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Abstract

In granular flows, when the solid volume fraction is large, the dynamic behaviour of particles becomes controlled by frictional effects. Theoretically these effects can not be taken into account in an Eulerian approach, based on the kinetic theory of granular flows, because the inter-particle contact times are long. However, in the literature several empirical models have been proposed which introduce a frictional pressure and viscosity. In the paper, these models are first compared on a simple case of sheared dense granular flows in order to analyze the individual behavior of each model. Second, the models have been implemented in an Eulerian solver and numerical simulations have been performed of an experiment of bin discharge [3]. The results show that for large diameter, the solid mass flow rate is well predicted, while it is systematically underestimated when the ratio between the injector diameter and the diameter of particles is small.
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1. Introduction

Granular flows are encountered in many practical applications such as fluidized beds in chemical process (Fluid Catalytic Cracking, polypropylene production), production of electricity (circulating fluidized bed combustion, pyrolysis of biomass), powder handling (silo discharge, pneumatic conveying), or physical flows (sand dune motion, ripple formation, volcano eruption). In these applications the granular flows exhibit different regimes which can be sorted according to the particle volume fraction, \( \alpha_p \). In dilute flows (\( \alpha_p < 0.01\% \)), the particle motion is mainly controlled by the interaction with the turbulence. A kinetic regime can be defined for \( 0.01\% < \alpha_p < 10\% \). In such a regime the solid phase transport properties is due to the particle fluctuating (random or turbulent) velocity with a mixing length scale controlled by inter-particle collisions and/or fluid-particle interactions. The two-way coupling (i.e. the modification of the fluid flow by the particle) may be present if the particle mass loading is sufficiently large. Finally for \( \alpha_p > 10\% \) takes place a dense gas-particle regime with two sub-regimes:

- **Rapid granular flows** (short inter-particle contact time) or collisional regime: solid phase transport properties due to inter-particle exchanges by collision (negligible effect of the interstitial gas).

- **Slow granular flows** (long inter-particle contact time) or frictional regime: solid phase rheology due to inter-particle friction.

Basically, the numerical simulation of granular flows can be performed in a Lagrangian or an Eulerian way. However the Lagrangian approach can not be used for a practical application because of the huge number of particles that must be tracked. In contrast, an Eulerian approach is much more adapted for complex and large-scale geometries but the Eulerian approach needs closures law for inter-particle collisions and high-order terms.

Eulerian approaches are based on the kinetic theory of granular flow (KTFG) [14, 4, 19] with additional terms taking into account the effects of interstitial fluid. From a theoretical point of view, such an approach is valid for dilute regime and also for the sub-regime called "Rapid granular flows" because the KTFG is based on the idea that the inter-particle collision are instantaneous. The present paper focuses on the modelling of "Slow granular flow" in the frame of Eulerian approach. In the following section several models from the literature are introduced. These models are compared on a simple case of sheared granular flows in order to understand the main differences between the models. Finally the predictions of the models are compared with experimental data for the case of a bin discharge [3].

2. Gas-particle mathematical model

The mathematical model is given in appendix. All details of the mathematical model can be found in [4, 19, 6]. The momentum equation of the particle phase reads

\[
\alpha_p \rho_p \left[ \frac{\partial U_{p,i}}{\partial t} + U_{p,j} \frac{\partial U_{p,i}}{\partial x_j} \right] = - \alpha_p \frac{\partial P_p}{\partial x_i} + \alpha_{p,p} \frac{\partial g_i}{\partial x_i} + I_{g=\rightarrow p, i} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \left[ \Sigma_{p,j}^{\text{coll}} + \Sigma_{p,j}^{\text{fr}} \right]
\]

where, \( \rho_p \) is particle density, \( U_{p,i} \) is the \( i^{th} \)-component of the mean velocity, \( P_p \) the mean gas pressure, and \( g_i \) is the gravity. The third term on the right-hand-side is the mean gas-particle momentum transfer.

\[
\alpha_p \rho_p \left[ \frac{\partial q^2}{\partial t} + U_{p,j} \frac{\partial q_j}{\partial x_j} \right] = \frac{1}{\tau_c} \left[ \alpha_p \rho_p \left( K_{p,\text{kin}}^{\alpha_p} + K_{p,\text{fr}}^{\alpha_p} \right) \frac{\partial q^2}{\partial x_j} \right] - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \left[ \Sigma_{p,j}^{\text{coll}} \frac{\partial U_{p,i}}{\partial x_j} \right] - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \left( \Sigma_{p,j}^{\text{fr}} \left( 2 q_{p,i} - q_{pp} \right) \right)
\]

The transport equations are derived by phase ensemble averaging for the continuous phase and in the frame of kinetic theory...
of granular flows [14] for the dispersed phase but extended to account for interstitial fluid effects and particle-turbulence interaction [2]. The fluid-particle momentum transfers are taken into account by the model proposed by [9]. The turbulence of the gas phase is computed using the $k - \epsilon$ model, and particle agitation is treated by the $q_{p} - \Sigma_{p}$ model. It is assumed that the particle agitation is purely decorrelated [20]. In fact these hypotheses are legitimate due to inertia of particle. The complete description of the mathematical model can be found in [4, 9, 19]. As explained in introduction, the particulate flow regime passes from quasi-static to dilute flows. Then the frictional effects have to be taken into account in the modelling approach, especially in the silo.

In the present study, a frictional contribution has been added to the particle kinetic stress tensor in the momentum equation. The model for frictional effects has been proposed by Johnson and Jackson [11] for the pressure and Srivastava and Sundaresan [21] for the viscosity. Frictional effects are assumed to be directly dissipated into heat without affecting the agitation. The frictional contribution doesn’t appear in the particle agitation equation, in particular the friction effect has been neglected.

3. Model for frictional effects

In the present section several models for taking into account the frictional effect are introduced. These models are essentially extensions of soil mechanics [17]. Basically, the frictional stress tensor, $\Sigma_{p,i,j}^{fr}$, is given in term of frictional pressure, $P_{fr}$, viscosity, $\mu_{fr}$, as

$$\Sigma_{p,i,j}^{fr} = P_{fr} \delta_{ij} - 2 \mu_{fr} \tilde{D}_{p,i,j}$$

where $\tilde{D}_{p,i,j}$ is the strain rate tensor given in the appendix.


Johnson & Jackson [11] proposed the following model for the frictional pressure

$$P_{fr}^{JJ} = \begin{cases} \frac{\mu_{fr}}{\sqrt{\rho_{p} D_{p}}} \sin (\phi) & \text{if} \quad \alpha_{p} > \alpha_{p}^{\min} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $\rho_{p}$, $r$ and $s$ are empirical material constants. For glass beads these constants can be chosen such as $Fr = 0.05$, $r = 2$, $s = 5$ and the threshold particle volume fraction $\alpha_{p}^{\min}$ is set to 0.5.


At the critical state the granular material deforms without any volume change ($\nabla \cdot U_{p} = 0$), Srivastava & Sundaresan [21] proposed to model the frictional viscosities as

$$\mu_{fr}^{SS} = \begin{cases} \frac{\sqrt{2 P_{fr}^{2} / \sin (\phi)}}{2 \sqrt{D_{p}} \rho_{p} + \frac{2}{\sqrt{\rho_{p}}} D_{p}} & \text{if} \quad \alpha_{p} > \alpha_{p}^{\min} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $\phi$ is the angle of internal friction, set to $28.5^\circ$.

3.3. Schneiderbauer et al. (2012) (SAP model) [18]

In 2012, Schneiderbauer et al. [18] proposed a model for the frictional pressure and viscosity based on the $\mu(I)$- rheology. The granular pressure reads

$$P_{fr}^{SAP} = 4 \rho_{p} \left( b d_{p} \frac{D_{p}}{\rho_{p} D_{p}} \right)$$

where $b \approx 0.2$ is a model constants [8]. The frictional viscosity is given by

$$\mu_{fr}^{SAP} = \frac{P_{fr}^{SAP}}{2 \sqrt{D_{p} / D_{p}}} \mu_{fr}(I)$$

where $\mu_{fr}(I)$ is a function. From experiments, Jop et al. (2006) [12] proposed

$$\mu_{fr}(I) = \mu_{fr}^{cet} + \frac{\mu_{fr}^{ci} - \mu_{fr}^{cet}}{I_{0}/I_{s} + 1}$$

with $I_{0} = 0.279$, $\mu_{fr}^{cet} = 0.382$ and $\mu_{fr}^{ci} = 0.6435$. In Eq. (8), $I_{s}$ is the inertial number that is computed by:

$$I_{s} = \frac{2 \sqrt{D_{p} / D_{p} d_{p}}}{\sqrt{P_{fr}^{SAP} / \rho_{p}}}$$

4. Simple sheared granular flows

This section is dedicated to the analysis of the frictional models on a simple configuration of sheared granular flows. In such a configuration only the equation of the particle agitation Eq. (2) has been solved. The production by the mean shear is balanced by the dissipation due to non-elastic inter-particle collisions. The gas is air with a density of $\rho_{g} = 1.224 \text{kg/m}^3$ and a viscosity of $\mu_{g} = 1.78 \times 10^{-5} \text{kg/m/s}$. The particle density is set to $\rho_{p} = 2500 \text{kg/m}^3$ and the particle diameter is $d_{p} = 487 \mu\text{m}$.

![Figure 1: Normalized pressure by $\rho_{p}(d_{p}S_{p})^{2}$ with respect to the particle volume fraction $\alpha_{p}$, for several values of the mean shear $S_{g}$.](image-url)
Johnson and Jackson frictional pressure model [11] presents a rapid transition from the dilute to the dense regime. This passage will take place after the threshold particle volume fraction. One may note that the pressure in Schneiderbauer et al.'s model [18] corresponds to the intermediate pressure proposed by [5], without the quasi-static contribution. The intermediate pressure links the dilute and dense regimes. Adding the frictional contribution proposed by [18] shows a smooth transition from the kinetic-collisional regime to the frictional regime. As will be seen below, the SAP model [18] allows a smoother transition to the frictional regime.

The granular and frictional pressures are shown by Figure 1. As expected the frictional pressure acts at large solid volume fractions.

Figure 2: Normalized viscosity by $\alpha_p \rho_p (d_p S_p)^2 /S_p$ with respect to the particle volume fraction $\alpha_p$ for several values of the mean shear $S_p$.

5. Simulations and experiments

In this section, numerical simulations of a silo discharge are performed. The modelling of the frictional term is performed with the data base given by [3]. Figure 3 shows the experimental geometry. The geometry consists of a rectangular bin 60 mm x 3.5 mm and x 500 mm height. The mesh contains 25000 hexahedral cells with a grid resolution of $\Delta x \sim 1$ mm, $\Delta y = 0.875$ mm and $\Delta z = 3.125$ mm. A region below the bin (0.1m) has been added which allows the granular media to pass through the oriﬁce. Computations on a refined mesh have been performed and showed no sensitivity on the results. The different meshes are not shown in this paper. The particles are glass beads of density $\rho_p = 2500 \text{ kg/m}^3$. Different particle diameters have been considered and are summarized in table 1. The air characteristics are the same as those of the previous section.

![Figure 3: Bin discharge geometry based on [3].](image)

The author [10] find a good agreement for the particle mass flow rate ($Q$) with beverloo’s law expressed in this form, for a rectangular configuration:

$$Q = C \rho_0 \sqrt{gW (D - kd_p)^3/2}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)

with the coefficient found $C = 0.91$ et $k = 1.36$.

Three dimensional numerical simulations has been performed using an Eulerian multi-fluid modelling approach for gas and solid interaction developed and implemented by IMFT (Institut de Mécanique des Fluides de Toulouse) in the NEPTUNE_CFD. NEPTUNE_CFD is a multiphase flow software developed in the framework of the NEPTUNE project, financially supported by CEA (Commissariat à l’Energie Atomique), EDF (Electricité de France), IRSN (Institut de Radioprotection et de Sûreté Nucléaire) and AREVA-NP. The numerical solver has been developed for High Performance Computing [16, 15]. Each numerical simulation has been performed for 10 seconds and time-averaged statistics are computed during the last 6 seconds. Test performed with and without turbulence gas model, and no significant effect was observed.
6. Comparisons

Figure 4 shows the temporal mass flow rate evolution for the different frictional models. Stabilization of the mass flow rate around the mean values takes 4 seconds for all numerical simulations. Small fluctuations have been observed around a mean value. Table 6 shows the results with the different frictional models described in section 3. For each simulation an underestimation of the mean flow rate is observed. The figure 5 compares the experimental and Beverloo law to the numerically predicted dimensionless mass flow rate. A good shape is predicted and the model better captures the mass flow rate for high $D/d_p$ ratios.

The results with the SS model show a better agreement with the experimental value. In contrast the frictional models have some difficulty to correctly predict the particle mass flow rate when $D/d_p$ is small. The simulation with the SS model, high fluctuations for low particle diameters have been observed (see Figure 6). This is provoked by the penetration of air into the system. These fluctuations help the mixing at the injector and create more shearing and agitation. This can reduce the effect of frictional viscosity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$D/d_p$</th>
<th>Exp.</th>
<th>SS model</th>
<th>$e_{SS}$</th>
<th>SAP model</th>
<th>$e_{SAP}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64.82</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>15.85</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>30.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.04</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>18.15</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>29.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.39</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>24.81</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>30.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.17</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>41.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>46.90</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>48.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>42.85</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>43.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>41.33</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>45.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: Dimensionless mass flow rate $Q/ρφ_bW\sqrt{gd_p^3}$. Dash line represent the Beverloo law eq. 10, symbol represent the experimental value given by [3], and numerical simulation with the different correlation show in section 3.

Figure 6: Temporal evolution of the particle mass flow rate for the SS model [21].

7 shows the velocity profile at the injector for the different diameters, for the case with the SS model and JJ model. Free fall arch hypothesis near to the injector suggests that particles fall like a solid in vacuum ($\sqrt{gD}$). When we compare the mean particle velocity to the numerical results a good agreement is obtained for sight $D/d_p$ ratio. However when this ratio is reduced the particle mean velocity decreases.
Figure 7: Mean particle velocity profiles at the injector (centered on the middle) with the Sundaresan & Srivastava model, for different particle diameter.

7. Conclusion

The results show that the frictional viscosity model captures the shape of the beverloo law. A better agreement to the experimental value has been found for the particle mass flow rate at high $D/d_p$ ratio. As for the high ratio the velocity follows the free fall of mass with a particle velocity fall for the same mass flow rate. Moreover recent development on rotating drum show an underestimation of the velocity fall for the same mass flow rate. For the Sundaresan & Srivastava model, some numerical simulations (not shown) suggest this underestimation could be due to the $q_2$ term (see equation 5) in the frictional viscosity. Frictional effects do not explicitly appear in the kinetic agitation equation and only appear through the effect on the momentum equation. As a matter of fact, frictional effects should induced an additional dissipation of the random kinetic energy which is not accounted for in the actual modelling approach and required further investigations. In recent development by Chialvo & et al. propose to consider an intermediate and quasi-static transition. This is under consideration in forthcoming work.

References


A. Appendix: Mathematical model

In the following when subscript \( k = g \) we refer to the gas and \( k = p \) to the particulate phase. The mass balance equation (without interphase mass transfer) is written

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \alpha_k \rho_k + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \alpha_k \rho_k U_{k,i} = 0
\]

where \( \alpha_k \) is the volume fraction of the phase \( k, \rho_k \) the material density and \( U_{k,i} \) the \( i^{th} \) component of the \( k \)-phase mean velocity.

The mean solid momentum equation is written

\[
\alpha_k \rho_k \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} U_{k,i} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \right] = - \alpha_k \frac{\partial p}{\partial x_i} + \alpha_k \rho_k g_i + I_{k,i} - \frac{\partial \Sigma_{k,ij}}{\partial x_j}
\]

where \( P_g \) is the mean gas pressure, \( g_i \) the gravity acceleration, \( \Sigma_{k,ij} \) the effective stress tensor, and \( I_{k,i} \) the mean gas-particle interphase momentum transfer without the mean gas pressure contribution. According to the large particle to gas density ratio, only the drag force is acting on the particles. The mean gas-particle interphase momentum transfer term is written as:

\[
I_{p,i} = -\alpha_p \rho_p \frac{V_{c,i}}{\tau_{gp}} \quad \text{and} \quad I_{g,i} = -I_{p,i}
\]

The particle relaxation time scale is written

\[
\frac{1}{\tau_{gp}} = 3 \frac{\rho_p}{4 \rho_p} \left[ \frac{\| \mathbf{v}_c \|}{d_p} \right] C_d
\]

where \( C_d \) is the drag coefficient given by [9]. The mean fluid-particle relative velocity, \( V_{c,i} \), is given in terms of the mean gas and solid velocities: \( V_{c,i} = U_{p,i} - U_{f,i} + V_{d,i} \). With \( V_{d,i} \) is the turbulent gas-particle drift velocity without the subgrid effect. The solid stress tensor is written

\[
\Sigma_{p,ij}^{col} = \alpha_p \rho_p \left( \mathbf{u}_{p,i}' \cdot \mathbf{u}_{p,j}' \right) + \Theta_{p,ij}
\]

where \( \mathbf{u}_{p,i}' \) is the fluctuating part of the instantaneous solid velocity and \( \Theta_{p,ij} \) the collisional particle stress tensor. The solid stress tensor is expressed as [4, 7, 1],

\[
\Sigma_{p,ij}^{col} = \left( P_p - \lambda_p D_{p,mm} \right) \delta_{ij} - 2 \mu_p \bar{D}_{p,ij}
\]

where the strain rate tensor is defined by

\[
\bar{D}_{p,ij} = D_{p,ij} - \frac{1}{3} D_{p,mm} \delta_{ij} \quad \text{with} \quad D_{p,ij} = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{\partial U_{p,i}}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial U_{p,j}}{\partial x_i} \right]
\]

The granular pressure, viscosities and model coefficients are given by

\[
\begin{align*}
P_p &= \frac{2}{3} \alpha_p \rho_p \left( \rho_p^2 \left[ 1 + 2 \alpha_p g_0 (1 + e_c) \right] \right) \\
\lambda_p &= \frac{4}{3} \alpha_p \rho_p d_p g_0 (1 + e_c) \sqrt{\frac{2 q_p^2}{3 \pi}} \\
\mu_p &= \alpha_p \rho_p \left( \nu_p^{kin} + \nu_p^{col} \right) \\
\nu_p^{kin} &= \left[ \frac{1}{3} q_p \tau_{gp} \right] \left( 1 + \frac{q_p^2}{3 \pi} \right) \\
\nu_p^{col} &= \frac{4}{5} \alpha_p g_0 (1 + e_c) \left[ \nu_p^{kin} + d_p \sqrt{\frac{2 q_p^2}{3 \pi}} \right] \\
\zeta &= \frac{2}{5} \left( 1 + e_c \right) (3e_c - 1) \\
\sigma &= \frac{1}{5} \left( 1 + e_c \right) (3 - e_c).
\end{align*}
\]

Decorrelated collision model is used, the collision time scale \( \tau_c \) is given by

\[
\frac{1}{\tau_c} = 4 \pi g_0 n_p d_p^2 \sqrt{\frac{2 q_p^2}{3 \pi}}
\]

where the radial distribution function, \( g_0 \), is computed according to [13] as

\[
g_0(\alpha_p) = \left[ 1 - \frac{\alpha_p}{\alpha_{max}} \right]^{-2.5 \alpha_{max}}
\]

where \( \alpha_{max} = 0.64 \) is the closest random packing.

The solid random kinetic energy transport equation is written:

\[
\alpha_p \rho_p \left[ \frac{\partial q_p^2}{\partial t} + U_{p,j} \frac{\partial q_p^2}{\partial x_j} \right] = - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \left[ \alpha_p \rho_p \left( \nu_p^{kin} + \nu_p^{col} \right) \frac{\partial q_p^2}{\partial x_j} \right] - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial U_{p,i}}{\partial x_j} - \alpha_p \rho_p \left( 2q_p^2 - q_g^2 \right) + \alpha_p \rho_p \left( 1 + e_c \right) \frac{1}{3} \frac{q_p}{q_g} - \alpha_p \rho_p \frac{\partial q_p}{\partial x_j} - \frac{1}{5} \frac{q_p}{q_g} \frac{\partial q_p}{\partial x_j}.
\]

The first term on the right-hand-side represents the transport of the random particle kinetic energy due to the particle agitation and the collisional effects. That term is written by introducing the diffusivity coefficients:

\[
K_p^{kin} = \left[ \frac{1}{3} q_p \tau_{gp} + \frac{2}{5} q_p \left( 1 + \alpha_p g_0 \zeta \right) \right] / \left[ 1 + \frac{5}{3} q_p \zeta \frac{\tau_{gp}}{\tau_c} \right]
\]

\[
K_p^{col} = \alpha_p g_0 \left( 1 + e_c \right) \left[ \frac{6}{5} K_p^{kin} + 4 \frac{q_p^2}{3 \pi} \right]
\]

\[
\zeta = \frac{3}{5} \left( 1 + e_c \right)^2 (2e_c - 1)
\]

\[
\xi_c = \frac{(1 + e_c)(49 - 33e_c)}{100}
\]

The second term on the right-hand-side of Eq. (11) represents the production of particle agitation by the gradients of the mean solid velocity. The third term is the interaction with the gas. Finally the fourth term is the particle agitation dissipation by inelastic collisions.