The Sanal flow choking (PMCID: PMC7267099) and the streamtube flow choking are new theoretical concepts applicable to both the continuum and non-continuum fluid flows. Once the streamlines compacted, the considerable pressure difference attains within the streamtube and the flow within the streamtube gets accelerated to the constricted section for satisfying the continuity condition set up the conservation law of nature, which leads to the Sanal flow choking and supersonic flow development at a critical-total-to-static pressure ratio (CPR) due to the convergent-divergent (CD) shape of the streamtube. As the pressure of the nanofluid/non-continuum-flows rises, average-mean-free-path diminishes and thus, the Knudsen number lowers heading to a zero-slip wall-boundary condition with compressible viscous (CV) flow regime. Sanal flow choking is a CV flow phenomenon creating a physical situation of the sonic-fluid-throat in a duct at a CPR. Herein, we presented a closed-form-analytical-
model, which is capable to predict exactly the three-dimensional boundary-layer-displacement-thickness of nanoscale diabatic fluid flow (flow involves transfer of heat) systems at the zero-slip-length. The innovation of Sanal flow choking model is established herein through the entropy relation, as it satisfies all the conservation laws of nature. The exact value of the 3D boundary-layer-displacement-thickness in the sonic-fluid-throat region presented herein for each gas is a universal benchmark data for performing high-fidelity in vitro and in silico experiments for the lucrative design optimization of nanoscale systems. The physical insight of the Sanal flow choking and streamtube flow choking presented in this letter sheds light on finding solutions for numerous unresolved scientific problems.
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The theoretical finding of the Sanal-flow-choking is a methodological advancement in the modeling of the continuum and non-continuum real-world composite fluid flows at the creeping-inflow (low subsonic flow) conditions. The closed-form analytical model conceiving all the conservation laws of nature at the Sanal flow choking condition for diabatic flow is certainly the unique scientific language of the Universe, which we are presenting herein for solving various unresolved problems carried forward over the centuries. Cognizing physics of multi-phase and multi-species fluid flows and controlling the composite flow at the nanoscale is vital for inventing, manufacturing, and lucrative performance improvements of nano-electro-mechanical systems (NEMS) for high precision applications. The design of such systems are currently a subject of great interest in aerospace industries. This is particularly true for the design optimization of certain aerospace systems in the international space station (ISS) and nanoscale
thrusters\textsuperscript{11} operating at both gravity and microgravity environments where the flow field exhibit both the continuum and non-continuum fluid properties. In such physical situations multiscale and hybrid modeling approaches are encouraged\textsuperscript{12}. Although the mathematical modeling and high-fidelity in silico simulation of physics of non-continuum/nanofluid flow is progressed substantially over the last few decades there are numerous unanswered research questions in real-world fluid flows\textsuperscript{1-10} for a plausible judgment on the space systems design. One such problem of paramount interest is for performing in silico and in vitro experiments for the design optimization of aerospace propulsion devices. Therefore, it is inevitable for capturing flow physics of high-pressure composite creeping fluid flow passing through a convergent-divergent (CD) duct, facilitated with a nanoscale throat with microscale length (see Fig.1(a)), featuring both continuum and the non-continuum fluid flow properties.

Nanofluid flow is a blend of nano-sized particles in a traditional operating fluid\textsuperscript{12}, which obeys all the conservation laws of nature. The occurrence of slip in gas flows, due to the local thermodynamic non-equilibrium, was originally reported by Maxwell\textsuperscript{14,15} and its scale varies on the extent of rarefaction of the gas. It describes in terms of the Knudsen number ($Kn$), which gives an explicit clue on the type of flow, viz., continuum or non-continuum. Note that numerous modeling efforts have been reported in the open literature for nanoscale flow simulation without authentic code verification using any benchmark data and/or any closed-form analytical solution\textsuperscript{16-35}. The fact is that generating benchmark data from the nanoscale system is a challenging task or quite impractical using a conventional in vitro methods and it is anticipated that the classical assumptions on the hydrodynamic model will ride into hitches as the composite flow system reaches nanometer (nm) size.\textsuperscript{19} Obviously the brilliant conclusions drawn using sophisticated models, by various investigators across the globe, viz., direct simulation Monte
Carlo (DSMC), molecular dynamics (MD), Burnett equation and the hydrodynamic models, will
not be endorsed by the high precision industries for the highly expensive nanoscale systems
designs for practical applications without providing an exact solution for the data verification.
Cooper et al.\textsuperscript{19} reported that in vitro data well matched with the predicted results using the

\textbf{Fig. 1(a) Demonstrating the Sanal flow choking condition in an idealized physical model of an internal nanoscale fluid flow system.}

hydrodynamic Navier Stokes method with the first-order slip condition for the range of average
pore diameters from 169-220 nm. Singh and Myong\textsuperscript{36} reported that neither continuum models
nor free-molecular models could be invoked for fluid flow cases when the \textit{Knudsen number} falls
in the intermediate range between the continuum (\textit{Kn} \leq 0.01) and free-molecular flow regimes
(\textit{Kn} \geq 10). When the \textit{Knudsen number} becomes large (\textit{Kn} > 0.01), the conventional assumptions
of no-slip boundary condition, thermodynamic equilibrium, and linear stress-strain relationship
fail. Admittedly, when the pressure of the nanofluid rises, the average-mean-free-path diminishes and thus, the Knudsen number lowers heading to a zero-slip wall-boundary condition with compressible viscous (CV) flow regime creating streamline pattern in the nanoscale fluid flow system. Therefore, the Sanal flow choking and supersonic flow development leading to shock-wave generation due to the fluid-throat effect at the zero-slip-length is a valid physical situation in continuum and non-continuum flows where CD shaped nanoscale streamtubes persists (see Fig. 1(b)). Herein, we provide a proof of the concept of fluid-throat persuaded flow choking in the nanoscale diabatic fluid flow system. For establishing this concept authoritatively, we are presenting an infallible closed-form analytical model for predicting the three-dimensional (3D) boundary layer displacement thickness (defined herein as 3D blockage factor) at the sonic-fluid-throat location where the slip length is zero, which will be a useful tool for the in vitro and in silico experiments in both the continuum and non-continuum flows with due consideration of heat transfer effects (real-world fluid flow effect).

D.M. Holland et al. reported that an in silico model enhanced with molecular-level information could accurately predict unsteady nanoscale flows in non-trivial geometries. Authors presented that slip at the nanoscale fluid flow system could make a noteworthy effect on the optimum channel dimensions; and formulated an analytical equation which corrects the well-known Murray’s Law. It was reported that for a given cavitation resistance throughout the xylem network, Murray’s law should apply, which predicts the optimal taper of viscoelastic vessels. While searching for singularities in the Navier–Stokes equations Terence Tao reported that the partial differential equations that describe nonlinear effects of several cases are inadequately realized. Moseler and Landman used molecular dynamics (MD) simulations of nanoscale jets to encounter a rupture profile not illustrated by macroscopic theory. Of late
(2020), Chengxi Zhao\textsuperscript{44} reported that the soundness of the traditional theories at the microscale and nanoscale has been taken into question. Authors reported that the thermal fluctuations are spontaneously occurring within molecular dynamics (MD) simulations. D.M.Holland et al.\textsuperscript{37} further reported that the time dependent mass flow rate predicted using their enhanced computational fluid dynamics (CFD) simulation matches well with full molecular dynamics (MD) simulation and highlighted that the traditional CFD results of such cases are incompetent. It leads to say that in real world scientific experiments of complex nano-microscale systems the robustness of \textit{in silico} model needs to be tested to featuring the actual fluid characteristics in a non-trivial geometry at the nanoscale. Singh and Myong\textsuperscript{36} reported that for improved modeling efforts, the joint effect of material properties, the scale and shape of the flowing medium on fluid flow must be taken into account, which is lacking now and we are addressing it through the closed-form analytical models.

It is an admitted fact that all the fluids in nature are compressible because the specific heat at the constant-pressure ($C_p$) is always higher, ranging from a zero-plus (0+) value, than the specific heat at the constant-volume ($C_v$) of all real-world fluids.\textsuperscript{1} The traditional assumption of taking water as an incompressible fluid\textsuperscript{10-27} is patently not true as its specific volume (or density) does change with temperature and/or pressure.\textsuperscript{1}

The exact prediction of the 3D blockage factor throughout the flow field is a meaningful objective of any fluid flow system design from \textit{yocto} to \textit{yotta} scale and beyond, which is still an unresolved problem. Of late V.R.S.Kumar et al.\textsuperscript{1,2} exactly predicted the 3D blockage factor in the \textit{sonic-fluid-throat} region at the Sanal flow choking condition. The real scientific fact is that the \textit{Sanal flow choking} is a \textit{compressible} fluid flow effect, which occurs in any duct with uniform port geometry, due to the boundary layer blockage induced internal flow choking at a critical-
total-to-static pressure ratio (CPR), as the boundary layer blockage factor will never be zero in any real-world flows. The critical TSPR for flow choking of composite fluids would vary based on the lowest heat capacity ratio (HCR) of the evolved species at the constriction region (fluid-throat) of the streamtube (see Fig.1(b)). Note that the molecular dynamics condition in the composite fluid flow system could alter the streamline-pattern at different time and location. Therefore, pinpointing the exact location of streamtube flow choking is a challenging in vitro and in silico topic of great interest to the nano-microscale system designers.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Herein, we presented an exact solution of the 3D blockage factor with molecular precision at the condition prescribed by the Sanal-flow-choking for diabatic fluid flows, which is an authorized benchmark data for the verification of the results generated from in vitro and in silico experiments of real-world nanoscale fluid flow problems. The innovation of the Sanal-flow-choking model is established herein through the entropy relation, as it satisfies all the conservation laws of nature. The beauty and novelty of the closed-form analytical model presented herein stem from the veracity that at the Sanal flow choking condition for diabatic nanoflows, all conservation laws of nature are satisfied in the unique sonic-fluid-throat location. In this letter analytical models are presented for establishing the causes and effects of the Sanal flow choking in an internal nanoscale fluid flow system with sudden expansion or divergent region. This was an unresolved world-wide scientific problem for more than a century.

Note that in general any fluid flow system from yocto to yotta scale and beyond with sudden expansion or divergent region (see Fig.1(a-b)) could create the physical situation of the Sanal flow choking at a CPR, which is regulated by HCR (γ) as dictated by Eq.1. The 3D non-dimensional blockage factor (3DNBF) in an internal flow system with the cylindrical upstream-
duct is derived from the compressible fluid flow theory\textsuperscript{2,46} and presented herein as Eq.2(a-b) for diabatic nanoscale flow systems with a desirable inflow condition (see Eq.3). At the Sanal flow choking condition, the 3D blockage factor (3DBF) at the sonic-fluid-throat ($M_{\text{axial}} = 1$) is derived and presented herein as Eq.2(b), which is the highest blockage factor in the internal-multispecies-choked-nanoscale fluid flow system.

\[
CPR = \left( \frac{(HCR)^{\text{evolved gases with the lowest HCR}}}{2} + 1 \right)^{(HCR)_{\text{lowest}} - 1}(HCR)_{\text{lowest}} - 1
\]  

\[
3\text{DNBF}_{\text{at the upstream port of the nanoscale system}} = \frac{2\delta_x}{d_{\text{inlet}}} = 1 - \left[ \frac{M_{\text{inflow}}}{M_{\text{axial}}} \right]^{1/2} \left[ 1 + \frac{\gamma - 1}{2} \frac{M_{\text{axial}}^2}{1 + \frac{\gamma - 1}{2} \left( \frac{M_{\text{inflow}}}{M_{\text{axial}}} \right)^2} \right]^{\gamma + 1 \over 4(\gamma - 1)}
\]  

\[
3\text{DBF}_{\text{at sonic-fluid-throat}} = 1 - \left[ \frac{M_{\text{inflow}}}{M_{\text{axial}}} \right]^{1/2} \left[ \frac{2}{\gamma_{\text{highest}} + 1} \left( 1 + \frac{\gamma_{\text{highest}} - 1}{2} \left( \frac{M_{\text{inflow}}}{M_{\text{axial}}} \right)^2 \right)^{1 \over \gamma_{\text{highest}} + 1} \right] \left( \frac{\gamma_{\text{highest}} + 1}{4(\gamma - 1)} \right) d_{\text{inlet port}}
\]

\[
\frac{1 + \gamma_{\text{lowest}}}{1 + \gamma_{\text{lowest}} M_{\text{inflow}}^2} = \left( \frac{\gamma_{\text{lowest}} + 1}{2} \right)^{\gamma_{\text{lowest}} - 1}
\]  

It is pertinent to highlight here that the model set for Sanal flow choking for real-world fluid flows, the inflow Mach number ($M_i$) must be selected based on the thermal choking (Rayleigh flow effect) condition as dictated by Eq.3. Note that the chances of Sanal flow choking increases when
Fig. 2(a) Inlet Mach number prediction of different gases with different HCR ($\gamma$) for achieving Sanal flow choking condition for diabatic nanoflows.

the HCR of gases decreases due to the decreases in CPR of the nanoscale flow system as dictated by Eq.1. The solution curve of Eq.3 is presented as Fig.2(a). While performing the in silico model verification and calibration, the average friction coefficient must be chosen in accordance with the Fanno flow choking condition.\textsuperscript{2,46} Admittedly, at the sonic-fluid-throat of the nanoscale fluid flow system (see Fig.1(a-b)), the thermal choking and the wall-friction induced flow choking converges and satisfy all the conservation laws of nature.

In the in silico study the average friction coefficient ($f$) may be estimated from Eq.4 based on the lowest HCR ($\gamma_{\text{lowest}}$) of the evolving gases for satisfying the condition set for the Sanal flow choking for real-world multiphase, multi-species nanoscale fluid-flow systems.

$$f = \frac{d_i}{4L^*} \left[ \frac{1-M_i^2}{\gamma_{\text{lowest}} M_i^2} + \frac{\gamma_{\text{lowest}} + 1}{2}\ln \left[ \frac{\left(\gamma_{\text{lowest}} + 1\right)M_i^2}{2 + \left(\gamma_{\text{lowest}} - 1\right)M_i^2} \right] \right]$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

where $f$ is an average friction coefficient\textsuperscript{46} termed as (see Eq.4(a)),

\[\text{Mach Number, } M_i\]
\[\text{Specific Heat Ratio, } \gamma\]
The solution curve of Eq.4 is given in Fig.2(b) in the semi-log plot.

Note that the dominant species with the lowest HCR predisposes for an early Sanal flow choking at the sudden expansion or transition region of any internal flow system (see Fig.1(a-b)).

Note that Eqs. 1-5 are useful mathematical models for the high-performance aerospace chemical systems architects for predicting the limiting condition of deflagration to detonation transition (DDT) in nanoscale thrusters with confidence. Further discussion pertaining to the nanoscale chemical system design is beyond the scope of this letter. This letter is set for predicting the benchmark data at the Sanal flow choking condition for *in vitro* and *in silico* experiments in nanoscale fluid flow systems for various applications.

**Fig. 2(b)** Analytical prediction of the average friction coefficient at the Sanal flow choking condition of different nanotubes at different inlet conditions.
Fig. 2(c) The solution curve of Eq.2(a) showing the 3D blockage factor with Methane as the working fluid.

Fig. 2(d) The solution curve of Eq.2(b) showing the 3D blockage factor at the sonic-fluid-throat of a nanofluid flow system with hydrogen as the working fluid.
Vigneshwaran’s Table (Table-1) gives the exact values of 3DNBF at the Sanal flow choking condition of seven different working gases and the corresponding CPR and inlet Mach number. The CPR value is an indication of the lower critical detonation index (LCDI) of the internal flow systems having accumulated with such types of gases. The 3DNBF is a very useful benchmark data for nanoscale in vitro experiments and in silico model verification, validation and calibration with credibility, which was an unresolved problem over centuries. The corresponding non-dimensional blockage factor for two-dimensional case is also given in Table-I for comparison at the Sanal flow choking condition for real-world flows. The solution curve of Eq.2(a) for Methane gas is given in Fig.2(c) and the solution curve of Eq.2(b) for Hydrogen gas is depicted in Fig.2(d).

It is important to note that, at the sonic-fluid-throat of any wall-bounded real-world flows, all the three flow choking conditions, viz., Sanal flow choking, Rayleigh flow choking and Fanno flow choking converges due to the prudent boundary conditions set herein for generating benchmark data. It is pertinent to note that the magnitude of the entropy of these three flow choking models are different at the sonic condition. The entropy relationship developed for the Sanal flow model altogether conceived the Rayleigh flow model and Fanno flow model effects and presented herein as Eq.6.

\[
\left( \frac{s_2 - s_1}{C_r} \right)_{\text{Sanal Flow}} = \ln \left[ \left( \frac{M_2}{M_1} \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma_{\text{inlet}}} - \frac{1}{\gamma_{\text{outlet}}}} \left( 1 + \frac{\gamma_{\text{inlet}}}{\gamma_{\text{outlet}}} M_1^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma_{\text{inlet}}}} \left( 1 + \frac{\gamma_{\text{inlet}}}{\gamma_{\text{outlet}}} - 1 \right) \frac{M_2^2}{2} \right]^{\frac{1}{\gamma_{\text{inlet}}}} \left( 1 + \frac{\gamma_{\text{inlet}}}{\gamma_{\text{outlet}}} - 1 \right) \frac{M_2^2}{2}
\]

(6)

The analytical solution of the Entropy-Mach relationship (see Eq.6) for the Sanal flow choking model for the nanoscale fluid flow system is compared with the Fanno flow and Rayleigh flow models and presented in Fig.2(c) with air as the operating fluid. It is apparent from
Fig. 2(f) that the change in entropy is obtained as zero at $M_1 = M_2 = 1$, which is validating the capability of the model for meeting the *Sanal flow choking* condition for the *nanoscale fluid* flow systems for benchmarking the data reported in Table-1. It could be taken as the authenticated data for elucidating high fidelity wall-bounded nanoscale fluid flow problems in various industrial applications. Attaining the *Sanal flow choking* effect in *diabatic nanoscale* fluid flow systems, the inlet Mach number needs to be estimated using Eq.3 related to the HCR ($\gamma$) of the operating fluid (see Table-1 & Fig.2(a)). The LCDI presented in Table-1 is a powerful indicator of knowing the *detonation* index of nanoscale chemical energy systems with sudden expansion or divergent port for prohibiting the catastrophic failures due to the *Sanal flow choking* and/or *streamtube flow choking* (see Fig.1(b)).

![Mach Number-Entropy chart of Fanno, Rayleigh and Sanal flow models at the choked flow condition.](chart.png)
Fig. 2(f). The demonstration of the *Sanal flow choking in diabatic nanofluid* flows. (Solution curves of Eq. 6).

It is pertinent to state that, as seen in Table-1, the three-dimensional blockage factor is always lower than the two-dimensional blockage factor of any wall-bounded *nanoscale fluid* flow system at the *Sanal flow choking* condition. Note that *nanoscale fluid* flow system must always maintain the flow *Mach number* less than one as dictated by Eq.7 and Eqs.7(a-c) for negating the undesirable *Sanal flow choking* and *streamtube flow choking* causing shock wave generation and pressure-overshoot. Eqs.7(a-c) are different forms of Eq.7, which are useful for deciding the *thermophysical* properties of *nanomaterials* and the corresponding base fluid for various nanoscale system developments and its applications.

\[ M_{\text{nanofluid}} < 1 \]  \hspace{1cm} (7)

\[
\frac{\text{Fluid flow rate}}{\text{Vessel cross sectional area}} \left( \frac{\text{Prandtl Number} \cdot \text{Thermal Conductivity}}{\text{HCR} \cdot \text{Density} \cdot C_p \cdot \text{Dynamic Viscosity} \cdot \text{Static Pressure}} \right) < 1 \]  \hspace{1cm} (7a)
The self-explanatory equations (see Eq.7(a-c)), derived from the compressible flow theory, are highlighting herein for demonstrating the various influencing parameters and the conflicting requirements to prohibit the Sanal flow choking in the nanoscale fluid flow system. Eq.7(a) reveals that a disproportionate increase of the thermal conductivity of nanofluid increases the risk of Sanal flow choking leading to supersonic flow development followed by shock wave and pressure-overshoot in the nanoscale flow systems with sudden expansion or divergent region (see Fig.1(a-b)). Therefore, the condition set by Eq.7(a) must be satisfied while addition of nanomaterials in the base fluid for reducing the risk of catastrophic failure of nanoscale propulsion systems. Furthermore, here we show through Eq.7(b) that while decreasing the whole-viscosity of the composite flow for prohibiting the Sanal flow choking, the Reynolds number (Re) increases and the laminar flow could be disrupted and becomes turbulent causing an early Sanal flow choking in the creeping inflow condition. Therefore, in vitro parametric studies of aerospace propulsion systems in ISS must be carried out with caution because relatively high and low fluid viscosity are risk factors for the Sanal flow choking. The coupled influence of various parameters of nanoscale fluid flow systems leading to the Sanal flow choking condition are, flow rate, Prandtl number (Pr), Nusselt number (Nu), Reynold number (Re), thermal conductivity, heat capacity ratio ($\gamma$), density ($\rho$), dynamic viscosity ($\mu$), and...
kinematic viscosity \( (\nu_{\text{nanofluid}}) \), static pressure \( (P_{\text{static}}) \), specific heat at constant pressure \( (C_p)_{\text{nanofluid}} \), hydraulic diameter of the duct \( (d_{\text{H}}) \), convective heat transfer coefficient \( (h_s)_{\text{nanofluid}} \), and the characteristic length in the direction of growth of the boundary layer \( (x_{\text{BL:length}}) \). Please note that the coupled influence of the above-listed parameters will be controlled by a unique property of the nanofluid, which is stated herein with brevity as the heat capacity ratio (HCR) of nanofluid as dictated by Eq.1. This is a remarkable finding for the nanoscale systems development.

Viscosity variations are depending on the shear rate or shear rate history of the fluid, which could vary due to the variations in the thermophysical properties of nanomaterials and local effects too. The boundary-layer-blockage factors presented in Table-1 (the solution of Eq.2(b)) and the average friction coefficient given in Table-II (the solution of Eq.4) for different gases are the authenticated benchmark data generated from the closed-form analytical models for conducting in silico experiments after due verification, validation and calibration of the corresponding in silico models with nanomolecular precision with credibility. The benchmark data at the Sanal flow choking condition for diabatic flows for both base fluid and nanofluid presented in Table-1 and Table-2 are useful to the nanoscale system designers for enormous interdisciplinary bids.

Several in vitro and in silico experiments were reported by other investigators for examining the heat transfer performance of different nanofluids with different thermophysical properties through the traditional verification, validation and calibration of in silico models. Although the published in silico results are interesting, the accuracy of the data generated through in silico modeling efforts, typically do for the physical and chemical industry problem solutions, are not sufficient to authorize nanoscale systems design for manned space missions or in vitro studies in ISS. The fact is that those in silico models were not used any reliable benchmark data or any
exact solution obtained from the closed-form analytical models, which we could resolve herein. Certainly, a well-calibrated fluid-structural, multi-phase, and the multi-species in silico model at the condition prescribed by the closed-form analytical model, presented herein for the Sanal flow choking for diabatic nanofluid, could generate a reliable database for examining the effectiveness of dispersing nanometer-sized materials in the base fluids for a credible decision making on the desirable characteristics of nanofluids for various nanotechnology applications. It is important to note that while adding nanometer-sized materials to the base fluid the HCR of the nanofluid should not decrease. Note that a decrease in HCR leads to an early Sanal flow choking leading to shock wave generation and pressure-overshoot in the nanoscale system owing to the fact that the value of CPR will decrease while decreasing the HCR.

In light of the above observations the risk and benefits of nanofluids can be examined for various industrial applications through multiphase, multispecies in silico experiments by performing reliable parametric analytical studies by varying size, shape, volume and mass concentration, and thermophysical properties of nanomaterials in any base fluid. It is appropriate to mention here that the Sanal flow choking is an undesirable phenomenon in any internal flow system as it generates shock waves and inherent pressure-overshoot, which could alter the thermoviscoelastic properties of the vessel wall. The consequence of the Sanal flow choking is more severe if the duct geometry is having sudden expansion, the divergent/bifurcation region, expansion values or CD nozzle passage effect. In such duct flows the creeping flow gets accelerated to supersonic flow, at a CPR for flow choking, for meeting the conservation laws of nature.\textsuperscript{1,2} It has been well proven over the years that, in accordance with the law of nature, any minor disturbance to the supersonic flow leads to the shock-wave generation in the downstream region of the duct leading to the causation of pressure-overshoot in the downstream region
inviting *memory effects* on the viscoelastic walls of the duct. This is a grey area, which needs to be examined in detail through fluid-structural interactive multiphase, multispecies *in silico* models, which is beyond the scope of this letter.

**CONCLUSIONS**

The Sanal flow choking model presented herein is useful for *in vitro* and *in silico* experiments of all real-world fluid flow problems (continuum / non-continuum). Although the interdisciplinary science of nanotechnology has been advanced significantly over the last few decades there were no closed-form analytical models to predict the 3D blockage factor of *diabatic nanoscale fluid flow system*. The *Sanal flow choking* for the diabatic condition presented herein is valid for all the real-world fluid flow problems for designing various *nanoscale fluid* flow systems and sub systems due to the fact that the model is untied from empiricism and any types of errors of discretization. Using Eq.1 and Eq.2 the chemical propulsion system designers could easily predict the likelihoods of *detonation* with the given inlet flow Mach number and the lowest value of the HCR of the leading gas coming from the upstream port of the chemical system. In a nutshell, the best choice of increasing the solid fuel loading in the nanoscale thruster design without inviting any undesirable *detonation* and catastrophic failures, is to increase the HCR of the working fluid. Further discussion on the nanoscale propulsion system design is beyond the scope of this letter.

We have established herein that, due to the evolving boundary layer and the corresponding area blockage in the upstream port of any internal *nanofluid* flow system with sudden expansion or divergent region, the creeping *diabatic nanoflow* ($M_i << 1$) originated from the upstream port of the system could accelerate to the supersonic flow leading to an undesirable phenomenon of
pressure-overshoot due to shock wave generation as a result of the *Sanal flow choking*. Through the proposed mathematical methodology, we could disprove the general belief of the impossibilities of internal flow choking in such real-world *nanoscale fluid* flow systems at the creeping inflow conditions. There was a general belief in the scientific community over the centuries that the subsonic/creeping flow would not be augmented up to supersonic flow without shipping through a geometric throat, which we have disproved herein through the closed-form analytical model. Note that if the total-to-static pressure ratio at the *fluid-throat* is lower than the LCDI the *detonation* would not occur even if the blockage factor is relatively high in nanoscale chemical propulsion systems. The physical insight of the *Sanal flow choking* and *streamtube* flow choking presented in this letter sheds light on finding solutions for numerous unresolved scientific problems carried forward over the centuries in physical, chemical and mechanobiological sciences.

**METHODS**

Closed-form analytical methodology <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5020333>.
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Table 1 Benchmark Data: Vigneshwaran’s Table of Exact Solutions of Blockage Factor

Sanal Flow Choking Condition for Diabatic Nano Flows

| Sl No. | Type of Gas | γ | 2δi* | 2δi** | LCDI (CPR) |
|--------|-------------|---|-------|--------|-------------|
|        |             |   | d_j   | d_j   |             |
|        |             |   |        |        | M_i 2D 3D   |
| 1      | Air         | 1.400 | 0.4374 | 0.3247 | 0.1782 | 1.8929   |
| 2      | Argon       | 1.667 | 0.4236 | 0.3296 | 0.1812 | 2.0530   |
| 3      | CO₂         | 1.289 | 0.4437 | 0.3224 | 0.1768 | 1.8257   |
| 4      | Hydrogen    | 1.405 | 0.4372 | 0.3248 | 0.1783 | 1.8959   |
| 5      | Methane     | 1.299 | 0.4431 | 0.3226 | 0.1770 | 1.8318   |
| 6      | Neon        | 1.667 | 0.4236 | 0.3296 | 0.1812 | 2.0530   |
| 7      | Octane      | 1.044 | 0.4587 | 0.3169 | 0.1735 | 1.6759   |

Table-II: Vigneshwaran’s Table of Exact Solution

Air - γ = 1.4

| Inlet Mach Number (M_i) | Average Friction Coefficient (\bar{f}) |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------------|
|                         | L* / d_i = 27 | L* / d_i = 28 | L* / d_i = 35 | L* / d_i = 85 | L* / d_i = 150 | L* / d_i = 300 |
| 0.02                    | 16.467129     | 15.879017     | 12.703213     | 5.230735      | 2.964083      | 1.482042      |
| 0.04                    | 4.077335      | 3.91716       | 3.145373      | 1.295154      | 0.733920      | 0.366960      |
| 0.06                    | 1.787325      | 1.723492      | 1.378793      | 0.567738      | 0.321718      | 0.160859      |
| 0.08                    | 0.988132      | 0.952841      | 0.762273      | 0.313877      | 0.177864      | 0.088932      |
| 0.1                     | 0.619644      | 0.597514      | 0.478011      | 0.196828      | 0.111536      | 0.055768      |
| 0.12                    | 0.420444      | 0.405428      | 0.324343      | 0.133553      | 0.075680      | 0.037840      |
| 0.14                    | 0.301031      | 0.290280      | 0.232224      | 0.095621      | 0.054186      | 0.027093      |
| 0.16                    | 0.224054      | 0.216052      | 0.172842      | 0.071170      | 0.040330      | 0.020165      |
| 0.18                    | 0.171691      | 0.165559      | 0.132448      | 0.054537      | 0.030904      | 0.015452      |
| 0.2                     | 0.134567      | 0.129761      | 0.103809      | 0.042745      | 0.024222      | 0.012111      |
| 0.22                    | 0.107371      | 0.103536      | 0.082829      | 0.034106      | 0.019327      | 0.009663      |
| 0.24                    | 0.086912      | 0.083808      | 0.067046      | 0.027607      | 0.015644      | 0.007822      |
| 0.26                    | 0.071181      | 0.068639      | 0.054911      | 0.022610      | 0.012813      | 0.006406      |
| 0.28                    | 0.038863      | 0.056761      | 0.045409      | 0.018698      | 0.010595      | 0.005298      |
| 0.3                     | 0.049067      | 0.047315      | 0.037852      | 0.015586      | 0.008832      | 0.004416      |
### Oxygen - $\gamma = 1.395$

| Inlet Mach Number ($M_i$) | $L^*/d_i = 27$ | $L^*/d_i = 28$ | $L^*/d_i = 35$ | $L^*/d_i = 85$ | $L^*/d_i = 150$ | $L^*/d_i = 300$ |
|---------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| 0.02                      | 16.526261      | 15.936037      | 12.748830      | 5.249518       | 2.974727       | 1.487363       |
| 0.04                      | 4.092037       | 3.945893       | 3.156714       | 1.299823       | 0.736567       | 0.368238       |
| 0.06                      | 1.793805       | 1.729740       | 1.383792       | 0.569797       | 0.322885       | 0.161442       |
| 0.08                      | 0.991738       | 0.956318       | 0.765055       | 0.315023       | 0.178513       | 0.089256       |
| 0.10                      | 0.621922       | 0.599711       | 0.479768       | 0.197552       | 0.111946       | 0.055973       |
| 0.12                      | 0.422002       | 0.406931       | 0.325545       | 0.134048       | 0.075960       | 0.037980       |
| 0.14                      | 0.302156       | 0.291364       | 0.233092       | 0.095979       | 0.054388       | 0.027194       |
| 0.16                      | 0.224899       | 0.216867       | 0.173493       | 0.071438       | 0.040482       | 0.020241       |
| 0.18                      | 0.172345       | 0.166190       | 0.132925       | 0.054745       | 0.031022       | 0.015511       |
| 0.20                      | 0.135084       | 0.130260       | 0.104208       | 0.042909       | 0.024315       | 0.012158       |
| 0.22                      | 0.107787       | 0.103938       | 0.083150       | 0.034238       | 0.019402       | 0.009701       |
| 0.24                      | 0.087252       | 0.084136       | 0.067309       | 0.027715       | 0.015705       | 0.007853       |
| 0.26                      | 0.071463       | 0.068911       | 0.055129       | 0.022700       | 0.012863       | 0.006432       |
| 0.28                      | 0.059099       | 0.056988       | 0.045590       | 0.018772       | 0.010638       | 0.005319       |
| 0.30                      | 0.049265       | 0.047506       | 0.038005       | 0.015649       | 0.008868       | 0.004434       |

### Carbon Dioxide - $\gamma = 1.289$

| Inlet Mach Number ($M_i$) | $L^*/d_i = 27$ | $L^*/d_i = 28$ | $L^*/d_i = 35$ | $L^*/d_i = 85$ | $L^*/d_i = 150$ | $L^*/d_i = 300$ |
|---------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| 0.02                      | 17.887824      | 17.248973      | 13.799179      | 5.682015       | 3.219805       | 1.609904       |
| 0.04                      | 4.430553       | 4.272319       | 3.417855       | 1.407352       | 0.797500       | 0.398750       |
| 0.06                      | 1.943020       | 1.873627       | 1.498901       | 0.617195       | 0.349744       | 0.174872       |
| 0.08                      | 1.074778       | 1.036393       | 0.829115       | 0.341400       | 0.193460       | 0.096730       |
| 0.10                      | 0.674383       | 0.650298       | 0.520238       | 0.214216       | 0.121389       | 0.060694       |
| 0.12                      | 0.457886       | 0.441533       | 0.353262       | 0.145446       | 0.082420       | 0.041210       |
| 0.14                      | 0.328069       | 0.316353       | 0.230824       | 0.104210       | 0.059053       | 0.029526       |
| 0.16                      | 0.244361       | 0.235634       | 0.188507       | 0.077621       | 0.043985       | 0.021992       |
| 0.18                      | 0.187399       | 0.180706       | 0.144565       | 0.059527       | 0.033732       | 0.016866       |
| 0.20                      | 0.146998       | 0.141748       | 0.113398       | 0.046693       | 0.026460       | 0.013230       |
| 0.22                      | 0.117388       | 0.113196       | 0.090556       | 0.037288       | 0.021130       | 0.010565       |
| 0.24                      | 0.095103       | 0.091706       | 0.073365       | 0.030209       | 0.017118       | 0.008559       |
| 0.26                      | 0.077959       | 0.075175       | 0.060140       | 0.024763       | 0.014033       | 0.007016       |
| 0.28                      | 0.064526       | 0.062222       | 0.049778       | 0.020497       | 0.011615       | 0.005807       |
| 0.30                      | 0.053838       | 0.051915       | 0.041532       | 0.017101       | 0.009691       | 0.004845       |
### Nitrogen - $\gamma = 1.4$

| Inlet Mach Number (M) | Average Friction Coefficient ($\tilde{f}$) |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------------|
|                       | $L^*/d_i = 27$ | $L^*/d_i = 28$ | $L^*/d_i = 35$ | $L^*/d_i = 85$ | $L^*/d_i = 150$ | $L^*/d_i = 300$ |
| 0.02                  | 16.467129     | 15.879017      | 12.703213      | 5.230735      | 2.964083       | 1.482042       |
| 0.04                  | 4.077335      | 3.931716       | 3.145373       | 1.295154      | 0.733920       | 0.366960       |
| 0.06                  | 1.787325      | 1.723492       | 1.378793       | 0.567738      | 0.321718       | 0.160859       |
| 0.08                  | 0.988132      | 0.952841       | 0.762273       | 0.313877      | 0.177864       | 0.088932       |
| 0.1                   | 0.619644      | 0.597514       | 0.478011       | 0.196828      | 0.111536       | 0.055768       |
| 0.12                  | 0.420444      | 0.405428       | 0.324343       | 0.133553      | 0.075680       | 0.037840       |
| 0.14                  | 0.301031      | 0.290280       | 0.232224       | 0.095621      | 0.054186       | 0.027093       |
| 0.16                  | 0.224054      | 0.216052       | 0.172842       | 0.071170      | 0.040330       | 0.020165       |
| 0.18                  | 0.171691      | 0.165559       | 0.132448       | 0.054537      | 0.030904       | 0.015452       |
| 0.2                   | 0.134567      | 0.129761       | 0.103809       | 0.042745      | 0.024222       | 0.012111       |
| 0.22                  | 0.107371      | 0.103536       | 0.082829       | 0.034106      | 0.019327       | 0.009663       |
| 0.24                  | 0.086912      | 0.083808       | 0.067046       | 0.027607      | 0.015644       | 0.007822       |
| 0.26                  | 0.071181      | 0.068639       | 0.054911       | 0.022610      | 0.012813       | 0.006406       |
| 0.28                  | 0.058863      | 0.056761       | 0.045409       | 0.018698      | 0.010595       | 0.005298       |
| 0.3                   | 0.049067      | 0.047315       | 0.037852       | 0.015586      | 0.008832       | 0.004416       |

### Helium - $\gamma = 1.667$

| Inlet Mach Number (M) | Average Friction Coefficient ($\tilde{f}$) |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------------|
|                       | $L^*/d_i = 27$ | $L^*/d_i = 28$ | $L^*/d_i = 35$ | $L^*/d_i = 85$ | $L^*/d_i = 150$ | $L^*/d_i = 300$ |
| 0.02                  | 13.824736     | 13.330996      | 10.664797      | 4.391387      | 2.488453       | 1.244226       |
| 0.04                  | 3.420418      | 3.298260       | 2.638608       | 1.086486      | 0.615675       | 0.307838       |
| 0.06                  | 1.497793      | 1.444300       | 1.155440       | 0.475769      | 0.269603       | 0.134801       |
| 0.08                  | 0.827028      | 0.797491       | 0.637993       | 0.262703      | 0.148865       | 0.074433       |
| 0.10                  | 0.517887      | 0.499391       | 0.399513       | 0.164505      | 0.093220       | 0.046610       |
| 0.12                  | 0.350858      | 0.338328       | 0.270662       | 0.111449      | 0.063154       | 0.031577       |
| 0.14                  | 0.250794      | 0.241837       | 0.193469       | 0.079664      | 0.045143       | 0.022571       |
| 0.16                  | 0.186338      | 0.179683       | 0.143746       | 0.059190      | 0.033541       | 0.016770       |
| 0.18                  | 0.142529      | 0.137438       | 0.109951       | 0.045274      | 0.025655       | 0.012828       |
| 0.20                  | 0.111499      | 0.107516       | 0.086013       | 0.035417      | 0.020070       | 0.010035       |
| 0.22                  | 0.088790      | 0.085619       | 0.068495       | 0.028204      | 0.015982       | 0.007991       |
| 0.24                  | 0.071727      | 0.069165       | 0.055332       | 0.022784      | 0.012911       | 0.006455       |
| 0.26                  | 0.058623      | 0.056530       | 0.045224       | 0.018622      | 0.010552       | 0.005276       |
| 0.28                  | 0.048376      | 0.046649       | 0.037319       | 0.015367      | 0.008708       | 0.004354       |
| 0.30                  | 0.040239      | 0.038802       | 0.031042       | 0.012782      | 0.007243       | 0.003622       |