

CHARACTERIZATION OF DYNAMICS OF UNARY AND BINARY GAS-SOLID FLOWS IN A CYLINDRICAL FLUIDIZED BED: ELECTRICAL CAPACITANCE TOMOGRAPHY MEASUREMENTS AND CFD SIMULATIONS

BRAJESH KUMAR SINGH



**DEPARTMENT OF CHEMICAL ENGINEERING
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI**

October 2019

CHARACTERIZATION OF DYNAMICS OF UNARY AND BINARY GAS-SOLID FLOWS IN A CYLINDRICAL FLUIDIZED BED: ELECTRICAL CAPACITANCE TOMOGRAPHY MEASUREMENTS AND CFD SIMULATIONS

by

Brajesh Kumar Singh

Department of Chemical Engineering

Submitted

In fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of *Doctor of Philosophy*

to the



Indian Institute of Technology Delhi

October 2019

Certificate

This is to certify that the thesis entitled “**Characterization of Dynamics of Unary and Binary Gas-Solid Flows in a Cylindrical Fluidized Bed: Electrical Capacitance Tomography Measurements and CFD Simulations**” being submitted by **Mr. Brajesh Kumar Singh** to the **Indian Institute of Technology Delhi, New Delhi** for the award of the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy** is a bonafide record of original research work carried out by him under my supervision in conformity with rules and regulations of the Institute. The results contained in this thesis have not been submitted, in part or in full, to any other University or Institute for the award of any Degree or Diploma.

Date:

Dr. Vivek V. Buwa

Professor

Department of Chemical Engineering,
Indian Institute of Technology Delhi,
New Delhi–110016, India.

Date:

Dr. Shantanu Roy

Professor

Department of Chemical Engineering,
Indian Institute of Technology Delhi,
New Delhi–110016, India.

Acknowledgements

First of all, I thank Almighty for enabling me to reach such a platform where I am able to write this acknowledgement. I consider myself very fortunate to become a part of the Department of Chemical Engineering, IIT Delhi. The time spent here has not only expanded and enriched my professional horizons but also helped me in attaining personal stability. The prestigious legacy of the institution has always encouraged and inspired me to dream big and work hard to get it. I am indebted and will remain eternally so, to this institution for providing me the opportunity to carry out my thesis work.

It is rightly said, ideas worth pennies without execution. I sincerely acknowledge my supervisors Prof. Vivek V. Buwa and Prof. Shantanu Roy for giving me an opportunity to work with them. I respect Prof. Buwa for having an eye for details, discipline, and his sedulous nature which makes him a perfectionist. I admire Prof. Roy's charming personality and his refine eloquence. The ease by which he pours his reservoir of knowledge in a fluidic way makes long technical conversations so interesting. Their constant mentorship improved me as a person and rigorous scrutiny always steered me to excel. In their guidance, I observed transformation in my thoughts, troubleshooting strategies and future approaches for the better. I thank them for their intelligent inputs and sincere efforts in shaping up my thesis, manuscripts and other internal reports at utmost priority despite their very busy schedule. I sincerely appreciate their generosity, mentorship and mental support during this work. I would also like to thank Prof. Buwa for his encouragement and providing platforms to work on other topics (Bubble Column, Trickle Bed, and LBM simulations of particulate flows) in addition to my Ph.D. thesis work which I also enjoyed and that open a way for my future employment.

I sincerely acknowledge the role of my Ph.D. committee members: Prof. Ratan Mohan, Prof. Sudip K. Pattanayek and especially Prof. P.M.V. Subbarao for their time-to-time critical

review to improve the quality of the thesis work. Their valuable suggestions were encouraging and helped in giving a definitive structure to the thesis.

I gratefully acknowledge the financial support provided by IIT Delhi for setting up the ECT system and providing financial assistance through the “High Impact Research (HIR)” program funded by IIT Delhi (MI00808).

I am indebted to my parents for encouraging me to explore new paths and giving strength to bear the hardships faced on those paths of life. I would like to acknowledge each and every person in IIT Delhi who came in contact with me and became a part of this journey in any little or big way. All my lab mates (Abdul, Abhijeet, Aniket, Ekta, Karthik, Saroj, and Sirisha) hold a special place as they were a family when I was away from home and I would definitely miss late night movies, random game sessions and chai hangout. I enjoyed on or off topic discussions with Karthik, Ekta and Abhijeet.

I personally feel so obliged to Prof. Buwa for the role he played in my life which he might be totally unaware of, had he not floated Transport Phenomenon course I would have never met my life partner. I would like to thank those tough Transport Phenomena problems which played as an indirect cupid in our lives. Finally, last but not the least, I would like to acknowledge my wife Rohini Singh for her all time optimistic approach, unconditional love and support. I thank her for keeping faith in me and encouraging me to be ambitious.

Brajesh Kumar Singh

Abstract

The thesis focuses on the study of space-/time-resolved phase volume fraction distribution of unary and binary gas-solid flows in a cylindrical fluidized bed. The thesis particularly deliberates on the characterization of time-/space-resolved phase distribution in unary and binary gas-solids flow and also segregation through measurements using the Electrical Capacitance Tomography (ECT), and through CFD simulations using two-/multi-fluid Eulerian models.

The ability of two-fluid Eulerian model to predict the instantaneous phase distribution was studied. The measured time-averaged phase distributions, bubble chord length distributions and bubbling frequency are compared with the corresponding predictions obtained from two-fluid Eulerian simulations for unary gas-solid flows. The results showed that the predicted time-averaged solid volume fraction distribution differed marginally and was in a satisfactory agreement with the corresponding measurements. However, the bubbling frequency and bubble chord length distribution predicted using different drag models, in particular, the formation of large bubbles/slugs, were considerably different. A modified drag model is proposed that led to a reduction in the regions in the bed in which higher drag force was applied, allowed the formation of larger bubbles/slugs and led to an improvement in the predicted bubbling behavior. It was also found that the use of different drag models, in turn, also affects the total solid viscosity and therefore the bubbling behavior.

The posterior analysis showed that among solid-phase kinematic, collisional, and frictional viscosities, the influence of frictional viscosity on the bubbling behavior was found to be more dominant. Also, the magnitude of frictional viscosity often goes up to more than 1000 times of the collisional and kinetic viscosity in the fluid domain. An increase in the frictional viscosity leads to compaction of the solid phase and increase in the formation of

large bubbles/slugs, those were observed experimentally. The predicted bubbling frequency and bubble chord length distribution were in a quantitative agreement with those measured using the ECT for different gas velocities and particle sizes.

Further, the ECT technique was applied to measure the segregation time for binary gas-solids flow in a cylindrical fluidized bed. The measurements of segregation and fluidization of binary mixtures were investigated using the ECT and high-speed imaging. It was shown that ECT can be used to detect the regions of complete segregation in a cylindrical fluidized beds. In particular, the binary gas-solids flows in systems with large D/d_p ratio, which are otherwise difficult to characterize using high-speed imaging. Under the fluidization conditions, the bubbling behavior of the mixtures was governed by the smaller-sized particles in spite of having an equal percentage by weight of the particles in the mixture. For the fluidization of binary mixtures, a relation between the measured variance of solid volume fraction fluctuations and the corresponding flow structures was studied. It was also found that different bubbling behaviors can produce the same time-averaged solid volume fraction profiles. As a consequence, different phase distributions can lead to different heat and mass transport rates depending on the local interfacial area, despite having the same time-averaged phase hold-up distribution.

Further, efforts are made to predict the segregation time using the Eulerian multi-fluid model. It was seen that due to higher gas-particle drag force magnitude, the larger particles were carried away from bottom to the top of the bed resulting into less extent of segregation and higher segregation time in comparison to the corresponding experiments. The collisional contribution in the particle-particle drag model, led to increase in the segregation time, and therefore it was neglected and frictional coefficient of 0.5 was used which improved the agreement with the measured segregation time. In fluidized bed conditions for binary mixtures,

the predicted distribution was in a qualitative agreement. The reason for quantitative difference was due to ad-hoc values of different parameters used in particle-particle drag models for collision and friction interactions between the solids.

The present thesis helps to understand the characteristics of instantaneous phase distribution and segregation in gas-solids fluidization. It also helps in accessing the ability of Eulerian multi-fluid CFD models to predict the dynamics of instantaneous phase distribution (in terms of bubble size distribution and bubbling frequency) and segregation in gas-solids fluidization.

सार

थीसिस अंतरिक्ष के अध्ययन पर केंद्रित है - एक बेलनाकार द्रवीकृत बिस्तर में एकता और बाइनरी गैस-ठोस प्रवाह के अंतरिक्ष-समय-निर्धारित चरण मात्रा अंश वितरण। थीसिस विशेष रूप से असमान और द्विआधारी गैस-ठोस प्रवाह में समय अंतरिक्ष-समाधान चरण वितरण के विचलन पर विचार-विमर्श करता है और विद्युत संधारित्र टोमोग्राफी (ईसीटी) का उपयोग करके माप के माध्यम से अलगाव, और दो- / बहु-द्रव यूलरियन का उपयोग करके सीएफडी सिमुलेशन के माध्यम से करता है। मॉडल।

तात्कालिक चरण वितरण की भविष्यवाणी करने के लिए दो-द्रव यूलरियन मॉडल की क्षमता का अध्ययन किया गया था। मापा समय-औसत चरण वितरण, बुलबुला कॉर्ड लंबाई वितरण और बुदबुदाहट आवृत्ति की तुलना गैस-ठोस प्रवाह के लिए दो-द्रव यूलर सिमुलेशन से प्राप्त संगत भविष्यवाणियों के साथ की जाती है। परिणामों से पता चलता है कि अनुमानित समय-औसत ठोस मात्रा अंश वितरण भिन्न रूप से भिन्न था और इसी माप के साथ एक संतोषजनक समझौते में था। हालांकि, बुदबुदाहट आवृत्ति और बबल कॉर्ड लंबाई वितरण ने अलग-अलग ड्रैग मॉडल का उपयोग करके भविष्यवाणी की, विशेष रूप से, बड़े बुलबुले / स्लग के गठन, काफी भिन्न थे। एक संशोधित ड्रैग मॉडल प्रस्तावित किया गया है जिससे बेड में उन क्षेत्रों में कमी आई है जिसमें उच्च ड्रैग फोर्स लागू किया गया था, जिससे बड़े बुलबुले / स्लग के गठन की अनुमति मिली और पूर्वानुमानित बुदबुदाहट व्यवहार में सुधार हुआ। यह भी पाया गया कि अलग-अलग ड्रैग मॉडल का उपयोग, बदले में, कुल ठोस चिपचिपाहट और इसलिए बुदबुदाने वाले व्यवहार को भी प्रभावित करता है।

पीछे के विश्लेषण से पता चला है कि ठोस-चरण कीनेमेटिक्स, कोलाइज़ल और घर्षण चिपचिपाहट के बीच, बुदबुदाती हुई व्यवहार पर घर्षण चिपचिपाहट का प्रभाव अधिक प्रभावी पाया गया। इसके अलावा, घर्षण चिपचिपाहट की भयावहता अक्सर द्रव क्षेत्र में टकराव और गतिज चिपचिपाहट के 1000 से अधिक बार तक जाती है। घर्षण चिपचिपाहट में वृद्धि से ठोस चरण का संघनन होता है और बड़े बुलबुले / स्लग के निर्माण में वृद्धि होती है, जिन्हें प्रायोगिक तौर पर देखा गया था। पूर्वानुमानित बुदबुदाहट आवृत्ति और बबल कॉर्ड लंबाई वितरण विभिन्न गैस वेगों और कण आकारों के लिए ईसीटी का उपयोग करके मापा गया उन लोगों के साथ एक मात्रात्मक समझौते में थे।

इसके अलावा, बेलनाकार द्रवित बिस्तर में द्विआधारी गैस-ठोस प्रवाह के लिए अलगाव समय को मापने के लिए ईसीटी तकनीक लागू की गई थी। ईसीटी और उच्च गति इमेजिंग का उपयोग करके द्विआधारी मिश्रण के अलगाव और द्रवीकरण के माप की जांच की गई। यह दिखाया गया

कि ईसीटी का उपयोग एक बेलनाकार द्रवीकृत बेड में पूर्ण अलगाव के क्षेत्रों का पता लगाने के लिए किया जा सकता है। विशेष रूप से, बाइनरी गैस-सोलिड्स बड़े डी / डीपी अनुपात वाले सिस्टम में बहते हैं, जो उच्च गति इमेजिंग का उपयोग करके चिह्नित करना मुश्किल है। विखंडन की स्थिति के तहत, मिश्रण के बबलिंग व्यवहार को मिश्रण में कणों के वजन के बराबर प्रतिशत होने के बावजूद छोटे आकार के कणों द्वारा नियंत्रित किया गया था। बाइनरी मिश्रण के द्रवीकरण के लिए, ठोस मात्रा अंश में उतार-चढ़ाव और संबंधित प्रवाह संरचनाओं के मापा विचरण के बीच एक संबंध का अध्ययन किया गया था। यह भी पाया गया कि विभिन्न बुदबुदाहट व्यवहार एक ही समय-औसत ठोस मात्रा अंश प्रोफाइल का उत्पादन कर सकते हैं। एक परिणाम के रूप में, अलग-अलग चरण के वितरण में एक ही समय-औसत चरण होल्ड-अप वितरण होने के बावजूद, स्थानीय इंटरफेशियल क्षेत्र के आधार पर विभिन्न गर्मी और बड़े पैमाने पर परिवहन दरों का कारण बन सकता है।

इसके अलावा, यूलरियन बहु-द्रव मॉडल का उपयोग करके अलगाव के समय की भविष्यवाणी करने का प्रयास किया जाता है। यह देखा गया कि उच्च गैस-कण ड्रैग फोर्स परिमाण के कारण, बड़े कणों को बेड के ऊपर से नीचे तक ले जाया गया था, जिसके परिणामस्वरूप संबंधित प्रयोगों की तुलना में अलगाव और कम अलगाव समय था। कण-कण ड्रैग मॉडल में समवर्ती योगदान, अलगाव के समय में वृद्धि का कारण बना, और इसलिए इसे उपेक्षित किया गया और 0.5 के घर्षण गुणांक का उपयोग किया गया, जिसने मापा पृथक्करण समय के साथ समझौते में सुधार किया। बाइनरी मिश्रण के लिए द्रवित बिस्तर की स्थिति में, अनुमानित वितरण एक गुणात्मक समझौते में था। मात्रात्मक अंतर का कारण ठोस पदार्थों के बीच टकराव और घर्षण इंटरैक्शन के लिए कण-कण ड्रैग मॉडल में उपयोग किए जाने वाले विभिन्न मापदंडों के तदर्थ मूल्यों के कारण था।

वर्तमान थीसिस गैस-ठोस तरल पदार्थ में तात्कालिक चरण वितरण और अलगाव की विशेषताओं को समझने में मदद करता है। यह तात्कालिक चरण वितरण (बुलबुला आकार वितरण और बुदबुदाहट आवृत्ति के संदर्भ में) और गैस-ठोस द्रव के अलगाव में अलगाव की गतिशीलता की भविष्यवाणी करने के लिए यूलियन मल्टी-द्रव सीएफडी मॉडल की क्षमता तक पहुंचने में भी मदद करता है।

Table of Contents

Certificate	i
Acknowledgements	ii
Abstract	iv
List of figures	x
List of tables	xxi
Nomenclature	xxii
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
1.1 Fluidized bed reactors	2
1.2 Motivation of the present work	5
1.3 Specific objectives	7
1.4 Structure of the thesis	8
Chapter 2: Time-Evolution of Solid Volume Fraction	
Distribution: ECT Measurements and CFD Simulations	10
2.1 Introduction	11
2.2 ECT measurements	16
2.3 Computational model	19
2.3.1 Effect of grid resolution	27
2.4 Results and discussion	27
2.4.1 Comparison of measured and predicted time-averaged solid volume fraction	27
2.4.2 Comparison of measured and predicted time-evolution of solid volume fraction	29
2.4.3 Modified drag model	31

2.4.4	Comparison of measured and predicted bubbling characteristics	40
2.4.5	Effect of solid viscosities on the bubbling behavior.....	48
2.5	Conclusions	56

Chapter 3: Effect of Solid-Phase Viscosity on Bubbling/Slugging in a Cylindrical Fluidized Bed59

3.1	Introduction	60
3.2	Methodology	65
3.3	Results and discussion.....	65
3.3.1	Measured and predicted particle dispersion heights.....	65
3.3.2	Bubbling behavior of <i>Geldart Group-D</i> and <i>Group-A</i> particles	67
3.3.3	Analysis of solid phase viscosity values around the bubbles	73
3.3.4	Quantification of bubbling characteristics for <i>Geldart Group-D</i> and <i>Group-A</i> particles	79
3.4	Conclusions	88

Chapter 4: Dynamics of Segregation and Fluidization of Binary Mixtures in a Cylindrical Fluidized Bed.....90

4.1	Introduction	91
4.2	Experiments.....	96
4.3	Results and discussion.....	97
4.3.1	Effect of superficial gas velocities on dispersion heights.....	97
4.3.2	Dynamics of segregation behavior of binary mixtures.....	101
4.3.3	Dynamics of fluidization behavior of binary mixtures.....	114
4.3.4	Bubble size distribution in unary and binary systems	126
4.3.5	Time-averaged solids volume fraction distribution for binary mixtures	129

4.4	Conclusions	132
Chapter 5: Multi-Fluid Eulerian Simulations of Binary Gas-Solids Flows in a Cylindrical Fluidized Bed 134		
5.1	Introduction	135
5.2	Computational models	138
5.2.1	Governing equations	138
5.2.2	Solution domain and numerics	141
5.3	Results and discussion.....	142
5.3.1	Effect of gas-particle drag force on the segregation.....	142
5.3.2	Effect of particle-particle drag force on the segregation	146
5.3.3	Comparison of measured and predicted bubbling characteristics of binary fluidization	153
5.4	Conclusions	159
Chapter 6: Summary, Conclusions, and Suggestions for Future Work 161		
6.1	Summary and conclusions	162
6.2	Suggestions for future work.....	167
References		169
List of publications		183
Bio-Data.....		186

List of figures

Figure 2.1. (a) Photograph of the experimental set-up and (b) schematic of the experimental set-up (A: compressor, B: pressure regulator, C: rotameter, D: pin valve, E: distributor, F, and G: ECT sensors, H: fluidized bed and I: ECT data acquisition system.	16
Figure 2.2. Effect of grid resolution on (i) time-averaged (a) dispersion height and (b) time-averaged α_s distribution along the diameter of the bed, and (ii) power spectra of local α_s fluctuations at $z = 8.9$ cm ($r/R = 0.5$, $U_G = 1.3$ m/s).....	25
Figure 2.3. Comparison of measured and predicted time-averaged (a) particle dispersion height and (b) radial distribution of time-averaged α_s at U_G of 0.9 m/s and $z = 8.9$ cm using different drag models	26
Figure 2.4. Time-evolution of α_s distribution measured using (a) ECT and predicted using different drag models of (b) Gidaspow [27], (c) Gao et al. [28], (d) Hong et al. [49], and (e) modified model used in the present work ($U_G = 0.9$ m/s, $z = 8.9$ cm).....	28
Figure 2.5. Time-evolution of α_s distribution measured using (a) ECT and predicted using different drag models of (b) Gidaspow [27], (c) Gao et al. [28], (d) Hong et al. [49], and (e) modified model used in the present work ($U_G = 1.3$ m/s, $z = 8.9$ cm).....	30
Figure 2.6. Time-evolution of α_s distribution measured using (a) ECT and predicted using different drag models (b) Gidaspow [27], (c) Gao et al. [28], (d) Hong et al. [49], and (e) modified model used in the present work ($U_G = 2.6$ m/s, $z = 8.9$ cm).....	30
Figure 2.7. Effect of local slip velocities and gas volume fraction on the magnitude of K_{gs} for (a) Gidaspow [27], (b) Gao et al. [28], (c) Hong et al. [49], and (d) modified (present work) drag models.....	32

Figure 2.8. Time-evolution of the cumulative drag force per unit volume in the domain predicted using different drag models at $U_G = 2.6$ m/s.....35

Figure 2.9. Instantaneous distribution of (a) gas volume fraction and (b) individual drag model zones on the mid-plane of the bed for (i) Gidaspow [27] (<1 -Ergun ($\alpha_g < 0.80$); <2 -Wen and Yu ($\alpha_g \geq 0.80$)), (ii) Gao et al. [28] (<1 -Ergun ($\alpha_g < 0.80$); <2 -ZP ($0.80 < \alpha_g \leq 0.933$); <3 -Wen & Yu ($0.933 < \alpha_g \leq 0.99$); <4 -Schiller & Naumann ($0.99 < \alpha_g \leq 1.0$)), (iii) Hong et al. [49] drag models (<1 -Ergun ($\alpha_g \leq \epsilon_{mf}$); <2 -Wen & Yu with H_d ($\epsilon_{mf} < \alpha_g \leq 0.5$); <3 -Wen & Yu with H_d ($0.5 < \alpha_g \leq 0.99$)), and (iv) modified drag model (<1 -Ergun ($\alpha_g \leq 0.65$); <2 -Gibilaro ($0.65 < \alpha_g \leq 0.93$); <3 -Wen & Yu ($0.93 < \alpha_g \leq 1.0$)) at $U_G = 1.3$ m/s.36

Figure 2.10. Time-evolution of the cumulative total solid viscosity in the domain predicted using different drag models and KTGF based model at $U_G = 2.6$ m/s.37

Figure 2.11. Time-evolution of predicted μ_s distribution along the diameter of the bed using drag models of (a) Gidaspow [27], (b) Gao et al. [28], (c) Hong et al. [49], and (d) modified (present work) ($U_G = 2.6$ m/s and $z = 8.9$ cm).....38

Figure 2.12. Measured time-evolution of bubbles chord length fluctuations for U_G of (a) 0.9 m/s, (b) 1.3 m/s, and (c) 2.6 m/s at (i) $z = 8.9$ cm and (ii) $z = 24$ cm.39

Figure 2.13. Time-evolution of (a) α_s distribution along the radial direction and (b) the corresponding time-evolution of bubble chord length (a threshold of $\alpha_s = 0.15$ was used to discriminate the gas bubble and emulsion phases).40

Figure 2.14. Power spectra of measured bubble-chord length fluctuations at (a) 0.9 m/s, (b) 1.3 m/s and (c) 2.6 m/s ($z = 8.9$ cm).41

Figure 2.15. Power spectra of simulated time-evolution of bubble-chord length for different drag models ($U_G = 0.9$ m/s, $z = 8.9$ cm).	43
Figure 2.16. Measured bubble chord length distribution at different U_G (a) 0.9 m/s, (b) 1.3 m/s and (c) 2.6 m/s at axial locations (i) 8.9 cm and (ii) 24 cm from the distributor.	44
Figure 2.17. Predicted bubble chord length distribution using different drag models at $z = 8.9$ cm from the distributor and $U_G = 0.9$ m/s.....	45
Figure 2.18. Predicted bubble chord length distribution using different drag models at 2.6 m/s ($z = 8.9$ cm).	46
Figure 2.19: (i) Measured time-evolution of α_s distribution along the diameter of the bed using ECT, predicted time-evolution of (a) α_s distribution and (b) μ_s predicted using $\mu_{s,fr}$ models based on (ii) KTGF and (iii) Johnson-Jackson frictional viscosity models ($U_G = 0.9$ m/s, $z = 8.9$ cm).	50
Figure 2.20: Comparison of (a) measured and predicted time-evolution of α_s distribution using (b) KTGF based and (c) Johnson-Jackson based $\mu_{s,fr}$ models at U_G of (i) 1.3 m/s, and (ii) 2.6 m/s ($z = 8.9$ cm).	50
Figure 2.21: Power spectra of time-evolution of bubble chord lengths (a) measured using ECT, predicted using (b) KTGF based $\mu_{s,fr}$ model and (c) Johnson-Jackson based $\mu_{s,fr}$ model ($U_G = 0.9$ m/s, $z = 8.9$ cm).	52
Figure 2.22: Comparison of measured and simulated power spectra of time-evolution of bubble chord lengths predicted using Johnson-Jackson based $\mu_{s,fr}$ model for U_G of (a) 1.3 m/s and (b) 2.6 m/s ($z = 8.9$ cm).....	53

Figure 2.23: Bubble chord length distribution (a) measured using ECT, predicted using (b) KTGF based model for $\mu_{s,fr}$ and (c) Johnson-Jackson based model for $\mu_{s,fr}$ ($U_G = 0.9$ m/s, $z = 8.9$ cm).54

Figure 2.24: Comparison of measured and predicted bubble chord length distribution measured using Johnson-Jackson based $\mu_{s,fr}$ model for U_G of (a) 1.3 m/s, and (b) 2.6 m/s ($z = 8.9$ cm).55

Figure 2.25: Time-evolution of cumulative total solid viscosities in the domain using KTGF and Johnson-Jackson based $\mu_{s,fr}$ models at (a) 0.9 m/s and (b) 2.6 m/s.56

Figure 3.1. Comparison of measured and predicted particle dispersion height for G96 and G922 at different U_G66

Figure 3.2. Time-evolution of α_s distribution along the diameter of the bed (a) measured using the ECT, (b) predicted without solid frictional stress, predicted with Schaffer's frictional stress model (c) using frictional pressure based on KTGF and (d) using frictional pressure based on Johnson-Jackson model. In the case of (d), Johnson-Jackson frictional pressure was calculated using (i) $\alpha_{s,min} = 0.5$, (ii) $\alpha_{s,min} = 0.55$, and (iii) $\alpha_{s,min} = 0.58$ (G922, $z = 24$ cm, $U_G = 0.9$ m/s).69

Figure 3.3. Time-evolution of cumulative solid frictional viscosity predicted using the frictional pressure based on (a) KTGF model and Johnson-Jackson model with (b) $\alpha_{s,min} = 0.5$ and (c) $\alpha_{s,min} = 0.55$ (G922, $z = 24$ cm, $U_G = 0.9$ m/s).....70

Figure 3.4. Instantaneous distributions predicted using frictional stress model using Johnson-Jackson based frictional pressure (a) α_s , (b) $\mu_{s,col}$, (c) $\mu_{s,kin}$, (d) $\mu_{s,fr}$. In figures (e) and (f), the $\mu_{s,kin}$ and $\mu_{s,fr}$, respectively are shown for the scale of 0 to 100 Pa.s. (G922, $z =$

24 cm, $U_G = 0.9$ m/s). Also, note that the distributions up to dispersed heights (and not for full domain height) are shown.....71

Figure 3.5. Instantaneous distributions predicted using frictional stress model using KTGF based frictional pressure (a) α_s , (b) $\mu_{s,col}$, (c) $\mu_{s,kin}$, (d) $\mu_{s,fr}$. In figures (e) and (f), the $\mu_{s,kin}$ and $\mu_{s,fr}$, respectively are shown for the scale of 0 to 100 Pa.s. (G922, $z = 24$ cm, $U_G = 0.9$ m/s). Also, note that the distributions up to dispersed heights (and not for full domain height) are shown.....72

Figure 3.6. Time-evolution of α_s distribution along the diameter of the bed (a) measured using the ECT, (b) predicted without solid frictional stress, predicted with Schaffer's frictional stress model (c) using frictional pressure based on KTGF and (d) using frictional pressure based on Johnson-Jackson model. In the case of (d), Johnson-Jackson frictional pressure was calculated using (i) $\alpha_{s,min} = 0.5$, and (ii) $\alpha_{s,min} = 0.55$ (G922, $z = 24$ cm, $U_G = 1.75$ m/s). 76

Figure 3.7. Time-evolution of α_s distribution along the diameter of the bed (a) measured using the ECT, (b) predicted without solid frictional stress, predicted with Schaffer's frictional stress model (c) using frictional pressure based on KTGF and (d) using frictional pressure based on Johnson-Jackson model. In the case of (d), Johnson-Jackson frictional pressure was calculated using (i) $\alpha_{s,min} = 0.5$, and (ii) $\alpha_{s,min} = 0.55$ (G96, $z = 24$ cm, $U_G = 0.9$ m/s).77

Figure 3.8. Time-evolution of cumulative solid frictional viscosity predicted using the frictional pressure based on (a) KTGF model and Johnson-Jackson model with (b) $\alpha_{s,min} = 0.5$ and (c) $\alpha_{s,min} = 0.55$ (G96, $z = 24$ cm, $U_G = 0.9$ m/s).....78

Figure 3.9. Power spectra of d_h fluctuations (a) measured using the ECT, (b) predicted using KTGF based frictional pressure model, predicted using Johnson-Jackson based frictional

pressure model with (i) $\alpha_{s,min} = 0.5$ and (ii) $\alpha_{s,min} = 0.55$ (G922, $z = 24$ cm, $U_G = 0.9$ m/s).
.....79

Figure 3.10. Power spectra of d_h fluctuations (a) measured using the ECT, (b) predicted using KTGF based frictional pressure model, predicted using Johnson-Jackson based frictional pressure model with (i) $\alpha_{s,min} = 0.5$ and (ii) $\alpha_{s,min} = 0.55$ (G96, $z = 24$ cm, $U_G = 0.9$ m/s).
.....81

Figure 3.11. Power spectra of d_h fluctuations (a) measured using the ECT, (b) predicted using KTGF based frictional pressure model, predicted using Johnson-Jackson based frictional pressure model with (i) $\alpha_{s,min} = 0.5$ and (ii) $\alpha_{s,min} = 0.55$ (G922, $z = 24$ cm, $U_G = 1.75$ m/s).
.....82

Figure 3.12. Bubble chord length distributions (a) measured using the ECT, (b) predicted using KTGF based frictional pressure model, predicted using Johnson-Jackson based frictional pressure model with (i) $\alpha_{s,min} = 0.5$ and (ii) $\alpha_{s,min} = 0.55$ (G922, $z = 24$ cm, $U_G = 0.9$ m/s).
.....83

Figure 3.13. Bubble chord length distributions (a) measured using the ECT, (b) predicted using KTGF based frictional pressure model, predicted using Johnson-Jackson based frictional pressure model with (i) $\alpha_{s,min} = 0.5$ and (ii) $\alpha_{s,min} = 0.55$ (G922, $z = 24$ cm, $U_G = 1.75$ m/s).
.....85

Figure 3.14. Bubble chord length distributions (a) measured using the ECT, (b) predicted using KTGF based frictional pressure model, predicted using Johnson-Jackson based frictional pressure model with (i) $\alpha_{s,min} = 0.5$ and (ii) $\alpha_{s,min} = 0.55$ (G96, $z = 24$ cm, $U_G = 0.9$ m/s).
.....86

Figure 3.15. Bubble chord length distributions (a) measured using the ECT, (b) predicted using KTGF based frictional pressure model, predicted using Johnson-Jackson based frictional pressure model with (i) $\alpha_{s,min} = 0.5$ and (ii) $\alpha_{s,min} = 0.55$ (G96, $z = 24$ cm, $U_G = 0.44$ m/s).

.....87

Figure 4.1 Effect of U_G on the particle dispersion height (static bed height: 36 cm).97

Figure 4.2. Photographs of instantaneous particle distribution in binary fluidization for 50d96-50d922 at U_G of (a) 0.02 m/s, (b) 0.065 m/s, and (c) 0.13 m/s (G96 particles are colored white and G922 particles are colored black).....100

Figure 4.3. Time-evolution of α_s along the diameter of the bed at (a) $z = 8.9$ cm and (b) $z = 24$ cm from the distributor (50d96-50d922, $U_G = 0.02$ m/s). Figures on left and right side show the α_s for time windows of 0-2 s and 60-62 s, respectively.....103

Figure 4.4. Effect of mixture composition on the time-evolution of α_s distribution along the diameter at (i) $z = 8.9$ cm and (ii) $z = 24$ cm for the mixtures (a) 50d96-50d922 and (b) 30d96-70d922 ($U_G = 0.13$ m/s). Figures on left and right side show the α_s for different time windows.104

Figure 4.5. Effect of mixture composition on the time-evolution of α_s distribution along the diameter at $z = 8.9$ cm for the mixtures (a) 50d96-50d922 and (b) 30d96-70d922 ($U_G = 0.17$ m/s). Figures on left and right side show the α_s for time windows of 0-2 s and 60-62 s, respectively.105

Figure 4.6. Effect of mixture composition on the rate of segregation for (a) $U_G = 0.13$ m/s and (b) $U_G = 0.17$ m/s ($z = 8.9$ cm).....109

Figure 4.7. Effect of particle diameter ratio on the time-evolution of α_s distribution along the diameter at $z = 8.9$ cm for the mixtures (a) $d_{pr} = \sim 4$ (50d3500-50d922) at $U_G = 2.2$ m/s and (b) $d_{pr} = \sim 2$ (50d430-50d922) at $U_G = 0.13$ m/s (the first and second figure correspond to different times).....110

Figure 4.8. Effect of particle diameter ratio on the time-evolution of α_s distribution along the diameter at $z = 24$ cm for (a) $d_{pr} = \sim 4$ (50d3500-50d922) at $U_G = 2.2$ m/s and (b) $d_{pr} = \sim 2$ (50d430-50d922) at $U_G = 0.13$ m/s (the first and second figure correspond to different times).111

Figure 4.9. Effect of particle diameter ratio on the rate of segregation (a) $d_{pr} = \sim 9$ (50d96-50d922), (b) $d_{pr} = \sim 4$ (50d3500-50d922), and (c) $d_{pr} = \sim 2$ (50d430-50d922) ($z = 8.9$ cm). 112

Figure 4.10. Comparison of local ($r/R = 0$) and cross-section averaged α_s fluctuations for (a) bubbling regime ($U_G = 0.44$ m/s, G96 particles) and (b) slugging regime ($U_G = 0.9$ m/s, G922 particles) ($z = 24$ cm).113

Figure 4.11. Comparison of power spectra of (a) cross-section averaged and (b) local ($r/R = 0$) α_s fluctuations in bubbling regime ($U_G = 0.44$ m/s, $z = 24$ cm, G96 particles).....116

Figure 4.12. Comparison of power spectra of (a) cross-section averaged and (b) local ($r/R = 0$) α_s fluctuations in bubbling regime ($U_G = 0.44$ m/s, $z = 24$ cm, G96 particles).....117

Figure 4.13. Time-evolution of α_s distribution along the radial direction for the (a) G96 particles, (b) G922 particles, (c) 50d96-50d922 mixture and (d) 30d96-70d922 mixture ($U_G = 0.9$ m/s, $z = 24$ cm).118

Figure 4.14. Time-evolution of instantaneous local ($r/R = -0.5$) α_s for (a) G96 particles, (b) G922 particles, (c) 50d96-50d922 mixture and (d) 30d96-70d922 mixture ($U_G = 0.9$ m/s, $z = 24$ cm). 119

Figure 4.15. Power spectra of local α_s fluctuations for unary particles (a) G96, (b) G922 and mixtures (c) 50d96-50d922 and (d) 30d96-70d922 ($z = 24$ cm, $r/R = -0.5$, $U_G = 0.9$ m/s). 120

Figure 4.16. Variance of local α_s fluctuations for (a) G96 particles (b) G922 particles, (c) 50d96-50d922 mixture and (d) 30d96-70d922 mixture at different U_G ($z = 42$ cm). 121

Figure 4.17. Time-evolution of α_s distribution for G96 particles along the radial direction at U_G of (a) 0.44 m/s and (b) 0.9 m/s ($z = 42$ cm). 122

Figure 4.18. Time-evolution of α_s distribution along the radial direction for G922 at U_G of (a) 0.9 m/s (b) 1.30 m/s and (c) 1.75 m/s ($z = 42$ cm). 123

Figure 4.19. (i) The variance of local α_s fluctuations, and (ii) time-evolution of α_s distribution along the radial direction at U_G of (a) 0.9 m/s (b) 1.30 m/s and (c) 1.75 m/s (G922 particles, $z = 24$ cm). 123

Figure 4.20. Time-evolution of α_s distribution along the radial direction for 50d96-50d922 at U_G of (a) 0.44 m/s (b) 0.9 m/s and (c) 1.3 m/s ($z = 42$ cm). 124

Figure 4.21. Time-evolution of α_s distribution along the radial direction for 30d96-70d922 at U_G of (a) 0.44 m/s (b) 0.9 m/s and (c) 1.3 m/s ($z = 42$ cm). 125

Figure 4.22. Bubble chord length distribution for (a) G96 particles, (b) G922 particles, (c) 50d96-50d922 mixture and (d) 30d96-70d922 mixture at different U_G ($z = 24$ cm). 126

Figure 4.23. Time spent in bubbles for (a) G96 particles, (b) G922 particles, (c) 50d96-50d922 mixture and (d) 30d96-70d922 mixture at $z = 24$ cm ($U_G = 0.9$ m/s).....	128
Figure 4.24. Comparison of α_s for (a) $U_G = 0.44$ m/s, (b) $U_G = 0.9$ m/s, and (c) $U_G = 1.3$ m/s at (i) $z = 24$ and (ii) $z = 42$ cm from the gas distributor.....	130
Figure 4.25. Time-evolution of α_s distribution along the radial direction for (a) G96 and (b) 30d96-70d922 ($z = 24$ cm, $U_G = 0.44$ m/s).	131
Figure 4.26. Time-evolution of α_s distribution of G922 along the radial direction at (a) $z = 24$ cm and (b) $z = 42$ cm ($U_G = 0.9$ m/s).....	131
Figure 5.1. Snapshots of simulated α_s of G922 at different times using gas-particle drag models of (a) Gidaspow [27] and (b) modified drag model (present work) (PP-drag-1, 50d96-50d922, $U_G = 0.02$ m/s).	143
Figure 5.2. Time-evolution of cross-sectional averaged of α_s of G922 and G96 particle at 8.9 cm using gas-particle drag of (a) Gidaspow [27] and (b) modified (PP-drag-1, 50d96-50d922, $U_G = 0.02$ m/s).	144
Figure 5.3. Snapshots of α_s of G922 at different times using gas-particle drag modified and particle-particle drag model of (a) PP-drag-2 and (a) PP-drag-3 (50d96-50d922, $U_G = 0.02$ m/s).	146
Figure 5.4. Time-evolution of cross-sectional averaged α_s of G922 using (a) PP-drag-2 and (a) PP-drag-3 ($U_G = 0.02$ m/s, 50d96-50d922).....	148
Figure 5.5. Comparison of cumulative particle-particle drag force over the entire domain (50d96-50d922, $U_G = 0.02$ m/s).....	149

Figure 5.6. Time-evolution of cumulative $\mu_{s,fr}$ of G922 and G96 particles over the entire domain using (a) PP-drag-1, (b) PP-drag-2, and (c) PP-drag-3 (50d96-50d922, $U_G = 0.02$ m/s).
.....152

Figure 5.7. Comparison of (a) measured and (b) predicted time-evolution of α_s distributions along the diameter of the bed for mixture (i) 50d96-50d922 and (ii) 30d96-70d922 ($U_G = 0.44$ m/s, $z = 24$ cm).154

Figure 5.8. Comparison of (a) measured and (b) predicted time-evolution of α_s distributions along the diameter of the bed for mixture (i) 50d96-50d922 and (ii) 30d96-70d922 ($U_G = 0.9$ m/s, $z = 24$ cm).154

Figure 5.9. Comparison of measured and predicted bubble chord length distribution for the mixture (a) 50d96-50d922 and (b) 30d96-70d922 at $U_G = 0.44$ m/s and $z = 24$ cm.155

Figure 5.10. Comparison of measured and predicted bubble chord length distribution for (a) 50d96-50d922 and (b) 30d96-70d922 at $U_G = 0.9$ m/s and $z = 24$ cm.156

Figure 5.11. Comparison of measured and predicted power spectra of bubble chord length fluctuations for mixture (a) 50d96-50d922 and (b) 30d96-70d922 at $U_G = 0.44$ m/s and $z = 24$ cm.158

Figure 5.12. Comparison of measured and predicted power spectra of bubble chord length fluctuations for mixture (a) 50d96-50d922 and (b) 30d96-70d922 at $U_G = 0.9$ m/s and $z = 24$ cm.159

List of tables

Table 2.1: Eulerian two-fluid model	20
Table 2.2. Drag models used in the present work.....	21
Table 2.3. Boundary conditions, closure models, and simulation parameters.....	23
Table 2.4. Kinetic Theory of Granular Flow (KTGF) closure models	24
Table 2.5. Modified drag model used in the present work	33
Table 4.1. Unary and binary solid particles used in the present study.....	96
Table 5.1: Eulerian multi-fluid model	139
Table 5.2. Kinetic Theory of Granular Flow (KTGF) closure models	140
Table 5.3. Boundary conditions and simulation parameters.....	142

Nomenclature

C_D	drag coefficient, -
C_{fr}	friction coefficient, -
D_b	fluidized bed (internal) diameter, cm
d_s	solid particle diameter, μm
d_h	horizontal bubble chord length, cm
d_v	vertical bubble chord, s
e_{ss}	particle-particle restitution co-efficient, -
g	gravitational acceleration, m/s^2
$g_{0,ss}$	radial distribution function, -
H_b	bed height, cm
H_d	heterogeneity index, -
H_s	static bed height, cm
I_{2D}	second invariant of the strain rate tensor, $1/\text{s}^2$
I	identity tensor, -
K_{gs}	gas-solid interphase momentum exchange coefficient, $\text{kg}/(\text{m}^3\cdot\text{s})$
K_{ss}, K_{ij}	solid-solid interphase momentum exchange coefficient, $\text{kg}/(\text{m}^3\cdot\text{s})$
l_i	chord length, cm
l_{32}	Sauter mean chord length, cm
p_s	solid pressure, Pa
$P_{s,f}$	solid frictional pressure, Pa
Re_s	particles Reynolds number, -
t	flow time, s
U	velocity, m/s
U_G	superficial gas velocity, m/s

Greek Letters

α	instantaneous phase volume fraction, -
α_i	gas volume fraction value for dividing criteria in the switch function, -
α_{st}	total solids volume fraction, -
$\bar{\alpha}_s$	time-averaged solid volume fraction, -

$\alpha_{s,max}$	maximum solid packing limit, -
$\alpha_{s,f,min}$	critical solid volume fraction, -
μ	viscosity, Pa·s
ρ	density, kg/m ³
$\bar{\tau}$	shear stress, N/m ²
ε	relative permittivity, -
β	interphase momentum exchange coefficient, kg/(m ³ s)
φ	specularity co-efficient, -
λ_s	solid bulk viscosity, Pa.s
$\kappa_{\theta,s}$	granular diffusion co-efficient, kg/(m.s)
$\gamma_{\theta,s}$	granular dissipation, W/m ³
Θ	granular temperature, m ² /s ²
ϕ	switch function, -
θ	angle of internal friction, degree

Subscripts

<i>col</i>	collisional
<i>fr</i>	friction
<i>g</i>	gas
<i>kin</i>	kinetic
<i>m</i>	mixture
<i>mf</i>	minimum fluidization
<i>r</i>	relative
<i>s</i>	solid phase
<i>sf</i>	solid phase friction

Acronyms

CFD	Computational Fluid Dynamics
ECT	Electrical Capacitance Tomography
ILBP	Iterative Linear Back Projection
KTGF	Kinetic Theory of Granular Flow
TFM	Two-Fluid Model