Soret and Dufour Effects on Unsteady MHD Heat and Mass Transfer from a Permeable Stretching Sheet with Thermophoresis and Non-Uniform Heat Generation/Absorption
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ABSTRACT

This paper is focused on the study of heat and mass transfer characteristics of an unsteady MHD boundary layer flow through porous medium over a stretching sheet in the presence of thermo-diffusion and diffusion-thermo effects with thermophoresis, thermal radiation and non-uniform heat source/sink. The transformed conservation equations are solved numerically subject to the boundary conditions using an optimized, extensively validated, variational finite element analysis. The numerical code is validated with previous studies on special cases of the problem. The influence of important non-dimensional parameters, namely suction parameter ($f_w$), magnetic parameter ($M$), unsteadiness parameter ($\alpha$), Soret parameter ($Sr$), Dufour parameter ($Du$) thermophoretic parameter ($\tau$), space dependent ($A1$) and temperature dependent parameters ($B1$) and radiation parameter($A_n$) on the velocity, temperature and concentration fields as well as the skin-friction coefficient, Nusselt number and Sherwood number are examined in detail and the results are shown graphically and in tabular form to know the physical importance of the problem. It is found that the imposition of wall fluid suction ($f_w>0$) in the flow problem has the effect of depreciating the velocity, temperature and concentration boundary layer thicknesses at every finite value of $\eta$. This deceleration in momentum, thermal and concentration profiles is because of the fact that suction is taken away the warm fluid from the surface of the stretching sheet.
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NOMENCLATURE

A1 coefficient of space-dependent heat source/sink radiative heat flux
a, c empirical constant non-uniform heat source/sink
B1 coefficient of temperature-dependent heat source/sink local Reynolds number
C concentration of the species Schmidt number
$C_p$ specific heat at constant pressure Sherwood number
$C_w$ uniform constant concentration mean fluid temperature
$c_i$ concentration susceptibility mean temperature
$C_{\infty}$ free stream concentration $T_w$ free stream temperature
$C_f$ skin-friction coefficient stretching surface velocity
$D_m$ mass diffusion coefficient $u$ velocity in the x-direction
$Du$ Dufour number $V_t$ thermophoretic velocity
$f_w$ dimensionless suction velocity $\mu$ dynamic viscosity
$K_1$ permeability parameter $\nu$ velocity in the y-direction
$k_{t}$ thermal diffusion ratio $\theta$ non-dimensional temperature
$M$ magnetic parameter $\sigma^*$ Stephan-Boltzman constant
$Nu_t$ Nusselt number $Pr$ Prandtl number
$q_{r}$ non-uniform heat source/sink
$Re_x$ local Reynolds number
$Sc$ Schmidt number
$Sh_t$ Sherwood number
$Sr$ Soret number
$t$ time
$T$ temperature of the fluid
$T_{\infty}$ free stream temperature
$\eta$ stretching surface velocity
1. INTRODUCTION

The problem of two dimensional boundary layer flow, heat and mass transfer over a continuous stretching heated surface through porous medium finds numerous and wide range of applications in many engineering and manufacturing disciplines. For example, in a melt spinning process, the extrudate from the die is generally drawn and simultaneously stretched into a sheet or filament, which is thereafter solidified through rapid quenching or gradual cooling by direct contact with water or chilled metal rolls. In fact, stretching will bring in a unidirectional orientation to the extrudate, thereby improving the quality of the final product considerably which greatly depends on the flow, heat and mass transfer mechanism. Glass blowing, extrusion process, melt-spinning, food-stuff processing, design of heat exchangers, wire and fiber coating, glass-fiber production, manufacture of plastic and rubber sheets, cooling of a large metallic plate in a bath and continuous casting are the other areas where this kind of problems has applications.

In industry, polymer sheets and filaments are manufactured by continuous extrusion of the polymer from a die. The thin polymer sheet constitutes a continuously moving surface with a non-uniform velocity through an ambient fluid. The problem of heat and mass transfer flow due to stretching sheet has been implemented on many flow situations. The problem of steady two-dimensional viscous incompressible fluid caused by a stretching sheet was first examined by Sikiadis (1961). The thermal behavior of the problem was experimentally verified by Tsou et al. (1967). Later, Crane (1970) has expended the problem of Sikiadis (1961) in which he studied the flow past a stretching plate by taking linearly varying velocity with a distance from a fixed point. Gupta et al. (1977) have studied the heat and mass transfer characteristics of a fluid over a stretching sheet with suction or blowing. Grubka and Bobba (1985) studied the heat transfer characteristics over a continuous stretching surface with variable temperature. Ali (1994) has investigated flow and heat transfer characteristics on a continuous stretching surface using power-law velocity and temperature distributions. Vajravelu (1994) has analyzed the study of flow and heat transfer in a saturated porous medium over an impermeable stretching sheet. Two cases have been discussed in this problem, (i) the sheet with prescribed sheet temperature (PST-case) and (ii) the sheet with prescribed wall heat flux (PHF-case).

In all the previous investigations, the effects thermal radiation and magnetic field on the flow and heat transfer have not been studied. It is well known fact that radiative heat transfer flow is very important in manufacturing industries for the design of reliable equipment’s, nuclear plants, gas turbines and various propulsion devices for aircraft, missiles, satellites and space vehicles. Also, the effects of thermal radiation on forced and free convection flow are important in the content of space technology and process involving high temperature. It is known fact that, the transverse magnetic field has specific industrial applications in polymer processing technology. Plumb et al. (1981) was the first to examine the effect of horizontal cross-flow and radiation on natural convection from vertical heated surface in a saturated porous media. Recently, Pal D et al. (2010) has discussed radiation effect on hydro magnetic Darcy-Forchheimer mixed convention flow over stretching sheet. Mansour and El-Shaer (2001) analyzed the effects of thermal radiation on magneto hydrodynamic natural convection flows in a fluid-saturated porous media. Pal (2005) studied heat and mass transfer in stagnation-point flow toward a stretching sheet in the presence of buoyancy force and thermal radiation. Vajravelu and Rollins (1992) studied heat transfer in electrically conducting fluid over a stretching sheet by taking into account of magnetic field only. Molla et al. (2011) studied the effect of thermal radiation on a steady two-dimensional natural convection laminar flow of viscous incompressible optically thick fluid along a vertical flat plate with streamwise sinusoidal surface temperature. Abo-Eldahab and El-Gendy (2004) investigated the problem of free convection heat transfer characteristics in an electrically conducting fluid near an isothermal sheet to study the combined effect of buoyancy and radiation in the presence of uniform transverse magnetic field.

In recent years, it is found that thermophoresis is a phenomenon and has many practical applications in removing small particles from gas streams, in determining exhaust gas particle trajectories from combustion devices, and in studying the particulate material deposition on turbine blades. It has been found that thermophoresis is the dominant mass transfer mechanism in the modified chemical vapor deposition (MCVD) process as currently used in the fabrication of optical fiber performs. Thermophoretic deposition of radioactive particles is considered to be one of the important factors causing accidents in nuclear reactors. A number of analytical and experimental papers in thermophoretic heat and mass transfer have been communicated. Talbot et al. (1980) presented a seminal study, considering boundary layer flow with thermophoretic effects, which has become a benchmark for subsequent studies. Several authors, Duwairi and Damseh (2008), Damseh et al. (2009), Mahdy and Hady (2009), Liu et al. (2009), Postelnica (2007), Dinesh and Jayaraj (2009), Grosan et al. (2009), Tsai and Huang (2010) have investigated the influence of thermophoresis over a vertical plate, micro-channel, horizontal plate...
Consider a two-dimensional unsteady laminar boundary layer flow of viscous incompressible fluid over a continuous moving stretching sheet which issue from a thin slot. The coordinate system is such that the x-axis is taken along the stretching surface in the direction of the motion with the slot at origin, and the y-axis is perpendicular to the surface of the sheet as shown schematically in Fig.1. A uniform transverse magnetic field \( B(x) \) is applied along the y-axis. The surface of the sheet is maintained at uniform temperature and concentration, \( T_a \) and \( C_a \), respectively, and these values are assumed to be greater than the ambient temperature and concentration, \( T_0 \) and \( C_e \), respectively. The flow is assumed to be confined in a region \( y > 0 \). We consider the non-uniform internal heat generation/absorption in the flow to get the temperature and concentration differences between the surface and the ambient fluid. We assume that the velocity is proportional to its distance from the slit. Under the usual boundary layer approximation, the governing equations describing the momentum, energy and concentration in the presence of radiation, thermophoresis and other important parameters take the following form:

\[
\frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} = 0
\]

\[
\rho \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + v \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} \right) = \mu \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial y^2} - \frac{\nu}{k^1} u - \sigma B_0^2 u
\]

\[
\frac{\partial T}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial T}{\partial x} + v \frac{\partial T}{\partial y} = \frac{k}{\rho c_p} \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial y^2} - \frac{1}{\rho c_p} \frac{\partial q_r}{\partial y} + \frac{1}{\rho c_p} (q''') + \frac{B_m k_T}{c_p} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial y^2}
\]
\[
\frac{\partial C}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial C}{\partial x} + v \frac{\partial C}{\partial y} = D_m \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial y^2} + \frac{D_m k_T}{T_m} \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial y^2} - \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( V_T \frac{\partial C}{\partial y} \right)
\] (4)

The associated boundary conditions are
\[
u = U_0(x, t), \quad v = V_0, \quad T = T_w(x, t), \quad C = C_w(x, t),
\] at \( y = 0 \),
\[
u \to 0, \quad T \to T_{\infty}, \quad C \to C_{\infty}, \quad \text{as} \ y \to \infty.
\] (5)

where \( u \) and \( v \) are the components of velocity along \( x \) and \( y \) directions, respectively and \( t \) is the time. \( U_0(x, t) \) is the stretching sheet velocity, \( T_w(x, t) \) is the stretching surface temperature, \( C_w(x, t) \) is the concentration far away from the stretching surface, \( T_{\infty} \) is the temperature far away from the stretching surface with \( T_w > T_{\infty} \), \( C_{\infty} \) is the concentration far away from the stretching surface with \( C_w > C_{\infty} \). The term \( v_w = -\sqrt{\frac{v_T}{2\nu}} f(0) \) represents the mass transfer at the surface with \( v_w < 0 \) for suction and \( v_w > 0 \) for injection.

The non-uniform heat source/sink, \( q''' \), is defined as
\[
q''' = \frac{2\nu f(x)}{x} (A_1(T_w - T_{\infty})f'' + (T - T_{\infty})B_1)
\]
where \( A_1 \) and \( B_1 \) are the coefficients of space and temperature-dependent heat source/sink, respectively. The case \( A_1 > 0, B_1 > 0 \) corresponds to internal heat source and the case \( A_1 < 0, B_1 < 0 \) corresponds to internal heat sink.

Due to stretching of the surface the flow is caused and it moves with the surface velocity, temperature and concentration of the form
\[
U_w(x, t) = \frac{ax}{1 - ct}, \quad T_w(x, t) = T_{\infty} + \frac{ax}{1 - ct}, \quad C_w(x, t) = C_{\infty} + \frac{ax}{1 - ct}.
\] (7)

where \( a \) (stretching rate) and \( c \) are positive constants with \( ct < 1, c \geq 0 \). It is noticed that the stretching rate \( \frac{a}{1 - ct} \) is increases with time \( t \) since \( a > 0 \).

The following similarity transformations (2009) are introduced to simplify the mathematical analysis of the problem
\[
\eta = \int \sqrt{\frac{a}{x(1 - ct)}} y, \quad u = \frac{ax}{1 - ct} f'\left(\frac{\eta}{\nu}\right), \quad v = -\frac{\nu a}{1 - ct} \frac{f'}{f}, \quad \theta = \frac{T - T_{\infty}}{T_{\infty} - T_{\infty}}, \quad \phi = \frac{C - C_{\infty}}{C_w - C_{\infty}}
\] (8)

By using the Rosseland approximation for radiation, the radiative heat flux \( q_r \) is defined as
\[
q_r = -\frac{\sigma_a^* \theta T^*}{\nu a y}
\] (10)

where \( \sigma_a^* \) is the Stephan-Boltzman constant, \( K^* \) is the mean absorption coefficient. We assume that the temperature differences within the flow are such that the term \( T^4 \) may be expressed as a linear function of temperature. This is accomplished by expanding \( T^4 \) in a Taylor series about a free stream temperature \( T_{\infty} \) as follows:
\[
T^4 = T_{\infty}^4 + 4T_{\infty}^3(T - T_{\infty}) + 6T_{\infty}^2(T - T_{\infty})^2 + \cdots \] (11)

Neglecting higher-order terms (9) in the above Eq. (11) beyond the first degree in \( (T - T_{\infty}) \), we get
\[
T^4 \approx 4T_{\infty}^3(T - T_{\infty})^2 + \cdots \] (12)

Thus substituting Eq. (12) in Eq.(10), we get
\[
q_r = -\frac{16T_{\infty}^2 \theta^* \phi T^*}{3K^* \nu a y}
\] (13)

The effect of thermophoresis is usually prescribed by means of an average velocity acquired by small particles to the gas velocity when exposed to a temperature gradient. In boundary layer flow, the temperature gradient in \( y \)-direction is very much larger than in the \( x \)-direction and therefore only the thermophoretic velocity in \( y \)-direction is considered. As a consequence, the thermophoretic velocity \( V_T \), which appears in Eq. (5), is expressed as
\[
V_T = -\frac{k_1 v \theta}{\tau}
\] (14)
in which \( k_1 \) is the thermophoretic coefficient and \( \tau \) is the reference temperature. A thermophoretic parameter \( \tau \) is given by the relation
\[
\tau = \frac{k(T_w - T_{\infty})}{\nu a}
\] (15)
where the typical values of \( \tau \) are 0.01, 0.1 and 1.0 corresponding to approximate values of \( k(T_w - T_{\infty}) \), equal to 3, 30, 300 \( K \) for a reference temperature of \( T = 298.15 \) \( K \).

Using Eqs. (8), (9), (13) and (15), the governing equations Eqs. (2) – (6) takes the form
\[
f'''' + f''f'' - f'^2 - a \left( f' + \frac{1}{2} \eta f'' \right) - M f' - k f' = 0
\] (16)

\[
\left[ 1 + \frac{2A_1}{3} \right] \theta'' + Pr \left( f \theta' - f'' \theta \right) - Pr \left( f' + \frac{1}{2} \eta \theta' \right) + (A_1 f' + B_1 \theta) + Du \phi'' = 0
\] (17)

\[
\phi'' - Sc \left( 2 f' \phi - f \phi' \right) - Sc \left( \phi + \frac{1}{2} \eta \phi' \right) + Sc \left( \phi' \theta' + \eta \phi' \phi \right) = 0
\] (18)

The boundary conditions take the form
\[
f = f_w, \quad f' = 1, \quad \theta = 1, \quad \phi = 1 \quad \text{at} \ \eta = 0,
\] (19)

\[
f' = 0, \quad \theta = 0, \quad \phi = 0, \quad \text{at} \ \eta \to \infty
\] (20)

where \( Pr \) is the Prandtl number, \( An \) is the radiation parameter, \( \alpha \) is the unsteadiness parameter, \( M \) is the magnetic field parameter, \( k \) is the permeability parameter, \( Sr \) is the Soret parameter, \( Du \) is the Dufour parameter, \( \tau \) is the thermophoresis parameter, \( \theta \) is the temperature, \( \phi \) is the concentration, \( \eta \) is the similarity variable, \( \nu \) is the dynamic viscosity, \( \mu \) is the magnetic permeability, \( k_T \) is the thermal conductivity, \( D_m \) is the molecular diffusion coefficient, \( a \) is the thermal diffusivity, \( \lambda \) is the heat generation rate, \( \nu \) is the kinematic viscosity, and \( \psi \) is the dimensionless streamfunction.
parameter, \( \text{Sc} \) is the Schmidt number, \( f(0) = f_w \) with \( f_w > 0 \) corresponds to suction and \( f_w < 0 \) represents injection.

Quantities of practical interest in this problem are the local skin friction coefficient \( C_f \), the local Nusselt number \( Nu \), and the local Sherwood number \( Sh \), are defined as:

\[
C_f = \frac{\tau_w}{\rho u^2}, \quad Nu = \frac{\nu w}{k(T_w - T_0)}, \quad Sh = \frac{kh}{D_n(T_w - T_0)}.
\]

Here \( \tau_w, u, \) and \( J_w \) are the wall shear stress, surface heat flux, and the mass flux, respectively.

Using (8) and (9), we obtain the dimensionless versions of these key design quantities:

\[
C_f = \phi'(0), \quad Nu = -\theta'(0)Re_x^\frac{1}{2}, \quad Sh = -\phi'(0)Re_x^\frac{1}{2}.
\]

Since the highly non-linear nature of ordinary differential Eqs. (16)-(18) together with boundary conditions (19)-(20), they cannot be solved analytically. So the variational finite-element method, Bhargava et al. (2009), Anwar Beg et al. (2008) and Rana. has been implemented.

3. NUMERICAL METHOD OF SOLUTION

3.1. The finite-element method

The finite element method (FEM) is such a powerful method for solving ordinary differential equations and partial differential equations. The basic idea of this method is divided the whole domain into smaller elements of finite dimensions called finite elements. This method is such a good numerical method in modern engineering analysis, and it can be applied for solving integral equations including heat transfer, fluid mechanics, chemical processing, electrical systems, and many other fields. The steps involved in the finite-element are as follows.

(i) Finite-element discretization

The whole domain is divided into a finite number of subdomains, which is called the discretization of the domain. Each subdomain is called an element. The collection of elements is called the finite-element mesh.

(ii) Generation of the element equations

a. From the mesh, a typical element is isolated and the variational formulation of the given problem over the typical element is constructed.

b. An approximate solution of the variational problem is assumed, and the element equations are made by substituting this solution in the above system.

c. The element matrix, which is called stiffness matrix, is constructed by using the element interpolation functions.

(iii) Assembly of element equations

The algebraic equations so obtained are assembled by imposing the interelement continuity conditions. This yields a large number of algebraic equations known as the global finite-element model, which governs the whole domain.

(iv) Imposition of boundary conditions

The essential and natural boundary conditions are imposed on the assembled equations.

(v) Solution of assembled equations

The assembled equations so obtained can be solved by any of the numerical techniques, namely, the Gauss elimination method, LU decomposition method, etc. An important consideration is that of the shape functions which are employed to approximate actual functions.

For the solution of system non-linear ordinary differential Eqs. (16-18) together with boundary conditions (19-20), first we assume

\[
\frac{df}{d\eta} = h
\]

(21)

The Eqs. (16) to (18) then reduces to

\[
h'' + fh' - h^2 - \alpha \left( h + \frac{1}{2} \right) = (M + K)h = 0
\]

(22)

\[
\left( 1 + \frac{4}{3} An \right) \theta'' + Pr(f \theta' - h \theta) - Pr \left( \theta + \frac{h}{2} \right) + (A_1 + B_1 \theta) + 2u \phi'' = 0
\]

(23)

\[
\phi'' - Sc \left( 2 h - f \phi' \right) - Sc \alpha \left( \phi + \frac{1}{2} \right) + Sc \alpha \left( \theta + \frac{1}{2} \right) = 0
\]

(24)

The boundary conditions take the form

\[
f = f_w, \quad h = 1, \quad \theta = 1, \quad \phi = 1 \quad \text{at} \ \eta = 0, \quad (25)
\]

\[
h = 0, \quad \theta = 0, \quad \phi = 0 \quad \text{at} \ \eta = \infty. \quad (26)
\]

It has been observed that for large values of \( \theta \), there is no remarkable change in the profiles, so, for computational purpose infinity has been taken as \( \infty \).

3.2. Variational Formulation

The variational form associated with Eqs. (21) to (24) over a typical linear element \((\eta_e, \eta_{e+1})\) is given by

\[
\int_{\eta_e}^{\eta_{e+1}} \omega_1 (\frac{df}{d\eta} - h) \ d\eta = 0
\]

(27)

\[
\int_{\eta_e}^{\eta_{e+1}} \omega_2 \left( h'' + fh' - h^2 - \alpha \left( h + \frac{1}{2} \right) \right) - (M + K)h \ d\eta = 0
\]

(28)

\[
\int_{\eta_e}^{\eta_{e+1}} \omega_3 \left( \left( 1 + \frac{4}{3} An \right) \theta'' + Pr(f \theta' - h \theta) \right.
\]

\[
- Pr \left( \theta + \frac{1}{2} \right) \theta' + (A_1 + B_1 \theta) + 2u \phi'' \right) \ d\eta = 0
\]

(29)
where $w_1, w_2, w_3$ and $w_4$ are arbitrary trial functions and may be viewed as the variations in $f, h$, $\theta$, and $\phi$, respectively.

### 3.3. Finite-Element Formulation

The finite-element model may be obtained from above equations by substituting finite-element approximations of the form

$$
\begin{align*}
\bar{f} &= \sum_{j=1}^{n} f_j \psi_j, \\
h &= \sum_{j=1}^{n} h_j \theta_j, \\
\theta &= \sum_{j=1}^{n} \theta_j \psi_j,
\end{align*}
$$

with $w_1 = w_2 = w_3 = w_4 = \psi_i, \quad (i = 1, 2, 3),$

where $\psi_i$ are the shape functions for a typical element ($\eta_i, \eta_{i+1}$) and are defined as

$$
\psi_i^1 = \frac{(\eta_{i+1} - \eta)}{(\eta_{i+1} - \eta_i)},
$$

$$
\psi_i^2 = \frac{4(\eta - \eta_i)(\eta_{i+1} - \eta)}{(\eta_{i+1} - \eta_i)^2},
$$

$$
\psi_i^3 = \frac{(\eta_{i+1} - \eta)(\eta - \eta_i)}{(\eta_{i+1} - \eta_i)^2}, \quad \eta_i \leq \eta \leq \eta_{i+1}.
$$

The finite element model of the equations thus formed is given by

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
[K^{11}] & [K^{12}] & [K^{13}] & [K^{14}] \\
[K^{21}] & [K^{22}] & [K^{23}] & [K^{24}] \\
[K^{31}] & [K^{32}] & [K^{33}] & [K^{34}] \\
[K^{41}] & [K^{42}] & [K^{43}] & [K^{44}]
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
h \\
\theta \\
f \\
\phi
\end{bmatrix} =
\begin{bmatrix}
[r^1] \\
r^2 \\
r^3 \\
r^4
\end{bmatrix}
$$

where $[K^{mn}]$ and $[r^m]$ $(m, n = 1, 2, 3, 4)$ are defined as,

$$
K_{ij}^{11} = \int_{\eta_i}^{\eta_{i+1}} \psi_i \frac{\partial \psi_j}{\partial \eta} d\eta, \quad K_{ij}^{12} = -\int_{\eta_i}^{\eta_{i+1}} \psi_i \frac{\partial \psi_j}{\partial \eta} d\eta, \quad K_{ij}^{13} = K_{ij}^{14} = 0, \quad K_{ij}^{21} = \int_{\eta_i}^{\eta_{i+1}} \psi_i \frac{\partial h_j}{\partial \eta} d\eta,
$$

$$
K_{ij}^{22} = \int_{\eta_i}^{\eta_{i+1}} \left\{-\frac{\partial \psi_i}{\partial \eta} \frac{\partial \psi_j}{\partial \eta} \psi_j + \alpha \psi_i \psi_j + \frac{1}{2} \eta \frac{\partial \psi_i}{\partial \eta} \frac{\partial \psi_j}{\partial \eta} \right\} d\eta - \int_{\eta_i}^{\eta_{i+1}} \psi_i (M + K) \psi_j d\eta,
$$

$$
K_{ij}^{23} = 0, \quad K_{ij}^{24} = 0,
$$

$$
K_{ij}^{31} = Pr \int_{\eta_i}^{\eta_{i+1}} \psi_i \frac{\partial \psi_j}{\partial \eta} d\eta, \quad K_{ij}^{32} = -Pr \int_{\eta_i}^{\eta_{i+1}} \psi_i \psi_j d\eta + A_1 \int_{\eta_i}^{\eta_{i+1}} \psi_i \psi_j d\eta,
$$

$$
K_{ij}^{33} = -\left(1 + \frac{4}{3}\alpha \right) \int_{\eta_i}^{\eta_{i+1}} \frac{\partial \psi_i}{\partial \eta} \frac{\partial \psi_j}{\partial \eta} d\eta + Pr \alpha \int_{\eta_i}^{\eta_{i+1}} \psi_i (1 + \frac{1}{2} \eta \frac{\partial \psi_j}{\partial \eta} d\eta + B_2 \psi_j d\eta,
$$

$$
K_{ij}^{34} = Du \int_{\eta_i}^{\eta_{i+1}} \frac{\partial \psi_i}{\partial \eta} \frac{\partial \psi_j}{\partial \eta} d\eta.
$$

The comparison of the skin friction coefficient $f''(0)$ for various values of $\alpha$ with Dulal Pal (2011) is made and the results are shown in Table 1 in the absence of the other parameters. The Nusselt number $Nu_x$ values for various values of $Pr$ and $\alpha$ are also compared with those of Ishak. A et al. (2009), Dulal Pal (2011) and Eshetu Haile et al. (2014) in the absence of $k, M, Sc, Du, A_1, B_2, Sc, f_\infty$ and are presented in Table 2. Thus, it is seen from Tables 1 and 2 that the numerical results are in close agreement with those published previously.

### 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Comprehensive numerical computations are conducted for different values of the parameters that describe the flow characteristics, and the results are illustrated graphically and in tabular form. Selected graphical profiles are presented in Figs. 2-19. The comparison of the skin friction coefficient $f''(0)$ for various values of $\alpha$ with Dulal Pal (2011) is made and the results are shown in Table 1 in the absence of the other parameters. The Nusselt number $Nu_x$ values for various values of $Pr$ and $\alpha$ are also compared with those of Ishak. A et al. (2009), Dulal Pal (2011) and Eshetu Haile et al. (2014) in the absence of $k, M, Sc, Du, A_1, B_2, Sc, f_\infty$ and are presented in Table 2. Thus, it is seen from Tables 1 and 2 that the numerical results are in close agreement with those published previously.
Table 1 Comparison of $f''(0)$ with previously published data for $k=0$, $M=0$, $Sr=0$, $Du=0$, $Sc=0$, $A_1=0$, $B_1=0$, $f_w=0$ and $\tau = 0$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>Dulal pal(2011)</th>
<th>Present Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-1.261043</td>
<td>-1.261036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-1.377724</td>
<td>-1.377658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-1.587366</td>
<td>-1.587301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Comparison of $-\theta'(0)$ with previously published data for $k=0$, $M=0$, $Sr=0$, $Du=0$, $Sc=0$, $A_1=0$, $B_1=0$, and $\tau = 0$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0004</td>
<td>1.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.9237</td>
<td>1.9236</td>
<td>1.9234</td>
<td>1.9235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.7207</td>
<td>3.7207</td>
<td>3.7205</td>
<td>3.7205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
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Fig. 2. Effect of M on Velocity profile.

Fig. 3. Effect of M on temperature profile.

The influence of magnetic field parameter (M) on the velocity, temperature and concentration profiles in the boundary layer is depicted in Figs. 2 to 4. It is noticed that the momentum boundary layer thickness decreases with increasing values of M. This is because of the fact that, the presence of magnetic field in an electrically-conducting fluid produces a force called the Lorentz force which acts against the flow direction causing the depreciation in the velocity profiles (Fig. 2). We noticed from Figs. 3 and 4 that the temperature and concentration profiles are enhanced with increasing values of M. This is from the reality that, to overcome the drag force imposed by the Lorentz retardation, the fluid has to perform extra work and this supplementary work can be converted into thermal energy which increases the temperature and concentration of the fluid.

Figures 5 - 7 depict the velocity ($f'$), temperature ($\theta$) and concentration ($\varphi$) distributions for different values of the suction parameter ($f_w$). It can be seen that as the values of suction parameter ($f_w$) increase the fluid velocity profiles decelerates in the boundary layer regime. This is due to the fact that suction takes away the warm fluid from...
the surface of the sheet and thereby decreases the thickness of hydrodynamic boundary layer (Fig. 5). It is observed that an increase in \( f_w \) decreases the temperature profiles in the flow region. This is because of the fact that as the suction is increased, more warm fluid is taken away from the fluid region causing depreciation in the thermal boundary layer thickness (Fig. 6). We notice from Fig. 7 that the concentration profiles decelerate with an increase in the suction parameter. This is because suction stabilizes the growth of the solutal boundary layer thickness.

\[ \text{Fig. 5. Effect of } f_w \text{ on Velocity profile.} \]

\[ \text{Fig. 6. Effect of } f_w \text{ on Temperature profile.} \]

The influence of unsteadiness parameter (\( \alpha \)) on the temperature and the concentration profiles is depicted in Figs. 8-9. It can be seen that the temperature profiles decelerate with an increase in the values of the unsteadiness parameter \( \alpha \). This is because of the usual fact that, motion is generated by the stretching of the sheet and the stretching sheet velocity and temperature are greater than the free stream velocity and temperature. As a result, the thermal boundary layer thickness decreases with the increase in the value of \( \alpha \) as shown in Fig. 8.

\[ \text{Fig. 7. Effect of } f_w \text{ on Concentration profile.} \]

\[ \text{Fig. 8. Effect of } \alpha \text{ on Temperature profile.} \]

\[ \text{Fig. 9. Effect of } \alpha \text{ on Concentration profile.} \]
The effects of the thermophoretic parameter on the temperature and concentration profiles are plotted in Figs. 10 and 11. It is seen from Fig. 10 that an increase in the value of $\tau$ there exist a slight enhancement in the temperature profiles throughout the fluid regime. This is because of the fact that the particles near the hot surface create a thermophoretic force. Fig. 11 exhibits the impact of $\tau$ on the concentration profiles. It is noticed that the concentration profiles decrease with an increase in the thermophoretic parameter $\tau$. This is because the fluid moves from the hot surface to the cold surface and that the values of the thermophoretic parameter have been taken positive. From these two figures, we conclude that the imposition of thermophoretic particle deposition into the flow increases the thickness of thermal boundary layer and decreases the solutal boundary layer thickness.

The temperature and concentration profiles for different values of the space-dependent and temperature-dependent coefficients $A_1$ and $B_1$ for the heat source/sink are depicted in Figs. 12 to 15. It is observed that the temperature in the thermal boundary layer increases with the increase in $A_1$ and $B_1$ (positive values), whereas the thermal boundary layer thickness decelerates with the decrease in the heat absorption parameters $A_1$ and $B_1$ (negative values). This is due to the fact that with increases in $A_1>0$, $B_1>0$ (heat source), the boundary layer creates energy which causes a rise in the temperature profile, whereas, with decreases in $A_1<0$, $B_1<0$ (heat absorption), the boundary layer absorbs the energy so that the thermal boundary layer thickness decreases in the fluid regime as shown in Figs. 12 and 14. The exact reverse trend is noticed on the concentration profiles with the space-dependent and temperature-dependent coefficients $A_1$ and $B_1$ for both heat generation and heat absorption cases and this behavior is presented in Figs. 13 and 15.

The combined influence of thermo-diffusion (Soret) and the diffusion-thermo (Dufour) effects on the temperature and the concentration profiles are plotted in Figs. 16 and 17, respectively. The values of $Sr$ and $Du$ have been taken as $Sr = 1.0, 0.7, 0.4, 0.1$ and $Du = 0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 0.7$, i.e. the Soret parameter values decrease and the Dufour parameter values increase. It is seen from these figures that the temperature profiles increase, whereas the concentration profiles decelerate with the rise in $Du$ and the fall in $Sr$. From the
definition, the Soret number can be defined as the effect of the temperature on the concentration and the Dufour number can be defined as the effect of the concentration on the temperature. This shows that diffusive species with lower Soret values decelerate the concentration profiles whereas the thermal species with higher Dufour values have the tendency of increasing the temperature profiles. It is worthwhile noticing that both the heat and mass transfer are highly influenced by the changes in $Sr$ and $Du$.

Figures 18 and 19 present the effects of the thermal radiation parameter $An$ on the temperature and the concentration distributions. It is observed from Fig. 18 that as the values of $An$ increase, the thickness of the thermal boundary layer also increases. This is due to the fact that imposition of $An$ in the fluid flow implies increasing of the thermal radiation in the thermal boundary layer which results in an increase in the value of the temperature profile in the fluid regime. However, reverse trend is observed in the solutal boundary layer thickness with increasing values of $An$ in the flow region and this is shown in Fig. 19.
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and the temperature-dependent (B1) parameters are presented in Table 3. It is evident that all these non-dimensional mass transfer enhances whereas the rates of the dimensionless velocity increase with increasing values of the magnetic parameter M. Moreover, the rates of non-dimensional velocity and heat transfer decrease whereas the rates of the non-dimensional mass transfer enhances for the values of both A1 and B1. The effect of the Soret parameter Sr together with the Dufour parameter Du on these non-dimensional rate coefficients is also shown in the table and it is observed that \( f''(0) \) and \( -\theta'(0) \) decelerate, whereas \( -\phi'(0) \) enhances in the flow region. The influence of thermophoretic parameter \( \tau \) and thermal radiation parameter Anis similar on these non-dimensional rate coefficients. It can be noted that the local skin-friction coefficient and the local Sherwood number increase whereas the Nusselt number decreases with increasing values of \( \tau \) and An.

### 5. CONCLUSION

In this paper, the problem of unsteady boundary layer, heat and mass transfer flow of a viscous incompressible electrically-conducting fluid through porous medium over a stretching sheet subject to thermal radiation, magnetic field, heat source/sink, Soret effect, Dufour effect and thermophoresis effect has been analyzed. The governing highly non-linear partial differential equations together with the boundary conditions are transformed into non-linear ordinary differential equations using the similarity variables and these are solved with the help of the variational finite-element method. The numerical results show that similar on these non-dimensional rate coefficients.
the present values of the local skin-friction coefficient and the Nusselt number are in good agreement with previously published work. In the present analysis, the following conclusions have attained.

(i) The velocity, temperature and the concentration profiles decrease with increases in the suction parameter, satisfying the fact that suction decelerates the momentum, thermal and solutal boundary layer thickness.

(ii) Increasing the Lorentz force decreases the velocity of the fluid.

(iii) The momentum, thermal and the concentration profiles decrease with increases in the unsteadiness parameter.

(iv) The effect of the Soret number enhances the rate of heat transfer, whereas it decelerates the rate of mass transfer.

(v) The Nusselt number decreases whereas the Sherwood number increases with increases in the values of the thermal radiation parameter.

(vi) The effect of space-dependent and temperature-dependent heat source/sink is same on both the Nusselt number and the Sherwood number.
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