Hydrothermal analysis on MHD squeezing nanofluid flow in parallel plates by analytical method
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Abstract

Background: In this paper, the heat and mass transfer of MHD nanofluid squeezing flow between two parallel plates are investigated. In squeezing flows, a material is compressed between two parallel plates and then squeezed out radially. The significance of this study is the hydrothermal investigation of MHD nanofluid during squeezing flow. The affecting parameters on the flow and heat transfer are Brownian motion, Thermophoresis parameter, Squeezing parameter and the magnetic field.

Methods: By applying the proper similarity parameters, the governing equations of the problem are converted to nondimensional forms and are solved analytically using the Homotopy Perturbation Method (HPM) and the Collocation Method (CM). Moreover, the analytical solution is compared with numerical Finite Element Method (FEM) and a good agreement is obtained.

Results: The results indicated that increasing the Brownian motion parameter causes an increase in the temperature profile, while an inverse treatment is observed for the concentration profile. Also, it was found that enhancing the thermophoresis parameter results in decreasing the temperature profile and augmenting the concentration profile.

Conclusions: Effects of active parameters have been considered for the flow, heat and mass transfer. The results indicated that temperature boundary layer thickness will increases by augmentation of Brownian motion parameter and Thermophoresis parameter, while it decreases by raising the other active parameters.
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Sheikholeslami and Ganji (2013a) studied analytically the heat transfer of a nanofluid flow compressed between parallel plates using Homotopy Perturbation Method (HPM). They indicated that the Nusselt number is directly related to nanoparticle volume fraction along with Squeeze number and Eckert number for two separated plates, while there is an inverse relationship between the Nusselt number and Squeeze number when two plates are squeezed.

Sheikholeslami and Bhatti (2017a) studied the heat transfer enhancement of nanofluid flow by using EHD. Results indicated that the effect of Coulomb force is more considerable in lower values of Reynolds number. The shape effects of nanoparticles on the natural convection nanofluid flow in a porous semi-annulus were studied by Sheikholeslami and Bhatti (2017b). Results illustrated that the maximum rate of
heat transfer is obtained at platelet shape. Bhatti and Rashidi (2016) investigated the influences of thermos-diffusion and thermal radiation on nanofluid flow over a stretching sheet. The authors showed that the temperature profile is an increasing function of thermal radiation and thermophoresis parameters. Ghadikolaei et al. (2017) reviewed the micropolar nanofluid flow over a porous stretching sheet. It was found that raising the radiation parameter enhances the boundary layer thickness. Ghadikolaei et al. (2017) analyzed the stagnation-point flow of hybrid nanofluid over a stretching sheet. They concluded that using hybrid nanofluid instead of conventional nanofluid results in higher Nusselt numbers. Dogonchi et al. (2017) investigated the influence of thermal radiation on MHD nanofluid flow in a porous channel. Results illustrated that there is a direct relationship between the Nusselt number and nanofluid volume fraction. Recently, many authors analyzed the effect of nanoparticles in their studies (Abbas et al. 2017; Bhatti et al. 2017b; Saedi Ardahaie et al. 2018; Abbas et al. 2017).

The results of the time-dependent chemical reaction on the viscous fluid flow over an unsteady stretching sheet were considered by Abd-El Aziz (2010). Furthermore, for a certain viscous fluid between parallel disks, the magnetohydrodynamic squeezed flow was investigated by Domairry and Aziz (2009). Also, for the fluid flow between parallel plates, the Homotopy Analysis Method (HAM) (Domairry and Ziabakhsh 2009a; Domairry and Ziabakhsh 2009b; Ziabakhsh et al. 2009)) was utilized by Mustafa et al. (2012). The majority of the problems in the field of nanofluid flow, especially heat transfer equations contain nonlinear equations. In this case, some of these nonlinear equations can be solved by numerical approaches, while some others are solvable using various analytical methods such as Perturbation method (PM) (Bhatti and Lu 2017), Collocation method (CM) (Rahimi et al. 2017), Variational iteration method (VIM) (He 2004), the elimination of small parameter has been the critical issue for the scientists nowadays which has led to the introduction of various ways to solve these special problems. One of these ways is the implementation of the semi-exact method called “HPM” which does not need any small parameters. The Homotopy perturbation method was suggested and modified by He (2004). This method results in a rapid convergence of the solution series in most cases. Including both the efficiency and accuracy in solving a large number of nonlinear problems, the HPM proved itself capable in dealing with such problems. Ijaz et al. (2018) applied the HPM to investigate the effect of liquid-solid particles interaction in a wavy channel. Dogonchi et al. (2015) analyzed the sedimentation of non-spherical particles in Newtonain media using DTM-Pade approximation. It was found that enhancing the sphericity of particles results in augmenting the velocity profile.

Mosayebidorcheh et al. (2016) studied the analysis of turbulent MHD Couette nanofluid flow and heat transfer using hybrid DTM–FDM. Sheikholeslami et al. (2011) investigated the rotation of MHD viscous flow along with the heat transfer between stretching and porous surfaces using HPM. Results showed that an increase in the rotation parameter along with the increase in the blowing velocity parameter and Prandtl number would cause an increase in the Nusselt number. The profiles of the variables such as the velocity, temperature, and the concentration of the nanofluids affected by the magnetic field were investigated by Uddin et al. (2014). They comprehended that the presence of magnetic field would cause a decrease in the velocity field and an increase in temperature and concentration profiles. Also, it was found that the convective heating parameter leads to augment the velocity, temperature, and concentration profiles. Uddin et al. (2014) also studied non-Newtonian nanofluid slip flow over a permeable stretching sheet. Their results revealed that the skin friction factor plays a key role in the characteristics of nanofluid flow. In addition, the chemical reaction of nanofluid in free convection in the presence of magnetic field was investigated by Uddin et al. (2015). During the study of Jing et al. (2015), they discovered that the presence of nanoparticles within the fluid can extremely increase the effective thermal conductivity of the fluid, and as a result, the heat transfer characteristics will be improved. Sheikholeslami and Ganji (2013b) examined the nanofluid flow squeezed between parallel plates utilizing Homotopy perturbation method (HPM). They reported that the Nusselt number has direct relationship with nanoparticle volume fraction, the Squeeze number and the Eckert number in the case of separated plates, while its relationship with the Squeeze number in the case of squeezed plates is vice versa. Paying attention to the nanoparticle migration, the mixed convection of alumina–water nanofluid inside a concentric annulus was investigated by Malvandi and Ganji (2016). Sulochana et al. (2016) examined the effect of transpiration on the magnetohydrodynamic stagnation-point flow of a Carreau nanofluid toward a stretching/shrinking sheet in the presence of thermophoresis and Brownian motion, numerically. They discovered that by raising the thermophoresis parameter, both the heat and mass transfer rates will be increased, whereas the Weissenberg number enlarges the momentum boundary layer thickness along with the heat and mass transfer rate. Sheikholeslami et al. (2016) studied the effect of Lorentz forces on forced-convection nanofluid flow over a stretched surface. Their results indicated that the skin friction coefficient increases by amplifying the magnetic field, while it decreases by enhancing the velocity ratio parameter. Sudarsana Reddy and Chamkha (2016) analyzed the influence of size, shape, and type of nanoparticles along with the type and temperature of the base fluid on the natural convection MHD nanofluid flow. Their results revealed
that decreasing the size of the nanoparticles leads to a significant natural convection heat transfer rate. Moreover, types of nanoparticles and the base fluid also impressed the natural convection heat transfer. Mishra and Bhatti (2017) investigated the MHD stagnation-point flow over a shrinking sheet, numerically. The authors compared the accuracy of their solution with previous studies and found that a good agreement was obtained. Newly, the study of MHD flow in different geometries has attracted many attentions (Bhatti et al. 2017a; Ghadikolaei et al. 2017; Hatami et al. 2014; Bhatti et al. 2018).

The main goal of the present study is to investigate the effect of Brownian motion and thermophoresis phenomenon on the squeezing nanofluid flow and heat transfer between two parallel flat plates in the presence of variable magnetic field. Both the flow and heat transfer characteristics have been examined under the effects of Squeeze number, suction parameter, Hartmann number, Brownian motion parameter, Thermophoretic parameter, and Lewis number.

**Problem description and governing equations**

This study is concerned with incompressible two-dimensional flow of squeezing nanofluid between two parallel and movable plates at distance of \( h(t) = H(1 - at)^{1/2} \) from each other. The schematic model of the problem is depicted in Fig. 1. As shown in Fig. 1, \( B(t) = B_0(t - at)^{1/2} \) is the variable magnetic field that applied perpendicular to the plates. To simplify the problem, only the flow patterns on the left part of the channel have been mentioned. It should be noted that the flow patterns of squeezing flow are axisymmetric.

The “x” marks show that magnetic field is perpendicular to the illustrated plane. “+” and “−” indicate the positive and negative charges, respectively. \( T_w \) and \( C_w \) represent the temperature and concentration of nanoparticles at the bottom disk while the temperature and concentration of nanoparticles at the upper disk are denoted by \( T_H \) and \( C_H \). The upper disk at \( Z = h(t) \) can move toward or away from the motionless bottom disk with the velocity of \( \frac{dh}{dt} \).

For \( a > 0 \) and \( a < 0 \), two plates are squeezed and separated, respectively. The viscous dissipation effect along with the generated heat remained intact due to the friction caused by shear forces in the flow. It should be noted that when the fluid is largely viscous or flowing at a high speed, the dissipation effect is quite important. Knowing that the nanofluid is a two-component mixture, the following assumption has been considered:

- Incompressible; no-chemical reaction; with negligibleness of viscous dissipation and radiative heat transfer; nano-solid-particles and the base fluid are in thermal equilibrium and without any slip between them. The equations which govern the flow, heat, and mass transfer in viscous fluid are as follows (Hashmi et al. 2012; Turkyilmazoglu 2017):

\[
\nabla \cdot \mathbf{V} = 0
\]

\[
\rho \left( \frac{\partial \mathbf{V}}{\partial t} + (\mathbf{V} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{V} \right) = -\nabla p + \mu \nabla^2 \mathbf{V} + \sigma (\mathbf{J} \times \mathbf{B})
\]

\[
(\rho C_p) \left( \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} + (\mathbf{V} \cdot \nabla) T \right) = K \nabla^2 T
\]

\[
+ \tau \left[ D_B + (\mathbf{V} T, \mathbf{V} C) + \frac{D_T}{T_m} (\mathbf{V} T, \mathbf{V} T) \right]
\]

\[
(\rho C_p) \left( \frac{\partial C}{\partial t} + (\mathbf{V} \cdot \nabla) C \right) = D_B \nabla^2 C + \frac{D_T}{T_m} \nabla^2 T
\]

where \( \mathbf{J} = \mathbf{E} + (\nabla \times \mathbf{B}) \), \( \mathbf{E} \) is neglected due to small magnetic Reynolds, so \( \mathbf{J} = (\nabla \times \mathbf{B}) \). \( \mathbf{V} = (U, V, W) \) is the velocity vector; \( \nabla \) is the gradient operator; \( T, P, \rho, \mu, \) and \( K \) are the temperature, pressure, density, viscosity, heat capacitance, and thermal conductivity of nanofluid, respectively. Also, the operation of \( \nabla \) can be defined as:

\[
\nabla = \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial X}, \frac{\partial}{\partial Y}, \frac{\partial}{\partial Z} \right)
\]

The boundary conditions are as follows:

\[
z = h(t) : u = 0, w = \frac{dh}{dt}, T = T_h, C = C_h
\]

\[
z = 0 : u = 0, w = -\frac{w_0}{\sqrt{1 - at}}, T = T_w, C = C_w
\]

where \( u \) and \( v \) represent velocity components in the \( r \)- and \( z \)-directions, respectively, \( \rho \) is the density, \( \mu \) is the dynamic viscosity, \( p \) is the pressure, \( T \) is the temperature, \( C \) is the nanoparticles concentration, \( a \) is
Table 1 HPM and CM solution when \( A = 1, M = 1, S = 1, Le = 1, Nb = 1, Nt = 1, Pr = 6.2. \)

| \( \eta \) | \( \eta f(\eta) \) | \( \theta(\eta) \) | \( \phi(\eta) \) | \%Error | \( \eta f(\eta) \) | \( \theta(\eta) \) | \( \phi(\eta) \) | \%Error | \( \eta f(\eta) \) | \( \theta(\eta) \) | \( \phi(\eta) \) | \%Error |
|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 0    | 1      | 1      | 1      | 1      | 0    | 1      | 1      | 1      | 0      |      | 1      | 1      | 1      | 0      |
| 0.1  | 0.9828509855 | 0.9824627697 | 0.9824361313 | 0.0000266384 | 0.9346923872 | 0.8308261117 | 0.8308351280 | 0.0000083142 | 0.7793705558 | 0.9000934056 | 0.9112683052 | -0.0111748996 |
| 0.2  | 0.9392513782 | 0.9375660234 | 0.9375269886 | 0.00003900384 | 0.8640178590 | 0.6999881997 | 0.6910783899 | -0.0006770702 | 0.6012601622 | 0.7989509826 | 0.8108534964 | -0.0119025138 |
| 0.3  | 0.8788058754 | 0.8752398967 | 0.8752157845 | 0.0000241122 | 0.7884934362 | 0.5714471980 | 0.5734084939 | -0.0010365131 | 0.4559056726 | 0.6702838289 | 0.7064057452 | -0.0077376232 |
| 0.4  | 0.8090072079 | 0.8036034623 | 0.8035984828 | 0.000049795 | 0.7076406847 | 0.4683460847 | 0.4695233998 | -0.0011770924 | 0.3359299240 | 0.5947812584 | 0.6016217396 | -0.0068404812 |
| 0.5  | 0.7359775756 | 0.7293903870 | 0.7293797925 | 0.000075651 | 0.6202061754 | 0.3767871883 | 0.377847835 | -0.0010663017 | 0.2360877164 | 0.4926652610 | 0.4980783825 | -0.0054131215 |
| 0.6  | 0.6650106060 | 0.6583174081 | 0.658336159 | -0.000187509 | 0.5243799637 | 0.2934637222 | 0.2943510479 | -0.0008873257 | 0.1530188204 | 0.3913604297 | 0.3962207368 | -0.0050846939 |
| 0.7  | 0.6009852669 | 0.5939562625 | 0.5954289745 | -0.000333489 | 0.4179140248 | 0.2158417967 | 0.2166670566 | -0.0007229089 | 0.0853794058 | 0.2906492557 | 0.2959127913 | -0.0052635356 |
| 0.8  | 0.5487041816 | 0.5416846184 | 0.5422560815 | -0.000414609 | 0.2979942644 | 0.1419761291 | 0.1425481689 | -0.00040398 | 0.0340955426 | 0.1916650515 | 0.196734353 | -0.0050929015 |
| 0.9  | 0.5131945405 | 0.5119893652 | 0.5120144707 | -0.000251055 | 0.1607055638 | 0.07038795247 | 0.0707603109 | -0.0003721993 | 0.00211931100 | 0.0062558233 | 0.00982635139 | -0.00363793157 |
| 1    | 0.4999999999 | 0.5000000008 | 0.5 | 0.0000000008 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
the thermal diffusivity, $D_B$ is the Brownian motion coefficient, $T_m$ is the mean fluid temperature, and $k$ is the thermal conductivity. The total diffusion mass flux for nanoparticles is the last term in the energy equation which is given as a sum of the Brownian motion and thermophoresis terms. In addition, $r$ is the dimensionless parameter which can calculate the ratio of effective heat capacity of the nanoparticles to heat capacity of the fluid. The parameters of similarity solution are as follows:

$$
\begin{align*}
 u &= \frac{ar}{2(1-at)} \frac{d}{d(\eta)}, w = -\frac{aH}{\sqrt{1-at}} \frac{d}{d(\eta)}, \frac{z}{H} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-at}} \\
 B(t) &= \frac{B_0}{\sqrt{1-at}}, \theta = \frac{T-T_h}{T_w-T_h}, f = \frac{C_C-C_h}{C_W-C_h} \\
\end{align*}
$$

(7)

By removing the pressure gradient from Eqs. (2) and (3), then rewriting Eqs. (4) and (5), the final nonlinear equations can be obtained as follows (Turkyilmazoglu 2016):

$$
\begin{align*}
 f''''-S(\eta f''''+3 f''-2 f') M^2 f' &= 0 \\
 \theta'' + pr S(2 \theta'^2 - \eta \theta') + pr Nt \eta \theta' + pr Nt \eta^2 &= 0 \\
 f'' + Le S(2 f' \eta f') + \frac{Nt}{\eta} \theta' &= 0 \\
\end{align*}
$$

Boundary conditions are described as follows:

$$
\begin{align*}
 f(0) &= A, & f'(0) &= 0, \quad \theta(0) = \phi(0) = 0 \\
 f'(1) &= \frac{1}{2}, & f'(1) &= 0, \quad \theta(1) = \frac{1}{2} \theta'(1) = 0 \\
\end{align*}
$$

(9)

where $S$ is the Squeeze number, $A$ is the suction/blowing parameter, $M$ is the Hartmann number, $Nb$ is the Brownian motion parameter, $Nt$ is the Thermophoretic parameter, $Pr$ is the Prandtl number, and $Le$ is the Lewis number and are defined as follows:

$$
\begin{align*}
 W_s &= \frac{aH^2}{aH}, \quad S = \frac{aH}{\sqrt{2v}}, \quad M = \sqrt{\frac{\sigma B^2 H^2}{v}}, \quad Pr = \frac{v}{\alpha} \\
 Nb &= \frac{(pc)_p D_B (C_W-C_h)}{(pc)_v}, \quad Nt = \frac{(pc)_p D_T (T_w-T_h)}{(pc)_v T_m v} \\
\end{align*}
$$

(10)

The continuity equation is identically satisfied. It should be noted that $A > 0$ indicates the suction of fluid from the lower disk, while $A < 0$ represents the injection flow.

Methods

Collocation method (CM)

Suppose we have a differential operator $D$ acting on a function $u$ to produce a function $p$ (Hatami et al. 2013).

$$
D(u(x)) = p(x) \\
$$

(11)

Function $u$ can be considered as a function $\tilde{u}$ which is a linear combination of basic functions chosen from a linearly independent as follows:

$$
\tilde{u}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i \phi_i \\
$$

(12)

Now, we can substitute it from (12) into the Eq. (11), generally $p(x)$ is not the result of the operations. Therefore an error or residual will exist:

$$
E(x) = R(x) = D(\tilde{u}(x)) - p(x) \\
$$

(13)

The basic principle of the Collocation method is to lead an error or the residual to zero in some average sense over the domain as follows:

$$
\int_{x} R(x) W_i(x) = 0 \quad i = 1, 2, ..., n \\
$$

(14)

So that the number of weight functions $W_i$ and the number of unknown constants $c_i$ (Eq.(13)) are exactly equal. The result is a set of $n$ algebraic equations for the unknown constants $c_i$. In collocation method, the weighting functions are obtained from the family of Dirac $\delta$ functions in the domain. That is, $W_i(x) = \delta(x-x_i)$.

The Dirac function is defined as follows:

$$
\delta(x-x_i) = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } x = x_i \\
0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases} \\
$$

(15)

Application of CM

To obtain an approximate solution for Eq. (8) in the domain $0 < \eta < 1$, we consider the basic function to polynomial in $\eta$. The trial solution contains three undetermined coefficients and satisfies the condition for all values of $c$ as follows:

$$
\begin{align*}
 f(\eta) &= C_0 + C_1 \eta + C_2 \eta^2 + C_3 \eta^3 + C_4 \eta^4 + C_5 \eta^5 + C_6 \eta^6 \\
 \theta(\eta) &= C_7 + C_8 \eta + C_9 \eta^2 + C_{10} \eta^3 + C_{11} \eta^4 + C_{12} \eta^5 + C_{13} \eta^6 \\
 \phi(\eta) &= C_{14} + C_{15} \eta + C_{16} \eta^2 + C_{17} \eta^3 \\
\end{align*}
$$

(16)

where Eq. (16) satisfies the boundary conditions of Eq. (9). The residual function ($R(c_1, c_2, c_3, \eta)$) can be obtained by substituting Eq. (16) into Eq. (13). The residual is equal to zero only by exact solution of the problem. Here, the problem is solved by the approximate solution.
so that the residual stays close to zero throughout the domain $0 < \eta < 1$. Three points are needed to find the three unknown parameters, so three specific points with approximately equal distance should be chosen in the domain. These points are:

$$\eta_1 = \frac{1}{4}, \eta_2 = \frac{2}{4}, \eta_3 = \frac{3}{4}$$

Eventually, by substitutions values of Eq. (17) into residual function $R(c_1, c_2, c_3, \eta)$, a set of three long equations with three unknown coefficients are obtained. After solving these unknown parameters ($c_1, c_2, c_3$), the temperature distribution equation, Eq. (16), will be determined.

To find the solution, the parameters can be considered as $Pr = 6.2$, $A = 1$, $Nt = 1$, and $M = S = Le = Nb = 1$, and based on Eq. (10) (Sabbaghi et al. 2011), the $f(\eta)$, $\theta(\eta)$ and $\phi(\eta)$ formulation are obtained as follows:

$$f(\eta) = 1 - 1.967401394\eta^2 + 2.249807551\eta^3 - 1.176830107\eta^4 + 0.4738431393\eta^5 - 0.7941918846e^{-\eta^6}$$

$$\theta(\eta) = 1 - 1.864675877\eta + 1.894175562\eta^2 - 1.748719915\eta^3 + 1.054402097\eta^4 - 4.154680758\eta^5 + 0.802620820e^{-\eta^6}$$

$$\phi(\eta) = 1 - 0.9913679607\eta - 0.8457402944e^{-\eta^2} + 0.7594199010e^{-\eta^3}$$

**Homotopy Perturbation Method (HPM)**

In order to show the main idea of this method, we consider the following equation (Turkyilmazoglu 2015):

$$A(u) - f(r) = 0 \quad r \in \Omega$$

Considering the boundary conditions:

$$B\left(u, \frac{\partial u}{\partial n}\right) = 0, \quad r \in \Gamma,$$

**Fig. 2** a Comparison velocity profile of the solutions via CM, HPM, and numerical solution for $A = 1$, $M = 1$, $S = 1$, $Le = 1$, $Nb = 1$, $Nt = 0.1$, $Pr = 6.2$ b Comparison temperature profile of the solutions via CM, HPM, and numerical solution for $A = 1$, $M = 1$, $S = 1$, $Le = 1$, $Nb = 1$, $Nt = 0.1$, $Pr = 6.2$ c Comparison concentration profile of the solutions via CM, HPM, and numerical solution for $A = 1$, $M = 1$, $S = 1$, $Le = 1$, $Nb = 1$, $Nt = 0.1$, $Pr = 6.2$
where \( A \) is a general differential operator, \( B \) is a boundary operator, \( f(r) \) is a known analytical function, and \( \Gamma \) is the boundary of the domain \( \Omega \).

\( A \) can be divided into linear and nonlinear parts, where \( L \) and \( N \) represent the linear and nonlinear parts, respectively. Therefore, Eq. (21) can be rewritten as follow:

\[
L(u) + N(u) - f(r) = 0, \quad r \in \Omega,
\]

The structure of homotopy perturbation is shown as follow:

\[
H(v, p) = (1 - p)[L(v) - L(u_0)] + p[A(v) - f(r)] = 0 \quad (22)
\]

where,

\[
v(r, p) : \Omega \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \quad (23)
\]

Here, \( p \in [0, 1] \) is an embedding parameter and \( u_0 \) is the first approximation that satisfies the boundary condition. The solution of Eq. (22) can be defined as a power series in \( p \) as following:

\[
V = V_0 + PV_1 + P^2V_2 + \ldots \quad (24)
\]

Finally, the best approximation for solution is written as:

\[
u = \lim_{p \to 1} v = v_0 + v_1 + v_2 + \ldots \quad (25)
\]

**Application of HPM**

In order to solve a problem with Homotopy Perturbation Method (HPM), we can construct a homotopy of Eq. (8) as follows:

\[
H(f, p) = (1 - p)(f^{iv} - f_0^{iv}) + p\left( f'''' - s(f'' - 2f'f') - M^2f''\right) = 0, \quad (26)
\]

\[
H(\theta, P) = (1 - p)(\theta^{iv} - \theta_0^{iv}) + p\left( \theta'''' - s(\theta'' - 2\theta'\theta') - Pr\theta''\right) = 0, \quad (27)
\]

**Fig. 3**

\( a \) Effect of \( A \) parameter on velocity distribution when \( M = 1, S = 1, Le = 1, Nb = 1, Nt = 1, Pr = 6.2 \). \( b \) Effect of \( S \) parameter on velocity distribution when \( M = 1, A = 1, Le = 1, Nb = 1, Nt = 1, Pr = 6.2 \). \( c \) Effect of \( M \) parameter on velocity distribution when \( Nt = 1, A = 1, Le = 1, S = 1, Nb = 1, Pr = 6.2 \).
By substituting $f$, $\theta$, $\phi$ from Eqs. (29–31) into Eqs. (26–28) and some simplification, then rearranging the equations in terms of powers of $p$, the following equations are achieved:

$$\phi^0 = 0, \quad f_0^0 = 0, \quad \phi^1 = 0$$

And boundary conditions are:

$$f_0(0) = A, \quad f_0(0) = 0, \quad \theta_0(0) = \phi_0(0) = 1$$

$$f_1(0) = \frac{1}{2}, \quad f_0(1) = \theta_0(1) = \phi_0(1) = 0$$

By solving Eqs. (32) and (34) with boundary conditions and then substituting their answers into Eqs. (29–31), $f$, $\theta$, $\phi$ are obtained as follows:

$$f(\eta) = 1 - 258890\eta^9 + 248449\eta^8 - 219322\eta^7 + 47762\eta^6 - 39417\eta^5 + 0.36385\eta^4 - 0.53870\eta^3 - 1.35169\eta^2 + 1.51284e - 1.9932e - 0.38072e - 0.32328e - 0.30668e - 0.4198 - 1.9412\eta^2 + 2.4363\eta^2 - 1.86619\eta - 0.72865\eta - 6.4135\eta^6 + 0.13957e - 0.10822\eta - 0.56182e - 1.6217\eta - 0.53182e - 21724\eta^2 + 0.33031e - 2.1517 - 0.27890e - 0.2410 - 0.18401e - 3.17 - 0.15641e - 0.22944e - 0.9 - 0.10194e - 0.31066e - 0.34694\eta^2 + 0.38059\eta - 5.1379\eta^4 - 2.3473\eta^2 - 2.90316\eta - 0.46540\eta - 0.99914e - 1.24579\eta - 0.36\eta - 0.21724\eta^8 - 0.0033031\eta - 0.009146\eta - 0.00018140\eta^2 + 0.015641\eta^4 + 0.84535\eta^5 + 0.049556\eta^6 - 0.041207\eta^4 + 2.73146\eta - 2.2946\eta^2 + 0.88028\eta^4 + 1.3372\eta^2 - 1.7434\eta^6 - 0.14292\eta^7 + 0.37952\eta^8$$

Numerical Finite Element Method (FEM)

Some several methods can be useful to find a solution of fluid flow and heat transfer problems such as the Finite Difference Method, the Finite Volume method (FVM), and the Finite Element Method (FEM). The control volume Finite Element Method (CVFEM) contains interesting features from both the FVM and FEM. The CVFEM benefits from
the flexibility of the FEMs to discretize complex geometry with conservative formulation of the FVMs, in which the variables can be easily interpreted physically in terms of fluxes, forces, and sources (Kandelousi and Ganji n.d.).

FlexPDE is a scripted Finite Element model builder and numerical solver. This software performs the essential operations to turn a description of a partial differential equations system into a Finite Element model and finally solve the system, and present graphical and tabular output of the results (Table 1).

Results and discussion
In the present study, the effect of Brownian motion and Thermophoresis phenomenon on the heat and mass transfer of MHD nanofluid flow between parallel plates is investigated, and Collocation Method (CM), Homotopy Perturbation Method (HPM) along with the finite element Method (FEM) are applied to solve this problem using Maple 16 and FlexPDE 5 softwares. The influence of certain active parameters such as Squeeze number, suction parameter, Hartmann number, Prandtl number, Brownian motion parameter, Thermophoretic parameter and Lewis number on the flow and heat transfer characteristics are examined. The presented code is validated by comparing the obtained results with the results of finite element method (FEM) (Fig. 2). The comparison well showed that by implementing this code, a highly accurate solution is obtained to solve the problem.
The effect of suction parameter, Squeeze number, and Hartmann number on velocity profile is shown in Fig. 3. Increasing the suction parameter would cause an increase in velocity profile due to the increase of the turbulence in the flow. It can be seen that the velocity values drop by enhancing the Squeeze number because the plate remained close to each other and limits the velocity. Also, it can be found that enhancing the Hartmann number in the flow results in augmenting the velocity profile.

Figures 4 and 5 represent the influences of suction parameter and Squeeze number on the temperature and concentration profiles, respectively. Figures depicted that increasing the suction parameter would cause a decrease in thermal boundary layer thickness and concentration profiles. Effect of Brownian motion parameter on temperature and concentration profiles is shown in Fig. 6, while the effect of Thermophoretic parameter on the mentioned profiles is examined in Fig. 7. It can be observed that increasing the Brownian motion parameter results in increasing the temperature profile, while the influence of Thermophoretic parameter on temperature profile is vice versa compared to Brownian motion parameter, whereas increasing both the Brownian motion parameter and Thermophoretic parameter individually would cause a decrease in concentration profiles which
is depicted in Fig. 8. As shown in these figures, the nanoparticle temperature and concentration profiles are decreasing functions of the Hartmann number. Figure 9 shows the effect of Lewis number on temperature and concentration profiles. It is observed that an increase in temperature profile near the bottom plate and also a decrease in temperature profile near the top plate are the results of enhancing the Lewis number. Also, it can be concluded that the thickness of concentration boundary layer declines by enhancing the Brownian motion parameter, while an inverse trend is observed by augmenting the Thermophoresis parameter.
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