An analysis is presented for a micro-contact where boundary and hydrodynamic fluid films simultaneously occur considering boundary slippage appearance at the upper contact surface in the boundary film area. The contact is one-dimensional, composed of two parallel plane surfaces, which are respectively rough rigid with rectangular projection in profile and ideally smooth rigid. In the outlet zone of the contact a boundary film occurs, and in the inlet zone of the contact a conventional hydrodynamic fluid film emerges. In the boundary film area, the film slips at the upper contact surface due to the limited shear stress capacity of the film-contact interface, while the film does not slip at the lower contact surface due to the shear stress capacity of the film-contact interface, which is large enough. In the boundary film area, the viscosity and density of the film are varied across the film thickness due to the film-contact interactions, and their effective values are used in modelling which depends on the boundary film thickness. In the fluid film area, the film does not slip at either of the contact surfaces.
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1. Introduction

In engineering applications, two solid surfaces often slide one against another. The contact between them usually needs to generate the load-carrying capacity with the ability of low friction and anti-wear. To achieve this requirement, the contact is usually lubricated with fluids. Since the solid contact surface is actually rough, when in carrying the load and fluid lubrication, the contact between two solid surfaces is actually usually quite mixed. The author pointed out that in a hydrodynamic lubricated line or point, concentrated contacts,
different contact regimes frequently simultaneously occur in different areas of the contact in modern industry (Zhang, 2004b, 2006b). Such contact regimes are conventional hydrodynamic lubricated contact, physical adsorbed boundary layer contact, chemical boundary layer contact and fresh solid material to material contact. Experiments and theories showed that these four contact regimes often simultaneously occur in the hydrodynamic concentrated contact with medium or heavy loads (Zhang, 2004a, 2006a,b; Begelinger and Gee de, 1974, 1976; Tabor, 1981).

In modelling of the hydrodynamic concentrated contact, however, the study goes backward to the experimental findings. It was pointed out that before 1990s the theoretical modelling of the hydrodynamic concentrated contact belongs to the classical modelling (Zhang, 2006b). In that modelling, although the contact surfaces were considered as rough, the whole contact between the two surfaces were treated as the conventional hydrodynamic lubricated contact, where the fluid film is relatively thick, see for example Goglia et al. (1984), Lubrecht et al. (1988). The theoretical modelling of the hydrodynamic concentrated contact at the end of the last century and in the beginning of this century belongs to the modern modelling (Zhang, 2006b). In that modelling, the whole contact of the two surfaces is considered as consisted of different contact parts where different contact regimes respectively occur. These contact regimes may be the conventional hydrodynamic lubricated contact and surface asperity to asperity contact, see for example Jiang et al. (1999), Holmes et al. (2003). They may be also the conventional hydrodynamic lubricated contact and physical adsorbed boundary layer contact, see Zhang (2004a), Zhang et al. (2003), Zhang and Lu (2003). It was pointed out that in the future modelling of the hydrodynamic concentrated contact, conventional hydrodynamic lubricated contact, physical adsorbed boundary layer contact, chemical boundary layer contact and fresh solid material to material contact may need to be simultaneously considered and treated as occurring in different contact parts depending on the operating condition (Zhang, 2006b). In the recent modelling of the hydrodynamic contact, conventional hydrodynamic lubricated contact, physical adsorbed boundary layer contact and direct surface asperity to asperity contact between two surfaces were simultaneously considered and treated as occurring in different parts of the contact depending on the film thickness (Zhang, 2007a,b,c). It is a more advanced modelling of the contact. As that modelling showed, it is admitted that the physical adsorbed boundary layer contact and direct surface asperity to asperity contact both actually occur in micro-contact areas with a very small contact width, which are irregularly and discretely distributed in the realistic hydrodynamic contact.
The boundary slippage is a phenomenon occurring in the hydrodynamic contact when the film-contact interfacial shear stress exceeds the shear strength of the film-contact interface. Experiments (Bonaccorso et al., 2003; Pit et al., 2000; Craig et al., 2001; Zhu and Granick, 2001) and molecular dynamics simulations (Thompson and Troian, 1997; Sun and Ebner, 1992) showed that the film-contact interfacial slippage can actually occur in a practical hydrodynamic contact not only of non-wetting or partially wetting systems but also of completely wetting systems due to the weak interaction strength and, then, the low shear strength of the film-contact interface. Experiments and molecular dynamics simulations showed that in micro-contact with boundary films the slippage at the film-contact interface needs to be considered in developing its load-carrying capacity theory. By molecular dynamics simulation, Thompson and Troian (1997) showed that in the micro-contact with boundary films, the boundary condition at the film-contact interface should be generally considered as slippage. They showed that this boundary slippage is a result of inefficient momentum transfer at the film-contact interface. It was determined by the interaction strength between the contact and the film. It was experimentally shown by Zhu and Granick (2001) that the film-contact interfacial slippage reduces the load-carrying capacity of boundary films in the micro-contact. Craig et al. (2001) experimentally found the slippage at the film-contact interface in the micro-contact with boundary films by using the Atomistic Force Microscope measurement. They found that the degree of the film-contact interfacial slippage in the micro-contact is increased with both contact surface speed and film viscosity. Sun and Ebner (1992), Cieplak et al. (2001) and Cheikh and Koper (2003) also observed the slippage occurring at the film-contact interface in the general micro-contact with boundary films, respectively by molecular dynamics simulation and experiments. They all found that the film-contact interfacial slippage is determined by the interaction strength between the contact and the film. It is generally agreed that a weak adhesion strength between the contact and the film or a repulsive wall yield film-contact interfacial slippage, while a strong film-contact attraction gives no slippage at the film-contact interface.

The present paper analytically investigates the boundary slippage effect in the micro-contact mixing with boundary and hydrodynamic fluid films considering the film-contact interfacial slippage in the boundary film area. The contact is one-dimensional, formed by two parallel rigid plane surfaces. The upper contact surface is rough with rectangular ridges in profile and the lower contact surface is ideally smooth. The boundary film is formed between the ridge of the upper contact surface and the lower contact surface. The fluid
film is formed between the dent of the upper contact surface and the lower contact surface. The analytical approach proposed by the author and his colleagues (Zhang, 2006c,d; Zhang et al., 2003) is used for the boundary film, and conventional hydrodynamic analysis is used for the fluid film.

2. Contact model

The micro-contact studied in the present paper is one-dimensional and isothermal, formed between two parallel rigid plane surfaces. The upper contact surface is stationary and rough with rectangular ridges in profile. The lower contact surface is moving and ideally smooth. In the micro-contact, the boundary film occurs in the outlet zone and the hydrodynamic fluid film occurs in the inlet zone. In the boundary film area, the film slips at the upper contact surface due to the limited shear stress capacity of the film-contact interface, and it does not slip at the lower contact surface due to the shear stress capacity of the film-contact interface, which is large enough. The viscosity and density properties of the boundary film are considered. In the fluid film area, the film does not slip at either of the contact surfaces. The fluid is entrained from the fluid film area into the boundary film area.

Figure 1 shows the profile of this micro-contact. In the figure, $h_b$ is the boundary film thickness, $h_a$ is the hydrodynamic fluid film thickness, $l_a$ is the width of the fluid film area, $l_b$ is the width of the boundary film area, and $u$ is the speed of the lower contact surface.

3. Analysis

The analysis of the pressures and carried loads of the micro-contact shown in Fig. 1 are respectively made with and without slippage assumed at the upper
contact surface in the boundary film area, i.e. the $B_1$ sub-zone. The analyses are based on the following assumptions:

(a) The flow is one-dimensional;
(b) The pressure across the film thickness is constant;
(c) The film inertia is negligible;
(d) The operating condition is steady-state.

These assumptions are usually realistic. Also, in the present analysis, the boundary film shear elastic modulus effect is neglected (Zhang, 2009a,b).

The used coordinates are shown in Fig. 1. The pressure boundary conditions of the micro-contact are

\[ p|_{x=0} = 0 \quad p|_{x=(l_b+l_a)} = 0 \]  

(3.1)

3.1. No slippage at the upper contact surface in the boundary film area

The approach proposed by the author and his colleagues (Zhang, 2006c; Zhang et al., 2003) is used to analyse the boundary film behaviour in the $B_1$ sub-zone in Fig. 1. The approach needs to incorporate both the molecular dynamics effect and the non-continuum effect of the boundary film. The boundary film non-continuum effect is described by the flow factor approach (Zhang and Lu, 2005; Zhang, 2006d) which incorporates the boundary film discontinuity and inhomogeneity effects across the film thickness. According to the previous simulation for the same contact, the value of the flow factor $\theta_v$ depicting the boundary film non-continuum effect is very small (no more than 1.01) (Zhang, 2008). It means that in the present analysis, the value of $\theta_v$ can be taken as unity and the boundary film non-continuum effect is negligible. The boundary film molecular dynamics effect is described by the following equivalent continuum rheological model (Zhang, 2004a,b; Zhang et al., 2003)

\[ \dot{\gamma} = \frac{\tau}{\eta_{bf}^{eff}(p,h_b)} \quad \text{for} \quad |\tau| < \tau_l \]

\[ \tau = \text{sgn}(\dot{\gamma})\tau_l \quad \text{for} \quad |\tau| \geq \tau_l \]  

(3.2)

where $\tau$ is the shear stress, $\dot{\gamma}$ - shear strain rate, $\eta_{bf}^{eff}$ - boundary film effective viscosity, and $\tau_l$ - limiting shear stress. In the present case, within the boundary film and at the two contact surfaces $\tau_l = +\infty$. The model assumes that slippage does not occur either within the boundary film or at the two contact surfaces.
The boundary film viscosity is predicted by the following equation (Zhang et al., 2003; Zhang and Lu, 2003)

\[ \eta_{bf}^{\text{eff}}(h_b) = C_y(h_b)\eta_c \quad \text{for} \quad 0 < \frac{h_b}{h_{cr,bf}} < 1 \quad (3.3) \]

where \( \eta_c \) is constant representing the average viscosity of the continuum film at the pressure of the boundary film area, \( h_{cr,bf} \) is the critical boundary film thickness, and \( C_y \) is expressed as

\[ C_y(h_b) = a_0 + a_1\left(\frac{h_b}{h_{cr,bf}}\right)^{-1} + a_2\left(\frac{h_b}{h_{cr,bf}}\right)^{-2} \quad (3.4) \]

where \( a_0, a_1 \) and \( a_2 \) are constants.

The boundary film density is expressed as (Zhang et al., 2003; Zhang and Lu, 2003)

\[ \rho_{bf}^{\text{eff}}(h_b) = C_q(h_b)\rho_c \quad \text{for} \quad 0 < \frac{h_b}{h_{cr,bf}} < 1 \quad (3.5) \]

where \( \rho_c \) is constant representing the average density of the continuum film at the pressure of the boundary film area, and \( C_q \) is expressed as

\[ C_q(h_b) = g_0 + g_1\frac{h_b}{h_{cr,bf}} + g_2\left(\frac{h_b}{h_{cr,bf}}\right)^2 + g_3\left(\frac{h_b}{h_{cr,bf}}\right)^3 \quad (3.6) \]

where \( g_0, g_1, g_2 \) and \( g_3 \) are constants.

The Reynolds equation in the boundary film area is

\[ q_m = -\frac{u h_b \rho_{bf}^{\text{eff}}}{2} - \frac{\rho_{bf}^{\text{eff}} h_b^3}{12\eta_{bf}^{\text{eff}}} \frac{dp}{dx} \quad (3.7) \]

where \( q_m \) is the mass flow through the contact.

Define

\[ \lambda_{b,bf} = -12\left(q_m + \frac{1}{2} u h_b \rho_{bf}^{\text{eff}} \right) \eta_c \frac{C_y}{\rho_{bf}^{\text{eff}} h_b^3} \]

Solving Eq. (3.7) by using the boundary condition expressed by Eq. (3.1) gives the pressure in the boundary film area as follows

\[ p = \lambda_{b,bf} x \quad (3.8) \]

The Reynolds equation in the \( B_2 \) sub-zone in Fig. 1 is

\[ q_m = -\frac{1}{2} \rho_c u h_a - \frac{\rho_c h_a^3}{12\eta_c} \frac{dp}{dx} \quad (3.9) \]
Define
\[ \lambda_{a,\rho} = -12\eta_c \frac{1}{h_a^3} \left( \frac{q_m}{\rho_c} + \frac{1}{2} u h_a \right) \]

Solving Eq. (3.9) by using the boundary condition expressed by Eq. (3.1) gives the pressure in the \( B_2 \) sub-zone as follows
\[ p = \lambda_{a,\rho} (x - l_a - l_b) \quad (3.10) \]

From the constraint condition that the pressure at \( x = l_b \) in Fig. 1 is continuous, the mass flow through the contact \( q_m \) is obtained by solving the constraint equation on the pressure at \( x = l_b \) as follows
\[ q_m = -u \rho_c \phi_2 (h_b + h_a \phi_1) \frac{2}{1 + \phi_1 \phi_2} \quad (3.11) \]

where \( \phi_1 = r_l / (r_h^2 C_g) \), \( \phi_2 = C_q \). Here \( r_l = l_a / l_b \) and \( r_h = h_a / h_b \).

The carried load (per unit contact length) by the micro-contact is derived as
\[ w_1 = \frac{\lambda_{b,bf} l_b^2 - \lambda_{a,\rho} l_a^2}{2} \quad (3.12) \]

The pressure at \( x = l_b \) is
\[ p_{no-slip} \big|_{x=l_b} = \lambda_{b,bf} l_b \quad (3.13) \]

### 3.2. Slippage at the upper contact surface in the boundary film area

In this case, the boundary film non-continuum effect is negligible due to the value of \( \theta_v \) approaching unity. The boundary film molecular dynamics effect is still described by Eq. (3.2). For this case, in Eq. (3.2), within the boundary film and at the film-lower contact surface interface \( \tau_l = +\infty \), while at the film-upper contact surface interface \( \tau_l = \tau_s \). Here, \( \tau_s \) is the shear strength of the film-upper contact surface interface. The model assumes that slippage does not occur either within the boundary film or at the film-lower contact surface interface, but can occur at the film-upper contact surface interface if the magnitude of the shear stress at the film-upper contact surface interface exceeds the value of \( \tau_s \).

The shear strength \( \tau_s \) of the film-upper contact surface interface is predicted by the following equation (Zhang et al., 2003; Zhang and Lu, 2003)
\[ \tau_s (h_b) = C_{\text{tao}l} (h_b) \tau_{s,c} \quad \text{for} \quad \beta_0 \leq \frac{h_b}{h_{cr,bf}} < 1 \quad (3.14) \]
where $\tau_{s,c}$ is constant representing the average shear strength of the continuum film-upper contact surface interface at the pressure of the boundary film area, and $C_{taol}^i$ is expressed as

$$C_{taol}^i(h_b) = d_0^i + d_1^i \left( \frac{h_b}{h_{cr,bf}} \right)^{-1} + d_2^i \left( \frac{h_b}{h_{cr,bf}} \right)^{-2} \quad (3.15)$$

where $d_0^i$, $d_1^i$ and $d_2^i$ are constants.

The Reynolds equation for the boundary film area is

$$q_m = B_0 + B_1 \frac{dp}{dx} \quad (3.16)$$

where $q_m$ is the mass flow through the contact and

$$B_0 = \frac{\rho_{bf}^e \tau_s h_b^2}{2\eta_{bf}^e} - \rho_{bf}^e u h_b \quad B_1 = -\frac{\rho_{bf}^e h_b^3}{2\eta_{bf}^e}$$

The solution of Eq. (3.16) is

$$p = \frac{q_m - B_0}{B_1} x + c \quad (3.17)$$

From the boundary condition $p(0) = 0$, it is solved that $c = 0$. The pressure in the boundary film area is then expressed as

$$p = \frac{q_m - B_0}{B_1} x \quad (3.18)$$

At $x = l_b$, the film pressure is

$$p_{slip}|_{x=l_b} = \left( \frac{q_m - B_0}{B_1} \right) l_b \quad (3.19)$$

According to Section 3.1, it is solved from the fluid film area that at $x = l_b$ the film pressure is $p_{slip}|_{x=l_b} = -\lambda_{a,\rho} l_a$. It is then equated that

$$\frac{q_m - B_0}{B_1} l_b = -\lambda_{a,\rho} l_a \quad (3.20)$$

It is solved from Eq. (3.20) that

$$q_m = \frac{u h_a \rho_c \left( 6 r_l + 2C_y r_b^2 - \tau_{s,a} r_b \right)}{-12 r_l - \frac{2C_y r_b^3}{C_q}} \quad (3.21)$$

The load per unit contact length carried by the micro-contact is

$$w_2 = \frac{q_m - B_0 l_b^2}{2B_1} - \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{a,\rho} l_a^2 \quad (3.22)$$
3.3. Performance parameters of the contact

Define the relative reduction of the carried load of the contact due to the boundary slippage as

\[ r_w = \frac{w_1 - w_2}{w_1} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.23)

The value of \( r_w \) can reflect the influence of the boundary slippage on the load-carrying capacity of the contact.

Define the relative reduction of the pressure at \( x = l_b \) due to the boundary slippage as

\[ r_p = \frac{p_{\text{no-slip}}|x=l_b} - p_{\text{slip}}|x=l_b}{p_{\text{no-slip}}|x=l_b} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.24)

The value of \( r_p \) can reflect the influence of the boundary slippage on the local pressure in the contact.

Define the relative increase of the mass flow through the contact due to the boundary slippage as

\[ I_q = \frac{|q_{m,\text{slip}}| - |q_{m,\text{no-slip}}|}{|q_{m,\text{no-slip}}|} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.25)

where \( q_{m,\text{no-slip}} \) is calculated from Eq. (3.11) and \( q_{m,\text{slip}} \) is calculated from Eq. (3.21).

4. Results

The values of \( r_w, r_p \) and \( I_q \) are respectively calculated for two cases. Case 1 represents the heavy load and high sliding speed operating condition. Case 2 represents the light load and low sliding speed operating condition. The operational parameter values for these two cases are respectively listed as follows:

**Case 1:** \( \eta_c = 4000 \text{ Pa.s}, \ u = 100 \text{ m/s}, \ l_a + l_b = 1 \mu m, \ h_{cr,bf} = 20 \text{ nm}, \ h_a - h_b = 20 \text{ nm}, \ r_l = 0.5, \ \rho_c = 960 \text{ kg/m}^3, \ \tau_{s,c} = 1 \sim 100 \text{ MPa}. \)

**Case 2:** \( \eta_c = 0.1 \text{ Pa.s}, \ u = 0.01 \text{ m/s}, \ l_a + l_b = 1 \mu m, \ h_{cr,bf} = 20 \text{ nm}, \ h_a - h_b = 20 \text{ nm}, \ r_l = 0.5, \ \rho_c = 960 \text{ kg/m}^3, \ r_h = 11 (h_b = 2 \text{ nm}). \)

These two cases have the same boundary film property parameter values shown in Table 1.
Table 1. Boundary film property parameter values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\beta_0$</th>
<th>$a_0$</th>
<th>$a_1$</th>
<th>$a_2$</th>
<th>$g_0$</th>
<th>$g_1$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>1.0822</td>
<td>-0.1758</td>
<td>0.0936</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>-1.0654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g_2$</td>
<td>$g_3$</td>
<td>$d_0$</td>
<td>$d_1$</td>
<td>$d_2$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3361</td>
<td>-0.571</td>
<td>0.9726</td>
<td>0.0261</td>
<td>1.3158$ \cdot 10^{-3}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1. Case 1

It is found that for Case 1 the values of $r_w$, $r_p$ and $I_q$ are not dependent on the interfacial shear strength $\tau_{s,c}$ but obviously depend on the boundary film thickness $h_b$, when the value of $\tau_{s,c}$ ranges between 1 MPa and 100 MPa. This may be a common result for the heavy load and high sliding speed condition. It may be drawn that in the heavy load and high sliding speed condition the reductions of the carried load and the local pressure of the contact and the increase of the mass flow through the contact due to the boundary slippage in the boundary film area are practically not determined by the boundary film-contact interfacial shear strength but determined by the boundary film thickness.

Figure 2 plots the values of $r_w$, $r_p$ and $I_q$ against the dimensionless boundary film thickness obtained for Case 1. The values of $r_w$ and $r_p$ are nearly linearly increased with the increase of the boundary film thickness $h_b$ and strongly influenced by the boundary film thickness. The value of $r_w$ appears considerable. It means that the boundary slippage considerably reduces the load-carrying capacity of the micro-contact.

Fig. 2. Plots of the values of $r_w$, $r_p$ and $I_q$ against the dimensionless boundary film thickness obtained for Case 1
Researches may also care about the value of $r_p$ at a small boundary film thickness. It is shown in Fig. 2 that the value of $r_p$ is increased from 0.12 to 0.3 when the boundary film thickness $h_b$ is increased from 2nm to 5nm. It is found that when the boundary film thickness is below 5nm, the boundary slippage occurring in the boundary film area can cause considerable reductions of the local pressure in the micro-contact. This reduction may be able to considerably influence the contact surface elastic deformations and then the local film thickness when the contact surfaces are elastic and the boundary film thickness is on the film molecule size scale. Figure 2 suggests that when the boundary film thickness is below 5nm and the boundary film is considered in the mixed contact modelling, the model should also consider the boundary film-contact interfacial slippage, probably occurring in the contact and influencing the local film thickness.

Figure 2 shows that the boundary slippage in the boundary film area causes the mass flow through the contact increased nearly one times in the condition of heavy load and high sliding speed for all boundary film thicknesses. At a small boundary film thickness, this increase is more significant.

4.2. Case 2

Figure 3 plots values of $r_w$, $r_p$ and $I_q$ against the interfacial shear strength $\tau_{s,c}$ obtained for Case 2. It is found that in the condition of a light load and low sliding speed, the values of $r_w$, $r_p$ and $I_q$ strongly depend on the boundary film-contact interfacial shear strength. These values are shown to be linearly increased with the reduction of the boundary film-contact interfacial shear strength. In the condition of the light load and low sliding speed, the boundary film interfacial slippage can also considerably reduce the load-carrying capacity of the micro-contact. Although the values of $r_p$ are shown to be small, the local pressure reductions under these $r_p$ values due to the boundary slippage are usually able to considerably influence the local film thickness by changing the local contact surface elastic deformations when the contact surfaces are elastic and the boundary film thickness is on the film molecule size scale. In the mixed contact modelling, for the condition of the light load and low sliding speed, when the boundary film thickness is below 5nm and the boundary film is considered, the boundary film-contact interfacial shear strength and the boundary film-contact interfacial slippage need to be considered. For the light load and low sliding speed condition, the reduction of the boundary film-contact interfacial shear strength is shown to significantly increase the mass flow through the contact.
Fig. 3. Plots of the values of $r_w$, $r_p$ and $I_q$ against the interfacial shear strength $\tau_{s,c}$ obtained for Case 2

5. Conclusions

The present paper analytically investigates the effect of the boundary film-contact interfacial slippage on the local pressure, carried load and mass flow of the micro-contact. The contact is a mixed contact. In its outlet zone there occurs a physical adsorbed boundary layer, and in its inlet zone a conventional hydrodynamic fluid film. The contact is formed between two parallel rigid plane surfaces. The upper contact surface is rough with rectangular projection. The lower contact surface is ideally smooth. The boundary film is assumed to slip at the upper contact surface but not slip at the lower contact surface. It is also assumed not to slip within the film. The conventional hydrodynamic fluid film is assumed not to slip at either of the contact surfaces.

It is found that when the boundary film thickness is below 5nm, the boundary slippage occurring in the boundary film area can cause considerable reductions of the local pressure in the micro-contact. This reduction may be able to considerably influence the contact surface elastic deformations and, then, the local film thickness when the contact surfaces are elastic and the boundary film thickness is on the film molecule size scale. It is suggested that when the boundary film thickness is below 5nm and the boundary film is considered in the mixed contact modelling, the model should also consider the boundary film-contact interfacial shear strength and the boundary film-contact interfacial slippage, which probably occurs in the contact and influences the local film thickness.
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Analiza kontaktu mieszanego z uwzględnieniem poślizgu brzegowego w strefie hydrodynamicznego filmu

Streszczenie

Analiza zaprezentowana w pracy dotyczy zagadnienia mikro-kontaktu w strefie jednoczesnego występowania brzegowego i hydrodynamicznego filmu płynu z możliwością poślizgu w strefie brzegowej na górnej powierzchni kontaktu. Rozważany kontakt jest jednowymiarowy i odnosi się do dwóch równoległych płaskich powierzchni, z których jedna jest sztywna i szorstka w przekroju prostokątnym, a druga tak samo sztywna lecz idealnie gładka. W obszarze wyjścia ze strefy kontaktu pojawia się brzegowy film płynu, natomiast w strefie wejścia konwencjonalny film hydrodynamiczny. W strefie brzegowej film ulega poślizgowi na górnej powierzchni wskutek ograniczonej zdolności przenoszenia naprężeń stycznych pomiędzy płynem a ścianką, natomiast na powierzchni dolnej poślizg nie występuje. W strefie brzegowej filmu jego lepkość i gęstość zmienia się wzdłuż grubości wskutek interakcji płynu z powierzchnią. Efektywne wartości użyte w modelowaniu kontaktu zależą od grubości filmu brzegowego. W regularnej strefie film nie ulega poślizgowi na żadnej z omawianych powierzchni.
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