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Sulfuric acid is the cause of severe attack to concrete in sewerage systems. Although normally sewage does not affect the concrete matrix, under some conditions (like raised local temperature activating anaerobic bacteria of the species *Desulfovibrio desulfuricans*, e.g., and a suitable pH range) considerable production of hydrogen sulfide $H_2S$ takes place and leads to acid attack [14]. This situation can be briefly described as follows: $H_2S$ present in the air space of a sewer dissolves in stationary moisture films on the exposed concrete surfaces where it undergoes oxidation by aerobic bacteria to sulfuric acid. The chemical attack seem to take place only on the roof and upper part of the sewer where it finally leads to damage, i.e. spalling of the material.

In spite of the fact that concrete has a long satisfactory service in sewerage systems, no hydraulic cement can withstand the acidity caused by the anaerobic conditions. In this paper, we focus our attention on forecasting the early stage of the corrosion$^1$.

We consider a semilinear reaction-diffusion system which we refer to as *micro-model*, see section 2.3 for the details. This describes the evolution of gaseous and dissolved $H_2S$, as well as of the sulfuric acid $H_2SO_4$, moisture, and gypsum at the pore level. Having as departure point a micro-model for this reaction-diffusion (RD) scenario, we want to derive, by means of asymptotic homogenization techniques, macroscopic RD models able to describe accurately the initiation of sulfate corrosion in sewer pipes. As further step, the “homogenized” models need to be tested against experimental findings at the macroscopic level and calibrated in order to forecast the penetration of the acid front.

A few basic questions are relevant at this stage:

(i) What would be “reasonable” assumptions which we may make concerning the microstructure of the concrete pipe? How much freedom we have for a deterministic averaging strategy?

(ii) Does the resulting macro-model approximate well the rather complex multi-scale physico-chemical situation?

(iii) How good is/can be this approximation?

---

$^1$ Whitish surface deposits appear, but the mechanical properties of the material stay unaffected. Note that at a later stage, a gradual softening of the cement paste appears and mechanical destabilization of the microstructure takes place. The literature reports about rates of corrosion of ca. 6–12 mm penetration depth per year.
Since the analysis we report here is only preliminary, we address particularly question (i) and leave questions (ii) and (iii) for the moment unanswered.

The paper is organized as follows: In section 2 we give a minimal modeling at the pore level of the relevant physicochemical processes involved in the early stage of sulfate corrosion of cement-based materials and explain both the flexibility and limitations of our modeling. We define in section 2.1 a periodic-cells approximation of the part of the concrete pipe we are looking at as well as the corresponding locally-periodic array of perforations. We nondimensionalize in section 3 the micro-model presented in section 2.3. The homogenization procedure, the macro and micro-macro mass-balance equations together with a list of effective transport and reaction coefficients are presented in section 4.

A FEW COMMENTS ON RELATED LITERATURE

The reader can find details on civil engineering aspects concerning concrete corrosion issues when acid attack is involved, for instance, in [4, 3, 27, 25, 19, 29]. We particularly like [4] for the clear exposition of the phenomenology and for the enumeration of the main mechanisms influencing acid corrosion. A standard reference work concerning cement chemistry is [28].

From the modeling point of view, we were very much inspired by [7] [see also the subsequent papers [17, 18]], where the authors adopted a macroscopic moving-boundary modeling strategy to capture the macroscopic corrosion front penetrating the pipe. We adapted some of their modeling ideas for the micro-model proposed in section 2.3. Another macroscopic approach for a closely related sulfatation problem has been reported in [1].

At the technical level, we essentially use formal asymptotics techniques for both the periodic and locally-periodic homogenization. We refer the reader to [2] for a discussion on uniform descriptions of heterogeneous media, while the working technique is detailed for instance in [6, 26], and [11] (chapter 7); see also [30] for a related application. Refs. [9, 15, 20, 11] contain more theoretical approaches able to justify the asymptotics at least for simpler PDE models.

Homogenization problems in \textit{locally-periodic perforated domains} have been dealt with in [21, 5, 8, 9], e.g.; see [10] for a more recent account of bibliographic information. At the technical level, we rely on the analysis reported in [8] for the case of a Poisson problem with a linear Fourier condition imposed at the boundary of the perforation. We assume a locally-periodic distribution of the perforations (i.e. of
the micropores). By this we step away from the often used periodic approximation of porous media, which for the particular case of concrete is much too rough. Moreover, we expect that some randomness is needed for better covering what happens in reality, but we prefer for the moment to stick with a deterministic approach and understand [for this easier case] the occurrence of new terms expressing deviations from periodicity.

Structured transport in porous media, like that arising when gaseous and dissolved chemical species (here: \( H_2S(g) \) and \( H_2S(aq) \)) diffuse simultaneously, multi-spatial-scale situations naturally occur [12, 22, 23, 24]. Many of these models can be derived rigorously by means of homogenization techniques [16]. Note that the formal analysis done for a two-scale setting in section 3.3.2 of [22] remotely resembles ours for the case (2).

2. Modeling sulfate corrosion in sewer pipes

In this section, we describe the geometry of the sewer and present our concept of microstructure. Next we recall the physical and chemical mechanisms that we take into account, and finally, we list the equations entering our micro-model.

2.1. Description of the problem and geometry

We consider a cross-section of a sewerage pipe made of partially wet concrete. It is worth noting that concrete is a mixture of cement, gel and mobile water as well as of aggregate (sand, gravels, etc). Therefore we assume that any microstructure (any representative cell) contains three non-overlapping regions: the solid matrix (aggregate, eventually inaccessible-to-diffusion gel water, cement paste, etc.), the pore water clinging on solid fabrics as well as the air-filled part of the pore; see Fig. 1 for a sketch of the cell geometry, say \( Y \), divided into three (distinct and non-mixed) components: solid, water, and air. We assume that the solid part is placed in the center of the cell which is enclosed by a stationary water film. Around the water film, we assume the presence of bulk air as shown in Fig 1 (bottom). Additionally, we assume that the domain of interest can be approximated by a finite union of this kind of cells.

Let us now have a look on our perforations: Each cell contains two internal interfaces: one separating the solid part from the water film, and the second separating the water film from the air part. We consider the following constraints to be fulfilled:
(i) Each cell contains all three regions: solid, air, and water. None of them disappears during the RD process. The shapes of their outer boundaries do not evolve with the time, but are allowed to be \( x \)-dependent. This means that they may be different at different space positions.

(ii) The \( x \)-dependency of the internal interfaces mentioned in (i) is locally periodic.

(iii) All internal interfaces are sufficiently smooth.

Usually, in periodic homogenization approaches (like in [6, 11]) the shape of these interfaces (i.e. the boundary of the perforations) is \( x \)-independent. If the shape of the internal interfaces in the cell is not \( x \)-dependent, then the outer normals to these interfaces depend on the fast variable \( y = \frac{x}{\varepsilon} \) only. Hence, oscillations of the internal boundaries from cell to cell cannot be captured anymore.

\[^2\text{Ref. [31] reports about a homogenization procedure which can deal (unfortunately only) formally with evolving microstructures for a precipitation/dissolution problem.}\]
We notice in section 4 that the dependence of the normals vectors to the active internal interfaces on both $x$ and $y$ variables involves difficulties at the technical level, but the fact that (ii) holds will be very helpful in controlling (at least formally) the oscillations.

2.2. Notation

Let $\Omega$ be an open set in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with a smooth boundary $\Gamma$ having two disjoint pieces $\Gamma^D$ and $\Gamma^N$. Here $\Gamma^D \cup \Gamma^N = \Gamma$ and $\mu(\Gamma^D) \neq 0$, where $\mu$ is the (surface) Lebesque measure in $\mathbb{R}^2$. The domain $Y$ is the reference cell in $\mathbb{R}^3$, while $S := (0, T)$ is the time interval. $Y$ splits up into $Y^a$ - the air-filled part of the cell, $Y^w$ - the water-filled part of the cell, and $Y^s$ - solid part of the cell. Furthermore,

$$Y := Y^w \cup Y^s \cup Y^a \text{ with } Y^w \cap Y^s \cap Y^a = \emptyset.$$

Also, we denote $\Gamma^{sw} := \partial Y^s$ to be the interface between water and solid part of the cell and $\Gamma^{wa} := \partial Y^w$ as the interface between the water-filled and air-filled part of the cell.

2.2.1. Periodic array of perforations

For a subset $X$ of $Y$ and the integer vectors $k = (k_1, k_2, k_3) \in \mathbb{Z}^3$, we denote the shifted subset by

$$X_k := X + \sum_{i=1}^{3} k_i e_i,$$  \hfill (1)

where $e_i$ is the $i$th unit vector in $\mathbb{R}^3$.

We assume that $\hat{\Omega}_\varepsilon$ is made up of copies of the unit cell scaled by a sufficiently small scaling factor $\varepsilon > 0$. Here $\varepsilon$ is a small parameter whose precise meaning will become clear in section 3.

$\hat{\Omega}_\varepsilon := \hat{Y}^\varepsilon \cup \hat{Y}^{wa}_\varepsilon \cup \hat{Y}^{wa}_\varepsilon$;

$\hat{Y}^a_\varepsilon := \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \{ \varepsilon Y^a_k | \varepsilon Y^a_k \subset \Omega \}$, the air-filled part of the pores;

$\hat{Y}^w_\varepsilon := \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \{ \varepsilon Y^w_k | \varepsilon Y^w_k \subset \Omega \}$, the water-filled part of the pores;

$\hat{Y}^s_\varepsilon := \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \{ \varepsilon Y^s_k | \varepsilon Y^s_k \subset \Omega \}$, solid matrix;

$\hat{\Gamma}^{sw}_\varepsilon := \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \{ \varepsilon \Gamma^{sw}_k | \varepsilon \Gamma^{sw}_k \subset \Omega \}$ water-solid interface;

$\hat{\Gamma}^{wa}_\varepsilon := \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \{ \varepsilon \Gamma^{wa}_k | \varepsilon \Gamma^{wa}_k \subset \Omega \}$ water-air interface.

2.2.2. Locally-periodic array of perforations

In the locally-periodic setting, one represents the normal vector $n^\varepsilon$ to the “oscillating” internal boundaries of the perforations in the form suggested, for instance, in [9, 5]:

$$n^\varepsilon(x, y) := \tilde{n}(x, y) + \varepsilon n'(x, y) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2),$$  \hfill (2)
where
\[ \tilde{n}(x, y) = \frac{\nabla_y P(x, y)}{\|\nabla_y P(x, y)\|} \] (3)
and
\[ n'(x, y) = \frac{\nabla_x P(x, y)}{\|\nabla_y P(x, y)\|} - \nabla_y P(x, y) \frac{\nabla_x P(x, y) \nabla_y P(x, y)}{\|\nabla_y P(x, y)\|^3}. \] (4)
Here the generic surface \( P(x, y) \), which describes the interfaces \( \Gamma_{sw}^\varepsilon \), \( \Gamma_{wa}^\varepsilon \), and \( \Gamma_\varepsilon \), respectively, is assumed to be 1-periodic function in the variable \( y \) and sufficiently smooth with respect to both variables \( x, y \).

It is worth noting that for uniformly periodic perforations \( \tilde{n} \) only depends in \( y \) and \( n' = 0 \). To give a meaning to the formal calculations, which we perform in this paper, is enough to define the locally-periodicity appearing in the geometry from (left) using the description (2) of the normal vectors to the non-periodically-placed interfaces.

![Figure 2. Left: Locally periodic array of perforations; Right: Uniformly periodic array of perforations. In the two pictures, we expect the occurrence of differences at most of order of \( O(\varepsilon) \) between any two corresponding inner interfaces.](image)

We refer the reader to [5] for an accurate mathematical description of the geometry described in Figure 2 (left) and to [21] for connections between locally-periodic perforated domains and quasi-periodic functions. See [15] for a notation strategy for the periodic case.

2.3. MICRO-MODEL

LIST OF DATA AND UNKNOWNS

The data is given by
\[ u_{10} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ - \text{the initial concentration of } H_2SO_4(aq) \]

\[ \Gamma_{sw}^{\varepsilon}, \Gamma_{wa}^{\varepsilon}, \text{ and } \Gamma_\varepsilon \text{ point out the same class of objects as those defined in the periodic setting with the same name under a hat, but now the periodicity assumption is removed. The same statment holds for } \Omega_\varepsilon, Y_{sw}^{\varepsilon}, Y_{wa}^{\varepsilon}, \text{ and } Y_\varepsilon^{\varepsilon}. \]
The mass-balance equation for moisture is given by

\[ \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \text{div}(-d_1^m \nabla u) = 0, \quad x \in Y^w, t \in S \]

The unknowns are

- \( u_1 \): mass concentration of H2S(aq) [g/cm^3]
- \( u_2 \): mass concentration of H2SO4(aq) [g/cm^3]
- \( u_3 \): mass concentration of H2S(g) [g/cm^3]
- \( u_4 \): mass concentration of moisture [g/cm^3]
- \( u_5 \): mass concentration of gypsum [g/cm^3]

The mass-balance equation for H2S(aq) is given by

\[ \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial t} + \text{div}(-d_1^m \nabla u_1) = -k_1^m u_1 + k_2^m u_2, \quad x \in Y^w, t \in S \]

The mass-balance equation for H2S(g) is given by

\[ \frac{\partial u_3}{\partial t} + \text{div}(-d_3^m \nabla u_3) = 0, \quad x \in Y^w, t \in S \]

The mass-balance equation for the gypsum present at the water-solid interface is

\[ \frac{\partial u_5}{\partial t} = \eta(u_1^g, u_5^g), \quad x \in \Gamma_{gw}^w, t \in S \]

The mass-balance equation for the gypsum present at the exterior concentration (Dirichlet data) is

\[ \frac{\partial u_5^D}{\partial t} : \Gamma_D \times S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \]
Note that the lack of diffusion in (9) gives the partly dissipative feature to the model.

The list of coefficients in (5)-(9) is as follows:

- \( k^\varepsilon_j : \Omega \times S \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) - reaction constants for all \( j \in \{1, 2, 3\} \),
- \( d^\varepsilon_i : \Omega \times S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} \) - diffusion coefficients for \( H_2SO_4, H_2S(aq), H_2S(g) \) and \( H_2O \) for all \( i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\} \),
- \( a^\varepsilon : \Gamma_{wa} \times S \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) - the adsorption factor of \( H_2S(air \rightarrow water) \),
- \( b^\varepsilon : \Gamma_{wa} \times S \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) - the desorption factor of \( H_2S(air \rightarrow water) \),
- \( \eta : \Gamma_{sw} \times S \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) - reaction rate on water-solid interface.

It is tacitly assumed that all reaction constants, diffusion coefficients, absorption and desorption factors as well as normal vectors to the water-solid and water-air interfaces are Y-periodic functions as follows:

- \( d^\varepsilon_i(x, t) := d_i(\tilde{x}, t), \quad i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\} \),
- \( k^\varepsilon_j(x, t) := k_j(\tilde{x}, t), \quad j \in \{1, 2, 3\} \),
- \( a^\varepsilon(x, t) := a(\tilde{x}, t) \), and \( b^\varepsilon(x, t) := b(\tilde{x}, t) \).

To fix ideas, notice that the reaction rate \( \eta \) may take the form

\[
\eta(\alpha, \beta) = \begin{cases} 
   k^\varepsilon_j(x)\alpha^{p}(\bar{c} - \beta)^{q}, & \text{if } \alpha \geq 0, \beta \geq 0 \\
   0, & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

where \( \bar{c} \) is a known constant. The reader is referred to [7, 29] for more modeling details.

Note that the micro-model can be easily extended by allowing for ionic transport and the reaction of sulfate ions with the aluminate phases in concrete. A much more difficult step is to model the reaction-induced deformation of the microstructure and to account for the simultaneous space- and time-evolution of the active parts of the perforations.

### 3. Nondimensionalization

We introduce the characteristic length \( L \) for the space variable such that \( x = L\tilde{x} \), the time variable is scaled as \( t = \tau s \), and for the concentrations we use \( u^\varepsilon_i = u^\varepsilon_i \tau \), where\(^4\) \( u^\varepsilon_i \tau = \| u^\varepsilon_i \|_{\infty} \) for all \( i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\} \). \( k_j \) are scaled as \( k^\varepsilon_j = k^\varepsilon_j \tilde{k}_j \), where \( k^\varepsilon_j = \| k^\varepsilon_j \|_{\infty} \) for all \( j \in \{1, 2, 3\} \) and \( d_i := d^\varepsilon_i \tau \), for all \( i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\} \). We make use of two mass-transfer Biot numbers\(^5\) for the two spatial scales in question: micro and macro.

\(^4\) \( L^\infty \)-bounds on concentrations and the existence of positive weak solutions to the micro-model are shown in [13].

\(^5\) Biot numbers are dimensionless quantities mostly used in heat transfer calculations. They relate the heat transfer (mass transfer) resistance inside and at the surface of a body.
Our first Biot number is defined by

\[ B_{im} := \frac{b_{m ref} L}{D}, \]  

(10)

where \( b_{m ref} \) is a reference reaction rate acting at the water solid interface within the microstructure and \( D \) is a reference diffusion coefficient. Our second Biot number is defined by

\[ B_{iM} := \frac{b_{M ref} L}{D}, \]  

(11)

where \( b_{M ref} \) is a reference reaction rate at the water-solid interface at the macro level. The connection between the two Biot numbers is given by

\[ B_{im} = \varepsilon B_{iM}. \]  

(12)

In some sense, relation (12) defines our small scaling parameter \( \varepsilon \) with respect to which we wish to homogenize. Furthermore, we introduce two other dimensionless numbers:

\[ \beta_i := \frac{u_{i ref}}{u_{i ref}}, \quad \gamma_i := \frac{d_{i ref}}{d_{3 ref}}. \]  

(13)

\( \beta_i \) represents the ratio of the maximum concentration of the \( i \)th species to the maximum \( H_2SO_4 \) concentration, while \( \gamma_i \) denotes the ratio of the characteristic time of the \( i \)th diffusive aqueous species to the characteristic diffusion time of \( H_2S(g) \).

In terms of the newly introduced quantities, the mass-balance equation for \( H_2SO_4 \) takes the form

\[ \frac{u_{i ref}}{\tau} \partial_s v_1^i + \frac{u_{i ref}}{\tau} \frac{d_{i ref}}{L} \text{div}(-\tilde{d}_1 \nabla v_1^i) = -k_1 u_{i ref} \tilde{k}_1 v_1^i + k_2 u_{i ref} \tilde{k}_2 v_2^i, \]  

(14)

and hence,

\[ \beta_1 \partial_s v_1^i + \frac{\beta_1 d_{i ref}}{L} \text{div}(-\tilde{d}_1 \nabla v_1^i) = -\frac{k_1 u_{i ref} \tau}{u_{i ref}} \tilde{k}_1 v_1^i + \frac{k_2 u_{i ref} \tau}{u_{i ref}} \tilde{k}_2 v_2^i. \]  

(15)

As reference time, we choose the characteristic time scale of the fastest species (here: \( H_2S(g) \)), that is \( \tau := \tau_{diff} = \frac{L^2}{\sigma_{ref}} \). We get

\[ \beta_1 \partial_s v_1^i + \beta_1 \gamma_1 \text{div}(-\tilde{d}_1 \nabla v_1^i) = -\frac{\eta_{i ref} \tau}{u_{i ref}} \tilde{k}_1 v_1^i + \frac{\eta_{i ref} \tau}{u_{i ref}} \tilde{k}_2 v_2^i \]  

(16)

Let us denote by \( \tau_{reac}^j := \frac{u_{i ref}}{\eta_{ref}^j} \) the characteristic time scale of the \( j \)th reaction, where the quantity \( \eta_{ref}^j \) is a reference reaction rate for the
corresponding chemical reaction. With this new notation in hand, we obtain

\[ \beta_1 \partial_s v_1^e + \beta_1 \gamma_1 \text{div}(-\tilde{d}_1 \nabla v_1^e) = -\Phi_1^2 k_1 v_1^e + \Phi_2^2 k_2 v_2^e \]  

(17)

where \( \Phi_j^2, j \in \{1, 2, 3\} \) are Thiele-like moduli. The \( j \)th Thiele modulus \( \Phi_j^2 \) compares the characteristic time of the diffusion of the fastest species and the characteristic time of the \( j \)th chemical reaction. It is defined as

\[ \Phi_j^2 := \frac{\tau_{\text{diff}}}{\tau_{\text{reac}}} \text{ for all } j \in \{1, 2, 3\}. \]  

(18)

For the boundary condition involving a surface reaction, we obtain

\[ \tilde{n}_e \cdot (-\tilde{d}_1 \nabla v_1^e)) = \frac{\tau_{\text{diff}}}{\gamma_1 \tau_{\text{reac}}} \tilde{\eta}(v_1^e, v_5^e), \]  

(19)

and therefore,

\[ \tilde{n}_e \cdot (-\tilde{d}_1 \nabla v_1^e)) = -\varepsilon \Phi_2^3 \tilde{\eta}(v_1^e, v_5^e). \]  

(20)

Note that the quantity \( \varepsilon \Phi_3^2 \) plays the role of a Thiele modulus for a surface reaction, while \( \Phi_1^2 \) and \( \Phi_2^2 \) are Thiele moduli for volume reactions. Similarly, the mass-balance equation for the species \( H_2S(aq) \) becomes

\[ \beta_2 \partial_s v_2^e + \beta_2 \gamma_2 \text{div}(-\tilde{d}_2 \nabla v_2^e) = \Phi_1^2 k_1 v_1^e - \Phi_2^2 k_2 v_2^e. \]  

(21)

The boundary condition at the air-water interface becomes

\[ \tilde{n}_e \cdot (-\tilde{d}_2 \nabla v_2^e)) = \varepsilon Bi^M (\frac{\alpha_1 \beta_2}{\beta_3} v_3^e - v_2^e). \]  

(22)

The mass balance equation for \( H_2S(g) \) is

\[ \beta_3 \partial_s v_3^e + \beta_3 \text{div}(-\tilde{d}_3 \nabla v_3^e) = 0, \]  

(23)

while the boundary condition at the air-water interface reads

\[ \tilde{n}_e \cdot (-\tilde{d}_3 \nabla v_3^e)) = -\varepsilon Bi^M (\frac{\alpha_3 \beta_3}{\beta_3} v_3^e - \frac{\beta_3}{\beta_3} v_2^e). \]  

(24)

Finally, the mass-balance equation for moisture is

\[ \beta_4 \partial_s v_4^e + \beta_4 \gamma_4 \text{div}(-\tilde{d}_4 \nabla v_4^e) = \Phi_1^2 k_1 v_1^e \]  

(25)

and the ODE for gypsum becomes

\[ \beta_5 \partial_s v_5^e = \Phi_3^2 \tilde{\eta}(v_1^e, v_5^e). \]  

(26)

To simplify the notation, we drop all the tildes and keep the meaning of the unknowns and operators as mentioned in this section.
4. Formal homogenization procedure

Homogenization is a generic term which refers to finding effective model equations and coefficients, i.e. objects independent of $\varepsilon$. For our problem, the homogenization procedure will provide us an approximate macroscopic model (that we refer to as macro-model) defined for a uniform medium, where the original microstructure and phase separation (water, air, and solid) can not be seen anymore. The hope is that the solutions to the macro-model are sufficient close\(^6\) to the solutions of the micro-model as $\varepsilon$ goes to zero.

In this section, we study the asymptotic behaviour of the solutions to the micro-model as $\varepsilon \to 0$ for two parameter regimes reflecting two different types of diffusive-like transport of chemical species in concrete: “uniform” diffusion (see section 4.1) and “structured” diffusion (section 4.2).

4.1. Case 1: $d_i^\varepsilon = \mathcal{O}(1)$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$

We consider that the diffusion speed is comparable for all concentrations, i.e. the diffusion coefficients $d_i^\varepsilon$ are of order of $\mathcal{O}(1)$ w.r.t. $\varepsilon$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. We assume that the solutions $v_i^\varepsilon(x, t)$ ($i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$) of the micro-model admit the following asymptotic expansion

$$v_i^\varepsilon(x, t) = v_{i0}(x, y, t) + \varepsilon v_{i1}(x, y, t) + \varepsilon^2 v_{i2}(x, y, t) + \ldots,$$

(27)

where $y = \frac{x}{\varepsilon}$ and the functions $v_{im}(x, y, t), m = 1, 2, 3, \ldots$, are $Y$-periodic in $y$.

If we define (compare [6, 11], e.g.)

$$\Psi_\varepsilon(x, t) := \Psi\left(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}, t\right),$$

then

$$\frac{\partial \Psi_\varepsilon}{\partial x_i} = \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial x_i}\left(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial y_i}\left(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right)$$

(28)

We investigate the asymptotic behavior of the solution $v_1^\varepsilon(x, t)$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$ of the following problem posed in the domain $Y_{w_\varepsilon}$

$$\beta_1 \partial_s v_1^\varepsilon + \beta_1 \gamma_1 \text{div}(-d_1 \nabla v_1^\varepsilon) = -\Phi_1^2 k_1^s v_1^\varepsilon + \Phi_2^2 k_2^s v_2^\varepsilon \quad \text{in} \ Y_{w_\varepsilon},$$

$v_1^\varepsilon(x, t) = 0$ on $\Gamma$,

$n_\varepsilon \cdot (-d_1 \nabla v_1^\varepsilon) = -\varepsilon \frac{\Phi_2}{\gamma_1} \eta(v_1^\varepsilon, v_5^\varepsilon)$ on $\Gamma_{w_\varepsilon}^u$,

$n_\varepsilon \cdot (-d_1 \nabla v_1^\varepsilon) = 0$ on $\Gamma_{w_\varepsilon}^u$,  

---

\(^6\) The status of being “close” needs rigorous concepts (and proofs) that will be discussed in a forthcoming paper.
Using now the asymptotic expansion of the solution $v_1(x, t)$ in (29) and equating the terms with the same powers of $\varepsilon$, we obtain:

\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{cases}
A_0 v_{10} &= 0 \text{ in } Y_\varepsilon^w, \\
v_{10} &= \text{Y-periodic in } y,
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]

(30)

where the operator $A_0$ is given by

\[
A_0 := -\sum_{i,j=1}^{3} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} (d^{ij}_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j}).
\]

As next step, we get

\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{cases}
A_0 v_{11} &= -A_1 v_{10} \text{ in } Y_\varepsilon^w, \\
v_{11} &= \text{Y-periodic in } y, \\
(d_1 \nabla_y v_{11}, \tilde{n}) &= -(d_1 \nabla_x v_{10}, \tilde{n}),
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]

(31)

where

\[
A_1 := -\sum_{i,j=1}^{3} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (d^{ij}_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}) - \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} (d^{ij}_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j}).
\]

Furthermore, it holds that

\[
\begin{align*}
\beta_1 \gamma_1 A_0 v_{12} &= -\beta_1 \gamma_1 A_1 v_{11} - \beta_1 \gamma_1 A_2 v_{10} - \beta_1 \partial_y v_{10} \\
&- \Phi^2_1 k_1(y) v_{10} + \Phi^2_2 k_2(y) v_{20} \text{ in } Y_\varepsilon^w, \\
v_{12} &= \text{Y-periodic in } y, \\
(d_1 \nabla_y v_{12}, \tilde{n}) &= -(d_1 \nabla_x v_{11}, \tilde{n}) - (d_1 \nabla_x v_{10}, n') - (d_1 \nabla_y v_{11}, n') \\
&- \frac{\Phi^2_2}{\gamma_1} (v_{10}, v_{50}) \text{ on } \Gamma_{sw}^\varepsilon, \\
(d_1 \nabla_y v_{12}, \tilde{n}) &= -(d_1 \nabla_x v_{11}, \tilde{n}) - (d_1 \nabla_x v_{10}, n') - (d_1 \nabla_y v_{11}, n') \text{ on } \Gamma_{wa}^\varepsilon,
\end{align*}
\]

(32)

(33)

(34)

where

\[
A_2 := -\sum_{i,j=1}^{3} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (d^{ij}_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}).
\]

From (30), we obtain that $v_{10}$ is independent of $y$. Since the elliptic equation for $v_{11}$ [with right-hand side defined in terms of $v_{10}$] is linear, its solution can be represented via

\[
v_{11}(x, y, t) := -\sum_{k=1}^{3} \chi_k(x, y, t) \frac{\partial v_{10}(x, t)}{\partial x_k} + v_1(x, t),
\]

where the functions $\chi_k(x, y, t)$ solve the cell problem(s) and are periodic w.r.t. $y$. In the rest of the paper, we do not point out anymore the dependence of $\chi_k$ on the parameter $t$. The exact expression of $v_1$ does
not matter much at this stage. Using the expression of $v_{11}$, we obtain following cell problems in the standard manner:

\[
A_0 \chi^k(x, y) = -\sum_{i=1}^{3} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} d_i^k(y), \; k \in \{1, 2, 3\} \text{ in } Y^w, \quad (35)
\]

\[
\sum_{i,j,k=1}^{3} \frac{\partial v_{10}}{\partial x_k} [d_i^j \frac{\partial \chi^k}{\partial y_j} \tilde{n}_i - d_i^k \tilde{n}_j] = 0, \quad \text{on } \Gamma^{sw},
\]

\[
\sum_{i,j,k=1}^{3} \frac{\partial v_{10}}{\partial x_k} [d_i^j \frac{\partial \chi^k}{\partial y_j} \tilde{n}_i - d_i^k \tilde{n}_j] = 0, \quad \text{on } \Gamma^{wa}
\]

Since the right-hand side of (35) integrated over $Y$ is zero, this problem has a unique solution. Note also that

\[
\beta_1 \gamma_1 A_0 v_{12} = \beta_1 \gamma_1 \left[ \sum_{i,j,k=1}^{3} \frac{\partial v_{10}}{\partial x_k} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} \left( d_i^j \frac{\partial \chi^k}{\partial x_j} \right) - \sum_{i,j,k=1}^{3} \frac{\partial^2 v_{10}}{\partial x_j \partial x_k} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} \left( d_i^j \chi^k \right) + \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} \frac{\partial d_i^j}{\partial y_i} \frac{\partial \tilde{n}_i}{\partial x_j} \right] - \beta_1 \partial_s v_{10} - \Phi_2^2 k_1(y) v_{10} + \Phi_2^2 k_2(y) v_{20}.
\]

Moreover, we have

\[
\beta_1 \gamma_1 (d_1 \nabla_y v_{12}, \tilde{n}) = \beta_1 \gamma_1 \left[ \sum_{i,j,k=1}^{3} d_i^j \frac{\partial v_{10}}{\partial x_k} \frac{\partial \chi^k}{\partial x_i} \tilde{n}_j \right] + \sum_{i,j,k=1}^{3} d_i^j \frac{\partial^2 v_{10}}{\partial x_j \partial x_k} \chi^k \tilde{n}_j - \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} d_i^j \frac{\partial v_{10}}{\partial x_i} \tilde{n}_j'
\]

\[
- \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} d_i^j \frac{\partial \tilde{n}_i}{\partial x_i} \tilde{n}_j + \sum_{i,j,k=1}^{3} d_i^j \frac{\partial \chi^k}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial v_{10}}{\partial x_k} \tilde{n}_j'
\]

\[
- \frac{\Phi_2^2}{\gamma_1} \eta(v_{10}, v_{50}). \quad (36)
\]

Writing down the compatibility condition (see e.g. Lemma 2.1 in [26]), we get

\[
\int_{Y^w} \beta_1 \gamma_1 \left[ \sum_{i,j,k=1}^{3} \frac{\partial v_{10}}{\partial x_k} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} \left( d_i^j \frac{\partial \chi^k}{\partial x_j} \right) + \sum_{i,j,k=1}^{3} \frac{\partial^2 v_{10}}{\partial x_j \partial x_k} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} \left( d_i^j \chi^k \right) \right]
\]
forward calculations, we obtain

\[
\beta_1 \partial_y v_{10} + \Phi_1^2 v_{10} \frac{1}{|Y_v|} \int_{Y_v} k_1(y) dy - \Phi_2^2 v_{20} \frac{1}{|Y_v|} \int_{Y_v} k_2(y) dy
\]

\[
- \beta_1 \gamma_1 \sum_{i,j,k=1}^3 \frac{\partial^2 v_{10}}{\partial x_i \partial x_k} \partial^2 \chi^k \frac{\partial v_{10}}{\partial y_j} (d_{ij}^k \partial y_j - d_{ik}^k) 
- \beta_1 \gamma_1 \sum_{i,j,k=1}^3 \langle d_{ij}^k \frac{\partial \chi^k}{\partial x_k} \partial v_{10} \rangle \frac{\partial v_{10}}{\partial x_k} 
= -\beta_1 \gamma_1 \sum_{i,j,k=1}^3 \frac{\partial v_{10}}{\partial x_k} \frac{1}{|Y_v|} \int_{\Gamma_v^w} (d_{ij}^k n_j - d_{ij}^k \frac{\partial v_{10}}{\partial y_j} n_j) d\sigma_y
- \beta_1 \gamma_1 \Phi_3^2 v_{10} \frac{1}{|Y_v|} \int_{\Gamma_v^w} v_{50}(x, y, t) k_3(y) d\sigma_y, 
\]

where \( \langle f \rangle_V := \frac{1}{V} \int_V f \, dx \) for any \( V \) a subset of either \( Y_v^a \) or \( Y_v^w \). The latter PDE can be rewritten as

\[
\beta_1 \partial_y v_{10} - \beta_1 \gamma_1 \sum_{i,j,k=1}^3 \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} (d_{ij}^k \frac{\partial \chi^k}{\partial y_j} - d_{ik}^k \frac{\partial v_{10}}{\partial x_k}) + \Phi_1^2 v_{10} K_1 - \Phi_2^2 v_{20} K_2 
= -\beta_1 \gamma_1 \sum_{k=1}^3 \frac{\partial v_{10}}{\partial x_k} U_k - \beta_1 \Phi_3^2 v_{10} K_3 \text{ in } \Omega, 
\]
and \( v_{10} = 0 \) on \( \Gamma \), where

\[
K_\ell := \frac{1}{|Y^w_\varepsilon|} \int_{Y^w_\varepsilon} k_\ell(y)dy, \; \ell \in \{1, 2\}
\]

(40)

\[
K_3 := \frac{1}{|Y^w_\varepsilon|} \int_{\Gamma^{sw}_\varepsilon} v_{50}(x, y, t)k_3(y)d\sigma_y,
\]

(41)

and

\[
U_k := \frac{1}{|Y^w_\varepsilon|} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \int_{\Gamma^{sw}_\varepsilon} (d_{ij}^{k} n'_j - d_i \partial \chi^k \partial y_i n'_j)d\sigma_y.
\]

(42)

The terms \( U_k \) are new. They occur due to the assumed deviation from a uniformly periodic distribution of perforations.

Now we apply the same procedure to the next mass-balance equation. To do this, we consider the auxiliary cell problem

\[
A_0 \chi^k(x, y) = -\sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} d_{ij}^{k}(y), \; k \in \{1, 2, 3\} \text{ in } Y^w,
\]

\[
\sum_{i,j,k=1}^3 \partial v_{10} \partial x_i [d_{ij}^{k} \partial \chi^k \partial y_i n_i - d_i \partial \chi^k \partial y_i n'_i] = 0, \; \text{on } \Gamma^{sw},
\]

\[
\sum_{i,j,k=1}^3 \partial v_{10} \partial x_i [d_{ij}^{k} \partial \chi^k \partial y_i n_i - d_i \partial \chi^k \partial y_i n'_i] = 0, \; \text{on } \Gamma^{wa},
\]

(43)

whose solution is \( \chi^k(x, y) \). We obtain the upscaled PDE:

\[
\beta_2 \partial_x v_{20} - \Phi_1^2 v_{10} k_1 + \Phi_2^2 v_{20} k_2 - \beta_2 \gamma_2 \sum_{i,j,k=1}^3 \partial \partial x_i ((d_{ij}^{k} \partial \chi^k \partial y_j - d_i \partial \chi^k \partial y_i) \partial v_{20} \partial x_k) =
\]

\[
- \beta_2 \gamma_2 \sum_{k=1}^3 \partial \partial x_k U_k - \beta_3 B_i M v_{30} C + \beta_2 B_i M v_{20} B,
\]

(44)

holding in \( \Omega \) and

\[ v_{20} = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma, \]

where

\[
C := \frac{1}{|Y^w_\varepsilon|} \int_{\Gamma^{wa}_\varepsilon} b(y)H(y)d\sigma_y,
\]

(45)

\[
H^x(\varepsilon) := \frac{a_x(x)}{b_x(x)}
\]

(46)

\[
B := \frac{1}{|Y^w_\varepsilon|} \int_{\Gamma^{wa}_\varepsilon} b(y)d\sigma_y,
\]

(47)

\[
U_k := \frac{1}{|Y^w_\varepsilon|} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \int_{\Gamma^{wa}_\varepsilon} (d_{ij}^{k} n'_j - d_i \partial \chi^k \partial y_i n'_i)d\sigma_y.
\]

(48)
We treat now the mass-balance equation for $H_2S(g)$. The corresponding cell problems are given by

\[
A_0 \chi^k(x, y) = -\sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} d^k_i(y), \quad k = 1, 2, 3 \quad \text{in } Y^a,
\]

\[
\sum_{j,k=1}^3 \frac{\partial v_{30}}{\partial x} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 d_{ij}^3 \frac{\partial \chi^k}{\partial y_j} - d^k_\delta \hat{n}_j \right] = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma^{wa},
\]

\[
\sum_{j,k=1}^3 \frac{\partial v_{30}}{\partial x} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 d_{ij}^3 \frac{\partial \chi^k}{\partial y_j} - d^k_\gamma \hat{n}_j \right] = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma^{we},
\]

while the macroscopic PDE is

\[
\partial_s v_{30} - \sum_{i,j,k=1}^3 \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left( (d_{ij}^3 \frac{\partial \chi^k}{\partial y_j} - d^k_\delta) \frac{\partial v_{30}}{\partial x_k} \right) = -\sum_{k=1}^3 \frac{\partial v_{30}}{\partial x_k} U_k + \beta_3 B_i M v_{30} C - \beta_2 B_i M v_{20} B \quad (49)
\]

in $\Omega$ with $v_{30} = v_{30}^D$, on $\Gamma^D$. Here we have

\[
C := \frac{1}{|Y^a|} \int_{\Gamma^{wa}} b(y) H(y) d\sigma_y,
\]

\[
B := \frac{1}{|Y^a|} \int_{\Gamma^{wa}} b(y) d\sigma_y.
\]

Same procedure leads to

\[
\beta_4 \partial_s v_{40} - \Phi_1^2 v_{10} k_1 - \beta_4 \gamma_4 \sum_{i,j,k=1}^3 \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left( (d_{ij}^4 \frac{\partial \chi^k}{\partial y_j} - d^k_\delta) \frac{\partial v_{40}}{\partial x_k} \right) = -\beta_4 \gamma_4 \sum_{k=1}^3 \frac{\partial v_{40}}{\partial x_k} U_k, \quad (52)
\]

in $\Omega$ with $v_{40} = 0$, on $\Gamma$.

Interestingly, the case of the ODE for gypsum

\[
\partial_s v_5 = \Phi_3^2 \eta(v_1, v_5) \quad \text{on } \Gamma^{sw}_s, \quad s \in S,
\]

\[
v_5(x, 0) = v_{50}(x),
\]

seems to be more problematic. Let us firstly use the same homogenization ansatz as before and employ

\[
\eta(v_1, v_5) = \eta_0^A(v_{10}(x, t), v_{50}(x, y, t)) + O(\varepsilon).
\]

We obtain

\[
\partial_s v_{50}(x, y, t) = \Phi_3^2 \eta_0^A(v_{10}(x, t), v_{50}(x, y, t)) \quad (55)
\]

\[
v_{50}(x, y, 0) = v_{50}(x, y), \quad (56)
\]
where \( v_{50}(x, y, t) \) is periodic w.r.t \( y \). Notice that we can not obtain an expression for \( v_{50}(x, y, t) \) that is independent of \( y \)!

On the other hand, if we make another ansatz for \( v^\varepsilon \), say

\[
v^\varepsilon(x, t) = v_{50}(x, t) + \varepsilon v_{51}(x, y, t) + \varepsilon^2 v_{52}(x, y, t) + \ldots, \tag{57}
\]

then

\[
\tilde{\eta}(v^\varepsilon, v^\varepsilon) = \eta_{0}^B(v_{10}(x, t), v_{50}(x, t)) + O(\varepsilon)
\]

and we obtain an averaged ODE independent of \( y \) as given via

\[
\partial_t v_{50}(x, t) = \Phi^2_{3,0}(v_{10}(x, t), v_{50}(x, t)). \tag{58}
\]

The advantage of the second choice is that it leads to the averaged reaction constant \( \bar{k}_3 = \frac{1}{|\Gamma^\varepsilon|} \int_{\Gamma^\varepsilon} k_3(y)dy \), which is, in practice, much nicer than (58). Summarizing: We have to choose between (55) and (58), but which of the two averaged ODEs is the right one? Does the correctness of the answer to this question depend on the choice of the initial datum for \( v_{50} \)? We will address these issues\(^7\) in a forthcoming analysis paper where we justify rigorously the asymptotic behavior indicated here.

### 4.2. Case 2: \( d^\varepsilon_2 = O(1) \) and \( d^\varepsilon_i = O(\varepsilon^2) \) for all \( i \in \{1, 2, 4\} \)

In this section, we take into account the fact that the diffusion of \( \text{H}_2\text{S} \) is much faster within the air-part of the pores than within the pore water. Particularly, we assume that \( d^\varepsilon_3 \) is of order of \( O(1) \), while \( d^\varepsilon_i = O(\varepsilon^2) \) for all \( i \in \{1, 2, 4\} \). We expect from the literature that the latter assumption will lead to a two-scale model for which the micro- and macro-structure need to be resolved simultaneously; see e.g. [16, 12, 23].

Assume the initial data to be given by \( v^\varepsilon_i(x, 0) = v^0_i(x, \xi) \), \( i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\} \) with functions \( v^0_i : \Omega \times Y \times S \to \mathbb{R} \) being \( Y \)-periodic with respect to the second variable \( y \in Y \). Assume also that \( d^\varepsilon_i = \varepsilon^2 d^0_i \), for \( i \in \{1, 2, 4\} \) and \( d^\varepsilon_3 = d^0_3 \). We employ the same homogenization ansatz

\[
v^\varepsilon_i(x, t) = w_{10}(x, y, t) + \varepsilon w_{11}(x, y, t) + \varepsilon^2 w_{12}(x, y, t) + \ldots \tag{59}
\]

for all \( i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\} \). Using the same strategy as in section 4.1, we obtain

\[
\beta_1 \partial_y w_{10}(x, y, t) = \beta_1 \gamma_1 \nabla_y \cdot (d^0_1 \nabla_y w_{10}(x, y, t)) \]

\[
= -k_1(y) w_{10}(x, y, t) + k_2(y) w_{20}(x, y, t) \tag{60}
\]

\(^7\) We anticipate here a bit the answer to the latter question: Trusting [20], relation (55) can be proven rigorously via a two-scale convergence approach. However, we will see that under some additional conditions (55) reduces to (58).
on $\Omega \times Y^w \times S$. The boundary conditions become

$$\tilde{n}(x, y) \cdot (-d_1^0 \nabla_y w_{10}(x, y, t)) = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \Omega \times \Gamma^{wo} \times S,$$

$$\tilde{n}(x, y) \cdot (-d_1^0 \nabla_y w_{10}(x, y, t)) = -\frac{\Phi_3^2}{\gamma_3} k_3(y) w_{10}(x, y, t) w_{50}(x, y, t) \quad (62)$$

on $\Omega \times \Gamma^{sw} \times S$. Similarly,

$$\tilde{n}(x, y) \cdot (-d_2^0 \nabla_y w_{10}(x, y, t)) = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \Omega \times \Gamma^{sw} \times S.$$  

Similarly,

$$\beta_2 \partial_s w_{20}(x, y, t) - \beta_2 \gamma_2 \nabla_y \cdot (d_2^0 \nabla_y w_{20}(x, y, t)) = k_1(y) w_{10}(x, y, t) - k_2(y) w_{20}(x, y, t), \quad (63)$$

in $\Omega \times Y^w \times S$ while the boundary conditions take the form

$$\tilde{n}(x, y) \cdot (-d_2^0 \nabla_y w_{20}(x, y, t)) = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \Omega \times \Gamma^{sw} \times S,$$

$$\tilde{n}(x, y) \cdot (-d_2^0 \nabla_y w_{20}(x, y, t)) = Bi \cdot M \cdot b(y) \times \left[ \frac{\beta_3}{\beta_2} H(y) w_{30}(x, y, t) - w_{20}(x, y, t) \right] \quad \text{on} \quad \Omega \times \Gamma^{wo} \times S. \quad (65)$$

Since we consider $d_3^0 = d_3^0$, we obtain the same macroscopic PDE as in Case 1:

$$\partial_s w_{30}(x, t) - \sum_{i,j,k=1}^3 \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left( (d_3^0)^{ij} \frac{\partial \chi_k^{ik}}{\partial y_j} - d_3^0 \frac{\partial w_{30}(x, t)}{\partial x_k} \right) = -\sum_{k=1}^3 \frac{\partial w_{30}(x, t)}{\partial x_k} U_k + \beta_3 Bi \cdot M \cdot w_{30}(x, t) C - \beta_2 Bi \cdot M \cdot w_{20}(x, t) B \quad (66)$$

in $\Omega$ and

$$w_{30}(x, t) = w_{30}^D(x, t) \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma^D,$$

where

$$C := \frac{1}{|Y^w|} \int_{\Gamma^{wa}} b(y) H(y) d\sigma_y,$$

$$B := \frac{1}{|Y^w|} \int_{\Gamma^{wa}} b(y) d\sigma_y,$$

$$U_k := \frac{1}{|Y^w|} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \int_{\Gamma^{wa}} (d_3^0)^{ij} n'_j - d_3^0 \frac{\partial \chi^{ik}}{\partial y_i} n'_j) d\sigma_y. \quad (69)$$

Next, we have

$$\beta_4 \partial_s w_{40}(x, y, t) - \beta_4 \gamma_4 \nabla_y \cdot (d_3^0 \nabla_y w_{40}(x, y, t)) = k_1(y) w_{10}(x, y, t), \quad (70)$$
on $\Omega \times Y^w \times S$, while the boundary conditions are now given by
\[
\tilde{n}(x, y) \cdot (-d_4^0 \nabla_y w_{40}(x, y, t)) = 0 \text{ on } \Omega \times \Gamma^{wa} \times S,
\]
\[
\tilde{n}(x, y) \cdot (-d_4^0 \nabla_y w_{40}(x, y, t)) = 0 \text{ on } \Omega \times \Gamma^{sw} \times S.
\]
(71)

The ODE modeling gypsum growth takes the form
\[
\beta_5 \partial_t w_{50}(x, y, t) = -\Phi_3^2 \eta(w_{10}(x, y, t)w_{50}(x, y, t))
\]
on $\Omega \times \Gamma^{sw} \times S$.
(72)
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