# Front propagation in channels with spatially modulated cross section

S. Martens,\* J. Löber, and H. Engel

Institut für Theoretische Physik, Hardenbergstraße 36, EW 7-1, Technische Universität Berlin, 10623 Berlin, Germany

(Received 15 September 2014; published 2 February 2015)

Propagation of traveling fronts in a three-dimensional channel with spatially varying cross section is reduced to an equivalent one-dimensional reaction-diffusion-advection equation with boundary-induced advection term. Treating the advection term as a weak perturbation, an equation of motion for the front position is derived. We analyze channels whose cross sections vary periodically with L along the propagation direction of the front. Taking the Schlögl model as a representative example, we calculate analytically the nonlinear dependence of the front velocity on the ratio L/l where l denotes the intrinsic front width. In agreement with finite-element simulations of the three-dimensional reaction-diffusion dynamics, our theoretical results predicts boundary-induced propagation failure for a finite range of L/l values. In particular, the existence of the upper bound of L/l can be completely understood based on the linear eikonal equation. Last, we demonstrate that the front velocity is determined by the suppressed diffusivity of the reactants for  $L \ll l$ .

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevE.91.022902

PACS number(s): 05.45.-a, 05.40.Jc, 82.33.-z, 89.75.Kd

## I. INTRODUCTION

Propagating fronts are building blocks of traveling wave (TW) activity in dissipative spatially extended systems. Like excitation pulses, periodic pulse trains, spirals, and scroll waves are examples of nonlinear waves and represent fascinating self-organized spatiotemporal patterns in nonequilibrium macroscopic systems. Traveling waves have been observed in many physical [1], biological [2–4], and chemical systems [5,6]. Prominent examples of front propagation include catalytic oxidation of carbon monoxide (CO) on platinum single crystal surfaces [7–10], arrays of coupled chemical reactors [11], and nematic liquid crystals [12].

Often the medium that supports front propagation exhibits a complex shape and/or its size is limited like in biological cells [13], nanoporous media [14], or zeolites [15]. In such a system the interaction of the reactants with the boundaries of the medium leads to nonintuitive confinement effects [16,17]. For example, phase separation in porous materials results in layering, freezing, wetting, and other novel phase transitions not found in the bulk system [18]. In particular, chemical reactions [19,20] as well as molecular diffusion [21-23] depend strongly on the shape of the domain. Recent studies on the fundamental problem of particle transport through microdomains exhibiting obstacles and/or small openings showed that the shape of these confinements (periodicity, size of the connecting openings) regulates the dynamics of diffusing particles leading to transport properties which significantly differ from free Brownian motion [24–28].

Even in systems ranging from the micro- to the macroscale there is ongoing interest in studies of nonlinear wave propagation under spatially confined conditions. Important issues investigated in this context are the dependence of front reflection on the shape of platinum surfaces in the catalytic CO oxidation [29], reaction fronts in Poiseuille [30] and shear flows [31], and three-dimensional (3D) traveling waves in the human heart [32] to name a few. Some parts of the human heart tissue, especially at the ventricles, are thick enough to support not only spiral waves but also 3D vortex structures, for example, scroll waves and scroll rings. Hence, detailed knowledge about the interaction of these self-organized spatiotemporal patterns with boundaries [33,34] might be important for the understanding of possible mechanisms responsible for atrial tachycardia. In particular, there is experimental evidence that spatial variations of the heart wall's thickness play a significant role in atrial fibrillation [35].

Nowadays, well-established techniques like microlithography enable us to design the shape of catalytic domains as well as to prescribe the boundary conditions [10]. This provides an efficient method to study experimentally the impact of confinement on front propagation and to control the local dynamics of catalytic reactions.

In this paper, we address the problem of traveling front (TF) propagation through a 3D channel with a periodically modulated cross section. Aiming at deriving an equation of motion for the front position in corrugated channels, we apply asymptotic perturbation analysis in a geometric parameter [27,36] and projection techniques [37–40] to the problem. Our goal is to analyze how spatial variations of the channel's cross section affect front propagation and, in particular, to determine the dependence of the propagation velocity on the characteristic length scales in the system. Furthermore, we focus on boundary-induced phenomena such as propagation failure and effective diffusivity.

The paper is organized as follows: In Sec. II, we formulate the reaction-diffusion (RD) equation in a 3D channel with spatially modulated cross section. In Secs. II A and II B, we derive an equation of motion for the traveling front using multiple scale analysis. Additionally, we obtain analytical expressions for the front velocity. In Sec. III, we compare our theoretical results with numerical simulations for the one-component Schlögl model. An analytical estimate for the interval of propagation failure is presented in Sec. III A. In Sec. IV, we demonstrate that the front velocity is determined by the suppressed diffusivity of the reactants if the intrinsic width of the front is much larger than the spatial variation of the channel's cross section. Finally, we conclude our results in Sec. V.

1539-3755/2015/91(2)/022902(8)

<sup>\*</sup>steffen.martens@tu-berlin.de

## **II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

We consider a RD system for the vector of *n* concentration fields  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r},t) = (u^1, \dots, u^n)^T$  whose spatial and temporal evolution is modeled by a reaction-diffusion equation,

$$\partial_t \mathbf{u} = \mathbb{D} \Delta \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{u}), \tag{1}$$

in a channel filled with an excitable medium. Here  $\mathbf{r} = (x, y, z)^T$  is the position vector,  $\mathbb{D} = \text{diag}(D_1, \ldots, D_n)$  is the diagonal matrix of constant diffusion coefficients,  $\Delta$  denotes the Laplacian operator, and  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{u})$  represents the nonlinear reaction kinetics. The medium filling the channel is assumed to be uniform, isotropic, and infinitely extended in the *x* direction. In transverse directions, the channel is confined by periodically modulated walls at  $y = \omega_{\pm}(x)$ , with spatial period *L* and plane walls located at z = 0 and z = H. A sketch of the setup is depicted in Fig. 1. Because of the channel walls' impermeability with respect to diffusion, the gradient of  $\mathbf{u}$  obeys no-flux boundary conditions (BCs) and reads

$$(\nabla \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r},t)) \cdot \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{r}) = 0, \quad \forall \mathbf{r} \in \text{channel wall.}$$
 (2)

Here  $\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{r})$  denotes the outward-pointing normal vector at the channel walls, viz.  $\mathbf{n}_z = (0,0,\pm 1)^T$  at z = 0,H and  $\mathbf{n}_{\pm} = (\mp \omega'_{\pm}(x), \pm 1, 0)^T$  at  $y = \omega_{\pm}(x)$ . The prime denotes the differentiation with respect to x.

Passing to dimensionless quantities, all lengths are measured in units of the widest cross section of the channel  $\omega_{\text{max}}$ , yielding  $\mathbf{r} \to \omega_{\text{max}} \bar{\mathbf{r}}$ . The time is scaled in units of the inverse characteristic kinetic constant of the slowest reaction,  $t \to \bar{t}/k_{\text{reac}}$ . Thus, the rescaled diffusion constants read  $\mathbb{D} \to \omega_{\text{max}}^2 k_{\text{reac}} \mathbb{D}$ .

## A. Asymptotic perturbation analysis

Below we perform asymptotic perturbation analysis in the dimensionless geometric parameter

$$\varepsilon = (1 - \delta)/\overline{L} \ll 1,\tag{3}$$

which characterizes the deviation of a corrugated boundary  $\omega_{\pm}(x)$  from a flat one, i.e.,  $\varepsilon = 0$ .  $\delta$  denotes the ratio of the bottleneck width  $\omega_{\min}$  to the maximal channel width  $\omega_{\max} \equiv 1$ , i.e.,  $\delta = \omega_{\min}/\omega_{\max}$ , and  $\overline{L}$  is the rescaled period length. The



FIG. 1. (Color online) Sketch of a segment of a spatially modulated 3D channel confining the excitable medium. The channel is composed of periodically modulated boundaries at  $y = \omega_+(x) =$  $+\omega(x)$  and  $y = \omega_-(x) = -\omega(x)$ , with spatial period *L*, and by plane walls placed at z = 0 and z = H; *H* represents the channel height. Thus, the channel's cross section  $Q(x) = H [\omega_+(x) - \omega_-(x)]$ changes periodically in space. The quantities  $\omega_{\min}$  and  $\omega_{\max}$  denote the bottleneck size and the maximum channel width, respectively. The size of an unit cell is indicated with the dashed lines. The concentration field  $u(\mathbf{r},t)$  of a front traveling from left to right is color coded.

choice for the expansion parameter  $\varepsilon$  is motivated by previous studies on Brownian motion in corrugated channels [27,36]. Upon rescaling the transverse coordinate  $y \to \varepsilon \overline{y}$ , the profile functions become  $\omega_{\pm}(\overline{x}) \to \varepsilon h_{\pm}(\overline{x})$  and the outward-pointing normal vector at the perpendicular side walls is given by  $\mathbf{n}_{\pm} =$  $(\mp \varepsilon h'_{\pm}(x), \pm 1, 0)^T$ . Thus, the no-flux BC Eq. (2) transforms to

$$(\nabla \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r},t)) \cdot \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{r}) = 0 = \mp \varepsilon^2 h'_+(\overline{x}) \partial_{\overline{x}} \overline{\mathbf{u}} \pm \partial_{\overline{y}} \overline{\mathbf{u}}, \qquad (4)$$

at  $\overline{y} = h_{\pm}(\overline{x})$ . Additionally, we scale the *z* coordinate by the dimensionless channel height  $\overline{H}, z \to \overline{H} \overline{z}$ , leading to

$$\varepsilon^{2}\partial_{\overline{t}}\mathbf{u} = \overline{\mathbb{D}}\left(\varepsilon^{2}\partial_{\overline{x}}^{2}\mathbf{u} + \partial_{\overline{y}}^{2}\mathbf{u} + \frac{\varepsilon^{2}}{\overline{H}^{2}}\partial_{\overline{z}}^{2}\mathbf{u}\right) + \varepsilon^{2}\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{u}).$$
(5)

In the following, we shall omit the overbar in our notation.

Since Eqs. (4) and (5) are proportional to  $\varepsilon^2$ , we solely expand **u** in a series in even powers of  $\varepsilon$ ,  $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r},t) = \mathbf{u}_0(\mathbf{r},t) +$  $\varepsilon^2 \mathbf{u}_1(\mathbf{r},t) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^4)$ . Substituting this ansatz into Eq. (5) and observing the no-flux BCs Eq. (4), we obtain a hierarchic set of coupled partial differential equations (PDEs). In leading order, one has to solve  $\mathbb{D}(\partial_{\nu}^2 + (\varepsilon/H)^2 \partial_{\varepsilon}^2) \mathbf{u}_0 = 0$  supplemented with no-flux BCs,  $0 = \pm \partial_y \mathbf{u}_0$  at  $y = h_{\pm}(x)$  and  $0 = \pm \partial_z \mathbf{u}_0$  at z = 0, 1. Depending on the ratio of the transverse length scales  $\varepsilon/H$ , different scenarios have to be discussed: For RD processes either (i) on two-dimensional surfaces (H =0) [7,8,10] or (ii) in very thin 3D channels ( $H \ll \varepsilon$ ) like microfluidic channels [41,42], the dynamics in the z direction takes place on the fastest time scale and thus separates from the relaxation dynamics in the y direction. Consequently, the concentrations  $\mathbf{u}$  can be simplified to be independent of z if the nonlinear reaction kinetics  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{u})$  is translational invariant in z. For increased channel height,  $H \gg 1$ , the dynamics in z is the slowest and thus we presume that  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{u})$  as well as the initial preparation of the system  $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r},0)$  are translational invariant in z. Then, from the leading-order PDE one immediately gets that the concentration profiles  $\mathbf{u}_0(\mathbf{r},t) = \mathbf{g}(x,t)$  are flat in the y and z directions. The unknown function g(x,t) has to be determined from the second order  $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)$  balance given by

$$\partial_t \mathbf{u}_0 = \mathbb{D} \big( \partial_x^2 \mathbf{u}_0 + \partial_y^2 \mathbf{u}_1 + \partial_z^2 \mathbf{u}_0 \big) + \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{u}_0).$$
 (6a)

Integrating the latter over the scaled cross section  $H(x) = h_+(x) - h_-(x)$  and taking into account the no-flux BCs,

$$0 = \mp h'_{\pm}(x)\partial_x \mathbf{u}_0 \pm \partial_y \mathbf{u}_1, \forall y = h_{\pm}(x), \tag{6b}$$

one obtains

$$\partial_t \mathbf{u}_0(x,t) = \mathbb{D}\partial_x^2 \mathbf{u}_0 + \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{u}_0) + \mathbb{D}\frac{Q'(x)}{Q(x)}\partial_x \mathbf{u}_0, \qquad (7)$$

with the rescaled channel's cross section  $Q(x) = H[\omega_+(x) - \omega_-(x)].$ 

By applying asymptotic perturbation analysis in the small parameter  $\varepsilon$ , the three-dimensional probem with spatially dependent Neumann boundary conditions on the reactants, Eq. (2), translates into a one-dimensional reaction-diffusionadvection equation with a *boundary-induced advection term*, Eq. (7). The advective velocity field  $\mathbf{v} = Q'(x)/Q(x)\mathbf{e}_x$  reflects the periodicity of the channel modulation L,  $\mathbf{v}(x + L) =$  $\mathbf{v}(x)$ , and has zero mean,  $\int_0^L dx \, \mathbf{v}(x) = \mathbf{0}$ . Referring to Eq. (7), a front propagating from left to right,  $\partial_x \mathbf{u}_0 < 0$ , becomes decelerated where the channel expands, Q'(x) > 0, and accelerated if the channel contracts, Q'(x) < 0, respectively. For systems where diffusion, advection, and reaction coefficients depend periodically on space and time it has been shown [43] that the profile of a traveling front and its velocity change periodically in time—the TF solutions are called *pulsating traveling fronts*. A lot of work has been done to proof the existence and stability of these pulsating TFs [44–46].

### B. Projection method: Multiple scale analysis

Next, we derive the equation of motion for the TW's position in response to the boundary-induced advection term,  $\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{u}_0 \propto Q'(x)$ , assuming weak spatial variations of the cross section in propagation direction, i.e.,  $\max(|Q'(x)|) \simeq \varepsilon$ . Following Ref. [40], we can treat the advection term as a weak perturbation to the 1D RD system for the leading order  $\mathbf{u}_0$ ,

$$\partial_t \mathbf{u}_0(x,t) = \mathbb{D}\partial_x^2 \mathbf{u}_0 + \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{u}_0). \tag{8}$$

We presume that the RD system Eq. (8) possesses a stable TW solution  $U_c$ . This solution is stationary in frame of reference  $\xi = x - c_0 t$  comoving with the velocity  $c_0$ ,

$$0 = \mathbb{D}\partial_{\xi}^{2}\mathbf{U}_{c} + c_{0}\partial_{\xi}\mathbf{U}_{c} + \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{U}_{c}).$$
(9)

The eigenvalues of the linear operator

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathbb{D}\partial_{\xi}^{2} + c_{0}\partial_{\xi} + \mathcal{D}\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{U}_{c})$$
(10)

determine the stability of the TW, where  $\mathcal{D}\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{U}_c)$  denotes the Jacobian matrix of **R** evaluated at  $U_c$ . Since we presume that  $\mathbf{U}_{c}(\xi)$  is stable, the eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{L}$  with the largest real part is  $\lambda_0 = 0$  and the Goldstone mode  $\mathbf{W}(\xi) = \mathbf{U}'_c(\xi)$ , also called the propagator mode, is the corresponding eigenfunction. Because  $\mathcal{L}$  is in general not self-adjoint, the eigenfunction  $\mathbf{W}^{\dagger}(\xi)$  of the adjoint operator  $\mathcal{L}^{\dagger}$  to eigenvalue zero, the socalled *response function*, is not identical to  $W(\xi)$ . Expanding Eq. (7) with  $\mathbf{u}_0 = \mathbf{U}_c(\xi) + \varepsilon \tilde{\mathbf{u}}$  up to  $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$  yields the PDE  $\partial_t \tilde{\mathbf{u}} = \mathcal{L} \tilde{\mathbf{u}} + \mathbf{v}(\xi + c_0 t) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{U}_c$ . Its solution  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$  can be expressed in terms of eigenfunctions  $\mathbf{w}_i$  of  $\mathcal{L}$  as  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} = \sum_i a_i(t) \mathbf{w}_i(\xi)$  with expansion coefficients  $a_i \sim \int_{t_0}^t d\tilde{t} e^{\lambda_i(t-\tilde{t})} b(\tilde{t})$  and b a functional of  $\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}_0$  involving eigenfunctions of  $\mathcal{L}^{\dagger}$ ; for details see the Supplemental Material in Ref. [40]. By multiple-scale theory for small perturbations of order  $\varepsilon$  [38,40,47], the following equation of motion (EOM) for the position  $\phi(t)$ of the TW in the presence of the boundary-induced advection term is obtained

$$\dot{\phi}(t) = c_0 - \frac{1}{K_c} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\xi \, \mathbf{W}^{\dagger}(\xi)^T \mathbb{D} \frac{Q'[\xi + \phi(t)]}{Q[\xi + \phi(t)]} \mathbf{U}'_c(\xi), \quad (11)$$

with constant  $K_c = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\xi \mathbf{W}^{\dagger}(\xi)^T \mathbf{U}'_c(\xi)$  and initial condition  $\phi(t_0) = \phi_0$ . For monotonically decreasing front solutions, we define its position  $\phi$  as the point of steepest slope, while for pulse solutions it is the point of maximum amplitude of an arbitrary component. The EOM (11) only takes into account the contribution of the perturbation  $\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}_0$  projected on the response function  $\mathbf{W}^{\dagger}(\xi)^T$  affecting the TW's position. Such EOM must be seen as the first two terms of an asymptotic series [48].

Since the integrand in Eq. (11) does not explicitly depend on time, the mean time  $T_c$  the TW needs to travel one period L is given by

$$T_c = \int_0^L d\phi \, \frac{1}{c_0 - \Theta(\phi)},\tag{12}$$

and thus the average propagation velocity c reads

$$c = \frac{L}{T_c} = L / \int_0^L d\phi \, \frac{1}{c_0 - \Theta(\phi)},$$
 (13)

with substitute  $\Theta(\phi) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\xi \mathbf{W}^{\dagger T} \mathbb{D} \frac{Q'(\xi + \phi)}{Q(\xi + \phi)} \mathbf{U}'_c / K_c.$ 

### III. SCHLÖGL MODEL

In what follows, we limit our consideration to a singlecomponent system,  $\mathbf{u} = u$ , with bistable reaction kinetics. The associated RD equation reads

$$\partial_t u = D_u \Delta u - u(u - a)(u - 1), \quad 0 < a < 1,$$
 (14)

in dimensionless form. The parameter *a* is related to the local excitation threshold of the medium while the two stable states are given by u = 0 and u = 1, respectively. This model was introduced by Zeldovich and Frank-Kamenetskii to model flame propagation in 1938 [49] and then applied by Schlögl to the description of a first-order nonequilibrium phase transition [50]. Traveling front solutions to Eq. (14) obey the Dirichlet boundary conditions  $\lim_{\xi \to \infty} u = 1$  and  $\lim_{\xi \to \pm \infty} \partial_{\xi}^{n} u = 0$ , respectively, and fulfill the condition  $\lim_{\xi \to \pm \infty} \partial_{\xi}^{n} u = 0, \forall n \ge 1$ .

In channels with nonmodulated cross section, Q(x) = const, Eq. (14) possesses a stable TF solution whose profile,

$$u(\mathbf{r},t) = U_c(\xi) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{\xi/\sqrt{2D_u}}},$$
(15)

and corresponding propagation velocity,

$$c_0 = \sqrt{\frac{D_u}{2}}(1 - 2a), \tag{16}$$

are known analytically. The width of the traveling front,

$$l = \sqrt{32 D_u},\tag{17}$$

defines the intrinsic length scale [50]. It is noteworthy that the front velocity depends on the excitation threshold *a* while the front profile and, consequently, the front width are independent of *a*. This is a peculiarity of the Schlögl model. We emphasize that the front width *l* depends solely on the diffusion constant  $D_u$  in our scaling. Therefore, we can adjust the latter by means of the diffusion coefficient in the simulations. Furthermore, one can prove that the response function  $W^{\dagger}(\xi)$  reads

$$W^{\dagger}(\xi) = e^{c_0 \,\xi/D_u} U_c'(\xi), \tag{18}$$

and thus the constant  $K_c$  is given by

$$K_c = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\xi \ W^{\dagger} \ U'_c = \frac{\pi}{3} \sqrt{\frac{2}{D_u}} \frac{a(1-a)(1-2a)}{\sin(2a\pi)}.$$
 (19)

For the profiles of the perpendicular side walls we chose a sinusoidally modulated boundary function,

$$\omega_{+}(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}, & \text{for } x < 0, \\ \frac{1}{4} \left[ 1 + \delta + (1 - \delta) \cos\left(\frac{2\pi x}{L}\right) \right], & \text{for } x \ge 0, \end{cases}$$
(20)



FIG. 2. (Color online) Average front velocity c in units of the propagation velocity  $c_0$  as a function of the ratio of period length L to front width l for a sinusoidally modulated channel; see Fig. 1. The projection method (lines), Eq. (13), yields excellent agreement with the numerical results (markers); particularly, it reproduces the interval of propagation failure c = 0 for intermediate values of L/l; however, it fails for small ratios  $L/l \ll 1$ . The remaining parameter values are set to L = 5 and a = 0.4.

for the upper wall and set the lower boundary to  $\omega_{-}(x) = 0$ . The chosen boundary profile can be seen as the first harmonic of a Fourier series of an arbitrary periodic boundary profile.

Next, we compare our analytic estimate for the average front velocity c, Eq. (13), with numerical results. Therefore, Eq. (14) supplemented with the Neumann BC Eq. (2) is solved numerically using the finite-element method (FEM) [51]. In our simulations, the front is initialized with  $U_c(x - x_{\text{start}})$  at  $x_{\text{start}} = \min(-4l, -L)$  and simulated until it reaches  $x_{\text{end}} = \max(10L, \operatorname{ceil}(10l/L)L)$ . The data for the average front velocity c are determined from a linear fit to a position versus time plot after subtracting transients.

In Fig. 2, we depict the average front velocity c in units of  $c_0$  as a function of the ratio of period length L to front width l. One observes a nonlinear dependence of c on the ratio L/l: If the spatial period is much larger than the intrinsic front width,  $L \gg l$ , the front velocity approaches  $c_0$ . In this limit, the front is well approximated by a step function, and all isoconcentration lines collapse onto a single curve. Furthermore, one can assume that its velocity instantaneously adapts when traveling through the corrugated channel. Then the average front velocity is correctly predicted by the harmonic mean velocity [39],

$$c_{\rm harm} = L \Big/ \int_0^L \frac{dx}{c_0 + D_u Q'(x)/Q(x)},$$
 (21)

which tends to  $c_0$  for  $L/l \to \infty$ . With decreasing ratio L/l, i.e., either increasing the diffusion constant  $D_u$  or decreasing the period length L, the average propagation velocity lessens until it attains its minimum value. Decreasing L further,  $L \leq l$ , the value of c grows and finally saturates at a value smaller than  $c_0$ .

It turns out that both the minimum value of c and the saturation value depend crucially on the bottleneck width  $\delta$ . In general, we find that the average front velocity diminishes with shrinking bottleneck width  $\delta$  for a given ratio L/l. In



FIG. 3. (Color online) Numerical results for propagation velocity c versus L/l for various period lengths L = 0.5 (squares), L = 1 (circles), and L = 5 (diamonds). The corresponding values for the expansion parameter  $\varepsilon$  are  $\varepsilon = 1.2, 0.6$ , and  $\varepsilon = 0.12$ . The analytical prediction based on Eq. (13) is represented by the dashed line and the predicted interval of propagation failure is indicated by the light red block. The remaining parameter values are set to a = 0.4 and  $\delta = 0.4$ .

particular, we identify a finite interval of L/l values where *propagation failure* occurs, i.e., the initially traveling front becomes quenched [52] and *c* goes to zero. One observes that the lower bound of L/l values, where the propagation failure interval begins, shrinks with decreasing bottleneck width  $\delta$  while the upper bound, where the propagation failure interval ends, becomes larger for smaller bottlenecks. Consequently, the width of the propagation failure interval grows with decreasing value of  $\delta$ . Lowering the excitation threshold while keeping the channel parameters L and  $\delta$  constant facilitates the traveling front to transit through the corrugated medium. Thus the interval of propagation failure disappears for  $a \rightarrow 0$  (not shown explicitly).

Additionally, we compare our numerical results (markers) with the analytical prediction (lines), Eq. (13), in Fig. 2. It is noteworthy that the analytic result matches satisfactorily with the numerics for all bottleneck widths  $\delta$ . Moreover, it reproduces correctly the interval of propagation failure for intermediate values of L/l; however, it fails for small ratios  $L/l \ll 1$ .

In Fig. 3, we illustrate a peculiarity of the projection method. The EOM for a TW under the boundary-induced perturbation Eq. (11) is determined by the convolution integral  $\Theta(\phi)$  with kernel  $W^{\dagger}(\xi)U'_{c}(\xi) = e^{c_{0}\xi/D_{u}}U'_{c}(\xi)^{2}$ . The latter consists of the response function  $W^{\dagger}(\xi)$  and the Goldstone mode  $U'_{c}$  both being localized around  $\xi = 0$  and decay exponentially to zero if  $|\xi| > l$  for traveling fronts. On the other hand, the advection field  $\mathbf{v}(x)$  changes periodically with period L. Therefore, the dynamics of the front position  $\phi(t)$ and, consequently, the analytic result for the average front velocity c depend solely on the ratio of L to l for a given set of  $\delta$  and *a* values. This is shown in Fig. 3 where we present the propagation velocity  $c/c_0$  for various period lengths, viz., L =0.5 (squares), L = 1 (circles), and L = 5 (diamonds). The value of  $D_u$  is adjusted accordingly. It turns out that the analytic prediction based on project method, Eq. (13), agrees well with the numerics for L = 5. With decreasing period length the range of applicability diminishes. This is in compliance with the assumptions made to derive Eq. (13): Both the asymptotic perturbation analysis, Sec. II A, and the multiple scale analysis, Sec. II B, require that the channel's cross-section changing rate  $\max(|Q'(x)|) \propto \varepsilon$  is small. According to Eq. (3), the value of  $\varepsilon$  is inversely proportional to the period length L and thus the analytical prediction fails, e.g., for L = 0.5 ( $\varepsilon = 1.2$ ).

Moreover, we observe that the range of L/l values where propagation failure occurs shrinks with decreasing period length L. Remarkably, the lower bound seems to be independent of L.

#### A. Propagation failure: Eikonal approach

Next we present a qualitative explanation for the appearance of propagation failure for  $L \gg l$ . If the intrinsic front width is much shorter than the spatial period, any front propagating through the channel geometry can be well approximated by a single time-dependent curve  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}(s,t)$  tracing out a chosen isoconcentration line parameterized by *s*. A plane front  $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (c_0 t, y)^T$  has constant velocity at all points in the forward, normal direction. A curved boundary distorts the plane wave geometry due to the requirement that the edge of the wave front must propagate so the TW always meets the boundary orthogonally. Consequently, the normal velocity varies locally across the front.

When a front attempts to turn around a curved boundary, the entire front becomes curved and is well described by a circular arc with radius  $r_c$  touching orthogonally the boundary  $\omega_+(x)$ , see inset of Fig. 4. The associated curvature at x\* is



FIG. 4. (Color online) Dependence of the upper bound  $(L/l)_{up}$ on the bottleneck width  $\delta$ . The L/l values for which the eikonal approach, Eqs. (23) and (24), predicts propagation failure are indicated by the colored areas (L = 2, stripped area; L = 5, filledarea). Above the colored areas front propagation is possible. The upper bound  $(L/l)_{up}$  agrees excellently with the numerical results (L = 2, diamonds; L = 5, squares) for narrow channels  $\delta \ll 1$  but fails for channels with wide openings. In simulations, no propagation failure was found for  $\delta \gtrsim 0.5$ . The numerical errors are of the size of the markers. Inset: Sketch of a circular isoconcentration line with radius  $r_c$  touching orthogonally the top boundary  $\omega_+(x)$  at x\*.

given by

$$\kappa(x*) = \frac{1}{r_c} = \frac{1}{\omega_+(x*)} \frac{\omega'_+(x*)}{\sqrt{1+\omega'_+(x*)^2}} \simeq \frac{\omega'_+(x*)}{\omega_+(x*)}.$$
 (22)

Comparing Eqs. (11) and (22), one notices that the EOM for TWs resembles the linear eikonal equation [53,54]

$$\phi(t) \simeq c_0 - D_u \,\kappa(\phi),\tag{23}$$

in the limit  $l \ll L$  and  $W^{\dagger}(\xi)U'_{c}(\xi) \rightarrow \delta(\xi)$ , respectively. Note that the linear eikonal equation is derived from the reaction-diffusion system in the sharp interface limit of vanishing front width *l*. According to Eq. (23), standing fronts exist and thus propagation failure occurs if the local curvature is equal to  $\kappa(\phi) = c_0/D_u$ . Grindrod *et al.* [55] demonstrated that stationary circular TW solutions are stable against deformations if the stability condition

$$\omega_{+}^{\prime\prime}(x*) \notin [0, \omega_{+}^{\prime}(x*)^{2} / (\omega_{+}(x*)(1+\omega_{+}^{\prime}(x*)^{2})^{2})]$$
(24)

holds at any  $x \in [0, L]$ .

In order to determine the upper bound of L/l, one has to, first, find the roots of  $0 = c_0 - D_u \kappa(x*)$  and, second, check if the stability condition Eq. (24) is not satisfied at x\*. The dependence of the upper bound  $(L/l)_{up}$  on the bottleneck width  $\delta$  is depicted in Fig. 4. Moreover, we compare the analytic predictions based on the linear eikonal approach (colored area) with the numerically obtained values for  $(L/l)_{up}$ using FEM simulations (markers). Obviously, the agreement is excellent for small bottlenecks but fails for large values of  $\delta$ . In channels with wide openings  $\delta \rightarrow 1$  traveling waves have to curve only close to edge of the wave front. Consequently, the isoconcentration lines  $\gamma(s,t)$  are almost planar, i.e., the front travels with almost constant velocity in the x direction, and propagation failure does not occur.

## IV. DIFFUSION LIMITED REGIME: CONFINED BROWNIAN MOTION

In Figs. 2 and 3, we have shown that the average propagation velocity saturates at a value which is smaller than  $c_0$  if the front width is much larger than the period of the channel,  $L/l \rightarrow 0$ . We emphasize that the projection method fails in this limit and predicts  $c = c_0$  regardless of the value of L and  $\delta$ . In contrast, the numerics show that the saturation value lessens with decreasing bottleneck width  $\delta$ , cf. Fig. 2, and with shrinking period L, see Fig. 3; in other words, with growing value of  $\varepsilon = (1 - \delta)/L$ . If the intrinsic width  $l = \sqrt{32D_u}$  is much larger than the periodicity of the channel L, the front is extended over many periods and boundary interactions play a subordinate role. Then the diffusion of reactants in propagation direction under spatially confined conditions is the predominant process for wave propagation and the problem can be approximated by an effective onedimensional description introducing an effective diffusion constant  $\mathbb{D}_{eff}$ ,

$$\partial_t \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r},t) = \mathbb{D}_{\text{eff}} \partial_x^2 \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{u}).$$
 (25)

Experimental [21,22] and theoretical studies [24,25] on particle transport in microdomains with obstacles [56,57] and/or small openings revealed that Brownian motion in such systems exhibits nonintuitive features like a significant suppression of particle diffusivity [23,27,58]. Numerous research activities in this topic led to the development of an approximate description of the diffusion problem: the *Fick-Jacobs approach* [59,60]. The latter provides a powerful tool to describe particle transport through corrugated channel geometries and its accuracy has been intensively studied for diffusing particles in two- [25,26] and three-dimensional channels [61]. The Fick-Jacobs approach predicts that the effective diffusion constant in longitudinal direction is solely determined by the variation of the cross section Q(x) and can be calculated according to the Lifson-Jackson formula [62]

$$D_{\rm eff}^{\rm FJ} = \frac{D_u}{\langle Q(x) \rangle_x \langle 1/Q(x) \rangle_x}$$
(26)

with period average  $\langle \cdot \rangle_x = L^{-1} \int_0^L \cdot dx$ . For the exemplarity chosen channel geometry, Eq. (20), the value of  $D_{\text{eff}}$  is given by

$$D_{\rm eff}^{\rm FJ} = D_u \frac{2\sqrt{\delta}}{1+\delta}.$$
 (27)

Similarly to the derivation of the reaction-diffusion-advection equation for  $\mathbf{u}_0$ , see Sec. II A, the Fick-Jacobs approach is valid solely for weakly modulated channel geometries, i.e.,  $\max |Q'(x)| \propto \varepsilon \ll 1$ . For moderate to strong corrugated boundaries, higher-order correction terms have to be considered [36], yielding

$$D_{\text{eff}}^{\varepsilon} = D_u \frac{4L\sqrt{\delta}}{\pi(1-\delta^2)} \operatorname{asinh}\left[\frac{\pi(1-\delta)}{2L}\right].$$
 (28)

For the studied Schlögl model, the average propagation velocity in units of the free velocity might be approximated well by  $c/c_0 \simeq \sqrt{D_{\text{eff}}^{\text{FJ},\varepsilon}/D_u}$ , cf. Eq. (16).

In Fig. 5, we present the impact of the bottleneck width  $\delta$  on the propagation velocity c in units of  $c_0$  for two different period lengths, viz., L = 1 and L = 5. In the numerics, the ratio L/l is set to L/l = 0.1 and the diffusion coefficient  $D_u$  is adjusted accordingly. One notices that the analytic estimate using  $D_{\text{eff}}^{\text{FJ}}$ .



FIG. 5. (Color online) Average front velocity *c* versus bottleneck width  $\delta$  for different values of a = 0.2 (blank markers) and a = 0.4 (filled markers). The ratio L/l is set to L/l = 0.1 and the diffusion coefficient  $D_u$  is adjusted accordingly, viz.,  $D_u = 3.125$  (L = 1) and  $D_u = 78.125$  (L = 5).

Eq. (27), agrees excellently with our simulation results for large period lengths L = 5 (circles) and small values of  $\varepsilon$ ,  $\varepsilon \in [0,0.2]$ , respectively. For smaller periods, L = 1 (squares), higher-order corrections to the effective diffusion coefficient Eq. (28) are necessary in order to ensure a good agreement between numerics and analytics. The corresponding value for the expansion parameter  $\varepsilon$ , Eq. (3), ranges from zero to unity. Remarkably, the saturation value for the front velocity in units of its free value  $c_0$  is independent of the value for the excitation threshold *a* and thus solely determined by the spatial variations of the channel cross section Q(x); to summarize,  $c \simeq \sqrt{0.5D_{\text{eff}}(Q(x))}(1-2a)$  for  $l \gg L$ .

Interestingly, in the limit  $L \ll l$  the propagation of traveling fronts through channels with spatially modulated cross sections can be well treated by a one-dimensional RD equation [Eq. (25)] which neglects the impact of the spatial variations on the reactants' microscopic dynamics. However, the influence of boundary modulation on diffusive transport of material is hidden in an artificially introduced effective diffusion coefficient  $D_{\text{eff}}$ . To estimate the value of  $D_{\text{eff}}$  detailed information about the shape of the cross section is needed [63].

### V. CONCLUSION

We have investigated the propagation of reaction-diffusion waves confined to a channel with walls impermeable to diffusion. The channel's cross section changes periodically on the length scale L in propagation direction. For weak modulations of the channel's cross section, the space-dependent no-flux boundary conditions can be mapped on a *boundaryinduced advection term*. The latter is proportional to the spatial variation of the cross section Q(x). Using projection method, we derive an equation of motion for the position of a traveling wave as function of time in the presence of the boundary-induced advection term. From the latter, we obtain an analytical expression for the average propagation velocity c of the wave traveling through periodically modulated channels.

Exemplarily, we study the impact of a sinusoidally modulated cross section on the propagation of traveling front solutions in the one-component Schlögl model. It turns out that the propagation velocity exhibits a nonlinear dependence on the ratio of the spatial period L to the intrinsic width of the front l: If the period is much larger than the intrinsic width,  $L \gg l$ , a Schlögl front travels at the harmonic mean velocity which tends to the value for nonmodulated channels  $c_0$ . With decreasing ratio L/l, the average propagation velocity lessens, attains its minimum value, and starts to grow again until it saturates finally at a value below the velocity in the straight channel for  $L \ll l$ .

Beyond a critical bottleneck width, *propagation failure* occurs, i.e., the initially traveling front becomes quenched inside the corrugated channel and hence the minimal propagation velocity vanishes identically. With decreasing bottleneck width, the lower and upper bound for propagation failure shift to smaller and larger values for L/l, respectively. While the shift is almost independent of L for the lower bound, the upper bound grows with L. Moreover, we have demonstrated that the existence of propagation failure and, in particular, the dependence of the upper bound of L/l can be completely understood based on the linear eikonal equation.

In the case of very small periods,  $L/l \ll 1$ , the front velocity is determined solely by the shape of the cross section. In this limit, front propagation is dominated by the diffusive motion of the reactants in spatial confinement. The spatially dependent no-flux boundary conditions on the reactants translate into a one-dimensional reaction-diffusion system with an effective diffusion coefficient  $D_{\text{eff}}$  as it is demonstrated by the excellent agreement with simulation results. Thereby, the influence of the spatial confinement on the microscopic dynamics is hidden in the value of  $D_{\text{eff}}$  and Luther's law is recovered.

Altogether, over a large range of spatial periods and bottleneck values, the analytical result for the averaged propagation velocity in the corrugated channel (including propagation failure) agrees remarkably well with numerical results obtained in FEM simulations. Since the applicability of our perturbation analysis is based on a small channel's crosssection changing rate,  $\max(|Q'(x)|) \propto \varepsilon$ , deviations from the analytical predictions are expected to grow for geometries

- [1] M. Cross and P. Hohenberg, Rev. Mod. Phys. 65, 851 (1993).
- [2] J. Murray, *Mathematical Biology* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003).
- [3] P. C. Bressloff and J. M. Newby, Rev. Mod. Phys. 85, 135 (2013).
- [4] E. Newman and K. Zahs, Science 275, 844 (1997).
- [5] Y. Kuramoto, *Chemical Oscillations, Waves, and Turbulence* (Courier Dover, New York, 2003).
- [6] R. Kapral and K. Showalter, eds., *Chemical Waves and Patterns* (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1995).
- M. Bär, C. Zülicke, M. Eiswirth, and G. Ertl, J. Phys. Chem. 96, 8595 (1992); M. Bär, I. G. Kevrekidis, H. H. Rotermund, and G. Ertl, Phys. Rev. E 52, R5739 (1995).
- [8] J. P. Voroney, A. T. Lawniczak, and R. Kapral, Physica D 99, 303 (1996).
- [9] S. Y. Shvartsman, E. Schütz, R. Imbihl, and I. G. Kevrekidis, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 2857 (1999).
- [10] H. H. Rotermund, Surf. Sci. 603, 1662 (2009).
- [11] J. Laplante and T. Erneux, J. Phys. Chem. 96, 4931 (1992).
- [12] F. Haudin, R. G. Elias, R. G. Rojas, U. Bortolozzo, M. G. Clerc, and S. Residori, Phys. Rev. Lett. 103, 128003 (2009).
- [13] H. R. Petty, in Self-Organized Morphology in Nanostructured Materials, Springer Series in Materials Science, Vol. 99, edited by K. Al-Shamery and J. Parisi (Springer. Berlin, 2008). pp. 155–167.
- [14] S. Atis, S. Saha, H. Auradou, D. Salin, and L. Talon, Phys. Rev. Lett. 110, 148301 (2013).
- [15] E. Beerdsen, D. Dubbeldam, and B. Smit, Phys. Rev. Lett. 96, 044501 (2006).
- [16] A. Toth, V. Gaspar, and K. Showalter, J. Phys. Chem. 98, 522 (1994).
- [17] V. M. Eguíluz, E. Hernández-García, O. Piro, and S. Balle, Phys. Rev. E 60, 6571 (1999); I. Sendiña-Nadal, V. Pérez-Muñuzuri, V. M. Eguíluz, E. Hernández-García, and O. Piro, *ibid.* 64, 046208 (2001).
- [18] L. D. Gelb, K. E. Gubbins, R. Radhakrishnan, and M. Sliwinska-Bartkowiak, Rep. Prog. Phys. 62, 1573 (1999).

with short-scale spatial modulations and narrow openings. Our results might be interesting for control purposes: In this case, a desired protocol of movement for a traveling wave,  $\phi(t)$ , is realized by a space-dependent cross section to be derived solving the integral equation Eq. (11) for the unknown Q(x), compare Ref. [40]. For periodically varying cross sections, Q(x) = Q(x + L), accessible control parameters include the spatial period, the modulation amplitude, and the bottleneck width. Results in this direction will be presented in a forthcoming paper.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge support by the DFG through Grant No. SFB 910 (S.M. and H.E.) and Grant No. GRK 1558 (J.L.). S.M. especially thanks L. Schimansky-Geier (Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin) for providing the computational resources to use FREEFEM++.

- [19] I. Santamaria-Holek, Z. J. Grzywna, and J. M. Rubí, Eur. Phys. J. Spec. Top. 222, 129 (2013).
- [20] T. Becker, K. Nelissen, B. Cleuren, B. Partoens, and C. Van den Broeck, Eur. Phys. J. Special Topics 223, 3243 (2014).
- [21] A. S. Verkman, Trends Biochem. 27, 27 (2002).
- [22] A. Corma, Chem. Rev. 97, 2373 (1997).
- [23] S. L. Dettmer, U. F. Keyser, and S. Pagliara, Rev. Sci. Instrum.
   85, 023708 (2014); S. L. Dettmer, S. Pagliara, K. Misiunas, and U. F. Keyser, Phys. Rev. E 89, 062305 (2014).
- [24] D. Reguera, G. Schmid, P. S. Burada, J. M. Rubí, P. Reimann, and P. Hänggi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 96, 130603 (2006).
- [25] P. S. Burada, G. Schmid, P. Talkner, P. Hänggi, D. Reguera, and J. M. Rubí, BioSystems 93, 16 (2008).
- [26] P. Burada, P. Hänggi, F. Marchesoni, G. Schmid, and P. Talkner, ChemPhysChem 10, 45 (2009).
- [27] S. Martens, A. V. Straube, G. Schmid, L. Schimansky-Geier, and P. Hänggi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 110, 010601 (2013).
- [28] T. Becker, K. Nelissen, B. Cleuren, B. Partoens, and C. Van den Broeck, Phys. Rev. Lett. 111, 110601 (2013).
- [29] G. Haas, M. Bär, I. G. Kevrekidis, P. B. Rasmussen, H. H. Rotermund, and G. Ertl, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 3560 (1995).
- [30] B. F. Edwards, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 104501 (2002).
- [31] D. A. Vasquez, Phys. Rev. Lett. 93, 104501 (2004).
- [32] E. Cherry and F. Fenton, J. Theo. Biol. 285, 164 (2011).
- [33] A. Azhand, J. F. Totz, and H. Engel, Eur. Phys. Lett. 108, 10004 (2014).
- [34] J. F. Totz, H. Engel, and O. Steinbock, arXiv:1401.6550 (2014).
- [35] M. Yamazaki, S. Mironov, C. Taravant, J. Brec, L. M. Vaquero, K. Bandaru, U. M. R. Avula, H. Honjo, I. Kodama, O. Berenfeld, *et al.*, Cardiovasc. Res. 94, 48 (2012).
- [36] S. Martens, G. Schmid, L. Schimansky-Geier, and P. Hänggi, Phys. Rev. E 83, 051135 (2011); Chaos 21, 047518 (2011).
- [37] L. Schimansky-Geier, A. S. Mikhailov, and W. Ebeling, Annalen der Physik **495**, 277 (1983); A. Engel, Phys. Lett. A **113**, 139 (1985).

- [38] I. V. Biktasheva and V. N. Biktashev, Phys. Rev. E 67, 026221 (2003); I. V. Biktasheva, D. Barkley, V. N. Biktashev, G. V. Bordyugov, and A. J. Foulkes, *ibid.* 79, 056702 (2009).
- [39] J. Löber, M. Bär, and H. Engel, Phys. Rev. E 86, 066210 (2012).
- [40] J. Löber and H. Engel, Phys. Rev. Lett. 112, 148305 (2014).
- [41] B. T. Ginn, B. Steinbock, M. Kahveci, and O. Steinbock, J. Chem. Phys. A 108, 1325 (2004).
- [42] P. H. King, J. C. Corsi, B.-H. Pan, H. Morgan, M. R. R. de Planque, and K.-P. Zauner, Biosystems 109, 18 (2012).
- [43] J. X. Xin, J. Stat. Phys. 73, 893 (1993).
- [44] J. X. Xin, SIAM Rev. 42, 161 (2000).
- [45] H. Berestycki and F. Hamel, Contemp. Math. 446, 101 (2007).
- [46] G. Nadin, J. Diff. Eq. 249, 1288 (2010).
- [47] H.-G. Purwins, H. U. Bödeker, and A. W. Liehr, in *Dissipative Solitons*, Lecture Notes in Physics, Vol. 661, edited by N. Akhmediev and A. Ankiewicz (Springer, Berlin, 2005), pp. 267–308.
- [48] C. M. Bender and S. A. Orszag, Advanced Mathematical Methods for Scientists and Engineers (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1978).
- [49] Y. Zeldovich and D. Frank-Kamenetsky, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR 19, 693 (1938).
- [50] F. Schlögl, Z. Phys. A 253, 147 (1972).
- [51] F. Hecht, J. Numer. Math. 20, 251 (2012).

#### PHYSICAL REVIEW E 91, 022902 (2015)

- [52] J. X. Xin and J. Zhu, Physica D 81, 94 (1995).
- [53] J. Keener, SIAM J. Appl. Math. 46, 1039 (1986).
- [54] H. Dierckx, O. Bernus, and H. Verschelde, Phys. Rev. Lett. 107, 108101 (2011).
- [55] P. Grindrod, M. A. Lewis, and J. D. Murray, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A 433, 151 (1991).
- [56] L. Dagdug, M.-V. Vazquez, A. M. Berezhkovskii, V. Y. Zitserman, and S. M. Bezrukov, J. Chem. Phys. 136, 204106 (2012).
- [57] P. K. Ghosh, P. Hänggi, F. Marchesoni, S. Martens, F. Nori, L. Schimansky-Geier, and G. Schmid, Phys. Rev. E 85, 011101 (2012).
- [58] A. E. Cohen and W. E. Moerner, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 103, 4362 (2006).
- [59] M. Jacobs, *Diffusion Processes*, 2nd ed. (Springer, New York, 1967).
- [60] R. Zwanzig, J. Phys. Chem. 96, 3926 (1992).
- [61] L. Dagdug, A. M. Berezhkovskii, Y. A. Makhnovskii, V. Y. Zitserman, and S. M. Bezrukov, J. Chem. Phys. 134, 101102 (2011); A. M. Berezhkovskii, M. A. Pustovoit, and S. M. Bezrukov, *ibid.* 126, 134706 (2007).
- [62] S. Lifson and J. L. Jackson, J. Chem. Phys. 36, 2410 (1962).
- [63] H. Brenner and D. A. Edwards, *Macrotransport Processes* (Butterworth-Heinemann, Boston, 1993).