DROP IMPACT BEHAVIOUR ON ALTERNATELY HYDROPHOBIC AND HYDROPHILIC LAYERED BEAD PACKS

Shaun Atherton[1], Daniel Polak[1], Christopher A. E. Hamlett[1], Neil J. Shirtcliffe[2], Glen McHale[3], Sujung Ahn[4], Stefan H. Doerr[4], Robert Bryant[4] and Michael I. Newton[1]

1 School of Science and Technology, Nottingham Trent University, Clifton Lane, Nottingham NG11 8NS, UK
2 Department of Technology and Bionics, Hochschule Rhein-Waal, Landwehr 4, 47533 Kleve, Germany
3 Northumbria University, Faculty of Engineering & Environment, Ellison Place, Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 8ST, UK
4 College of Science, Swansea University, Singleton Park, Swansea SA2 8PP, UK
shaun.atherton02@ntu.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

A high level of water repellency in soils has an impact on soil hydrology, plant growth and soil erosion. Studies have been performed previously on model soils; consisting of close packed layers of glass spheres (140-400 μm in diameter), to mimic the behaviour of rain water on water repellent soils. In this study measurements were performed on multi-layered bead packs, with different combinations of hydrophobic and hydrophilic layers. A high speed video camera was used to record the impact behaviour of water droplets on the bead packs focussing on the spreading of the droplet and the subsequent rebound behaviour of the droplet. Observations were made from the videos of the liquid marble effect on the droplet, whereby hydrophobic particles form a coating around the droplet, and how it differed depending on the arrangement of hydrophobic and hydrophilic layers within the bead pack. The droplet release height was varied in order to establish a relationship between impact velocity and the degree to which liquid marbling occurs, with higher impact speeds leading to a greater degree of liquid marbling. Measurements were also made to find the transition speeds between the three rebound conditions; rebound, pinning and fragmentation, showing an overall decrease in pinning velocity as the bead size increased.

KEYWORDS

Hydrophobicity, Hydrophilicity, Drop impact, Water repellent soil, Soil science, Liquid marbles.

1. INTRODUCTION

Typically the minerals found naturally in soils, e.g. silica in sandy soils, display hydrophilic properties. However, with the addition of contaminants, such as oils and other organic matter, the soil particles become hydrophobic [1, 2, 3]. Due to their granular nature, soil particles will form a matrix with a hierarchical structure with individual grains providing a rough topography; and each individual particle also possessing a rough surface. Combining this rough surface structure with the chemical water repellency of the chemical compounds, a soil matrix can achieve high levels of hydrophobicity [4, 5, 6, 7].

Hydrophobicity is defined by the contact angle of a water droplet on a surface with a more water repellent surface resulting in a higher angle between the surface and the droplet [8]. In the case of a rough surface, such as soil, water will typically take on one of two different wetting states, Figure 1. The Cassie-Baxter state is where the water cannot infiltrate the gaps between the surface roughness, leaving a layer of trapped air below the liquid [9]. In the Wenzel state the liquid infiltrates the gaps and increases the surface contact area [10]. While chemically induced hydrophobicity has a contact angle upper limit of $\approx 120°$, as shown by fluoropolymers such as polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE) [11]; complex surface topography can increase the contact angle even further, with super-hydrophobic materials having a contact angle of over 160°.


Figure 1: Diagram showing the a) Cassie-Baxter and b) Wenzel states of wetting. [15]

Such high levels of hydrophobicity can have a number of deleterious effects on the natural landscape. Soil erosion due to rain fall can become more pronounced [12], due to reduced water infiltration and hence an increase in surface run off. The reduced infiltration results in drier soils that can also lead to an increase in wind erosion [13]. In addition there may be a corresponding reduction in the germination and growth of vegetation with the lower availability of water within the soil matrix.

Previous work has attempted to model the effects of water drop impacts on soils by using glass beads as a model soil [14, 15, 16]. Hamlett *et al*. [15] investigated the behaviour of water drop impacts on bead pack which consisted of a single type of wettability (either hydrophobic or hydrophilic) throughout the entire depth of the bead pack. In this study expands on this and investigates the effect of layers of different hydrophobicity throughout the depth of the bead pack on both the drop impact behaviour and on the formation of liquid marbles [17].

2. EXPERIMENTAL METHOD

The experiment involved the creation of a number of bead packs, using glass beads between 140 μm and 400 μm (Worf Glaskugeln GmbH, Germany). Beads were ordered in a number of different colours in order to distinguish different layers within the bead packs. Before the bead packs could be created the beads were sieved and treated to make them either hydrophobic or hydrophilic. To sort the beads they were placed into small scale sieves (Endecotts Ltd, UK) and an Endecotts Minor 200 sieve shaker (Endecotts Ltd, UK) to separate them into size categories. The categories used in this study are 140 - 160 μm, 160 - 180 μm, 180 - 200 μm, 250 - 300 μm and 400 μm.

Both hydrophobic and hydrophilic beads were required for this study, and this required two separate processes. The first step in the process was common to both types of beads and involved the beads being immersed in HCl (30% vol%) for 24 hours, then rinsed thoroughly with deionised

water (DI) until a strip of indicator paper showed that the DI water, after rinsing the beads, was neutral. Finally the beads were then place in an oven at 80°C for 3 hours in order to dry the beads completely.

To make the hydrophobic beads, the beads previously cleaned with HCl were treated using Granger's Extreme Wash-In (Grangers, UK). A solution of Granger's in DI was prepared (5% vol%) and the beads were immersed in the solution for 1 hour. The beads were then dried in an oven at 80°C for 3 hours.

The hydrophilic beads were made by applying a titanium oxide coating to the surface of the beads. While glass is typically hydrophilic after being cleaned with HCl, the colour coating on the beads caused them to be hydrophobic. The beads were placed into a small dish and then into an Emitech K575X sputter coater (Quorum Technologies Ltd, UK). Titanium was sputtered onto the beads for 3 minutes at a current of 150 mA; the beads were then agitated and sputtered again to coat all sides of the beads. Next the titanium coated beads were place into an ozone cleaner (BIOFORCE Nanosciences, USA) for 20 minutes in order to produce an oxide layer on the surface of the beads.

The bead packs consisted of three layers, a base layer which was fixed in place and two loose layers on top of this. To produce the base layer, a mono layer of beads was fixed to a microscope slide using double sided tape. The fixed layer was then sputtered with Ti for 3 minutes at 150 mA and then gold (Au) for 3 minutes at 85 mA. If hydrophobic base layers were needed, they were treated with Granger's as above; hydrophilic base layers had a further layer of Ti sputter as above and then ozone treated as above to form an oxide layer. To form the second layer, loose beads were placed on top of the base layer and agitated to form a monolayer. The third layer was then formed by placing loose beads on top again and agitating to form a monolayer. Care was taken to prevent the loose layers from mixing.


Figure 2. Diagrammatic representations of the configurations of hydrophobic (red) and hydrophilic (blue) glass beads used in this study.

For the experimental work the bead packs were created with layers in different configurations of hydrophobic and hydrophilic, Figure 2. The configurations ranged from a completely hydrophobic bead pack to a completely hydrophilic one with other configurations alternating hydrophobic and hydrophilic layers. For each bead pack, different coloured beads were used for the hydrophobic and hydrophilic layers in order to tell the layers apart during the drop impact measurements.

The drop impacts were recorded with a high speed camera, a Hotshot 512SC (NAC Image Technology, UK). A syringe was suspended at a known height above the bead pack and a single

0.019 ml droplet of DI dispensed so that it would fall directly onto the beads. The high speed camera was used to record the impact event and a separate digital camera was used to take a still image of the aftermath of the impact. The height of the syringe was varied up to 250 mm to change the impact velocity of the water droplet. The video footage was then analysed using ImageJ software (http://imagej.nih.gov/ij/).

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

There were five different bead pack configurations used in this investigation, see Figure 2, and for each configuration there were five bead sizes tested. This section will discuss the impact behaviour, transition velocities and liquid marbling for each configuration and for the bead sizes used.

Figure 3 shows frame grabs from videos of the drop impacts. The frames depict a droplet falling at 0.93 ms^{-1} immediately prior to impacting the bead pack; followed by impact and spreading of the droplet and then bounce or pinning to the surface. All five bead pack configurations are shown for comparison.

Figure 3. Comparative still images from video showing 0.93 ms^{-1} droplet impacting bead pack configurations 1-5 for 180-200 μm beads. Images show liquid marbling of hydrophobic beads, absorption of hydrophilic beads and wetting of wholly hydrophilic bead pack.

Figure 4 compares the droplet immediately after the impact has taken place and the droplet has reach equilibrium for the five different bead pack configurations with 180-200 μm beads. Images are shown for increasing impact velocity, showing how the increase in velocity affects resulting droplet.

Figure 4. Images showing the droplet impact zones immediately after impact for bead pack configurations 1-5 and at different impact velocities.

3.1. Configuration 1 (Hydrophobic (base layer)-Hydrophobic-Hydrophobic)

This bead pack consisted of purely hydrophobic particles. In the case of a hydrophobic top layer, the droplet shows clear liquid marbling behaviour, whereby the hydrophobic particles form a coating around the outside of the droplet. Column 1 in Figure 3 shows frames from an impact video for an impact velocity of $0.93 ms^{-1}$ onto 180-200 μm beads; after impact the droplet shows almost complete covering of beads to form a liquid marble. The liquid marble effect can be seen on all bead sizes and at all impact velocities; the degree of liquid marbling and which bead pack layer contributes to the marble varies with bead size and impact velocity.

Row 1 in Figure 4 shows the droplet after impact at four different impact velocities. The degree to which the beads coat the surface is seen to increase with impact velocity. By observing the colour of the beads coating the drop it can be seen that the majority are from the top layer, showing that the droplet mainly interacts with the top layer of the pack and not the lower layer.

When measuring the transition velocities there was no clear relationship between the bead size and the velocity, Table 1. The 180-200 and 250-300 μm beads transition from bouncing to fragmentation with no pinning regime in-between. The 250-300 μm beads also showed the lowest fragmentation velocity. The other bead sizes showed similar pinning velocities, but the fragmentation velocities varied more.

Bead size (μm)	Pinning velocity (ms^{-1})	Fragmentation velocity (ms^{-1})
140-160	0.97±0.14	1.18±0.17
160-180	0.87±0.11	1.01±0.13
180-200	No pinning	1.18±0.17
250-300	No pinning	0.98±0.13
400	0.84±0.11	1.23±0.16

Table 1. Pinning and fragmentations velocities for all hydrophobic bead pack.

3.2. Configuration 2 (Hydrophobic-Hydrophilic-Hydrophobic)

This bead pack consisted of a hydrophilic layer sandwiched between two hydrophobic layers. Column 2 in Figure 3 shows frames from an impact video for an impact velocity of 0.93ms^{-1} onto 180-200 μm beads and row 2 in Figure 4 shows the droplets after impact for 180-200um beads. Similar to the all hydrophobic bead pack, the droplet forms a liquid marble using the hydrophobic beads on the top layer of the pack. There appears to be little interaction with the hydrophilic beads in the middle layer. By forming a liquid marble with the top layer, a barrier is formed around the droplet preventing the water from interacting with the hydrophilic particles.

Table 2 shows the transition velocities for this bead pack configuration. There appears to some relationship between bead size and pinning velocity, with and overall decrease in pinning velocity as bead size increases. Fragmentation velocity shows great variation, with no clear decrease overall.

Bead size (μm)	Pinning velocity (ms^{-1})	Fragmentation velocity (ms^{-1})
140-160	1.13±0.16	1.35±0.19
160-180	1.01±0.13	1.08±0.14
180-200	1.10±0.16	1.34±0.19
250-300	0.78±0.10	1.11±0.14
400	0.87±0.11	1.23±0.16

Table 2. Pinning and fragmentations velocities for hydrophobic, hydrophilic, hydrophobic bead pack.

3.3. Configuration 3 (Hydrophobic-Hydrophobic-Hydrophilic)

Unlike the previous two bead pack configurations, this bead pack had a layer of hydrophilic beads forming the top layer. Column 3 in Figure 3 shows frames from an impact video for an impact velocity of $0.93 ms^{-1}$ onto 180-200 μm beads and row 3 in Figure 4 shows the droplets after impact for 180-200um beads. This bead pack configuration showed markedly different behaviour as the droplet impacts the bead pack. As the droplet interacts with the hydrophilic top layer, the beads are absorbed into the droplet. Some of the middle layer hydrophobic beads start to form a liquid marble round the outside of the droplet, but this effect is much less significant than with the hydrophobic top layer. Once the droplet comes to rest it forms a ball on top of the hydrophobic beads.

Table 3 shows the transition velocities for this bead pack configurations. There is not a clear relationship between impact speed and transition velocity looking at this configuration alone. However, compared to the bead packs with a hydrophobic top layer, the fragmentation velocity is higher. The reason for this may be the absorption of the hydrophilic beads into the droplet. The presence of the hydrophilic beads may help to hold the droplet together due to the attractive forces between the water and the beads. As a result, impact velocities that would normally fragment the droplet, fail to do so in this case; this may be due to capillary forces acting to hold the droplet together as the liquid infiltrates between the hydrophilic beads.

Bead size (μm)	Pinning velocity (ms^{-1})	Fragmentation velocity (ms^{-1})
140-160	1.23±0.17	1.39±0.2
160-180	0.89±0.11	1.33±0.18
180-200	1.55±0.10	1.73±0.07
250-300	0.89±0.11	1.47±0.2
400	0.73±0.09	No fragmentation

Table 3. Pinning and fragmentations velocities for hydrophobic, hydrophobic, hydrophilic bead pack.

3.4. Configuration 4 (Hydrophobic-Hydrophilic-Hydrophilic)

This bead pack has both the top and middle layer hydrophilic and the fixed base layer hydrophobic. Column 4 in Figure 3 shows frames from an impact video for an impact velocity of $0.93 ms^{-1}$ onto 180-200 μm beads and row 4 in Figure 4 shows the droplets after impact for 180-200um beads. The droplets show similar behaviour to the previous pack configurations, except with no liquid marble effect as there are not loose hydrophobic beads present. The droplet absorbs both the top and middle layers, due to them both comprising of hydrophilic beads; interacting with both the top and middle layers equally. A circular void can be seen where the beads have been removed, exposing the base layer below. The size of the circular void increases with impact velocity, due to the droplet spreading more upon impact at higher velocities. As the base layer is hydrophobic, once the droplet reaches equilibrium it is not able to spread and so forms a ball on the surface with the hydrophilic beads contained within.

Table 4 shows the pinning and fragmentation velocities for this bead pack configurations. Of most significance is the lack of fragmentation. Within the range of impact velocities tested, the droplet did not transition to fragmentation upon impact. The effect seen in the previous bead pack, with just the top layer hydrophilic, appears to be enhanced with the middle layer also hydrophilic. The droplet is able to absorb a greater number of beads by interacting with both the top and middle layers, the beads then act to hold the droplet together and prevent fragmentation.

Bead size (μm)	Pinning velocity (ms^{-1})	Fragmentation velocity (ms^{-1})
140-160	0.83±0.12	No fragmentation
160-180	1.07±0.14	No fragmentation
180-200	0.20±0.03	No fragmentation
250-300	0.85±0.11	No fragmentation
400	0.50±0.06	No fragmentation

Table 4. Pinning and fragmentations velocities for hydrophobic, hydrophilic, hydrophilic bead pack.

3.5. Configuration 5 (Hydrophilic-Hydrophilic-Hydrophilic)

The final bead pack configuration consisted of a hydrophilic base layer and hydrophilic top and middle layers. Column 5 in Figure 3 shows frames from an impact video for an impact velocity of 0.93ms^{-1} onto 180-200 μm beads and row 5 in Figure 4 shows the droplets after impact for 180-200um beads. Due to there being no hydrophobic beads present in the bead pack, there is no liquid marble behaviour or ball like equilibrium droplet. The droplet spreads upon impact and recedes due to surface tension; at lower impact velocities the droplet bounces slightly. Once the droplet has come to rest it leaves a small mound of beads at the impact site, while the water wets into the bead pack.

Table 5 shows the pinning and fragmentation velocities for this bead pack configuration. Typically the pinning transition happens at lower velocities compared to the previous bead pack configurations. For all but the 140-160 μm beads, the droplet failed to fragment in the range of velocities tested.

Bead size (μm)	Pinning velocity (ms^{-1})	Fragmentation velocity (ms^{-1})
140-160	1.02±0.15	1.38±0.2
160-180	1.06±0.14	No fragmentation
180-200	0.20±0.03	No fragmentation
250-300	0.98±0.13	No fragmentation
400	0.75±0.09	No fragmentation

Table 5. Pining and fragmentation velocities for all hydrophilic bead pack.

3.6. Pinning velocities

Figure 5 compares the pinning velocities for all the bead pack configurations and bead sizes. By looking at the data set as a whole, there appears to be a general decrease in pinning velocity as the bead size increases. As in each case the impact results in the beads combining with the droplet, either through the liquid marble effect or absorption of hydrophilic beads; as the number of beads combined with the droplet increases the kinetic energy required to de-pin from the surface would increase, with the larger beads providing more mass and therefore causing the droplet to pin at a lower impact velocity.


Figure 5. A graph showing the pinning velocities of the bead pack against bead size. Legend describes base layer to top layer and whether the layer is hydrophobic (B) or hydrophilic (L).

5. CONCLUSIONS

This work investigated the impact behaviour of water droplets on bead packs; consisting of sub-millimetre sized beads with varying configurations of hydrophobic and hydrophilic beads. By colour coding the layers of the bead pack it was possible to distinguish which layers the droplets had interacted with during the impact event.

In the case of bead packs with a hydrophobic top layer, the droplet would mostly interact with only the top layer. A liquid marble was formed as the beads coated the droplet, forming a solid barrier preventing the droplet from interacting with the lower layers. In the case of bead packs with hydrophilic middle layers, this prevented the droplet from wetting the middle layer and instead the liquid marble sat on top of the hydrophilic beads. Higher impact velocities resulted in a greater degree of liquid marbling, as the droplet would spread out more and gather up more of the hydrophobic beads, but also resulted in more interaction with the middle layer of the pack.

In the case of a hydrophilic top layer, the droplet was seen to absorb the hydrophilic beads. In a wholly hydrophilic bead pack this resulted in the droplet gathering together the beads to form a small mound where the impact took place; the droplet would then wet into the bead pack. If a loose hydrophobic layer was present then the droplet would start to form a liquid marble. The hydrophobic beads would form a coating around the outside of the droplet with the hydrophilic beads within the droplet. With a hydrophobic fixed base layer; the droplet would absorb the hydrophilic beads and then form a ball on top of the base layer, unable to wet the hydrophobic beads.

Measurements of pinning velocities showed a general decrease in velocity as the size of the beads within the pack increased. The fragmentations velocities measured showed that the presence of hydrophilic beads within the bead pack helped to prevent the droplet from fragmenting upon impact; with the droplet failing to fragment in the velocity range investigated for the wholly hydrophilic and the hydrophilic top and middle layer bead packs.

In the context of soil hydrology; these results suggest that while top layer hydrophobicity can increase erosion due to liquid marbling [15], this effect will not penetrate into the soil matrix for any given droplet. Hydrophobic particles just below the surface, however, may result multiple layers of the matrix eroding simultaneously.

ACKNOWLEDEMENTS

REFERENCES

[1] S.H. Doerr, R.A. Shakesby, R.P.D. Walsh, Soil water repellency, its characteristics, causes and hydro-geomorphological consequences, Earth Science Reviews, 51 (2000), 33–65.

[2] R.H. Ellerbrock, H.H. Gerke, J. Bachmann, M. Goebel, Composition of organic matter fractions for explaining wettability of three forest soils, Soil Science Society of America Journal, 69 (2005), 57–66.

[3] I. Atanassova, S.H. Doerr, . Organic compounds of different extractability in total solvent extracts from soils of contrasting water repellency, European Journal of Soil Science, 61 (2010), 298–313.

[4] G. McHale, M.I. Newton, N.J. Shirtcliffe, 2005, Water-repellent soil and its relationship to granularity, surface roughness and hydrophobicity: a materials science view, European Journal of Soil Science, 56 (2005), 445–452.

[5] G. McHale, N.J. Shirtcliffe, M.I. Newton, F.B. Pyatt, Implications of ideas on super-hydrophobicity on water repellent soil, Hydrological Processes, 21 (2007), 2229–2238.

[6] N.J. Shirtcliffe, G. McHale, M.I. Newton, F.B. Pyatt, Critical conditions for the of the wetting of soils, Applied Physics Letters, 89 (2006), 094101.

[7] J. Bachmann, G. McHale, Superhydrophobic surface: a model approach to predict contact angle and surface energy of soil particles, European Journal of Soil Science, 60 (2009), 420–430.

[8] N.J. Shirtcliffe, G. McHale, S. Atherton, M.I. Newton, An introduction to superhydrophobicity, Advances ing Colloid and Interface Science, 161 (2010), 124-138.

[9] A.B.D. Cassie, S. Baxter, Wettability of porous surfaces, Transactions of the Faraday Society, 40 (1944), 546-551.

[10] R.N. Wenzel, Resistance of solid surfaces to wetting by water, Industrial and Engineering Chemistry, 28 (1936), 988-994.

[11] W.A. Zisman, Contact Angle, Wettability, and Adhesion, American Chemical Society, 43 (1964), 1–51.

[12] J.P. Terry, R.A Shakesby, Soil water repellency effects on rainsplash: simulated rainfall and photographic evidence, Earth Surface Processes and Landforms, 18 (1993), 519–525.

[13] L.F. DeBano, Water repellency in soils: a historical overview, Journal of Hydrology, 231–232 (2000), 4–32.

[14] C.A.E. Hamlett, N.J. Shirtcliffe, G. McHale, S. Ahn, R. Bryant, S.H. Doerr, M.I. Newton, Effect of particle size on droplet infiltration into hydrophobic porous media as a model of water repellent soil, Environmental Science and Technology, 45 (2011), 9666–9670.

[15] C.A.E. Hamlett, S. Atherton, N.J. Shirtcliffe, G. McHale, S. Ahn, R. Bryant, S.H. Doerr, M.I. Newton, Transitions of water-drop impact behaviour on hydrophobic and hydrophilic particles, European Journal of Soil Science, 64 (2013), 324-333.

[16] S. Ahn, S.H. Doerr, P. Douglas. R. Bryant, C.A.E. Hamlett, G. McHale, M.I. Newton, N.J. Shirtcliffe, Effects of hydrophobicity on splash erosion of model soil particles by a single water drop impact, Earth Processes and Landforms, 38 (2013), 1225-1233.

[17] P. Aussillous, D. Quere, Liquid Marbles, Nature, 411 (2001), 924-927.