



HAL
open science

A class of compressible multiphase flow models

Jean-Marc Hérard

► **To cite this version:**

Jean-Marc Hérard. A class of compressible multiphase flow models. *Comptes Rendus. Mathématique*, 2016, 354 (9), pp.954-959. 10.1016/j.crma.2016.07.004 . hal-01348880

HAL Id: hal-01348880

<https://hal.science/hal-01348880v1>

Submitted on 26 Aug 2016

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

A class of compressible multiphase flow models

Jean-Marc Hérard ^{1,2}

1 EDF R&D, 6 quai Watier, F-78400 Chatou

2 I2M, Aix Marseille Université, 39 rue Joliot Curie, F-13453 Marseille

Keywords: Multi-phase flows / entropy inequality / hyperbolic models / closure laws / relaxation effects.

Abstract: We propose in this note a class of entropy-consistent hyperbolic models for multi-phase barotropic flows. Relevant closure laws are derived and discussed.

Introduction: The accurate modelling of multiphase flows with mixtures involving several components is crucial for several highly unsteady applications for petroleum engineering, but also for nuclear safety applications and more generally for thermal-hydraulics. Many studies in the nuclear framework, for instance those that aim at predicting hydrogen risk, vapor explosion, or similar fast transient situations, require models that comply with some basic specifications, in order to handle strong rarefaction waves as well as shock waves. Rather recent proposals have arisen within the last twenty years, at least for two-phase flow models. Some among them ([1, 2, 5, 9, 10, 14]), which rely on the two-fluid approach, enable meaningful unsteady computations. However, only few multiphase flow models have emerged in the past in order to tackle three-phase flows or even multiphase situations. Some among the latter assume a system of PDE for mass balance of components, while simplified momentum equations are considered (see for instance [3, 7] for flows in reservoirs). More recently, a couple of contributions, among which we may cite [11, 12, 15, 16], has given focus on the modeling of mass, momentum and energy balances for three-phase flow situations, and even more. The main objective of the present contribution is to give some new insight on this particular topic, while considering three-phase or four-phase models in order to account for unsteady compressible flows. We only consider here barotropic situations for sake of simplicity. We first give emphasis on the modelling of interfacial transfer of momentum for multi-component flows. Next we discuss relevant closure laws for pressure and velocity relaxation terms, but also for the interface velocity that governs the evolution of statistical fractions. Finally we give some closure laws for mass transfer.

1 A class of compressible multiphase flow models

We consider N distinct compressible phases. We also assume that components are -at least slightly- compressible. Thus the starting point is the governing set of equations:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t (\alpha_k) + \mathcal{V}_i(Y) \partial_x (\alpha_k) = \phi_k(Y) ; \\ \partial_t (m_k) + \partial_x (m_k U_k) = 0 ; \\ \partial_t (m_k U_k) + \partial_x (m_k U_k^2 + \alpha_k P_k(\rho_k)) + \sum_{l=1, l \neq k}^N \Pi_{kl}(Y) \partial_x (\alpha_l) = m_k S_k(Y) . \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where we note $m_k = \alpha_k \rho_k$, and as usual α_k, ρ_k, U_k represent the mean statistical fraction, the mean density and the mean velocity in phase k . Mean densities are positive, and the constraint :

$$\sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k = 1$$

holds everywhere, at any time. The interfacial transfer terms $\phi_k(Y), S_k(Y)$ are such that:

$$\sum_{k=1}^N \phi_k(Y) = 0 \quad ; \quad \sum_{k=1}^N m_k S_k(Y) = 0.$$

Thus the main unknown is:

$$Y = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{N-1}, \rho_1, U_1, \dots, \rho_N, U_N)^t \quad (2)$$

It lies in \mathcal{R}^p , with $p = 3N - 1$. The functions $P_k(\rho_k)$ are classically chosen such that $c_k^2 = P'_k(\rho_k) > 0$. We also define $\psi_k(\rho_k)$ such that:

$$\psi'_k(\rho_k) = \frac{P_k(\rho_k)}{\rho_k^2} \quad (3)$$

and the entropy of the mixture $\eta(Y)$ is defined as:

$$\eta(Y) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^N m_k U_k^2 + \sum_{k=1}^N m_k \psi_k(\rho_k). \quad (4)$$

From now on, we will assume that the velocity $\mathcal{V}_i(Y)$ is a convex combination of phasic velocities U_k , so that we may write:

$$\mathcal{V}_i(Y) = \sum_{k=1}^N a_k(Y) U_k \quad (5)$$

where $\sum_{k=1}^N a_k(Y) = 1$, and $0 \leq a_k(Y)$.

We define the quantity $\mathcal{A}(Y, \partial_x(Y))$ such that:

$$\mathcal{A}(Y, \partial_x(Y)) = \sum_{k=1}^N (\sum_{l \neq k} (P_k(\mathcal{V}_i(Y) - U_k) + U_k \Pi_{kl}(Y)) \partial_x(\alpha_l)) \quad (6)$$

Using this definition, we can obtain the governing equation of $\eta(Y)$ for smooth solutions of (1), which reads:

$$\partial_t(\eta(Y)) + \partial_x(f_\eta(Y)) = RHS_\eta(Y) - \mathcal{A}(Y, \partial_x(Y)) \quad (7)$$

setting:

$$RHS_\eta(Y) = \sum_{k=1}^N (m_k S_k(Y) U_k - \phi_k(Y) P_k) \quad (8)$$

$$f_\eta(Y) = \sum_{k=1}^N \left(\frac{U_k^2}{2} + \psi_k(\rho_k) + \frac{P_k}{\rho_k} \right) m_k U_k. \quad (9)$$

We wonder now whether there exists a unique set of $N(N-1)$ functions $\Pi_{kl}(Y)$ with $k \neq l$ that guarantees the minimal entropy dissipation $\mathcal{A}(Y, \partial_x(Y)) = 0$, when $N \leq 4$.

Proposition 1 (Closure laws for interfacial pressures)

Smooth solutions of system (1) comply with the constraint $\mathcal{A}(Y, \partial_x(Y)) = 0$, iff:

- N=2:

$$\Pi_{12}(Y) = \Pi_{21}(Y) = (1 - a_1(Y)) P_1 + a_1(Y) P_2 \quad (10)$$

- N=3:

$$\begin{cases} \Pi_{12}(Y) = (1 - a_1(Y))P_1 + a_1(Y)P_2 ; \\ \Pi_{21}(Y) = a_2(Y)P_1 + (1 - a_2(Y))P_2 ; \\ \Pi_{13}(Y) = (1 - a_1(Y))P_1 + a_1(Y)P_3 ; \\ \Pi_{31}(Y) = a_3(Y)P_1 + (1 - a_3(Y))P_3 ; \\ \Pi_{23}(Y) = (1 - a_2(Y))P_2 + a_2(Y)P_3 ; \\ \Pi_{32}(Y) = a_3(Y)P_2 + (1 - a_3(Y))P_3 ; \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

- N=4:

$$\begin{cases} \Pi_{kl}(Y) = (1 - a_k(Y))P_k + a_k(Y)P_l & (if : 1 \leq k < l \leq 4) ; \\ \Pi_{kl}(Y) = a_l(Y)P_k + (1 - a_l(Y))P_l & (if : 1 \leq l < k \leq 4) . \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

Sketch of proof: The proof is obtained by construction. It is almost obvious when $N = 2$, but more tedious when $N = 3$ or $N = 4$. First it is necessary to rewrite the scalar quantity $\mathcal{A}(Y, \partial_x(Y))$ in terms of the $N - 1$ independent gradients $\partial_x(\alpha_i)$ for $l = 1 \rightarrow N - 1$ (since $\partial_x(\alpha_N) = -\sum_{l=1}^{N-1} \partial_x(\alpha_l)$). All cofactors must be set to zero, which results in a new set of $(N - 1)$ scalar equations $LHS_k(Y) = 0$. For each equation among these, one must again rewrite quantities in terms of $N - 1$ independent relative velocities $(U_N - U_l)$ for $l = 1 \rightarrow N - 1$, and also use the form (5) in order to obtain $(U_l - \mathcal{V}_i(Y))$ in terms of the latter relative velocities and of the $a_l(Y)$. Moreover, one needs to take into account the constraint:

$$\sum_{k=1}^N \left(\sum_{l=1, l \neq k}^N \Pi_{kl}(Y) \partial_x(\alpha_l) \right) = 0$$

that arises since these represent interfacial transfer terms inside the mixture. This ends up in a system of $N(N - 1)$ scalar equations, which is linear with respect to the $\Pi_{kl}(Y)$. It only remains to find the *unique* $N(N - 1)$ solutions $\Pi_{kl}(Y)$ of the latter system. \diamond

Hence, once the $a_k(Y)$ in (5) are given, there exists a unique choice for the $\Pi_{kl}(Y)$. Note that, unlike for two-phase flows, and for a given couple of phases (k, l) , there exists a disequilibrium at the (k, l) interface when three (or four) phases occur, since:

$$\Pi_{kl}(Y) - \Pi_{lk}(Y) = (1 - a_k(Y) - a_l(Y))(P_k - P_l) \quad \text{for: } k < l$$

is non zero unless a perfect pressure equilibrium holds between the three (or four) phases. This was actually expected, since the quantity $\Pi_{kl} \partial_x(\alpha_l) + \Pi_{lk} \partial_x(\alpha_k)$ is no longer null, for given (k, l) with $k \neq l$, when $N > 2$. Moreover, it clearly arises that $\Pi_{kl}(Y)$ is an average of pressures P_k and P_l .

Proposition 2 (Entropy inequality for multi-phase flow models)

We consider some fixed phase index $k_0 \in 1, \dots, N$. We assume that closure laws for interfacial quantities $\phi_k(Y), S_k(Y)$ comply with the two constraints:

$$\begin{cases} 0 \leq \sum_{k=1}^N (\phi_k(Y)(P_k - P_{k_0})) ; \\ 0 \leq \sum_{k=1}^N (m_k S_k(Y)(U_{k_0} - U_k)) \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

then smooth solutions of system (1) satisfy the following inequality:

$$\partial_t(\eta(Y)) + \partial_x(f_\eta(Y)) \leq 0 \quad (14)$$

for the minimal entropy dissipation model associated with: $\mathcal{A}(Y, \partial_x(Y)) = 0$.

The proof is straightforward. We may now give some admissible form for the pressure relaxation terms.

Proposition 3 (Pressure-velocity relaxation terms for multi-phase flow models)
Assume that closure laws for $\phi_k(Y), S_k(Y)$ take the form:

$$\begin{cases} \phi_k(Y) = \sum_{l=1}^N (d_{kl}(Y)(P_k - P_l)) ; \\ m_k S_k(Y) = \sum_{l=1}^N (e_{kl}(Y)(U_l - U_k)) \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

with: $0 < d_{kl}(Y) = d_{lk}(Y)$, and: $0 \leq e_{kl}(Y) = e_{lk}(Y)$, then the pressure-velocity relaxation terms $\phi_k(Y), S_k(Y)$ comply with the entropy inequality (14).

Proof: It is classical for $N = 2$. We skip the case $N = 3$, and we only consider here the case $N = 4$. We define: $x = P_1 - P_2, y = P_1 - P_3, z = P_1 - P_4$. The remaining pressure disequilibria may be written as follows: $P_4 - P_3 = y - z, P_4 - P_2 = x - z, P_3 - P_2 = x - y$. Hence we may compute:

$$\sigma_4 = \sum_{k=1}^4 (\phi_k(Y)(P_k - P_1))$$

which turns to be:

$$\sigma_4 = d_{21}(Y)x^2 + d_{31}(Y)y^2 + d_{41}(Y)z^2 + d_{42}(Y)(z-x)^2 + d_{32}(Y)(y-x)^2 + d_{43}(Y)(y-z)^2$$

Thus σ_4 is strictly positive unless $P_1 = P_2 = P_3 = P_4$. \diamond

A similar proof holds for velocity relaxation contributions. We emphasize first that the counterpart of properties 2, 3 also holds for non isentropic two or three-phase flow models (see [5, 12, 15]). Quantities $S_k(Y)$ stand for drag effects between phases; besides, pressure relaxation terms $\phi_k(Y)$ are already present in all standard two-phase flow models such as those described in [1, 14] for instance. Physically relevant pressure relaxation time scales associated with the d_{kl} were proposed in [8]. One may nonetheless wonder whether these relaxation terms act as expected. Actually, the following result clearly provides some assessment of the latter claim. For that purpose, we consider some flow in a box (thus neglecting all convective effects), so that system (1) reduces to:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t (\alpha_k) = \phi_k(Y) ; \\ \partial_t (m_k) = 0 ; \\ \partial_t (m_k U_k) = m_k S_k(Y) . \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

Proposition 4 (Pressure relaxation for barotropic three-phase flow models)
We set: $N = 3$, and we assume for sake of simplicity that pressure relaxation time scales are equal, so that: $\phi_k(Y) = d(Y)\sum_{l=1}^N (P_k - P_l)$. We also define :

$$\mathcal{E}_P(Y) = ((P_1 - P_2)^2 + (P_1 - P_3)^2 + (P_2 - P_3)^2)/2.$$

Then solutions of (16) comply with:

$$0 \leq \mathcal{E}_P(Y)(t) \leq \mathcal{E}_P(Y)(0) \times \exp\left(-6 \int_0^t f_{min}^P(t) dt\right)$$

if the frequency $0 < f_{min}^P(t)$ denotes some positive lower bound of $(\rho_k c_k^2 d(Y)/\alpha_k)(t)$ (for $k = 1, 3$).

Proof: We define: $y = P_1 - P_2$ and: $x = P_2 - P_3$, thus: $P_1 - P_3 = y + x$, and : $\mathcal{E}_P(Y) = x^2 + y^2 + xy$. We use the notation: $\beta_k = \rho_k c_k^2 / \alpha_k$. Using the second equation of (16), which gives: $\partial_t(\rho_k) = -\rho_k \partial_t(\alpha_k) / \alpha_k$, and hence: $\partial_t(P_k) = -\rho_k c_k^2 \partial_t(\alpha_k) / \alpha_k$, it clearly arises that solutions of (16) agree with:

$$\partial_t(x) = -\beta_2 \partial_t(\alpha_2) + \beta_3 \partial_t(\alpha_3)$$

$$\partial_t(y) = -\beta_1 \partial_t(\alpha_1) + \beta_2 \partial_t(\alpha_2)$$

Since $\partial_t(\alpha_k) = 2d(Y)(P_k - \bar{P}_{lm})$, with: $\bar{P}_{lm} = (P_l + P_m)/2$, for k, l, m non equal in $\{1, 2, 3\}^3$, we get at once:

$$\partial_t(\mathcal{E}_P(Y)) = -d(Y) (\beta_2(x-y)^2 + \beta_3(2x+y)^2 + \beta_1(x+2y)^2)$$

which yields:

$$\partial_t(\mathcal{E}_P(Y)) \leq -f_{min}^P(t) ((x-y)^2 + (2x+y)^2 + (x+2y)^2)$$

or alternatively:

$$\partial_t(\mathcal{E}_P(Y)) \leq -6f_{min}^P(t) \mathcal{E}_P(Y)(t)$$

which ends up with the above statement. \diamond

This property is still valid for four-phase flow models (see [13]). Considering the same assumption of a flow in a box (16), a similar property may be obtained for velocity relaxation effects in three-phase flow models, considering the counterpart of $\mathcal{E}_P(Y)$:

$$\mathcal{E}_U(Y) = ((U_1 - U_2)^2 + (U_1 - U_3)^2 + (U_2 - U_3)^2)/2.$$

It now remains to select admissible closure laws for the interface velocity $\mathcal{V}_i(Y)$ which governs the statistical fractions evolution. The specifications that are enforced here correspond to the fact that the α_l should be perfectly advected (if all phase pressures are in equilibrium), and thus without any thickening; as a consequence, one must enforce that the field associated with the eigenvalue $\lambda = \mathcal{V}_i(Y)$ should be linearly degenerated. The next proposition illustrates that feature, and it is indeed a well-known result for two-phase flow models (see [4] and [5] for instance, for barotropic and non isentropic models respectively, and also [6] for some generalization):

Proposition 5 (Admissible interface velocity in barotropic three-phase flow models) *We set: $N = 3$, and we still assume that: $\mathcal{V}_i(Y) = \sum_{k=1}^N a_k(Y) U_k$, with: $\sum_{k=1}^N a_k(Y) = 1$. We set: $a_k(Y) = m_k/M$ where: $M = \sum_{k=1}^N m_k$. Then the field associated with: $\lambda_{1,2} = \mathcal{V}_i(Y)$ is linearly degenerated.*

Proof: It is straightforward but cumbersome. We define $r_1(Y), r_2(Y)$ the two right eigenvectors associated with the eigenvalue: $\lambda = \mathcal{V}_i(Y)$, it then only remains to check that: $\nabla_Y \lambda_{1,2}(Y) \cdot r_1(Y) = \nabla_Y \lambda_{1,2}(Y) \cdot r_2(Y) = 0$. \diamond

A similar result holds for four-phase flow models. The structure of the contact wave associated with $\lambda = \mathcal{V}_i(Y)$ is examined in detail in [13] for $N = 3$ and $N = 4$. Actually the connection of states through the latter wave is very similar to what happens in

two-phase flow models (see [4, 5]). Eventually, we may give the expected result, that is:

Proposition 6 (Structure of the convective part of system (1))

We assume that: $|U_k - \mathcal{V}_i(Y)|/c_k \neq 1$. Then system (1) is hyperbolic, since all eigenvalues are real, and the set of right eigenvectors spans the whole space of states \mathcal{R}^p .

2 Taking mass transfer into account

We consider now the following system for a mixture of N phases with possible mass transfer between phases. This reads:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t (\alpha_k) + \mathcal{V}_i(Y) \partial_x (\alpha_k) = \phi_k(Y) ; \\ \partial_t (m_k) + \partial_x (m_k U_k) = \sum_{l=1, l \neq k}^N \Gamma_{kl}(Y) = G_k(Y) ; \\ \partial_t (m_k U_k) + \partial_x (m_k U_k^2 + \alpha_k P_k(\rho_k)) + \sum_{l=1, l \neq k}^N \Pi_{kl}(Y) \partial_x (\alpha_l) = m_k S_k(Y) + S_k^G(Y) . \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

with:

$$S_k^G(Y) = \sum_{l=1, l \neq k}^N \mathcal{V}_{kl}(Y) \Gamma_{kl}(Y)$$

and: $\Gamma_{kl}(Y) + \Gamma_{lk}(Y) = 0$. We also enforce the law:

$$\mathcal{V}_{kl}(Y) = \beta_{kl}(Y) U_k + (1 - \beta_{kl}(Y)) U_l,$$

with: $\beta_{kl}(Y) \in [0, 1]$. We evenmore assume symmetry, that is: $\mathcal{V}_{kl}(Y) = \mathcal{V}_{lk}(Y)$, which means that: $\beta_{kl}(Y) + \beta_{lk}(Y) = 1$. The term $\Gamma_{kl}(Y)$ simply denotes the interfacial mass transfer between phases k and l . Of course, we still consider the previous closure laws for $\phi_k(Y)$, $S_k(Y)$ and $\Pi_{kl}(Y)$.

The time evolution of the entropy η is now governed by:

$$\partial_t (\eta(Y)) + \partial_x (f_\eta(Y)) = RHS_\eta^G(Y) \quad (18)$$

but the source term on the right handside becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} RHS_\eta^G(Y) = & \sum_{k=1}^N (m_k S_k(Y) U_k - \phi_k(Y) P_k) \\ & + \sum_{k=1}^N \left(U_k (\sum_{l=1, l \neq k}^N \mathcal{V}_{kl}(Y) \Gamma_{kl}(Y) - \frac{U_k}{2} G_k(Y)) + G_k(Y) (\frac{P_k}{\rho_k} + \psi_k(\rho_k)) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Thus we get :

Proposition 7 (An entropy-consistent closure law for the interfacial mass transfer)

Assume that: $\beta_{kl}(Y) = 1/2$, and also that $f_{kl}(Y) = f_{lk}(Y) > 0$. Then the following closure law for the mass transfer:

$$\Gamma_{kl}(Y) = f_{kl}(Y) \left(\left(\frac{P_l}{\rho_l} + \psi_l(\rho_l) \right) - \left(\frac{P_k}{\rho_k} + \psi_k(\rho_k) \right) \right) \quad (20)$$

complies with the entropy inequality for smooth solutions Y of (17):

$$\partial_t (\eta(Y)) + \partial_x (f_\eta(Y)) \leq 0 \quad (21)$$

The proof is simple and left to the reader, who is referred to [13]. The latter reference also provides more details and a thorough analysis of the statistical fraction LD wave $\lambda = \mathcal{V}_i(Y)$. Details on (unique) jump conditions can also be found therein. The extension to the framework of non-isentropic multiphase multi-component flows is currently investigated for $4 \leq N$.

References

- [1] M.R. BAER AND J.W. NUNZIATO, A two phase mixture theory for the deflagration to detonation transition (DDT) in reactive granular materials, *Int. J. Multiphase Flow*, vol. 12-6, pp. 861–889, 1986.
- [2] W. BO, H. JIN, D. KIM, X. LIU, H. LEE, N. PESTIAU, Y. YU, J. GLIMM AND J.W. GROVE, Comparison and validation of multiphase closure models, *Computers and Mathematics with Applications*, vol. 56, pp. 1291-1302, 2008.
- [3] Z. CHEN AND R. EWING, Comparison of various formulations of three-phase flow in porous media, *J. of Comp. Phys.*, vol. 132, pp 362–373, 1997.
- [4] F. COQUEL AND S. CORDIER, CEMRACS en calcul scientifique 1999 , *MATAPLI* 62, pp. 27-58, 2000.
- [5] F. COQUEL, T. GALLOUËT, J.M. HÉRARD AND N. SEGUIN, Closure laws for a two fluid two-pressure model, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, vol. I-332, pp. 927–932, 2002.
- [6] F. COQUEL, J.M. HÉRARD, K SALEH AND N. SEGUIN, A class of two-fluid two-phase flow models, *AIAA paper 2012-3356*, 42nd AIAA CFD conference, New Orleans, Louisiana, available on: <http://www.aiaa.org>, 2012.
- [7] H. FRID AND V. SHELUKHIN, A quasi-linear parabolic system for three-phase capillary flow in porous media, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, vol. 35, n4, pp. 1029-1041, 2003.
- [8] S. GAVRILYUK, The structure of pressure relaxation terms: the one-velocity case, *EDF report H-183-2014-0276-EN*, 2014 .
- [9] S. GAVRILYUK, H. GOUIN AND Y. V. PEREPECHKO, A variational principle for two fluid models, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, vol. Iib-324, pp. 483-490, 1997.
- [10] S. GAVRILYUK AND R. SAUREL, Mathematical and numerical modelling of two-phase compressible flows with micro-inertia, *J. of Comp. Phys.*, vol. 175, pp. 326-360, 2002.
- [11] S. GIAMBO AND V. LA ROSA, A hyperbolic three-phase relativistic flow model, *ROMAI Journal*, vol. 11, pp. 89-104, 2015.
- [12] J.M. HÉRARD, A three-phase flow model, *Mathematical and Computer Modeling*, vol. 45, pp. 732-755, 2007.
- [13] J.M. HÉRARD, Modelling multiphase multi-component flows: following the QUEST, *EDF report H-18D-2016-0123-EN*, to appear, 2016.
- [14] A.K. KAPILA, S.F. SON, J.B. BDZIL, R. MENIKOFF AND D.S. STEWART, Two phase modeling of a DDT: structure of the velocity relaxation zone, *Phys. of Fluids* , vol. 9-12, pp. 3885–3897, 1997.
- [15] S. MÜLLER, M. HANTKE AND P. RICHTER, Closure conditions for non-equilibrium multi-component models, *Continuum Mechanics and Thermodynamics*, pp. 1-33, available online, 2015.

- [16] E. ROMENSKI, A. A. BELOZEROV AND I. M. PESHKOV, Conservative formulation for compressible multiphase flows, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1405.3456>, pp. 1-21, 2014.