

Electron swarm and streamer transport across the gas–liquid interface: a comparative fluid model study

Author

Garland, NA, Simonovic, I, Boyle, GJ, Cocks, DG, Dujko, S, White, RD

Published

2018

Journal Title

Plasma Sources Science and Technology

Version

Accepted Manuscript (AM)

DOI

[10.1088/1361-6595/aae05c](https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6595/aae05c)

Rights statement

This Accepted Manuscript is available for reuse under a CC BY-NC-ND licence after the 12 month embargo period provided that all the terms of the licence are adhered to. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Downloaded from

<http://hdl.handle.net/10072/429633>

Griffith Research Online

<https://research-repository.griffith.edu.au>

Electron swarm and streamer transport across the gas-liquid interface: a comparative fluid model study

NA Garland¹, I Simonović², GJ Boyle^{1,3}, DG Cocks⁴, S Dujko² and RD White¹

1. College of Science and Engineering, James Cook University, Townsville, QLD 4811, Australia
2. Institute of Physics, University of Belgrade, Pregrevica 118, 11080 Belgrade, Serbia
3. Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron DESY, Hamburg, Germany
4. Plasma Research Laboratories, Australian National University, Canberra, 2601, ACT, Australia

E-mail: nathan.garland@my.jcu.edu.au

Abstract. In this work we present a comparative study of fluid modeling methods in order to determine a recommended procedure to describe electron transport and streamer propagation across gas-liquid interfacial regions. A test case of a cryogenic argon gas-liquid interface is simulated in this work to demonstrate applicability of the recommended procedures. The recommended non-local four moment model takes into consideration the density variation across the interface, and its associated impact on the transport properties/collisional transfer rates, as well as the spatial variation of the dielectric permittivity and the conduction band through the liquid binding energy, V_0 . The study examines the impacts of various assumptions involved in the modeling of electron transport across the plasma-liquid interface, by comparing a local field (drift-diffusion) approximation with the non-local (four moment) model, as well as a step function change in the density to actual spatially dependent density variations across the interface. We provide recommendations on necessary physical considerations needed to adequately model transport phenomena across gas-liquid interfaces.

1. Introduction

Over the last century, there has been much effort applied to furthering the understanding of plasma discharges in gases, and developing advanced predictive models for both industrial applications, including microelectronic circuit manufacture [1–3], and for understanding complex natural phenomena such as lightning [4–6]. In addition to gas discharges, there is increasing interest in modeling discharges in liquids [7, 8] to better understand processes such as underwater arc welding and plasma medicine [9–12]. At the nexus of these two extremes is the gas-liquid interface, which has been of particular interest to the plasma community due to emerging applications such as plasma medicine. While advanced models for gas discharges, and recently liquid discharges, are available [13–15] we believe there is an opportunity to unify the two extremes in order to model electron transport as a continuous process between gas and liquid. In this study we present the framework, and application, of such a model to electron transport across an argon gas-liquid interface.

Argon was chosen as the background medium for this study primarily because much work has already been done to understand electron transport in both gaseous and, recently, liquid argon [16, 17] and so the input data required for fluid models was readily available. In addition to the availability of input data, the study of electron transport over argon gas-liquid interfaces is directly applicable to the field of dual-phase particle detectors used to detect dark matter or neutrino scattering events [18–22]. In these experiments a very small reduced electric field $\approx 10^{-2} - 10^{-1}$ Td, where $1 \text{ Td} = 10^{-21} \text{ V} \cdot \text{m}^2$, is applied to a large volume of cryogenic liquid argon, or xenon, to assist in extracting electrons produced by ionization events in the liquid [22]. These electrons are extracted through the surface of the liquid, where they transport across an interface into a vapor region atop the liquid. Once in the gas phase, the current produced by the extracted electrons is amplified by multiplier grids providing stronger reduced electric fields ($\approx 10^2$ Td) to generate avalanche events. We identify this application as one that could benefit from a modeling framework that could provide a continuous simulation of electron transport out of the liquid, across the interface, and into the gas phase.

Conversely, in terms of plasma transport from gas phase to liquid, a major application is plasma medicine and plasma treatment of liquids. The importance of electron transfer and electron induced chemistry at these plasma-liquid interfaces has been well established in recent years [11, 12, 23]. Despite this importance, it has been noted that radicals, ions, and photons are primarily considered when studying plasma-liquid reactions with little attention given to electron interactions with the liquid phase [11]. We note that this present study focuses on electron transport in argon, a non-polar atomic fluid that is relatively simple when compared to complex biological tissue or even water. Despite this, we believe the methodology and framework presented in this study presents an important first step towards simulating more complicated plasma-liquid interactions.

In order to model charged particle transport between gas and liquid media, a range of methods

1
2
3
4
5 have been used in the literature. Some studies have modeled charged particle transport in gases
6 and liquids as two separate models, each including distinctly different physics, coupled by matching
7 conditions at the boundary [9, 24–27]. Alternatively, liquid interface effects have been simply treated
8 as a density and energy absorption or emission boundary condition applied to a single gas phase
9 model [10, 24, 27]. Finally, we note that there is an obvious temptation to simply use existing gas
10 phase transport models and input data, and “scale-up” the input data to liquid neutral densities in
11 order to simulate transport in liquids [24, 28]. The errors in this assumption have been addressed
12 in previous studies [16, 17, 29, 30], and in this study we demonstrate how to better accommodate
13 transport in liquids through accurate input data.
14

15
16 The aims of this comparative study were to extend a recently proposed and benchmarked higher
17 order four moment fluid model [13], as well as drift diffusion fluid models [4, 14, 15, 31, 32], to
18 simulate electron transport across gas-liquid interfaces and formulate a recommendation for best
19 practice future interfacial modeling. Interfacial considerations will be addressed by comparing the
20 types of fluid model used but also through comparison of functional form assumptions for neutral
21 density, n_0 , variation of the interface. Inclusion of gas-liquid interface effects, such as variation
22 of delocalized electron energy level, V_0 , and dielectric permittivity, ε , into the proposed modeling
23 framework will also be addressed.
24

25
26 We begin this study by briefly reviewing fluid models used for electron transport in gases and liquids
27 in Section 2 where distinctions between gas and liquid phase electron transport are highlighted. In
28 Section 3 a continuous fluid model of electron transport between gas and liquid media is proposed,
29 with modifications to include some interfacial effects discussed. The results of the proposed
30 interfacial fluid models are detailed in Section 4, with key advantages and disadvantages of each
31 model highlighted, with details of the numerical solution method employed in this study available
32 in Appendix B. Finally, in Section 5, key recommendations drawn from the results of this study
33 are made, with a focus on how to best accommodate interfacial electron transport in future fluid
34 models.
35
36
37

38 39 **2. Fluid modeling in gases and liquids**

40 41 *2.1. Fluid models for electron transport*

42
43 Fluid models have been used to describe plasma phenomena such as streamers [4, 15, 33],
44 industrial plasmas used in fabricating microelectronics [2, 34], and more recently bio-medical [23, 24]
45 applications of discharges. Fluid models are essentially continuity equations of velocity-averaged,
46 spatially varying macroscopic variables, such as particle density, momentum, and energy [4, 13–
47 15, 31] derived via velocity moments of the Boltzmann equation [13, 35]. This gives a relatively
48 straightforward macroscopic model that provides a good description of the discharge dynamics,
49
50
51

without the computational overhead of comprehensive particle based methods. Error bounds of fluid models are considered to be within 10-20% [36], and are suited to providing a “line-of-best-fit” description of charged particle properties, especially when non-trivial electron velocity distributions are present [13].

Advanced solution techniques, like Partice-in-Cell (PIC), Monte Carlo (MC) [37–39], or solutions of the Boltzmann kinetic equation [2, 4, 32, 36, 40, 41], directly yield an electron velocity distribution function (EVDF) as a function of space, velocity, and time $f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}, t)$. If electron velocity space dynamics are of importance then a particle based method should be used, in lieu of a fluid model as demonstrated in previous studies [13].

In this study we have selected three approaches to fluid modeling, and examined the results and subsequent appropriateness of each model towards describing interfacial electron transport between gas and liquid densities of liquid argon. Here we present a brief overview of the selected fluid models, with the finer details of the origins and formulations of the models deferred to previous comprehensive studies on fluid modeling specifically [4, 13–15, 31, 32].

2.1.1. Drift diffusion models The most popular approach to fluid modeling of electron transport in gaseous plasmas has traditionally been a hydrodynamic drift diffusion continuity equation (1) of the electron density, $n_e(z, t) = \int f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}, t) d\mathbf{v}$. The electron flux is obtained by assuming a steady-state of the momentum balance equation, and that the field-driven component of electron energy is much greater than the thermal contribution [15, 32, 36, 42]. The generalised one dimensional continuity equation is

$$\frac{\partial n_e}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left(n_e W + D \frac{\partial n_e}{\partial z} \right) = n_e (\nu_I - \nu_a - \nu_r), \quad (1)$$

where input data terms are the drift velocity, W , diffusion coefficient, D , and ionization/attachment/ electron-ion recombination collision rates, ν_I , ν_a , and ν_r . All input data are assumed to be functions of the local instantaneous reduced electric field, $\frac{E}{n_0}$, where E is the instantaneous electric field and n_0 is the neutral atom density.

Interpolation of steady state transport coefficients and collision rates is used to provide values for these input parameters. The steady state values are obtained from the steady state EVDF which can be found via Monte Carlo simulations [37, 43] or a multi-term kinetic solution of the Boltzmann equation [17, 30, 35, 44], given appropriate microscopic inputs of electron scattering cross sections for the target gas (see Section 2.2).

In addition to the electron continuity equation (1), continuity equations for the creation of positive, n_+ , (via ionization reactions) and negative, n_- , (via attachment reactions) ion densities are used

$$\frac{\partial n_+}{\partial t} = n_e (\nu_I - \nu_r), \text{ and } \frac{\partial n_-}{\partial t} = n_e \nu_a. \quad (2)$$

where ion transport has been neglected over the transient time scales considered in this study for ionization front propagation [4, 15] owing to the significantly reduced mobility and diffusion of molecular ions [45, 46].

Alongside the continuity equations for charged species densities (1) - (2), the space charge effects on the electric field, E , must be computed to determine any screening effects due to the creation of electrons and ions. To accommodate a spatially varying dielectric permittivity in an inhomogeneous, isotropic material we self-consistently solve

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial z} (\varepsilon_r(z) \varepsilon_0 E) = e (n_e + n_- - n_+), \quad (3)$$

$$E = -\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial z}, \quad (4)$$

where e is the elementary charge, $\varepsilon_r(z)$ and ε_0 are the fluid's relative and the vacuum dielectric permittivities respectively. Boundary conditions are supplied on the electric potential are $\varphi(0, t) = 0$ and $\varphi(L, t) = \varphi_{\text{applied}}$ where φ_{applied} is a fixed voltage to produce the desired applied electric field in the absence of space-charge contributions.

While the model described by (1) - (4) has been traditionally used to describe charged particle transport within gases, the functional form of the model has been demonstrated to be applicable to describe transport within liquid discharges assuming appropriate modifications to the input data are made [13]. As the neutral density increases the single-scattering assumption used for gas transport breaks down as the effects of elastic coherent scattering and electron interaction potential screening and polarization become important [17, 29, 30]. These effects are significant when the electron de Broglie wavelength is comparable to the average background particle spacing, $\lambda \sim n_0^{-\frac{1}{3}}$, which corresponds to low-energy electron scattering or scattering in very dense liquids.

Comprehensive formulations are available on how to modify gas phase electron interaction cross sections of non-polar atomic targets, such as noble liquids, to account for coherent scattering [30], and later the interaction potential screening and polarization [16, 29]. These structure modifications were implemented through a density dependent momentum transfer cross section

$$\Sigma_m(v, n_0) = 2\pi \int_0^\pi \Sigma(v, \chi, n_0) [1 - \cos \chi] \sin \chi d\chi, \quad (5)$$

where v is the incoming electron speed, χ is the electron scattering angle off the target atom, and $\Sigma(v, \chi, n_0)$ is an effective differential cross section including coherent scattering and interaction potential modifications via

$$\Sigma(v, \chi, n_0) = \tilde{\sigma}(v, \chi) S(\Delta k; n_0), \quad (6)$$

where $\tilde{\sigma}(v, \chi)$ is the liquid phase differential cross section containing any screening and polarization effects [16, 29], $S(\Delta k; n_0)$ is the static structure factor and $\Delta k = \frac{2m_e v}{\hbar} \sin \frac{\chi}{2}$ is the wave number proportional to the change in momentum [30], where m_e is the electron mass and \hbar is reduced

Planck's constant. The static structure factor is a non-linear function of n_0 of the target material, and may be calculated from molecular simulations, measured via experiments [29, 30, 37], or derived analytically through solutions of pair-correlation functions as per the Verlet-Weiss corrected Percus-Yevick structure factor [47]. For detailed discussion on the static structure factor, and its implementation in liquid scattering, readers are directed to previous studies [29, 30, 37].

These fundamental liquid transport studies demonstrated substantially different cross sections for liquid transport at low incoming electron energies compared to transport in gas phase, particularly in reduced momentum transfer from preferential forward scattering [16, 29]. It was shown that, while energy transfer was impacted by modifications of the cross section due to potential screening, energy transfer was not explicitly modified by including coherent elastic scattering effects [30, 31] and energy transfer due to inelastic excitation collisions is considered localized to the immediate target atom. In summary, the functional form of the balance equations used to model electron transport is the same whether transport is in gas or liquid. However, explicit modifications to include liquid phase physics must be performed [17, 30] to obtain the appropriate cross sections for computing electron transport data. If the correct cross sections are used to generate input data for either gas or liquid transport, then the drift diffusion model (1) - (2) can then be applied directly.

2.1.2. Higher order models In addition to drift diffusion fluid models, so called higher order fluid models have gained popularity for modeling charged particle transport in plasmas [4, 13, 35, 48]. In these models, the hierarchy of velocity moments of Boltzmann's equation is not truncated at the electron flux, but often extends to include four continuity equations for electron density, n_e , electron particle flux, $\Gamma = n_e \langle \mathbf{v} \rangle = \int f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}, t) \mathbf{v} d\mathbf{v}$, electron mean energy density, $n_\epsilon = n_e \langle \epsilon \rangle = \int f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}, t) \frac{1}{2} m v^2 d\mathbf{v}$, and electron energy flux, $\Gamma_\epsilon = n_e \langle \xi \rangle = \int f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}, t) \frac{1}{2} m v^2 \mathbf{v} d\mathbf{v}$, where $\langle \mathbf{v} \rangle$, $\langle \epsilon \rangle$, and $\langle \xi \rangle$ denote the electron average velocity, average energy, and average energy flux. Following the formulation of a four moment higher order model benchmarked in gas and liquid transport [13], we employ the following generalised model equations, in addition to the ion continuity equations (2),

$$\frac{\partial n_e}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial z} = n_e (\nu_I \langle \epsilon \rangle - \nu_a \langle \epsilon \rangle - \nu_r \langle \epsilon \rangle), \quad (7)$$

$$\frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (n_e \theta_m \langle \epsilon \rangle) + n_e \frac{e}{m_e} E = -\Gamma \nu_m \langle \epsilon \rangle, \quad (8)$$

$$\frac{\partial n_\epsilon}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \Gamma_\epsilon}{\partial z} + e E \Gamma = -n S_\epsilon \langle \epsilon \rangle, \quad (9)$$

$$\frac{\partial \Gamma_\epsilon}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (n \theta_\xi \langle \epsilon \rangle) + n \theta_m \langle \epsilon \rangle e E + n_\epsilon \frac{e}{m_e} E = -\Gamma_\epsilon \nu_\xi \langle \epsilon \rangle, \quad (10)$$

where input data is required via collision rates for ionization, ν_I , attachment, ν_a , electron-ion recombination, ν_r , momentum transfer, ν_m , energy transfer, S_ϵ , energy flux transfer, ν_ξ , and higher order tensor product closure approximations, θ_m , and θ_ξ .

1
2
3
4
5 In this model, the higher order moments, $\theta_m = \langle v_z v_z \rangle$ and $\theta_\xi = \langle \frac{1}{2} m v^2 v_z v_z \rangle$, are closed by
6 evaluation over the equilibrium steady-state EVDF used to also evaluate collision input rates, similar
7 to that of the input data described in Section 2.1.1. While we choose to specify generic expectation
8 value expressions for θ_m and θ_ξ , to facilitate computation via any particle based method, we note
9 that under the formalism of a three-term decomposition of the EVDF these expressions yield the
10 exact results presented by Becker and Loffhagen [35]. The virtues of this closure technique were
11 demonstrated previously [13] to provide a parameter free, physically sound alternative to other
12 closure assumptions, such as non-physical heat flux assumptions or parameterization in terms of
13 $\langle \epsilon \rangle$, previously used in literature [4, 13, 48].

14
15
16 The same process for generating a look-up table of steady state input data via an equilibrium
17 EVDF, described in Section 2.1.1, is used for this higher order model also. Higher order models
18 differ to drift-diffusion models because more information of electron dynamics is natively included,
19 so that phenomena such as temporal and spatial non-locality can be resolved [15]. In lieu of using
20 $\frac{E}{n_0}$ to determine input data as per the drift-diffusion model, here the electron mean energy, $\langle \epsilon \rangle$,
21 is used as the interpolating variable to determine input data at each point in space during the
22 simulation [49].

23
24
25 As discussed in Section 2.1.1, for a local field dependent model, a higher order model can also be
26 equally applicable in gas or liquid, assuming the correct modifications have been made to generate
27 accurate input data to account for liquid effects. For further details on the higher order moment
28 model used in this study we refer the reader to a recent formulation and benchmarking study [13].
29
30

31 32 *2.2. Transport data in gaseous and liquid argon*

33
34 Following the generalised fluid models presented in the previous section, we present the electron
35 scattering cross sections for gaseous and liquid argon, in addition to the resulting argon transport
36 and collision data that serves as input to the fluid models presented in Section 2.1. It should be
37 noted that this study assumes that ion transport is neglected over the timescales studied [45, 46],
38 and that, for simplicity, singly ionized molecular argon ions are only considered in this study.
39 Furthermore, electron-ion recombination and the formation of excited states are neglected in this
40 study as it was found that at the applied reduced fields used in this study, for the electron and
41 ion densities in liquid argon, the resulting recombination rates [50–54] were significant orders of
42 magnitude less than the other collisional processes considered in this work.
43
44
45

46
47 *2.2.1. Electron scattering cross sections* As this study involves both gas and liquid extremes of
48 argon we require two sets of electron scattering cross sections in order to generate input data for
49 fluid models. The gaseous argon electron scattering cross sections of Hayashi [55, 56] were used as
50 input to a multi-term solution of the Boltzmann equation [16, 17, 31] to generate input data for
51
52

1
2
3
4
5 this study. The set comprising of an elastic momentum transfer cross section (MTCS), twenty five
6 inelastic excitation cross sections, and an ionization cross section were retrieved from the online
7 database www.lxcat.net.

8
9 As recommended by recent studies of electron transport and negative planar streamer fronts in
10 atomic liquids [57, 58], liquid argon cross sections were compiled from recent works on accurate
11 low-energy liquid cross sections, combined with necessary modification of the gas phase Hayashi
12 cross sections for inelastic processes. To form the basis of the MTCS scattering cross section, the
13 low-energy (≤ 10 eV) MTCS for liquid argon proposed by Boyle et al. [16] was taken in order
14 to include the effects of coherent scattering and atomic potential screening which are critical for
15 low-energy electron scattering in dense liquids. At higher incoming electron energies, where the
16 liquid cross section converges to the gas cross section, the gaseous argon MTCS of Hayashi [55] was
17 once again used. These two elastic scattering cross sections were joined and smoothed at ~ 10 eV
18 to form a single elastic scattering cross section.

19
20 As precise measurements, or calculations, of liquid phase ionization cross sections do not exist for
21 atomic argon, a liquid argon ionization cross section was constructed by modifying the gaseous argon
22 ionization cross section as detailed in [59–62]. The liquid argon ionization threshold energy, I_{liq} , was
23 computed by modifying the gaseous argon threshold energy, $I_{\text{gas}} = 15.68$ eV, to account for dense
24 liquid effects. The known gaseous ionization cross section of Hayashi [55] was then translated to the
25 new threshold energy for liquid. The foundation and derivation of these modifications are detailed
26 in [59], and the key result relevant to this present study can be summarized by the expression
27
28
29

$$30 \quad I_{\text{liq}} = I_{\text{gas}} + P_+ + V_0 + E_{\text{val}}, \quad (11)$$

31
32 where P_+ is the ion polarization energy of the positive ion ($P_+ = -1.08$ eV for argon [59]), V_0 is the
33 energy of the delocalized electron level in the liquid i.e. the bottom of conduction band ($V_0 = -0.3$
34 eV for the liquid argon density used in this study [60]), and E_{val} is the change in energy of valence
35 bands due to condensing the gas ($E_{\text{val}} = 0.1$ eV for argon [59]). This process yields the ionization
36 threshold energy of $I_{\text{liq}} = 14.4$ eV.
37
38

39 In order to account for excitations in the liquid state, the set of inelastic atomic excitation cross
40 sections of the Hayashi database was slightly modified to form a set of excitation cross sections for
41 intermediate excitons in liquid argon [57, 58]. This is informed by the work of Laporte *et al.* [63],
42 which demonstrated that as dilute rare gases are compressed to high, liquid densities the presence
43 of atomic excitations is replaced by excitations of intermediate excitons in the liquid phase [63]. As
44 these intermediate excitons have a unique parentage, via the isolated atom's excited states [64, 65],
45 we thus approximate the cross sections for intermediate exciton excitations by cross sections of the
46 corresponding atomic excitations.
47
48

49 The threshold energies of the adopted excitation cross sections are unmodified from the atomic
50 excitations out of necessity, because complete threshold energies for excitons in liquid argon are
51

not available in the literature, especially for the optically forbidden transitions. This assumption is supported by the fact that thresholds for known intermediate excitons in liquid rare gases (argon, krypton and xenon) are very close (within 5%) to the thresholds of atomic excitations [63, 65].

Finally, the reflectivity spectra of solid argon reported by Haensel *et al.* [66] demonstrated that lines below 14.5 eV correspond to discrete excitonic states, while lines above 14.5 eV correspond to continuous interband transitions. We have therefore excluded the two atomic excitations which have thresholds above 14.5 eV (being 14.71 eV and 15.2 eV) as their energies are in the region of continuous band to band transitions. The final sets of electron scattering cross sections in both gaseous and liquid argon are shown in Figure 1.

2.2.2. Fluid model input electron transport data Using the electron scattering cross sections for both gas and liquid argon extremes (see Figure 1) equilibrium electron transport data was calculated to serve as input data for the fluid models used in this study. A multi-term solution of the Boltzmann kinetic equation [16, 17, 31] was used to calculate EVDFs over a range of reduced electric field values at 85 K, a common cryogenic temperature, near the triple point, used in argon applications and experimental studies [51, 67–69]. These velocity distribution functions were then used to calculate the flux transport coefficients necessary for input to the drift-diffusion fluid model (1). Plots of electron drift velocity, longitudinal diffusion, and ionization collision rate, used as input for (1) - (2), are shown in Figure 2; though not used as a model input, a plot of the electron mean energy as a function of reduced field is included to demonstrate key differences between gas and liquid transport.

Reduced collision rates for input to the higher order fluid model are directly computed from spatially homogeneous steady-state EVDFs found via multi-term solution of the Boltzmann equation [17], these rates are presented in Figure 3 demonstrating the variation of collision rates for momentum transfer ν_m/n_0 , energy flux transfer ν_ξ/n_0 , lumped energy loss S_ϵ/n_0 , and ionization ν_I/n_0 .

3. Modeling at the gas-liquid interface

Following the brief review of fluid modeling methods and associated input data for electrons in either gas or liquid presented in Section 2, we now discuss necessary interfacial effects that should be considered when trying to model electron transport between gas and liquid extrema as a continuous process. We consider four important factors of the gas-liquid interface model: (i) functional form of the variation in n_0 , (ii) variation of input data for fluid models across the interface, (iii) variation of the delocalised electron energy level, V_0 , across the interface, and (iv) variation of the relative dielectric permittivity, ϵ_r , across the interface. In this study we examine the effects of differing treatments of (i) the form of the interface, as well as (ii) the type of input data used in the models. The presence of spatially varying (iii) delocalised electron energy level, V_0 , and (iv) relative dielectric

permittivity, ϵ_r , are assumed fixed properties in this study as they present essential physics, induced by large atomic densities, that cannot be ignored when simulating the gas-liquid interface.

3.1. Density profile variations

In order to accurately model electron transport between a gas phase plasma and a condensed liquid, the structure of the interfacial region must be known. For this study, we assume the existence of an equilibrium interfacial density profile formed between gas and liquid phases for atomic fluids, as outlined in Figure 4. The existence of this interfacial profile in non-polar atoms, such as argon and xenon, has been probed in various molecular dynamics (MD) and Monte Carlo (MC) studies [70–73]. These simulations employ Lennard-Jones (LJ) potentials as an approximation to the atomic interaction potentials between each atom of noble liquid [70–73]. Key measurables from these studies were equilibrium liquid and vapor densities, surface tension, and interface layer thickness.

Of particular use in this study, is a commonly proposed functional form describing the interfacial atomic density variation via a hyperbolic tangent function [73, 74]

$$n_0(z) = \frac{1}{2}(n_g^{\text{eq}} + n_l^{\text{eq}}) - \frac{1}{2}(n_g^{\text{eq}} - n_l^{\text{eq}}) \tanh\left(\frac{2(z - z_{\text{int}})}{\delta_{\text{int}}}\right), \quad (12)$$

where n_g^{eq} and n_l^{eq} are the gas and liquid equilibrium densities, z_{int} is the center position of the interface, and δ_{int} is a measure of the thickness of the interface, defined as the distance between 90% and 10% of the liquid density. From previous studies conducted on the existence of noble liquid interfaces, the value of δ_{int} is around $5\sigma_{\text{LJ}}$, where $\sigma_{\text{LJ}} = 0.34$ nm is the atomic diameter [68, 70, 71, 73, 74], while the liquid-vapor density ratios ($n_l^{\text{eq}}:n_g^{\text{eq}}$) were found to vary from 200:1 up to 500:1, depending on the cut-off distance employed in the Lennard-Jones potentials [71, 73, 74].

3.2. Fluid model input data for continuum models between gas and liquid phases

With a well defined density configuration of the equilibrium interface between gas and liquid argon extremes, we now consider the effects of this density variation on the required fluid model input data. One question that we wish to probe in this study, is whether or not we must use n_0 dependent input data between gas and liquid density extremes, or if we can simply use pure gas and liquid data either side of a defined interface point, z_0 , akin to a step-function profile. One factor to consider in answering this question is the electron-neutral collisional mean free path

$$\lambda_{\text{mfp}} \approx \frac{1}{n_0\sigma}, \quad (13)$$

where n_0 is some neutral background density and σ is an electron scattering cross section. For gas, liquid, or intermediate densities, a range of mean free paths can be calculated to determine if the collisional scattering dynamics and any non-equilibrium behavior will impact transport in the

interfacial transition between gas and liquid. Typical liquid argon densities are $n_l^{\text{eq}} \approx 10^{28} \text{ m}^{-3}$ while the gas density at the equilibrium interface used in this study is roughly 300 times smaller than the liquid, resulting in mean free paths for electron scattering in liquid argon in the range 1 – 100 nm, while the corresponding mean free path range in gaseous argon is 0.3 – 30 μm . Since the equilibrium interfacial region in argon is on the order of nanometers we must consider n_0 dependence in fluid model transport data in this interfacial region.

We now appropriately label fluid models introduced in Section 2.1, and define explicitly whether n_0 dependent input data is used. Firstly, the simplest fluid model used in this study is a local-field dependent drift-diffusion model (1) - (2), utilized with n_0 dependent input data to allow for both gaseous and liquid background media. This dependence is introduced by asserting the W , D_L and ν_I input parameters of (1) - (2) are now functions of both the instantaneous reduced electric field and neutral density across the interface, $f\left(\frac{E}{n_0}\right) \rightarrow f\left(\frac{E}{n_0}, n_0\right)$. This model will henceforth be referred to as the **LFA** model.

Finally, taking the higher order model presented in (7) - (10) we recast the functional form of the input parameters such that any input parameter dependent on electron mean energy is now also a function of the neutral density $f(\langle\epsilon\rangle) \rightarrow f(\langle\epsilon\rangle, n_0)$. As this is a higher order four moment model this model will henceforth be referred to as the **4MM** model. Input data requirements accounting for the density variation for both the LFA and 4MM models are discussed and presented in Appendix A using the results of a recently proposed and benchmarked study [75].

3.3. Space-charge field \mathcal{E} spatially varying permittivity

Self-consistent solution of the electric field was performed via solution of (3) and (4) where the functional form of the spatially varying relative dielectric constant, $\epsilon_r = \epsilon_r(z)$, was specified using the same tanh function (12) used to modulate n_0 , where liquid and gaseous argon constants were taken as $\epsilon_r^l = 1.504$ and $\epsilon_r^g = 1.0005$ respectively [76].

3.4. Accommodating spatial variation of V_0 across the interface

As gas densities increase to liquid values, we need to also consider the variation in the energy of the delocalized electron level in the liquid, V_0 . This can be positive (neon, helium) or negative (argon, xenon) and is largely a function of the electron scattering length of the target atom [59, 60]. The dependence of V_0 on the neutral atomic density of argon, n_0 , demonstrates an approximate linear roll-off from 0 eV in gas down to approximately -0.3 eV at the maximum liquid density used in this study [59, 60]. Given a known equilibrium $n_0(z)$ profile, and thus an equilibrium $V_0(z)$, an effective electric field is found by differentiating $V_0(z)$, and combined with the electric field, E , computed

via (3) to yield the total electric field

$$E_{\text{total}} = E + E_{V_0}. \quad (14)$$

4. Results and discussion

Using the fluid models and input data presented in Sections 2 and 3, we present results and discussion for two prototype interfacial problems. Section 4.2 presents transient simulations of an electron swarm propagating from liquid argon into gaseous argon (left to right in this study's frame of reference). Brief results of an ionization front in gaseous argon penetrating into liquid argon (from right to left) are presented in Section 4.3. We believe it is most instructive to start investigations with essentially swarm transport in the liquid phase transitioning to gas phase, where fields and ionization rates are low, before considering cases where space-charge field considerations are important due to ionization events. To examine the impacts of electron transport experiencing a gas-liquid interface transition in cryogenic argon, we present results from (i) large macroscopic length scales to examine the overall qualitative nature of the results, and (ii) small length scales at the immediate vicinity of the interfacial region in order to examine the impact of the interface transition. Liquid to gas results of Section 4.2 are presented at early (2 ps), intermediate (15 ps), and late (50 ps) times to demonstrate the physics of electron transport over different time scales, while the gas to liquid results of Section 4.3 are taken at 50 ps. Finally, following the results of the two prototype problems (liquid to gas and gas to liquid), Section 4.4 demonstrates the distinctly different results produced by electron transport simulations that assume a simple step function interface, in lieu of the equilibrium tanh function transition proposed in this work.

4.1. Simulation conditions

An applied reduced field magnitude of $|E/n_0| = 300$ Td in gas phase, corresponding to 0.8 Td in the liquid, was applied to drive electrons into the gas-liquid interface; the appropriate sign was assigned in each simulation to drive electrons left to right or vice versa. In this study the neutral atom temperature was kept constant at $T_0 = 85$ K, a commonly used cryogenic temperature for liquid argon experiments [21, 69, 77]. The neutral density, n_0 , was varied using the tanh function interfacial density ramp (12), where $n_l^{\text{eq}} = 1.8 \times 10^{28} \text{ m}^{-3}$ was obtained from the liquid argon coexistence curve at 85 K [77]. The van der Waals radius of argon $r_{\text{Ar}} = 188$ pm was used in computation of the Percus-Yevick structure factor [30, 37, 47]. Based on previous studies of equilibrium gas-liquid interface properties found in literature [70, 71, 73, 74], the ratio of equilibrium gas density to liquid density was assumed to be $n_g^{\text{eq}} = n_l^{\text{eq}}/300$, and the 10-90 interface width, δ_{int} , was assumed to be 2 nm. Using the specified reduced field strengths, and the density profile provided by a tanh function, the initial total effective reduced electric field (14) is shown in Figure 5.

Naturally, the space-charge field effects will evolve over the course of simulations but by simply considering the initial total fields assists in understanding of the results presented in Sections 4.2 and 4.3. From the liquid to gas plot of Figure 5 it is clear that the effective field due to V_0 variation acts to impede electron transport from the liquid to the gas, while conversely it enhances electron transport into the liquid when the applied field is reversed on the right-hand plot.

Initial conditions for simulation of streamer formation and propagation were assumed as a narrow Gaussian pulse of electron/ion densities created by an arbitrary ionization event prior to the simulation start. To ensure initial conditions didn't experience immediate interfacial effects, initial charged particle densities for the liquid to gas simulation were set at $2\mu\text{m}$ from the interface and the ionization front propagating from gas to liquid was set at $100\mu\text{m}$ from the interface. Although there is no physical meaning to a mean energy in regions of zero density, the fluid model input parameters are interpolated from a mean energy value. Hence, to avoid numerical issues, we specify the initial values of mean energy, velocity and energy flux to be their steady-state values at the corresponding E/n_0 value, even in regions of zero density, as was done in previous fluid modeling studies [4, 13, 15]. At later times, when the density becomes non-zero, these fluid model parameters will then vary smoothly both spatially and temporally.

4.2. Electron transport from liquid argon into gaseous argon

Electron and ion density initial conditions of narrow Gaussian pulses were used in a simulation of electron transport across an interface, analogous to a single ionization event within a liquid argon detection chamber. Evolution of the electron density in Figure 6 shows the initial pulse of electrons diffuses very quickly, leading to electron extraction from liquid into the gas phase as electrons impinge on the interface region. Qualitatively, both models predict similar results over all times however, it is clear the 4MM model demonstrates higher rates of electron extraction from the liquid. The LFA model predicts at least twice as much charge blocking on the liquid side of the interface compared to the 4MM model. Examining the expanded interfacial region of Figure 6, we see the charge build-up at a narrow scale, with the 4MM result demonstrating two distinct roll-off gradients across the interface. To interpret this structure it is beneficial to consider the average electron velocity.

Figure 7 demonstrates that far from the interfacial region, the average electron velocity has relaxed to an equilibrium value. However, near the interface we see that initially the 4MM result predicts a large positive velocity, due to the large initial diffusive flux, and never becomes negative. In contrast, at the immediate vicinity of the interface the LFA model predicts a negative average velocity due to the blocking field contribution of the V_0 potential in liquid argon. As time continues, the magnitude of these initially large velocities decreases but their sign differences remain. As the distance over which the blocking field is applied is very small, and the time for mean energy relaxation is quite

1
2
3
4
5 long, the mean energy does not rapidly respond to the field variation. This is an example of non-
6 local electron transport that the LFA model cannot predict, but the 4MM model can. These major
7 differences in the average electron velocity at the interface are the drivers for deviations in electron
8 density results observed in Figure 6.
9

10 The top half of Figure 7 also demonstrates a short, but persistent, relaxation length on the liquid
11 side of the interface well before the interface is encountered. We believe this gradual decrease in
12 electron average velocity prior to the interface is a further demonstration of spatial non-locality
13 being predicted by the mean energy dependent model, which the LFA model simply cannot predict
14 owing to its reliance on the instantaneous electric field, shown in Figure 8. From Figure 8 we cannot
15 see a significant variation in the total E/n_0 over the lifetime of this transient simulation; this is
16 a result of the space charge effects being small compared to the applied field, as indicated in the
17 figure where we have plotted the isolated contributions of space-charge effects.
18

19 Figure 9 demonstrates the electron mean energy of the 4MM model to assist in interpreting the
20 results of the preceding figures. We can clearly see a gradual relaxation of $\langle \epsilon \rangle$ on the liquid side of
21 the interface, consistent with the observed non-local effects on electron transport in Figure 7. Far
22 from the interface the mean energy relaxes to the equilibrium value given by the value of E/n_0 in the
23 gas or liquid. We note a clear minimum in mean energy is observed at short times in the expanded
24 interface region of Figure 9 due to the relatively high transient electron flux, combining with the
25 sign change of the blocking electric field provided by the V_0 potential, as a result of the $\Gamma \cdot E$ term
26 in the energy balance equation (9). This energy reduction immediately at the interface is only present
27 at short times because of the large initial diffusive electron flux. As this large initial diffusive flux
28 subsides over time, the energy loss via the $\Gamma \cdot E$ term becomes less significant, demonstrated at 15
29 and 50 ps.
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 4.3. Electron ionization front transport from gaseous argon into liquid argon

37 We now briefly present and discuss results of directing an electron streamer front in gaseous argon
38 into liquid argon. This simulation was performed under the same conditions as the previous section,
39 apart from simply reversing the sign of the applied electric field to yield a total reduced electric
40 field configuration as shown in Figure 5. The initial condition to this simulation was provided by
41 allowing a streamer front to form in gaseous argon, before imposing a gas-liquid interface transition
42 approximately 100 μm in front of the streamer front.
43
44

45 For brevity, we present electron transport profiles after 50 ps, instead of multiple time points, in
46 Figure 10. Examining the LFA and 4MM results produced by the tanh interface assumption, we
47 see that the initial electron density of the streamer tip is transported across the interface with a
48 notable attenuation of the electron density further into the liquid. Examining the expanded view
49 of the interface, the LFA model predicts a larger charge-build up at the gas side of the interface
50
51

1
2
3
4
5 compared to the 4MM model consistent with a noticeably lower speed immediately at the interface,
6 arising from the combination of the increase in n_0 at the interface as well as space-charge screening
7 effects on E/n_0 .
8

9 When comparing the average electron velocity plot, the most distinguished point of difference
10 between the two models is the clear spatial relaxation length of $\langle v_e \rangle$ following the interface transition.
11 Results of the 4MM model indicate a decay to the equilibrium drift velocity value observed in liquid
12 argon, which demonstrates the presence of spatial non-locality which is not replicated by the LFA
13 model. Additionally, a discrepancy arises between the two models at the expanded interface scale,
14 where a smaller average velocity is produced by the LFA model as a result of a weaker reduced
15 field occurring at the gas-liquid interface. In this range, the mean energy dependent 4MM model
16 does experience a reduction in average velocity, but to a lesser extent than that found in the LFA
17 results.
18

19 Finally, to assist further in interpreting the 4MM results, the electron mean energy is presented
20 in Figure 10. Here we note that in the expanded interfacial region of Figure 10 a reduction in
21 mean energy occurs on the gas side, due to increasing collisional energy losses from an increasing
22 n_0 , however the electron mean energy experiences a slight increase over the interface due to the
23 restorative effects of the V_0 field via the $\Gamma \cdot E$ term in the energy balance equation (9). Once the
24 effects of the interface transition have subsided, the mean energy decays to the equilibrium mean
25 energy value for electrons in liquid argon with a clear relaxation length, indicating the presence of
26 non-local electron transport.
27
28
29
30

31 *4.4. Impact of step function input data*

32 To determine if using a tanh function to modulate n_0 at the interface, which necessarily requires
33 the density dependent fluid model input data, between gas and liquid extrema is actually required
34 compared to simply using a standard step function variation in the density, we repeated the
35 simulation of an ionization front propagating from gas to liquid. In this case we employed a step
36 function transition between liquid on the left and gas on the right. For brevity, we present results
37 at 50 ps in Figure 10, demonstrating the vastly different qualitative results produced by assuming
38 a step function transition.
39

40 From Figure 10, we see that by assuming a step-function with the LFA model the electron densities
41 are much higher over the macroscopic length scale. Approximately twice as many electrons are
42 transported into the liquid as compared with any of the previous results. At the narrow length scale
43 of the interface, we see the step-function LFA result actually decreases prior to the interface before
44 experiencing a sharp build up of electrons on the liquid side; this is a starkly different qualitatively
45 result compared to any of the previous results obtained using the smooth tanh function. On the
46 other hand, while the step-function 4MM results are not equal to those achieved through the tanh
47
48
49
50
51

assumption, they are very similar and produce no major deviations compared to the LFA results. The step-function LFA electron density differences are consistent with a very high average velocity at the interface, demonstrated in Figure 10, compared to any of the previous simulation results. This order of magnitude difference in the average velocity transports electrons into the liquid at a considerably higher rate compared to the results using the tanh interface assumption. This high average velocity occurs due to a large E/n_0 , produced due to the small, gaseous argon value of n_0 assumed near the interface instead of a gradually increasing value. Once again, compared to the distinctly different observations of the LFA models we see no major deviation between 4MM results, with the only noticeable difference being the discontinuity immediately at the interface. For completeness, Figure 10 also shows the electron mean energy for the 4MM models using both tanh and step-function assumptions. We see no major differences in $\langle\epsilon\rangle$ for the two results, indicating why differences between 4MM results for the other variables were minimal. Since $\langle\epsilon\rangle$ is observably insensitive to the form of interface assumptions, and demonstrably a continuous variable, we believe that it is a much more reliable variable to use when determining input data compared to E/n_0 which suffers from being explicitly related to the assumptions we impose on n_0 .

5. Conclusions

In this study we have presented results from multiple fluid models simulating (i) an electron swarm propagating from liquid argon into gaseous argon over an equilibrium interface density variation, and (ii) an electron streamer front being driven out of gaseous argon across the interface into liquid argon. We presented a method to account for large density variation from gas to liquid phase by assuming both a realistic density profile and step-function variation of n_0 in order to implement approximation rules for density dependent input transport data between gas and liquid extremes. Furthermore, we have accommodated interfacial effects of the spatial variation of both the dielectric constant, ϵ_r , through solution of Poisson's equation, and binding energy of an electron in liquid, V_0 , through an effective applied electric field.

Using the proposed methods to compare local (LFA) and non-local transport (4MM) models and their sensitivities, our key recommendation to best describe electron transport between gas and liquid densities is to adopt a mean energy dependent higher order fluid model, such as the 4MM method used in this study. This model demonstrated greater flexibility and reliability in resolving non-local physics and interfacial electron transport compared to the local field drift-diffusion model. It was demonstrated that a drift-diffusion continuity equation (LFA) model required careful treatment of input data between gas and liquid extremes by way of approximating field dependent input data for intermediate densities using a tanh function, whereas the non-local 4MM model was relatively insensitive to the functional form of n_0 variation.

In summary, this work has presented the findings of a fundamental comparative modeling study of electron transport across cryogenic argon gas-liquid interfaces. We successfully demonstrated the importance of modifying gaseous electron transport models to account for interfacial and liquid effects when considering transport at the gas-liquid interface. A key message of this study is that vastly different electron transport is produced if gas phase input data is simply scaled to liquid densities, compared to using accurate liquid phase data. While this study has focused on a simple atomic liquid-gas system, we hope that this work will stimulate further modeling and experimental efforts to benchmark and refine the work presented. By expanding on the work of this study, extensions to complex interfacial systems, like those found in plasma medicine, can eventually be made to better understand important plasma applications. Further physical processes that should be considered in interfacial modeling may include electron solvation processes in polar liquids [11, 78], and condensed phase evaporation [74].

Acknowledgments

NG, GB, DC, and RW acknowledge the financial support from the Australian Government, through the Australian Postgraduate Award, James Cook University, through the HDR Research Enhancement Scheme, and the Australian Research Council, through its Discovery and DECRA schemes. IS and SD are supported by the Grants No. OI171037 and III41011 from the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia

Appendix A. Input data at densities intermediate to the gas and liquid phases

In order accommodate $n_0(z)$ variation of input data, we have implemented an approximation method recently proposed, and benchmarked for simple atomic liquids, by Garland *et al.* [75] that seeks to approximate input transport data and collision rates as weighted combinations of the gas and liquid extreme values. This process is analogous to Blanc's Law [79], or the energy-dependent approach proposed by Chiflikian [80], used for approximating transport data in gas mixtures, where instead we now seek to describe transport at intermediate densities between two density extremes of one substance instead of mixing two distinct gases. Where necessary to account for the differences in momentum transfer for gas and liquid systems, non-linear weightings of gas and liquid extreme data are combined [75]. Using a zeroth order momentum transfer theory (MTT) approximation [31, 75, 81], the non-linear dependence is extracted via the angle-integrated structure factor evaluated at a given electron mean energy, $\langle \varepsilon \rangle$, and at a neutral atom density

$$s(\langle \varepsilon \rangle; n_0) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\pi S\left(\frac{2}{\hbar} \sqrt{2m_e \langle \varepsilon \rangle} \sin \frac{\chi}{2}; n_0\right) [1 - \cos \chi] d\chi, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where, for this work, the static structure factor, $S\left(\frac{2}{\hbar}\sqrt{2m_e\langle\varepsilon\rangle}\sin\frac{\chi}{2};n_0\right)$, is assumed to be the analytic Verlet-Weis corrected Percus-Yevick structure factor [47] which has been demonstrated to be a good approximation of atomic liquid structure [16, 29, 37, 82]. The full analytic expression is included in a preceding study [75]. When considering largely localized energy transfer due to inelastic excitations, we use simpler linear combinations of gas and liquid extrema data as this was demonstrated to provide a sufficient first-order approximation to the intermediate density's transport data because explicit modifications to the energy balance equation (9) aren't required [30, 75].

Appendix A.1. Local field dependent input data

For the LFA model the drift velocity at intermediate densities, W_{int} , is approximated as function of reduced field, $\frac{E}{n_0}$. A weighted sum of reciprocals of gas, W_g , and liquid, W_l , extreme values was used

$$\frac{1}{W_{\text{int}}\left(\frac{E}{n_0}\right)} = x_g s_{\text{int}}\left(\frac{E}{n_0}\right) \frac{1}{W_g\left(\frac{E}{n_0}\right)} + x_l \frac{s_{\text{int}}\left(\frac{E}{n_0}\right)}{s_l\left(\frac{E}{n_0}\right)} \frac{1}{W_l\left(\frac{E}{n_0}\right)}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where the density fractions, $x_{g,l}$, follow the relation

$$x_l = 1 - x_g. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

These density fractions are determined by defining the intermediate density, n_{int} , as a sum of fractions of either density extrema

$$n_{\text{int}} = x_g n_g^{\text{eq}} + x_l n_l^{\text{eq}}, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

and by combining (A.3) and (A.4) we find

$$x_g = \frac{n_l^{\text{eq}} - n_{\text{int}}}{n_l^{\text{eq}} - n_g^{\text{eq}}}. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

The approximated angle-integrated structure factor at any intermediate points is given by

$$s_{\text{int}} \approx w s_g + (1 - w) s_l, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where s_g is defined as unity for the gas, s_l for the liquid extreme is evaluated via (A.1), and to ensure the approximation is physically grounded in both the high and low energy limits, the weighting factor, w , is fixed in the low energy limit by

$$w = \frac{S_{\text{int}}(0; n_{\text{int}}) - S_l(0; n_l)}{S_g(0; n_g) - S_l(0; n_l)}, \quad (\text{A.7})$$

where $S(0; n)$ is the $\Delta k \rightarrow 0$ limit of the analytic structure factor [47], or otherwise proportional to the fluid compressibility which is a measurable input.

To demonstrate the output generated by this approximation method, we use (A.2) in conjunction with the accurate data of gas and liquid extremes described in Section 2.2, to generate a drift velocity surface, shown in Figure A1, which we interpolate onto as a function of the instantaneous $\frac{E}{n_0}$ and n_0 given at each point in space during the simulation.

We note that the reduced longitudinal diffusion coefficient $n_0 D_L$ was computed via a generalized Einstein relation (GER)[83] once the drift velocity was known via (A.2).

$$\frac{D_L^{\text{int}}}{\mu_{\text{int}}} = \frac{k_B T_0}{q} \left(1 + (1 + \Delta_{\text{int}}) \frac{\partial \ln \mu_{\text{int}}}{\partial \ln E} \right), \quad (\text{A.8})$$

where $\mu_{\text{int}} = \frac{W_{\text{int}}}{E}$ is the electron mobility derived from the drift velocity (A.2), T_0 is the neutral atom temperature, and the correction factor [83]

$$\Delta_{\text{int}} = \frac{\xi_{\text{int}}}{2k_B T_0 W_{\text{int}}}, \quad (\text{A.9})$$

where ξ_{int} is the electron heat flux which can be approximated via a similar rule as used for W_{int} via non-linear combinations of gas, ξ_g , and liquid, ξ_l , extreme values

$$\frac{1}{\xi_{\text{int}} \left(\frac{E}{n_0} \right)} = x_g s_{\text{int}} \left(\frac{E}{n_0} \right) \frac{1}{\xi_g \left(\frac{E}{n_0} \right)} + x_l \frac{s_{\text{int}} \left(\frac{E}{n_0} \right)}{s_l \left(\frac{E}{n_0} \right)} \frac{1}{\xi_l \left(\frac{E}{n_0} \right)}. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Appendix A.2. Higher order model input data

The 4MM model collision data was also approximated between gas and liquid densities with energy dependent approximation methods [75]. As an example, as was done for the drift velocity, non-linear weights taken from the angle-integrated structure factor are used to generate a sum rule using gas, $\check{\nu}_m^g$, and liquid, $\check{\nu}_m^l$, data to yield a reduced momentum transfer collision frequency at intermediate densities, $\check{\nu}_m^{\text{int}}$, evaluated at a common mean energy, $\langle \varepsilon \rangle$,

$$\check{\nu}_m^{\text{int}}(\langle \varepsilon \rangle) = x_g s_{\text{int}}(\langle \varepsilon \rangle) \check{\nu}_m^g(\langle \varepsilon \rangle) + x_l \frac{s_{\text{int}}(\langle \varepsilon \rangle)}{s_l(\langle \varepsilon \rangle)} \check{\nu}_m^l(\langle \varepsilon \rangle), \quad (\text{A.11})$$

where $\check{\nu}$ notation is used to denote a reduced collision rate scaled by n_0 . To demonstrate the application of the non-linear sum rule the reduced momentum transfer collision frequency surface generated via (A.11) is included in Figure A2, demonstrating the reduction in momentum transfer collisions as the argon density increases.

Appendix B. Numerical solution of system of hyperbolic PDEs

Numerical solution of both the LFA and higher order fluid models for electron and ion properties was achieved by a custom Flux-Corrected Transport (FCT) code [13], with explicit fourth order Runge-Kutta (RK4) time-integration used to advance forward in time [84–86]. Spatial discretization was performed via FCT by augmenting a monotonic first order upwinding scheme [87], with a second order conservative finite difference scheme. The FCT flux limiting algorithm of Boris and Book [85, 86] was used to enable resolution of sharp gradients found in ionization fronts. To account for the varying length scales present in the problems, we employed variably spaced grids, as shown in Figure B1, to allow spatial steps appropriate to liquid, gas, and interfacial regions. Given the spatial grid sizes, time step size was chosen as the smallest step computed via: (i) a Courant–Friedrichs–Lewy (CFL) condition of 0.05, or (ii) $1/20$ of the fastest collisional relaxation time. Employing both the spatial discretization of FCT and RK4 time-integration assists in avoiding excessive numerical diffusion that may be introduced as a result of small time steps due to the small CFL number.

Solution of the coupled electric field evolution was obtained via second order finite difference discretization of (3) and (4), given fixed boundary conditions for electric potential at either end of the solution domain [13]. To ensure the accuracy of this scheme, systematic benchmarking was performed by comparing numerical solutions against known analytic solutions, and ensuring particle conservation was guaranteed at each time step. Typical systems used for benchmarking are square-wave advection, Gaussian pulse advection-diffusion, and the solution of Euler’s equations for Sod’s shock-tube [84–86].

Continuous boundary conditions were implemented to allow passage of information outside of the solution domain to avoid impacting the solution. To further assist in this aim, streamer formation and propagation was performed well inside the solution domain, away from the necessary boundaries, to minimize the impact of boundary conditions.

References

- [1] Demetre J. Economou. Pulsed plasma etching for semiconductor manufacturing. *Journal of Physics D: Applied Physics*, 47(30):303001, jul 2014.
- [2] J. P. Boeuf and L. C. Pitchford. Two-dimensional model of a capacitively coupled rf discharge and comparisons with experiments in the Gaseous Electronics Conference reference reactor. *Physical Review E*, 51(2):1376–1390, 1995.
- [3] Dimitris P LyMBERopoulos and Demetre J. Economou. Two-Dimensional Self-Consistent Radio-Frequency Plasma Simulations Relevant to the Gaseous Electronics Conference Rf Reference Cell. *Journal of Research of the National Institute of Standards and Technology*, 100(4):473, 1995.

- 1
2
3
4
5 [4] S. Dujko, A. H. Markosyan, R. D. White, and U. Ebert. High-order fluid model for streamer
6 discharges: I. Derivation of model and transport data. *Journal of Physics D: Applied Physics*,
7 46(47):475202, nov 2013.
8
9 [5] R. Morrow and J. J. Lowke. Streamer propagation in air. *Journal of Physics D: Applied*
10 *Physics*, 30(4):614–627, 1997.
11
12 [6] Jianqi Qin, Victor P. Pasko, Matthew G. McHarg, and Hans C. Stenbaek-Nielsen. Plasma
13 irregularities in the d-region ionosphere in association with sprite streamer initiation. *Nature*
14 *Communications*, 5(May):1–6, 2014.
15
16 [7] Ilya Marinov, Svetlana Starikovskaia, and Antoine Rousseau. Dynamics of plasma evolution
17 in a nanosecond underwater discharge. *Journal of Physics D: Applied Physics*, 47(22):224017,
18 jun 2014.
19
20 [8] Yu Akishev, V. Karalnik, M. Medvedev, A. Petryakov, A. Shafikov, and N. Trushkin.
21 Propagation of positive streamers on the surface of shallow as well as deep tap water in wide
22 and narrow dielectric channels. *Plasma Sources Science and Technology*, 26(2), 2017.
23
24 [9] Alexander D. Lindsay, David B. Graves, and Steven C. Shannon. Fully coupled simulation of
25 the plasma liquid interface and interfacial coefficient effects. *Journal of Physics D: Applied*
26 *Physics*, 49(23):235204, jun 2016.
27
28 [10] P. J. Bruggeman, M. J. Kushner, B. R. Locke, J G E Gardeniers, W. G. Graham, D. B.
29 Graves, R C H M Hofman-Caris, D. Maric, J. P. Reid, E. Ceriani, D. Fernandez Rivas, J. E.
30 Foster, S. C. Garrick, Y. Gorbanev, S. Hamaguchi, F. Iza, H. Jablonowski, E. Klimova, J. Kolb,
31 F. Krcma, P. Lukes, Z Machala, I. Marinov, D. Mariotti, S. Mededovic Thagard, D. Minakata,
32 E. C. Neyts, J. Pawlat, Z. Lj Petrovic, R. Pflieger, S. Reuter, D. C. Schram, S. Schröter,
33 M. Shiraiwa, B. Tarabová, P. A. Tsai, J R R Verlet, T von Woedtke, K. R. Wilson, K. Yasui,
34 and G. Zvereva. Plasma-liquid interactions: a review and roadmap. *Plasma Sources Science*
35 *and Technology*, 25(5):053002, sep 2016.
36
37 [11] Davide Mariotti, Jenish Patel, Vladimir Švrček, and Paul Maguire. Plasma-liquid interactions
38 at atmospheric pressure for nanomaterials synthesis and surface engineering. *Plasma Processes*
39 *and Polymers*, 9(11-12):1074–1085, 2012.
40
41 [12] Carolyn Richmonds, Megan Witzke, Brandon Bartling, Seung Whan Lee, Jesse Wainright,
42 Chung Chiun Liu, and R. Mohan Sankaran. Electron-transfer reactions at the plasma-liquid
43 interface. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 133(44):17582–17585, 2011.
44
45 [13] N. A. Garland, D. G. Cocks, G. J. Boyle, S. Dujko, and R. D. White. Unified fluid model
46 analysis and benchmark study for electron transport in gas and liquid analogs. *Plasma Sources*
47 *Science and Technology*, 26(7):075003, jun 2017.
48
49 [14] M. M. Becker, H. Kählert, A. Sun, M. Bonitz, and D. Loffhagen. Advanced fluid modeling and
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- PIC/MCC simulations of low-pressure ccrf discharges. *Plasma Sources Science and Technology*, 26(4):044001, mar 2017.
- [15] Aram H. Markosyan, Jannis Teunissen, Saša Dujko, and Ute Ebert. Comparing plasma fluid models of different order for 1D streamer ionization fronts. *Plasma Sources Science and Technology*, 24(6):065002, oct 2015.
- [16] G. J. Boyle, R. P. McEachran, D. G. Cocks, and R. D. White. Electron scattering and transport in liquid argon. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 142(15):154507, apr 2015.
- [17] G. J. Boyle, W. J. Tattersall, D. G. Cocks, R. P. McEachran, and R. D. White. A multi-term solution of the space-time Boltzmann equation for electrons in gases and liquids. *Plasma Sources Science and Technology*, 26(2):024007, jan 2017.
- [18] D. Akimov, A. Bondar, A. Burenkov, and A. Buzulutskov. Detection of reactor antineutrino coherent scattering off nuclei with a two-phase noble gas detector. *Journal of Instrumentation*, 4(06):P06010–P06010, jun 2009.
- [19] A. Bondar, A. Buzulutskov, A. Grebenuk, D. Pavlyuchenko, R. Snopkov, and Y. Tikhonov. Two-phase argon and xenon avalanche detectors based on Gas Electron Multipliers. *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research, Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment*, 556(1):273–280, 2006.
- [20] R. Brunetti, E. Calligarich, M. Cambiaghi, F. Carbonara, A. Cocco, C. De Vecchi, R. Dolfini, A. Ereditato, G. Fiorillo, L. Grandi, G. Mangano, A. Menegolli, C. Montanari, M. Prata, A. Rappoldi, G. L. Raselli, M. Roncadelli, M. Rossella, Carlo Rubbia, R. Santorelli, and C. Vignoli. WARP liquid argon detector for dark matter survey. *New Astronomy Reviews*, 49(2 SPEC. ISS.):265–269, 2005.
- [21] S. Sangiorgio, T.H. Joshi, A. Bernstein, J. Coleman, M. Foxe, C. Hagmann, I. Jovanovic, K. Kazkaz, K. Mavrokoridis, V. Mozin, S. Pereverzev, and P. Sorensen. First demonstration of a sub-keV electron recoil energy threshold in a liquid argon ionization chamber. *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment*, 728:69–72, nov 2013.
- [22] Christian Regenfus. The argon dark matter experiment (ArDM). *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 203:99–102, 2010.
- [23] I. Adamovich, S. D. Baalrud, A. Bogaerts, P. J. Bruggeman, M. Cappelli, V. Colombo, U. Czarnetzki, U. Ebert, J. G. Eden, P. Favia, D. B. Graves, S. Hamaguchi, G. Hieftje, M. Hori, I. D. Kaganovich, U. Kortshagen, M. J. Kushner, N. J. Mason, S. Mazouffre, S. Mededovic Thagard, H-R Metelmann, A. Mizuno, E. Moreau, A. B. Murphy, B. A. Niemira, G. S. Oehrlein, Z. Lj Petrovic, L. C. Pitchford, Y-K Pu, S. Rauf, O. Sakai, S. Samukawa, S. Starikovskaia, J. Tennyson, K. Terashima, M. M. Turner, M C M van de Sanden, and A. Vardelle. The 2017

- 1
2
3
4
5 Plasma Roadmap: Low temperature plasma science and technology. *Journal of Physics D: Applied Physics*, 50(32):323001, aug 2017.
- 6
7
8 [24] Natalia Yu Babaeva, Wei Tian, and Mark J. Kushner. The interaction between plasma filaments in dielectric barrier discharges and liquid covered wounds: electric fields delivered to model platelets and cells. *Journal of Physics D: Applied Physics*, 47(23):235201, jun 2014.
- 9
10
11
12 [25] Peter Bruggeman and Christophe Leys. Non-thermal plasmas in and in contact with liquids. *Journal of Physics D: Applied Physics*, 42(5):053001, mar 2009.
- 13
14
15 [26] R. Gopalakrishnan, E. Kawamura, A. J. Lichtenberg, M. A. Lieberman, and D. B. Graves. Solvated electrons at the atmospheric pressure plasma-water anodic interface. *Journal of Physics D: Applied Physics*, 49(29):295205, 2016.
- 16
17
18 [27] Amanda M. Lietz and Mark J. Kushner. Air plasma treatment of liquid covered tissue: long timescale chemistry. *Journal of Physics D: Applied Physics*, 49(42):425204, oct 2016.
- 19
20
21 [28] Wei Tian and Mark J. Kushner. Atmospheric pressure dielectric barrier discharges interacting with liquid covered tissue. *Journal of Physics D: Applied Physics*, 47(16):165201, apr 2014.
- 22
23
24 [29] G. J. Boyle, R. P. McEachran, D. G. Cocks, M. J. Brunger, S. J. Buckman, S. Dujko, and R. D. White. Ab initio electron scattering cross-sections and transport in liquid xenon. *Journal of Physics D: Applied Physics*, 49(35):355201, sep 2016.
- 25
26
27 [30] R. D. White and R. E. Robson. Multiterm solution of a generalized Boltzmann kinetic equation for electron and positron transport in structured and soft condensed matter. *Physical Review E*, 84(3):031125, sep 2011.
- 28
29
30 [31] Robert Robson, Ronald White, and Malte Hildebrandt. *Fundamentals of Charged Particle Transport in Gases and Condensed Matter (Monograph Series in Physical Sciences)*. CRC Press, 2017.
- 31
32
33 [32] G.J.M. Hagelaar and G.M.W. Kroesen. Speeding Up Fluid Models for Gas Discharges by Implicit Treatment of the Electron Energy Source Term. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 159(1):1–12, mar 2000.
- 34
35
36 [33] U. Ebert, F. Brau, G. Derks, W. Hundsdorfer, C-Y Kao, C. Li, A. Luque, B. Meulenbroek, S. Nijdam, V. Ratushnaya, L. Schäfer, and S. Tanveer. Multiple scales in streamer discharges, with an emphasis on moving boundary approximations. *Nonlinearity*, 24(1):C1–C26, jan 2011.
- 37
38
39 [34] J Meunier, P Belenguer, and J P Boeuf. Numerical-Model of an Ac Plasma Display Panel Cell in Neon-Xenon Mixtures. *Journal of Applied Physics*, 78(2):731–745, 1995.
- 40
41
42 [35] Markus M. Becker and Detlef Loffhagen. Derivation of Moment Equations for the Theoretical Description of Electrons in Nonthermal Plasmas. *Advances in Pure Mathematics*, 03(03):343–352, 2013.
- 43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

- 1
2
3
4
5 [36] R. E. Robson, R. D. White, and Z. Lj Petrović. Colloquium : Physically based fluid modeling
6 of collisionally dominated low-temperature plasmas. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 77(4):1303–
7 1320, nov 2005.
8
9 [37] W. J. Tattersall, D. G. Cocks, G. J. Boyle, S. J. Buckman, and R. D. White. Monte Carlo
10 study of coherent scattering effects of low-energy charged particle transport in Percus-Yevick
11 liquids. *Physical Review E*, 91(4):043304, 2015.
12
13 [38] S. Dujko, R. D. White, Z. Lj Petrović, and R. E. Robson. Benchmark calculations of
14 nonconservative charged-particle swarms in dc electric and magnetic fields crossed at arbitrary
15 angles. *Physical Review E*, 81(4):046403, apr 2010.
16
17 [39] C. K. Birdsall Particle-in-Cell charged-particle simulations, Plus Monte Carlo collision with
18 neutral atom, PIC-MCC. *IEEE Transactions on Plasma Science*, 19(2):65–85, 1991.
19
20 [40] R. E. Robson, P. Nicoletopoulos, M. Hildebrandt, and R. D. White. Fundamental issues in
21 fluid modeling: Direct substitution and aliasing methods. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*,
22 137(21):214112, dec 2012.
23
24 [41] M. M. Turner, A. Derzsi, Z. Donkó, D. Eremin, S. J. Kelly, T. Lafleur, and T. Mussenbrock.
25 Simulation benchmarks for low-pressure plasmas: Capacitive discharges. *Physics of Plasmas*,
26 20(1):013507, jan 2013.
27
28 [42] M. M. Becker and D. Loffhagen. Enhanced reliability of drift-diffusion approximation for
29 electrons in fluid models for nonthermal plasmas. *AIP Advances*, 3(1):012108, jan 2013.
30
31 [43] S. Dujko, R. D. White, and Z. Lj Petrović. Monte Carlo studies of non-conservative electron
32 transport in the steady-state Townsend experiment. *Journal of Physics D: Applied Physics*,
33 41(24):245205, dec 2008.
34
35 [44] R. D. White, R. E. Robson, S. Dujko, P. Nicoletopoulos, and B. Li. Recent advances in the
36 application of Boltzmann equation and fluid equation methods to charged particle transport
37 in non-equilibrium plasmas. *Journal of Physics D: Applied Physics*, 42(19):194001, oct 2009.
38
39 [45] A. V. Phelps. Cross Sections and Swarm Coefficients for Nitrogen Ions and Neutrals in N₂
40 and Argon Ions and Neutrals in Ar for Energies from 0.1 eV to 10 keV. *Journal of Physical
41 and Chemical Reference Data*, 20(3):557–573, may 1991.
42
43 [46] Larry A. Viehland and Charles C. Kirkpatrick. Relating ion/neutral reaction rate coefficients
44 and cross-sections by accessing a database for ion transport properties. *International Journal
45 of Mass Spectrometry and Ion Processes*, 149-150(C):555–571, nov 1995.
46
47 [47] Loup Verlet and Jean-Jacques Weis. Equilibrium Theory of Simple Liquids. *Physical Review
48 A*, 5(2):939–952, 1972.
49
50 [48] A. H. Markosyan, S. Dujko, and U. Ebert. High-order fluid model for streamer discharges: II.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 Numerical solution and investigation of planar fronts. *Journal of Physics D: Applied Physics*,
6 46(47):475203, nov 2013.
7
- 8 [49] G. K. Grubert, M. M. Becker, and D. Loffhagen. Why the local-mean-energy approximation
9 should be used in hydrodynamic plasma descriptions instead of the local-field approximation.
10 *Physical Review E*, 80(3):036405, sep 2009.
11
- 12 [50] Manfred A. Biondi and Sanborn C. Brown. Measurement of Electron-Ion Recombination.
13 *Physical Review*, 76(11):1697–1700, dec 1949.
14
- 15 [51] M. Foxe, C. Hagmann, I. Jovanovic, A. Bernstein, K. Kazkaz, V. Mozin, S.V. Pereverzev,
16 S. Sangiorgio, and P. Sorensen. Low-energy (<10 keV) electron ionization and recombination
17 model for a liquid argon detector. *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research*
18 *Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment*, 771:88–92, jan
19 2015.
20
- 21 [52] S. Kubota, A. Nakamoto, T. Takahashi, T. Hamada, E. Shibamura, M. Miyajima, K. Masuda,
22 and T. Doke. Recombination luminescence in liquid argon and in liquid xenon. *Physical Review*
23 *B*, 17(6):2762–2765, 1978.
24
- 25 [53] Kyoji Shinsaka, Mitsufumi Codama, Tipaporn Srithanratana, Motohiko Yamamoto, and
26 Yoshihiko Hatano. Electron-ion recombination rate constants in gaseous, liquid, and solid
27 argon. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 88(12):7529–7536, jun 1988.
28
- 29 [54] J. Thomas and D. A. Imel. Recombination of electron-ion pairs in liquid argon and liquid
30 xenon. *Physical Review A*, 36(2):614–616, jul 1987.
31
- 32 [55] M Hayashi. *Bibliography of electron and photon cross sections with atoms and molecules*
33 *published in the 20th century - Argon*. Report NIFS-DATA-72 of the National Institute for
34 Fusion Science of Japan, 2003.
35
- 36 [56] Hayashi Database. Available online at www.lxcat.net, Retrieved on 18 Feb 2018.
37
- 38 [57] S Dujko, I Simonovic, G Boyle, R White, D Bosnjakovic, and Z Petrovic. Transport properties
39 of electrons and transition of an electron avalanche into a streamer in atomic liquids. In *APS*
40 *Gaseous Electronics Conference 2016 Abstracts*, page MW6.036, sep 2016.
- 41 [58] I Simonović, Z Lj Petrović, and S Dujko. Simulation of electron transport and negative planar
42 streamer fronts in liquid argon and liquid xenon. In *Proc. 21st Symposium on Application of*
43 *Plasma Processes (SAPP XXI)*, pages 226–230, 2017.
44
- 45 [59] Werner F. Schmidt and Eugen Illenberger. Low energy electrons in non-polar liquids.
46 *Nukleonika*, 48(2):75–82, 2003.
47
- 48 [60] C. M. Evans and G. L. Findley. Energy of the Conduction Band in Near Critical Point Fluids.
49 *Physics Research International*, 2010:1–6, 2010.
50
51

- 1
2
3
4
5 [61] U. Asaf and I. T. Steinberger. Photoconductivity and electron transport parameters in liquid
6 and solid xenon. *Physical Review B*, 10(10):4464–4468, 1974.
7
8 [62] M Miyajima, T. Takahashi, S. Konno, T. Hamada, S. Kubota, H. Shibamura, and T. Doke.
9 Average energy expended per ion pair in liquid argon. *Physical Review A*, 9(3):1438–1443, mar
10 1974.
11
12 [63] P. Laporte, J. L. Subtil, R. Reininger, V Saile, S. Bernstorff, and I. T. Steinberger. Evolution
13 of intermediate excitons in fluid argon and krypton. *Physical Review B*, 35(12):6270–6280, apr
14 1987.
15
16 [64] P. Laporte and I. T. Steinberger. Evolution of excitonic bands in fluid xenon. *Physical Review*
17 *A*, 15(6):2538–2544, jun 1977.
18
19 [65] P. Laporte, J. L. Subtil, U. Asaf, I. T. Steinberger, and S. Wind. Intermediate and Wannier
20 Excitons in Fluid Xenon. *Physical Review Letters*, 45(26):2138–2140, dec 1980.
21
22 [66] R. Haensel, G. Keitel, E. E. Koch, M. Skibowski, and P. Schreiber. Reflection Spectrum of
23 Solid Argon in the Vacuum Ultraviolet. *Physical Review Letters*, 23(20):1160–1163, nov 1969.
24
25 [67] EM Gushchin, AA Kruglov, and IM Obodovskii. Electron dynamics in condensed argon and
26 xenon. *Sov. Phys. JETP*, 55(4):650–655, 1982.
27
28 [68] M. H. Kalos, J. K. Percus, and M. Rao. Structure of a liquid-vapor interface. *Journal of*
29 *Statistical Physics*, 17(3):111–136, 1977.
30
31 [69] Bret Halpern, John Lekner, Stuart Rice, and Robert Gomer. Drift Velocity and Energy of
32 Electrons in Liquid Argon. *Physical Review*, 156(2):351–352, 1967.
33
34 [70] D. J. Lee, M. M. Telo Da Gama, and K. E. Gubbins. The vapour-liquid interface for a lennard-
35 jones model of argon-krypton mixtures. *Molecular Physics*, 53(5):1113–1130, 1984.
36
37 [71] Andrij Trokhymchuk and José Alexandre. Computer simulations of liquid/vapor interface in
38 Lennard-Jones fluids: Some questions and answers. *Journal of Chemical Physics*, 111(18):8510–
39 8523, 1999.
40
41 [72] Pan Yi, D. Poulikakos, J. Walther, and G. Yadigaroglu. Molecular dynamics simulation of
42 vaporization of an ultra-thin liquid argon layer on a surface. *International Journal of Heat and*
43 *Mass Transfer*, 45(10):2087–2100, 2002.
44
45 [73] Gustavo A Chapela, Graham Saville, Stephen M Thompson, and John S Rowlinson. Computer
46 simulation of a gas- liquid surface. Part 1. *J. Chem. Soc., Faraday Trans. 2*, 73(7):1133–1144,
47 1977.
48
49 [74] Tatsuya Ishiyama, Takeru Yano, and Shigeo Fujikawa. Molecular dynamics study of kinetic
50 boundary condition at an interface between argon vapor and its condensed phase. *Physics of*
51 *Fluids*, 16(8):2899–2906, 2004.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 [75] N A Garland, G J Boyle, D G Cocks, and R D White. Approximating the nonlinear density
6 dependence of electron transport coefficients and scattering rates across the gas-liquid interface.
7 *Plasma Sources Science and Technology*, 27(2):024002, 2018.
8
- 9 [76] Ralph L Amey and Robert H Cole. Dielectric Constants of Liquefied Noble Gases and Methane.
10 *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 40(1):146–148, jan 1964.
11
- 12 [77] H. Lippold. Isothermal Compressibility and Density of Liquid Argon and Neon Up To Pressures
13 of 1000 kg/cm². *Cryogenics*, April:112–114, 1969.
14
- 15 [78] B. Abel, U. Buck, A. L. Sobolewski, and W. Domcke. On the nature and signatures of the
16 solvated electron in water. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 14(1):22–34, 2012.
17
- 18 [79] A. Blanc. Recherches sur les mobilités des ions dans les gaz. *Journal de Physique Théorique
19 et Appliquée*, 7(1):825–839, 1908.
- 20 [80] R. V. Chiflikian. The analog of Blanc’s law for drift velocities of electrons in gas mixtures in
21 weakly ionized plasma. *Physics of Plasmas*, 2(10):3902–3909, 1995.
22
- 23 [81] G. J. Boyle, R. D. White, R. E. Robson, S. Dujko, and Z Lj Petrović. On the approximation
24 of transport properties in structured materials using momentum-transfer theory. *New Journal
25 of Physics*, 14(4):045011, apr 2012.
26
- 27 [82] J. Lekner. Motion of electrons in liquid argon. *Physical Review*, 158(1):130–137, 1967.
28
- 29 [83] RE Robson. Generalized Einstein Relation and Negative Differential Conductivity in Gases.
30 *Australian Journal of Physics*, 37(1):35, 1984.
- 31 [84] Steven T. Zalesak. The Design of Flux-Corrected Transport (FCT) Algorithms for Structured
32 Grids. In D Kuzmin, R Löhner, and S Turek, editors, *Flux-Corrected Transport*, number
33 Scientific Computation., chapter 2, pages 23–65. Springer, Dordrecht, 1 edition, 2012.
34
- 35 [85] Jay P Boris and David L Book. Flux-corrected transport. I. SHASTA, a fluid transport
36 algorithm that works. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 11(1):38–69, jan 1973.
37
- 38 [86] Steven T. Zalesak. Fully multidimensional flux-corrected transport algorithms for fluids.
39 *Journal of Computational Physics*, 31(3):335–362, 1979.
40
- 41 [87] R.C Swanson and Eli Turkel. On central-difference and upwind schemes. *Journal of
42 Computational Physics*, 101(2):292–306, aug 1992.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 1. Gas and liquid argon electron scattering cross sections utilized in this study. Gas cross section data of Hayashi [55] via www.lxcat.net. Liquid cross section data of Boyle *et al.* [16] and necessary modifications of Hayashi set detailed in Section 2.2.1.




Figure 2. Input transport data of electrons in argon for local-field dependent electron fluid models. Dashed lines denote gas transport, dotted lines denote liquid transport. (Top-left) Drift velocity versus reduced field. (Top-right) Electron mean energy versus reduced field. (Bottom-left) Longitudinal reduced diffusion coefficient versus reduced field. (Bottom-right) Reduced ionization collision rate versus reduced field.




Figure 3. Input collision rates of electrons in argon for mean energy dependent higher order fluid model. Dashed lines denote gas transport, dotted lines denote liquid transport.




Figure 4. Equilibrium argon vapor-liquid interface as determined by molecular dynamics simulations [70, 71, 73]. The approximate length of the full interface transition region as well as the 90%-10% parameter length, δ_{int} , used in this study are marked explicitly.




Figure 5. Reduced electric field profiles for applied and V_0 contributions for both simulation configurations presented. Note that symmetric logarithmic axes have been employed in this figure. The vertical dashed black line denotes the center point of the interface transition.




Figure 6. Electron density evolution for 4MM and LFA models at short, intermediate, and longer times as the electron swarm propagates from liquid to gaseous argon. Top view: Macroscopic results. Bottom view: Expanded view of interfacial results. Initial condition given by green dash-dot green line. Direction of field-driven propagation is from left to right.




Figure 7. Average electron velocity for 4MM and LFA models at short, intermediate, and longer times as the electron swarm propagates from liquid to gaseous argon. Top view: Macroscopic results. Bottom view: Expanded view of interfacial results. Initial condition given by green dash-dot green line. Direction of field-driven propagation is from left to right. Note that symmetric logarithmic axes have been employed in this figure.




Figure 8. Total E/n_0 and space-charge contribution to E/n_0 for 4MM and LFA models at short, intermediate, and longer times as the electron swarm propagates from liquid to gaseous argon. Top view: Macroscopic results. Bottom view: Expanded view of interfacial results. Note that symmetric logarithmic axes have been employed in this figure.




Figure 9. Electron mean energy for 4MM model at short, intermediate, and longer times as the electron swarm propagates from liquid to gaseous argon. Top view: Macroscopic results. Bottom view: Expanded view of interfacial results. Initial condition given by green dash-dot green line. Direction of field-driven propagation is from left to right.




Figure 10. Electron density, average velocity and mean energy for 4MM and LFA models after 50 ps of an electron streamer penetrating from gaseous to liquid argon. Results of assuming a tanh or step function interface on are shown for comparison. Top view: Macroscopic results. Bottom view: Expanded view of interfacial results. Direction of field-driven propagation is from right to left.




Figure A1. Drift velocity surface of electrons in argon as a function of $\frac{E}{n_0}$ and n_0 used to interpolate input data for LFA models.




Figure A2. Reduced momentum transfer collision frequency, $\frac{\nu_m}{n_0}$, surface of electrons in argon computed via (A.11) as a function of $\langle\epsilon\rangle$ and n_0 used to interpolate input data for the 4MM model.




Figure B1. An example of the spatially varying numerical grid steps employed in discretization of the solution domain over the interface transition region.