

# Supplementary Material: Lift force in odd compressible fluids

Ruben Lier <sup>a,1,2,\*</sup> Charlie Duclut <sup>a,3,1,†</sup> Stefano Bo <sup>1,‡</sup>  
Jay Armas <sup>4,5,§</sup> Frank Jülicher <sup>1,6,7,¶</sup> and Piotr Surówka <sup>8,4,5,\*\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Max Planck Institute for the Physics of Complex Systems, 01187 Dresden, Germany

<sup>2</sup>Würzburg-Dresden Cluster of Excellence ct.qmat, Germany

<sup>3</sup>Université Paris Cité, Laboratoire Matière et Systèmes Complexes (MSC), UMR 7057 CNRS, F-75205 Paris, France

<sup>4</sup>Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Amsterdam, 1090 GL Amsterdam, The Netherlands

<sup>5</sup>Dutch Institute for Emergent Phenomena (DIEP),

University of Amsterdam, 1090 GL Amsterdam, The Netherlands

<sup>6</sup>Center for Systems Biology Dresden, Pfotenhauerstrasse 108, 01307 Dresden, Germany

<sup>7</sup>Cluster of Excellence Physics of Life, TU Dresden, 01062 Dresden, Germany

<sup>8</sup>Department of Theoretical Physics, Wrocław University of Science and Technology, 50-370 Wrocław, Poland

## I. INCOMPRESSIBLE DRAG FORCE

In this section we explicitly compute the response matrix in two simple incompressible scenarios. In the absence of relaxation ( $\tilde{\tau}^{-1} \rightarrow 0$ ), the incompressible response matrix is given by

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{M}^{-1})_{ij}(\tilde{\omega}) &= \frac{\delta_{ij}}{4\pi\eta_s} \int dz \frac{zJ_0(z)}{z^2 - i\tilde{\omega}} \\ &= -\frac{\delta_{ij}}{8\pi\eta_s} \left[ \log\left(\frac{\tilde{\omega}}{4}\right) + 2\gamma_{\text{EM}} - i\frac{\pi}{2} \right] + \mathcal{O}(\tilde{\omega}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S1})$$

where  $\gamma_{\text{EM}}$  is the Euler-Mascheroni constant. We see that this result is divergent in the steady-state limit ( $\tilde{\omega} \rightarrow 0$ ), which is a signature of the Stokes paradox [1]. Note that the shell localization result given in Eq. (S1) matches the drag force that one would obtain from solving explicitly the Stokes equation with no-slip boundary conditions [2, 3].

A second scenario is the steady-steady case  $\tilde{\omega} \rightarrow 0$  with a finite relaxation rate  $\tilde{\tau}^{-1} \neq 0$ . The incompressible response matrix now reads

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{M}^{-1})_{ij}(0) &= \frac{\delta_{ij}}{4\pi\eta_s} \int dz \frac{zJ_0(z)}{z^2 + 1/\tilde{\tau}} \\ &= \frac{\delta_{ij}}{4\pi\eta_s} \left[ \log\left(2\sqrt{\tilde{\tau}}\right) - \gamma_{\text{EM}} \right] + \mathcal{O}(\tilde{\tau}^{-1}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S2})$$

In this case, the response matrix is non-divergent thanks to the momentum relaxation circumventing the Stokes paradox [4–7]. The result in Eq. (S2) can be compared to the result from works of Saffman and Delbrück [8, 9], if one matches the relaxation  $\tilde{\tau}$  as [5]

$$\tilde{\tau} = \left( \frac{\eta_s}{2a\eta'_s} \right)^2, \quad (\text{S3})$$

where  $\eta'_s$  is the shear viscosity of the surrounding bulk fluid that is tied to the substrate in Refs. [8, 9]<sup>1</sup>. We thus find that in these two instances, the shell localization approach yields the same results as in previous works where the fluid velocity profile is computed over the entire two-dimensional surface [8, 9].

---

<sup>a</sup> These authors contributed equally.

\* [rubenl@pks.mpg.de](mailto:rubenl@pks.mpg.de)

† [charlie.duclut@u-paris.fr](mailto:charlie.duclut@u-paris.fr)

‡ [stefabo@pks.mpg.de](mailto:stefabo@pks.mpg.de)

§ [j.armas@uva.nl](mailto:j.armas@uva.nl)

¶ [julicher@pks.mpg.de](mailto:julicher@pks.mpg.de)

\*\* [piotr.surowka@pwr.edu.pl](mailto:piotr.surowka@pwr.edu.pl)

<sup>1</sup> Note in Refs. [8, 9] the shear viscosity in the substrate  $\eta_s^{(SD)}$  is three-dimensional and therefore it has different units from the  $\eta_s$  appearing in this letter. In Eq. (S3) the two viscosities are related by taking  $\eta_s^{(SD)} \rightarrow \eta_s/h$ , with  $h$  being the height of the substrate.

## II. ANALYTICAL COMPUTATION OF THE RESPONSE MATRIX

In this section, we show how the integrals performed throughout this Letter can be performed using the method of residues. For a compressible fluid as described in the main text, the response coefficients are obtained by performing momentum integrals that take the form

$$I[R] = \int_0^\infty dz R(z) J_0(z), \quad (\text{S4})$$

where  $R(z) = A(z)/B(z)$  is an **odd** function of  $z$ , and where  $A$  and  $B$  are polynomials in  $z$ . We call  $z_n$  the  $n^{\text{th}}$  root of  $B(z)$ , such that  $B(z_n) = 0$ . Following Ref. [10], the integral  $I[R]$  can be computed analytically in terms of the Hankel functions of the first kind  $H_\nu^{(1)}$  and the Bessel functions of the second kind  $Y_\nu$ . It reads:

$$I[R] = i\pi \sum_{z_n \in \mathbb{C}^+ \setminus \mathbb{R}} \text{Res} \left( R(z) H_0^{(1)}(z), z_n \right) - \pi \sum_{z_n \in \mathbb{R}^+} \text{Res} (R(z) Y_0(z), z_n), \quad (\text{S5})$$

where the first sum is over the roots of  $B(z)$  whose imaginary part is strictly positive, and the second one is over the positive real roots of  $B(z)$ . We denote by  $\text{Res}(f(z), z_n)$  the residue of  $f$  at point  $z_n$ .

As an illustration, we consider the oscillatory incompressible case in the absence of relaxation ( $\tilde{\tau}^{-1} \rightarrow 0$ ), for which one has

$$R(z) = \frac{z}{z^2 - i\tilde{\omega}}, \quad (\text{S6})$$

and thus for which  $A(z) = z$  and  $B(z) = z^2 - i\tilde{\omega}$  with the roots  $z_{1,2} = \pm\sqrt{i\tilde{\omega}}$ . In this case, only the first term in the right-hand side of Eq. (S5) contributes, and since the Hankel function  $H_0^{(1)}$  has no pole in  $z_1 = \sqrt{i\tilde{\omega}}$ , it yields

$$I [z/(z^2 - i\tilde{\omega})] = \frac{i\pi}{2} H_0^{(1)}(\sqrt{i\tilde{\omega}}) = K_0(-i\sqrt{i\tilde{\omega}}), \quad (\text{S7})$$

where  $K_\nu(x)$  is the  $\nu^{\text{th}}$  modified Bessel function of the second kind. An expansion of Eq. (S7) in series of  $\tilde{\omega}$  yields the result given in Eq. (S1).

The same procedure can be applied for the compressible case, and was used the main text.

- 
- [1] J. Veysey and N. Goldenfeld, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **79**, 883 (2007).
  - [2] R. E. Williams and R. G. Hussey, *Phys. Fluids* **15**, 2083 (1972).
  - [3] G. Dolfo, J. Vigué, and D. Lhuillier, arXiv:2011.12000 (2020), arXiv:2011.12000.
  - [4] E. Evans and E. Sackmann, *J. Fluid Mech.* **194**, 553 (1988).
  - [5] K. Seki and S. Komura, *Phys. Rev. E* **47**, 2377 (1993).
  - [6] S. Ramachandran, S. Komura, M. Imai, and K. Seki, *Eur. Phys. J. E* **31**, 303 (2010).
  - [7] A. Lucas, *Phys. Rev. B* **95**, 115425 (2017).
  - [8] P. G. Saffman and M. Delbruck, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **72**, 3111 (1975).
  - [9] P. G. Saffman, *J. Fluid Mech.* **73**, 593 (1976).
  - [10] Q.-G. Lin, *Integral Transforms Spec. Funct.* **24**, 783 (2013).