

LETTER | NOVEMBER 24 2025

The *natural*-conformation tensor constitutive laws

A. M. Afonso  ; J. D. Evans  ; I. L. Palhares Junior 



Physics of Fluids 37, 111706 (2025)

<https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0284330>



Articles You May Be Interested In

Numerical verification of sharp corner behavior for Giesekus and Phan-Thien–Tanner fluids

Physics of Fluids (November 2022)

On the similarities between the simplified Phan-Thien–Tanner model and the finitely extensible nonlinear elastic dumbbell (Peterlin closure) model in simple and complex flows

Physics of Fluids (March 2022)

Frame-invariant formulation of novel generalized Newtonian fluid constitutive equation for polymer melts

Physics of Fluids (September 2020)



Physics of Fluids

Special Topics Open
for Submissions

[Learn More](#)

The *natural*-conformation tensor constitutive laws

Cite as: Phys. Fluids **37**, 111706 (2025); doi: [10.1063/5.0284330](https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0284330)

Submitted: 6 June 2025 · Accepted: 2 November 2025 ·

Published Online: 24 November 2025



View Online



Export Citation



CrossMark

A. M. Afonso,^{1,a)}  J. D. Evans,^{2,b)}  and I. L. Palhares Junior^{3,c)} 

AFFILIATIONS

¹CEFT – Transport Phenomena Research Center, Faculdade de Engenharia, Universidade do Porto, Rua Dr. Roberto Frias s/n, 4200-465 Porto, Portugal

²Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Bath, Bath BA2 7AY, United Kingdom

³Departamento de Matemática e Computação, Faculdade de Ciências e Tecnologia, Universidade Estadual Paulista ‘Júlio de Mesquita Filho’, 19060-900 Presidente Prudente, Sao Paulo, Brazil

^{a)}Author to whom correspondence should be addressed: aafonso@fe.up.pt

^{b)}Electronic mail: masjde@bath.ac.uk

^{c)}Electronic mail: irineu.palhares@unesp.br

ABSTRACT

In this work, we revisit the seminal work of Renardy [M. Renardy, J. Non-Newtonian Fluid Mech. **52**(1), 91–95 (1994)] on the reformulation of the stress tensor in its “natural” basis and present a generic framework for the *natural*-conformation tensor for a large class of differential constitutive models. We show that the proposed dyadic transformation can be equated as an orthogonal transformation of the conformation tensor into a streamlined orthonormal basis given by a rotation tensor expressed in terms of the unit velocity vectors. We also show that the *natural*-conformation tensor formulation is a particular sub-case of the *kernel*-conformation tensor transformation [A. M. Afonso, F. T. Pinho, M. A. Alves, J. Non-Newtonian Fluid Mech. **167–168**, 30–37 (2012)] with the *kernel* function acting on the rotation of the eigenvectors rather than on the magnitude of the extension of the conformation tensor.

© 2025 Author(s). All article content, except where otherwise noted, is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0284330>

I. THE NATURAL BASIS TENSOR REFORMULATION

More than 30 years ago, Renardy¹ proposed a stress reformulation by representing the extra-stress tensor in its “natural” basis, rather than in Cartesian or polar coordinates. It was proposed that this “natural” basis in planar flow be aligned with the streamlines. The idea was based on the key evidence that in a flow near a reentrant corner, where the upper convected derivative dominates, the stresses are of the type $h(\psi)\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^T$, for an arbitrary $h(\psi)$ function of the stream function ψ and \mathbf{u} the velocity field. Hinch² had earlier used this exact solution to derive a local similarity solution for the Oldroyd-B model.

Following this simple observation, Renardy proposed the extra-stress tensor in its “natural” basis, aligned with streamlines. As such, the extra stress tensor \mathbf{T} is represented relative to a basis formed with the dyadic products of \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} :

$$\mathbf{T} = \lambda\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^T + \mu(\mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}^T + \mathbf{v}\mathbf{u}^T) + \nu\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^T, \quad (1)$$

where λ , μ , ν are termed the natural stress variables (or using an orthonormal basis defined by the streamline direction, s , and the normal direction, n , then the natural stress variables can be labeled as $\lambda = \tau_{ss}$,

$\mu = \tau_{sn}$, and $\nu = \tau_{nn}$). The vector \mathbf{v} is taken perpendicular to the velocity \mathbf{u} such that the determinant formed from their components is unity. Explicitly, for two-dimensional (2D) flow,

$$\mathbf{u} = (u, v), \quad \mathbf{v} = \left(-\frac{v}{u^2 + v^2}, \frac{u}{u^2 + v^2} \right). \quad (2)$$

For models such as upper convected Maxwell (UCM), a significant decoupling in the component equations for the natural stress variables takes place in steady flow. In fact, the equation for ν is decoupled from the rest. This is significant, as it is the term $\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^T$, which grows unboundedly at solid boundaries where the velocity vanishes. By keeping the equation for ν separate, it avoids the excitation of numerical discretization errors, which were found to amplify at the downstream wall of reentrant corners.³

II. THE NATURAL STRESS FORMULATION

In general flows, it is advantageous to consider the conformation tensor \mathbf{A} instead of the extra-stress tensor, using the same “natural”

basis alignment. This is apparent when considering High Weissenberg number boundary layers,^{4–6} for example. Specifically,

$$\mathbf{A} = \lambda \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^T + \mu (\mathbf{u} \mathbf{v}^T + \mathbf{v} \mathbf{u}^T) + \nu \mathbf{v} \mathbf{v}^T. \quad (3)$$

The two representations are related through $\mathbf{T} = \frac{\eta_p}{\tau_p} (\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I})$, where η_p is the polymer viscosity and τ_p its relaxation time. Evans and Oishi⁷ proposed to term (3) the Natural Stress Formulation. The use of the conformation tensor is motivated by several reasons. Primarily, it must remain positive definite, due to its representation as a variance-covariance matrix in the microstructure model. Also, for simple models such as UCM, the range of stresses are restricted due to the extra-stress being dependent on the relative strain Finger tensor.

This again manifests itself in the conformation tensor having to remain positive definite. This condition is also suffice to ensure that the UCM equations never become Hadamard unstable, i.e., catastrophically unstable to short waves.⁸ It is also beneficial in viscoelastic models where the identity term plays a significant role in the boundary layer equations at solid surfaces. This is seen in the Giesekus model for general flows at high Weissenberg numbers⁹ and specifically at reentrant corners.¹⁰ Alves *et al.*¹¹ observed that the numerical use of the natural stress formulation can alleviate numerical diffusion problems when using upwind-based schemes since the transported quantity is advected along the streamlines.

The time and spatial evolution of this conformation tensor obeys an evolution equation, represented by the following generic differential constitutive model:

$$\frac{D\mathbf{A}}{Dt} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{A}}{\partial t} + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}(\nabla \mathbf{u}) + (\nabla \mathbf{u})^T \mathbf{A} + \frac{\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{A})}{Wi} \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{A}), \quad (4)$$

where $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{A})$ is a scalar and $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{A})$ is a tensor, and both of these functions allow the definition of a specific constitutive model, such as the Oldroyd-B (UCM), PTT, or FENE-type models.¹² The Weissenberg number is defined as $Wi = \tau_p U/L$, where U and L are characteristic velocity and length scales, respectively. It is a non-dimensional parameter that measures the elasticity of a fluid, indicating the degree of anisotropy or orientation generated by the deformation.

For computational purposes, Evans and Oishi⁷ suggested a form of (3) using rescaled natural stress variables, namely,

$$\mathbf{A} = \hat{\lambda} \hat{\mathbf{u}} \hat{\mathbf{u}}^T + \hat{\mu} (\hat{\mathbf{u}} \hat{\mathbf{v}}^T + \hat{\mathbf{v}} \hat{\mathbf{u}}^T) + \hat{\nu} \hat{\mathbf{v}} \hat{\mathbf{v}}^T, \quad (5)$$

where

$$\hat{\lambda} = |\mathbf{u}|^2 \lambda, \quad \hat{\mu} = \mu, \quad \hat{\nu} = \frac{\nu}{|\mathbf{u}|^2}, \quad (6)$$

and

$$\hat{\mathbf{u}} = \frac{\mathbf{u}}{|\mathbf{u}|} = \frac{1}{|\mathbf{u}|} \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{\mathbf{v}} = \frac{\mathbf{v}}{|\mathbf{v}|} = \frac{1}{|\mathbf{u}|} \begin{pmatrix} -v \\ u \end{pmatrix}, \quad (7)$$

are unit vectors.

III. THE NATURAL-CONFORMATION TENSOR FORMULATION

In this short note, we present a generalization for the *natural*-conformation tensor formulation for a family of differential constitutive equations, following the key idea that the *natural*-conformation tensor, \mathbf{N} , can be obtained by equating the proper relation with the

conformation tensor, \mathbf{A} . Therefore, based on the original idea proposed by Renardy,¹ we can define the *natural*-conformation tensor, \mathbf{N} , as the orthogonal transformation of the conformation tensor,

$$\mathbf{N} = \mathbf{R}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{R}, \quad (8)$$

where the *natural* basis rotation tensor, \mathbf{R} , is a proper rotation tensor transforming into a streamlined orthonormal basis defined by three unitary vectors, $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$, $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$, and $\hat{\mathbf{w}}$, with $|\hat{\mathbf{u}}| = |\hat{\mathbf{v}}| = |\hat{\mathbf{w}}| = 1$, $\hat{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{v}} = 0$, and $\hat{\mathbf{u}} \times \hat{\mathbf{v}} = \hat{\mathbf{w}}$. Denoting by $\hat{\mathbf{i}}$, $\hat{\mathbf{j}}$, and $\hat{\mathbf{k}}$, the unit vectors in fixed Cartesian x , y , and z directions, we have

$$\mathbf{R} = \hat{\mathbf{u}} \hat{\mathbf{i}}^T + \hat{\mathbf{v}} \hat{\mathbf{j}}^T + \hat{\mathbf{w}} \hat{\mathbf{k}}^T. \quad (9)$$

The *natural* basis rotation tensor, \mathbf{R} , is a real, orthogonal matrix, with columns represented by unit vectors, it belongs to the special orthogonal group with dimensions three, such as $\mathbf{R}^T = \mathbf{R}^{-1}$, $\mathbf{R}^T \mathbf{R} = \mathbf{R} \mathbf{R}^T = \mathbf{I}$, and $\det \mathbf{R} = +1$. We can use this property and perform the material derivative on both sides of $\mathbf{R}^T \mathbf{R} = \mathbf{I}$, obtaining $\frac{D\mathbf{R}^T}{Dt} \mathbf{R} + \mathbf{R}^T \frac{D\mathbf{R}}{Dt} = \mathbf{0}$, which indicates that $\boldsymbol{\Omega} = \frac{D\mathbf{R}^T}{Dt} \mathbf{R}$ is a skew-symmetric tensor satisfying $\boldsymbol{\Omega} + \boldsymbol{\Omega}^T = \mathbf{0}$.

The *natural* conformation tensor differential constitutive model can be derived by equating the material derivative in relation (8) and using the generic differential constitutive model for the conformation tensor of Eq. (4), to obtain

$$\frac{D\mathbf{N}}{Dt} = \mathbf{N} \widetilde{\nabla \mathbf{u}} + \widetilde{\nabla \mathbf{u}}^T \mathbf{N} + \frac{\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{N})}{Wi} \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{N}), \quad (10)$$

where the *natural* velocity gradient tensor is defined by $\widetilde{\nabla \mathbf{u}} = \mathbf{R}^T \nabla \mathbf{u} \mathbf{R} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}$ and $\widetilde{\nabla \mathbf{u}}^T = \mathbf{R}^T \nabla \mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{R} + \boldsymbol{\Omega}$. The *natural* velocity gradient tensor can be related to a symmetric *natural* rate of strain tensor, $\widetilde{\mathbf{D}} = \frac{1}{2} [\widetilde{\nabla \mathbf{u}} + \widetilde{\nabla \mathbf{u}}^T] = \mathbf{R}^T \frac{1}{2} [\nabla \mathbf{u} + \nabla \mathbf{u}^T] \mathbf{R} = \mathbf{R}^T \mathbf{D} \mathbf{R}$, and an anti-symmetric *natural* vorticity tensor $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}} = \frac{1}{2} [\widetilde{\nabla \mathbf{u}} - \widetilde{\nabla \mathbf{u}}^T] = \mathbf{R}^T \frac{1}{2} [\nabla \mathbf{u} - \nabla \mathbf{u}^T] \mathbf{R} - \boldsymbol{\Omega} = \mathbf{R}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{R} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}$. This *natural* vorticity tensor can also be described as a form of the relative-rate-of-rotation tensor proposed by Astarita,¹³ measuring the rate of rotation of the material as measured by an observer who is fixed, not into the principal directions of the rate of strain as proposed by Astarita,¹³ but rather into the principal streamline direction. In fact, the right hand side of Eq. (10) is obtained by means of an orthogonal transformation (operated by the rotation \mathbf{R} tensor) of a Jaumann corotational derivative of the conformation tensor (operated by the spin tensor, $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$). Other pairs of *rotation/spin* corotational operators have been proved as objective tensors by Goddard and Miller¹⁴ and Dafalias,¹⁵ for example.

As final remark, if we use other orthogonal basis in Eq. (8), for instance, the set of eigenvectors of the conformation tensor itself, meaning a change in the pair *rotation/spin* defined as $\mathbf{R}|\boldsymbol{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbf{O}|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{O}}$, we obtain, by Eq. (10), the *eigendecomposed* version of Vaithianathan and Collins,¹⁶ for the diagonal tensor, $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \mathbf{O}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{O}$,

$$\frac{D\boldsymbol{\lambda}}{Dt} = \boldsymbol{\lambda} \overline{\nabla \mathbf{u}} + \overline{\nabla \mathbf{u}}^T \boldsymbol{\lambda} + \frac{\mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})}{Wi} \mathcal{H}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}), \quad (11)$$

where $\overline{\nabla \mathbf{u}} = \mathbf{O}^T \nabla \mathbf{u} \mathbf{O} - \boldsymbol{\mathcal{O}}$, and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{O}} = \frac{D\mathbf{O}^T}{Dt} \mathbf{O}$ is the corresponding spin tensor. This means that the *natural*-conformation tensor reformulation is an orthogonal operation on the eigenvectors of the conformation tensor and, therefore, can be devised as a

particular case of the *kernel*-conformation tensor transformation.¹² In the *natural* conformation tensor differential constitutive model, the *kernel* operation acts directly in the orientation of the principal directions of the eigenvectors rather than on the magnitude of the extension of the conformation tensor.

Example for 3D case: The extension to three dimensions of the *natural*-conformation tensor formulation is also simpler, and here we present the demonstration for a 3D case for the generalization of the natural conformation tensor formulation. There are infinite possibilities to define the *natural* basis rotation tensor, \mathbf{R} , in a 3D flow. One possibility to define the *natural* basis rotation tensor is to use a Frenet–Serret type of representation¹⁷ for the streamlined orthonormal basis defined by three unitary vectors, $\{\hat{\mathbf{u}} = \frac{\mathbf{u}}{|\mathbf{u}|}, \hat{\mathbf{v}} = \frac{d\hat{\mathbf{u}}/ds}{|d\hat{\mathbf{u}}/ds|}, \hat{\mathbf{w}} = \hat{\mathbf{u}} \times \hat{\mathbf{v}}\}$, defined as the unit tangent vector, the normal vector, and the binormal vector, respectively. Here, we propose a different streamlined orthonormal basis in which the plane of rotation is formed by $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{v}} = \frac{-v}{\sqrt{u^2+v^2}}\hat{\mathbf{i}} + \frac{u}{\sqrt{u^2+v^2}}\hat{\mathbf{j}} + 0\hat{\mathbf{k}}$, meaning that the axis of rotation is along a unit vector $\hat{\mathbf{w}} = \frac{\hat{\mathbf{u}} \times \hat{\mathbf{v}}}{|\hat{\mathbf{u}} \times \hat{\mathbf{v}}|}$, forming the orthonormal basis: $\{\hat{\mathbf{u}} = \frac{\mathbf{u}}{|\mathbf{u}|}, \hat{\mathbf{v}}, \hat{\mathbf{w}} = \frac{\hat{\mathbf{u}} \times \hat{\mathbf{v}}}{|\hat{\mathbf{u}} \times \hat{\mathbf{v}}|}\}$. This representation preserves the original idea from Renardy,¹ preserving the same definition for both the angle, $\theta = \arccos \frac{u}{|\mathbf{u}|}$, and the axis of rotation, $\hat{\mathbf{w}}$ (or $\hat{\mathbf{k}}$ in a 2D case). Using this representation in dyadic products (9), \mathbf{R} takes the form of

$$\mathbf{R} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{u}{|\mathbf{u}|} & \frac{-v}{\sqrt{u^2+v^2}} & \frac{-uw}{\sqrt{(uw)^2+(vw)^2+(u^2+v^2)^2}} \\ \frac{v}{|\mathbf{u}|} & \frac{u}{\sqrt{u^2+v^2}} & \frac{-vw}{\sqrt{(uw)^2+(vw)^2+(u^2+v^2)^2}} \\ \frac{w}{|\mathbf{u}|} & 0 & \frac{u^2+v^2}{\sqrt{(uw)^2+(vw)^2+(u^2+v^2)^2}} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (12)$$

with w representing the magnitude of the velocity along $\hat{\mathbf{w}}$ direction. The conformation tensor can be defined in the dyadic decomposition as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{R}\mathbf{N}\mathbf{R}^T = \mathbf{R} \begin{bmatrix} n_{11} & n_{12} & n_{13} \\ n_{12} & n_{22} & n_{23} \\ n_{13} & n_{23} & n_{33} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}^T &= \begin{bmatrix} \frac{u}{|\mathbf{u}|} & \frac{-v}{\sqrt{u^2+v^2}} & \frac{-uw}{\sqrt{(uw)^2+(vw)^2+(u^2+v^2)^2}} \\ \frac{v}{|\mathbf{u}|} & \frac{u}{\sqrt{u^2+v^2}} & \frac{-vw}{\sqrt{(uw)^2+(vw)^2+(u^2+v^2)^2}} \\ \frac{w}{|\mathbf{u}|} & 0 & \frac{u^2+v^2}{\sqrt{(uw)^2+(vw)^2+(u^2+v^2)^2}} \end{bmatrix} \\ &\times \mathbf{N} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{u}{|\mathbf{u}|} & \frac{v}{|\mathbf{u}|} & \frac{w}{|\mathbf{u}|} \\ \frac{-v}{\sqrt{u^2+v^2}} & \frac{u}{\sqrt{u^2+v^2}} & 0 \\ \frac{-uw}{\sqrt{(uw)^2+(vw)^2+(u^2+v^2)^2}} & \frac{-vw}{\sqrt{(uw)^2+(vw)^2+(u^2+v^2)^2}} & \frac{u^2+v^2}{\sqrt{(uw)^2+(vw)^2+(u^2+v^2)^2}} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= n_{11}\hat{\mathbf{u}}\hat{\mathbf{u}}^T + n_{22}\hat{\mathbf{u}}\hat{\mathbf{v}}^T + n_{33}\hat{\mathbf{w}}\hat{\mathbf{w}}^T + n_{12}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}\hat{\mathbf{v}}^T + \hat{\mathbf{v}}\hat{\mathbf{u}}^T) + n_{13}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}\hat{\mathbf{w}}^T + \hat{\mathbf{w}}\hat{\mathbf{u}}^T) + n_{23}(\hat{\mathbf{w}}\hat{\mathbf{v}}^T + \hat{\mathbf{v}}\hat{\mathbf{w}}^T). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

For the 2D case, the natural basis rotation tensor obtained from Eq. (12), takes the form

$$\mathbf{R} = \frac{1}{|\mathbf{u}|} \begin{bmatrix} u & -v & 0 \\ v & u & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & |\mathbf{u}| \end{bmatrix}, \quad (14)$$

and the conformation tensor can be expressed by

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{R} \begin{bmatrix} n_{11} & n_{12} & 0 \\ n_{12} & n_{22} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}^T = \mathbf{R} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\lambda} & \hat{\mu} & 0 \\ \hat{\mu} & \hat{\nu} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}^T = \frac{1}{|\mathbf{u}|^2} \begin{bmatrix} u & -v & 0 \\ v & u & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & |\mathbf{u}| \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\lambda} & \hat{\mu} & 0 \\ \hat{\mu} & \hat{\nu} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u & v & 0 \\ -v & u & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & |\mathbf{u}| \end{bmatrix} \quad (15)$$

$$= \frac{1}{|\mathbf{u}|^2} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\lambda} u^2 - 2\hat{\mu} uv + \hat{\nu} v^2 & \hat{\lambda} uv + \hat{\mu}(u^2 - v^2) - \hat{\nu} uv & 0 \\ \hat{\lambda} uv + \hat{\mu}(u^2 - v^2) - \hat{\nu} uv & \hat{\lambda} v^2 + 2\hat{\mu} uv + \hat{\nu} u^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (16)$$

$$= \frac{\hat{\lambda}}{|\mathbf{u}|^2} \begin{bmatrix} u^2 & uv & 0 \\ uv & v^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \frac{\hat{\mu}}{|\mathbf{u}|^2} \left(\begin{bmatrix} -uv & u^2 & 0 \\ -v^2 & uv & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} -uv & -v^2 & 0 \\ u^2 & uv & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right) + \frac{\hat{\nu}}{|\mathbf{u}|^2} \begin{bmatrix} v^2 & -uv & 0 \\ -uv & u^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (16)$$

$$= \hat{\lambda} \hat{\mathbf{u}} \hat{\mathbf{u}}^T + \hat{\mu} (\hat{\mathbf{u}} \hat{\mathbf{v}}^T + \hat{\mathbf{v}} \hat{\mathbf{u}}^T) + \hat{\nu} \hat{\mathbf{v}} \hat{\mathbf{v}}^T,$$

which recovers the relations proposed by Evans and Oishi⁷ in (5). We can also observe that $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ are eigenvectors of both the first and fourth dyadic products in (5), while separately $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ the third dyadic term. Consequently, we have the following diagonalizations:

$$\hat{\mathbf{u}} \hat{\mathbf{u}}^T = \mathbf{R} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{R}^T, \quad \hat{\mathbf{v}} \hat{\mathbf{v}}^T = \mathbf{R} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{R}^T \quad (17)$$

and further

$$\hat{\mathbf{u}} \hat{\mathbf{v}}^T = \mathbf{R} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{R}^T, \quad \hat{\mathbf{v}} \hat{\mathbf{u}}^T = \mathbf{R} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{R}^T \quad (18)$$

so that expression (5) can be written succinctly in the matrix form $\mathbf{R} \mathbf{N} \mathbf{R}^T$.

The limit for zero velocity: Other advantage of the notation used to describe the natural-conformation tensor on Eq. (8) is that it clarifies the possible divergence issues for the limiting behavior when approaching points with zero velocity magnitudes ($|\mathbf{u}| \rightarrow 0$), such as internal stagnation points.¹¹

Since the *natural* basis rotation tensor, \mathbf{R} , is a proper rotation tensor, it can also be represented to the 2D case [complementing Eq. (14)] as

$$\mathbf{R} = e^{\theta \mathbf{K}}, \quad (19)$$

with the angle of rotation $\theta = \arccos \frac{u}{|\mathbf{u}|}$ and $\mathbf{K} = [\hat{\mathbf{k}}]_x$ the skew-symmetric tensor obtained by the cross product matrix of the axis of rotation unit vector:

$$\mathbf{K} = [\hat{\mathbf{k}}]_x = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (20)$$

This representation allows the physical interpretation that even when the velocity magnitude goes to zero, it goes at a finite and fixed angle of rotation $\theta = \alpha$, leading to a finite rotation $\mathbf{R} = e^{\alpha \mathbf{K}}$. When $\alpha = 0$, $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{I}$ and $\mathbf{N} = \mathbf{A}$.

IV. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this section, we present numerical results for the 4:1 contraction benchmark flow using the Oldroyd-B viscoelastic model. For this, we set $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{A}) = 1$ and $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{A}) = (\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I})$ in Eq. (4). The same substitutions are applied to Eq. (10), but using \mathbf{N} instead of \mathbf{A} . The *natural*-conformation tensor formulation was implemented in an in-house code using a finite difference scheme. For more details about the code, refer to Ref. 18. The simulations were conducted with the following parameters: Reynolds number $Re = 0.01$, Weissenberg number $Wi = 1$, and solvent viscosity ratio $\beta = 0.5$. A non-uniform Cartesian mesh, with a minimum element size of $\Delta x_{min} = \Delta y_{min} = 4 \times 10^{-3}$, was employed to discretize the domain, with a finer mesh near the corners.

To assess the potential of the *natural*-conformation formulation, we compared the numerical results with known asymptotic predictions for the velocity and stress fields. Specifically, the velocity behaves as $\mathbf{u} \sim r^{5/9}$, the stress tensor as $\mathbf{T} \sim r^{-2/3}$, and the components of the *natural*-conformation stress tensor as $n_{11} \sim r^{-16/9}$, $n_{12} \sim r^{-2/9}$, and $n_{22} \sim r^{4/3}$, where r is the polar coordinate representing the radial distance from one of the corners. For details on the derivation of these asymptotic solutions, see Refs. 2 and 19.

Figure 1(a) illustrates the slope of the u -velocity component obtained with both the *natural*-conformation and the Cartesian formulation, compared to the expected asymptotic results. The u -velocity component aligns reasonably well with the inclination line, and the *natural*-conformation formulation shows better convergence behavior.¹⁶

Finally, Figs. 1(b) and 1(c) display the results for the stress and natural components, comparing both the Cartesian and *natural*-conformation formulations. Once again, the *natural*-conformation formulation accurately captures the expected asymptotic behavior. However, the Cartesian stress results are less satisfactory, indicating a lack of resolution.

V. DISCUSSION

In this work, we have a generic framework for the *natural*-conformation tensor for a large class of differential constitutive models.




FIG. 1. Numerical verification of the asymptotic behavior for (a) the u -velocity component, using both Cartesian and *natural*-conformation formulations; (b) the Cartesian stress components; and (c) the *natural*-conformation components.

We show that the proposed dyadic transformation proposed by Renardy¹ can be equated as a proper rotation of the conformation tensor into a streamlined orthonormal basis given by a rotation tensor expressed in terms of the unit velocity vectors. We also show that the *natural*-conformation tensor formulation is a particular sub-case of the *kernel*-conformation tensor transformation¹² with the *kernel*

function acting on the rotation of the eigenvalues rather than on the magnitude of the eigenvalues.

The main contributions of this short communication can be summarized as follows:

- A simple relation between the *natural* basis tensor reformulation proposed by Renardy¹ and the *natural*-conformation tensor was presented.
- The *natural*-conformation tensor formulation for a family of differential constitutive laws for two- and three-dimensional unsteady flows has been presented.

In the extension of this work, we will present further details regarding the stabilization methods for the numerical method for the *natural*-conformation tensor in 3D and different strategies for the transient term in the *natural* velocity gradient tensor.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A. M. Afonso acknowledges FCT – Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia for financial support through Nos. LA/P/0045/2020 (ALiCE), UIDB/00532/2020, UIDP/00532/2020 (CEFT), and UID/532/2025, funded by national funds through FCT/MCTES (PIDDAC). J. D. Evans would like to acknowledge support from FAPESP-SPRINT Grant No. 2018/22242-0 and thank the University of Bath for sabbatical leave in 2023-2024. I. L. Palhares Junior would like to acknowledge support from FAPESP – CEPID/CeMEAI Grant No. 2013/07375-0, FAPESP – SPRINT Grant No. 2024/01651-0, and FAPESP – ANR Grant No. 2024/04769-1.

AUTHOR DECLARATIONS

Conflict of Interest

The authors have no conflicts to disclose.

Author Contributions

A. M. Afonso: Conceptualization (equal); Data curation (equal); Formal analysis (equal); Funding acquisition (equal); Investigation (equal); Methodology (equal); Project administration (equal); Resources (equal); Software (equal); Supervision (equal); Validation (equal); Visualization (equal); Writing – original draft (equal); Writing – review & editing (equal). **J. D. Evans:** Conceptualization (equal); Data curation (equal); Formal analysis (equal); Funding acquisition (equal); Investigation (equal); Methodology (equal); Project administration (equal); Resources (equal); Software (equal); Supervision (equal); Validation (equal); Visualization (equal); Writing – original draft (equal); Writing – review & editing (equal). **I. L. Palhares Junior:** Conceptualization (equal); Data curation (equal); Formal analysis (equal); Funding acquisition (equal); Investigation (equal); Methodology (equal); Project administration (equal); Resources (equal); Software (equal); Supervision (equal); Validation (equal); Visualization (equal); Writing – original draft (equal); Writing – review & editing (equal).

DATA AVAILABILITY

The data that support the findings of this study are available within the article.

REFERENCES

- ¹M. Renardy, "How to integrate the upper convected Maxwell (UCM) stresses near a singularity (and maybe elsewhere, too)," *J. Non-Newtonian Fluid Mech.* **52**, 91–95 (1994).
- ²E. Hinch, "The flow of an Oldroyd fluid around a sharp corner," *J. Non-Newtonian Fluid Mech.* **50**, 161–171 (1993).
- ³M. Renardy, "The stresses of an upper convected maxwell fluid in a newtonian velocity field near a re-entrant corner," *J. Non-Newtonian Fluid Mech.* **50**, 127–134 (1993).
- ⁴M. Renardy, "High weissenberg number boundary layers for the upper convected maxwell fluid," *J. Non-Newtonian Fluid Mech.* **68**, 125–132 (1997).
- ⁵M. Renardy, "Asymptotic structure of the stress field in flow past a cylinder at high weissenberg number," *J. Non-Newtonian Fluid Mech.* **90**, 13–23 (2000).
- ⁶P. Wapperom and M. Renardy, "Numerical prediction of the boundary layers in the flow around a cylinder using a fixed velocity field," *J. Non-Newtonian Fluid Mech.* **125**, 35–48 (2005).
- ⁷J. Evans and C. Oishi, "Transient computations using the natural stress formulation for solving sharp corner flows," *J. Non-Newtonian Fluid Mech.* **249**, 48–52 (2017).
- ⁸D. D. Joseph, *Fluid Dynamics of Viscoelastic Liquids* (Springer, 1990).
- ⁹T. Hagen and M. Renardy, "Boundary layer analysis of the Phan-Thien-Tanner and Giesekus model in high Weissenberg number flow," *J. Non-Newtonian Fluid Mech.* **73**, 181–189 (1997).
- ¹⁰J. Evans, "Re-entrant corner behaviour of the Giesekus fluid with a solvent viscosity," *J. Non-Newtonian Fluid Mech.* **165**, 538–543 (2010).
- ¹¹M. Alves, P. Oliveira, and F. Pinho, "Numerical methods for viscoelastic fluid flows," *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.* **53**, 509–541 (2021).
- ¹²A. Afonso, F. Pinho, and M. Alves, "The kernel-conformation constitutive laws," *J. Non-Newtonian Fluid Mech.* **167–168**, 30–37 (2012).
- ¹³G. Astarita, "Objective and generally applicable criteria for flow classification," *J. Non-Newtonian Fluid Mech.* **6**, 69–76 (1979).
- ¹⁴J. Goddard and C. Miller, "An inverse for the Jaumann derivative and some applications to the rheology of viscoelastic fluids," *Rheol. Acta* **5**, 177–184 (1966).
- ¹⁵Y. F. Dafalias, "Corotational integrals in constitutive formulations," *J. Eng. Mech.* **113**, 1967–1973 (1987).
- ¹⁶T. Vaithianathan and L. R. Collins, "Numerical approach to simulating turbulent flow of a viscoelastic polymer solution," *J. Comput. Phys.* **187**, 1–21 (2003).
- ¹⁷H.-C. Tseng, "A revisitation of generalized Newtonian fluids," *J. Rheol.* **64**, 493–504 (2020).
- ¹⁸J. D. Evans, H. L. França, and C. M. Oishi, "Application of the natural stress formulation for solving unsteady viscoelastic contraction flows," *J. Comput. Phys.* **388**, 462–489 (2019).
- ¹⁹J. Evans and A. O'Byrne, "Re-entrant corner flows of Oldroyd-B fluids in the natural stress basis," *AIP Conf. Proc.* **1027**, 288–290 (2008).