

Parallel solution of Uni-directional coupled PBM-DEM for fast evaluation

A1, A2, A3, A4, A5*

Department of Chemical and Biochemical Engineering, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, Piscataway, NJ, USA 08854

Abstract

abstract text goes here ...

Keywords: Population balance model, heteroaggregation, alginate, chitosan, oppositely charged

1. Introduction & Objectives

Half of all industrial chemical production is carried out using particulate processes (Seville et al. (2012)) and important products made using these processes include detergents, aerosols, fertilizers, and pharmaceuticals. *pp are divrse and blah but in general are described as .* Despite how common particulate processes are the underlying physics of these procesess is poorly understood *when compared to the well developed theory of fluid processes.* As a results industries that rely on these processes, in particular pharmecuticals, have to use expensive heuristic studies and inefficient operational protocols with high recycle ratios to meet strict regulatory standards (Ramachandran et al. (2009)). This drives up the costs and delays the release of new drugs to patients. What makes these processes so challenging to design is that there are no governing equations to accurately predict their behavior ?sen2013). However in place of exact governing equations highly accurate models could be used because of this there has been a great deal of research in to how best to model the complex physics of these processes.

Particulate processes are defined by chaotic microscale phenomena that result from the many particle-particle interactions of these systems. These small scale phenomena develop into the complex bulk behavior of these processes. To successfully predict the bulk behavior of these systems, models need to capture their particle-particle interactions and emergent mesoscale scale phenomena.

DEM breif concept - model microscale great - takes to long to run

Discrete element methods (DEM) have proven to be an accurate way of model a bulk material properties of particulate systems using microscale particle level interactions (CITE SOME DEM PAPERS?). DEMs use newton's equations of motion to model each particle in the system of study and it's interactions with the system geometry and other particles, which is what enables DEMs to model the small scale phenomena that determines the bulk behavior of particulate systems. However becuase many forces and particle interactions are being calculated for each particle DEMs take a large amount of time to run *(maybe give estimated time scale).* Often times scientists need to alter simulation properties to make DEMs run faster but it makes them less accruate (CITE NUMEROUS DEM WORKS WE LATER USE). Another more computationally efficient, but less accurate technique, used for these particulate processes are population balance models (PBMs).

PBM breif concept - model bulk/meso not accurate enough

*Corresponding author
Email address: A5 (A5)

PBMs are semi-mechanistic, meaning they use population averages and probabilities to capture bulk behavior but still seek to try to capture some of the microphenomena of particle-particle interactions using correlations or empirically developed kernels to approximate those interactions. Even though PBMs model process physics less rigorously than DEMs, PBMs have been successfully used to model many processes for academic and commercial purposes (CITE SOME PBM PAPERS HERE ramkrishna review would be good). Even though PBMs are much faster than DEMs, detailed PBMs can still take a significant amount of time to solve which prevents them from being used as widely as they could be in academia and industry (CITE NUMEROUS WORKS ON PBMs WE USE LATER and from chai work in intro). Due to the populating averaging and their semi-mechanistic kernels, highly detailed PBMs still can have difficulties in capturing the microscale phenomena that are crucial to predicting the dynamics of particulate processes.

PBM-DEM brief concept - better acc but fast likepdm - still take too long to solve!

In attempts to take advantage of the highly accurate modeling capabilities of DEMs and the efficiency of PBMs there has been great interest in hybrid PBM-DEM methods. The typical workflow of these PBM-DEM coupled models involves using short DEMs to capture the particle-particle level interactions of the system and then those particle-particle physics from the DEM are fed into the PBMs particle-particle so that the PBM can more accurately simulate bulk system behavior (CITE NUMEROUS coupled DEM-PBM people we cite later on and from chai paragraph in intro). These PBM-DEM methods are more accurate than PBM alone but run much faster than DEMs. However despite the performance benefits of these coupled PBM-DEM models they still take too long to solve for optimization, controls, design, hundreds of sims but each sim take hrs to evaluate ddd not practical. In the past parallel computing has been used to speed up computationally intensive problems such as list stuff here cfd, MD, finite diffs, etc and in more recent years has been applied to DEM and PBMs (cite me gunawana anuj).

parallel computing intro, need, how if fit into this problem - answer to those things taking too long!

Parallel computing involves distributing small pieces of a large problem across many CPUs so that they can work together to solve the problem simultaneously. or use this better first sentence - In order to solve large computational problems parallel computing can be used to distribute the problem across many CPUs which can work together to solve the problem more quickly. . To solve problems in parallel computing clusters are often used and have been dropping significantly in price making them more accessible than ever want to show that cheaper and user can get excited but might need to throw some ideas about cloud access or amazon bs or something?. A cluster is essentially a collection of conventional computers connected together via a high speed network like ethernet or infiniband. The difficulty with implementing parallel computing to solve a computational problem is it involves a lot of computer-computer communication and algorithm redesigning which needs to be done very carefully to ensure numerical consistency and with consideration of the cluster the program will be run on. info about how RP helps with running these sims etc. When parallel computing has been used successfully it has been possible to speed up programs by examples of speed up gains from using parallel computing so solve stuff so reader gets ideas about what could do. this makes good segway into talking about the potential opportunities afforded by using these methods to solve these problems.

The potential benefits of having developing a highly accurate DEM-PBM model that can run in relatively short periods of time because of parallel computing include improved QbD, lower production costs, shorter time to market scales for products, and high accuracy model predictive controllers for better quality control.

1.1. Objectives

The main objective of this work is to develop a uni-directional DEM-PBM model that runs in parallel so that modern computing clusters can be used to solve the coupled model in the shortest amount of time possible and so that more detail can be used in modeling than was possible without the performance improvements of parallel computing. Specific goals include the following:

- Developed a 4-Dimensional PBM that is parallelized using hybrid techniques (MPI + OpenMP) for optimal utilization of modern high performance computing equipment.
- Use LIGGGHTS[®] to perform Discrete Element Model (DEM) simulations to model the micromechanics of the Lodgitech granulator.
- Uni-directionally couple DEM to PBM using RP, to create an accurate model which can be run quickly on high performance computing clusters

2. Background & Motivation

2.1. Particulate Processes

part proc gen description - general part-part interactions that make the crazy physics of these processes happen

Particulate processes are ones in which a system of discrete species exist, such as granules or catalyst pellets, that undergo changes in average composition, size, or other pertinent properties. (line or 2 that says something about force bridges or stuff that form due to system of discrete parts leads to chaotic behavior. These processes are especially prevalent in the pharmaceutical industry, one of the most important is granulation.

granulation - talk about specifics of granulation purpose and mechanisms

Granulation is used to produce larger particles from mixtures of powders and liquid binders, for better flowability, compactability, and particle uniformity. The primary mechanisms that govern granulation are aggregation and consolidation, breakage and attrition, wetting and nucleation. descriptions of each rate process (1 sentence each). CITE(DANA2015CHERD)

To understand how a granulation processes will behave with different parameter settings and chemical mixtures it large experimental studies of the process parameter space are performed which is a method referred to as Quality-by-Testing (QbT). This methodology is time consuming and expensive. A great deal of research is now focused on shifting to a Quality-by-Design (QbD) approach which would use models to predict much of the behavior of these processes instead of testing huge numbers of different parameter combinations. CITE(DANA2015CHERD)

2.2. Modeling

2.2.1. Discrete Element Modeling (DEM)

Discrete Element Method is a simulation technique used to monitor the behaviour of each particle as a separate entity compared to other bulk continuum models. This method tracks the movement of each of the particles within the space, records the collisions of each particle with the geometry as well as with each other and it is also subject to other force fields like gravity (Barrasso and Ramachandran (2015)). This model is based on the Newton's laws of the motion and is expressed as in Equations 1 and 2 :

$$m_i \frac{dv_i}{dt} = F_{i,net} \quad (1)$$

$$F_{i,net} = F_{i,coll} + F_{i,ext} \quad (2)$$

In the above equations m_i represents the mass of the particle, v_i represents the velocity of the particle, $F_{i,net}$ represents the net force on the particle, forces on the particle due to collisions and other external forces are represented in $F_{i,coll}$ $F_{i,ext}$ respectively.

The distance between each particle calculated at every time step and if the distance between two particles is less than the sum of the radii (for spherical particles) a collision between the two particles is recorded. The tolerance for overlap is low in the normal as well as the tangential direction (Cundall and Strack (1979)). Microscale DEM simulations are computationally demanding and simulations may take upto several days to replicate a few seconds of real time experiments. Many methods have been implemented to increase the speed of these simulations, such as scaling by increasing the size of the particles. These approximations are good in understanding the physics of the system but are not directly applicable to process-level simulations.

2.2.2. PBM

Population balance models (PBM) predict how groups of discrete entities will behave on a bulk scale due to certain effects acting on the population with respect to time (Ramkrishna and Singh (2014)). In the context of process engineering and granulation, population balance models are used to describe how the number densities, of different types of particles, in the granulator change as rate processes such as aggregation and breakage reshape particles (Barrasso et al. (2013)). A general form of population balance model is shown here as equation 3.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} F(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}, t) + \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{v}} [F(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}, t) \frac{d\mathbf{v}}{dt}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}, t)] + \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{x}} [F(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}, t) \frac{d\mathbf{x}}{dt}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}, t)] \\ = \mathfrak{R}_{formation}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}, t) + \mathfrak{R}_{depletion}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}, t) + \dot{F}_{in}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}, t) - \dot{F}_{out}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}, t) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

In equation (3), \mathbf{v} is a vector of internal coordinates. For modelling a granulation process \mathbf{v} is commonly used to describe the solid, liquid, and gas content of each type of particle. The vector \mathbf{x} represents external coordinates, usually spatial variance. For a granulation process this account for spatial variance in the particles as they flow along the granulator.

talk about kernels - empirical, semi mech, and DEM informed? talking about kernels then mentioning there is DEM informed could be GREAT SEGWAY to multi-physics models dotdotdot combined PBM DEM etc.

SEGWAY - Even with the extensive research that has been done on kernels for PBMs the are still limited because they do not model the individual partilce-particle interactions of the process. To address the limitations of many emperical and semi mechanistic PBM kernels researchers have studied how supplement PBM kernels with particle-particle interaction data from DEMs.

2.2.3. Coupled DEM-PBMs *Multi-physics models*

The goal of mutli-physics or coupled models is to try get the best of both worlds. Someones want faster modeling of one or the better accuracy of others. It is somewhat dependend on the goal of the work and nature of the over all context of the problem being solved (industry wants faster over more fundamental etc).

Due to the potential benefits a coupled PBM-DEM model could have there has been a number of studies of the topic. talk about past works here. pros cons good bad potential benefits tricks methods. mention stuff about difficulties in getting the the two models to talk to each other etc.

The use of multi-physics models has been used to understand the behaviour of particle systems. These models help understand the physics of the system at various scales *ie* micro, meso and macro scale(Sen et al. (2014)). Particle process dynamics have been inferred from coupling of various physics models *viz.* Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD), DEM and PBM. Earlier works

from Sen et al. (2014) and Barrasso and Ramachandran (2015) have successfully predicted process dynamics of the granulation process.

closing remarks about this paper in regards to these other coupled works? IN LAST SENTENCE OF THIS SECTION TOUCH ON HOW LONG IT CNA STILL TAKE EVEN WITH THIS BETTER METHOD OF DOING IT this will be great segway back into parallel computing with detail this time!

2.3. Parallel Computing and Computer Architectures

The goal of parallel computing is to distribute large amounts of computation across many compute cores to solve problems faster (Wilkinson and Allen (1999)).

2.3.1. Computer Architecture

would like to shorten this section

Iannis - please review, edit, correct as see fit

Parallel programs are commonly run on computer clusters. Computer clusters are a collection of nodes interconnected by a high speed communication network for message passing from one node to another. Analogously to a conventional PC each node as one or more CPUs and RAM. Commonly nodes are manufactured with two CPUs, each CPU is a multi-core meaning it has multiple compute cores that each can carry out calculations separately from one another. CPUs also have built in memory called cache that is much faster than RAM which is why for optimal performance cache utilization should be favoured over RAM when possible. On a node memory is divided by CPU sockets, so each CPU has direct access to memory local to its own socket, but accessing memory on another socket is much slower Jin et al. (2011). For this reason data that is needed for computation should be stored locally to the CPU that needs it.

Computer architectures are often classified by memory locality features. There are two distinct classes, distributed memory systems and shared memory systems. A cluster is a combination of the two classes. Each node operates its memory independently of the other nodes and explicit message passing is needed to share memory between nodes. While the cores on a node can operate in shared memory mode since memory updates can be made without explicit message passing statements from the user. All of these aspects of the computer architecture should be considered when designing a parallel program for the best performance should reword better to make more like CACE paper. also not really the difference in shared and distributed memory especailly not from comp eng point of view.

2.3.2. Parallel Application Program Interfaces

would like to shorten this section

Iannis - please review, edit, correct as see fit

Message Passing Interface (MPI) is a common parallel computing application interface standard. MPI is used for distributed memory parallel computing, this is because MPI will operate every MPI process as a discrete unit that does not share memory with the other processes unless explicit message passing is used. Even on shared a single node where the hardware is supports shared memory computing, MPI will still operate it in a distributed memory fashion Jin et al. (2011). Operating all cores as distinct units also means they each need their own copy of all variables used for computation which results in a large overall memory foot print compared to a same system if it was operated in shared memory.

Open Multi-Processing (OMP) is another application program interface stand for parallel computing. OMP is used for shared memory and can take advantage of shared memory systems which can result in much faster computation. It does not work well on distributed systems though. This

prevents it from being used to efficiently carry out computations across multiple nodes of a cluster simultaneously Jin et al. (2011).

Since MPI is best for distributed computing and OMP is better for shared computing many individuals have studied the performance of MPI vs MPI+OMP methods and many studies have used MPI+OMP for scientific computation for improved performance. Often times a trade off is made between optimizing a program for performance and trying to make it flexible enough to run on many different computer architectures [might need reference for this](#). A summary of some works addressing MPI+OMP methods for scientific computing and architecture features and concerns can be found in Bettencourt et al. (2017). In the conclusion to the work by Bettencourt et al. (2017) it was found that hybrid methods for PBMs allow the code flexibility for different architectures while still maintaining good performance. [should I mention load balancing techniques of gunawan paper?](#). In the work of Bettencourt et al. (2017) only the external(spatial) coordinates of the PBM were parallelized. In this current work external and internal(compositions) calculations are parallelized. [comment about how int and ext pll methods means better model for xyz reasons dotdotdot helps to explicitly say reason](#)

2.3.3. Previous works on parrallel PBM and DEM

[need to review this part](#)

The idea of parallelization to reduce the amount of time required has been employed by various researchers in the past. Gunawan et al. (2008) used high-resolution finite volumes solution methods for the parallelization of their PBM. Gunawan et al. (2008) performed load balancing effectively by decomposing the internal coordinates of their PBM. They acheived speed improvements upto 100 cores on one system size, but was not tested for models with more dimensions. Moreover, they mentioned that the parallelisation could be improved using shared memory processing. Bettencourt et al. (2017) took a hybrid approach towards the parallelization of the PBM using both Message Parsing Interface (MPI) and Open Multi-Processing. The hybrid parallelisation helped achieve a speed up of about 98% over the serial code. Prakash et al. (2013b),Prakash et al. (2013a) used the inbuilt Parallel Computation Toolbox (PCT) in Matlab to parallelize their PBM on lower number of cores, but this faced the shortcomings of Matlab’s internal processing and could not achieve the speed improvements of parallelistion of a program if it were written in a native programming language like C or FORTRAN.

LIGGGHTS is an open-source software used to perform DEM simulations. This package nativly supports MPI for parallelizing the simulation by static decomposition which partitions space such that the area of communication between the the MPI ranks is minimized. Kačianauskas et al. (2010) used load balancing methods similar to a static decompostion and observed that this works well for a mono-dispersed system but the computational effort increases for simulations for poly-dispersed material. Gopalakrishnan and Tafti (2013) also reported a speed increase and a parallel efficiency of about 81% in their CFD-DEM simulation. LIGGGHTS could not take advantage of shared memory interfaces since it did not support OpenMP. Berger et al. (2015) implemented hybrid parallelization methods for the particle-particle interaction and the particle-wall interaction modules in LIGGGHTS and also used the Zoltan library (Boman et al., 2012) developed by Sandia National Laboratories for dynamic load balancing. They achieved a speed improvement of about 44% for simulations performed on higher number of cores, but there was no significant speed improvement for smaller core counts.

3. Methods

3.1. DEM

3.1.1. LIGGGHTS

LAMMPS Improved for general granular and granular heat transfer simulations (LIGGGHTS® v3.60) (Kloss et al. (2012)) developed by DCS computing was used for all the simulation performed in this study. Edits were made to the compute_contact_atom source file to obtain particle – particle collisions. The aforementioned version of LIGGGHTS was compiled using the mvapich (mvapich2 v2.1) and intel (intel v15.0.2) compilers with the -o3 optimisation option as well as an option to use OpenMP threads was implemented. The speed improvements and the disadvantages are illustrated in Table (refer to the speed table). The studies were performed on STAMPEDE supercomputer located at Univeristy of Texas, Austin. The hardware configuration of each node consists of 2 8-core Intel Xeon E5-2680 processors based on the Sandy Bridge architecture, 32 gb of memory with QPI interconnects at 8.0 GT/s PCI-e lanes.

3.1.2. Geometry

In this study, the Lödige CoriMix CM5 continuous high shear granulator has been studied. Its geometry was developed using the SolidWorksTM (Dassault Systèmes). This granulator consisted of a high speed rotating element enclosed within a horizontal cylindrical casing. The casing (shown in Figure 1) consists of a cylinder with diameter of 120 mm at the inlet and 130 mm at the outlet and having a total length of 440 mm. A vertical inlet port is provided at one end of the casing and an angled outlet port is provided at the larger end of the case.




Figure 1: Shows an isometric view of the granulator casing.

The impeller consists of a cylindrical shaft of length 370 mm and diameter 68 mm with four flattened sides 15 mm wide running along the axis. The blades are placed on these flattened sides as shown in figure 2. There are three different blade elements on the shaft (figure 2). At the granulator inlet, there are 4 paddle shaped feed elements following which there are 20 tear drop shaped shearing elements and finally 4 trapezoidal blades near the exit. All these elements are placed in a spiral configuration. The final configuration of the granulator is shown in figure 3.







Figure 2: a) Shows the side view of the impeller. b) and c) show the front and back views of the impeller which correspond to the inlet and outlet ends respectively.



(a) Feed element



(b) Shear element



(c) Exit element

Figure 3: Various components of the impeller

3.1.3. Meshing

After the geometry was built in SolidWorksTM (Dassault Systèmes) the shell and impeller were exported as STL files. The coarsest output option was used to keep the STL files small and simple for faster computations times. They were also exported not keeping there original coordinates This resulted in the impeller having 2802 faces and 1281 points with approximately a file size of 775 KBs. The shell had 1948 faces and 720 points and size was about 544 KBs.

Meshlab was used to align the STL files for importing into LIGGGHTS[®]. No mesh treatments were used on the STLs.

The meshes were then imported into LIGGGHTS[®] using the write command. This resulted in 50 elements of the impeller file having "highly skewed elements", which have more than 5 neighbours per surface or have an angle less than 0.0181185 degrees, that according to LIGGGHTS[®] would degrade parallel performance. The write exclusion list command in LIGGGHTS[®] was used and this exclusion list file as then used in the simulation to skip the highly skewed elements during the simulation

look at notes from olgिटdraft pdf file on this section overall looks good though

3.1.4. DEM input file settings

The DEM simulation in LIGGGHTS[®] are setup using an input script which defines the physical parameters of the particles, importing of the geometry, particle insertion commands, various physics models to be used during the simulation as well as various compute and dump commands to help

print the data required for post-processing of the data. A script was prepared each of the particle was considered granular in nature. The Hertzian model was used for non-adhesive elastic contact between the granular particles. The particles were inserted inside the granulator from the inlet at a constant mass flow rate of 15 kilograms per hour. The rotation speed of the impeller was kept throughout the study at 2000 rotations per minute. Such a high rotation speed was chosen since this would lead to high shear between the particles and the walls of the shell resulting in better size control of the granules. There were 2 sets of simulations that were performed, one with mono-sized particles and second consisting of a distribution of sizes. The particle radii chosen for mono-sized simulation varied 0.59mm - 2mm, consecutive particles radii had volume twice of one before them. The radii range of the distributed size simulation was 1mm - 3mm. The difference in the mechanics of these two simulations is discussed later in the results section. The physical constants used for the simulations are given in Table 1.

The simulation data was collected after a constant number of iterations for the visualization of the particles inside the shell, further post processing and to be used in the PBM. The collisions between each of the particles and the collisions between of the particle and the geometry was also collected. *might be better to include more tables or more of the DEM settings info in the table like runtime time steps etc just as a nicer summary of these sections work.*

Table 1: Physical Properties of the particle for the LIGGGHTS[®] input script

Parameter	Value	Units
Young's Modulus of particles	8×10^6	$N.m^{-2}$
Young's Modulus of Geometry	1×10^9	$N.m^{-2}$
Poisson's Ratio	0.2	—
Coefficient of restitution (constant for all collisions)	0.4	—
Coefficient of static friction	0.5	—
Coefficient of rolling friction	0.2	—
Density of the granules	500	$kg.m^{-3}$

3.1.5. DEM data post processing

The post processing of the data obtained from the DEM simulations was done using MATLAB[®]. The first test run on the output data was to determine if the simulation had reached steady-state. The mass inside the granulator was found out by averaging it over 5 time steps and then compared to mass inside the granulator after every 10000 time steps (about 5×10^{-4} seconds) with a tolerance of about 10%. If the mass was found to be constant for most of the iterations, it was considered to be at steady state. Another test to determine steady state was to monitor the number of collision inside the granulator. It can be seen that the number of collision start to oscillate around a mean value. The number of collisions were then plotted and steady state time was determined. *1. could this be an issue if error is 10 percent that is large. what if we start from non steady state time need to consider if 10 of total mass is coming in in how much time for that to be fair right? if less than 10 percent comes in in that time or more then it will skew analysis? 2. can we make a multi plot thing that has time on x and other parameter in y. then show how collisions, mass flow, etc align at some time approximately which kind of indicates steady state or a constant flow has been reached. (since not supposed to use steady state in particulate systems apparently)*

A precautionary script was also run so as to determine that no particles were lost due to overlap of the geometry with the particles as well as from particle particle overlap.

3.2. PBM

3.2.1. Model Development

The main PBM equation developed for this work can be expressed as shown below:

$$\frac{d}{dt}F(s_1, s_2, x) = \mathfrak{R}_{agg}(s_1, s_2, x) + R_{break}(s_1, s_2, x) + \dot{F}_{in}(s_1, s_2, x) - \dot{F}_{out}(s_1, s_2, x) \quad (4)$$

citation?

where, $F(s_1, s_2, x)$ is the number of particles with an API volume of s_1 and an excipient volume of s_2 in the spatial compartment x . The rate of change of number of particles with time in different size classes depend on the rate of aggregation $\mathfrak{R}_{agg}(s_1, s_2, x)$ and the rate of breakage $\mathfrak{R}_{break}(s_1, s_2, x)$. Also, the rate of particles coming into, $\dot{F}_{in}(s_1, s_2, x)$ and going out, $\dot{F}_{out}(s_1, s_2, x)$ of the spatial compartment due to particle transfer affect the number of particles in different size classes. The rate of change of liquid volume is calculated using the equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}F(s_1, s_2, x)l(s_1, s_2, x) = & \mathfrak{R}_{liq,agg}(s_1, s_2, x) + \mathfrak{R}_{liq,break}(s_1, s_2, x) + \dot{F}_{in}(s_1, s_2, x)l_{in}(s_1, s_2, x) \\ & - \dot{F}_{out}(s_1, s_2, x)l_{out}(s_1, s_2, x) + F(s_1, s_2, x)\dot{l}_{add}(s_1, s_2, x) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where, $l(s_1, s_2, x)$ is the amount of liquid volume in each particle with API volume of s_1 and excipient volume of s_2 in the spatial compartment x . $\mathfrak{R}_{liq,agg}(s_1, s_2, x)$ and $\mathfrak{R}_{liq,break}(s_1, s_2, x)$ are respectively the rates of liquid transferred between size classed due to aggregation and breakage. $l_{in}(s_1, s_2, x)$ and $l_{out}(s_1, s_2, x)$ are respectively the liquid volumes of the particles coming in and going out of the spatial compartment. $\dot{l}_{add}(s_1, s_2, x)$ is the volume of liquid acquired by each particle in the compartment at every time step due to external liquid addition.

Similarly, the rate of change of gas volume is calculated using the following equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}F(s_1, s_2, x)g(s_1, s_2, x) = & \mathfrak{R}_{gas,agg}(s_1, s_2, x) + \mathfrak{R}_{gas,break}(s_1, s_2, x) + \dot{F}_{in}(s_1, s_2, x)g_{in}(s_1, s_2, x) \\ & - \dot{F}_{out}(s_1, s_2, x)g_{out}(s_1, s_2, x) + F(s_1, s_2, x)\dot{g}_{cons}(s_1, s_2, x) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

citation?

where, $g(s_1, s_2, x)$ is the gas volume of each particle with API volume of s_1 and excipient volume of s_2 in the spatial compartment x . $\mathfrak{R}_{gas,agg}(s_1, s_2, x)$ and $\mathfrak{R}_{gas,break}(s_1, s_2, x)$ are respectively the rates of gas transferred between size classed due to aggregation and breakage. $g_{in}(s_1, s_2, x)$ and $g_{out}(s_1, s_2, x)$ are respectively the gas volume of the particles entering and leaving the spatial compartment. $\dot{g}_{cons}(s_1, s_2, x)$ is the volume of gas coming out of each particle in the compartment at every time-step due to consolidation of the particles.

The rate of aggregation, $\mathfrak{R}_{agg}(s_1, s_2, x)$ in Equation 4 is calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{R}_{agg}(s_1, s_2, x) = & \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{s_1} \int_0^{s_2} \beta(s'_1, s'_2, s_1 - s'_1, s_2 - s'_2, x) F(s'_1, s'_2, x) F(s_1 - s'_1, s_2 - s'_2, x) ds'_1 ds'_2 \\ & - F(s_1, s_2, x) \int_0^{s_{max1}-s_1} \int_0^{s_{max2}-s_2} \beta(s_1, s_2, s'_1, s'_2, x) F(s'_1, s'_2, x) ds'_1 ds'_2 \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

citation?

where, the aggregation kernel, $\beta(s_1, s_2, s'_1, s'_2, x)$ is expressed as a function of collision frequency (C) and collision efficiency (ψ)

$$\beta(s_1, s_2, s'_1, s'_2, x) = \beta_o C(s_1, s_2, s'_1, s'_2) \psi(s_1, s_2, s'_1, s'_2, x) \quad (8)$$

where, β_o is aggregation rate constant.

Collision frequency is a function of particle size and is calculated from the number of collisions between group of particles obtained from LIGGGHTS[®]. A recent study shows that collision frequency depends on PSD as well (Sen et al. (2014)). Collision frequency can be expressed as:

$$C(s_1, s_2, s'_1, s'_2) = \frac{N_{coll}(s_1, s_2, s'_1, s'_2)}{F(s_1, s_2)F(s'_1, s'_2)\Delta t} \quad (9)$$

In equation(9), N_{coll} is the number of collision between two solid particles in time interval Δt . The ψ in equation (8) can be expressed as

$$\psi((s_1, s_2, s'_1, s'_2)) = \begin{cases} \psi_0, & LC((s_1, s_2)) \geq LC_{min} \text{ or } LC((s'_1, s'_2)) \geq LC_{min} \\ 0, & LC((s_1, s_2)) < LC_{min} \text{ or } LC((s'_1, s'_2)) < LC_{min} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

In above equation, LC is the liquid content of particles and LC_{min} stands for minimum liquid content required for coalescence of particle.

Similarly, the breakage rate is expressed as-

$$\mathcal{R}_{break}(s_1, s_2, x) = \int_0^{s_{max1}} \int_0^{s_{max2}} K_{break}(s'_1, s'_2, x)F(s'_1, s'_2, x)ds'_1ds'_2 - K_{break}(s_1, s_2, x)F(s_1, s_2, x) \quad (11)$$

citation?

where, the breakage kernel $K_{break}(s_1, s_2, x)$ is formulated as

$$K_{break}(s_1, s_2, x) = C_{impact} \int_{U_{break}}^{\infty} p(U)dU \quad (12)$$

citation?

The rate of increase of liquid volume of one particle, $\dot{l}_{add}(s_1, s_2, x)$ is expressed as $\frac{(s_1+s_2)(\dot{m}_{spray}(1-c_{binder})-\dot{m}_{evap})}{m_{solid}(x)}$ where, $(s_1 + s_2)$ is the total solid volume of the particle; \dot{m}_{spray} is the rate of external liquid addition, c_{binder} is the concentration of binder in the external liquid (which is assumed to be zero in this case as pure liquid is added); \dot{m}_{evap} is the rate of evaporation of liquid from the system (which is also assumed to be zero in this case) and m_{solid} is the total amount of solid present in the compartment.

The rate of decrease in gas volume per particle due to consolidation is calculated using the following expression:

$$\dot{g}_{cons}(s_1, s_2, x) = c * (\nu_{impeller})^{\omega} * V(s_1, s_2, x) \frac{(1 - \epsilon_{min})}{s} [g(s_1, s_2, x) + l(s_1, s_2, x) - (s_1 + s_2) \frac{\epsilon_{min}}{1 - \epsilon_{min}}] \quad (13)$$

where, c and ω are the consolidation constants; $\nu_{impeller}$ is the impeller rotational speed; $V(s_1, s_2, x)$ is the volume of particle, ϵ_{min} is the minimum porosity; $g(s_1, s_2, x)$ and $l(s_1, s_2, x)$ are respectively the gas and liquid volume of the particle.

Particle transfer rate, $F_{out}(s_1, s_2, x)$ in Equation 4 is calculated as $F(s_1, s_2, x) * \frac{\nu_{compartment(x)} * dt}{d_{compartment}}$ where, $\nu_{compartment(x)}$ and $d_{compartment}$ are respectively the average velocity of particles in compartment x and the distance between the mid-points of two adjacent compartment, which is the distance particles have to travel to move to the next spatial compartment. dt is the time-step. The values of various parameters used in the model are provided in Table 2.

Table 2: Parameters for PBM from Anik’s hetero. agg. paper. currently place holder

Parameter	Symbol	Value	Units
Time step	δt	0.5	s
Total granulation time	T	20, 120	s
Velocity in axial direction	v_{axial}	1	ms^{-1}
Velocity in radial direction	v_{radial}	1	ms^{-1}
Aggregation constant	β_0	1×10^{-12}	—
Initial particle diameter	R	15	μm
Breakage kernel constant	B	5×10^4	—
Diameter of impeller	D	0.1	m
Impeller rotation speed	RPM	300	rpm
Minimum granule porosity	ϵ_{min}	0.1	—
Consolidation rate	C	1×10^{-3}	—
Total starting particles in batch	$F_{initial}$	1×10^6	—
Liquid to solid ratio	L/S	0.7	—
Number of Compartments	c	3	—
Number of first solid bins	s	16	—
Number of second solid bins	ss	16	—

3.2.2. Parameters

3.3. PBM Parallel C++

3.3.1. Discretization & Parallelizing PBM

The PBM was discretized by converting each of its coordinates in to discrete bins. For the spatial coordinates a linear bin spacing was used. For the internal coordinates, solid, liquid, and gas a nonlinear binning was used. [get more details from Anik on this will probably need more detail on binning for reproducibility](#)

Once the PBM had been discretized (compartmentalized/binning) a finite differences method was used which created a system of ordinary differential equations (ODEs). The numerical integration technique used to evaluate the system of ODEs was first order Euler integration [check with Anik that is what we used](#) as it is commonly used to solve these types of systems and author found it improved speeds while having minimal impact on accuracy. To obtain the most optimal parallel performance, when solving the PBM, work loads were distributed in a manner which took into account the shared memory and distributed memory aspects of the clusters the PBM was being run on. To parallelize the model in a way which could take advantage of shared memory but still effectively run across a distributed system both OMP and MPI were implemented.

One MPI process was used per CPU socket and one OMP process was used per CPU core, as authors (Bettencourt et al. (2017)) found it resulted in the best performance. MPI was used for message passing from one node to another while OMP was used for calculations on each node that could be efficiently solved using a shared memory system [i.e. calculations were inter-dependent but could be computed simultaneously](#).

Pseudo code is presented below illustrating how the calculations are distributed and carried out during the simulation. For each time step the MPI processes are made responsible for a specific chunk of the spatial compartments. Then each OMP thread, inside of each MPI process, is allocated to one of the cores of the the multi-core CPU the MPI process is bound too. The OMP processes

divide up and compute \mathfrak{R}_{agg} and \mathfrak{R}_{brk} . (include more detail about how they do it? last paper reviewer complained that could not understand figure by JUST reading what I wrote about it in meat of paper)

After \mathfrak{R}_{agg} and \mathfrak{R}_{brk} are calculated the MPI processes calculate the new PSD value for their chunk at that specific time step, $F_{t,c}$. The slave processes send their $F_{t,c}$ to the master processes which collects them into the complete $F_{t,all}$. The master process then broadcasts the $F_{t,all}$ value to all slave processes.

A crucial feature of the PBM is that the current PSD ($F_{t,all}$) value is used to compute a new time step size for the next iteration. This means all of the MPI processes need to have the same dynamic time step size at each iteration for the calculations to be properly carried out in parallel. Since the completely updated $F_{t,all}$ value is shared before calculating a new time step each process will have the same $F_{t,all}$ value. As a result each process calculates the same size for the new time step. Did not include the liquid and gas PBMs in this but hoping they will be some what assumed? Also the Ragg omp distributed work is an a what about private OMP vars specified that has impact on how model is solved etc. Should look into this. might change based on locking/blocking tests that need to be implemented still.

3.4. RP & PBM+DEM Communication

4. Results

4.1. PBM

4.1.1. PBM Validation




Figure 4: Ratio of formation-to-depletion through aggregation and breakage over time. Breakage ratio of 2 and aggregation ratio of 0.5 indicate mass conservation in the model. NOTE DID NOT HAVE .fig file for this figure so it is in as JPG will need to replace

The ratio between the number of particles formed due to aggregation and the number of particles depleted due to aggregation and the ratio of the number of particles formed due to breakage to the number of particles depleted due to breakage are plotted. In aggregation two particles agglomerate to form one particle and in breakage one particle breaks to form two particles. So, these ratios

Algorithm 1 Pseudo code

```

while  $t < t_{final}$  do
  // the spatial domain is divided into equal chunks (with in 1 bin size)
  // each MPI process is assigned on chunk of spatial domain shown as  $c_{low}$  to  $c_{up}$ 
  // sum all  $c_{low_i}$  to  $c_{up_i}$  is = to  $[0, \text{numCompartments}]$ 
  for each MPI processes do  $c = c_{low_i}$  to  $c_{up_i}$ 
    // each MPI process is further divided with OMP to take advantage of multi-core CPU
    // each OMP process is allocated to a single compute core
    //  $\Re$  integrals (i1)  $\int_0^{s_2}$ , (i2)  $\int_0^{s_{max2}-s_2}$ , and (i3)  $\int_0^{s_{max2}-s_2}$  are divided into smaller integrals
    //  $\int_{i1low_n}^{i1up_n}$ ,  $\int_{i2low_n}^{i2up_n}$ , and  $\int_{i3low_n}^{i3up_n}$  which are solved by the "n" OMP processes
    // allocated to that MPI process (CPU)
    for each OMP process do

      
$$\Re_{agg}(s_1, s_2, c) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{s_1} \int_{i1low_n}^{i1up_n} \beta(s'_1, s'_2, s_1 - s'_1, s_2 - s'_2, c) F(s'_1, s'_2, c) F(s_1 - s'_1, s_2 - s'_2, c) ds'_1 ds'_2$$


$$- F(s_1, s_2, c) \int_0^{s_{max1}-s_1} \int_{i2low_n}^{i2up_n} \beta(s_1, s_2, s'_1, s'_2, c) F(s'_1, s'_2, c) ds'_1 ds'_2$$


      
$$\Re_{break}(s_1, s_2, c) = \int_0^{s_{max1}} \int_{i3low_n}^{i3up_n} K_{break}(s'_1, s'_2, c) F(s'_1, s'_2, c) ds'_1 ds'_2 - K_{break}(s_1, s_2, c) F(s_1, s_2, c)$$


    end for

    
$$F_{t,c} = \frac{\Delta F(s_1, s_2, c)}{\Delta t} \Delta t + F(s_1, s_2, c)_{t-1}$$


$$= (\Re_{agg}(s_1, s_2, c) + \Re_{break}(s_1, s_2, c) + \dot{F}_{in}(s_1, s_2, c) - \dot{F}_{out}(s_1, s_2, c)) \Delta t + F(s_1, s_2, c)_{t-1}$$


    end for
    MPI Send  $F_{t,c}$  to Master MPI process
    MPI Recv  $F_{t,c}$  from MPI all slave processes
    Master consolidate all  $F_{t,c}$  chunks into a complete  $F_{t,all}$ 
    Master does inter-bin particle transfers (updates  $F_{t,all}$ )
    MPI Bcast  $F_{t,all}$  to all slave processes
     $t_{new} = t + timestep$ 
  end while

```

are expected to be 0.5 and 2 respectively. As can be seen from Figure 4, these ratios are accurate confirming that mass is conserved accurately in the model.

The granulator was divided into 3 compartments spatially and the total volume, solid volume and pore volume and the median diameter d_{50} in each compartment were plotted to study the granulation behaviour and are shown in Figure 5.

It can be seen from Figure 5a that the total volume starts to increase first in compartment 1 followed by compartment 2 and then compartment 3. This happens as gradually particles entering compartment 1 moves to the other compartment due to particle transfer from compartment 1 to compartment 2 and then compartment 3. In Figure 5b it is observed that the solid volume similar to the total volume increases first in compartment 1 and last in compartment 3. The solid volume

becomes constant and equal in all the compartments at around 30-50 seconds and steady state is reached when the rate of particle volume being transported through the compartments and leaving the system is equal to the rate of particles entering the system. Although, as seen in Figure 5c the pore volume which is the sum of the gas and the liquid volume is highest in compartment 3 and lowest in compartment 1. This happens due to the external liquid addition to the system. As the particles move from compartment 1 to compartment 3, they gradually acquire a higher amount liquid, thereby increasing the pore volume. In Figure 5d, the D_{50} is seen to be increasing from compartment 1 to 3. This happens because of the size enlargement of large particles coming in from the previous compartment because of the external liquid added to each compartment and a longer residence time in the granulator.




Figure 5: Volume and D_{50} in all compartments over time. Volumes become constant as steady state is reached. Median diameter increases and then decreases as bigger particles leave the system and smaller particles occupy that volume.

4.1.2. Parallel C++ PBM Validation

show PSD or D_{50} is the same as Matlab or serial PBM

1. fig D_{50} Matlab vs Parallel

4.1.3. Parallel PBM Performance

show that RP has minimal impact on performance




Figure 6: D_{50} of Matlab PBM vs Parallel PBM

439 show that performance is mostly unaffected by RP
 440 1. fig scaling




Figure 7: PBM strong scale slurm

441 2. fig scaling w/ RP




Figure 8: PBM strong scale RP

4.1.4. Parallel PBM Parameter space and Parameter Estimation

- I. show how effective parallel pbm is for parameter estimation
- II. Find/ explore ranges of DEM data that PBM can use to find Critical parameters and sensitivities will be useful to us in linking and in picking best DEM parameters to vary and best parameters for PBM+DEM code
 1. fig range of some parameters?
 2. fig range of other pbm parameter ?

4.2. DEM

4.2.1. DEM Validation and Parameter Space Studies

should this be after param space studies - needs to validate our sim we are using for most of study - need to show that sim is working correctly though before we do any param space examining.

FIGURE - mass/vol flow

SHOW CONSTANT FLOW REACHED end of DEM simulation - perhaps see if can address whole up fraction as well

FIGURE - coll freq

SHOW CONSTANT OR NEAR CONSTANT COLLISION FREQ REACHED at end of DEM

FIGURE - velocities

SHOWS VELOCITIES AND HOW THEY LOOK AT DEM FINISH will help evaluate velocities we use in pbm etc




Fig. 3. Time trajectories from DEM simulation showing number of contacts between 1-mm particles with particles of the same size, and the average and standard deviation of the velocity of 1-mm particles. Particles are added at time=0s with a median diameter of 1.5 mm and a standard deviation of 0.5 mm. Dotted lines indicate start of rotation of the screw and start of data collection, respectively.

Figure 9

param space studies - show sim good? - useful to us in figuring out issues or PBM interplay

FIGURE - RTD

show affects of certain parameters on DEM and which ones are most critical to outcomes - will help decide on PBM+DEM parameters to study in later section

fig vary impeller RPM see how RTD or hold up changes

fig vary PSD (range and/or particle sizes) to see how C_{coll} etc will be affected - important for PBM Kernel




Fig. 6. DEM results showing the effects of screw element type and rotational speed on (a) impact frequency, (b) collision frequency with 1-mm particles, (c) average particle velocity, and (d) standard deviation of particle velocity for each size class.

Figure 10: fig showing sensitivity of C_{coll} and etc to RPM

469

FIGURE VARY IMPELLER RM SEE see C_{coll} changes




Fig. 4. DEM results showing the effects of size distribution on (a) impact frequency, (b) collision frequency with 1-mm particles, (c) average particle velocity, and (d) standard deviation of particle velocity for each size class. Median diameters are listed in the legend. The standard deviation of the diameter is fixed at 0.2 mm for the smallest two simulations and 0.5 mm for the larger simulations.

Figure 11: fig from dana 2015 mechanistic bi-directional

4.2.2. DEM Spacial Decomposition Studies

The effect of spacial decomposition on the simulation time

Speed improvements and issues using only MPI and hybrid (MPI + OpenMP)

	Total Number of Cores	Slicing in X	Slicing in Y	Slicing in Z	# OpenMP Threads	Time for 0.5 sec simulation (minutes)	Projection for 30s simulation (minutes)
MPI - only	64	64	1	1	1	10.27	616 (10.27 hrs)
	32	32	1	1	1	23.4	1404 (23.4 hrs)
Hybrid	64	8	1	1	8	10.25	616(10.25 hrs)
	64	16	1	1	4	8.7	522 (8.7 hrs)
	64	32	1	1	2	7.47	448 (7.5 hrs)
	64	8	2	2	2	6.83	410 (6.8 hrs)
	64	16	2	1	2	7.2	430 (7.2 hrs)
	64	4	2	2	4	7.96	480 (8 hrs)

Figure 12: The effect of spacial decomposition on the performance of the simulation

fig vary PSD (range and/or particle sizes) to see how C_{coll} etc will be affected - important for




Fig. 6. DEM results showing the effects of screw element type and rotational speed on (a) impact frequency, (b) collision frequency with 1-mm particles, (c) average particle velocity, and (d) standard deviation of particle velocity for each size class.

Figure 13: fig showing sensitivity of C_{coll} and etc to RPM




Fig. 4. DEM results showing the effects of size distribution on (a) impact frequency, (b) collision frequency with 1-mm particles, (c) average particle velocity, and (d) standard deviation of particle velocity for each size class. Median diameters are listed in the legend. The standard deviation of the diameter is fixed at 0.2 mm for the smallest two simulations and 0.5 mm for the larger simulations.

Figure 14: fig from dana 2015 mechanistic bi-directional

4.2.3. DEM Performance

Talk about how the time for simulation varies with # of cores

1. fig scaling




Figure 15: The variation in the amount of time taken for the simulation as a function of # of cores

479 2. fig scaling w/ RP




Figure 16: DEM scale with RP

480 4.3. PBM+DEM - RP

481 4.3.1. PBM+DEM Validation/Accuracy?

482 Talk about how the physics remain the same whether mono-sized particles are used or a size
483 distribution is used.

484 Figs comparing the one-way coupling from both these sources.

485 4.3.2. PBM+DEM Performance

486 strong scaling

487 fig PBM + DEM RP strong scaling




Figure 17: PBM+DEM scale with RP

4.3.3. PBM+DEM Parameter studies

show how PBM+DEM captures multi-physics as parameters changed. helps validate and support model development. show we have made a useful tool for future work.

fig




Figure 8: PSD evolution for simulations run at 120 rpm, 360 rpm, 720 and 840 rpm.

Figure 18: PBM+DEM scale with RP

5. Conclusions

References

- Barrasso, D., Ramachandran, R., 2015. Multi-scale modeling of granulation processes: bi-directional coupling of pbm with dem via collision frequencies. *Chemical Engineering Research and Design* 93, 304–317.
- Barrasso, D., Walia, S., Ramachandran, R., 2013. Multi-component population balance modeling of continuous granulation processes: a parametric study and comparison with experimental trends. *Powder technology* 241, 85–97.
- Berger, R., Kloss, C., Kohlmeyer, A., Pirker, S., 2015. Hybrid parallelization of the liggghts open-source dem code. *Powder Technology* 278, 234–247.
- Bettencourt, F. E., Chaturbedi, A., Ramachandran, R., 2017. Parallelization methods for efficient simulation of high dimensional population balance models of granulation. *Computers & Chemical Engineering* (Article in press).
- Boman, E. G., Çatalyürek, Ü. V., Chevalier, C., Devine, K. D., 2012. The zoltan and isorropia parallel toolkits for combinatorial scientific computing: Partitioning, ordering and coloring. *Scientific Programming* 20 (2), 129–150.
- Cundall, P. A., Strack, O. D., 1979. A discrete numerical model for granular assemblies. *geotechnique* 29 (1), 47–65.
- Gopalakrishnan, P., Tafti, D., 2013. Development of parallel dem for the open source code mfix. *Powder technology* 235, 33–41.
- Gunawan, R., Fusman, I., Braatz, R. D., 2008. Parallel high-resolution finite volume simulation of particulate processes. *AIChE journal* 54 (6), 1449–1458.
- Jin, H., Jespersen, D., Mehrotra, P., Biswas, R., Huang, L., Chapman, B., 2011. High performance computing using mpi and openmp on multi-core parallel systems. *Parallel Computing* 37 (9), 562–575.
- Kačianauskas, R., Maknickas, A., Kačeniauskas, A., Markauskas, D., Balevičius, R., 2010. Parallel discrete element simulation of poly-dispersed granular material. *Advances in Engineering Software* 41 (1), 52–63.
- Kloss, C., Goniva, C., Hager, A., Amberger, S., Pirker, S., 2012. Models, algorithms and validation for opensource dem and cfd-dem. *Progress in Computational Fluid Dynamics, an International Journal* 12 (2-3), 140–152.
- Prakash, A. V., Chaudhury, A., Barrasso, D., Ramachandran, R., 2013a. Simulation of population balance model-based particulate processes via parallel and distributed computing. *Chemical Engineering Research and Design* 91 (7), 1259–1271.
- Prakash, A. V., Chaudhury, A., Ramachandran, R., 2013b. Parallel simulation of population balance model-based particulate processes using multicore cpus and gpus. *Modelling and Simulation in Engineering* 2013, 2.

- 529 Ramachandran, R., Immanuel, C. D., Stepanek, F., Litster, J. D., Doyle, F. J., 2009. A mechanistic
530 model for breakage in population balances of granulation: Theoretical kernel development and
531 experimental validation. *Chemical Engineering Research and Design* 87 (4), 598–614.
- 532 Ramkrishna, D., Singh, M. R., 2014. Population balance modeling: current status and future
533 prospects. *Annual review of chemical and biomolecular engineering* 5, 123–146.
- 534 Sen, M., Barrasso, D., Singh, R., Ramachandran, R., 2014. A multi-scale hybrid cfd-dem-pbm
535 description of a fluid-bed granulation process. *Processes* 2 (1), 89–111.
- 536 Seville, J., Tüzün, U., Clift, R., 2012. Processing of particulate solids. Vol. 9. Springer Science &
537 Business Media.
- 538 Wilkinson, B., Allen, M., 1999. Parallel programming: techniques and applications using networked
539 workstations and parallel computers. Prentice-Hall.