Production and dispersion of free radicals from transient cavitation Bubbles: An integrated numerical scheme and applications
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ABSTRACT

As an advanced oxidation process with a wide range of applications, sonochemistry relies on acoustic cavitation to induce free radicals for degrading chemical contaminants. The complete process includes two critical steps: the radical production inside the cavitation bubble, and the ensuing dispersion of these radicals into the bulk solution. To grasp the physicochemical details in this process, we developed an integrated numerical scheme with the ability to quantitatively describe the radical production-dispersion behavior. It employs coupled simulations of bubble dynamics, intracavity chemical reactions, and diffusion-reaction-dominated mass transport in aqueous solutions. Applying this method to the typical case of argon and oxygen bubbles, the production mechanism for the main radicals is revealed. Moreover, the temporal-spatial distribution of the radicals in the liquid phase is presented. The results demonstrate that the enhanced radical production observed in oxygen bubbles can be traced to the initiation reaction $\text{O}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{OH} + \text{HO}_2$, which requires relatively low activation energy. In the outside liquid region, the dispersion of radicals is limited by robust recombination reactions. The simulated penetration depth of OH is around 0.2 μm and agrees with reported experimental measurements. The proposed numerical approach can be employed to better capture the radical activity and is instrumental in optimizing the engineering application of sonochemistry.

1. Introduction

Sonochemistry has been recognized as a promising advanced oxidation process with the capability of degrading various contaminants effectively, including phenol [1], hydrocarbons [2], pesticides [3], and polymers [4]. The versatility of sonochemistry is rooted in acoustic cavitation: the formation, growth, and violent collapse of microbubbles in sonicated liquids [5]. In the last stage of the dynamic phase, compressional heating creates hotspots inside the bubble, with temperatures as high as that on the surface of the sun [6]. For volatile pollutants such as carbon tetrachloride, their pyrolysis in the interior of the collapsing bubble is the main degradation pathway [7–9]. For nonvolatile species, however, the reactive species produced and diffused out from the cavitation bubble are primarily responsible.

For the bubbles undergoing stable oscillation, the oxidation potential of cavitation-induced radicals depends on two integral steps: the production of the radicals inside the collapsing bubble, and their dispersion in the bulk solutions. The radicals generated in the first step determine the categories and amounts of the oxidants, while the distribution in the second step influences the probability of the interaction with the pollutants. A schematic showing the complete process is displayed in Fig. 1. Another route for the radicals to get into contact with the contaminants is the breakup of the bubble. In this situation, the radicals are released into the solution directly. As many unknowns exist for this case (e.g. the time of the breakup, the disturbed flow field surrounding the bubble, etc.), we don’t consider the latter process in the present study.

Owing to the transient nature of the oscillating bubble, numerical simulation has been traditionally used to investigate the radicals in acoustic cavitation [10–13]. Desirably, the numerical models should account for both the production and dispersion integrally, since they form a complete process for the radicals to realize the oxidation potential. However, previous studies [10–13] have exclusively focused on the radical production inside the bubble, while the dispersion process in the aqueous medium is generally ignored. In consequence, a full picture of the radical behavior around the transient bubble is still missing.

Even for the most examined production part, considerable opacities remain regarding the exact chemical activities in the collapsing bubble. In most cases, the chemical simulations from past literature only reported the produced quantity of the various radicals. Vital information
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in terms of the exact reactions responsible for the generation of a specific radical is not accessible. However, such information may be crucial in interpreting some sonochemical phenomena. For example, prior tests showed that dissolving oxygen in water is more efficient than using argon in inducing hydroxyl radicals \[14-16\]. This conjecture is not convincing – \[14-19\]. This is counterintuitive at first glance since a much lower collapsing temperature is formed in the oxygen bubble \[14,17,18\]. Lacking sufficient knowledge of the reaction details, some researchers guessed that the enhanced radical production is caused by the additional dissociation of oxygen molecules via \(\text{O}_2 \rightarrow 2\text{O}^\cdot\) and \(\text{O}^\cdot + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow 2\text{OH}^-\) \[14,17,19\]. This conjecture is not convincing when taking into account that the dissociation energy of oxygen is as high as that of water molecules (493.4 kJ/mol versus 492.2 kJ/mol) \[20,21\]. With decreased collapsing temperature, the overall yields of hydroxyl radicals should still be lowered. We argue that issues as such can only be solved by a complete understanding of the reaction kinetics in the radical productions.

In this paper, an integrated numerical scheme is proposed to close the abovementioned knowledge gaps. The main components for this scheme are introduced in Section. 2 with two subsections, each detailing the radical production and the dispersion in the liquid region. In Section. 3, we use two typical cases to demonstrate the applicability of the proposed scheme: one for an argon bubble and another for an oxygen bubble. Also in this section, we propose a new theory to explain how the existence of oxygen in the bubble increases the production of hydroxyl radicals. Section. 4 discusses some unresolved issues around the interfacial chemistry that may affect the reported simulation results. Several implications derived from this study are also highlighted in the context of sonochemical degradation of chemical compounds. Finally, the main findings are concluded in Section. 5.

2. Formulation

We consider a spherical bubble oscillating in water under ultrasonic driving. The water is saturated with either argon or oxygen. At the initial state, the bubble is assumed to contain water vapor and the saturated gas. As the bubble expands in the rarefication phase of ultrasound, additional water molecules would enter the interior through evaporation at the gas–liquid interface. At the collapse stage, chemical reactions among the gases generate various radicals. Parts of the produced radicals would penetrate the gas–liquid interface and diffuse into the surrounding liquid. In the following sections, the models for radical production and dispersion are introduced separately.

2.1. The model for radical production

The free radicals are produced through chemical reactions in the collapsing bubble and are intrinsically associated with the bubble dynamics. The radial oscillation of the bubble determines the intracavity conditions, i.e., the temperature and pressure, for the reactions, while the latter would in turn affect the temperature via releasing/absorbing reaction energy and change the bubble composition through creating/
destruction of chemical species. In our method, the bubble dynamics are simulated with the Gilmore model [22]. The heat and mass transfer between the bubble and the ambient liquid are also accounted for. For the simulation of chemical reactions, two mechanisms are used: the comprehensive GRI-Mech 3.0 [23] for the argon bubble, and the state-of-the-art H$_2$/O$_2$/H$_2$O mechanism [24] for the oxygen bubble. The coupled simulation yields the category and quantity of radicals at each moment in the bubble collapse. The implementation details of these models are presented in our recent publication [25] and therefore will not be elaborated here. We only listed the corresponding equations in Table 1 with the parameters explained in the Nomenclature. In the following, we stress several key points regarding the application of these models.

Firstly, both the temperature and pressure are treated as homogeneous inside the bubble. Since thermal conduction at the interface is the main energy dissipation mechanism for the bubble [26,27], the heat transfer between the bubble and the ambient liquid is calculated based on the temperature gradient through assumed thermal boundary layers. Stricker et al. [28] demonstrated that the estimated temperatures using this method are close to the results from solving the full energy equations and can be reliably applied in sonochemistry simulation. The technique in our method involves two thermal boundary layers, one in the gas phase and another in the surrounding liquid. The heat transfer is estimated as thermal conduction through these layers.

Secondly, the GRI-Mech 3.0 mechanism used for the chemical simulation in argon bubble contains all the radical species of interest in sonochemistry study, including OH, H, O, HO$_2$, and H$_2$O$_2$. It has been optimized through a systematic procedure and extensively validated [29]. Its reliability in simulating cavitation-related chemistry has also been verified before [25] using test data from Kalus [30,31]. Owing to the huge number of reactions involved in this mechanism, the complete reaction data is not listed here but can be accessed from the complete reaction data is not listed here but can be accessed from the database [23]. The H$_2$/O$_2$/H$_2$O reaction mechanism [24] for the oxygen bubble contains the species O$_2$ and HO$_2$ in addition to the radicals mentioned above. The rate parameters of the reactions are updated continuously and represent the latest development for the simulation of high-temperature gas reactions. As in the case of GRI-Mech 3.0, the reaction data is not listed here for brevity. The readers are referred to the literature [24] for a complete description of this mechanism.

Thirdly, all the chemical simulations are conducted on the open-source platform Cantera [32]. The most significant advantage conferred by using Cantera is that it allows real-time analysis of the reaction pathways. By tracing the flow of a specific element, the reaction kinetics for the production of certain radicals can be accurately identified. This is a critical improvement compared with previous simulations. The associated benefits will be illustrated in the production mechanistic analysis in Section 3.

2.2. The model for radical dispersion

The radical dispersion includes two simultaneous processes: the mass diffusion driven by the concentration gradient, and the chemical reactions among the radicals as well as with the saturated gas. The diffusion–reaction equation governing the dispersion can be expressed as:

$$\frac{\partial c_i}{\partial t} + R\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\right)^2 c_i - D_i \frac{\partial^2 c_i}{\partial r^2} = \sum_j \alpha_{ij} f_j$$

where $r$ is the radial coordinate with $r = 0$ denoting the bubble center and $r = R$ the bubble wall, $c_i(r, t)$ the molar concentration of the species $i$ at time $t$ and distance $r$ in the liquid, $D_i$ the diffusion coefficients, $R(t)$ the instant bubble radius, and $f_j$ the velocity of the bubble wall. Both $R(t)$ and $f_j(t)$ come from the bubble dynamics simulation. The values of $D_i$ for the species discussed in this study are listed in Table 2.

The last term in Eq 1 represents the rate of concentration change due to chemical reactions, in which $\alpha_{ij}$ is the stoichiometric weight of species $i$ in the reaction $f_j$. The main radicals produced from the investigated bubbles are OH, H, O, HO$_2$, as well as O$_2$ and HO$_2$ for the oxygen bubble. When they dissolve in the bulk liquid, the possible chemical reactions and the associated rate constants are listed in Table 3. They are taken from previous studies of plasma-liquid interaction and have been widely adopted for simulating the radical reactions in aqueous solutions [33,34]. Categorically, they can be divided into radical recombination, and the attack of radicals on the recombination products, dissolved molecular gases, and water molecules. Additional reactions with other chemical compounds may occur in the wastewater environment. In this study, the sonicated water is assumed as neat and those reactions are not considered.

The radicals are supplied from the bubble with the time-varying flux $\Gamma_i$. At infinite, their concentrations are assumed to reach the asymptotic value. The corresponding boundary conditions for Eq 1 thus become:

$$4\pi R^2 D_i \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial r} = \Gamma_i$$

$$\frac{\partial c_i}{\partial r} = 0$$

Determining the value of $\Gamma_i$ is the trickiest part of this simulation. Large uncertainty exists when the radicals are transported through the gas–liquid interface. Since there is no reported experimental measurement, we refer to two proposed approximations to estimate $\Gamma_i$. The first uses an uptake coefficient defined as [35,36]:

$$\frac{\partial c_i}{\partial t} = \frac{\Gamma_i}{\sqrt{\pi D_i t}}$$

Table 2
The diffusion coefficients of the species in water, 10$^{-5}$ cm$^2$/s.

| Species | H$_2$O$_2$ | O | H | HO$_2$ | H$_2$ | O$_2$ | HO$_2$ |
|---------|------------|---------|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| OH      | 2.3        | 1.0     | 2.0 | 4.5   | 1.0   | 4.5   | 1.97  |
| H       | 1.0        | 0.3     | 1.0 | 4.5   | 1.9   | 1.7   | 1.0   |

#### Table 1
The model for simulating the bubble dynamics and intracavity chemical reactions. The specifications for the parameters are listed in the Nomenclature table.

| Components | Equations | Key parameters or implementation |
|------------|-----------|---------------------------------|
| Bubble radial dynamics | $$\frac{1}{n} \frac{R}{C} \pi \left(\frac{R}{C}\right)^2 \left(1 - \frac{R}{C}\right)\right)^2 = \frac{1}{n} \frac{R}{C} \pi \left(1 - \frac{R}{C}\right)H + \left(1 - \frac{R}{C}\right)^2$$ | Conducted on the platform Cantera. |
| Energy balance | $$E = -P_v V + Q + n_{i,0} C_{Te} + E_{kin}$$ | |
| Heat transfer | $$Q_{Te} = 4\pi R^2 \alpha_{Te}(T_e - T_i) = 4\pi R^2 \frac{\alpha_{Te}}{\sqrt{\pi D_{Te}}}$$ | |
| Mass transfer | $$n_{i,0} = 4\pi R^2 \frac{\alpha_{Te}}{\sqrt{\pi D_{Te}}}$$ | |
| Chemical reactions | GRI-Mech 3.0, H$_2$/O$_2$/H$_2$O reaction mechanism | Conducted on the platform Cantera. |
The chemical reactions with the rate coefficients in the liquid [33,34].

| No. | Reactions | Rate coefficients (M⁻¹s⁻¹, 1 M = 1 × 10⁷ mol/m³) |
|-----|-----------|-----------------------------------------------|
| R.1 | OH⁻(aq) + OH⁻(aq) → H₂O₂(aq) | 3.6 × 10⁹ |
| R.2 | O₂⁻(aq) + O₂⁻(aq) → O₃(aq) | 2.8 × 10⁹ |
| R.3 | H⁻(aq) + H⁻(aq) → H₂(aq) | 7.9 × 10⁷ |
| R.4 | H⁻(aq) + OH⁻(aq) → H₂O(aq) | 7.0 × 10⁶ |
| R.5 | H⁻(aq) + H₂O₂(aq) → OH⁻(aq) + H₂O(aq) | 9.0 × 10⁵ |
| R.6 | H⁺(aq) + O₂⁻(aq) → HO₂⁻(aq) | 2.1 × 10⁴ |
| R.7 | H⁺(aq) + HO₂⁻(aq) → H₂O₂⁻(aq) | 1.8 × 10⁴ |
| R.8 | OH⁻(aq) + HO₂⁻(aq) → H₂O₁⁺(aq) + O₂(aq) | 6.0 × 10³ |
| R.9 | OH⁻(aq) + H₂O₂⁻(aq) → H₂O₃⁻(aq) + H⁺(aq) | 4.3 × 10³ |
| R.10 | H₂O₂⁻(aq) + OH⁻(aq) → HO₂⁻(aq) + H₂O(aq) | 2.7 × 10³ |
| R.11 | HO₂⁻(aq) + HO₂⁻(aq) → H₂O₂⁻(aq) + O₂(aq) | 7.0 × 10³ |
| R.12 | HO₂⁻(aq) + O⁻(aq) → HO₂⁻(aq) + OH⁻(aq) | 1.6 × 10³ |
| R.13 | O⁻(aq) + HO₂⁻(aq) → OH⁻(aq) + HO⁻(aq) | 1.3 × 10⁴ |
| R.14 | HO⁻(aq) + HO₂⁻(aq) → H₂O⁻(aq) + OH⁻(aq) | 1.0 × 10² |
| R.15 | H₂O₃⁻(aq) + O₂⁻(aq) → H₂O₂⁻(aq) + H⁺(aq) | 6.0 × 10⁴ |
| R.16 | O₂⁻(aq) + O₂⁻(aq) → O₃⁻(aq) | 4.0 × 10⁹ |
| R.17 | HO₂⁻(aq) + O₂⁻(aq) → HO.linalg.₁⁻(aq) | 3.8 × 10⁹ |
| R.18 | OH⁻(aq) + O₂⁻(aq) → HO₂⁻(aq) + O₂(aq) | 1.1 × 10⁸ |
| R.19 | HO₂⁻(aq) + O₂⁻(aq) → HO₂⁻(aq) + O₂(aq) | 5.0 × 10⁸ |
| R.20 | HO⁻(aq) + O₂⁻(aq) → OH⁻(aq) + O₂(aq) | 1.1 × 10⁸ |
| R.21 | H₂O₂⁻(aq) + O₂⁻(aq) → OH⁻(aq) + HO₂⁻(aq) + O₂ | 3.0 × 10⁸ |

\[ \Theta = \frac{N_{\text{mol}} - N_{\text{out}}}{N_{\text{coll}}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3)

which characterizes the fraction of molecules that penetrate the liquid through the bubble interface. \( N_{\text{mol}} \) represents the number of molecules evading the liquid, \( N_{\text{out}} \) is the number of molecules that reflect from the liquid, and \( N_{\text{coll}} \) are the total molecules that collide with the gas-liquid interface. With this coefficient, the flux can be calculated according to the molecular dynamics theory [10].

\[ \Gamma_i = 4\pi R^2 \Theta_i \frac{L_{ij}}{2M_i} \]  \hspace{1cm} (4)

In which \( \Theta_i \) is the particle density of the species inside the bubble, \( T_b \) the bubble temperature, \( k_B \) the Boltzmann constant, and \( M_i \) the molecular weight of the species. By setting \( \Theta = 0.001 \), Yasui et al. [10] found that the simulated number of OH radicals dissolved from a SBSL bubble into liquid water matches well with the experimental data [37]. We adopt this value in the simulation.

Another method assumes that the dissolution of radicals occurs in the manner of diffusion through a boundary layer. Then the flux can be estimated by the concentration gradient [11,12,38]:

\[ \Gamma_i = 4\pi R^2 D_{\text{eff}} \chi_i \]  \hspace{1cm} (5)

with

\[ L_i = \min \left( \frac{R D_{\text{eff}} \eta}{\sqrt{\pi}}, \frac{R^2}{\pi} \right) \]

where \( \chi_i \) is the species concentration at the bubble wall, and \( D_{\text{eff}} \) the mass diffusion constant among the gas mixture in the bubble. Since most radicals are highly soluble in water, \( \chi_i \) is assumed as zero.

In the Dissolution section, it is shown that while quantitative differences between these two methods can be observed in the dissolution of radicals at the bubble, the influence on the dispersion process is not significant. In the following case studies, the uptake method is employed unless otherwise specified.

2.3. Numerical method

The methods for simulating the bubble dynamics and the chemical reactions have been introduced in our previous studies [25,39–41]. Therefore, only the method for the dispersion simulation is illustrated in this section. To solve the diffusion-reaction equation (Eq. 1), we split the reaction term from the equation and calculate the diffusion and reaction process sequentially at each time step. The rationale for this treatment lies in the vastly disparate time scales for mass diffusion and chemical reactions. For the typical case considered in the present simulation, the time scale for bubble oscillation around the collapse point \( t_{\text{col}} = R/|\Delta R/\Delta t| \) is about 10⁻⁹ s. When the characteristic length is set with the equilibrium bubble radius \( R_0 = 10 \mu m \), the time scale of mass diffusion for OH radicals can be estimated as \( t_{\text{diff}} = R_0^2/\Delta \Omega \) and is in the order of 10⁻¹ s, while that for recombination reaction is about 10⁻⁵ s. Based on this distinction, it is expected that the dispersion process is characterized by rapid chemical reactions followed by slow diffusions. Therefore, a separate calculation of reaction and diffusion at each time step is justified.

The new pure diffusion equation is solved by the numerical method proposed by Hegedüs et al. [42]. They introduced a new variable \( \zeta \) to transform the Eulerian coordinates into the Lagrangian ones and convert the unbounded liquid domain into the bounded one [42]:

\[ \zeta = \frac{R}{r}, \quad \zeta \in [0, 1] \]  \hspace{1cm} (6)

Then the diffusion equation becomes:

\[ \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta} \left( \zeta c_i \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial \zeta} \right) = D \frac{\partial^2 c_i}{\partial \zeta^2} \]  \hspace{1cm} (7)

with \( c_i \) now being a function of \( \zeta \) and \( t \). Discretizing the spatial domain \( \zeta \in [0,1] \) into the Gauss-Lobatto points.

\[ \zeta_k = \cos \left( \frac{k \pi}{m} \right), \quad k = 1, ..., m \]  \hspace{1cm} (8)

and approximating the derivative terms with the central difference method, the diffusion equation is written as a set of algebraic equations and can be solved readily. In our calculation, we used 100 points for the Gauss-Lobatto discretization and further refined the grids near the interface by adding 16 points in the first 5 layers to ensure sufficient spatial resolution. Other methods like the Galerkin or spectral collocation approach can also be used to solve the diffusion equation. A comparison of the efficiency between the different methods is reported by Hegedüs et al. [42].

For the time marching, we employed the fully implicit method coupled with an adaptive time step scheme to maintain numerical stability. The absolute error in the calculated radical concentration between two consecutive steps is controlled to be lower than 0.001 mol/m³. After the diffusion calculation is completed, the chemical simulation based on the reactions in Table 3 is conducted and the concentration field is updated.

The initial bubble composition is determined by applying equilibrium condition [7,8,39]:

\[ \frac{n_{\text{H}_2,0}}{\sqrt{\mathcal{F}_w}} = \frac{p_{\text{sat}}}{\sqrt{\mathcal{F}_w}} V, \quad n_{\text{H}_2,0} = \frac{(p_0 - p_{\text{sat}})}{\sqrt{\mathcal{F}_w}} V \]  \hspace{1cm} (9)

where \( n_{\text{H}_2,0} \) and \( n_{\text{H}_2,0} \) are the initial amounts of water vapor and gas (argon or oxygen), \( p_{\text{sat}} \) the saturated vapor pressure, \( V \) the bubble volume, \( \mathcal{F}_w \) the gas constant, \( T_w \) the ambient pressure and temperature, and \( p_0 \) the total bubble pressure. From the pressure balance for the bubble, \( p_0 \) is calculated by:

\[ p_0 = p_\infty + \frac{2\sigma}{R_0} \]  \hspace{1cm} (10)

in which \( p_\infty \) is the ambient pressure, \( \sigma \) the surface tension, and \( R_0 \) the initial radius of the bubble. The initial concentration of radicals is assumed to be zero and those of dissolved gases are taken as the
3. Case study

In this section, the proposed numerical scheme is applied to two typical cases where argon or oxygen is saturated in water. A similar experiment has been conducted to examine the sonochemical production of free radicals [14]. Corresponding to the referenced test, the bubble is assumed to oscillate under the acoustic driving with the amplitude $p_a = 1.3$ bar and frequency $f = 20$ kHz. The equilibrium radius $R_0 = 10 \, \mu m$ and the temperature of ambient water $T_0 = 298$ K. It should be noted that besides the saturated gas, the bubble also contains water vapor and various species created by chemical reactions. However, for brevity and comparison, we will still refer to the bubble in each case as argon or oxygen bubble without further explicitly indicating the presence of other species.

3.1. The argon bubble

3.1.1. Bubble dynamics and radical productions

Fig. 2 (a) and (b) show the bubble dynamics and the productions of the main reactive species inside the argon bubble within the first 6.5 acoustic cycles. Under the prescribed acoustic driving, the periodic oscillation of the bubble is quite stable and shows a strong nonlinearity, indicating the violent motion in the compression stage. The peak temperature in the bubble collapse reaches 5619 K, suggesting the extreme intracavity condition. As a monatomic gas, argon has a relatively large polytropic index and small thermal conductivity. The former property points to a lower heat capacity that is preferential for compressional heating, while the latter dictates that the thermal loss to the ambient liquid is small when the bubble is heated. The chemical reactions in the collapse produce hydroxyl radical (OH$^\cdot$), hydrogen atom (H$^\cdot$), oxygen atom (O$^\cdot$), hydrogen peroxide (H$_2$O$_2$), and hydroperoxyl radical (HO$_2$), in descending order by the produced amount in one acoustical cycle.

Table 4 summarizes several parameters that quantify the production of the main radicals, including the peak number of the radical particles, $N_{i,\text{max}}$, the maximum concentration, $c_{i,\text{max}}$, inside the bubble, and the accumulative number of molecules dissolved in the liquid in one acoustic cycle, $\Delta N_{i,s}$. The data shows that despite the small number of radicals produced in a single collapse, their particle density can be enormous inside the strongly compressed bubble. Especially, the value of $c_{i,\text{max}}$ for OH$^\cdot$ is as high as 631.5 mol/m$^3$, implying huge oxidation potential at the collapse point if the bubble disintegrates at this moment. Very large values of $c_{i,\text{max}}$ are also observed for O$^\cdot$ and H$^\cdot$ atoms. Similar results have been reported in the case of laser-induced bubbles [25].

3.1.2. Reaction pathway analysis

The productions of radicals last for dozens of nanoseconds in the collapse as shown in Fig. 3 (a), where the number of radicals is displayed as the collapse progresses around the collapse point. In the figure, a new time parameter $t^*$ is adopted with $t^* = 0$ denoting the moment when $R = R_{\text{min}}$. It is observed that the radicals are produced sequentially with the OH$^\cdot$ and H$^\cdot$ emerging first. The reaction pathways of H atoms at $t^* = 3.8$ ns displayed in Fig. 3 (b) suggest that the thermal dissociation of water molecules is responsible for the generation of OH$^\cdot$ radicals and H$^\cdot$ atoms at this early stage:

$$\text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{M} \rightarrow \text{H} + \text{OH} + \text{M} \quad \text{(R22)}$$

Note that this reaction is also the initiation step for whole chemical reactions in the argon bubble. With the activation temperature as high as 59700 K for this reaction, a very high energy barrier must be overcome before other radicals can be generated.

After the reactions are activated, the H$^\cdot$ atoms produced from the reaction R22 would attack water molecules and create additional OH$^\cdot$ radicals as shown in Fig. 3 (b):

$$\text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{H}_2 + \text{OH} \quad \text{(R23)}$$

![Fig. 2. The bubble dynamics and productions of free radicals inside the argon bubble within the period of 6.5 acoustic cycles: (a) The evolution of bubble radius; (b) The temporal variation of the number of particles for the main radical products. The parameters for the calculated case are: $p_a = 1.3$ bar, $f = 20$ kHz, $R_0 = 10 \, \mu m$, and $T_0 = 298$ K.](image-url)
As more \( \text{OH}^\cdot \) and \( \text{H}^\cdot \) are produced and the temperature inside the bubble continues to increase, the reactions become increasingly complicated. Fig. 3 (c) displays that at \( t^* = -0.5 \) ns, \( \text{O}^\cdot \) atoms are produced by the following reactions.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{OH}^\cdot + \text{OH}^\cdot &\rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{O}^\cdot \quad \text{(R24)} \\
\text{OH}^\cdot + \text{H}^\cdot &\rightarrow \text{H}_2 + \text{O}^\cdot \quad \text{(R25)}
\end{align*}
\]

These two reactions are barrierless and can proceed rapidly once the supply of the reactants (\( \text{OH}^\cdot \) and \( \text{H}^\cdot \)) is adequate.

For \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) and \( \text{HO}_2^\cdot \), their productions rely on the recombination of \( \text{OH}^\cdot \) radicals:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{OH}^\cdot + \text{OH}^\cdot + \text{M} &\rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{M} \quad \text{(R26)} \\
\text{OH}^\cdot + \text{OH}^\cdot &\rightarrow \text{H}^\cdot + \text{HO}_2^\cdot \quad \text{(R27)}
\end{align*}
\]

Similar to R24 and R25, the above two reactions are also barrierless. For \( \text{HO}_2^\cdot \), there is another production channel where \( \text{OH}^\cdot \) reacts with \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \):

\[
\text{OH}^\cdot + \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{HO}_2^\cdot + \text{H}_2\text{O} \quad \text{(R28)}
\]

The preceding analysis reveals that the reactions in the argon bubble progress in a cascading way. It is provoked by the initiation reaction (dissociation of water molecules, R22) and proceeds with the products from the previous reactions acting as the reactants for the next reactions. The high energy barrier of the initiation reaction is the major factor limiting the radical productions.

### 3.1.3. Radical dispersion

Before analyzing the dispersion of the radicals in the liquid phase, we first examine the dissolution behavior at the bubble interface. Fig. 4 displays the concentration of the radicals and their recombination products at the gas–liquid interface \( (r = R) \). Note again that the new time parameter \( t^* \) is used in order to illustrate the nuanced dynamics near the collapse point. It is seen that the time duration of the radicals at the interface is rather short. Owing to the small diffusivity, the main radicals \( \text{OH}^\cdot, \text{H}^\cdot, \) and \( \text{O}^\cdot \) attain peak concentration in several nanoseconds.

Afterward, the strong recombination reactions quickly consume the main body of radicals, leaving only a small part to diffuse away.

The complete dispersion process within the first 6.5 acoustic cycles is displayed in Fig. 5 for the main radicals \( \text{OH}^\cdot, \text{H}^\cdot, \) and \( \text{O}^\cdot \). As a result of the slow diffusion and rapid recombination reaction, a concentration profile with a sharp gradient is observed in the near liquid region. The penetration depth of \( \text{OH}^\cdot \) radicals is about 0.2 \( \mu \text{m} \), which agrees well with experimental results from previous investigations [43,44]. For \( \text{H}^\cdot \) and \( \text{O}^\cdot \), this distance is shorter due to fewer supplies from the interior of the bubble and the higher rate of recombination reaction (see Table 3). As the bubble collapses periodically, the release and dispersion of radicals are also intermittent.

The dispersion pattern of the recombination products \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) and \( \text{H}_2 \) is
Fig. 5. The dispersion of different radicals in the liquid for the argon bubble: (a) OH\(^{-}\) radicals; (b) H\(^{+}\) atoms, and (c) O\(^{+}\) atoms. The ordinate shows the radial position in the ambient liquid and the abscissa denotes the time \(t\) normalized by the acoustical cycle \(T, T = 1/f\). The maximum concentration for each radical species is not indicated in the figure but can be referenced from Fig. 4. Since the high concentration lasts briefly, in order to present a better image of the radical dispersion, all the regions with concentrations larger than 1 mol/m\(^3\) are colored red.
different from that for the radicals as shown in Fig. 6. We stress that the diffusion of these stable species is very slow due to the small diffusivity in water. Modeling such long-term behavior involves a huge number of bubble oscillations and is out of the scope of this paper. Still, the results presented in Fig. 6 offer a glimpse of the dispersion pattern for these products.

After being produced at the bubble interface, \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) and \( \text{H}_2 \) gradually diffuse away in the liquid. The periodicity in the generation and propagation is obvious in Fig. 6. With each bubble collapse, new \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) and \( \text{H}_2 \) molecules are created at the interface. The periodic supply sustains the consistent diffusion with increasing concentration in the near liquid region. At the end of 6.5 cycles, the traveling distance of \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) and \( \text{H}_2 \) is about 1 \( \mu \text{m} \). It should be noted that the investigated case assumes that only the inert argon is dissolved in the water. When other reactive species exist in the solution, a part of recombination products, especially the \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \), will be consumed and the diffusion distance will be shortened.

3.2. The oxygen bubble

3.2.1. Bubble dynamics and radical productions

In this section, we turn our attention to the case where oxygen is saturated in the water. Fig. 7(a) shows that while the pattern of bubble dynamics is similar to that for the argon bubble, much milder conditions are generated inside the oxygen bubble when it collapses. The maximum temperature is only 3692 K compared with the 5619 K attained in the argon bubble. This difference is expected considering the physical properties of oxygen, i.e., the relatively small polytropic index and large thermal conductivity. Fig. 7(b) indicates that the most produced reactive species is still \( \text{OH}^- \), but a large quantity of \( \text{O}^\cdot \), \( \text{HO}_2^- \) and \( \text{O}_3 \) is also created.

As with the case of the argon bubble, the parameters quantifying the production of radicals in the oxygen bubble are also obtained and presented in Table 5. Comparing the data in Table 4 and 5 reveals that while fewer \( \text{H}^\cdot \) are produced in the oxygen bubble than in the argon bubble, more \( \text{OH}^\cdot \), \( \text{O}^\cdot \), \( \text{HO}_2^- \) and \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) are generated in the former case. Measured by the total quantity of reactive species, the oxygen bubble yields a higher output of radicals than the argon bubble, which matches conclusions from previous reports [14–16].

3.2.2. Reaction pathway analysis

To account for the diverging trends in the collapsing temperature and radical production in the oxygen bubble, the reaction kinetics are investigated by the analysis of reaction pathways shown in Fig. 8.

As the bulk of produced radicals is oxidants for the oxygen bubble, we only present the reaction pathways of \( \text{O}^\cdot \) atoms at \( t^*=5 \text{ ns} \) and \( -0.4 \text{ ns} \), respectively. Similar to the case of the argon bubble, there exists a time sequence by which different radicals are produced. Fig. 8(a) shows that the first two species emerging from the reactions are \( \text{OH}^\cdot \) and \( \text{HO}_2^- \), rather than \( \text{OH}^\cdot \) and \( \text{H}^\cdot \) as in the case of the argon bubble. This suggests a different initiation reaction other than the pyrolysis of water molecules at play in the oxygen bubble. Analysis of the reaction pathway in Fig. 8(b) identifies this reaction as:

\[
\text{O}_3 + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow 2\text{OH}^- + \text{HO}_2^- \quad (\text{R29})
\]

The activation temperature of R29 is only about 34813 K compared with the 59700 K for the dissociation of water molecules, suggesting that a much lower energy barrier needs to be overcome in order to trigger the whole chemical reactions in the bubble. Following the activation of the initiation reaction, other reactions occur more readily and begin to produce radicals. This well explains the paradox that more radicals are produced under a milder reaction condition in the oxygen bubble.
The HO\textsubscript{2} derived from O\textsubscript{2} further reacts with water molecules and produces additional OH radicals at later moments as shown in Fig. 8(c).

\begin{equation}
\text{HO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{OH} \quad (\text{R30})
\end{equation}

For the O atoms, the dissociation of O\textsubscript{2} and the attack of H\textsuperscript{+} on the O\textsubscript{2} both contribute to its production:

\begin{align*}
\text{O}_2 + \text{M} & \rightarrow 2\text{O} + \text{M} \quad (\text{R31}) \\
\text{O}_2 + \text{H} & \rightarrow \text{O} + \text{OH} \quad (\text{R32})
\end{align*}

Note that the reaction R32 also produces OH\textsuperscript{+}. In addition, the O\textsuperscript{−} atoms generated from the pyrolysis of oxygen molecules (R31) provide another production channel for OH\textsuperscript{−} by combining with water molecules:

\begin{equation}
\text{O} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow 2\text{OH} \quad (\text{R33})
\end{equation}

The reactions R32 and R33 require relatively low activation energies. Therefore, the main constraint for these two reactions is the supply of O\textsubscript{2} and H\textsuperscript{+} atoms. As the collapse progresses and the temperature rises, the O\textsuperscript{−} and H\textsuperscript{+} atoms become abundant. In this situation, the production of OH\textsuperscript{−} through R32 and R33 is accelerated and their contributions increase.

The generation of O\textsubscript{3} is mainly attributed to the attack of O\textsuperscript{−} on the oxygen molecules:

\begin{equation}
\text{O} + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{O}_3 \quad (\text{R34})
\end{equation}

This reaction is characterized by the high activation energy and its rate at the investigated moment is relatively slow.

### Table 5

| Species | OH\textsuperscript{−} | O\textsuperscript{−} | HO\textsubscript{2} | H\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{2} | O\textsubscript{2} | H\textsuperscript{+} |
|---------|----------------------|-------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| \(N_{c_{\max}}\) | 9.4 \(\times\) 10\textsuperscript{9} | 9.4 \(\times\) 10\textsuperscript{9} | 1.0 \(\times\) 10\textsuperscript{9} | 4.6 \(\times\) 10\textsuperscript{8} | 5.8 \(\times\) 10\textsuperscript{8} | 2.1 \(\times\) 10\textsuperscript{7} |
| \(c_{\max}\) | 1039.0 | 104.4 | 112.8 | 51.1 | 6.5 | 2.3 |
| \(\Delta N_{c_{\max}}\) | 2.9 \(\times\) 10\textsuperscript{8} | 4.2 \(\times\) 10\textsuperscript{8} | 1.7 \(\times\) 10\textsuperscript{8} | 3.4 \(\times\) 10\textsuperscript{7} | 1.3 \(\times\) 10\textsuperscript{7} | 9.1 \(\times\) 10\textsuperscript{6} |

The above reaction mechanism analysis demonstrates that the existence of O\textsubscript{2} in the bubble lowers the energy barrier for radical productions through the initiation reaction R29. This compensates for the adverse effect brought about by the lower collapsing temperature and helps strengthen the efficiency of radical production in the oxygen bubble.

#### 3.2.3. Radical dispersion

The radical dispersion in this case is complicated by the pre-existence of dissolved oxygen in the water that would participate in the chemical reactions. Notably, the combination of the O\textsubscript{2} and H\textsuperscript{+} atoms would create HO\textsubscript{2} radicals through H\textsuperscript{+} + O\textsubscript{2} → HO\textsubscript{2} (R.6 in Table 3). In addition, the attack of O\textsuperscript{−} atoms on water molecules may contribute new OH\textsuperscript{−} radicals via O\textsuperscript{−} + H\textsubscript{2}O → OH\textsuperscript{−} + HO\textsubscript{2} (R.13 in Table 3).

Despite these additional reactions, the overall pattern of the radical dissolution at the bubble interface is not changed as can be seen from Fig. 9. The rapid increase and decrease of the main radicals at the bubble dissolution at the bubble interface is not changed as can be seen from Fig. 9. The rapid increase and decrease of the main radicals at the bubble surface suggest that the influence of reactions R6 and R13 is not significant due to their small rate constants (see Table. 3). Instead, the robust recombination reactions still dominate the dissolution dynamics and quickly deplete the radicals.

Fig. 10 also suggests that the dispersion characteristics are similar to that in the case of the argon bubble. The radicals react away rapidly within a short diffusion distance. Despite a larger radical supply at the bubble interface, Fig. 10(a) suggests that for OH\textsuperscript{−} the overall concentration is lower and the penetration depth in the liquid is shorter compared with the case of argon bubble. This is due to the stronger recombination reactions with higher initial concentrations of reactants. The same mechanism can also explain the diminishing presence of O\textsuperscript{−} and HO\textsubscript{2} in the liquid region as displayed in Fig. 10(b) and (c). On the other hand, the initially saturated oxygen in the liquid has indiscernible effects on the radical dispersion. Table. 3 shows that the rate constants for reactions involving molecular oxygen are several orders of magnitude smaller than that for the radical recombination. Therefore, the dispersion behavior of the radicals is predominately driven by the recombination reactions.

In sonochemical degradation of phenol, enhanced treatment efficiency was observed by dissolving oxygen in the solution. There have been conjectures [14] that attribute this phenomenon to the reaction O\textsubscript{2}
+ \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \rightarrow 2\text{HO}_2 \text{ in the liquid phase since it reverts the loss of oxidation potential caused by the recombination of OH radicals. However, the rate constant for this reaction is as low as } 4.2 \times 10^{19} \text{ M}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1} \text{ [45,46]. The results from the present simulation show that the effects from such reactions are insignificant. The increased radical production inside the bubble combined with a higher number of bubbles may be responsible.}

4. Discussion

The reaction mechanism analysis demonstrates that the production of radicals involves various elementary reactions, among which the initiation reaction is the critical step. It not only produces the main body of the highly reactive OH radicals, but also influences the productions of other species owing to the nature of chain reactions. The energy barrier of the initiation reaction is an important parameter determining the overall intensity of the radical productions, which in turn is dependent on the initial species of gases inside the bubble. From this perspective, more attention should be paid to the reaction kinetics when discussing the influences of saturated gas on the sonochemical production of radicals.

Our calculation as well as a previous study [10] showed that the number of radicals that diffuse out from the bubble is small compared with the total amount of radicals produced inside the bubble. Therefore, the influence of using different methods to calculate the interfacial flux of radicals, \( \Gamma \), on the radical production is negligible.

As far as the impact on the radical dispersion is concerned, we tested two approaches to estimating \( \Gamma \): the uptake method specified by Eq. (4) and the diffusion method dictated by Eq. (5). The simulated OH radicals dissolving at the bubble surface for the argon bubble are depicted in Fig. 11. It shows that while the peak concentration varies between the two methods, the general patterns are similar. Moreover, due to the dominance of recombination reactions in the radical dispersion process, there is no significant difference in the spatial distribution of the radicals, including the penetration distance. It is thus concluded that the specific choice of estimation method for the radical flux doesn’t affect the reported results significantly.

Strictly speaking, the liquid layer surrounding the bubble would be heated in the violent collapse as a result of heat diffusion from the interior hotspot. Correspondingly, the exact rates for the reactions in the radical dispersion simulation should be calculated using the local temperatures. However, for aqueous solutions under room temperatures, a detailed calculation demonstrated that the maximum temperature rise in the liquid layer is on the order of dozens of Kelvins [28]. Therefore, the thermal influence on the reaction rates is expected to be small and all the calculations are based on the ambient temperature in the present simulation. However, the thermodynamic effect is an important feature for cavitation in high-temperature conditions and should be considered in this situation. This involves solving the heat diffusion equation in the liquid region together with the mass diffusion simulation. The numerical method introduced in Section 2.3 can be applied similarly and the grids can be shared as the values of thermal and mass diffusivity are in the same order of magnitude.

The dispersion of radicals in the liquid region is severely constrained by the rapid recombination reactions. The penetration depth of the main radicals OH is around 0.2 \( \mu \text{m} \) and barely changes by the existence of the saturated gas. If the solution contains other scavenging species, this depth is expected to decrease further. This feature may explain the poor performance in some sonochemistry applications. For example, in degrading nonvolatile organic pollutants in wastewater, direct contact between the free radicals and contaminants in the liquid phase is required. The limited sphere of influence of the radicals is the main challenge for fully realizing their oxidation potential. To overcome this inherent deficiency, some strategies have been proposed to drive the pollutants closer to the bubble interface. One of the approaches is adding salts into the solution by altering the partition coefficient of organic pollutants and increasing the concentration at the bubble interface [47]. More studies in this direction are warranted to mitigate the oxidation loss by radical recombinations.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a complete numerical scheme to integrally simulate the radical production inside the bubble and dispersion in the outside liquid region. For the former purpose, the bubble dynamics model is coupled with the chemical reaction simulation through the platform Cantera. In the dispersion simulation, the diffusion–reaction equations are solved with the inputs from the production simulation. Two features of practical merits in the proposed model
have been highlighted: the ability to investigate the production mechanism for each radical species based on reaction pathway analysis, and the ability to reveal the temporal-spatial distribution of the radicals in the liquid phase. To demonstrate the applicability, the typical cases of an argon bubble and an oxygen bubble are investigated with the model. The obtained insights are summarized as follows:

1. The reactions in the collapsing bubble progress in a cascading way. The production of radicals largely depends on the initiation reaction, which in turn is determined by the initial gas species inside the bubble. Especially, the activation energy of the initiation reaction dictates the overall intensity of the radical productions.

2. For the argon bubble, the initiation reaction is the thermal dissociation of water molecules and is characterized by the high energy barrier. However, for the oxygen bubble, the reaction between the oxygen molecules and water vapor becomes the initiation step and requires a much lower energy threshold. This explains the enhanced radical productions in the oxygen bubble despite the lower collapsing temperatures.

3. The dispersion of radicals is strongly driven by the recombination reactions with a penetration distance of smaller than 0.2 μm. Explicit intermittency is noticed in the dispersion behavior in

The dissolution of radicals at the gas–liquid interface (r = R) for the oxygen bubble. The concentration of main radicals and recombination products are shown around the collapse (R = R_{min}).

Fig. 9. The dissolution of radicals at the gas–liquid interface (r = R) for the oxygen bubble. The concentration of main radicals and recombination products are shown around the collapse (R = R_{min}).

Fig. 10. The dispersion of different radicals in the liquid for the oxygen bubble: (a) OH• radicals; (b) O• atoms, and (c) HO2• atoms. For the interpretation of the results, the readers are referred to the caption of Fig. 5.
Fig. 11. The influence of the estimation method for the radical flux on the dissolution of OH* at the bubble interface for the argon bubble.
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