

Numerical Modelling of Turbulent Gas-Particle Flow and Its Applications

ZHAOFENG TIAN
B.E., M.E.S

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy.

November, 2006

School of Aerospace, Manufacturing & Mechanical Engineering
RMIT University

To the memory of the most admirable and beloved Grandfather Xinglin Du, who has passed away in China while I was carrying out my research in Australia. Thanks to all his guidance, inspiration and encouragement.

Declaration

I, Zhaofeng Tian, hereby submit the thesis titled “*Numerical Modelling of Turbulent gas-particle flow and its Applications*” for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy and certify that the work is my own work except where due acknowledge has been made; the work has not been submitted previously, in whole or in part, for any other academic award; the content of the thesis is the result of work which has been carried out since the official commencement date of the approved research program.

I give consent for this copy of my thesis to be made available for loan and photocopying when handed to the University Library for archiving.

ZHAOFENG TIAN

November 2006

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Professor Jiyuan Tu of the School of Aerospace, Manufacturing & Mechanical Engineering in RMIT University for his fruitful, organised and patient guidance in every aspect of my research work. The immense influence he presented in shaping my research attitude and approach can never be overestimated.

I would also like to express sincere gratitude to my co-supervisor, Dr Guan Heng Yeoh of Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organization, for the guidance in the Computational Fluid Dynamics and scientific writing.

I would also like to express sincere thanks to Dr William Yang of Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization, and Dr Li Chen of Defence Science and Technology Organisation, for their kindly help in developing my knowledge in experimental and numerical approaches.

I would like to thank members of RMIT CFD group and my colleagues in the research office –Dr Hao Tang, Dr Yan Ding, Edsil Dilla, Kiao Inthavong, Dr Shengjin Xu, Dr Rong Situ, Huafeng Li, Dr Randeep Singh, Krishna Mohanarangam, Weng Yew Cheng, Thau Do and Dr Sherman Cheung. They have always provided assistance where necessary.

A special acknowledgement to my family back in China for their care and encouragement throughout my student years, my mother Xiuling Du for her concern and love, my uncle Guowei Du for his constant motivation and support, my sister Zhaoying Tian for her guidance and advice, my wife Jun Chen for her love and encouragement.

Abstract

With the increase of computer power and advancement of modeling software, the study of turbulent gas-particle flow problems using computational fluid dynamics (CFD) techniques is gradually becoming attractive in the engineering field. Two basic CFD approaches are used to simulate the gas-particle flow, i.e. the Eulerian-Lagrangian model and the Eulerian-Eulerian model. The aim of this thesis is three-fold: i) to investigate the performance of both the Eulerian-Lagrangian model and the Eulerian-Eulerian model to simulate the turbulent gas-particle flow; ii) to investigate the indoor airflows and contaminant particle flows using the Eulerian-Lagrangian model; iii) to develop and validate particle-wall collision models and a wall roughness model for the Eulerian-Lagrangian model and to utilize these models to investigate the effects of wall roughness on the particle flows.

In the first part of this thesis, the Eulerian-Lagrangian model in the software package FLUENT (FLUENT Inc.) and the Eulerian-Eulerian model in an in-house research code were employed to simulate the gas-particle flows. The validation against the measurement for two-phase flow over backward facing step and in a 90-degree bend revealed that both CFD approaches provide reasonably good prediction for both the gas and particle phases.

Then, the Eulerian-Lagrangian model was employed to investigate the indoor airflows and contaminant particle concentration in two geometrically different rooms. For the first room configuration, the performances of three turbulence models for simulating indoor airflow were evaluated and validated against the measured air phase velocity data. All the three turbulence models provided good prediction of the air phase velocity, while the Large Eddy Simulation (LES) model based on the Renormalization Group theory (RNG) provided the best agreement with the measurements. As well, the RNG-based LES model is able to provide the instantaneous air velocity and turbulence that are required for the evaluation and design of the ventilation system. In the other two-zone ventilated room configuration, contaminant particle concentration decay within the room was simulated and validated against the experimental data using the RNG-based LES model together with the Lagrangian particle tracking model. The numerical results revealed that the particle-wall

collision model has a considerable effect on the particle concentration prediction in the room.

This research culminates with the development and implementation of particle-wall collision models and a stochastic wall roughness model in the Eulerian-Lagrangian model. This Eulerian-Lagrangian model was therefore used to simulate the gas-particle flow over an in-line tube bank. The numerical predictions showed that the wall roughness has a considerable effect by altering the rebounding behaviours of the large particles and consequently affecting the particles motion downstream along the in-line tube bank and particle impact frequency on the tubes. Also, the results demonstrated that for the large particles the particle phase velocity fluctuations are not influenced by the gas-phase fluctuations, but are predominantly determined by the particle-wall collision. For small particles, the influence of particle-wall collisions on the particle fluctuations can be neglected. Then, the effects of wall roughness on the gas-particle flow in a two-dimensional 90-degree bend were investigated. It was found that the wall roughness considerably altered the rebounding behaviours of particles by significantly reducing the 'particle free zone' and smoothing the particle number density profiles. The particle mean velocities were reduced and the particle fluctuating velocities were increased when taking into consideration the wall roughness, since the wall roughness produced greater randomness in the particle rebound velocities and trajectories.

Work Published During Candidature

During the course of my PhD study, a number of papers have been produced based on the results described in this thesis. Six journal papers have been published or accepted for publication, and another three journal papers have been submitted. Additionally, seven conference papers have been presented in national and international conferences. A detailed publication list is presented below:

Journal papers:

1. **Tian, ZF**, Tu, JY, & Yeoh, GH 2005, 'Numerical simulation and validation of dilute gas-particle flow over a backward-facing step', *Aerosol Science and Technology*, Vol 39, pp. 319-332.
2. **Tian, ZF**, Tu, JY, Yeoh, GH, & Yuen, RKK 2006, 'On the numerical study of contaminant particle concentration in indoor airflow', *Building and Environment*, Vol 41, pp. 1504-1514.
3. Inthavong, K, **Tian, ZF**, Li, HF, Tu, JY, Yang, W, Xue, CL, & Li, CG 2006, 'A numerical study of spray particle deposition in a human nasal cavity', *Aerosol Science and Technology*, Vol 40, pp. 1034-1045.
4. **Tian, ZF**, Tu, JY, & Yeoh, GH 2006, 'Numerical modelling and validation of gas-particle flow in an in-line tube bank', *Computer and Chemical Engineering*, in press.
5. **Tian, ZF**, Tu, JY, & Yeoh, GH 2006, 'CFD studies of indoor airflows and contaminant particle transportations', *Particulate Science and Technology*, in press.
6. **Tian, ZF**, Tu, JY, Yeoh, GH, & Yuen, RKK 2006, 'Numerical studies of indoor airflow and particle dispersion by large eddy simulation', *Building and Environment*, in press.
7. Mohanarangam, K, **Tian, ZF**, & Tu, JY 2006, 'Numerical simulation of Turbulent Gas-Particle Flow in a 90 degree bend: Eulerian approach', submitted.
8. Inthavong, K, **Tian, ZF**, & Tu, JY 2006, 'Optimising nasal spray parameters for efficient drug delivery using CFD', submitted.
9. **Tian, ZF**, Inthavong, K, Tu, JY, & Yeoh, GH 2006, 'Numerical investigation into the effects of wall roughness on a gas-particle flow in a 90-degree bend', submitted.
10. Inthavong, K, **Tian, ZF**, & Tu, JY 2006, 'A numerical study into heat and mass transfer in a human nasal cavity under different inhalation conditions', submitted.

Conference papers:

1. **Tian, ZF**, Tu, JY, Yeoh, GH, & Yuen, RKK 2004, 'Comparison of different k - ε models for prediction of transport of particles in a ventilated room', in *Proceedings of 5th International Conference of Multiphase Flow*, Paper number 429, Yokohama, Japan.
2. **Tian, ZF**, Tu, JY, & Yeoh, GH 2004, 'Computational fluid dynamics simulation and validation of dilute gas-particle flow over a backward facing step: Lagrangian versus Eulerian method', in *Proceedings of 3rd International Symposium on Two-phase Flow Modelling and Experimentation*, Paper I-523, Pisa, Italy.
3. **Tian, ZF**, Tu, JY, Yang, W, & Yeoh, GH 2005, 'Numerical simulation and validation of gas-particle flow in a curved duct', in *Proceedings of 5th International Symposium on Multiphase Flow, Heat Mass Transfer and Energy Conversion*, Paper number 213, Xi'An, China.
4. **Tian, ZF**, Tu, JY, & Yeoh, GH 2006, 'Numerical modelling of gas-particle flow over crossflow tube bank', presented in *The 13th Biennial Computational Techniques and Applications Conference*, Townsville, Australia.
5. Mohanaragam, K, **Tian, ZF**, & Tu, JY 2006, 'Numerical simulation of Turbulent Gas-Particle Flow in a 90 degree bend: Eulerian vs. Lagrangian approach', presented in *The 13th Biennial Computational Techniques and Applications Conference*, Townsville, Australia.
6. Li, HF, **Tian, ZF**, Tu, JY, Yang, W, Yeoh, GH, Xue, CL, & Li, CG 2006, 'Studies of airflow through a human nasopharynx and pharynx airway', in *Proceedings of The 5th International Conference on CFD in the Process Industries*, CSIRO, Melbourne, Australia.
7. Inthavong, K, **Tian, ZF**, Li, HF, Tu, JY, Yang, W, Xue, CL, & Li, CG 2006, 'Local deposition sites of drug particles in a human nasal cavity', in *Proceedings of The 5th International Conference on CFD in the Process Industries*, CSIRO, Melbourne, Australia.

Contents

Declaration	III
Acknowledgements	IV
Abstract	V
Work Published during Candidature	VII
Contents	IX
List of Figures	XII
List of Tables	XVIII
Nomenclature	XIX

Chapters

1. Introduction	1
1.1 Background and objectives	1
1.2 Outline of this thesis	4
2. Literature Review	6
2.1 Basic concepts of turbulent gas-particle flow	6
2.2 Numerical approaches for gas-particle flow	8
2.2.1 Eulerian-Eulerian model	8
2.2.2 Eulerian-Lagrangian model	9
2.3 Turbulence models	15
2.4 Particle-wall collision models	16
3. Mathematical and Numerical Methodology	25
3.1 Gas phase modelling	25
3.1.1 General conservation equations for gas phase	25

3.1.2	k- ϵ models	26
3.1.3	RNG-based LES model	31
3.2	Particle phase modelling	33
3.2.1	Eulerian-Eulerian model	33
3.2.2	Eulerian-Lagrangian model	43
3.3	Particle-wall collision model for Eulerian-Lagrangian model	44
4.	Numerical Studies of Gas-particle Flow over a Backward Facing Step and in a 90-degree Bend	49
4.1	Turbulent gas-particle flow over a backward facing step	49
4.1.1	Numerical procedure	50
4.1.2	Results and discussions	53
4.1.3	Summary	64
4.2	Turbulent gas-particle flow through a 90-degree bend	65
4.2.1	Numerical procedure	67
4.2.2	Results and discussions	67
4.2.3	Summary	72
5.	Numerical Simulation of Indoor Airflow and Particle Concentration	73
5.1	Introduction	73
5.2	Numerical procedure	77
5.3	Numerical results for the first room	78
5.4	Numerical results for the second room	94
5.5	Summary	102
6.	Effects of Wall Roughness on Gas-particle Flows	106
6.1	Turbulent gas-particle flow over an in-line tube bank	106
6.1.1	Background and previous studies	106
6.1.2	Numerical procedure	109
6.1.3	Grid independence test	110
6.1.4	Particle phase simulation validation	115
6.1.5	The effects of wall roughness on particle trajectories	115

6.1.6	The effects of particle-wall collision behaviour on particle phase flow	118
6.1.7	Summary	122
6.2	The effects of wall roughness on a gas-particle flow in a 2D 90° bend	123
6.2.1	Background	123
6.2.2	Numerical procedure	124
6.2.3	The effects of wall roughness on particle trajectories	126
6.2.4	The effects of wall roughness on particle number density	130
6.2.5	The effects of wall roughness on particle mean velocities	132
6.2.6	The effects of wall roughness on particle fluctuating velocities	135
6.2.7	Summary	136
7.	Conclusion and Recommendations	137
	Reference	141

List of Figures

Figure 2.1	Eddy-particle interaction model	11
Figure 2.2	Particle-wall collision configuration	18
Figure 2.3	Particle-wall collisions with wall roughness	
	(a) Particle diameter larger than cycle of roughness	
	(b) Particle diameter less than cycle of roughness	22
Figure 2.4	Virtual wall model for particle-wall collision	24
Figure 3.1	A finite control volume adjacent to a solid wall for deriving wall boundary conditions of particle phase	37
Figure 3.2	Solution procedures for Eulerian two-fluid model	42
Figure 3.3	Illustration of shadow effect due to wall roughness	47
Figure 3.4	Flowchart of the roughness wall model	48
Figure 4.1	Schematic drawing of the backward facing step ($h = 0.025\text{m}$)	50
Figure 4.2	Distribution of y^+ of boundary cells (RNG $\kappa\text{-}\varepsilon$ model)	52
Figure 4.3	Comparison between the experimental data and numerical simulation	
	(a) Particle velocities	
	(b) Particle turbulent fluctuations ($Re = 64000$, $d_p = 1\mu\text{m}$)	54
Figure 4.4	Maximum negative velocity $U\text{-max}$ (normalized with free stream velocity U_0) in the recirculation zone of particles of different $k\text{-}\varepsilon$ models ($Re = 64000$, $d_p = 1\mu\text{m}$)	55
Figure 4.5	(a) The computed turbulent kinetic energy k (normalized by the inlet mean k) at $x/H=5$	
	(b) The computed turbulent dissipation rate ε (normalized by the inlet mean ε) at $x/H=5$	56
Figure 4.6	The turbulent viscosity profiles predicted by three models	58
Figure 4.7	Comparison between the experimental data and numerical simulation of particle velocities	

	(a) $Re=64000$	
	(b) $Re=15000$ ($d_p = 70\mu m$)	59
Figure 4.8	Comparison between the experimental data and numerical simulation results with Lagrangian and Eulerian models	
	(a) Particle velocities	
	(b) Particle turbulent fluctuations ($Re = 64000$, $d_p=1\mu m$)	60
Figure 4.9	Maximum negative velocity U_{-max} (normalized with U_o) in the recirculation zone of particles; Lagrangian and Eulerian models ($Re = 64000$, $d_p=1\mu m$)	61
Figure 4.10	Comparison between the experimental data and numerical simulation results with Lagrangian and Eulerian models	
	(a) Particle velocities	
	(b) Particle turbulent fluctuations ($Re = 15000$, $d_p=70\mu m$)	63
Figure 4.11	Maximum positive velocity U_{+max} (normalized with U_o) in the streamwise portion of the velocity profile of particle ($Re = 15000$, $d_p = 70\mu m$)	64
Figure 4.12	Computational domain for the 3-D 90 degree bend	
	(a) Bend	
	(b) Inlet	66
Figure 4.13	Calculated static pressure distribution	68
Figure 4.14	(a) Mean streamwise gas velocities along the bend	
	(b) Mean streamwise gas turbulence along the bend	69
Figure 4.15	Mean streamwise particle velocities along the bend	70
Figure 4.16	Streamwise velocities along the bend for varying Stokes number	71
Figure 4.17	Lagrangian particle paths for varying Stokes number	72
Figure 5.1	(a) Configuration of room #1	
	(b) Mesh for the mid-plane	
	(c) Mesh for the room top	79
Figure 5.2	Comparison between simulation and measured results of the vertical velocity component	
	(a) Along the vertical inlet jet axis	
	(b) Along the horizontal line at mid-partition height	80

Figure 5.3	(a) The computed turbulent kinetic energy k (normalized by 0.005 kg/ms) (b) The computed turbulent dissipation rate ε (normalized by $0.01\text{m}^2/\text{s}^3$) along the vertical inlet jet axis	84
Figure 5.4	The turbulent viscosity profiles predicted by (a) Standard k - ε model (b) RNG k - ε model	85
Figure 5.5	Comparison of predicted RMS velocity in the mid-plane of the room.	86
Figure 5.6	Comparison of the predicted time-mean velocity field in the mid-plane of room 1	87
Figure 5.7	LES prediction (a) Instantaneous velocity field of the mid-plane (b) Instantaneous total pressure profile of the mid-plane	88
Figure 5.8	Comparison of tracked sample small particles utilising the various turbulence models	90
Figure 5.9	The comparison of the contaminant particle concentration ($d_p = 1\text{ }\mu\text{m}$) simulated by three turbulence models at the midplane of the model room after an elapsed time of 100 seconds	91
Figure 5.10	The comparison of the contaminant particle concentration ($d_p = 1\text{ }\mu\text{m}$) simulated by three turbulence models at the midplane of the model room after an elapsed time of 130 seconds	92
Figure 5.11	The comparison of the contaminant particle concentration ($d_p = 1\text{ }\mu\text{m}$) simulated by three turbulence models at the midplane of the model room after an elapsed time of 160 seconds	93
Figure 5.12	Comparison of tracked sample large particles utilising the various turbulence models ($d_p = 10\text{ }\mu\text{m}$)	94
Figure 5.13	Configuration of room 2	95
Figure 5.14	(a) Predicted time-mean air velocity field of the mid-plane in room 2 (b) Predicted time-mean static pressure of the mid-plane in room 2	96

Figure 5.15	The predicted and measured zone-averaged particle concentration decay $ACH=10.26$ 1/H	
	(a) Zone 1	
	(b) Zone 2 (Particles depositing only on room floor)	97
Figure 5.16	The predicted and measured zone-averaged particle concentration decay $ACH=9.216$ 1/H	
	(a) Zone 1	
	(b) Zone 2 (Particles depositing only on room floor)	98
Figure 5.17	The comparison of zone-averaged particle concentration decay with three assumptions $ACH=10.26$	
	(a) Zone 1	
	(b) Zone 2	101
Figure 5.18	The contaminant particle concentration distribution in room 2 after an elapsed time	
	(a) 5 minutes	
	(b) 10 minutes and	
	(c) 15 minutes	104
Figure 6.1	The dependence of R_1 , ρ_1 and e on the normal incident velocities	110
Figure 6.2	(a) Computational domain	
	(b) Region of comparison between prediction and measurement	
	(c) Part of mesh density 108797	112
Figure 6.3	Comparisons predictions of gas phase with experimental data	
	(a) Streamwise velocity profiles	
	(b) Turbulence intensity	113
Figure 6.4	(a) The velocity and angle notations for the particle colliding on the tube	
	(b) The particle normal incident velocity of different angular location	114
Figure 6.5	Comparisons of predictions of $93\ \mu\text{m}$ particles with experimental data	
	(a) Streamwise velocity	
	(b) Turbulence intensity	116

Figure 6.6	Computed trajectories for 93 μm particles	
	(a) Without roughness model	
	(b) with roughness model	117
Figure 6.7	Particle collision frequency distribution on the second middle tube	118
Figure 6.8	Computed particle trajectories	
	(a) 93 μm particles	
	(b) 15 μm particles	
	(c) 1 μm particles	120
Figure 6.9	Comparisons of turbulence intensity for particle trapping and rebounding	
	(a) 93 μm particles	
	(b) 1 μm particles	121
Figure 6.10	Predicted mean streamwise velocity for gas, 1 μm and 93 μm particles	122
Figure 6.11	Computational domain and grids of the two-dimensional 90-degree bend.	125
Figure 6.12	Computed trajectories for 100 μm particles released with different wall roughness angle	
	(a) 0°	
	(b) 2.5°	
	(c) 5°	128
Figure 6.13	Computed trajectories for 100 μm particles released 0.1m before the bend with different wall roughness angle	
	(a) 0°	
	(b) 2.5°	
	(c) 5°	129
Figure 6.14	Computed particle number concentration with different wall roughness angles at different locations.	131
Figure 6.15	Comparison of particle streamwise mean velocity profiles with different roughness angles at different locations.	132
Figure 6.16	Comparison of particle transverse mean velocity profiles with different roughness angles at different locations.	133

- Figure 6.17** Comparison of particle streamwise fluctuating velocity profiles with different roughness angles at different locations. 134
- Figure 6.18** Comparison of particle transverse fluctuating velocity profiles with different roughness angles at different locations 135

List of Tables

Table 3.1	The governing equations for gas phase in Cartesian coordinate	26
Table 4.1	y+ of boundary cells along the top wall, bottom wall and inlet bottom wall	51
Table 4.2	normalized CPU times of Eulerian-Lagrangian and Eulerian- Eulerian approaches	53

Nomenclature

A_i	convective flux
A_0, A_s	model constants for realizable k - ε turbulence model
B	diffusion coefficient
B_{gp}, B_ε	model constants for the Eulerian two-fluid model
C_μ	coefficient in the k - ε turbulence model
C_D	particle drag coefficient
C_{RNG}	constant in RNG LES model
C_1, C_2	model constants for realizable k - ε turbulence model
$C_{\varepsilon 1}, C_{\varepsilon 2}$	model constants for standard and RNG k - ε turbulence models
d_p	particle diameter
e	coefficient of restitution
e_n, e_t	mean normal and tangential restitution coefficients
f	correction factor
F_{Di}	aerodynamic drag force
F_{Gi}	gravity force
F_r	Froude number
F_{WMi}	wall-momentum transfer due to particle-wall collision force
g	gravitational acceleration
h	step height
H_r	the mean roughness depth for wall surface

I_{gp}	turbulence interaction between the gas and particle phases for the particle phase turbulent fluctuating energy
l	length scale of energetic turbulent eddies
Lr	the mean cycle of roughness
L_s	characteristic length of the system
Le	eddy length scale
m	ratio of particle to gas density
\dot{m}	mass of particles in per unit volume of the gas and particle mixture
P_A^R	the normal impulse due to adhesion during rebound
P_D^A	the normal impulse generated by deformation during approach
P_{kgp}	turbulence production by the mean velocity gradients of two phases
P_k	rate of production term of the turbulent kinetic energy
P_{kp}	production term of the particle fluctuating energy
q_ϕ	general source term
r^*	normalized radial co-ordinate
r	uniform random number
r_i	radius of curvature of the inner wall (90 degree bend)
r_o	radius of curvature of the outer wall (90 degree bend)
R	strain rate or radius of the 90 degree bend
Re	Reynolds number
R_l	restitution coefficient in the absence of adhesion
S	source term
St	Stokes number
S_{ij}, S_{jk}, S_{ki}	strain rates

t_{cross}	eddy crossing time
t_{int}	eddy-particle interaction time
t_p	particle relaxation time
t_s	system response time
T	fluid temperature
T_L	fluid Lagrangian integral time
u_t^p	particle incident velocity in tangential direction
u_n^p	particle incident velocity in normal direction
u_i, u_j, u_k	velocity
u_o	free stream velocity
V_s	characteristic velocity of the system
v_t^p	particle rebound velocity in tangential direction
v_n^p	particle rebound velocity in normal direction
v_p	particle rebounding velocity
x_i, x_j, x_k	Cartesian coordinate system

Greek letters

α	volume fraction
β	model constant for RNG κ - ε turbulence model
Γ	diffusivity of the scalar
ε	dissipation rate of turbulent kinetic energy
ε_0	the direction of the relative velocity between particle surface and wall

ϕ	governing variable
η	function defined in Equation (6)
η_o	model constant for RNG κ - ε turbulence model
k	turbulent kinetic energy
μ	dynamic viscosity
μ_0	the static friction coefficient
μ_d	dynamic friction coefficient
μ_{eff}	effective turbulent viscosity
μ_t	turbulent viscosity
ν	kinematic viscosity
θ	angle between velocities of the particle and gas
θ	particle incident angle
ρ	density
ρ_1	adhesion coefficient
σ	turbulence Prandtl number
τ_e	eddy life time
τ_f	fluid time scale
τ_w	wall shear stress
τ_p	particle relaxation time
ω	fluctuating vorticity
ω_p	particle initial angular velocity
ζ	normally distributed random number
Π_{gp}	turbulence interaction between the gas and particle phases for the gas-particle

Ω	vorticity
Ω_p	particle rebounding angular velocity

Subscripts

add	additional
eff	effective
g	gas phase
gp	gas-particle
n	normal direction
p	particle phase
s	solid phase
t	tangential direction or turbulent phase

Superscript

g	gas phase
gp	gas-particle
p	particle phase
ε	dissipation rate of turbulent kinetic energy
κ	turbulent kinetic energy
$(\bar{\quad})$	averaged or resolved parameters
$(\quad)'$	fluctuation