²K. Mills, B. Keene, R. Brooks, and A. Shirali, "Marangoni effects in welding," *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. London, Ser. A* **356**, 911–925 (1998).
- ³F. Preisser, D. Schwabe, A. Scharmann *et al.*, "Steady and oscillatory thermocapillary convection in liquid columns with free cylindrical surface," *J. Fluid Mech.* **126**, 545–567 (1983).
- ⁴G. J. Amador, A. F. Tabak, Z. Ren, Y. Alapan, O. Yasa, and M. Sitti, "Thermocapillary-driven fluid flow within microchannels," [arXiv:1802.00475](https://arxiv.org/abs/1802.00475) (2018).
- ⁵Y. Zhao, D. Wan, X. Chen, X. Chao, and H. Xu, "Uniform breaking of liquid-jets by modulated laser heating," *Phys. Fluids* **33**, 044115 (2021).
- ⁶Y. S. Ryazantsev, M. G. Velarde, R. G. Rubio, E. Guzmán, F. Ortega, and P. López, "Thermo-and soluto-capillarity: Passive and active drops," *Adv. Colloid Interface Sci.* **247**, 52–80 (2017).
- ⁷K.-X. Hu, C.-Y. Yan, and Q.-S. Chen, "Instability of thermocapillary-buoyancy convection in droplet migration," *Phys. Fluids* **31**, 122101 (2019).
- ⁸M. A. Rahman, J. Cheng, Z. Wang, and A. T. Ohta, "Cooperative micromanipulation using the independent actuation of fifty microrobots in parallel," *Sci. Rep.* **7**, 3278 (2017).
- ⁹M. Lu, J. Lu, Y. Zhang, and G. Tryggvason, "Numerical study of thermocapillary migration of a bubble in a channel with an obstruction," *Phys. Fluids* **31**, 062101 (2019).
- ¹⁰K. Dietrich, N. Jaensson, I. Buttinoni, G. Volpe, and L. Isa, "Microscale Marangoni surfers," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 098001 (2020).
- ¹¹E. Lucassen-Reynders, A. Cagna, and J. Lucassen, "Gibbs elasticity, surface dilation modulus and diffusional relaxation in nonionic surfactant monolayers," *Colloids Surf. A* **186**, 63–72 (2001).
- ¹²L. Champougny, B. Scheid, F. Restagno, J. Vermant, and E. Rio, "Surfactant-induced rigidity of interfaces: A unified approach to free and dip-coated films," *Soft Matter* **11**, 2758–2770 (2015).
- ¹³A. Mizev, A. Shmyrov, and A. Shmyrova, "On the shear-driven surfactant layer instability," [arXiv:2101.02485](https://arxiv.org/abs/2101.02485) (2021).
- ¹⁴G. Koleski, A. Vilquin, J.-C. Loudet, T. Bickel, and B. Pouligny, "Azimuthal instability of the radial thermocapillary flow around a hot bead trapped at the water–air interface," *Phys. Fluids* **32**, 092108 (2020).
- ¹⁵A. Shmyrov, A. Mizev, V. Demin, M. Petukhov, and D. Bratsun, "On the extent of surface stagnation produced jointly by insoluble surfactant and thermocapillary flow," *Adv. Colloid Interface Sci.* **255**, 10–17 (2018).
- ¹⁶R. Terrazas Mallea, A. Bolopion, J. Beugnot, P. Lambert, and M. Gauthier, "Laser-induced thermocapillary convective flows: A new approach for noncontact actuation at microscale at the fluid/gas interface," *IEEE/ASME Trans. Mechatronics* **22**, 693–704 (2017).
- ¹⁷F. N. Piñan Basualdo, A. Bolopion, M. Gauthier, and P. Lambert, "A microrobotic platform actuated by thermocapillary flows for manipulation at the air–water interface," *Sci. Rob.* **6**, eabd3557 (2021).
- ¹⁸T. B. Nguyen and C. M. Phan, "Influence of hydrophilicity on the thermal-driven surfactant flow at the air/water surface," *ACS Omega* **3**, 9060–9065 (2018).
- ¹⁹J. Eastoe and J. Dalton, "Dynamic surface tension and adsorption mechanisms of surfactants at the air–water interface," *Adv. Colloid Interface Sci.* **85**, 103–144 (2000).
- ²⁰H. A. Stone, "A simple derivation of the time-dependent convective–diffusion equation for surfactant transport along a deforming interface," *Phys. Fluids A* **2**, 111–112 (1990).
- ²¹A. K. Sen and S. H. Davis, "Steady thermocapillary flows in two-dimensional slots," *J. Fluid Mech.* **121**, 163–186 (1982).
- ²²B. Messmer, T. Lemee, K. Ikebukuro, I. Ueno, and R. Narayanan, "Confined thermo-capillary flows in a double free-surface film with small Marangoni numbers," *Int. J. Heat Mass Transfer* **78**, 1060–1067 (2014).
- ²³H. Chraïbi and J.-P. Delville, "Thermocapillary flows and interface deformations produced by localized laser heating in confined environment," *Phys. Fluids* **24**, 032102 (2012).
- ²⁴P. Kosky, R. Balmer, W. Keat, and G. Wise, "Mechanical engineering," in *Exploring Engineering*, 5th ed., edited by P. Kosky, R. Balmer, W. Keat, and G. Wise (Academic Press, 2021), Chap. 14, pp. 317–340.
- ²⁵T. Dracos, "Particle tracking velocimetry (PTV)," in *Three-Dimensional Velocity and Vorticity Measuring and Image Analysis Techniques* (Springer, 1996), pp. 155–160.
- ²⁶S. Ferrari and L. Rossi, "Particle tracking velocimetry and accelerometry (PTVA) measurements applied to quasi-two-dimensional multi-scale flows," *Exp. Fluids* **44**, 873–886 (2008).
- ²⁷A. Prasad, "Particle image velocimetry," *Curr. Sci.* **79**, 51–60 (2000), <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24103321>.
- ²⁸S. Dehaeck, P. Queekers, and P. Colinet, "Analyse par ptv du champ de vitesse de surface dans l'instabilité de Marangoni-Bénard," in *Congrès Francophone de Techniques Laser* (2010).
- ²⁹D. Vella, "Floating versus sinking," *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.* **47**, 115–135 (2015).
- ³⁰R. G. Rubio, Y. S. Ryazantsev, V. M. Starov, G.-X. Huang, A. P. Chetverikov, P. Arena, A. A. Nepomnyashchy, A. Ferrus, and E. G. Morozov, "Thermography applied to interfacial phenomena, potentials and pitfalls," in *Without Bounds: A Scientific Canvas of Nonlinearity and Complex Dynamics* (Springer, 2013), pp. 157–182.
- ³¹F. Girard, M. Antoni, and K. Sefiane, "Infrared thermography investigation of an evaporating sessile water droplet on heated substrates," *Langmuir* **26**, 4576–4580 (2010).
- ³²J. Earnshaw, "Surface viscosity of water," *Nature* **292**, 138–139 (1981).
- ³³A. Choudhury, V. K. Paidi, S. K. Kalpathy, and H. N. Dixit, "Enhanced stability of free viscous films due to surface viscosity," *Phys. Fluids* **32**, 082108 (2020).
- ³⁴T. Bickel, "Effect of surface-active contaminants on radial thermocapillary flows," *Eur. Phys. J. E* **42**, 1–9 (2019).
- ³⁵M. Roché, Z. Li, I. M. Griffiths, S. L. Roux, I. Cantat, A. Saint-Jalmes, and H. A. Stone, "Marangoni flow of soluble amphiphiles," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 208302 (2014).
- ³⁶H. Schlichting and K. Gersten, *Boundary-Layer Theory* (Springer, 2016).