

# Finite-Difference Lattice Boltzmann Methods for Binary Fluids

Aiguo Xu

*Department of Physics, Yoshida-South Campus, Kyoto University, Sakyo-ku, Kyoto, 606-8501, Japan*

In this paper we develop two-fluid BGK kinetic models and the corresponding lattice Boltzmann methods for binary fluids. This study consists of two parts: In part I, we first clarify Sirovich's kinetic theory and give the corresponding thermal Euler equations and isothermal Navier-Stokes equations. To simulate the two kinds of systems from the microscopic level, two multispeed lattice Boltzmann methods are formulated. To overcome defects in existing standard lattice Boltzmann method, the finite-difference scheme is used. In part II, we first discuss the validity condition of Sirovich's kinetic theory and demonstrate that it works for (nearly) symmetric systems where the masses and temperatures of the two components are not significantly different. Then, for the asymmetric cases, we present modified kinetic models, from which hydrodynamic equations are derived and corresponding finite-difference lattice Boltzmann methods are formulated. The modified kinetic models become necessary when one component dominates in the system. In such cases, the two components are not symmetric in the kinetic models, hydrodynamics and lattice Boltzmann methods. The solution for binary mixtures with disparate-mass components is included. The validity of the new methods is verified by investigating (i) the Couette flow and (ii) the uniform relaxation process of the two components.

PACS numbers: 47.11.+j, 51.10.+y, 05.20.Dd

## I. INTRODUCTION

Kinetic theory studies change rates and corresponding mechanisms of material properties. Gas kinetic theory plays a fundamental role in understanding many complex processes. To make solutions possible, many of the kinetic models for gases are based on the linearized Boltzmann equation, especially based on the BGK approximation[1]. Since only in very limited cases analytic solutions of Boltzmann equation are available, designing discrete kinetic methods to simulate complex systems from microscopic and/or mesoscopic level(s) is becoming a promising and viable approach. Basically speaking, there are two options to simulate Boltzmann equation systems. First, one can design procedures based on the fundamental properties of rarefied gas alone, like free flow, the mean free path, and collision frequency. Such a scheme does not need an a priori relationship to Boltzmann equation, but the scheme itself will reflect many ideas and/or concepts used in the derivation of Boltzmann equation. In the best case, such a simulation will produce results that are consistent with and converge to the solution of Boltzmann equation. The second option is to start from the Boltzmann equation and design simulation schemes as accurate as possible[2]. To discretize the Boltzmann equation, the first choice is to use the general finite-difference scheme. This scheme is referred to as the finite-difference lattice Boltzmann method (FDLBM). A big question here is "How to treat with the infinite velocities?". The second choice is to use the so-called special form of the finite-difference[3] – the splitting scheme where one evolution step is treated as a propagation and a collision ones. This idea is extensively used in the lattice gas cellular automata (LGCA)[4] and the standard lattice Boltzmann method (SLBM). Historically, the SLBM was developed from the LGCA by overcoming some well-known defects. A big question here is "Whether or not are the simulation results practical or physical?"

Since the Euler and Navier-Stokes equations have their basis in the Boltzmann equation – the former can be derived from the latter under the hydrodynamic limit by using the Chapman-Enskog analysis[5], an appropriately designed lattice Boltzmann method (LBM), SLBM or FDLBM, can be regarded as a useful tool to simulate hydrodynamic equations from the microscopic or mesoscopic level[6], which is different from the conventional methods which start directly from the hydrodynamic equations. Various merits can be expected from appropriately designed LBMs: (i) simple schemes, (ii) linear advective terms, (iii) high resolution for shock wave computation[7], (iv) interparticle interactions can be easily incorporated if needed, etc. In systems involving interfaces, the interfaces separating different components/domains are difficult for the conventional Navier-Stokes solver to track due to the complex geometry and possible phase change. Additionally, for some systems such as those involving pollutant dispersion, chemical processing, combustor mixing, it is difficult to construct continuum-based models from the first principle[8]. In such cases, the LBM is expected to be a convenient tool. Due to the historical reason, the SLBM has been studied more extensively than the FDLBM.

In this study we investigate binary fluids. To show the necessity of the present study, we first briefly review the present status of the LBM research on binary mixtures: (i) Various LBMs have been proposed and developed [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21]; (ii) The FDLBM and SLBM are expected to be complementary in the LBM studies. Comparison between them will tell that in a specific situation which one is more appropriate. However, most existing LBMs [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18] belong to the SLBM; (iii) Most existing

LBM [9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19] for multicomponent fluids are based on the single-fluid theory[22]. To more precisely describe the dynamical process, the two-fluid theory is preferable. At the same time, for some other systems, for example, granular mixture systems, the above cited LBMs are not valid; (iv) In Ref. [8], a SLBM based on a two-fluid kinetic theory, proposed by Sirovich[23], was developed. But it is a pity that within this model mass conservation does not hold for each individual species at the Navier-Stokes level. The basic reason is that in the SLBM the “propagation” step (particle or distribution functions hopping between neighboring cells) produces an artificial diffusion term between the two components. (For single-component fluid this term becomes zero.) (v) As we will show later, Sirovich’s kinetic model is not trivial, but is accurate only when the total masses and the local temperatures of the two components are not significantly different. For all other cases, the two-fluid kinetic models should be modified; (vi) The LBM scheme for binary Euler equation systems has not been investigated. In summary, developing general and accurate LBM schemes for binary mixtures is still an open project. We expect that the formulated FDLBMs can partly fill this gap and overcome the defects of SLBM for binary mixtures.

The implementation of a FDLBM depends on the designing of an appropriate discrete velocity model (DVM). The continuous Boltzmann equation has infinite velocities. So the rotational symmetry is automatically satisfied. Recovering rotational symmetry from finite discrete velocities impose constraints on the DVM. The FDLBM was proposed to improve the numerical stability and apply to nonuniform grids[24]. Recently, the FDLBM has been paid more attention[7, 19, 25, 26, 27, 28].

This paper is arranged in the following way: In Section II, the Sirovich’s BGK kinetic theory is clarified, the thermal Euler and isothermal Navier-Stokes equations are derived, FDLBMs for the two kinds of systems are formulated. In Section III, we discuss the validity condition of Sirovich’s kinetic theory; and for the asymmetric cases, modified kinetic models, hydrodynamic equations and FDLBMs are presented. In section IV, we summarize the kinetic models and briefly discuss the interfacial tension and binary fluids with disparate-mass components. Section V shows numerical verifications of the FDLBMs. Section VI concludes the present paper.

## II. SIROVICH’S BGK KINETIC THEORY, HYDRODYNAMICS AND FDLBMS

In a multicomponent gas system, there are a number of competing equilibration processes occurring simultaneously. Roughly speaking, the approach to equilibrium can be divided into two processes. The first one is that each species equilibrates within itself so that its local distribution function approaches to the local Maxwellian distribution. The second one is that the entire system equilibrates so that the differences among different species eventually vanish. Correspondingly, the interparticle collisions can be divided into collisions within the same species (self-collision) and collisions among different species (cross-collision)[8, 23].

We consider a binary mixture with two components,  $A$  and  $B$ . If two components are symmetric, we will have two sets of symmetric equations for  $A$  and  $B$ , respectively. In this case, we will write only one set for the component  $\sigma$ , where  $\sigma = A, B$ . If the other component is involved, it will be labelled by  $\varsigma$ , where  $\varsigma = B, A$ . The convenience of this symbol usage is evident for the asymmetric cases.

### A. Formulation of the theoretical model

Following Gross and Krook[29], Sirovich[23], Morse[30], Hamel[31], Burgers[32], Vahala, et al[33], Sofonea and Sekerka[22], Luo and Girimaji[8], we will use the BGK model for binary mixtures. The 2-dimensional BGK kinetic equation for the species  $\sigma$  reads,

$$\partial_t f^\sigma + \mathbf{v}^\sigma \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{r}^\sigma} f^\sigma + \mathbf{a}^\sigma \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{v}^\sigma} f^\sigma = J^{\sigma\sigma} + J^{\sigma\varsigma} \quad (1)$$

where

$$J^{\sigma\sigma} = -\frac{1}{\tau^{\sigma\sigma}} [f^\sigma - f^{\sigma(0)}], \quad J^{\sigma\varsigma} = -\frac{1}{\tau^{\sigma\varsigma}} [f^\sigma - f^{\sigma\varsigma(0)}], \quad (2)$$

$$f^{\sigma(0)} = \frac{n^\sigma}{2\pi\Theta^\sigma} \exp \left[ -\frac{(\mathbf{v}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^\sigma)^2}{2\Theta^\sigma} \right], \quad (3)$$

$$f^{\sigma\varsigma(0)} = \frac{n^\sigma}{2\pi\Theta^{\sigma\varsigma}} \exp \left[ -\frac{(\mathbf{v}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^{\sigma\varsigma})^2}{2\Theta^{\sigma\varsigma}} \right], \quad (4)$$

$$\Theta^\sigma = \frac{k_B T^\sigma}{m^\sigma}, \Theta^{\sigma\zeta} = \frac{k_B T^{\sigma\zeta}}{m^\sigma}. \quad (5)$$

$f^{\sigma(0)}$  and  $f^{\sigma\zeta(0)}$  are corresponding Maxwellian distribution functions.  $n^\sigma$ ,  $\mathbf{u}^\sigma$ ,  $T^\sigma$  are the local density, hydrodynamic velocity and local temperature of the species  $\sigma$ .  $\mathbf{u}^{\sigma\zeta}$ ,  $T^{\sigma\zeta}$  are the hydrodynamic velocity and local temperature of the mixture after equilibration process.  $\mathbf{a}^\sigma$  is the acceleration of the species  $\sigma$  due to the effective external field, which will be discussed later.

For species  $\sigma$ , we have

$$n^\sigma = \int d\mathbf{v}^\sigma f^\sigma, \quad (6)$$

$$n^\sigma \mathbf{u}^\sigma = \int d\mathbf{v}^\sigma \mathbf{v}^\sigma f^\sigma, \quad (7)$$

$$n^\sigma k_B T^\sigma = \int d\mathbf{v}^\sigma \frac{1}{2} m^\sigma (\mathbf{v}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^\sigma)^2 f^\sigma, \quad (8)$$

$$\rho^\sigma = n^\sigma m^\sigma, \quad (9)$$

$$e_{\text{int}}^\sigma = n^\sigma k_B T^\sigma, \quad (10)$$

where  $e_{\text{int}}^\sigma$  is the local internal energy of species  $\sigma$ . For species  $\zeta$ , we have similar relations. For the mixture, we have

$$n = n^\sigma + n^\zeta, \rho = \rho^\sigma + \rho^\zeta, \quad (11)$$

$$\mathbf{u}^{\sigma\zeta} = \frac{\rho^\sigma \mathbf{u}^\sigma + \rho^\zeta \mathbf{u}^\zeta}{\rho}, \quad (12)$$

$$n k_B T^{\sigma\zeta} = \int d\mathbf{v}^\sigma \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{v}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^{\sigma\zeta})^2 m^\sigma f^\sigma + \int d\mathbf{v}^\zeta \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{v}^\zeta - \mathbf{u}^{\sigma\zeta})^2 m^\zeta f^\zeta. \quad (13)$$

It is easy to find the following relations,

$$\mathbf{u}^{\sigma\zeta} = \mathbf{u}^{\zeta\sigma}, T^{\sigma\zeta} = T^{\zeta\sigma}, \quad (14)$$

$$\mathbf{u}^{\sigma\zeta} - \mathbf{u}^\sigma = \frac{\rho^\zeta}{\rho} (\mathbf{u}^\zeta - \mathbf{u}^\sigma), \quad (15)$$

$$T^{\sigma\zeta} - T^\sigma = \frac{n^\zeta}{n} (T^\zeta - T^\sigma) + \frac{\rho^\sigma \rho^\zeta}{2n k_B \rho} (\mathbf{u}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^\zeta)^2. \quad (16)$$

Here three sets of hydrodynamic quantities (density, velocity and temperature) are involved. But only two sets of them are independent. So this is a two-fluid theory. We assume that the local equilibrium distribution function  $f^{\sigma\zeta(0)}$  can be calculated through expanding around  $f^{\sigma(0)}$  to the first order of flow velocity and temperature. Then, the cross-collision term becomes

$$\begin{aligned} J^{\sigma\zeta} = & -\frac{1}{\tau^{\sigma\zeta}} [f^\sigma - f^{\sigma(0)}] \\ & -\frac{f^{\sigma(0)}}{\Theta^\sigma} \left\{ \mu_D^\sigma (\mathbf{v}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^\sigma) \cdot (\mathbf{u}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^\zeta) + \mu_T^\sigma \left[ \frac{(\mathbf{v}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^\sigma)^2}{2\Theta^\sigma} - 1 \right] (T^\sigma - T^\zeta) \right. \\ & \left. - M^\sigma \left[ \frac{(\mathbf{v}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^\sigma)^2}{2\Theta^\sigma} - 1 \right] (\mathbf{u}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^\zeta)^2 \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where

$$\mu_D^\sigma = \frac{\rho^\varsigma}{\tau^{\sigma\varsigma}\rho}, \mu_T^\sigma = \frac{k_B n^\varsigma}{\tau^{\sigma\varsigma} n m^\sigma}, M^\sigma = \frac{n^\sigma \rho^\varsigma}{2\tau^{\sigma\varsigma} n \rho}. \quad (18)$$

To get the hydrodynamic equations up to the Navier-Stokes level, in the Chapman-Enskog analysis[5], we need (i) expand  $f^\sigma$  around  $f^{\sigma(0)}$  to the first order in the Knudsen number  $\epsilon$ ,

$$f^\sigma = f^{\sigma(0)} + \epsilon f^{\sigma(1)}; \quad (19)$$

(ii) require

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \sim O(\epsilon), \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial r_\alpha} \sim O(\epsilon); \quad (20)$$

(iii) neglect the second and higher order terms in the Knudsen number  $\epsilon$ . If notice

$$\mathbf{a}^\sigma \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{v}^\sigma} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{v}^\sigma}{\partial t} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{v}^\sigma} \sim \frac{\partial}{\partial t}, \quad (21)$$

we have

$$\mathbf{a}^\sigma \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{v}^\sigma} (\epsilon f^{\sigma(1)}) \sim O(\epsilon^2). \quad (22)$$

So, in the force term of the BGK model (1),  $f^\sigma$  can be replaced by  $f^{\sigma(0)}$ .

Since

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{v}^\sigma} f^{\sigma(0)} = -f^{\sigma(0)} \frac{(\mathbf{v}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^\sigma)}{\Theta^\sigma}, \quad (23)$$

it is easy to verify the following relations,

$$\int d\mathbf{v}^\sigma \mathbf{a}^\sigma \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{v}^\sigma} f^\sigma = \int d\mathbf{v}^\sigma \mathbf{a}^\sigma \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{v}^\sigma} f^{\sigma(0)} = 0, \quad (24)$$

$$\int d\mathbf{v}^\sigma \mathbf{v}^\sigma \mathbf{a}^\sigma \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{v}^\sigma} f^\sigma = \int d\mathbf{v}^\sigma \mathbf{v}^\sigma \mathbf{a}^\sigma \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{v}^\sigma} f^{\sigma(0)} = -n^\sigma \mathbf{a}^\sigma, \quad (25)$$

$$\int d\mathbf{v}^\sigma v_\alpha^\sigma v_\beta^\sigma \mathbf{a}^\sigma \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{v}^\sigma} f^\sigma = \int d\mathbf{v}^\sigma v_\alpha^\sigma v_\beta^\sigma \mathbf{a}^\sigma \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{v}^\sigma} f^{\sigma(0)} = -n^\sigma (a_\alpha^\sigma u_\beta^\sigma + a_\beta^\sigma u_\alpha^\sigma), \quad (26)$$

$$\int d\mathbf{v}^\sigma \frac{1}{2} (v^\sigma)^2 \mathbf{a}^\sigma \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{v}^\sigma} f^\sigma = \int d\mathbf{v}^\sigma \frac{1}{2} (v^\sigma)^2 \mathbf{a}^\sigma \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{v}^\sigma} f^{\sigma(0)} = -n^\sigma \mathbf{a}^\sigma \cdot \mathbf{u}^\sigma, \quad (27)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \int d\mathbf{v}^\sigma \frac{1}{2} (v^\sigma)^2 v_\alpha^\sigma \mathbf{a}^\sigma \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{v}^\sigma} f^\sigma &= \int d\mathbf{v}^\sigma \frac{1}{2} (v^\sigma)^2 v_\alpha^\sigma \mathbf{a}^\sigma \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{v}^\sigma} f^{\sigma(0)} \\ &= -n^\sigma \left[ \frac{1}{2} (u^\sigma)^2 a_\alpha^\sigma + \mathbf{a}^\sigma \cdot \mathbf{u}^\sigma u_\alpha^\sigma + 2\Theta^\sigma a_\alpha^\sigma \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

So we can rewrite the BGK model (1-5) as

$$\partial_t f^\sigma + \mathbf{v}^\sigma \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{r}^\sigma} f^\sigma - \mathbf{a}^\sigma \cdot \frac{(\mathbf{v}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^\sigma)}{\Theta^\sigma} f^{\sigma(0)} = Q^{\sigma\sigma} + Q^{\sigma\varsigma} \quad (29)$$

$$Q^{\sigma\sigma} = - \left( \frac{1}{\tau^{\sigma\sigma}} + \frac{1}{\tau^{\sigma\varsigma}} \right) [f^\sigma - f^{\sigma(0)}] \quad (30)$$

$$Q^{\sigma\varsigma} = -\frac{f^{\sigma(0)}}{\Theta^\sigma} \left\{ \mu_D^\sigma (\mathbf{v}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^\sigma) \cdot (\mathbf{u}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^\varsigma) + \mu_T^\sigma \left[ \frac{(\mathbf{v}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^\sigma)^2}{2\Theta^\sigma} - 1 \right] (T^\sigma - T^\varsigma) - M^\sigma \left[ \frac{(\mathbf{v}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^\sigma)^2}{2\Theta^\sigma} - 1 \right] (\mathbf{u}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^\varsigma)^2 \right\} \quad (31)$$

For the isothermal case,  $T^\sigma = T^\varsigma = T^{\sigma\varsigma}$ . The expression of  $Q^{\sigma\varsigma}$  is simplified as

$$Q^{\sigma\varsigma} = -\frac{f^{\sigma(0)}}{\Theta^\sigma} \mu_D^\sigma (\mathbf{v}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^\sigma) \cdot (\mathbf{u}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^\varsigma). \quad (32)$$

For the convenience of description, the kinetic model with (29)-(31) is referred to as kinetic model A; the one with (29)-(30),(32) is referred to as kinetic model B.

### B. Uniform relaxation theory

To indicate the equilibration behavior of the mixture, we consider the relaxation theory of  $f^\sigma$  and  $f^\varsigma$ . For simplicity we disregard the terms resulted from the external forces and consider only an uniform relaxation theory ( $\partial f^\sigma / \partial \mathbf{r} = 0$ ).

The mass conservation and uniformity of the system ensure that  $n^\sigma$ ,  $n^\varsigma$  are constants. The velocity integrals of (29) for the two species give

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\mathbf{u}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^\varsigma) = -(\mu_D^\sigma + \mu_D^\varsigma) (\mathbf{u}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^\varsigma). \quad (33)$$

So,

$$\mathbf{u}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^\varsigma = \mathbf{C}_1 \exp \left[ -\left( \frac{\rho^\varsigma}{\tau^{\sigma\varsigma}} + \frac{\rho^\sigma}{\tau^{\varsigma\sigma}} \right) \frac{t}{\rho} \right], \quad (34)$$

where  $\mathbf{C}_1$  is an arbitrary velocity. Energy integrals of (29) for the two species give

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (T^\sigma - T^\varsigma) &= -\frac{1}{k_B} (m^\sigma \mu_T^\sigma + m^\varsigma \mu_T^\varsigma) (T^\sigma - T^\varsigma) \\ &+ \frac{1}{k_B} (m^\sigma M^\sigma - m^\varsigma M^\varsigma) (\mathbf{u}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^\varsigma)^2 \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

So the equilibration of temperature difference follows the following relation,

$$\begin{aligned} T^\sigma - T^\varsigma &= C_2 \exp \left[ -\left( \frac{n^\varsigma}{\tau^{\sigma\varsigma}} + \frac{n^\sigma}{\tau^{\varsigma\sigma}} \right) \frac{t}{n} \right] \\ &+ \frac{C_1^2 \rho^\sigma \rho^\varsigma (\tau^{\varsigma\sigma} - \tau^{\sigma\varsigma})}{2k_B [\rho (n^\varsigma \tau^{\sigma\varsigma} + n^\sigma \tau^{\varsigma\sigma}) - 2n (\rho^\varsigma \tau^{\sigma\varsigma} + \rho^\sigma \tau^{\varsigma\sigma})]} \exp \left[ -2 \left( \frac{\rho^\varsigma}{\tau^{\sigma\varsigma}} + \frac{\rho^\sigma}{\tau^{\varsigma\sigma}} \right) \frac{t}{\rho} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

where  $C_2$  is an arbitrary time. The second term of Eq. (36) decreases more quickly with time than first one. The velocity and temperature differences of the two species vanish in time. They approach the mean gas properties. The relaxation times depend on both  $\tau^{\sigma\varsigma}$  and  $\tau^{\varsigma\sigma}$ .

### C. Two-dimensional finite-difference lattice Boltzmann methods

For a velocity group with  $m$  components, the  $n$ th rank tensor is defined as

$$T_{\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \dots \alpha_n}^{(n)} = \sum_{i=1}^m v_{i\alpha_1} v_{i\alpha_2} \dots v_{i\alpha_n} \quad (37)$$

where  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n$  indicate either  $x$  or  $y$  component. The tensor is isotropic if it is invariant under the group operations, rotation and reflection. If being isotropic, the odd rank tensors should be zero and the even rank tensors

should be the sum of all possible products of Kronecker delta. The formulated discrete velocity models in this study are based on the following velocity group,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{v}_{ki} &= v_k \left[ \cos\left(\frac{i\pi}{4}\right), \sin\left(\frac{i\pi}{4}\right) \right], \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, 8 \\ v_0 &= 0,\end{aligned}\tag{38}$$

where subscript  $k$  indicates the  $k$ -th group of particle velocities and  $i$  indicates the direction of the particle speed. Such a discrete velocity model is isotropic up to its seventh rank tensors[7].

### 1. DVM for thermal, compressible, binary Euler equations

LBM for single-component Euler equations have been studied by Yan, et al[34] and Kataoka, et al[7]. But LBM for binary Euler equations have not been investigated.

For binary fluids, according to the BGK kinetic theory (29)-(31), the general multi-speed finite-difference lattice Boltzmann equation reads

$$\frac{\partial f_{ki}^\sigma}{\partial t} + v_{ki\alpha}^\sigma \frac{\partial f_{ki}^\sigma}{\partial r_\alpha} = \mathbf{a}^\sigma \cdot \frac{(\mathbf{v}_{ki}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^\sigma)}{\Theta^\sigma} f_{ki}^{\sigma(0)} + Q_{ki}^{\sigma\sigma} + Q_{ki}^{\sigma\varsigma},\tag{39}$$

where

$$Q_{ki}^{\sigma\sigma} = -\frac{1}{\tau^\sigma} \left[ f_{ki}^\sigma - f_{ki}^{\sigma(0)} \right],\tag{40}$$

$$\frac{1}{\tau^\sigma} = \frac{1}{\tau^{\sigma\sigma}} + \frac{1}{\tau^{\sigma\varsigma}},\tag{41}$$

$$\begin{aligned}Q_{ki}^{\sigma\varsigma} &= -\frac{f_{ki}^{\sigma(0)}}{\Theta^\sigma} \left\{ \mu_D^\sigma (\mathbf{v}_{ki}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^\sigma) \cdot (\mathbf{u}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^\varsigma) + \mu_T^\sigma \left[ \frac{(\mathbf{v}_{ki}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^\sigma)^2}{2\Theta^\sigma} - 1 \right] (T^\sigma - T^\varsigma) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - M^\sigma \left[ \frac{(\mathbf{v}_{ki}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^\sigma)^2}{2\Theta^\sigma} - 1 \right] (\mathbf{u}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^\varsigma)^2 \right\},\end{aligned}\tag{42}$$

$$f_{ki}^{\sigma(0)} = n^\sigma \left( \frac{m^\sigma}{2\pi k_B T^\sigma} \right) \exp \left[ -\frac{m^\sigma (\mathbf{v}_{ki}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^\sigma)^2}{2k_B T^\sigma} \right].\tag{43}$$

Corresponding to the (6)-(8) of the continuous kinetic theory, we have

$$n^\sigma = \sum_{ki} f_{ki}^\sigma,\tag{44}$$

$$n^\sigma \mathbf{u}^\sigma = \sum_{ki} \mathbf{v}_{ki}^\sigma f_{ki}^\sigma,\tag{45}$$

$$n^\sigma k_B T^\sigma = \sum_{ki} \frac{1}{2} m^\sigma (\mathbf{v}_{ki}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^\sigma)^2 f_{ki}^\sigma.\tag{46}$$

The Chapman-Enskog analysis[5] shows that the following requirements on the discrete equilibrium distribution function  $f_{ki}^{\sigma(0)}$ ,

$$\sum_{ki} f_{ki}^{\sigma(0)} = n^\sigma,\tag{47}$$

$$\sum_{ki} \mathbf{v}_{ki}^\sigma f_{ki}^{\sigma(0)} = n^\sigma \mathbf{u}^\sigma, \quad (48)$$

$$\sum_{ki} \frac{1}{2} m^\sigma (v_k^\sigma)^2 f_{ki}^{\sigma(0)} = n^\sigma k_B T^\sigma + \frac{1}{2} \rho^\sigma (u^\sigma)^2, \quad (49)$$

$$\sum_{ki} m^\sigma v_{ki\alpha}^\sigma v_{ki\beta}^\sigma f_{ki}^{\sigma(0)} = P^\sigma \delta_{\alpha\beta} + \rho^\sigma u_\alpha^\sigma u_\beta^\sigma, \quad (50)$$

$$\sum_{ki} m^\sigma v_{ki\alpha}^\sigma v_{ki\beta}^\sigma v_{ki\gamma}^\sigma f_{ki}^{\sigma(0)} = P^\sigma (u_\gamma^\sigma \delta_{\alpha\beta} + u_\alpha^\sigma \delta_{\beta\gamma} + u_\beta^\sigma \delta_{\gamma\alpha}) + \rho^\sigma u_\alpha^\sigma u_\beta^\sigma u_\gamma^\sigma, \quad (51)$$

$$\sum_{ki} \frac{1}{2} m^\sigma (v_k^\sigma)^2 v_{ki\alpha}^\sigma f_{ki}^{\sigma(0)} = 2n^\sigma k_B T^\sigma u_\alpha^\sigma + \frac{1}{2} \rho^\sigma (u^\sigma)^2 u_\alpha^\sigma, \quad (52)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{ki} \frac{1}{2} m^\sigma (v_k^\sigma)^2 v_{ki\alpha}^\sigma v_{ki\beta}^\sigma f_{ki}^{\sigma(0)} \\ &= 2P^\sigma \Theta^\sigma \delta_{\alpha\beta} + \frac{P^\sigma}{2} (u^\sigma)^2 \delta_{\alpha\beta} + 3P^\sigma u_\alpha^\sigma u_\beta^\sigma + \frac{1}{2} \rho^\sigma (u^\sigma)^2 u_\alpha^\sigma u_\beta^\sigma \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

are necessary and enough to derive the binary Euler equations,

$$\frac{\partial \rho^\sigma}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial r_\alpha} (\rho^\sigma u_\alpha^\sigma) = 0, \quad (54)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\rho^\sigma u_\alpha^\sigma) + \frac{\partial}{\partial r_\beta} (\rho^\sigma u_\alpha^\sigma u_\beta^\sigma) + \frac{\partial P^\sigma}{\partial r_\alpha} - \rho^\sigma a_\alpha^\sigma + \frac{\rho^\sigma \rho^\varsigma}{\tau^{\sigma\varsigma} \rho} (u_\alpha^\sigma - u_\alpha^\varsigma) = 0, \quad (55)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial e^\sigma}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial r_\alpha} [(e^\sigma + P^\sigma) u_\alpha^\sigma] - \rho^\sigma \mathbf{a}^\sigma \cdot \mathbf{u}^\sigma + \frac{\rho^\sigma \rho^\varsigma}{\tau^{\sigma\varsigma} \rho} [(u^\sigma)^2 - \mathbf{u}^\sigma \cdot \mathbf{u}^\varsigma] \\ & + \frac{n^\sigma n^\varsigma}{\tau^{\sigma\varsigma} n} k_B (T^\sigma - T^\varsigma) - n^\sigma \frac{\rho^\sigma \rho^\varsigma}{2\tau^{\sigma\varsigma} n \rho} (\mathbf{u}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^\varsigma)^2 = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

where  $e^\sigma$  is the local total energy,

$$e^\sigma = e_{\text{int}}^\sigma + \frac{1}{2} \rho^\sigma (u^\sigma)^2, \quad (57)$$

and  $P^\sigma$  is the local pressure. For the two-dimensional system,

$$P^\sigma = e_{\text{int}}^\sigma. \quad (58)$$

The terms in  $\tau^{\sigma\varsigma}$  correspond to the cross-collision effects. When without interparticle interactions and external forces,  $a_\alpha^\sigma = 0$ , the Euler equations (54)-(56) describe binary ideal fluids. The Euler equations (54)-(56) can be rewritten as,

$$\frac{\partial \rho^\sigma}{\partial t} = -u_\alpha^\sigma \frac{\partial \rho^\sigma}{\partial r_\alpha} - \rho^\sigma \frac{\partial u_\alpha^\sigma}{\partial r_\alpha}, \quad (59)$$

$$\frac{\partial u_\alpha^\sigma}{\partial t} = -\frac{\partial \Theta^\sigma}{\partial r_\alpha} - \frac{\Theta^\sigma}{\rho^\sigma} \frac{\partial \rho^\sigma}{\partial r_\alpha} - u_\beta^\sigma \frac{\partial u_\alpha^\sigma}{\partial r_\beta} + a_\alpha^\sigma - \frac{\rho^\varsigma}{\tau^{\sigma\varsigma} \rho} (u_\alpha^\sigma - u_\alpha^\varsigma), \quad (60)$$

$$\frac{\partial \Theta^\sigma}{\partial t} = - \left[ u_\alpha^\sigma \frac{\partial \Theta^\sigma}{\partial r_\alpha} + \Theta^\sigma \frac{\partial u_\alpha^\sigma}{\partial r_\alpha} \right] - \left[ \frac{k_B n^\varsigma}{\tau^{\sigma\varsigma} n m^\sigma} (T^\sigma - T^\varsigma) - \frac{n^\sigma \rho^\varsigma}{2 \tau^{\sigma\varsigma} n \rho} (\mathbf{u}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^\varsigma)^2 \right]. \quad (61)$$

The effect of the force term is explicitly shown in Eq. (60). From the Euler equations (60)-(61), by neglecting the terms in spatial derivatives and forces, it is easy to verify the two results of the uniform relaxation theory, Eqs. (34) and (36).

The requirement equation (53) contains up to the fourth order of the flow velocity  $u^\sigma$ . So we need expand the local equilibrium distribution function  $f_{ki}^{\sigma(0)}$  in the polynomial form up to the fourth order of the flow velocity:

$$\begin{aligned} f_{ki}^{\sigma(0)} = n^\sigma F_k^\sigma & \left\{ \left[ 1 - \frac{(u^\sigma)^2}{2\Theta^\sigma} + \frac{(u^\sigma)^4}{8(\Theta^\sigma)^2} \right] + \frac{1}{\Theta^\sigma} \left( 1 - \frac{(u^\sigma)^2}{2\Theta^\sigma} \right) v_{ki\xi}^\sigma u_\xi^\sigma \right. \\ & + \frac{1}{2(\Theta^\sigma)^2} \left( 1 - \frac{(u^\sigma)^2}{2\Theta^\sigma} \right) v_{ki\xi}^\sigma v_{ki\pi}^\sigma u_\xi^\sigma u_\pi^\sigma + \frac{1}{6(\Theta^\sigma)^3} v_{ki\xi}^\sigma v_{ki\pi}^\sigma v_{ki\eta}^\sigma u_\xi^\sigma u_\pi^\sigma u_\eta^\sigma \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{24(\Theta^\sigma)^4} v_{ki\xi}^\sigma v_{ki\pi}^\sigma v_{ki\eta}^\sigma v_{ki\lambda}^\sigma u_\xi^\sigma u_\pi^\sigma u_\eta^\sigma u_\lambda^\sigma \right\} \\ & + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

where

$$F_k^\sigma = \frac{1}{2\pi\Theta^\sigma} \exp \left[ -\frac{(v_k^\sigma)^2}{2\Theta^\sigma} \right] \quad (63)$$

is a function of  $\Theta^\sigma$  and particle velocity  $v_k^\sigma$ . Thus the expanded equilibrium distribution function  $f_{ki}^{\sigma(0)}$  contains the fourth rank tensor in particle velocity. Substituting (62) into requirement (51) shows that an appropriate discrete velocity model should possess an isotropy up to its seventh rank tensor. So DVM (38) satisfies the need.

To numerically calculate the local equilibrium distribution function  $f_{ki}^{\sigma(0)}$ , one needs first calculate the parameter  $F_k^\sigma$ . It should be noted that  $F_k^\sigma$  can not be calculated directly from its definition (63). It should take values in such a way that the discrete equilibrium distribution function  $f_{ki}^{\sigma(0)}$  satisfies (47) - (53). Then the isotropic properties of the discrete velocity model specifies the solution.

To satisfy (47), we require

$$\sum_{ki} F_k^\sigma = 1, \quad (64)$$

$$\sum_{ki} F_k^\sigma v_{ki\xi}^\sigma v_{ki\pi}^\sigma u_\xi^\sigma u_\pi^\sigma = \Theta^\sigma (u^\sigma)^2, \quad (65)$$

$$\sum_{ki} F_k^\sigma v_{ki\xi}^\sigma v_{ki\pi}^\sigma v_{ki\eta}^\sigma v_{ki\lambda}^\sigma u_\xi^\sigma u_\pi^\sigma u_\eta^\sigma u_\lambda^\sigma = 3(\Theta^\sigma)^2 (u^\sigma)^4. \quad (66)$$

To satisfy (48), we require

$$\sum_{ki} F_k^\sigma v_{ki\alpha}^\sigma v_{ki\xi}^\sigma u_\xi^\sigma = \Theta^\sigma u_\alpha^\sigma, \quad (67)$$

$$\sum_{ki} F_k^\sigma v_{ki\alpha}^\sigma v_{ki\xi}^\sigma v_{ki\pi}^\sigma v_{ki\eta}^\sigma u_\xi^\sigma u_\pi^\sigma u_\eta^\sigma = 3(\Theta^\sigma)^2 (u^\sigma)^2 u_\alpha^\sigma. \quad (68)$$

To satisfy (49), we require

$$\sum_{ki} F_k^\sigma \frac{1}{2} (v_k^\sigma)^2 = \Theta^\sigma, \quad (69)$$

$$\sum_{ki} F_k^\sigma \frac{1}{2} (v_k^\sigma)^2 v_{ki\xi}^\sigma v_{ki\pi}^\sigma u_\xi^\sigma u_\pi^\sigma = 2(\Theta^\sigma)^2 (u^\sigma)^2, \quad (70)$$

$$\sum_{ki} F_k^\sigma \frac{1}{2} (v_k^\sigma)^2 v_{ki\xi}^\sigma v_{ki\pi}^\sigma v_{ki\eta}^\sigma v_{ki\lambda}^\sigma u_\xi^\sigma u_\pi^\sigma u_\eta^\sigma u_\lambda^\sigma = 9 (\Theta^\sigma)^3 (u^\sigma)^4. \quad (71)$$

To satisfy (50), we require

$$\sum_{ki} F_k^\sigma v_{ki\alpha}^\sigma v_{ki\beta}^\sigma = \Theta^\sigma \delta_{\alpha\beta}, \quad (72)$$

$$\sum_{ki} F_k^\sigma v_{ki\alpha}^\sigma v_{ki\beta}^\sigma v_{ki\xi}^\sigma v_{ki\pi}^\sigma u_\xi^\sigma u_\pi^\sigma = (\Theta^\sigma)^2 \left[ (u^\sigma)^2 \delta_{\alpha\beta} + 2u_\alpha^\sigma u_\beta^\sigma \right], \quad (73)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{ki} F_k^\sigma v_{ki\alpha}^\sigma v_{ki\beta}^\sigma v_{ki\xi}^\sigma v_{ki\pi}^\sigma v_{ki\eta}^\sigma v_{ki\lambda}^\sigma u_\xi^\sigma u_\pi^\sigma u_\eta^\sigma u_\lambda^\sigma \\ &= 3 (\Theta^\sigma)^3 (u^\sigma)^2 \left[ (u^\sigma)^2 \delta_{\alpha\beta} + 4u_\alpha^\sigma u_\beta^\sigma \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

To satisfy (51), we require

$$\sum_{ki} F_k^\sigma v_{ki\alpha}^\sigma v_{ki\beta}^\sigma v_{ki\gamma}^\sigma v_{ki\xi}^\sigma u_\xi^\sigma = (\Theta^\sigma)^2 (u_\alpha^\sigma \delta_{\beta\gamma} + u_\beta^\sigma \delta_{\gamma\alpha} + u_\gamma^\sigma \delta_{\alpha\beta}), \quad (75)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{ki} F_k^\sigma v_{ki\alpha}^\sigma v_{ki\beta}^\sigma v_{ki\gamma}^\sigma v_{ki\xi}^\sigma v_{ki\pi}^\sigma v_{ki\eta}^\sigma u_\xi^\sigma u_\pi^\sigma u_\eta^\sigma \\ &= 3 (\Theta^\sigma)^3 (u^\sigma)^2 (u_\alpha^\sigma \delta_{\beta\gamma} + u_\beta^\sigma \delta_{\gamma\alpha} + u_\gamma^\sigma \delta_{\alpha\beta}) + 6 (\Theta^\sigma)^3 u_\alpha^\sigma u_\beta^\sigma u_\gamma^\sigma. \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

To satisfy (52), we require

$$\sum_{ki} F_k^\sigma \frac{(v_k^\sigma)^2}{2} v_{ki\alpha}^\sigma v_{ki\xi}^\sigma u_\xi^\sigma = 2 (\Theta^\sigma)^2 u_\alpha^\sigma, \quad (77)$$

$$\sum_{ki} F_k^\sigma \frac{(v_k^\sigma)^2}{2} v_{ki\alpha}^\sigma v_{ki\xi}^\sigma v_{ki\pi}^\sigma v_{ki\eta}^\sigma u_\xi^\sigma u_\pi^\sigma u_\eta^\sigma = 9 (\Theta^\sigma)^3 (u^\sigma)^2 u_\alpha^\sigma. \quad (78)$$

To satisfy (53), we require

$$\sum_{ki} F_k^\sigma \frac{(v_k^\sigma)^2}{2} v_{ki\alpha}^\sigma v_{ki\beta}^\sigma = 2 (\Theta^\sigma)^2 \delta_{\alpha\beta}, \quad (79)$$

$$\sum_{ki} F_k^\sigma \frac{(v_k^\sigma)^2}{2} v_{ki\alpha}^\sigma v_{ki\beta}^\sigma v_{ki\xi}^\sigma v_{ki\pi}^\sigma u_\xi^\sigma u_\pi^\sigma = 3 (\Theta^\sigma)^3 \left[ (u^\sigma)^2 \delta_{\alpha\beta} + 2u_\alpha^\sigma u_\beta^\sigma \right], \quad (80)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{ki} F_k^\sigma \frac{(v_k^\sigma)^2}{2} v_{ki\alpha}^\sigma v_{ki\beta}^\sigma v_{ki\xi}^\sigma v_{ki\pi}^\sigma v_{ki\eta}^\sigma v_{ki\lambda}^\sigma u_\xi^\sigma u_\pi^\sigma u_\eta^\sigma u_\lambda^\sigma \\ &= 12 (\Theta^\sigma)^4 \left[ (u^\sigma)^4 \delta_{\alpha\beta} + 4 (u^\sigma)^2 u_\alpha^\sigma u_\beta^\sigma \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

If further consider the isotropic properties of the discrete velocity model, the above 18 requirements reduce to the following five ones.

Requirement (64) gives

$$\sum_{ki} F_k^\sigma = 1. \quad (82)$$

Requirements (65), (67), (69), (72) give

$$\sum_k F_k^\sigma (v_k^\sigma)^2 = \frac{\Theta^\sigma}{4}. \quad (83)$$

Requirements (66), (68), (70), (73),(75), (77), (79) give

$$\sum_k F_k^\sigma (v_k^\sigma)^4 = (\Theta^\sigma)^2. \quad (84)$$

Requirements (71), (74), (76), (78), (80) give

$$\sum_k F_k^\sigma (v_k^\sigma)^6 = 6(\Theta^\sigma)^3. \quad (85)$$

Requirements (81) gives

$$\sum_k F_k^\sigma (v_k^\sigma)^8 = 48(\Theta^\sigma)^4. \quad (86)$$

To satisfy the above five requirements, five particle velocities are sufficient. We choose a zero speed,  $v_0^\sigma = 0$ , and other four nonzero ones,  $v_k^\sigma$  ( $k = 1, 2, 3, 4$ ). From (83)-(86) it is easy to find the following solution,

$$F_k^\sigma = \frac{\Psi_k^\sigma}{\Phi_k^\sigma}, \quad (87)$$

where

$$\Psi_k^\sigma = 192(\Theta^\sigma)^4 - 24(\Theta^\sigma)^3 \sum_{j=1}^3 (v_{k+j}^\sigma)^2 + 4(\Theta^\sigma)^2 \sum_{j=1}^3 (v_{k+j}^\sigma v_{k+j+1}^\sigma)^2 - \Theta^\sigma \Pi_{j=1}^3 (v_{k+j}^\sigma)^2 \quad (88)$$

$$\Phi_k^\sigma = 4(v_k^\sigma)^2 \Pi_{j=1}^3 [(v_k^\sigma)^2 - (v_{k+j}^\sigma)^2], \quad (89)$$

$k = 1, 2, 3, 4$ , and  $v_{4+j}^\sigma = v_j^\sigma$ , ( $j = 1, 2, 3$ ). From (82) and (38) we get

$$F_0^\sigma = 1 - 8 \sum_{k=1}^4 F_k^\sigma. \quad (90)$$

To keep the same accuracy for the two components, one needs note the relation  $v_k^\sigma \propto \sqrt{\Theta^\sigma} = \sqrt{k_B T^\sigma / m^\sigma}$ . Except that, only if the simulation can be stably performed, the numerical accuracy does not depend on the specific values of  $v_k^\sigma$  ( $k = 1, 2, 3, 4$ ). This flexibility can be used to simulate a temperature range as wide as possible. (The formulated DVM here, together with an appropriate finite-difference scheme described later, is referred to as FDLBM A.)

## 2. DVM for isothermal, compressible Navier-Stokes equations

Regarding a system as isothermal is a kind of ideal treatment. We expect that such a treatment can grasp the main behavior of the system when it approaches such a limiting case. Energy transport phenomena will be neglected, although, during the diffusion process, the system may exchange energy with the environment to keep isothermal[22]. In the isothermal case,

$$Q_{ki}^{\sigma\zeta} = -\frac{f_{ki}^{\sigma(0)}}{\Theta^\sigma} \mu_D^\sigma (\mathbf{v}_{ki}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^\sigma) \cdot (\mathbf{u}^\sigma - \mathbf{u}^\zeta). \quad (91)$$

The Chapman-Enskog analysis shows that, to get the isothermal Navier-Stokes equations, the following requirements on the discrete equilibrium distribution function,

$$\sum_{ki} f_{ki}^{\sigma(0)} = n^\sigma, \quad (92)$$

$$\sum_{ki} \mathbf{v}_{ki}^\sigma f_{ki}^{\sigma(0)} = n^\sigma \mathbf{u}^\sigma, \quad (93)$$

$$\sum_{ki} m^\sigma v_{ki\alpha}^\sigma v_{ki\beta}^\sigma f_{ki}^{\sigma(0)} = P^\sigma \delta_{\alpha\beta} + \rho^\sigma u_\alpha^\sigma u_\beta^\sigma, \quad (94)$$

$$\sum_{ki} m^\sigma v_{ki\alpha}^\sigma v_{ki\beta}^\sigma v_{ki\gamma}^\sigma f_{ki}^{\sigma(0)} = P^\sigma (u_\gamma^\sigma \delta_{\alpha\beta} + u_\alpha^\sigma \delta_{\beta\gamma} + u_\beta^\sigma \delta_{\gamma\alpha}) + \rho^\sigma u_\alpha^\sigma u_\beta^\sigma u_\gamma^\sigma, \quad (95)$$

are necessary and also sufficient. The continuity equation (at any level) reads

$$\frac{\partial \rho^\sigma}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial r_\alpha} (\rho^\sigma u_\alpha^\sigma) = 0. \quad (96)$$

The momentum equations at the Euler and Navier-Stokes levels are, respectively,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\rho^\sigma u_\alpha^\sigma) + \frac{\partial}{\partial r_\beta} (\rho^\sigma u_\alpha^\sigma u_\beta^\sigma) + \frac{\partial P^\sigma}{\partial r_\alpha} - \rho^\sigma a_\alpha^\sigma + \frac{\rho^\sigma \rho^s}{\tau^{\sigma s} \rho} (u_\alpha^\sigma - u_\alpha^s) = 0, \quad (97)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\rho^\sigma u_\alpha^\sigma) + \frac{\partial}{\partial r_\beta} (\rho^\sigma u_\alpha^\sigma u_\beta^\sigma) + \frac{\partial P^\sigma}{\partial r_\alpha} - \rho^\sigma a_\alpha^\sigma \\ & - \frac{\partial}{\partial r_\beta} \left[ \eta^\sigma \left( \frac{\partial u_\alpha^\sigma}{\partial r_\beta} + \frac{\partial u_\beta^\sigma}{\partial r_\alpha} - \frac{\partial u_\gamma^\sigma}{\partial r_\gamma} \delta_{\alpha\beta} \right) \right] + \frac{\rho^\sigma \rho^s}{\tau^{\sigma s} \rho} (u_\alpha^\sigma - u_\alpha^s) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (98)$$

where

$$\eta^\sigma = P^\sigma \tau^\sigma. \quad (99)$$

It should be noted that  $\tau^\sigma$  also contains the cross-collision effects.

The requirement (95) contains the third order of the flow velocity  $u^\sigma$ . So it is reasonable to expand the local equilibrium distribution function  $f_{ki}^{\sigma(0)}$  in the polynomial form to the third order in the flow velocity,

$$\begin{aligned} f_{ki}^{\sigma(0)} = & n^\sigma F_k^\sigma \left\{ \left[ 1 - \frac{(u^\sigma)^2}{2\Theta^\sigma} \right] + \frac{1}{\Theta^\sigma} \left( 1 - \frac{(u^\sigma)^2}{2\Theta^\sigma} \right) v_{ki\xi}^\sigma u_\xi^\sigma + \frac{1}{2(\Theta^\sigma)^2} v_{ki\xi}^\sigma v_{ki\pi}^\sigma u_\xi^\sigma u_\pi^\sigma \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{6(\Theta^\sigma)^3} v_{ki\xi}^\sigma v_{ki\pi}^\sigma v_{ki\eta}^\sigma u_\xi^\sigma u_\pi^\sigma u_\eta^\sigma \right\} + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (100)$$

Due to the same reason, to recover the correct fluid equations, the DVM should be isotropic up to its sixth rank tensor in particle velocity. So DVM (38) is, again, an appropriate choice.

To satisfy (92), we require

$$\sum_{ki} F_k^\sigma = 1, \quad (101)$$

$$\sum_{ki} F_k^\sigma v_{ki\xi}^\sigma v_{ki\pi}^\sigma u_\xi^\sigma u_\pi^\sigma = \Theta^\sigma (u^\sigma)^2, \quad (102)$$

To satisfy (93), we require

$$\sum_{ki} F_k^\sigma v_{ki\alpha}^\sigma v_{ki\xi}^\sigma u_\xi^\sigma = \Theta^\sigma u_\alpha^\sigma \quad (103)$$

$$\sum_{ki} F_k^\sigma v_{ki\alpha}^\sigma v_{ki\xi}^\sigma v_{ki\pi}^\sigma v_{ki\eta}^\sigma u_\xi^\sigma u_\pi^\sigma u_\eta^\sigma = 3(\Theta^\sigma)^2 (u^\sigma)^2 u_\alpha^\sigma. \quad (104)$$

To satisfy (94), we require

$$\sum_{ki} F_k^\sigma v_{ki\alpha}^\sigma v_{ki\beta}^\sigma = \Theta^\sigma \delta_{\alpha\beta} \quad (105)$$

$$\sum_{ki} F_k^\sigma v_{ki\alpha}^\sigma v_{ki\beta}^\sigma v_{ki\gamma}^\sigma v_{ki\pi}^\sigma u_\xi^\sigma u_\pi^\sigma = (\Theta^\sigma)^2 \left[ (u^\sigma)^2 \delta_{\alpha\beta} + 2u_\alpha^\sigma u_\beta^\sigma \right] \quad (106)$$

To satisfy (95), we require

$$\sum_{ki} F_k^\sigma v_{ki\alpha}^\sigma v_{ki\beta}^\sigma v_{ki\gamma}^\sigma v_{ki\xi}^\sigma u_\xi^\sigma = (\Theta^\sigma)^2 (u_\alpha^\sigma \delta_{\beta\gamma} + u_\beta^\sigma \delta_{\gamma\alpha} + u_\gamma^\sigma \delta_{\alpha\beta}) \quad (107)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{ki} F_k^\sigma v_{ki\alpha}^\sigma v_{ki\beta}^\sigma v_{ki\gamma}^\sigma v_{ki\xi}^\sigma v_{ki\pi}^\sigma v_{ki\eta}^\sigma u_\xi^\sigma u_\pi^\sigma u_\eta^\sigma \\ &= 3(\Theta^\sigma)^3 (u^\sigma)^2 (u_\alpha^\sigma \delta_{\beta\gamma} + u_\beta^\sigma \delta_{\gamma\alpha} + u_\gamma^\sigma \delta_{\alpha\beta}) + 6(\Theta^\sigma)^3 u_\alpha^\sigma u_\beta^\sigma u_\gamma^\sigma \end{aligned} \quad (108)$$

If further consider the isotropic properties of the discrete velocity model, the above 8 requirements reduce to the following four ones.

Requirement (101) gives

$$\sum_{ki} F_k^\sigma = 1. \quad (109)$$

Requirements (102), (103), (105) give

$$\sum_k F_k^\sigma (v_k^\sigma)^2 = \frac{\Theta^\sigma}{4}. \quad (110)$$

Requirements (104), (106), (107) give

$$\sum_k F_k^\sigma (v_k^\sigma)^4 = (\Theta^\sigma)^2. \quad (111)$$

Requirement (108) give

$$\sum_k F_k^\sigma (v_k^\sigma)^6 = 6(\Theta^\sigma)^3. \quad (112)$$

To satisfy the above four requirements, four particle velocities are sufficient. We choose a zero speed,  $v_0^\sigma = 0$ , and other three nonzero ones,  $v_k^\sigma$  ( $k = 1, 2, 3$ ). From (110)-(112) it is easy to find the following solution,

$$F_k^\sigma = \frac{\Psi_k^\sigma}{\Phi_k^\sigma} \quad (113)$$

$$\Psi_k^\sigma = \Theta^\sigma \left\{ (v_{k+1}^\sigma v_{k+2}^\sigma)^2 - 4\Theta^\sigma \left[ (v_{k+1}^\sigma)^2 + (v_{k+2}^\sigma)^2 \right] + 24(\Theta^\sigma)^2 \right\} \quad (114)$$

$$\Phi_k^\sigma = 4(v_k^\sigma)^2 \left\{ (v_{k+1}^\sigma v_{k+2}^\sigma)^2 - (v_k^\sigma)^2 \left[ (v_{k+1}^\sigma)^2 + (v_{k+2}^\sigma)^2 \right] + (v_k^\sigma)^4 \right\} \quad (115)$$

where  $k = 1, 2, 3$  and  $v_4^\sigma = v_1^\sigma$ ,  $v_5^\sigma = v_2^\sigma$ . From (109) we get

$$F_0^\sigma = 1 - 8 \sum_{k=1}^3 F_k^\sigma. \quad (116)$$

Similarly, we will refer to this DVM, together with an appropriate finite-difference scheme, as FDLBM B.

### 3. Finite-difference scheme

Now, let us go to the finite-difference implementation of the discrete kinetic model. There are more than one choices[19] at this step. One possibility is to solve the evolution equation (39) by using the Euler and the second upwind difference schemes. In this case, the distribution function  $f_{ki}^{\sigma,(n+1)}$  is calculated in the following way,

$$f_{ki}^{\sigma,(n+1)} = f_{ki}^{\sigma,(n)} - \left( v_{kix}^{\sigma} \frac{\partial f_{ki}^{\sigma,(n)}}{\partial x} + v_{kiy}^{\sigma} \frac{\partial f_{ki}^{\sigma,(n)}}{\partial y} \right) \Delta t + \left[ Q_{ki}^{\sigma\sigma,(n)} + Q_{ki}^{\sigma\varsigma,(n)} + \mathbf{a}^{\sigma} \cdot \frac{(\mathbf{v}_{ki}^{\sigma} - \mathbf{u}^{\sigma})}{\Theta^{\sigma}} f_{ki}^{\sigma(0)} \right] \Delta t, \quad (117)$$

where the second superscripts  $n, n+1$  indicate the consecutive two iteration steps,  $\Delta t$  the time step; the spatial derivatives are calculated as

$$\frac{\partial f_{ki}^{\sigma,(n)}}{\partial \alpha} = \begin{cases} \frac{3f_{ki,I}^{\sigma,(n)} - 4f_{ki,I-1}^{\sigma,(n)} + f_{ki,I-2}^{\sigma,(n)}}{2\Delta\alpha} & \text{if } v_{ki\alpha}^{\sigma} \geq 0 \\ \frac{3f_{ki,I}^{\sigma,(n)} - 4f_{ki,I+1}^{\sigma,(n)} + f_{ki,I+2}^{\sigma,(n)}}{-2\Delta\alpha} & \text{if } v_{ki\alpha}^{\sigma} < 0 \end{cases}, \quad (118)$$

where  $\alpha = x, y$ , the third subscripts  $I-2, I-1, I, I+1, I+2$  indicate consecutive mesh nodes in the  $\alpha$  direction.

## III. MODIFIED BGK KINETIC THEORIES, HYDRODYNAMICS, FDLBMS

In this section we answer the following questions: Under what condition is Sirovich's kinetic model appropriate? When it is not appropriate, how to modify? After the modification, how about the corresponding hydrodynamics and FDLBMs?

### A. Reference distribution function

The starting point is how to calculate the mixture Maxwellian distribution function  $f^{\sigma\varsigma(0)}$  in the BGK model (1)-(16). In Sirovich's theory, it is expanded around  $f^{\sigma(0)}$  to the first order of the flow velocity  $\mathbf{u}^{\sigma}$  and temperature  $T^{\sigma}$ . This treatment is reasonable when  $|\mathbf{u}^{\sigma\varsigma} - \mathbf{u}^{\sigma}|$  and  $|T^{\sigma\varsigma} - T^{\sigma}|$  are small quantities. Let us consider the kinetic and hydrodynamic descriptions from a more general point of view: We hope that the hydrodynamic equations depend only on the hydrodynamic quantities of the two individual species. ( $\mathbf{u}^{\sigma\varsigma}$  and  $T^{\sigma\varsigma}$  will not appear.) To that aim, we expand the mixture Maxwellian distribution function  $f^{\sigma\varsigma(0)}$  around a reference distribution function  $g^{\sigma(0)}$ ,

$$g^{\sigma(0)} = \frac{n^{\sigma}}{2\pi\Theta^{\sigma r}} \exp \left[ -\frac{(\mathbf{v}^{\sigma} - \mathbf{u}^{\sigma r})^2}{2\Theta^{\sigma r}} \right], \quad (119)$$

where the second superscript "r" means "reference" and the corresponding quantity is the reference hydrodynamic quantity, specifically,

$$\Theta^{\sigma r} = \frac{k_B T^{\sigma r}}{m^{\sigma}}, \quad (120)$$

$$\mathbf{u}^{\sigma r} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{u}^{\sigma} & \text{( if } |\mathbf{u}^{\sigma\varsigma} - \mathbf{u}^{\sigma}| \leq |\mathbf{u}^{\sigma\varsigma} - \mathbf{u}^{\varsigma}| \text{ )} \\ \mathbf{u}^{\varsigma} & \text{( if } |\mathbf{u}^{\sigma\varsigma} - \mathbf{u}^{\sigma}| > |\mathbf{u}^{\sigma\varsigma} - \mathbf{u}^{\varsigma}| \text{ )} \end{cases}, \quad (121)$$

$$T^{\sigma r} = \begin{cases} T^{\sigma} & \text{( if } |T^{\sigma\varsigma} - T^{\sigma}| \leq |T^{\sigma\varsigma} - T^{\varsigma}| \text{ )} \\ T^{\varsigma} & \text{( if } |T^{\sigma\varsigma} - T^{\sigma}| > |T^{\sigma\varsigma} - T^{\varsigma}| \text{ )} \end{cases}. \quad (122)$$

Now let us make the solution more specifically. Firstly for  $\mathbf{u}^{\sigma\varsigma}$ , from Eq.(12) we have

$$\left| \frac{\mathbf{u}^{\sigma\varsigma} - \mathbf{u}^{\sigma}}{\mathbf{u}^{\sigma\varsigma} - \mathbf{u}^{\varsigma}} \right| = \frac{\rho^{\varsigma}}{\rho^{\sigma}} = \frac{n^{\varsigma} m^{\varsigma}}{n^{\sigma} m^{\sigma}}. \quad (123)$$

Then for  $T^{\sigma^c}$ , from Eq. (16), when  $T^\sigma > T^c$  we have

$$\left| \frac{T^{\sigma^c} - T^\sigma}{T^{\sigma^c} - T^c} \right| = \left| \frac{\frac{\rho^c \rho^\sigma}{2nk_B \rho} (\mathbf{u}^c - \mathbf{u}^\sigma)^2 - \frac{n^c}{n} (T^\sigma - T^c)}{\frac{\rho^c \rho^\sigma}{2nk_B \rho} (\mathbf{u}^c - \mathbf{u}^\sigma)^2 + \frac{n^\sigma}{n} (T^\sigma - T^c)} \right| < 1; \quad (124)$$

when  $T^\sigma < T^c$  we have

$$\left| \frac{T^{\sigma^c} - T^\sigma}{T^{\sigma^c} - T^c} \right| = \left| \frac{\frac{\rho^c \rho^\sigma}{2nk_B \rho} (\mathbf{u}^c - \mathbf{u}^\sigma)^2 + \frac{n^c}{n} (T^c - T^\sigma)}{\frac{\rho^c \rho^\sigma}{2nk_B \rho} (\mathbf{u}^c - \mathbf{u}^\sigma)^2 - \frac{n^\sigma}{n} (T^c - T^\sigma)} \right| > 1. \quad (125)$$

Considering together (121)-(125) gives

$$\mathbf{u}^{\sigma r} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{u}^\sigma & (\text{if } \rho^\sigma \geq \rho^c) \\ \mathbf{u}^c & (\text{if } \rho^\sigma < \rho^c) \end{cases}, \quad (126)$$

$$T^{\sigma r} = \begin{cases} T^\sigma & (\text{if } T^\sigma \geq T^c) \\ T^c & (\text{if } T^\sigma < T^c) \end{cases}. \quad (127)$$

In the case of  $\mathbf{u}^{\sigma r} = \mathbf{u}^\sigma$  and  $T^{\sigma r} = T^\sigma$ , we have  $g^{\sigma(0)} = f^{\sigma(0)}$ . In other cases,  $g^{\sigma(0)}$  is a new introduced reference distribution function.

It is easy to verify the following properties of the reference distribution function  $g^{\sigma(0)}$ :

$$\int d\mathbf{v}^\sigma g^{\sigma(0)} = n^\sigma, \quad (128)$$

$$\int d\mathbf{v}^\sigma \mathbf{v}^\sigma g^{\sigma(0)} = n^\sigma \mathbf{u}^{\sigma r}, \quad (129)$$

$$\int d\mathbf{v}^\sigma \frac{1}{2} (v^\sigma)^2 g^{\sigma(0)} = n^\sigma \Theta^{\sigma r} + \frac{1}{2} n^\sigma (\mathbf{u}^{\sigma r})^2, \quad (130)$$

$$\int d\mathbf{v}^\sigma v_\alpha^\sigma v_\beta^\sigma g^{\sigma(0)} = n^\sigma \Theta^{\sigma r} \delta_{\alpha\beta} + n^\sigma u_\alpha^{\sigma r} u_\beta^{\sigma r}, \quad (131)$$

$$\int d\mathbf{v}^\sigma \frac{1}{2} (v^\sigma)^2 v_\alpha^\sigma g^{\sigma(0)} = n^\sigma \left[ \frac{1}{2} (u^{\sigma r})^2 + 2\Theta^{\sigma r} \right] u_\alpha^{\sigma r}, \quad (132)$$

$$\int d\mathbf{v}^\sigma v_\alpha^\sigma v_\beta^\sigma v_\gamma^\sigma g^{\sigma(0)} = n^\sigma \Theta^{\sigma r} (u_\gamma^{\sigma r} \delta_{\alpha\beta} + u_\alpha^{\sigma r} \delta_{\beta\gamma} + u_\beta^{\sigma r} \delta_{\gamma\alpha}) + n^\sigma u_\alpha^{\sigma r} u_\beta^{\sigma r} u_\gamma^{\sigma r}, \quad (133)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \int d\mathbf{v}^\sigma \frac{1}{2} (v^\sigma)^2 v_\alpha^\sigma v_\beta^\sigma g^{\sigma(0)} &= n^\sigma \left[ \frac{1}{2} (u^{\sigma r})^2 (u_\alpha^{\sigma r} u_\beta^{\sigma r} + \Theta^{\sigma r} \delta_{\alpha\beta}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2(\Theta^{\sigma r})^2 \delta_{\alpha\beta} + 3\Theta^{\sigma r} u_\alpha^{\sigma r} u_\beta^{\sigma r} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (134)$$

Since  $\rho^\sigma$  and  $T^\sigma$  are local quantities, they may change with the position in the system. To make use of the same treatment of the reference states in the whole system, in the criteria  $\rho^\sigma$  and  $T^\sigma$  should be replaced by their mean values,  $\bar{\rho}^\sigma$  and  $\bar{T}^\sigma$ , averaged over the whole system. Now we can answer the first question: In the case of  $\bar{\rho}^A \approx \bar{\rho}^B$  and  $\bar{T}^A \approx \bar{T}^B$ , we can use  $\mathbf{u}^{Ar} = \mathbf{u}^A, T^{Ar} = T^A$ , and  $\mathbf{u}^{Br} = \mathbf{u}^B, T^{Br} = T^B$ , i.e, Sirovich's kinetic theory. The kinetic model and the hydrodynamic equations are symmetric about the two components. As the second part of the study, we will investigate other cases where both the kinetic models and the hydrodynamic equations are not symmetric about the two components.

**B. Kinetic model C: for the case of  $\bar{\rho}^A > \bar{\rho}^B$  and  $\bar{T}^A > \bar{T}^B$**

In this case,  $\mathbf{u}^{Ar} = \mathbf{u}^{Br} = \mathbf{u}^A$ ,  $T^{Ar} = T^{Br} = T^A$ ,  $\Theta^{Ar} = \Theta^A$ ,  $\Theta^{Br} = k_B T^A / m^B$ . Thus  $g^{A(0)} = f^{A(0)}$ , and

$$g^{B(0)} = \frac{\rho^B}{2\pi k_B T^A} \exp \left[ -\frac{m^B (\mathbf{v}^B - \mathbf{u}^A)^2}{2k_B T^A} \right]. \quad (135)$$

$$\begin{aligned} f^{BA(0)} &= g^{B(0)} + g^{B(0)} \left( \frac{m^B}{k_B T^A} \right) (\mathbf{v}^B - \mathbf{u}^A) \cdot (\mathbf{u}^{BA} - \mathbf{u}^A) \\ &\quad + g^{B(0)} \left[ \frac{m^B}{k_B T^A} (\mathbf{v}^B - \mathbf{u}^A)^2 - 1 \right] \frac{(T^{BA} - T^A)}{T^A} \\ &= g^{B(0)} \left\{ 1 + \frac{\rho^B}{\rho} \frac{(\mathbf{v}^B - \mathbf{u}^A)}{\Theta^{Br}} \cdot (\mathbf{u}^B - \mathbf{u}^A) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left[ \frac{(\mathbf{v}^B - \mathbf{u}^A)^2}{2\Theta^{Br} T^A} - \frac{1}{T^A} \right] \left[ \frac{n^B}{n} (T^B - T^A) + \frac{\rho^B \rho^A}{2nk_B \rho} (\mathbf{u}^B - \mathbf{u}^A)^2 \right] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (136)$$

The BGK kinetic model C reads,

$$\partial_t f^A + \mathbf{v}^A \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{r}} f^A - \mathbf{a}^A \cdot \frac{(\mathbf{v}^A - \mathbf{u}^A)}{\Theta^A} f^{A(0)} = -\frac{1}{\tau^A} [f^A - f^{A(0)}] + Q^{AB}, \quad (137)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t f^B + \mathbf{v}^B \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{r}} f^B - \mathbf{a}^B \cdot \frac{(\mathbf{v}^B - \mathbf{u}^B)}{\Theta^B} f^{B(0)} &= -\frac{1}{\tau^{BB}} [f^B - f^{B(0)}] - \frac{1}{\tau^{BA}} [f^B - g^{B(0)}] \\ &\quad + Q^{BA}, \end{aligned} \quad (138)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Q^{AB} &= -\frac{f^{A(0)}}{\Theta^A} \left\{ \mu_D^A (\mathbf{v}^A - \mathbf{u}^A) \cdot (\mathbf{u}^A - \mathbf{u}^B) + \mu_T^A \left[ \frac{(\mathbf{v}^A - \mathbf{u}^A)^2}{2\Theta^A} - 1 \right] (T^A - T^B) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - M^A \left[ \frac{(\mathbf{v}^A - \mathbf{u}^A)^2}{2\Theta^A} - 1 \right] (\mathbf{u}^A - \mathbf{u}^B)^2 \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (139)$$

$$\begin{aligned} Q^{BA} &= -\frac{g^{B(0)}}{\Theta^{Br}} \left\{ \mu_D^{B*} (\mathbf{v}^B - \mathbf{u}^A) \cdot (\mathbf{u}^A - \mathbf{u}^B) + \mu_T^{B*} \left[ \frac{(\mathbf{v}^B - \mathbf{u}^A)^2}{2\Theta^{Br}} - 1 \right] (T^A - T^B) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - M^B \left[ \frac{(\mathbf{v}^B - \mathbf{u}^A)^2}{2\Theta^{Br}} - 1 \right] (\mathbf{u}^B - \mathbf{u}^A)^2 \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (140)$$

$$\mu_D^{B*} = \frac{\rho^B}{\tau_{BA} \rho}, \quad \mu_T^{B*} = k_B \frac{n^B}{\tau_{BA} m^B n}. \quad (141)$$

The definitions of  $\mu_D^A$ ,  $\mu_T^A$ ,  $M^A$ , and  $M^B$  are referred to Eq. (18).

1. *Hydrodynamics*

The Euler equations derived from the kinetic model (137)-(141) by using Chapman-Enskog analysis are

$$\frac{\partial \rho^\sigma}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial r_\alpha} (\rho^\sigma u_\alpha^\sigma) = 0, \quad (142)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\rho^\sigma u_\alpha^\sigma) + \frac{\partial P^\sigma}{\partial r_\alpha} + \frac{\partial}{\partial r_\beta} (\rho^\sigma u_\alpha^\sigma u_\beta^\sigma) - \rho^\sigma a_\alpha^\sigma + \frac{\rho^\sigma \rho^\varsigma}{\tau^\sigma \rho^\varsigma} (u_\alpha^\sigma - u_\alpha^\varsigma) = 0, \quad (143)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial e^A}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial r_\alpha} [(e^A + P^A) u_\alpha^A] - \rho^A \mathbf{a}^A \cdot \mathbf{u}^A + \frac{\rho^A \rho^B}{\tau^{AB} \rho} [(u^A)^2 - \mathbf{u}^A \cdot \mathbf{u}^B] \\ & + k_B \frac{n^A n^B}{\tau^{AB} n} (T^A - T^B) - n^A \frac{\rho^A \rho^B}{2\tau^{AB} n \rho} (\mathbf{u}^A - \mathbf{u}^B)^2 = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (144)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial e^B}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial r_\alpha} [(e^B + P^B) u_\alpha^B] - \rho^B \mathbf{a}^B \cdot \mathbf{u}^B + \frac{\rho^B}{2\tau^{BA}} [(\mathbf{u}^B)^2 - (\mathbf{u}^A)^2] \\ & + \frac{(\rho^B)^2}{\tau^{BA} \rho} [(u^A)^2 - \mathbf{u}^A \cdot \mathbf{u}^B] + k_B \frac{n^A n^B}{\tau^{BA} n} (T^B - T^A) - n^B \frac{\rho^A \rho^B}{2\tau^{BA} n \rho} (\mathbf{u}^B - \mathbf{u}^A)^2 = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (145)$$

Based on the discrete velocity model (38), in the derivation process of the Euler equations, besides the same requirements on  $f_{ki}^{A(0)}$ ,  $f_{ki}^{B(0)}$  as shown in Eqs.(47)-(53), the following requirements on  $g_{ki}^{B(0)}$  are necessary and sufficient,

$$\sum_{ki} g_{ki}^{B(0)} = n^B, \quad (146)$$

$$\sum_{ki} g_{ki}^{B(0)} \mathbf{v}_{ki}^B = n^B \mathbf{u}^A, \quad (147)$$

$$\sum_{ki} g_{ki}^{B(0)} \frac{1}{2} (v_k^B)^2 = n^B \Theta^{Br} + \frac{1}{2} n^B (\mathbf{u}^A)^2, \quad (148)$$

$$\sum_{ki} g_{ki}^{B(0)} v_{ki\alpha}^B v_{ki\beta}^B = n^B \Theta^{Br} \delta_{\alpha\beta} + n^B u_\alpha^A u_\beta^A, \quad (149)$$

$$\sum_{ki} g_{ki}^{B(0)} \frac{1}{2} (v_k^B)^2 v_{ki\alpha}^B = n^B \left[ \frac{1}{2} (u^A)^2 + 2\Theta^{Br} \right] u_\alpha^A, \quad (150)$$

$$\sum_{ki} g_{ki}^{B(0)} v_{ki\alpha}^B v_{ki\beta}^B v_{ki\gamma}^B = n^B \Theta^{Br} (u_\gamma^A \delta_{\alpha\beta} + u_\alpha^A \delta_{\beta\gamma} + u_\beta^A \delta_{\gamma\alpha}) + n^B u_\alpha^A u_\beta^A u_\gamma^A, \quad (151)$$

$$\sum_{ki} g_{ki}^{B(0)} \frac{1}{2} (v_k^B)^2 v_{ki\alpha}^B v_{ki\beta}^B = n^B \left[ \frac{1}{2} (u^A)^2 (u_\alpha^A u_\beta^A + \Theta^{Br} \delta_{\alpha\beta}) + 2 (\Theta^{Br})^2 \delta_{\alpha\beta} + 3\Theta^{Br} u_\alpha^A u_\beta^A \right]. \quad (152)$$

The above requirements are consistent with the properties (128)-(134) of the reference distribution function.

## 2. Discrete reference distribution functions

The formulated discrete distribution functions  $f_{ki}^{A(0)}$  and  $f_{ki}^{B(0)}$  are the same as those based on Sirovich's theory. Additionally, we need formulate the new reference distribution function  $g_{ki}^{B(0)}$  in a similar way. For the Euler equation system,

$$\begin{aligned}
g_{ki}^{B(0)} = n^B G_k^B & \left\{ \left[ 1 - \frac{(u^A)^2}{2\Theta^{Br}} + \frac{(u^A)^4}{8(\Theta^{Br})^2} \right] + \frac{1}{\Theta^{Br}} \left( 1 - \frac{(u^A)^2}{2\Theta^{Br}} \right) v_{ki\xi}^A u_\xi^A \right. \\
& + \frac{1}{2(\Theta^{Br})^2} \left( 1 - \frac{(u^A)^2}{2\Theta^{Br}} \right) v_{ki\xi}^B v_{ki\pi}^B u_\xi^A u_\pi^A + \frac{1}{6(\Theta^{Br})^3} v_{ki\xi}^B v_{ki\pi}^B v_{ki\eta}^B u_\xi^A u_\pi^A u_\eta^A \\
& \left. + \frac{1}{24(\Theta^{Br})^4} v_{ki\xi}^B v_{ki\pi}^B v_{ki\eta}^B v_{ki\lambda}^B u_\xi^A u_\pi^A u_\eta^A u_\lambda^A \right\} + \dots \tag{153}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$G_k^B = \frac{1}{2\pi\Theta^{Br}} \exp \left[ -\frac{(v_k^B)^2}{2\Theta^{Br}} \right]. \tag{154}$$

The formulae for  $G_k^B$  can be obtained through formal replacements in Eqs.(87)-(90),  $\Theta^\sigma \rightarrow \Theta^{Br} = k_B T^A / m^B$ ,  $F_k^\sigma \rightarrow G_k^B$ .

### 3. Finite-difference scheme

We can use the same finite-difference scheme for the modified BGK kinetic model (137)-(140). Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
f_{ki}^{A,(n+1)} = f_{ki}^{A,(n)} & - \left( v_{kix}^A \frac{\partial f_{ki}^{A,(n)}}{\partial x} + v_{kiy}^A \frac{\partial f_{ki}^{A,(n)}}{\partial y} \right) \Delta t \\
& + \left[ -\frac{1}{\tau^A} \left( f_{ki}^{A,(n)} - f_{ki}^{A(0),(n)} \right) + Q_{ki}^{AB,(n)} + \mathbf{a}^A \cdot \frac{(\mathbf{v}_{ki}^A - \mathbf{u}^A)}{\Theta^A} f_{ki}^{A(0)} \right] \Delta t, \tag{155}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
f_{ki}^{B,(n+1)} = f_{ki}^{B,(n)} & - \left( v_{kix}^B \frac{\partial f_{ki}^{B,(n)}}{\partial x} + v_{kiy}^B \frac{\partial f_{ki}^{B,(n)}}{\partial y} \right) \Delta t \\
& + \left[ -\frac{1}{\tau^{BB}} \left( f_{ki}^{B,(n)} - f_{ki}^{B(0),(n)} \right) \right. \\
& \left. - \frac{1}{\tau^{BA}} \left( f_{ki}^{B,(n)} - g_{ki}^{B(0),(n)} \right) + Q_{ki}^{BA,(n)} + \mathbf{a}^B \cdot \frac{(\mathbf{v}_{ki}^B - \mathbf{u}^B)}{\Theta^B} f_{ki}^{B(0)} \right] \Delta t. \tag{156}
\end{aligned}$$

The discrete method for this case is referred to as FDLBM C.

#### C. Kinetic model D: for the isothermal case with $\bar{\rho}^A > \bar{\rho}^B$

For the isothermal case,  $T^A = T^B = T^{AB}$ . The expression of  $Q^{AB}$  and  $Q^{BA}$  in (139)-(140) are simplified as

$$Q^{AB} = -\frac{f^{A(0)}}{\Theta^A} \mu_D^A (\mathbf{v}^A - \mathbf{u}^A) \cdot (\mathbf{u}^A - \mathbf{u}^B), \tag{157}$$

$$Q^{BA} = -\frac{g^{B(0)}}{\Theta^B} \mu_D^{B*} (\mathbf{v}^B - \mathbf{u}^A) \cdot (\mathbf{u}^A - \mathbf{u}^B), \tag{158}$$

respectively.

The isothermal Navier-Stokes equations derived from the kinetic model with (137),(138), (157) and (158) are

$$\frac{\partial \rho^\sigma}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial r_\alpha} (\rho^\sigma u_\alpha^\sigma) = 0, \tag{159}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\rho^A u_\alpha^A) + \frac{\partial}{\partial r_\beta} (\rho^A u_\alpha^A u_\beta^A) + \frac{\partial P^A}{\partial r_\alpha} - \rho^A a_\alpha^A \\ & - \frac{\partial}{\partial r_\beta} \left[ \eta^A \left( \frac{\partial u_\alpha^A}{\partial r_\beta} + \frac{\partial u_\beta^A}{\partial r_\alpha} - \frac{\partial u_\gamma^A}{\partial r_\gamma} \delta_{\alpha\beta} \right) \right] + \frac{\rho^A \rho^B}{\tau_{AB} \rho} (u_\alpha^A - u_\alpha^B) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (160)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\rho^B u_\alpha^B) + \frac{\partial}{\partial r_\beta} (\rho^B u_\alpha^B u_\beta^B) + \frac{\partial P^B}{\partial r_\alpha} - \rho^B a_\alpha^B \\ & - \frac{\partial}{\partial r_\beta} \left[ \eta^B \tau^B \left( \frac{\partial u_\alpha^B}{\partial r_\beta} + \frac{\partial u_\beta^B}{\partial r_\alpha} - \frac{\partial u_\gamma^B}{\partial r_\gamma} \delta_{\alpha\beta} \right) \right] \\ & - \frac{\partial}{\partial r_\beta} \left\{ \frac{\tau^B \rho^B (\rho^B - \rho^A)}{\tau^{BA} \rho} [(u_\alpha^B - u_\alpha^A) (u_\beta^B - u_\beta^A)] \right\} + \frac{\rho^B \rho^A}{\tau^{BA} \rho} (u_\alpha^B - u_\alpha^A) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (161)$$

If neglect terms in  $\tau^\sigma$ , the momentum equation recovers to the Euler level. If  $\rho^A = \rho^B$ , the momentum equations for  $A$  species and  $B$  species will be symmetric.

To formulate the discrete reference distribution functions, we need expand them in polynomials up to the third-order in flow velocities. For  $g_{ki}^{B(0)}$ , it is

$$\begin{aligned} g_{ki}^{B(0)} &= n^B G_k^B \left\{ \left[ 1 - \frac{(u^A)^2}{2\Theta^{Br}} \right] + \frac{1}{\Theta^{Br}} \left( 1 - \frac{(u^A)^2}{2\Theta^{Br}} \right) v_{ki\xi}^B u_\xi^A + \frac{1}{2(\Theta^{Br})^2} v_{ki\xi}^B v_{ki\pi}^B u_\xi^A u_\pi^A \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{6(\Theta^{Br})^3} v_{ki\xi}^B v_{ki\pi}^B v_{ki\eta}^B u_\xi^A u_\pi^A u_\eta^A \right\} + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (162)$$

In the derivation process of the isothermal Navier-Stokes equations (159)-(161), besides the same requirements on  $f_{ki}^{A(0)}$ ,  $f_{ki}^{B(0)}$  as shown in Eqs.(92)-(95), the requirements (146), (147), (149), (151) on  $g_{ki}^{B(0)}$  are necessary. The formulae for  $G_k^B$  can be obtained through formal replacements in Eqs.(113)-(116),  $\Theta^\sigma \rightarrow \Theta^{Br} = k_B T^A / m^B$ ,  $F_k^\sigma \rightarrow G_k^B$ . The final discrete Boltzmann equations are referred to (155)-(156) with (157)-(158). The discrete method in this case is referred to FDLBM D.

#### D. Kinetic model E: for the case of $\bar{\rho}^A > \bar{\rho}^B$ and $\bar{T}^A < \bar{T}^B$

In this case, the reference velocity and reference temperature for both  $f^{AB(0)}$  and  $f^{BA(0)}$  are  $\mathbf{u}^A$  and  $T^B$ , respectively. Thus  $\Theta^{Ar} = k_B T^B / m_A$ ,  $\Theta^{Br} = k_B T^B / m^B = \Theta^B$ , and

$$g^{A(0)} = \frac{\rho^A}{2\pi k_B T^B} \exp \left[ -\frac{m^A (\mathbf{v}^A - \mathbf{u}^A)^2}{2k_B T^B} \right] \quad (163)$$

$$= \frac{n^A}{2\pi \Theta^{Ar}} \exp \left[ -\frac{(\mathbf{v}^A - \mathbf{u}^A)^2}{2\Theta^{Ar}} \right]. \quad (164)$$

$$g^{B(0)} = \frac{\rho^B}{2\pi k_B T^B} \exp \left[ -\frac{m^B (\mathbf{v}^B - \mathbf{u}^A)^2}{2k_B T^B} \right] \quad (165)$$

$$= \frac{n^B}{2\pi \Theta^B} \exp \left[ -\frac{(\mathbf{v}^B - \mathbf{u}^A)^2}{2\Theta^B} \right]. \quad (166)$$

The BGK kinetic model E reads,

$$\partial_t f^A + \mathbf{v}^A \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{r}} f^A - \mathbf{a}^A \cdot \frac{(\mathbf{v}^A - \mathbf{u}^A)}{\Theta^A} f^{A(0)} = -\frac{1}{\tau_{AA}} [f^A - f^{A(0)}] - \frac{1}{\tau_{AB}} [f^A - g^{A(0)}] + Q^{AB}, \quad (167)$$

$$\partial_t f^B + \mathbf{v}^B \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{r}} f^B - \mathbf{a}^B \cdot \frac{(\mathbf{v}^B - \mathbf{u}^B)}{\Theta^B} f^{B(0)} = -\frac{1}{\tau_{BB}} [f^B - f^{B(0)}] - \frac{1}{\tau_{BA}} [f^B - g^{B(0)}] + Q^{BA}, \quad (168)$$

where

$$Q^{AB} = -\frac{g^{A(0)}}{\Theta^{Ar}} \left\{ \mu_D^A (\mathbf{v}^A - \mathbf{u}^A) \cdot (\mathbf{u}^A - \mathbf{u}^B) + \mu_T^A \left[ \frac{(\mathbf{v}^A - \mathbf{u}^A)^2}{2\Theta^{Ar}} - 1 \right] (T^A - T^B) \right. \\ \left. - M^A \left[ \frac{(\mathbf{v}^A - \mathbf{u}^A)^2}{2\Theta^{Ar}} - 1 \right] (\mathbf{u}^A - \mathbf{u}^B)^2 \right\} \quad (169)$$

$$Q^{BA} = -\frac{g^{B(0)}}{\Theta^B} \left\{ \mu_D^{B*} (\mathbf{v}^B - \mathbf{u}^A) \cdot (\mathbf{u}^A - \mathbf{u}^B) + \mu_T^{B*} \left[ \frac{(\mathbf{v}^B - \mathbf{u}^A)^2}{2\Theta^B} - 1 \right] (T^A - T^B) \right. \\ \left. - M^B \left[ \frac{(\mathbf{v}^B - \mathbf{u}^A)^2}{2\Theta^B} - 1 \right] (\mathbf{u}^B - \mathbf{u}^A)^2 \right\} \quad (170)$$

### 1. Hydrodynamics

The Euler equations are

$$\frac{\partial \rho^\sigma}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial r_\alpha} (\rho^\sigma u_\alpha^\sigma) = 0, \quad (171)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\rho^\sigma u_\alpha^\sigma) + \frac{\partial P^\sigma}{\partial r_\alpha} + \frac{\partial}{\partial r_\beta} (\rho^\sigma u_\alpha^\sigma u_\beta^\sigma) - \rho^\sigma a_\alpha^\sigma + \frac{\rho^\sigma \rho^\varsigma}{\tau^\sigma \varsigma \rho} (u_\alpha^\sigma - u_\alpha^\varsigma) = 0, \quad (172)$$

$$\frac{\partial e^A}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial r_\alpha} [(e^A + P^A) u_\alpha^A] - \rho^A \mathbf{a}^A \cdot \mathbf{u}^A + \frac{\rho^A \rho^B}{\tau^{AB} \rho} [(u^A)^2 - \mathbf{u}^A \cdot \mathbf{u}^B] \\ + k_B \frac{n^A (n + n^B)}{\tau^{AB} n} (T^A - T^B) - n^A \frac{\rho^A \rho^B}{2\tau^{AB} n \rho} (\mathbf{u}^A - \mathbf{u}^B)^2 = 0, \quad (173)$$

$$\frac{\partial e^B}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial r_\alpha} [(e^B + P^B) u_\alpha^B] - \rho^B \mathbf{a}^B \cdot \mathbf{u}^B + \frac{\rho^B}{2\tau^{BA}} [(\mathbf{u}^B)^2 - (\mathbf{u}^A)^2] \\ + \frac{(\rho^B)^2}{\tau^{BA} \rho} [(u^A)^2 - \mathbf{u}^A \cdot \mathbf{u}^B] + k_B \frac{(n^B)^2}{\tau^{BA} n} (T^A - T^B) - n^B \frac{\rho^A \rho^B}{2\tau^{BA} n \rho} (\mathbf{u}^B - \mathbf{u}^A)^2 = 0. \quad (174)$$

Under the discrete velocity model (38), the Chapman-Enskog analysis shows that, besides the same requirements on  $f_{ki}^{A(0)}$  and  $f_{ki}^{B(0)}$  as those based on kinetic model A, similar requirements on  $g_{ki}^{A(0)}$  and  $g_{ki}^{B(0)}$  are necessary. The requirements on  $g_{ki}^{B(0)}$  can be obtained from those of FDLBM C (for the case of  $\bar{\rho}^A > \bar{\rho}^B$  and  $\bar{T}^A > \bar{T}^B$ ) by using formal replacements:  $\mathbf{u}^B \rightarrow \mathbf{u}^A$ ,  $\Theta^{Br} \rightarrow \Theta^B$ . Then the requirements on  $g_{ki}^{A(0)}$  can be obtained from those on  $g_{ki}^{B(0)}$  by using formal replacements:  $\mathbf{v}^B \rightarrow \mathbf{v}^A$ ,  $\Theta^B \rightarrow \Theta^{Ar} = k_B T^B / m^A$ ,  $g_{ki}^{B(0)} \rightarrow g_{ki}^{A(0)}$ .

### 2. Finite-difference scheme

Under the finite-difference scheme, the BGK kinetic model reads,

$$f_{ki}^{A,(n+1)} = f_{ki}^{A,(n)} - \left( v_{kix}^A \frac{\partial f_{ki}^{A,(n)}}{\partial x} + v_{kiy}^A \frac{\partial f_{ki}^{A,(n)}}{\partial y} \right) \Delta t \\ + \left[ -\frac{1}{\tau^{AA}} (f_{ki}^{A,(n)} - f_{ki}^{A(0),(n)}) \right. \\ \left. - \frac{1}{\tau^{AB}} (f_{ki}^{A,(n)} - g_{ki}^{A(0),(n)}) + Q_{ki}^{AB,(n)} + \mathbf{a}^A \cdot \frac{(\mathbf{v}_{ki}^A - \mathbf{u}^A)}{\Theta^A} f_{ki}^{A(0)} \right] \Delta t, \quad (175)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
f_{ki}^{B,(n+1)} &= f_{ki}^{B,(n)} - \left( v_{kix}^B \frac{\partial f_{ki}^{B,(n)}}{\partial x} + v_{kiy}^B \frac{\partial f_{ki}^{B,(n)}}{\partial y} \right) \Delta t \\
&+ \left[ -\frac{1}{\tau_{BB}} \left( f_{ki}^{B,(n)} - f_{ki}^{B(0),(n)} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{1}{\tau_{BA}} \left( f_{ki}^{B,(n)} - g_{ki}^{B(0),(n)} \right) + Q_{ki}^{BA,(n)} + \mathbf{a}^B \cdot \frac{(\mathbf{v}_{ki}^B - \mathbf{u}^B)}{\Theta^B} f_{ki}^{B(0)} \right] \Delta t. \tag{176}
\end{aligned}$$

The discrete method for this case is referred to as FDLBM E.

#### IV. DISCUSSIONS ON THE KINETIC MODELS AND FDLBMS

(i) In the case of  $\bar{\rho}^A \approx \bar{\rho}^B$ ,  $\bar{T}^A \approx \bar{T}^B$  (or  $\bar{T}^A = \bar{T}^B$ ), Sirovich's kinetic theory works. The kinetic models A and B are symmetric about the two components. The FDLBMs A and B require to formulate the two discrete Maxwellian distribution functions,  $f_{ki}^{A(0)}$  and  $f_{ki}^{B(0)}$ . To that aim, one needs first calculate  $F_k^A$ ,  $F_k^B$ . (ii) In the case of  $\bar{\rho}^A > \bar{\rho}^B$  and  $\bar{T}^A > \bar{T}^B$ , (especially when  $\bar{\rho}^A \gg \bar{\rho}^B$ ,  $\bar{T}^A \gg \bar{T}^B$ ,) the modified kinetic model C works. In the case of  $\bar{\rho}^A > \bar{\rho}^B$  and  $T^A = T^B = T^{AB}$ , (especially when  $\bar{\rho}^A \gg \bar{\rho}^B$ ,  $T^A = T^B = T^{AB}$ ,) kinetic model D works. The FDLBMs C and D require to formulate three reference distribution functions,  $f_{ki}^{A(0)}$ ,  $f_{ki}^{B(0)}$ , and  $g_{ki}^{B(0)}$ . Correspondingly, one needs first calculate  $F_k^A$ ,  $F_k^B$ ,  $G_k^B$ . In the calculations of  $G_k^B$  and  $g_{ki}^{B(0)}$ , one should note that  $\Theta^{Br} = k_B T^A / m^B$ ,  $u^{Br} = u^A$ . (iii) In the case of  $\bar{\rho}^A > \bar{\rho}^B$ ,  $\bar{T}^A < \bar{T}^B$ , (especially when  $\bar{\rho}^A \gg \bar{\rho}^B$ ,  $\bar{T}^A \ll \bar{T}^B$ ,) kinetic model E works. The FDLBM E requires to formulate four reference distribution functions,  $f_{ki}^{A(0)}$ ,  $f_{ki}^{B(0)}$ ,  $g_{ki}^{A(0)}$ , and  $g_{ki}^{B(0)}$ . For that one needs first calculate  $F_k^A$ ,  $F_k^B$ ,  $G_k^A$ , and  $G_k^B$ . In the calculations of  $G_k^A$  and  $g_{ki}^{A(0)}$ , one should note that  $\Theta^{Ar} = k_B T^B / m^A$ ,  $u^{Ar} = u^A$ . In the calculations of  $G_k^B$  and  $g_{ki}^{B(0)}$ , one should note that  $\Theta^{Br} = k_B T^B / m^B$ ,  $u^{Br} = u^A$ .

It is interesting to find that the FDLBMs for symmetric and asymmetric binary-fluid systems can be resolved based on the same DVM group. The necessity of calculating  $G_k^A$  and/or  $G_k^B$  does not give additional the requirement on the isotropy of the DVM. For different cases, the systems are described by different hydrodynamic equations. Only in the first case [with  $\bar{\rho}^A \approx \bar{\rho}^B$ ,  $\bar{T}^A \approx \bar{T}^B$  (or  $\bar{T}^A = \bar{T}^B$ )], the two components are symmetric in the kinetic models, hydrodynamic equations and FDLBMs.

##### A. Interfacial tension for immiscible fluids

Investigating the interfacial tension is crucial in the industrial context for controlling the size and phase stability of mechanically dispersed droplets and other transient structures formed in the course of phase separation. The interfacial tension is another aspect of thermodynamic interaction between component fluids. For immiscible fluids, one possibility of introducing interfacial tension is through taking into account the the interparticle interaction. One possibility of incorporating the interparticle interaction is through the force terms in the Boltzmann equations. In such a case, the force terms in the BGK kinetic models are responsible for the phase separation and interfacial tension. The acceleration  $\mathbf{a}^\sigma$  ( $\sigma = A, B$ ) is determined by the interparticle interactions and the external field. The determination of the specific form of  $\mathbf{a}^\sigma$  depends on the system under consideration, which is out of the scope of the present paper. An interesting point found in this study is that the incorporation of the force term in the Boltzmann equation makes no additional requirement on the formulation process of the FDLBMs. So the specific forces can be directly considered under the same frame.

##### B. Binary fluids with disparate-mass components

An interesting research topic should be mentioned: binary mixtures with disparate-mass components, say,  $m^A \gg m^B$ . The solution for this kind of systems has been included in the present study. It is interesting to find that the parameter space should be divided according to the mean temperature  $\bar{T}^\sigma$  and the mean mass density  $\bar{\rho}^\sigma$ , instead of the particle mass  $m^\sigma$  of individual species. Besides the particle mass  $m^\sigma$ , which kinetic model to use depends also on the mean number density  $\bar{n}^\sigma$  of the two species. If  $\bar{n}^A m^A \approx \bar{n}^B m^B$ , one can use Sirovich's model or the modified models according to the relation of  $\bar{T}^A$  and  $\bar{T}^B$ . If  $\bar{n}^A m^A \gg \bar{n}^B m^B$ , one can only use the modified kinetic models. The numerical verifications for such systems are referred to the next section.

## V. NUMERICAL VERIFICATIONS OF THE FDLBMS

The Chapman-Enskog analysis shows that the FDLBMs for the thermal and compressible Euler equations possess higher isotropy than those for the isothermal Navier-Stokes equations. In principle, the FDLBMs for the complete Euler equations can also be used to simulate the isothermal Navier-Stokes equations. But with the increase of the system size, the FDLBMs with fewer discrete velocities becomes preferable, even necessary. As numerical verifications, we do not need very large systems. So FDLBMs for the complete Euler equations are also used to simulate the isothermal Navier-Stokes systems.

The numerical verifications will tell (i) whether or not the FDLBMs can describe the correct physical processes, and (ii) how accurate they are. In real physical systems, the relaxation times  $\tau^{AA}, \tau^{BB}, \tau^{AB}, \tau^{BA}$  may depend on the local densities and the non-ideal-gas effects of the two species. Since (i) the Boltzmann equation is only an approximation of the true gas picture, (ii) the discussion on the relaxation times in LBMs is still an open project, (iii) within the existing LBMs, the relaxation times are generally assumed to be constants, here we will follow the same treatment – the relaxation times  $\tau^{AA}, \tau^{BB}, \tau^{AB}, \tau^{BA}$  are used as constants in the following simulations. Such a treatment is more reasonable for the systems which are nearly uniform. Two physical tests are used. The first one is the Couette flow: The distance between the upper and lower walls is  $D$ . The two walls possess temperatures  $T_{\text{up}}, T_{\text{low}}$  and at time  $t = 0$  start to move at velocities  $U, -U$ , respectively. The second one is the uniform relaxation process. We work at the unit where the Boltzmann constant  $k_B = 1$  and consider systems where the force terms can be neglected from the Boltzmann equations.

### A. Couette-Flow for isothermal, incompressible Navier-Stokes equations

#### 1. FDLBMs based on Sirovich's kinetic theory

Sirovich's kinetic theory works best for the case with  $\bar{\rho}^A = \bar{\rho}^B$ . For such a system, FDLBMs A and B are available.

We first check the simplest case where the two components have exactly the same properties. We study the horizontal velocity profiles along a vertical line for the two species. The simulation results for each species agree with the following analytical solution,

$$u = \gamma y - \sum_j (-1)^{j+1} \frac{\gamma D}{j\pi} \exp\left(-\frac{4j^2\pi^2\eta}{\rho D^2} t\right) \sin\left(\frac{2j\pi}{D} y\right), \quad (177)$$

where  $\gamma = 2U/D$  is the imposed the shear rate,  $j$  is an integer, the two walls locate at  $y = \pm D/2$ . For the example shown in Fig. 1, the time  $t = 2.9$ . The parameters used in the simulations are  $m^A = m^B = 1$ ,  $T^A = T^B = T_{\text{up}} = T_{\text{low}} = 1$ ,  $n^A = n^B = 1$ ,  $\tau^{AA} = \tau^{BB} = \tau^{AB} = \tau^{BA} = 0.1$ ,  $\gamma = 0.001$ , the space steps  $\Delta x = \Delta y = 0.1$  and the time step  $\Delta t = 0.0001$ . The symbols denote the simulation results. The line is for Eq. (177) with  $\eta = 0.05$  and  $\rho = 1$ .

Secondly, we check systems with different components. Since the two components are evolving under the same shear condition, the flow velocities of the two components approach to the same values with time. According to the Navier-Stokes momentum equation (98), when  $\tau^{AB}$  ( $\tau^{BA}$ ) and  $\tau^{AA}$  ( $\tau^{BB}$ ) are comparable, the cross-collisions make significant effects so that the flow velocities asymptotically approach to the mean velocity of the mixture. Thus, after the initial transient process, the velocity profiles of the two components asymptotically approach to the curve described by Eq. (177) with mean viscosity and mean density. For the case shown in Fig. 2(a), the time  $t = 8$ . The parameters used in the simulation are  $m^A = 2$ ,  $m^B = 1$ ,  $T^A = T^B = T_{\text{up}} = T_{\text{low}} = 1$ ,  $n^A = 1, n^B = 2$ ,  $\tau^{AA} = 0.2$ ,  $\tau^{BB} = 0.1$ ,  $\tau^{AB} = 0.1$ ,  $\tau^{BA} = 0.2$ ,  $\gamma = 0.001$ , the space steps  $\Delta x = \Delta y = 0.1$  and the time step  $\Delta t = 0.0001$ ; the line is for in Eq. (177) with  $\eta = 0.1$  and  $\rho = 2$ . When  $\tau^{AB} \gg \tau^{AA}$  and  $\tau^{BA} \gg \tau^{BB}$ , the cross-collisions make only slight effects and the coupling between the two components is negligible. Either of them evolves in the similar way to that of the single-component fluid. Thus, after the initial transient process, the velocity profiles of the two components can be approximately described by Eq. (177) with corresponding kinematic viscosities  $\nu^\sigma = \eta^\sigma / \rho^\sigma = n^\sigma k_B T \tau^\sigma / \rho^\sigma$ , ( $\sigma = A, B$ ). For the case in Fig.2 (b),  $t = 8$ ; the parameters used in simulation are  $m^A = 2$ ,  $m^B = 1$ ,  $T^A = T^B = T_{\text{up}} = T_{\text{low}} = 1$ ,  $n^A = 1$ ,  $n^B = 2$ ,  $\tau^{AA} = 0.1$ ,  $\tau^{BB} = 0.1$ ,  $\tau^{AB} = 100$ ,  $\tau^{BA} = 200$ ,  $\gamma = 0.001$ , the space steps  $\Delta x = \Delta y = 0.1$  and the time step  $\Delta t = 0.0001$ ; the solid curve corresponds to Eq. (177) with  $\eta = \eta^A = 0.1$ ,  $\rho = \rho^A = 2$ ; the dashed curve corresponds to Eq. (177) with  $\eta = \eta^B = 0.2$ ,  $\rho = \rho^B = 2$ .

## 2. FDLBM based on kinetic model D

When  $\bar{\rho}^A > \bar{\rho}^B$ , but  $\bar{\rho}^A - \bar{\rho}^B$  is not large, both of kinetic models B and D are available. For such a system, we can use FDLBM B or D. With the increase of  $\bar{\rho}^A - \bar{\rho}^B$ , FDLBM B becomes less accurate and FDLBM D becomes preferable. Especially, when  $\bar{\rho}^A \gg \bar{\rho}^B$ , FDLBM D becomes necessary.

According to the momentum equations (160)-(161), when  $\tau^{AB}$  ( $\tau^{BA}$ ) and  $\tau^{AA}$  ( $\tau^{BB}$ ) are comparable, the cross-collisions make significant effects so that the flow velocities asymptotically approach to the barycentric velocity of the mixture. When  $\rho^A \gg \rho^B$ , the barycentric velocity is nearly the same as the velocity of component A. For the case shown in Fig. 3 (a),  $m^A = 10$ ,  $m^B = 1$ ,  $T^A = T^B = T_{\text{up}} = T_{\text{low}} = 1$ ,  $n^A = 10$ ,  $n^B = 1$ ,  $\tau^{AA} = 0.1$ ,  $\tau^{BB} = 0.1$ ,  $\tau^{AB} = 1$ ,  $\tau^{BA} = 0.1$ ,  $\gamma = 0.001$ , the space steps  $\Delta x = \Delta y = 0.1$  and the time step  $\Delta t = 0.0001$ ; the line is for Eq. (177) with  $\eta = \eta^A = 9.091$  and  $\rho = \rho^A = 100$ . When  $\tau^{AB} \gg \tau^{AA}$  and  $\tau^{BA} \gg \tau^{BB}$ , the coupling terms become negligible. The two components evolve nearly separately. Fig. 3 (b) shows an example, where  $m^A = 10$ ,  $m^B = 1$ ,  $T^A = T^B = T_{\text{up}} = T_{\text{low}} = 1$ ,  $n^A = 10$ ,  $n^B = 1$ ,  $\tau^{AA} = 0.1$ ,  $\tau^{BB} = 0.1$ ,  $\tau^{AB} = 1000$ ,  $\tau^{BA} = 100$ ,  $\gamma = 0.001$ , the space steps  $\Delta x = \Delta y = 0.1$  and the time step  $\Delta t = 0.0001$ . The symbols denote the simulation results. The solid line corresponds to (177) with  $\eta = \eta^A = 1$  and  $\rho = \rho^A = 100$ , the dashed line corresponds to (177) with  $\eta = \eta^B = 0.1$  and  $\rho = \rho^B = 1$ .

### B. FDLBM A for the thermal, compressible single-component fluid

The Chapman-Enskog analysis shows that FDLBM A works also for the thermal Navier-Stokes equations of single-component fluid. We compare simulation results from FDLBM A to those obtained from FDLBM of Watari, et al[7]. The latter has been shown to be strictly accurate[7]. Figure 4 shows a comparison of simulation results from FDLBM A and from FDLBM of Watari, et al. Parameters for FDLBM A are  $m^A = m^B = 1$ ,  $T_{\text{up}} = 2$ ,  $T_{\text{low}} = 1$ ,  $\tau^{AA} = \tau^{BB} = \tau^{AB} = \tau^{BA} = 0.2$ ,  $\gamma = 0.001$ . The initial state is uniform and isothermal with  $n^{A(0)} = n^{B(0)} = 1$ ,  $T^{A(0)} = T^{B(0)} = 1$ ,  $u^{A(0)} = u^{B(0)} = 0$ , where the second superscript, (0), denotes the initial value. Three parameters used in the FDLBM of Watari, et al are  $m = 1$ ,  $n^{(0)} = 1$ , and  $\tau = 0.1$ , where  $m$  is the particle mass,  $n$  is local number density, and  $\tau$  is the relaxation time in the BGK kinetic equation. The other parameters are same as those for FDLBM A. The profiles of horizontal velocity, local density, local temperature and local pressure at time  $t = 13$  are shown, respectively, in (a)-(d). Under the precision of calculations, the two FDLBMs give the same results.

### C. Uniform relaxation process for Euler-equation FDLBMs

Finally, we verify the FDLBMs for the Euler equations. What we choose is the ideal uniform relaxation process. The choice of the FDLBMs depends on the sizes of  $|\rho^A - \rho^B|$  and  $|T^A - T^B|$ . Since FDLBM A is verified above, we focus on FDLBMs C and E.

For the kinetic model C, from the Euler momentum equation (143), by eliminating the terms in spatial derivatives and in forces, we have

$$\frac{\partial (u_\alpha^A - u_\alpha^B)}{\partial t} = -\frac{1}{\rho} \left( \frac{\rho^B}{\tau^{AB}} + \frac{\rho^A}{\tau^{BA}} \right) (u_\alpha^A - u_\alpha^B); \quad (178)$$

from the Euler energy equations (144)-(145), by eliminating the terms in spatial derivatives and in forces, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial (T^A - T^B)}{\partial t} &= -\frac{1}{n} \left( \frac{n^B}{\tau^{AB}} + \frac{n^A}{\tau^{BA}} \right) (T^A - T^B) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2k_B n \rho} \left[ \rho^A \rho^B \left( \frac{1}{\tau^{AB}} - \frac{1}{\tau^{BA}} \right) - \frac{n m^B}{\tau^{BA}} (\rho^A - \rho^B) \right] (\mathbf{u}^A - \mathbf{u}^B)^2 \end{aligned} \quad (179)$$

For the kinetic model E, velocity equilibration follows also Eq. (178), while the temperature equilibration follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial (T^A - T^B)}{\partial t} &= -\frac{1}{n} \left( \frac{n + n^B}{\tau^{AB}} - \frac{n^B}{\tau^{BA}} \right) (T^A - T^B) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2k_B n \rho} \left[ \rho^A \rho^B \left( \frac{1}{\tau^{AB}} - \frac{1}{\tau^{BA}} \right) - \frac{n m^B}{\tau^{BA}} (\rho^A - \rho^B) \right] (\mathbf{u}^A - \mathbf{u}^B)^2 \end{aligned} \quad (180)$$

In either of the two cases, the temperature equilibration depends on two terms. When the velocity difference is small, the second term is a higher order small quantity and the temperature relaxation is mainly determined by the first term of Eq. (179) or (180) after the initial process. When velocity difference becomes zero, the temperature equilibrates exponentially with time. To check the kinetic models C and E, in Fig.5, we choose the following common parameters,  $n^A = 1$ ,  $n^B = 1$ ,  $m^A = 100$ ,  $m^B = 1$ ,  $\tau^{AA} = \tau^{BB} = \tau^{AB} = \tau^{BA} = 1$ ,  $u^{A(0)} = -u^{B(0)} = 0.3$  for both FDLBMs C and E; while  $T^{A(0)} = 10$ ,  $T^{B(0)} = 0.1$  for FDLBM C and  $T^{A(0)} = 0.1$ ,  $T^{B(0)} = 10$  for FDLBM E. Here the superscript “(0)” denotes the initial value. The slopes of the two lines in the figure are both  $-1$ .

Now we come to a summary: (i) The five FDLBMs recover, with high-fidelity, what the continuous BGK models describe under the hydrodynamic limit; (ii) The relaxation times  $\tau^{\sigma\sigma}$ ,  $\tau^{\zeta\zeta}$ ,  $\tau^{\sigma\zeta}$  and  $\tau^{\zeta\sigma}$  depend on the system under consideration; (iii) One can control the numerical accuracy and stability by adjusting the space and time steps under the Courant-Friedrichs-Lewy condition. The relation  $v_k^\sigma \propto \sqrt{\Theta^\sigma} = \sqrt{k_B T^\sigma / m^\sigma}$  should be noted.

## VI. CONCLUSIONS AND REMARKS

In the hydrodynamic limit the Euler and Navier-Stokes equations can be derived from the Boltzmann equation by using the Chapman-Enskog analysis. When the Knudsen number is not small, the derivation of the hydrodynamic equations breaks down, while the Boltzmann equation is still valid. From this sense, the Boltzmann equation is more than the Euler and the Navier-Stokes equations. Correspondingly, the LBM (SLBM and FDLBM) is more than an Euler or Navier-Stokes solver. It simulates systems from the microscopic or mesoscopic level. Its extensive studies are meaningful even if one has various conventional Euler or Navier-Stokes solvers. SLBM and FDLBM stand for two different ways to discretize the Boltzmann equation. Investigations on SLBM and FDLBM are expected to be complementary.

Designing more accurate numerical schemes is an important task of the computational physics. Starting from the BGK kinetic model for binary mixtures, we have three sets of hydrodynamic quantities  $[(\rho^A, \mathbf{u}^A, T^A), (\rho^B, \mathbf{u}^B, T^B), \text{ and } (\rho^{AB}, \mathbf{u}^{AB}, T^{AB})]$ . In the one-fluid kinetic theory, the flow velocity  $\mathbf{u}^\sigma$  and temperature  $T^\sigma$  in the Maxwellian distribution function  $f^{\sigma(0)}$  ( $\sigma = A, B$ ) is approximated by the barycentric velocity  $\mathbf{u}^{AB}$  and mean temperature of the mixture  $T^{AB}$ . Under such an approximation, some detailed dynamics of the individual species is neglected.

Among the three sets of hydrodynamic quantities, only two sets are independent. So the hydrodynamic equations depend only on two sets of them. Without losing generality, we require that the hydrodynamic equations depend on the two sets of hydrodynamic quantities for the two individual species. To that aim, Sirovich[23] expanded the mixture Maxwellian  $f^{\sigma\zeta(0)}$  around  $f^{\sigma(0)}$  to the first order in flow velocity  $\mathbf{u}^\sigma$  and temperature  $T^\sigma$  ( $\sigma = A, B$  and  $\zeta = B, A$ ). That is also what was used by Luo, et al. in Ref. [8] and by us in the first part of this study. Luo, et al.[8] are the first to introduce Sirovich’s two-fluid kinetic theory into the LBM field. But within the LBM for isothermal binary mixtures proposed by them, mass conservation does not hold for each individual species, which makes artificial results in the simulation. Up to that step, we still do not have a satisfying two-fluid LBM scheme for binary mixtures. This is the starting point of this study. In the first part of this study, besides a two-fluid LBM (FDLBM B) for the isothermal Navier-Stokes system, a two-fluid LBM (FDLBM A) for the thermal and compressible Euler equation systems is presented.

In terms of the two sets of parameters,  $\bar{\rho}^\sigma$  and  $\bar{T}^\sigma$ , we showed that Sirovich’s theory works within a relatively small regime in the parameter space where  $\bar{\rho}^A \approx \bar{\rho}^B$  and  $\bar{T}^A \approx \bar{T}^B$ . In other regimes, especially when one component is dominant in the system, the kinetic theory needs to be modified. Correspondingly, so do the hydrodynamic equations and the LBMs. This is the task of the second part of this study. For other possible cases, (i)  $\bar{\rho}^A > \bar{\rho}^B$  and  $\bar{T}^A > \bar{T}^B$ , (ii)  $\bar{\rho}^A > \bar{\rho}^B$  and  $T^A = T^B$ , and (iii)  $\bar{\rho}^A > \bar{\rho}^B$  and  $\bar{T}^A < \bar{T}^B$ , the BGK kinetic models, hydrodynamics, and FDLBMs are presented. These models become necessary when “>” is replaced by “ $\gg$ ” and/or “<” is replaced by “ $\ll$ ”. Within Sirovich’s kinetic theory, the two components,  $A$  and  $B$ , are symmetric in the kinetic models, hydrodynamic equations and LBMs. For asymmetric systems, especially for the significantly asymmetric cases, the modified kinetic models give solutions. Even for the same physical system, where the  $n^A, m^A$  and  $n^B, m^B$  are fixed, one should use different kinetic models and the corresponding hydrodynamic equations are different for the two cases: (i) where  $\bar{T}^A \gg \bar{T}^B$ , and (ii) where  $\bar{T}^A \ll \bar{T}^B$ .

The symmetric and asymmetric systems can be resolved under the same discrete velocity group. The incorporation of the force term in the Boltzmann equation makes no additional requirement on the isotropy of the discrete velocity model. The complete Euler equations requires a higher rank of isotropy on the discrete velocity model than the isothermal Navier-Stokes equations. The used finite-difference scheme overcomes defects, in existing SLBM, resulted from the splitting scheme where an evolution step is separated as a propagation and a collision ones. Both the self-collisions and cross-collisions contribute to the viscosity, which is clearly shown in the present study. This work contributes to complete the BGK kinetic theory, hydrodynamics and LBMs for binary mixtures.

### Acknowledgments

Aiguo Xu acknowledges Prof. G. Gonnella for guiding him into the LBM field and thanks Profs. H. Hayakawa, V. Sofonea, M. Watari, and L. S. Luo for helpful discussions. This work is partially supported by Grant-in-Aids for Scientific Research (Grand No. 15540393) and for the 21-th Century COE “Center for Diversity and Universality in Physics” from the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) of Japan.

- 
- [1] P. L. Bhatnagar, E. P. Gross, and M. Krook, *Phys. Rev.* **94**, 511 (1954).
  - [2] C. Cercignani, R. Illner and M. Pulvirenti, *The mathematical theory of dilute gases*, Applied Mathematical Sciences, Vol. 106, edited by F. John, J.E.Marsden, and L. Sirovich (Springer-Verlag, 1994).
  - [3] X.He, L.S.Luo, *Phys. Rev. E* **55**, R6333 (1997); **56**, 6811 (1997).
  - [4] U. Frisch, B. Hasslacher, and Y. Pomeau, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **56**, 1505 (1986).
  - [5] S. Chapman and T. G. Cowling, *The Mathematical Theory of Non-Uniform Gases*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1970).
  - [6] For example, see (i) *Lattice Gas Methods for PDE: Theory, Applications and Hardware*, Physica D Vol. 47, No. 1-2, edited by G.D.Doolan (Elsevier Science, Amsterdam, 1991); (ii) S. Succi, *The Lattice Boltzmann Equation* (Oxford University Press, New York, 2001).
  - [7] M. Watari, M. Tsutahara, *Phys. Rev. E* **67**, 36306 (2003); T. Kataoka, M. Tsutahara, *Phys. Rev. E* **69**, 56702 (2004); T. Kataoka, M. Tsutahara, *Phys. Rev. E* **69**, R35701 (2004).
  - [8] L.S. Luo and S. S. Girimaji, *Phys. Rev. E* **66**, 035301(R) (2002); *ibid.* **67**, 36302 (2003).
  - [9] Z. Guo, T. S. Zhao, *Phys. Rev. E* **68**, 035302(R) (2003).
  - [10] Aiguo Xu, G. Gonnella, A. Lamura, *Phys. Rev. E* **67**, 56105 (2003); *Physica A* **331**, 10 (2004); *Physica A* (in press); Lamura, cond-mat/0404205; Aiguo Xu, *Commun. Theor. Phys.* **39**, 729 (2003).
  - [11] A. K. Gunstensen, D. H. Rothman, S. Zaleski, and G. Zanetti, *Phys. Rev. A* **43**, 4320 (1991).
  - [12] E. G. Flekkoy, *Phys. Rev. E* **47**, 4247 (1993).
  - [13] D. Grunau, S. Chen, and K. Eggert, *Phys. Fluids A* **5**, 2557 (1993).
  - [14] X. Shan and G. Doolen, *J. Stat. Phys.* **81**, 379 (1995); *Phys. Rev. E* **54**, 3614 (1996).
  - [15] E. Orlandini, W. R. Osborn, and J. M. Yeomans, *Europhys. Lett.* **32**, 463 (1995); W. R. Osborn, E. Orlandini, M. R. Swift, J. M. Yeomans, and J. R. Banavar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 4031 (1995); M. R. Swift, E. Orlandini, W. R. Osborn, and J. M. Yeomans, *Phys. Rev. E* **54**, 5041 (1996); G. Gonnella, E. Orlandini, J. M., Yeomans, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 1695 (1997); A. Lamura, G. Gonnella, and J. M. Yeomans, *Europhys. Lett.* **45**, 314 (1999).
  - [16] V. M. Kendon, J. C. Desplat, P. Bladon, and M.E. Cates, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 576 (1999); V. M. Kendon, M. E. Cates, I. Pagonabarrage, J. C. Desplat, and P. Bladon, *J. Fluid Mech.* **440**, 147 (2001).
  - [17] H. Yu, L. S. Luo, S. S. Girimaji, *Int. J. Comp. Eng. Sci.* **3**, 73 (2002).
  - [18] P.C.Facin, P.C.Philippi, and L. O. E. dos Santos, in *P.M.A.Sloot et al. (Eds.): ICCS 2003, LNCS 2657*, pp. 1007-1014, 2003.
  - [19] A. Cristea and V. Sofonea, *Central European J. Phys.* **2**, 382 (2004).
  - [20] X. Shan and H. Chen, *Phys. Rev. E* **47**, 1815 (1993); *ibid.* **49**, 2941 (1994).
  - [21] P. J. Love, P.V.Coveney, and B.M.Boghosian, *Phys. Rev. E* **64**, 21503 (2001); P. J. Love, J. B. Maillet, and P. V. Coveney, *ibid.* **64**, 61302 (2001); J. Chin, P. V. Coveney, *ibid.* **66**, 16303 (2002); N. Gonzalez-Segredo, M. Nekovee, P. V. Coveney, *ibid.* **67**, 46304 (2003); N. Gonzalez-Segredo, P. V. Coveney, *ibid.* **69**, 61501 (2004).
  - [22] Victor Sofonea, Robert F. Sekerka, *Physica A* **299**, 494 (2001).
  - [23] L. Sirovich, *Phys. Fluids* **5**, 908 (1962); *ibid.* **9**, 2323 (1966); E. Goldman and L. Sirovich, *Phys. Fluids* **10**, 1928 (1967).
  - [24] N. Cao, S. Chen, S. Jin and D. Martinez, *Phys. Rev. E* **55**, R21 (1997).
  - [25] T. Seta and R. Takahashi, *J. Stat. Phys.* **107**, 557 (2002).
  - [26] V. Sofonea and R. F. Sekerka, *J. Comp. Phys.* **184**, 422 (2003).
  - [27] A. Cristea and V. Sofonea, *Proceedings of the Romanian Academy, Series A: Mathematics, Physics, Technical Sciences, Information Science*, **3**, 87 (2002); *ibid.* **4**, 59 (2003); arXiv: nlin.CG/0305013.
  - [28] V. Sofonea and R. F. Sekerka, submitted to *J. Comp. Phys.*; submitted to *Phys. Rev. E*.
  - [29] E. P. Gross and M. Krook, *Phys. Rev.* **102**, 593 (1956).
  - [30] T. F. Morse, *Phys. Fluids* **6**, 1420 (1963).
  - [31] B. B. Hamel, *Phys. Fluids* **8**, 418 (1965); *ibid.* **9**, 12 (1966).
  - [32] J. M. Burgers, *Flow Equations for Composite Gases*, Academic Press, New York, 1969.
  - [33] L. Vahala, D. Wah, G. Vahala, J. Carter, P. Pavlo, *Phys. Rev. E* **62**, 507 (2000).
  - [34] G. Yan, Y. Chen, and S. Hu, *Phys. Rev. E* **59**, 454 (1999).




FIG. 1: Isothermal Couette-flow with the same components. The parameters used in the simulations are  $m^A = m^B = 1$ ,  $T^A = T^B = T_{\text{up}} = T_{\text{low}} = 1$ ,  $n^A = n^B = 1$ ,  $\tau^{AA} = \tau^{BB} = \tau^{AB} = \tau^{BA} = 0.1$ ,  $\gamma = 0.001$ ,  $t = 2.9$ . The symbols denote the simulation results. The initial state is uniform and static. The line is for Eq. (177) with  $\eta = 0.05$  and  $\rho = 1$ .




FIG. 2: Isothermal Couette-flow with different components. The parameters used in (a) are  $m^A = 2$ ,  $m^B = 1$ ,  $T^A = T^B = T_{\text{up}} = T_{\text{low}} = 1$ ,  $n^A = 1$ ,  $n^B = 2$ ,  $\tau^{AA} = 0.2$ ,  $\tau^{BB} = 0.1$ ,  $\tau^{AB} = 0.1$ ,  $\tau^{BA} = 0.2$ ,  $\gamma = 0.001$ ,  $t = 8$ ; the line in (a) is for in Eq. (177) with  $\eta = 0.1$  and  $\rho = 2$ . The parameters used in (b) are  $m^A = 2$ ,  $m^B = 1$ ,  $T^A = T^B = T_{\text{up}} = T_{\text{low}} = 1$ ,  $n^A = 1$ ,  $n^B = 2$ ,  $\tau^{AA} = 0.1$ ,  $\tau^{BB} = 0.1$ ,  $\tau^{AB} = 100$ ,  $\tau^{BA} = 200$ ,  $\gamma = 0.001$ ,  $t = 8$ ; the solid line in (b) corresponds to Eq. (177) with  $\eta = \eta^A = 0.1$ ,  $\rho = \rho^A = 2$ ; the dashed line in (b) corresponds to Eq. (177) with  $\eta = \eta^B = 0.2$ ,  $\rho = \rho^B = 2$ . The symbols denote the simulation results. The initial state is uniform and static. FDLBMs A and B give the same simulation results under the precision of calculations.




FIG. 3: Isothermal Couette-flow with different components. Parameters in (a) are  $m^A = 10$ ,  $m^B = 1$ ,  $T^A = T^B = T_{\text{up}} = T_{\text{low}} = 1$ ,  $n^A = 10, n^B = 1$ ,  $\tau^{AA} = 0.1$ ,  $\tau^{BB} = 0.1$ ,  $\tau^{AB} = 1$ ,  $\tau^{BA} = 0.1$ ,  $\gamma = 0.001$ ; the line in (a) is for Eq. (177) with  $\eta = \eta^A = 9.091$  and  $\rho = \rho^A = 100$ . Parameters in (b) are  $m^A = 10$ ,  $m^B = 1$ ,  $T^A = T^B = T_{\text{up}} = T_{\text{low}} = 1$ ,  $n^A = 10, n^B = 1$ ,  $\tau^{AA} = 0.1$ ,  $\tau^{BB} = 0.1$ ,  $\tau^{AB} = 1000$ ,  $\tau^{BA} = 100$ ,  $\gamma = 0.001$ . The solid line in (b) corresponds to (177) with  $\eta = \eta^A = 1$  and  $\rho = \rho^A = 100$ , the dashed line in (b) corresponds to (177) with  $\eta = \eta^B = 0.1$  and  $\rho = \rho^B = 1$ . The symbols denote the simulation results. The initial state is uniform and static.




FIG. 4: Thermal Couette-flow with a single component. Parameters for FDLBM A are  $m^A = m^B = 1$ ,  $T_{\text{up}} = 2$ ,  $T_{\text{low}} = 1$ ,  $\tau^{AA} = \tau^{BB} = \tau^{AB} = \tau^{BA} = 0.2$ ,  $\gamma = 0.001$ . The initial state is uniform with  $n^{A(0)} = n^{B(0)} = 1$ ,  $T^{A(0)} = T^{(0)} = 1$ ,  $u^{A(0)} = u^{B(0)} = 0$ . Three parameters used in the FDLBM of Watari, et al are  $m = 1$ ,  $n^{(0)} = 1$ , and  $\tau = 0.1$ , where  $m$  is the particle mass,  $n$  is local number density, and  $\tau$  is the relaxation time in the BGK kinetic equation. The other parameters are the same as those for FDLBM A. The profiles of horizontal velocity, local density, local temperature and local pressure at time  $t = 13$  are shown, respectively, in (a)-(d).




FIG. 5: FDLBMs C and E for the uniform relaxation processes. The common parameters are  $n^A = 1$ ,  $n^B = 1$ ,  $m^A = 100$ ,  $m^B = 1$ ,  $\tau^{AA} = \tau^{BB} = \tau^{AB} = \tau^{BA} = 1$ ,  $u^{A(0)} = -u^{B(0)} = 0.3$ ; while  $T^{A(0)} = 10$ ,  $T^{B(0)} = 0.1$  for FDLBM C and  $T^{A(0)} = 0.1$ ,  $T^{B(0)} = 10$  for FDLBM E. Here the superscript “(0)” denotes the initial value. The slopes of the two lines in the figure are both  $-1$ .