

Linearized instability of Couette flow in stress-power law fluids*

Krishna Kaushik Yanamundra^a, Lorenzo Fusi^b

^a*Department of Mechanical Engineering, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843, USA*

^b*Dipartimento di Matematica e Informatica “U. Dini”, Università degli Studi di Firenze, 50134, Firenze, Italy*

Abstract

This paper examines the linearized stability of plane Couette flow for stress-power law fluids, which exhibit non-monotonic stress-strain rate behavior. The constitutive model is derived from a thermodynamic framework using a non-convex rate of dissipation potential. Under velocity boundary conditions, the system may admit three steady-state solutions. Linearized stability analysis reveals that the two solutions on ascending constitutive branches are unconditionally stable, while the solution on the descending branch is unconditionally unstable. For mixed traction-velocity boundary conditions, the base state is unique. Stability depends solely on whether the prescribed traction lies on an ascending (stable) or descending (unstable) branch of the constitutive curve. The results demonstrate that flow stability in these complex fluids is fundamentally governed by both boundary conditions and constitutive non-monotonicity.

Keywords: Stress power law fluid, implicit constitutive relations, non-monotonic stress strain rate response, plane Couette flow, linear stability analysis, Orr Sommerfeld eigenvalue problem, pseudospectral collocation method, shear banding, discontinuous shear thickening

1. Introduction

The class of Stokesian fluids is defined as those fluids whose mechanical response is modeled by expressing the Cauchy stress tensor \mathbf{T} as a function of the symmetric part of the velocity gradient \mathbf{D} , i.e., $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{D})$ (see [1, 2]). While such a prescription is broad, it cannot adequately model fluids whose steady-state stress-strain rate response is non-monotonic, wherein a given strain rate may correspond to multiple stress values (see [3–7]). Such fluids also exhibit markedly different responses in stress controlled and strain rate controlled experiments. In those cases, stress can no longer be expressed as a function of the symmetric part of the velocity gradient. Moreover, since the stress (traction) is the cause and motion (kinematics)

*This work is dedicated to the memory of Prof. K. R. Rajagopal, whose guidance continues to inspire us.

the effect, prescribing the stress as a function of kinematical quantities is contrary to causality.¹

In view of this, Rajagopal [8, 9] generalized the class of constitutive relations to allow for an implicit relationship between the Cauchy stress and the symmetric part of the velocity gradient, i.e. $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{D}) = \mathbf{O}$. While this broader definition contains the class of Stokesian fluids as a special case, it also naturally accommodates models that cannot be expressed within that class, such as fluids with pressure-dependent viscosity [10], and the widely used Bingham [11] and Herschel–Bulkley [12] models. A particularly interesting subset of these implicit constitutive relations, which may be viewed as a natural complement to the classical prescription, is the class of fluids whose symmetric part of the velocity gradient \mathbf{D} is given explicitly in terms of Cauchy stress, $\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{T})$. Clearly \mathbf{f} is the inverse function of \mathbf{h} whenever an inverse exists, but the utility of this formulation lies precisely in its ability to model fluids for which \mathbf{h} is not bijective. Moreover, such a prescription is in keeping with the notion of causality.

Malek et al. [13] introduced one such constitutive relation wherein the symmetric part of the velocity gradient \mathbf{D} was prescribed as a “power-law” of the deviatoric stress. For certain parameter values, this relation becomes non-monotonic and hence non-invertible. They observed that in Couette flows velocity boundary conditions may yield one, two, or no solutions, whereas prescribing a traction boundary condition always yields a unique solution. A similar dependence on boundary conditions was reported by Srinivasan and Karra [14] for flows between eccentrically rotating disks.

Le Roux and Rajagopal [15] generalized this model to capture the S-shaped, non-monotonic steady-state stress–strain rate response observed in several experiments [3–7], a behaviour commonly associated with discontinuous shear thickening and shear banding in complex fluids (see [16, 17]). This model has since been examined in a number of flow configurations, including squeeze flow [18], flows between eccentrically rotating disks [19, 20], and pressure driven flows [21, 22].

Blechta et al. [23] and Rajagopal [24] have proposed other variants of stress power law type models which show stress limiting response. Yanamundra et al. [20] studied a generalization that encompasses many of these variants, and in the present work we derive such a generalized stress power-law model within the thermodynamic framework of Rajagopal and Srinivasa [25, 26] by constructing a rate of dissipation potential that is non-convex for a range of parameters.

The fact that these constitutive relations may admit non-unique solutions renders a stability analysis indispensable in identifying which among these states are physically admissible, and

¹For a detailed discussion on the role of causality in the development of constitutive relations, see [8, 9].

under what conditions. While some initial progress has been made in this direction, with studies examining the stability of the quiescent state and of flows past a porous plate [27, 28], much remains to be understood about the stability of non-trivial base flows.

Since many of the experiments in which the non-monotonic response was observed were conducted in cylindrical Couette geometries, it is natural to consider the stability of Taylor–Couette flow. However, Taylor–Couette flow is susceptible to a wide range of instabilities even for linearly viscous fluids [29], whereas plane Couette flow is unconditionally stable [30]. Therefore, to distinguish instabilities induced by geometry from those arising from the constitutive prescription, we consider the stability of plane Couette flow.

The organization of the paper is as follows. In §2, we present the kinematic and thermodynamic preliminaries and derive the generalized stress power–law model by maximizing the rate of entropy production subject to the second law of thermodynamics as a constraint. In §3, we introduce an appropriate scaling and non–dimensionalize the governing equations. In §4, we analyze planar Couette flow and obtain exact base–flow solutions for both velocity and traction boundary conditions. In §5, we then linearize the governing equations about these base states, and arrive at an Orr–Sommerfeld–type eigenvalue problem. The pseudospectral collocation method used for its numerical solution and the corresponding stability results are discussed in §6 and §7, respectively. Finally, in §8, we summarize the key conclusions and outline potential directions for future work.

2. Constitutive Relations

Let $\kappa_R(\mathcal{B})$ denote a stress-free reference configuration of the body \mathcal{B} , and let $\kappa_t(\mathcal{B})$ denote its configuration at current time t . The motion of the body from $\kappa_R(\mathcal{B})$ to $\kappa_t(\mathcal{B})$ is assumed to be a diffeomorphic mapping given by $\chi(\mathbf{X}, t)$, which assigns each material point \mathbf{X} in the reference configuration a position \mathbf{x} in the current configuration. The deformation gradient is defined as

$$\mathbf{F} := \frac{\partial \chi}{\partial \mathbf{X}}, \quad (2.1)$$

and the velocity of the body as

$$\mathbf{v} := \frac{\partial \chi}{\partial t}. \quad (2.2)$$

The velocity gradient \mathbf{L} and its symmetric part \mathbf{D} are then given by

$$\mathbf{L} := \frac{\partial \mathbf{v}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} = \dot{\mathbf{F}}\mathbf{F}^{-1}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{D} := \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{L} + \mathbf{L}^T). \quad (2.3)$$

Let ρ denote the mass density, ϵ the specific internal energy, η the specific entropy, θ the temperature, \mathbf{T} the Cauchy stress, and \mathbf{q} the heat flux in the current configuration κ_t . The local form of the second law of thermodynamics may be expressed as

$$\mathbf{T} \cdot \mathbf{D} - \rho \dot{\epsilon} + \rho \theta \dot{\eta} - \frac{1}{\theta} \mathbf{q} \cdot \text{grad } \theta = \zeta \geq 0, \quad (2.4)$$

where, ζ signifies the rate of entropy production per unit volume, and the dot denotes the inner product of tensors, i.e. $\mathbf{M} \cdot \mathbf{N} := \text{tr}(\mathbf{M}\mathbf{N}^T)$, $\text{tr}(\cdot)$ being the trace operator. Specific Helmholtz free energy ψ is related to the specific internal energy ϵ through a Legendre transform given by

$$\psi = \epsilon - \theta \eta. \quad (2.5)$$

Using this relation, (2.4) may be rewritten in terms of ψ as

$$\mathbf{T} \cdot \mathbf{D} - \rho \dot{\psi} - \rho \eta \dot{\theta} - \frac{1}{\theta} \mathbf{q} \cdot \text{grad } \theta = \zeta \geq 0. \quad (2.6)$$

Under the idealization that the fluid under consideration is purely viscous and therefore incapable of storing energy, the material time derivative of the free energy vanishes, i.e. $\dot{\psi} = 0$. Furthermore, if the process is assumed to be both isothermal and homothermal, the inequality (2.6) simplifies to

$$\mathbf{T} \cdot \mathbf{D} = \zeta \geq 0. \quad (2.7)$$

If we assume that the body has a uniform mass density ρ and assume that the body can only undergo isochoric deformations, then from balance of mass,

$$\text{div}(\mathbf{v}) = \text{tr}(\mathbf{D}) = 0. \quad (2.8)$$

We decompose \mathbf{T} into its spherical and deviatoric parts as

$$\mathbf{T} = \frac{1}{3} \text{tr}(\mathbf{T}) \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{S}, \quad (2.9)$$

and since \mathbf{D} is deviatoric, the inequality (2.7) further reduces to

$$\mathbf{S} \cdot \mathbf{D} = \zeta \geq 0. \quad (2.10)$$

Following Rajagopal and Srinivasa [25], we derive the constitutive relations by prescribing a specific form for the rate of dissipation, ζ , which in the present case is taken to be a function of the deviatoric part of the Cauchy stress, $\hat{\zeta}(\mathbf{S})$, and by maximizing it subject to the constraints (2.10) and $\text{tr}(\mathbf{S}) = 0$. Hence, we introduce the augmented function

$$\Phi = \hat{\zeta} + \lambda_1 (\hat{\zeta} - \mathbf{S} \cdot \mathbf{D}) + \lambda_2 (\mathbf{I} \cdot \mathbf{S}), \quad (2.11)$$

where λ_1 and λ_2 are the Lagrange multipliers. Differentiating Φ with respect to \mathbf{S} we obtain

$$\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \mathbf{S}} = (1 + \lambda_1) \frac{\partial \hat{\zeta}}{\partial \mathbf{S}} - \lambda_1 \mathbf{D} + \lambda_2 \mathbf{I} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (2.12)$$

Hence

$$\mathbf{D} = \frac{1 + \lambda_1}{\lambda_1} \frac{\partial \hat{\zeta}}{\partial \mathbf{S}} + \frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1} \mathbf{I}. \quad (2.13)$$

Taking inner product of (2.13) with \mathbf{S} gives

$$\frac{1 + \lambda_1}{\lambda_1} = \frac{\hat{\zeta}}{\frac{\partial \hat{\zeta}}{\partial \mathbf{S}} \cdot \mathbf{S}}, \quad (2.14)$$

and since $\text{tr}(\mathbf{D}) = 0$,

$$\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1} = -\frac{1 + \lambda_1}{3\lambda_1} \text{tr} \left(\frac{\partial \hat{\zeta}}{\partial \mathbf{S}} \right). \quad (2.15)$$

Let us consider the rate of dissipation potential of the form

$$\hat{\zeta}(\mathbf{S}) = \alpha \left(a + (b + \beta \text{tr}(\mathbf{S}^2))^n \right) \text{tr}(\mathbf{S}^2), \quad (2.16)$$

where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $a \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$, $b \in \{0, 1\}$, and

$$n \in \begin{cases} [-\frac{1}{2}, \infty), & b = 0 \\ (-\infty, \infty), & b = 1 \end{cases} \quad (2.17)$$

such that $\hat{\zeta}$ is always non-negative, and it is 0 only when $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{0}$, i.e. the zero tensor. The functional form (2.16) depends solely on the second principal invariant of \mathbf{S} , thereby ensuring material isotropy and invariance under Galilean transformations. The potential chosen here is noteworthy in that it is non-convex for certain material parameters. In much of the literature, for instance [25, 31–33], the dissipation potential is assumed to be strictly convex, thereby ensuring the uniqueness of the maximizer of the rate of dissipation potential, whereas in this case, when the potential is non-convex, the extremization process yields non-unique maximizers. This departure from standard assumptions allows us to model the non-monotonic response where multiple values of stress can cause the same strain rate.

Now, from (2.13) and (2.16) we get

$$\mathbf{T} = -p\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{S}, \quad (2.18a)$$

$$\mathbf{D} = \alpha \left(a + (b + \beta \text{tr}(\mathbf{S}^2))^n \right) \mathbf{S}, \quad (2.18b)$$

where p is the mechanical pressure defined as the negative of the mean normal stress.




Figure 1: Constitutive response of the generalized stress power-law model. *Left:* $\|\mathbf{D}\|$ as a function of $\|\mathbf{S}\|$ for representative values of n with $a = 0$, $\alpha = 1$, $b = 1$, $\beta = 1$. *Right:* Variation with a for $n = -2$, $\alpha = 1$, $b = 1$, $\beta = 0.1$, illustrating the emergence of non-monotonicity and the regime in which multiple solutions may arise.

Let us qualitatively analyze the model for different parametric values. For $b = 1$ as n varies the generalized stress power-law model behaves as follows:

$$n \in \begin{cases} [-\frac{1}{2}, 0) : & (2.18b) \text{ exhibits stress-thickening} \\ \{0\} : & (2.18b) \text{ reduces to a linearly viscous model} \\ (0, \infty) : & (2.18b) \text{ exhibits stress-thinning} \end{cases} \quad (2.19)$$

When $b = 1$ and $n < -\frac{1}{2}$, nature of (2.18b) depends on a as follows (Refer to Le Roux and Rajagopal [15] for proof):

$$a \in \begin{cases} \{0\} : & \text{non-monotonic with one inflection point} \\ \left(0, 2 \left(\frac{|2n+1|}{2(1-n)}\right)^{(1-n)}\right) : & \text{S-type non-monotonicity with two inflection points} \\ \left[2 \left(\frac{|2n+1|}{2(1-n)}\right)^{(1-n)}, \infty\right) : & \text{monotonically increasing} \end{cases} \quad (2.20)$$

For $b = 0$ and $n < 0$, the generalized fluidity, $\alpha_g(\|\mathbf{S}\|)$ given by $\alpha(a + (b + \beta\|\mathbf{S}\|^2)^n)$ in (2.18b) tends to ∞ as $\|\mathbf{S}\| \rightarrow 0$ behaving like an Euler fluid and asymptotically reaches $a\alpha$ as $\|\mathbf{S}\| \rightarrow \infty$, akin to a linear model. When $b = 0$, and $n \rightarrow \infty$, the model shows “stress-limiting” behaviour. In this paper, we limit our analysis to the case where \mathbf{D} varies non-monotonically with \mathbf{S} .

We solve the constitutive relation given by (2.18b) along with balance of linear momentum (neglecting body forces) given by

$$\rho \frac{d\mathbf{v}}{dt} = -\text{grad}(p) + \text{div}(\mathbf{S}) \quad (2.21)$$

where, $\frac{d}{dt}(\cdot)$ is the material time derivative.

3. Non-dimensionalization

To non-dimensionalize the governing equations, we introduce the following scaled quantities:

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\mathbf{v}} &= \frac{1}{v^*} \mathbf{v}, & \bar{\mathbf{x}} &= \frac{1}{x^*} \mathbf{x}, & \bar{t} &= \frac{v^*}{x^*} t, \\ \bar{\mathbf{S}} &= \frac{\alpha x^*}{v^*} \mathbf{S}, & \bar{\mathbf{T}} &= \frac{\alpha x^*}{v^*} \mathbf{T}, & \bar{p} &= \frac{\alpha x^*}{v^*} p, \\ \bar{\mathbf{D}} &= \frac{x^*}{v^*} \mathbf{D}, & \text{Re} &= \rho v^* x^* \alpha, & \bar{\beta} &= \left(\frac{v^*}{\alpha x^*} \right)^2 \beta.\end{aligned}$$

Here, x^* and v^* denote characteristic length and velocity scales, respectively, ρ is the density of the fluid and α is the fluidity parameter. The non-dimensional quantity $\rho \alpha v^* x^*$ can be defined as the Reynolds number (Re). The non-dimensional term $\bar{\beta}$ can then be expressed as ΓRe^2 , where

$$\Gamma = \frac{\beta}{\rho^2 \alpha^4 x^{*4}} \quad (3.1)$$

is also non-dimensional and depends only on the material and geometric parameters. Governing equations in the non-dimensional form then become (dropping the overbar)

$$\text{Re} \frac{d\mathbf{v}}{dt} = -\text{grad}(p) + \text{div}(\mathbf{S}), \quad (3.2a)$$

$$\mathbf{D} = (a + (b + \Gamma \text{Re}^2 \|\mathbf{S}\|^2)^n) \mathbf{S}. \quad (3.2b)$$

4. Planar-Couette base flow

Let us consider the flow between two parallel planes separated by a distance $2h$. We use a right-handed Cartesian frame with its origin mid-way between the planes, with the y coordinate normal to the planes and x coordinate along the planes. We then choose the characteristic length x^* as h so that domain maps to the interval $[-1, 1]$, which is convenient while using spectral methods to solve our resulting system of equations. Assuming that the base flow is planar, let us consider the following ansatz for the non-dimensional velocity $\mathbf{v}^{(b)}$ and the non-dimensional extra stress $\mathbf{S}^{(b)}$ as

$$\mathbf{v}^{(b)} = \begin{bmatrix} v_x^{(b)}(y) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{S}^{(b)} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & s_{xy}^{(b)}(y) \\ s_{xy}^{(b)}(y) & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.1)$$

It follows from the above ansatz that the velocity gradient of the base flow $\mathbf{L}^{(b)}$ can be written as

$$\mathbf{L}^{(b)} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & v_{x,y}^{(b)} \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (4.2)$$

where $(\cdot)_{,y}$ denotes derivative with respect to y . $\mathbf{L}^{(b)}$ can be decomposed into its symmetric and skew-symmetric parts $\mathbf{D}^{(b)}$ and $\mathbf{W}^{(b)}$ respectively, such that

$$\mathbf{D}^{(b)} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & v_{x,y}^{(b)} \\ v_{x,y}^{(b)} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{W}^{(b)} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & v_{x,y}^{(b)} \\ -v_{x,y}^{(b)} & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.3)$$

Assuming there is no pressure gradient, the simplified governing equations for the base flow then become -

$$2 \left(a + \left(b + 2\Gamma \text{Re}^2 s_{xy}^{(b)^2} \right)^n \right) s_{xy}^{(b)} = v_{x,y}^{(b)} \quad (4.4)$$

$$s_{xy,y}^{(b)} = 0 \quad (4.5)$$

It is straightforward to obtain an exact general solution for the above system as

$$s_{xy}^{(b)}(y) = c_1, \quad (4.6)$$

$$v_x^{(b)}(y) = 2 \left(a + \left(b + 2\Gamma \text{Re}^2 c_1^2 \right)^n \right) c_1 y + c_2. \quad (4.7)$$

Where c_1 and c_2 are constants of integration, which are to be determined from the specific boundary conditions.

4.1. Boundary Conditions

4.1.1. Case 1: Velocity Boundary Conditions

Let us consider the case where the upper plane slides with a constant velocity v_u , and the lower plate with a velocity v_l . We shall use these quantities to define a Reynolds number corresponding to the upper and lower planes as

$$\text{Re}_u = \rho \alpha h v_u, \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Re}_l = \rho \alpha h v_l. \quad (4.8)$$

If we then define our characteristic velocity scale v^* as $(v_u - v_l)$, we could express our Reynolds number as a difference of the Reynolds numbers corresponding to the top and bottom planes

$$\text{Re} = \rho \alpha h (v_u - v_l) = \text{Re}_u - \text{Re}_l. \quad (4.9)$$

The non-dimensional boundary conditions can then be expressed as

$$v_x^{(b)}|_{y=+1} = \frac{v_u}{v_u - v_l} = \frac{\text{Re}_u}{\text{Re}_u - \text{Re}_l}, \quad \text{and} \quad v_x^{(b)}|_{y=-1} = \frac{v_l}{v_u - v_l} = \frac{\text{Re}_l}{\text{Re}_u - \text{Re}_l}. \quad (4.10)$$

Using these in conjunction with (4.7) we could obtain the exact expression for the velocity profile as an affine function,

$$v_x^{(b)}(y) = \frac{1}{2} \left(y + \frac{\text{Re}_u + \text{Re}_l}{\text{Re}_u - \text{Re}_l} \right). \quad (4.11)$$

In order to find the solution for stress, we need to find the roots of the following expression

$$F(c_1) = 4 \left(a + (b + 2\Gamma \text{Re}^2 c_1^2)^n \right) c_1 = 1. \quad (4.12)$$

Depending on the material parameters, one could find anywhere between one to three roots, which we shall do numerically. We shall assess the stability of these solutions in a following section.

4.1.2. Case 2: Mixed Boundary Conditions

Let us now consider the case where the value of stress is prescribed on one of the boundaries while we prescribe velocity on the other. Without loss of generality, we assume that the stress s_u is applied on the upper plane and the lower plane slides with a constant velocity v_l . Using which we define a Reynolds number associated with the upper and lower planes as

$$\text{Re}_u = \rho \alpha^2 h^2 s_u, \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Re}_l = \rho \alpha h v_l. \quad (4.13)$$

The characteristic velocity scale v^* in this case is then defined as $(\alpha d s_u - v_l)$ and therefore the characteristic stress becomes

$$s^* = \frac{v^*}{\alpha h} = \frac{\alpha h s_u - v_l}{\alpha h} \quad (4.14)$$

we retain the definition of Reynolds number as before

$$\text{Re} = \rho \alpha h (\alpha h s_u - v_l) = \text{Re}_u - \text{Re}_l. \quad (4.15)$$

The non-dimensional boundary conditions are

$$s_{xy}^{(b)}|_{y=+1} = \frac{s_u}{s^*} = \frac{\alpha h s_u}{\alpha h s_u - v_l} = \frac{\text{Re}_u}{\text{Re}_u - \text{Re}_l}, \quad \text{and} \quad v_x^{(b)}|_{y=-1} = \frac{v_l}{v_u - v_l} = \frac{\text{Re}_l}{\text{Re}_u - \text{Re}_l}. \quad (4.16)$$

We could now use these along with (4.6) and (4.7) to determine the particular solution as

$$s_{xy}^{(b)}(y) = \frac{\text{Re}_u}{\text{Re}_u - \text{Re}_l} \quad (4.17)$$

$$v_x^{(b)}(y) = 2 \left(a + (b + 2\Gamma \text{Re}_u^2)^n \right) \frac{\text{Re}_u}{\text{Re}_u - \text{Re}_l} (y + 1) + \frac{\text{Re}_l}{\text{Re}_u - \text{Re}_l}. \quad (4.18)$$

5. Stability

Now let us assume that the perturbed flow is given by the following ansatz -

$$\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}^{(b)} + \mathbf{v}^{(p)} = \begin{bmatrix} v_x^{(b)}(y) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} v_x^{(p)}(y) \\ v_y^{(p)}(y) \end{bmatrix} e^{i(kx-st)} \quad (5.1)$$

$$\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{S}^{(b)} + \mathbf{S}^{(p)} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & s_{xy}^{(b)}(y) \\ s_{xy}^{(b)}(y) & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} s_{xx}^{(p)}(y) & s_{xy}^{(p)}(y) \\ s_{xy}^{(p)}(y) & s_{yy}^{(p)}(y) \end{bmatrix} e^{i(kx-st)} \quad (5.2)$$

$$p = p^{(b)} + p^{(p)}(y) e^{i(kx-st)} \quad (5.3)$$

The governing equations for the perturbed flow can be expressed as -

$$\operatorname{div}(\mathbf{v}^{(p)}) = 0 \quad (5.4a)$$

$$\operatorname{Re} \frac{D\mathbf{v}^{(p)}}{Dt} = -\operatorname{grad}(p^{(p)}) + \operatorname{div}(\mathbf{S}^{(p)}) \quad (5.4b)$$

$$\mathbf{D}^{(b)} + \mathbf{D}^{(p)} = \left(a + (b + \beta \|\mathbf{S}^{(b)} + \mathbf{S}^{(p)}\|^2)^n \right) (\mathbf{S}^{(b)} + \mathbf{S}^{(p)}) \quad (5.4c)$$

Assuming that the perturbations are of infinitesimal amplitude, above equations can be linearized to obtain -

$$\left(a + \left(b + 2\Gamma \operatorname{Re}^2 s_{xy}^{(b)2} \right)^n \right) s_{xx}^{(p)} = ikv_x^{(p)} \quad (5.5)$$

$$\left(a + \left(b + 2\Gamma \operatorname{Re}^2 s_{xy}^{(b)2} \right)^n + 4n\Gamma \operatorname{Re}^2 \left(b + 2\Gamma \operatorname{Re}^2 s_{xy}^{(b)2} \right)^{n-1} s_{xy}^{(b)2} \right) s_{xy}^{(p)} = \frac{\left(v_{x,y}^{(p)} + ikv_y^{(p)} \right)}{2} \quad (5.6)$$

$$\left(a + \left(b + 2\Gamma \operatorname{Re}^2 s_{xy}^{(b)2} \right)^n \right) s_{yy}^{(p)} = v_{y,y}^{(p)} \quad (5.7)$$

$$\operatorname{Re} \left(-isv_x^{(p)} + ikv_x^{(p)}v_x^{(b)} + v_y^{(p)}v_{x,y}^{(b)} \right) = -ikp^{(p)} + ks_{xx}^{(p)} + s_{xy,y}^{(p)} \quad (5.8)$$

$$\operatorname{Re} \left(-isv_y^{(p)} + ikv_x^{(b)}v_y^{(p)} \right) = -p_{,y}^{(p)} + ks_{xy}^{(p)} + s_{yy,y}^{(p)} \quad (5.9)$$

$$ikv_x^{(p)} + v_{y,y}^{(p)} = 0 \quad (5.10)$$

In order to study the temporal stability of the above system of equations, we assume that $k \in \mathbb{R}$ and $s \in \mathbb{C}$. Since we already have our basic solution for $s_{xy}^{(b)}$ and $v_x^{(b)}$ from (4.6) and (4.7), we shall define two constants

$$c_3 = \left(a + \left(b + 2\Gamma \operatorname{Re}^2 c_1^2 \right)^n \right) \quad (5.11)$$

$$c_4 = \left(a + \left(b + 2\Gamma \operatorname{Re}^2 c_1^2 \right)^n + 4n\Gamma \operatorname{Re}^2 \left(b + 2\Gamma \operatorname{Re}^2 c_1^2 \right)^{n-1} c_1^2 \right) \quad (5.12)$$

We can then express

$$s_{xx}^{(p)} = \frac{ikv_x^{(p)}}{c_3} \quad (5.13)$$

$$s_{xy}^{(p)} = \frac{\left(v_{x,y}^{(p)} + ikv_y^{(p)} \right)}{2c_4} \quad (5.14)$$

$$s_{yy}^{(p)} = \frac{v_{y,y}^{(p)}}{c_3} \quad (5.15)$$

Upon substituting in (5.8) and (5.9),

$$\operatorname{Re} \left(-isv_x^{(p)} + ikv_x^{(p)}v_x^{(b)} + v_y^{(p)}v_{x,y}^{(b)} \right) = -ikp^{(p)} - \frac{k^2v_x^{(p)}}{c_3} + \frac{\left(v_{x,yy}^{(p)} + ikv_{y,y}^{(p)} \right)}{2c_4} \quad (5.16)$$

$$\operatorname{Re} \left(-isv_y^{(p)} + ikv_x^{(b)}v_y^{(p)} \right) = -p_{,y}^{(p)} + \frac{\left(ikv_{x,y}^{(p)} - k^2v_y^{(p)} \right)}{2c_4} + \frac{v_{y,yy}^{(p)}}{c_3} \quad (5.17)$$

Multiplying (5.17) with $-ik$ and adding to the y -derivative of (5.16), we obtain

$$\operatorname{Re} \left((ikv_x^{(b)} - is)v_{x,y}^{(p)} + (k^2v_x^{(b)} - ks)v_y^{(p)} \right) = \frac{1}{2c_4}v_{x,y^{(3)}}^{(p)} + \left(\frac{k^2}{c_4} - \frac{2k^2}{c_3} \right) v_{x,y}^{(p)} + \frac{ik^3}{2c_4}v_y^{(p)}. \quad (5.18)$$

Using the continuity relation (5.10), $ikv_x^{(p)} + v_{y,y}^{(p)} = 0$, we can eliminate $v_x^{(p)}$ and write (5.18) entirely in terms of $v_y^{(p)}$ as

$$\operatorname{Re} \left(\frac{s - kv_x^{(b)}}{k} v_{y,yy}^{(p)} + (k^2v_x^{(b)} - ks) v_y^{(p)} \right) = \frac{i}{2c_4k} v_{y,y^{(4)}}^{(p)} - i \left(\frac{2k}{c_3} - \frac{k}{c_4} \right) v_{y,yy}^{(p)} + \frac{ik^3}{2c_4} v_y^{(p)}. \quad (5.19)$$

Introducing $s = km$, where $m \in \mathbb{C}$, equation (5.19) becomes

$$\operatorname{Re}(v_x^{(b)} - m) (k^2v_y^{(p)} - v_{y,yy}^{(p)}) = \frac{i}{2c_4k} v_{y,y^{(4)}}^{(p)} - i \left(\frac{2k}{c_3} - \frac{k}{c_4} \right) v_{y,yy}^{(p)} + \frac{ik^3}{2c_4} v_y^{(p)}. \quad (5.20)$$

Multiplying through by ik yields the Orr–Sommerfeld–type form

$$ik\operatorname{Re}(v_x^{(b)} - m)(k^2v_y^{(p)} - v_{y,yy}^{(p)}) = -\frac{1}{2c_4} v_{y,y^{(4)}}^{(p)} + \left(\frac{2k^2}{c_3} - \frac{k^2}{c_4} \right) v_{y,yy}^{(p)} - \frac{k^4}{2c_4} v_y^{(p)}, \quad (5.21)$$

which could then be expressed as an eigenvalue problem

$$(A_0 + mA_1) v_y^{(p)} = 0, \quad (5.22)$$

using the differential operator D

$$\begin{aligned} A_0 &= A_{00}I + A_{01}D + A_{02}D^2 + A_{03}D^3 + A_{04}D^4, \\ A_1 &= A_{10}I + A_{11}D + A_{12}D^2, \end{aligned} \quad (5.23)$$

where the coefficients are

$$\begin{aligned} A_{00} &= -ik^3\operatorname{Re} v_x^{(b)} + \frac{k^4}{2c_4}, & A_{01} &= 0, & A_{02} &= ik\operatorname{Re} v_x^{(b)} - \frac{2k^2}{c_3} + \frac{k^2}{c_4}, & A_{03} &= 0, & A_{04} &= \frac{1}{2c_4}, \\ A_{10} &= ik^3\operatorname{Re}, & A_{11} &= 0, & A_{12} &= -ik\operatorname{Re}. \end{aligned}$$

Once the eigenvalue problem (5.22) has been solved, we can write the perturbation of the transverse component of the velocity as

$$\tilde{v}_y(x, y, t) = v_y^{(p)}(y)e^{ik(x-mt)}. \quad (5.24)$$

To determine the longitudinal component

$$\tilde{v}_x(x, y, t) = v_x^{(p)}(y)e^{ik(x-mt)}. \quad (5.25)$$

we observe that, from the mass balance,

$$\tilde{v}_x(x, y, t) = \frac{i\tilde{v}_{y,y}(x, y, t)}{k}, \quad (5.26)$$

so that

$$v_x^{(p)}(y) = \frac{iv_{y,y}^{(p)}(y)}{k}. \quad (5.27)$$

We then introduce the complex stream function

$$\tilde{\psi}(x, y, t) = \psi^{(p)}(y)e^{ik(x-mt)}, \quad (5.28)$$

defined so that

$$\tilde{v}_x(x, y, t) = \tilde{\psi}_{,y}(x, y, t), \quad \tilde{v}_y(x, y, t) = -\tilde{\psi}_{,x}(x, y, t). \quad (5.29)$$

It is easily found by integration that

$$\tilde{\psi}(x, y, t) = \frac{i}{k}v_{y,y}^{(p)}(y)e^{ik(x-mt)} + \text{const}. \quad (5.30)$$

The curves $\Re(\tilde{\psi}(x, y, t)) = \text{const}$ represent the streamlines of the perturbation. The spatial period of the streamlines is $2\pi/k$.

6. Numerical Method

In the eigenvalue problem (5.22) A_0 and A_1 are linear differential operators, $v_y^{(p)}(y)$ is the eigenfunction, and $m \in \mathbb{C}$ denotes the complex eigenvalue. The problem is solved numerically using a pseudospectral collocation method based on Gauss–Lobatto points.

The computational domain is discretized by $N + 1$ collocation points $\{y_j\}_{j=0}^N$, corresponding to the Gauss–Lobatto nodes associated with Legendre (or Chebyshev) polynomials. The continuous function $v_y^{(p)}(y)$ is approximated by an interpolating polynomial,

$$v_y^{(p)}(y) \approx \sum_{j=0}^N v_y^{(p)}(y_j) \ell_j(y), \quad (6.1)$$

where $\ell_j(y)$ are the Lagrange cardinal polynomials satisfying $\ell_j(y_i) = \delta_{ij}$. The derivatives of $v_y^{(p)}(y)$ at the collocation points are computed by means of the *differentiation matrix* D , whose entries are given by $D_{ij} = \ell'_j(y_i)$. Higher-order derivatives are obtained recursively as $D^{(k)} = D^k$. Applying the pseudospectral discretization to the differential operators A_0 and A_1 yields the discrete matrices $A_0^{(N)}$ and $A_1^{(N)}$, which act on the vector of nodal values

$$\mathbf{v} = [v_0, v_1, \dots, v_N]^T, \quad v_i = v_y^{(p)}(y_i).$$

Boundary conditions are imposed by appropriately modifying the rows of the matrices or by eliminating the boundary degrees of freedom. The resulting discrete eigenvalue problem reads

$$\left(A_0^{(N)} + mA_1^{(N)}\right) \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}, \quad (6.2)$$

which is an algebraic eigenvalue problem. This system is then solved using standard numerical eigensolvers (e.g., the QZ algorithm) to obtain the discrete set of eigenvalues m_k and corresponding eigenvectors \mathbf{v}_k .

Convergence of the pseudospectral discretization is spectral for sufficiently smooth eigenfunctions, meaning that the error decreases exponentially with increasing N . The use of Gauss–Lobatto nodes ensures that the collocation points include the domain boundaries, facilitating the accurate imposition of boundary conditions.

7. Results

In this section, we present some stability results obtained from the solution of the eigenvalue problem (5.22). The spectrum of the discretized operator provides direct information on the linear stability of the system. In particular, the complex part of the computed eigenvalues determines whether small perturbations decay or grow in time. By analyzing the distribution of eigenvalues in the complex plane, we identify the stability characteristics of the base state and determine the conditions under which instability arises.

7.1. Case 1: Velocity Boundary Conditions

Let us begin by considering the case in which the velocity is prescribed on the upper wall, see section 4.1.1. This is the setting in which, depending on the imposed velocities on the upper and lower walls, three different velocity profiles may coexist. We observe that, depending on the material parameters, there exists a limited range of $Re = Re_u - Re_l$ in which three basic solutions can occur. In fact, looking at Fig. 2, which shows the function $F(c_1)$ defined in (4.12), it can be seen that, if $Re \in [Re_m, Re_M]$, there can be three solutions to equation (4.12), while outside this range there is only one. The material parameters used in the plots in Fig. 2 are $a = 0.032$, $b = 1$, $\Gamma = 10^{-3}$, $n = -1.2$ (non-monotonic constitutive equation) and $Re_m = 23$, $Re_M = 42.2$.

In Fig. 3 we show, in the (Re_l, Re_u) plane, the regions of interest for studying the stability of the basic solutions. Without loss of generality, we can restrict ourselves to the portion of the plane where $Re_u \geq Re_l$, i.e. where $Re \geq 0$ (the case $Re \leq 0$ can be obtained by symmetry). In this part of the plane, for a non-monotonic constitutive equation, we observe three distinct zones in which we have: (a) existence of only one solution (stress corresponding to the first ascending branch of the constitutive law); (b) existence of three solutions (stresses corresponding to the two ascending branches and to the descending branch of the constitutive law); (c) existence of only one solution (stress corresponding to the second ascending branch of the constitutive law).




Figure 2: Plot of the function $F(c_1)$ defined in (4.12) with $a = 0.032$, $b = 1$, $\Gamma = 10^{-3}$, $n = -1.2$ and for various Re . The range in which 3 solutions occur is (Re_m, Re_M) , with $Re_m = 23.2$ and $Re_M = 42.2$.

From Figs. 2 and 3, it is evident that the solution corresponding to the first ascending branch can exist only for (Re_l, Re_u) belonging to the region $(a) \cup (b)$. On the other hand, the solution corresponding to the third ascending branch can exist only for $(Re_l, Re_u) \in (b) \cup (c)$. Finally, the solution corresponding to the descending branch can exist only for $(Re_l, Re_u) \in (b)$.

To study the stability of the basic solutions in regions (a) , (b) , and (c) , we numerically solve the eigenvalue problem (5.22) for each pair of values (Re_l, Re_u) belonging to the aforementioned regions. In particular, we use the basic solution corresponding to the first increasing branch in region $(a) \cup (b)$, the basic solution corresponding to the decreasing branch in (b) , and the basic solution corresponding to the second increasing branch in region $(b) \cup (c)$. For simplicity, we denote these solutions as follows:

$$v_x^{(b,1)}(y) \text{ first ascending branch } (a) \cup (b), \quad (7.1)$$

$$v_x^{(b,2)}(y) \text{ descending branch } (b), \quad (7.2)$$

$$v_x^{(b,3)}(y) \text{ second ascending branch } (a) \cup (b). \quad (7.3)$$

For each basic solution we consider the eigenvalue with the largest imaginary part and define such imaginary part as $m_i(Re_l, Re_u; k; v_x^{(b,i)})$, $(i = 1, 2, 3)$. This is a real-valued function of Re_l , Re_u , k , $v_x^{(b,i)}$ plus all the material parameters appearing in the problem. We plot the function m_i in the plane (Re_l, Re_u) , more precisely in the region in which the basic solution $v_x^{(b,i)}$ is defined. We assume that the wavenumber k is fixed and equal to one (we shall see that stability results are not altered for different values of k).

In Figs. 4(i), 4(ii), 4(iii), we show the plots of the function $m_i(Re_l, Re_u; k; v_x^{(b,i)})$ correspond-




Figure 3: Regions of existence of the three solutions.

ing to the three solutions $v_x^{(b,i)}(y)$, $i = 1, 2, 3$ in the regions where they are defined. We observe that solutions $v_x^{(b,1)}(y), v_x^{(b,3)}(y)$ are unconditionally stable ($m_1, m_3 < 0$, Figs. 4(i), 4(iii)) in regions $(a) \cup (b)$ and $(b) \cup (c)$, respectively, while solution $v_x^{(b,2)}(y)$ is unconditionally unstable ($m_2 > 0$, Fig. 4(ii)) in (b) . To better highlight the region where the functions m_i are defined, in each plot we have shown the projection of the three definition domains (a) , (b) and (c) .

From the plots in Figs. 4(i), 4(ii), 4(iii), it is evident that the functions $m_i(Re_l, Re_u; k; v_x^{(b,i)})$ are constant along the lines $Re_u - Re_l = \text{const}$, that is the function m_i depends only on $Re = Re_u - Re_l$, i.e. $m_i(Re; k; v_x^{(b,i)})$. Stability/instability is thus determined (when Dirichlet boundary conditions for the velocity are applied) by the relative velocity of the upper and lower plate, not by their absolute values.

To investigate the dependence of m_i on the wavenumber k we can also study the function $m_i(Re; k; v_x^{(b,i)})$ relative to solution $v_x^{(b,i)}(y)$, for the admissible values of Re . We find that for any k the solutions $v_x^{(b,1)}(y), v_x^{(b,3)}(y)$ are unconditionally stable ($m_1, m_3 < 0$), whereas $v_x^{(b,2)}(y)$ is unconditionally unstable ($m_2 > 0$), so that stability is not influenced by the particular wavenumber.

To better study the behavior of the functions m_1 and m_3 with respect to the Reynolds number Re , we can plot the curves m_1, m_3 for fixed values of k .

The curves in Fig. 5(i) represent the functions m_i , $i = 1, 3$ in terms of Re for $k = 1$. The region between the two vertical dashed lines indicates the coexistence zone of the stable solutions 1 and 3. It is observed that the function m_1 does not tend to zero as $Re \rightarrow Re_M^-$. The same behavior occurs for the function m_3 as $Re \rightarrow Re_m^+$ (both limits are constant values,




Figure 4: $m_i(Re_l, Re_u)$ corresponding to the three base states $v_x^{(b,i)}(y)$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. States (i) and (iii), lying on the ascending branches of the constitutive curve, are unconditionally stable, whereas state (ii), associated with the descending branch, is unconditionally unstable.

not infinite). This implies that the demarcation lines between regions (a), (b), and (c) do not represent “true” marginal stability curves, since the function m_i does not vanish on those lines. We also note that in the region of coexistence m_3 is always smaller than m_1 , meaning that the third solution is always more stable² than the first one. This is in accordance with the constitutive behavior depicted in Fig. 2, in which the slope of the first solution (yellow curve) is smaller than that of the third solution, indicating that the third solution is “more viscous” than the first one and hence more stable.

In Fig. 5(ii) we plot the functions m_1, m_3 vs k for $Re = 32$, i.e. for a Reynolds number for which we have the coexistence of both solutions. We again observe that the third solution is

²By “more stable” we mean that the perturbation decays at a faster rate.




Figure 5: Plot of the functions m_1, m_3 versus (i) Re with $k = 1$ and (ii) k with $Re = 32$.

more stable than the first one. Finally, in Figs. 6(i), 6(ii) we show the streamlines $\Re(\tilde{\psi}) = \text{const}$ of the perturbation defined in (5.30) $k = 1, 6$, $Re = 80$ (third solution). We observe that the increase of k results in a stronger shearing of the fluid.




Figure 6: Streamlines $\Re(\tilde{\psi}) = \text{const}$ for two representative wavenumbers, computed for the third (stable) base state with parameters $a = 0.032$, $b = 1$, $\Gamma = 10^{-3}$, $n = -1.2$.

7.2. Case 2: Mixed Boundary Conditions

Let us now consider the case in which a stress is prescribed on the upper wall, and velocity is imposed on the lower. The stress in the fluid layer is constant and equal to the one imposed on the upper wall. The solution is now uniquely determined, since a fixed stress corresponds to a single velocity profile.

Assigning the stress on the upper wall and the velocity on the lower wall is equivalent to fixing Re_u and Re_l (and therefore $Re = Re_u - Re_l$) defined as in (4.13). In this case, there are no restrictions on Re , except for the assumption $Re \geq 0$ (the opposite case can be easily obtained by symmetry).

The prescribed stress on the upper wall is Re_u/Re and corresponds to a single value of $v_{x,y}^{(b)}$, which may lie on either one of the two ascending branches or on the descending branch of the constitutive equation. In the first case, the basic solution is unconditionally stable, whereas in the second it is unconditionally unstable.




Figure 7: $v_{x,y}^{(b)}$ vs $s_{xy}^{(b)}$, eq. (4.4). The material parameters are $n = -1.2$, $a = 0.032$, $b = 1$, $\Gamma = 10^{-3}$. $Re_l = 0$, $Re_u = 10, 35, 180$. The coordinates of the dot represent the values of the shear stress and the corresponding velocity gradient.

In Fig. 7 we show the plots of the strain rate versus stress function (4.4) for $Re_l = 0$, $Re = Re_u = 10, 35, 180$, $n = -1.2$, $a = 0.032$, $b = 1$, $\Gamma = 10^{-3}$. The point on the curve corresponds to the stress Re_u/Re applied on the top (in this case it is 1 because $Re_l = 0$). It can be observed that, depending on the applied shear stress, this point may lie on either of the two ascending branches or on the descending one. In the former case, the function $m(Re_l, Re_u; k; v_x^{(b)})$ (which is now uniquely defined, since the stress is prescribed) is strictly negative (we can easily check this solving the eigenvalue problem), indicating unconditional stability, whereas in the latter it is strictly positive, indicating unconditional instability.

In Fig. 8 we plot in the $Re_u \geq Re_l$ plane the marginal stability curves for the system with stress Re_u/Re applied on the upper wall. The material parameters are the same of Fig. 7. The blue area corresponds to the pairs (Re_l, Re_u) in which the basic solution is stable, whereas the gray area corresponds to those in which the solution is unstable. We observe that the




Figure 8: Stability diagram. Stress Re_u/Re applied on the top surface.

stability/instability regions are symmetric with respect to the line $Re_u = 0$, which allows us to limit our analysis to the portion $Re_u \geq 0$.

From the figure it can be seen that, regardless of the velocity imposed on the lower wall, there exist two critical values Re_u^1, Re_u^2 ($Re_u^1 = 22, Re_u^2 = 101$) such that, for $Re_u > 0$ outside the interval $[Re_u^1, Re_u^2]$, the basic solution is stable, whereas for $Re_u \in [Re_u^1, Re_u^2]$ the solution is unstable. Although the marginal stability curves are symmetric with respect to $Re_u = 0$, the function $m(Re_l, Re_u; k; v_x^{(b)})$ is not, meaning that the decay rate for a particular (Re_l, Re_u) is different from that of $(Re_l, -Re_u)$.

Fig. 9 shows the surface $m(Re_l, Re_u; k; v_x^{(b)})$ as a function of Re_l and k with $Re_u = 15, 125$, $n = -1.2$, $a = 0.032$, $b = 1$, $\Gamma = 10^{-3}$. It is evident that m is a non-increasing function of Re_l and exhibits a non-monotonic dependence on k . In particular, with regard to the non-monotonic behavior in k , it can be observed that the trend closely resembles that obtained in the case of a prescribed velocity at the upper wall (see Fig. 5(ii)). Furthermore, we see that when the difference $Re = Re_u - Re_l$ becomes large, the solution corresponding to a larger value of Re_u is more stable, but for small value of Re the solution relative to the smaller Re_u is more stable.

To conclude our analysis of the case with prescribed stress on the top wall we plot the streamlines $\Re(\tilde{\psi}) = const$ of the perturbation defined in (5.30) $k = 1, 6$, $Re = 15$, $Re_l = 0$, $n = -1.2$, $a = 0.032$, $b = 1$, $\Gamma = 10^{-3}$. From Figs. 10(i), 10(ii), we see that the streamlines are qualitatively similar to those of Figs. 6(i), 6(ii).




Figure 9: Function $m(Re_l, Re_u; k; v_x^{(b)})$ as a function of Re_l and k with $Re_u = 15, 125$, $n = -1.2$, $a = 0.032$, $b = 1$, $\Gamma = 10^{-3}$.




Figure 10: Streamlines $\Re(\tilde{\psi}) = \text{const}$ for two choices of the wavenumber k ($Re = 15$, $Re_l = 0$, $a = 0.032$, $b = 1$, $\Gamma = 10^{-3}$, $n = -1.2$).

8. Conclusion

In this work we derived the generalized stress power law model from the thermodynamic framework of Rajagopal and Srinivasa by constructing a rate of dissipation potential that is non-convex for a range of parameters. This approach provides a natural thermodynamic origin for constitutive relations that exhibit non-monotonic stress–strain rate behavior and may admit multiple steady state solutions. We analyzed the linearized stability of plane Couette flow for this class of fluids under both velocity and traction boundary conditions.

For velocity boundary conditions, the constitutive prescription may admit from one to three

base states depending on the value of the relative Reynolds number. When three solutions exist, the two lying on ascending portions of the constitutive curve are unconditionally stable, whereas the solution on the descending portion is unconditionally unstable. Among the two stable branches, perturbations decay more rapidly on the third branch, which may be attributed to its viscosity being higher than that of the first branch.

For traction boundary conditions the base state is unique. However, if the solution lies on the descending branch the flow is unconditionally unstable, consistent with the behavior observed under velocity-driven flow, while solutions on the ascending branches remain unconditionally stable. One might expect that, at the inflection points where the base state switches from the first to the second ascending branch, a marginally stable state would arise. However, no neutrally stable solutions were observed. A key distinction between the two boundary conditions is that, when traction is prescribed, the stability depends solely on the Reynolds number Re_u associated with the boundary on which traction is applied, and not on the relative Reynolds number. However, the Reynolds number associated with the boundary where the velocity is imposed Re_l affects the decaying rate of the perturbation.

The analysis presented here is not intended to be exhaustive and has been restricted to the S-type non-monotonic case. We have focused on the instabilities arising solely from the constitutive response in the simplest shear flow. A natural continuation is to study the stability of solutions in Taylor–Couette flow, which is of greater experimental relevance and is expected to exhibit a much richer stability behavior due to the interplay between curvature and constitutive nonlinearities.

Acknowledgements

The present work has been performed under the auspices of the Italian National Group for Mathematical Physics (GNFM-Indam). This work has been done under the framework PRIN 2022 project “Mathematical modelling of heterogeneous systems” financed by the European Union - Next Generation EU, CUP B53D23009360006/B53D23009370006, Project Code 2022MKB7MM, PNRR M4.C2.1.1.

References

- [1] G. Stokes, On the theories of the internal friction of fluids in motion, and of the equilibrium and motion of elastic solids., Transactions of the Cambridge Philosophical Society 8 (1845) 287–305.

- [2] C. Truesdell, A new definition of a fluid. i. the stokesian fluid, *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées* 29 (1950) 215–244.
- [3] P. Boltenhagen, Y. Hu, E. F. Matthys, D. J. Pine, Observation of bulk phase separation and coexistence in a sheared micellar solution, *Physical review letters* 79 (12) (1997) 2359.
- [4] E. Macias, A. Gonzalez, O. Manero, R. Gonzales-Nunez, J. F. A. Soltero, P. Attané, Flow regimes of dilute surfactant solutions, *Journal of non-newtonian fluid mechanics* 101 (1-3) (2001) 149–172.
- [5] E. Bertrand, J. Bibette, V. Schmitt, From shear thickening to shear-induced jamming, *Physical review E* 66 (6) (2002) 060401.
- [6] D. Lopez-Diaz, E. Sarmiento-Gomez, C. Garza, R. Castillo, A rheological study in the dilute regime of the worm-micelle fluid made of zwitterionic surfactant (tdps), anionic surfactant (sds), and brine, *Journal of colloid and interface science* 348 (1) (2010) 152–158.
- [7] G. M. H. Wilkins, P. D. Olmsted, Vorticity banding during the lamellar-to-onion transition in a lyotropic surfactant solution in shear flow, *The European Physical Journal E* 21 (2) (2006) 133–143.
- [8] K. R. Rajagopal, On implicit constitutive theories, *Applications of Mathematics* 48 (4) (2003) 279–319.
- [9] K. R. Rajagopal, On implicit constitutive theories for fluids, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 550 (2006) 243–249.
- [10] J. Hron, J. Málek, K. R. Rajagopal, Simple flows of fluids with pressure-dependent viscosities, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* 457 (2011) (2001) 1603–1622.
- [11] J. G. Oldroyd, A rational formulation of the equations of plastic flow for a bingham solid, in: *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, Vol. 43, Cambridge University Press, 1947, pp. 100–105.
- [12] W. H. Herschel, R. Bulkley, Konsistenzmessungen von gummi-benzollösungen, *Kolloid-Zeitschrift* 39 (4) (1926) 291–300.

- [13] J. Málek, V. Průša, K. R. Rajagopal, Generalizations of the navier–stokes fluid from a new perspective, *International Journal of Engineering Science* 48 (12) (2010) 1907–1924.
- [14] S. Srinivasan, S. Karra, Flow of “stress power-law” fluids between parallel rotating discs with distinct axes, *International Journal of Non-Linear Mechanics* 74 (2015) 73–83.
- [15] C. L. Roux, K. R. Rajagopal, Shear flows of a new class of power-law fluids, *Applications of Mathematics* 58 (2) (2013) 153–177.
- [16] P. D. Olmsted, Perspectives on shear banding in complex fluids, *Rheologica Acta* 47 (3) (2008) 283–300.
- [17] J. F. Morris, Shear thickening of concentrated suspensions: Recent developments and relation to other phenomena, *Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics* 52 (1) (2020) 121–144.
- [18] L. Fusi, A. Ballotti, Squeeze flow of stress power law fluids, *Fluids* 6 (6) (2021) 194.
- [19] L. Fusi, B. Calusi, A. Farina, K. R. Rajagopal, On the flow of a stress power-law fluid in an orthogonal rheometer, *International Journal of Non-Linear Mechanics* 149 (2023) 104306.
- [20] K. K. Yanamundra, C. C. Benjamin, K. R. Rajagopal, Flow of a colloidal solution in an orthogonal rheometer, *Physics of Fluids* 36 (4) (2024).
- [21] A. Almqvist, A. Larsson, M. Fuchs, K. R. Rajagopal, On modeling flow between adjacent surfaces where the fluid is governed by implicit algebraic constitutive relations, *Applications of Mathematics* 69 (6) (2024) 725–746.
- [22] J. P. Gomez-Constante, K. R. Rajagopal, Flow of a new class of non-newtonian fluids in tubes of non-circular cross-sections, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A* 377 (2144) (2019) 20180069.
- [23] J. Blechta, J. Málek, K. R. Rajagopal, On the classification of incompressible fluids and a mathematical analysis of the equations that govern their motion, *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis* 52 (2) (2020) 1232–1289.
- [24] K. R. Rajagopal, A review of implicit algebraic constitutive relations for describing the response of nonlinear fluids, *Comptes Rendus. Mécanique* 351 (S1) (2023) 703–720.
- [25] K. R. Rajagopal, A. R. Srinivasa, A thermodynamic framework for rate type fluid models, *Journal of Non-Newtonian Fluid Mechanics* 88 (3) (2000) 207–227.

- [26] K. R. Rajagopal, A. R. Srinivasa, On the thermodynamics of fluids defined by implicit constitutive relations, *Zeitschrift für angewandte Mathematik und Physik* 59 (4) (2008) 715–729.
- [27] K. R. Rajagopal, A note on the stability of flows of fluids whose symmetric part of the velocity gradient is a function of the stress, *Applications in Engineering Science* 8 (2021) 100072.
- [28] L. Fusi, G. Saccomandi, K. R. Rajagopal, L. Vergori, Flow past a porous plate of non-newtonian fluids with implicit shear stress shear rate relationships, *European Journal of Mechanics-B/Fluids* 92 (2022) 166–173.
- [29] G. I. Taylor, Viii. stability of a viscous liquid contained between two rotating cylinders, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Containing Papers of a Mathematical or Physical Character* 223 (605-615) (1923) 289–343.
- [30] V. A. Romanov, Stability of plane-parallel couette flow, *Functional analysis and its applications* 7 (2) (1973) 137–146.
- [31] S. Karra, K. R. Rajagopal, Development of three dimensional constitutive theories based on lower dimensional experimental data, *Applications of Mathematics* 54 (2) (2009) 147–176.
- [32] S. Karra, K. R. Rajagopal, A thermodynamic framework to develop rate-type models for fluids without instantaneous elasticity, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1007.3764* (2010).
- [33] S. Atul Narayan, K. Rajagopal, A constitutive model for wet granular materials, *Particulate Science and Technology* 39 (7) (2021) 903–910.