

**A NUMERICAL STUDY OF COHESIVE AND NON-COHESIVE
PARTICLES IN A BOTTOM SPRAY FLUIDIZED BED USING FULLY
COUPLED CFD-DEM SIMULATIONS**

by

MANOGNA ADEPU

A thesis submitted to the

Graduate School – New Brunswick

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

In partial fulfillment of the requirement

For the degree of

Master of Science

Graduate Program in Chemical and Biochemical Engineering

Written under the direction of

Dr. Rohit Ramachandran

And approved by

New Brunswick, New Jersey

MAY, 2015

ABSTRACT OF THESIS

A NUMERICAL STUDY OF COHESIVE AND NON-COHESIVE PARTICLES IN A BOTTOM SPRAY FLUIDIZED BED USING FULLY COUPLED CFD-DEM SIMULATIONS

by

MANOGNA ADEPU

Thesis Director:

Rohit Ramachandran

Fully coupled CFD-DEM simulations were conducted to investigate the applicability of the van der Waals cohesive force model to a bottom spray fluid bed. For the present simulation DEM was executed on the Graphic Unit Processing Unit (GPU) and the CFD on the Central Processing Unit (CPU). For this, DEM code XPS was coupled with CFD code AVL FIRE®. Based on this approach a bottom spray fluid bed coater was simulated for a process of 30 sec to investigate the agglomeration process. The growth and breakage of agglomerates was numerically confirmed. Number of particles sprayed over the simulation time and mean velocity were monitored in both cohesive and non-cohesive systems to understand the behavior of fluidization. To understand the fluidization in the cohesive system three different cases of coating process were investigated with different fluidization velocities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

To try and thank everyone who made my life and work at Rutgers colorful and meaningful is clearly daunting; nevertheless, I will try my best. Foremost, my advisor, Dr. Rohit Ramachandran, for his creative suggestions and patient instructions which have guided me all the way through, and also other members of my thesis committee: Prof. Nina Shapley and Prof. Meenakshi Dutt. Also, I need to express my sincere gratitude to Ph.D. students Anwesha Chaudary and Sarang Oka for their insightful discussions which gave shape to my thoughts and ideas and their help with various resources. Special thanks to all members of the Marshall Plan Foundation and RCPE, Austria, for their generous support and thought out advice, especially Dr. Charles Radeke and Eva Siegmann. My parents for believing in my abilities and supporting me to pursue Master's abroad. And lastly, the people who made my stay at Rutgers a wonderful one - my fellow group members, roommates and dear friends of the Chemical and Biochemical Engineering (CBE) department – thank you all for the valuable memories; I am truly indebted.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	TOPIC	PAGE No.
	Abstract	ii
	Acknowledgement	iii
	List of tables	v
	List of figures	vi
	List of graphs	vii
1.	Introduction	1
2.	Simulation Methods	4
	2.1. Discrete Element Model (DEM)	4
	2.2. Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD)	5
	2.3. CFD-DEM coupling	5
3.	Theoretical background of CFD-DEM Model	7
	3.1. Gas-phase modeling	7
	3.2. Solid-phase and drag phase modeling	8
	3.3. Particle-particle and particle-wall interactions modeling	11
	3.4. Particle-coating modeling	14
	3.5. CFD-DEM model	14
4.	Application of CFD-DEM Simulation	18
5.	Results and Discussions	22
	5.1. Implementing the Cohesive Force model	23
	5.2. Comparison between Cohesive and Non-Cohesive systems	27
	5.3. Comparison between different Cohesive systems	31
6.	Conclusion	35
7.	Reference	36

LIST OF TABLES

S.No	TITLE	PAGE NO.
1	DEM simulation parameter and material	20
2	CFD simulation parameters	21

LIST OF FIGURES

Fig.	DETAILS	PAGE NO.
1	Soft-sphere model of a particle-particle interaction.	11
2	Scheme of the CFD–DEM coupling method	15
3	Sketch of the bottom spray fluid bed coater	18
4	Sketch of the distribution plate	19
5	Screenshot of Case 1 simulation after a process time of 0.49 sec	23
6	Snapshots of behavior of (a) Non-cohesive particles and (b) agglomerating fluidized bed	24
7	Snapshots of velocity distribution (CFD-simulations) and corresponding particles (DEM-simulations) in the bed with Case 3 simulations	25
8	Snapshots of agglomerates growth and breakage	26
9	Snapshots of growth and breakage with further magnification	27
10	Snapshots comparing the behavior of fluidized particles in a (a) cohesive and (b) non-cohesive models	28
11	Velocity distribution in the fluid bed (a) with cohesive force model and (b) without cohesive force model	30
12	Snapshots of particle distribution in an agglomerating fluid bed	32
13	Snapshots of velocity distribution for different cases in a cohesive system	34

LIST OF GRAPHS

S.No	DETAILS	PAGE NO.
1	Shows the number of particles sprayed through the simulation time	29
2	Shows the mean velocities of both systems	31
3	Number of particles sprayed in different cohesive systems	33
4	Mean velocities of different cohesive systems	33

1. Introduction

Coating is a common unit operation in the pharmaceutical industry. The Coating layer may have different functions, from controlling release to taste masking [1]. The oldest form of pharmaceutical coating is sugar coating. The coating liquid was applied by hand using ladles, where temperature and amount of drying air were critical. Due to difficulties in identification of product and high operator skills sugar coating lost its importance to film coating. Commonly, open bowl-shaped copper pans were used initially, where stainless steel is the material used today. In the beginning, 150-200 kg per batch was coated, which increased to 500-600 kg per batch with the use of newly improved coating pans such as Pelligrini pans (an angular pan that is rotated on a horizontal axis).

The first commercial film coated tablet was produced by Abbott in 1954 using a fluidized bed (Wurster) coating process with cellulose derivate. After 1975, due to increase in cost of organic solvents, strict regulations due to environmental concerns related to organic liquids, aqueous film coating became popular. With this trend towards aqueous film coating and vented coating pans, fluidized bed film coating is least used nowadays. Large pans having two vents (front and rear) with the drying air moving inside the coating drum are used today. A huge quality improvement was achieved after perforated pans were developed.

Coating has progressed through systematic research with its application in pharmaceutical industry. Different powders are used for making tablets and granules which are coated depending upon their application. Most of the powders are cohesive by nature, where few powders exhibit cohesive nature after getting wet when sprayed with liquid (coating). Experiments become complex in the handling and fluidization of these powders. This is due to the unpredictable behavior of the cohesive powders, which belong to group C of Geldart's classification [2]. Such powders tend to form agglomerates of random massive size and shape due to interparticle forces. This effects the powder flow and flow properties, creating difficulties in understanding the fluidization process. In the case of cohesive powders, the interparticle forces are considerable and they control the behavior of a bed composed of fine particles. Thus,

during fluidization, the bed of powder cracks into large portions and the gas tends to flow into the gap between the fissures. Then, channeling occurs in the bed and, eventually, the gas-solid contact is very low and any heat and mass transfer operation is weakened. When particles are fluidized with air and where the distance between the particles are very small, there arises a particle-particle interaction forces. In most cases Vanderwaals forces are controlling compared to other interaction forces like, capillary and electrostatic forces. As this particle-particle interaction force is achieved by contact, no force is exerted between them, when the particles are not in contact. The force of interaction between two solids depends on the size, the shape of the particles and as well as the distance between the particles. These forces are calculated starting from the Derjaguin approximation [3] and the theory of Lifshitz [4]. The calculation of the Van der Waals forces is estimated as the sum of all interactions between molecules held on the surface of the particles. The magnitude of these forces increases with the size reduction of the particles and becomes dominating compared to the weight of the particles.

Owing to this unpredicted behavior of cohesive powders as a result of coating, it is important to understand the coating process handling cohesive powders in great detail. This work focuses on a comparative study between the cohesive and non-cohesive nature of a powder when subjected to coating. An additional cohesive force model was added to the existing model [5] to simulate the cohesive powder. A large number of experimental work has been conducted to understand and optimize coating process for a consistent quality maintenance [6, 7, 8]. Some of the works deal with the cohesive powders [9, 10]. Computer simulations have established as a powerful tool to study this coating process. As simulations are conducted with experimental data, they are a complement to experiments. Although it does not give results matching reality due to model assumptions, they reduce the number of experiments. Many process parameters and interactions which are hard to measure experimentally can be measured using simulations. For example, to find out the terminal velocity of air pumped into a fluid bed, many experiments should be conducted which are economical and time consuming. But one could simulate a fluid bed with varying air velocity just to find

out the terminal velocity. This enables to perform lab scale experiments on a single desk-side Graphic Processing Unit (GPU) [11].

In this work a two way coupling of Discrete Element Model (DEM) and Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) was used. The CFD-code solves the volume averaged Navier-Stokes equation to simulate the flow of continuum fluid in the gas phase. The DEM-code solves the Newton's second law of motion to simulate the motion of individual particles. Coupling between the CFD-code, AVL FIRE® and DEM-code XPS was established based on Compute United Device Architecture (CUDA) technology [12]. Based on this a bottom spray fluid bed coater was simulated for a process time of 30 sec.

2. Simulation Methods

The complete work is concerned with the application of computer simulations on the investigation of coating processes. A detailed study of powder is conducted with two cases. One when it behaves as a cohesive powder and second when it behaves as a non-cohesive powder.

2.1. Discrete Element Model (DEM)

DEM is a first principle computational numerical technique with the theoretical basis of the method originating from Newton's laws of motion. The total force experienced by individual grains or particles in a granular system is modeled and the subsequent accelerations, velocities, and positions are tracked over a period of time. The total force is the summation of contact forces (particle/particle and particle/boundary), and body forces, such as gravity, fluid, magnetic, or electrostatic forces. The first DEM application for coating was proposed by Yamane et al. [14]. He used only 600 spherical tablets binding to computational limitations then. In recent times, DEM became a very valuable tool for bulk particle analysis in pharmaceutical industry [13]. As the movement of particles in a coater is governed mostly by gravitational and inertial body forces in combination with particle-particle and particle-wall collisions, DEM is well suited to simulate coating of powders and other similar particles like tablets. DEM captures the movement of individual particles such as velocity and position and saves it for a certain time span. Due to this, at any point the simulated time span is less than the total process duration. Generally, as in the present work, 3 sec of simulation takes 24 hours. So typically values are some minutes of simulated process versus a total duration of some hours.

One important concern with DEM is the shape of particles. In most of the cases, from literature, spherical particles are used which if not realistic. But it is known that particle shape is an important factor for numerical simulations [15]. Large scale realistic modeling is still beyond current computational capacity. However this might change in future with the increase in CPU power and advent of new approaches. DEM simulations are computationally expensive, and it is limited for

a study of hundred thousand particles. In the current work, the in house DEM code XPS is used which is improved by newly available Compute United Device Architecture (CUDA) technology [12].

2.2. Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD)

Fluid (gas and liquid) flows are governed by partial differential equations which represent conservation laws for the mass, momentum, and energy. Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) is the art of replacing such PDE systems by a set of algebraic equations which can be solved using digital computers. It gives an insight into flow patterns that are difficult, expensive or impossible to study using traditional (experimental) techniques. In simple terms, Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) is a method used to simulate the flow behavior of a liquid or a gas. Apart from the velocity field of a fluid, modern CFD software enables one to include different phases, considering heat and mass transfer between phases, or describe porous region. It is also possible to track the movement of particles in the flow (Euler-Lagrange approach). The particle movement is influenced by the flow of liquid in the system, which in turn is affected by particles (two way coupling). An approach involving the Euler-Lagrange Discrete Droplet Method can be applied to simulate the spray flow in the surrounding air. In this approach the particles themselves can only have limited interactions (such as coalescing droplets), but no sophisticated models for particle collisions are included. For the full description of particle movement and collision in a fluid stream, a coupled DEM-CFD has to be applied. In present work CFD is executed on a Central Processing Unit (CPU) using the commercial CFD code AVL FIRE®.

2.3. CFD-DEM coupling

The interactions between the solid particles and fluid makes a platform to couple DEM and CFD. The approaches to couple them was developed giving the ability to consider air stream and particle movement and their interactions in a single simulation. This ability of CFD-DEM coupling makes it possible to simulate fluidic-granular systems. The main advantage of CFD-DEM is, it provides a

detailed information on particle interactions, trajectories and forces acting on individual particles. With the increasing simulation capacity of DEM using GPU [12], the coupling of CFD-DEM has emerged as a high performance method for coupled CFD-DEM simulations with up to 9 million particles per GB of GPU-Memory. Also Kafui et al. (2011) showed maximal speed with 64 processing cores by applying a semi-automatic parallelization of CFD-DEM code.

The main objective of this work is to study the fluid flow patterns and understand the behavior of cohesive and non-cohesive powders using a new hybrid approach. The new CUDA technology was used for the particle simulation by coupling with an existing CFD-code. Data exchange between the two codes was done by AVL Code Coupling Interface (ACCI), which is a software component for co-simulations with an arbitrary number of instances of different simulation programs. This newly developed technology was validated by Jajcevic et al. (2013) using fluidized granular systems and was later used in the simulation of a wurster coater by Siegmann et al. (2014) [5]. Siegmann et al. (2014) has simulated a wurster coater by monitoring the residence time distribution and size distribution of the particles using the CFD-DEM model validated by Jajcevic et al. (2013). In the present work, same model has been used to simulate the non-cohesive powder. Additionally the Van der Waals cohesive force model has been introduced in the DEM-code to simulate the same powder (which is expected to behave as cohesive powder).

3. Theoretical background of CFD-DEM Model

The dispersed particle phase was treated as a collection on individual particles, whose movement is described by applying Newton's second law. Where the gas-phase dynamics was described by the incompressible Newtonian fluid based on an Euler approach. In simple terms, the model is an Euler-Lagrange approach for a non-reactive flow. The two phases, continuum and dispersed phases, are coupled via the momentum exchange between gas phase and particles.

In the following sections, the gas phase and the solid phase equations are explained followed by the particle-particle interactions and particle-wall interactions. Also, the Van der Waals cohesive force model added to the force models in Jajcevic et al. (2013) was introduced.

3.1 Gas-phase modeling

The gas phase is modeled by solving the volume-averaged Navier-Stokes equations. All the variable are considered to be locally volume-averaged quantities over the control volume V , which was chosen to be at least order of magnitude larger than the particle volume V_p . The conservation of mass leads to:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}(\epsilon_f \rho_f) + \nabla \cdot (\epsilon_f \rho_f \mathbf{u}_f) = 0, \quad (1)$$

where ρ_f is the fluid density, ϵ_f is the local volume fraction of the fluid, \mathbf{u}_f is the fluid velocity vector and t is the time. Similarly, the conservation of the momentum can be given as:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}(\epsilon_f \rho_f \mathbf{u}_f) + \nabla \cdot (\epsilon_f \rho_f \mathbf{u}_f \mathbf{u}_f) = -\epsilon_f \nabla p - \nabla \cdot (\epsilon_f \boldsymbol{\tau}_f) + \epsilon_f \rho_f \mathbf{g} - \mathbf{S}_p \quad (2)$$

where p is the hydrodynamic pressure, $\boldsymbol{\tau}_f$ is the stress tensor, \mathbf{g} is the gravitational acceleration and \mathbf{S}_p is the inter-phase momentum transfer source term between particles and fluid. The stress tensor is defined as

$$\boldsymbol{\tau} = p\mathbf{I} + \boldsymbol{\sigma} \quad (3)$$

where \mathbf{I} is the unit matrix, and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ is the viscous stress tensor

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \mu_f (\nabla \mathbf{u}_f + \nabla \mathbf{u}_f^T) - 2/3(\mu_f \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}_f \mathbf{I}) \quad (4)$$

with μ_f being the dynamic viscosity.

3.2 Solid-phase and drag phase modeling

The motion of each particle (considered a point source) is described by Newton's equation of motion

$$m_p \frac{d\mathbf{u}_p}{dt} = V_i \nabla p + \beta (\mathbf{u}_f - \mathbf{u}_p) + \sum F_{pp} + \sum F_{pw} + m_p \mathbf{g} \quad (5)$$

where m_p is the particle mass, \mathbf{u}_p is the particle velocity, $-V_i \nabla p$ is pressure gradient force, β is the inter-phase momentum transfer coefficient and the remaining terms are interaction forces between the interacting particles and walls and the gravity forces, respectively.

The angular momentum of the particle is calculated as

$$I_p \left(\frac{d\omega_p}{dt} \right) = \sum \mathbf{M}_p \quad (6)$$

where ω_p is particle angular velocity, \mathbf{M}_p is the torque, and I_p is the moment of inertia.

The inter-phase momentum transfer coefficient was given as a function of the solid ε_s , and the fluid ε_f fractions, the particle Reynolds number Re_p , the particle diameter d_p and the particle density ρ_p . The model by Gidaspow (1994) combines

the Ergun (1952) equation for dense regimes and a correlation proposed by Wen and Yu (1966) for more dilute regimes

$$\beta_{Ergun} = 150 \left(\frac{\varepsilon_s^2 \mu_f}{\varepsilon_f d_p^2} \right) + 1.75 \left(\frac{\varepsilon_s \rho_f}{d_p} \right) |\mathbf{u}_f - \mathbf{u}_p| \quad \text{for } \varepsilon < 0.8,$$

$$\beta_{Wen-Yu} = \left(\frac{3}{4} \right) C_D \left(\frac{\varepsilon_s \rho_f}{d_p} \right) |\mathbf{u}_f - \mathbf{u}_p| \varepsilon_f^{-2.65} \quad \text{for } \varepsilon < 0.8, \quad (7)$$

where the drag coefficient C_D and the particle Reynolds number Re_p are expressed as

$$C_D = \begin{cases} \frac{24}{\varepsilon_f Re_p} \left[1 + 0.15 (\varepsilon_f Re_p)^{0.687} \right] & Re_p < 1000 \\ 0.44 & Re_p \geq 1000 \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

$$Re_p = \frac{\rho_f |\mathbf{u}_f - \mathbf{u}_p| d_p}{\mu_f} \quad (9)$$

To avoid the discontinuity between the two equations, Huilin and Gidaspow (2003)[16] introduced an additional function that describes the transition between the regimes

$$\varphi_{gs} = \frac{\arctan[150 \times 1.75 (0.2 - \varepsilon_s)]}{\pi} + 0.5 \quad (10)$$

Using Eq. (10) the inter-phase momentum transfer coefficient can be calculated as

$$\beta = (1 - \varphi_{gs})\beta_{Ergun} + \varphi_{gs}\beta_{Wen-Yu} \quad (11)$$

By applying Lattice-Boltzmann simulations, Koch and Hill (2001) determined the inter-phase momentum transfer coefficient:

$$\beta = \frac{18\mu_f\varepsilon_f^2\varepsilon_p}{d_p^2} \left(F_0(\varepsilon_p) + \frac{1}{2}F_3\varepsilon_f Re_p \right) \frac{V_p}{\varepsilon_p}, \quad (12)$$

The particle Reynolds number Re_p' is calculated taking into account the fluid volume fraction

$$Re_p' = \frac{\varepsilon_f \rho_f |\mathbf{u}_f - \mathbf{u}_p| d_p}{\mu_f} \quad (13)$$

In Eq. (12)

$$F_0(\varepsilon_p) = \begin{cases} \frac{1+3\sqrt{\varepsilon_p/2}+2.109\varepsilon_p \ln(\varepsilon_p)+16.14\varepsilon_p}{1+0.681\varepsilon_p-8.48\varepsilon_p^2+8.14\varepsilon_p^3} & \text{if } \varepsilon_p < 0.4 \\ \frac{10\varepsilon_p}{\varepsilon_f^3} & \text{if } \varepsilon_p \geq 0.4 \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

$$F_3(\varepsilon_p) = 0.0673 + 0.212\varepsilon_p + \frac{0.0232}{\varepsilon_f^5} \quad (15)$$

From the most recently proposed model by jajcevic 2013 [11], which was used by Pepiot and Desjardins (2012), the inter-phase momentum transfer coefficient of the model is as follows:

$$\beta = \frac{18\mu_f\varepsilon_f}{\rho_p d_p^2} F(\varepsilon_f, Re_p) m_p \quad (16)$$

where $F(\varepsilon_f, Re_p)m_p$ is the dimensionless drag force coefficient proposed by Beetstra et al. (2007a), given as

$$\begin{aligned}
F(\varepsilon_f, Re_p) = & 10 \frac{1-\varepsilon_f}{\varepsilon_f^2} + \varepsilon_f^2 (1 + 1.5\sqrt{1-\varepsilon_f}) \\
& + \frac{0.413 Re_p}{24 \varepsilon_f^2} \left(\frac{\varepsilon_f^{-1} + 3\varepsilon_f(1-\varepsilon_f) + 8.4 Re_p^{-0.343}}{1 + 10^{3(1-\varepsilon_f) P \varepsilon_p^{-0.5-2(1-\varepsilon_f)}}} \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where the particle Reynolds number is calculated taking into account the fluid volume fraction ε_f as given in Eq. (13).

The models described above were developed based on experimental data and was validated by Jajecieve [11]. He investigated whether the models correctly predicted the pressure drop in a fixed mono disperse particle bed.

3.3 Particle-particle and particle-wall interactions modeling

Since fluidized beds operate near the close-packing limit, particle–particle collisions are frequent and dominate the process. Thus, describing particle–particle interactions is critical to predicting the bed's dynamics.




Fig. 1. Soft-sphere model of a particle-particle interaction.

There are several ways of describing particle–particle interactions. i.e., via volumetric, hard and soft-sphere models. In this work the soft-sphere approach (Fig. 1) model was used in this, where a linear-spring and dashpot model is employed to calculate the contact forces. When two particles are in contact with each other (see Fig. 1), a slightly overlap δ_n occurs resulting in a repulsive force. The force's magnitude depends on the overlap between the two particles, their relative velocity, the spring stiffness and the damping parameter, according to

$$F_{p_A \rightarrow p_B, n} = -k_n \delta_n \mathbf{n}_{AB} - \eta_n \mathbf{u}_{AB, n}, \quad (18)$$

where k_n is the spring stiffness, \mathbf{u}_{AB} , n is the normal relative velocity vector of particles A and B, \mathbf{n}_{AB} is the unit vector between the center of particle B and A, and η_n is the damping parameter expressed as

$$\eta_n = -2 \ln(e_{n, p \rightarrow p}) \frac{\sqrt{m_{AB} k_n}}{\sqrt{\pi^2 + (\ln(e_{n, p \rightarrow p}))^2}} \quad (19)$$

With,

$$m_{AB} = \left(\frac{1}{m_A} + \frac{1}{m_B} \right)^{-1}$$

In this expression, $0 < e_{n, p-p} < 1$ is the normal coefficient of restitution, and m_A , m_B are the masses of particles A and B, respectively.

The relative velocity vector is calculated as follows:

$$\mathbf{u}_{AB} = \mathbf{u}_A - \mathbf{u}_B - (R_A \omega_A + R_B \omega_B) \times \mathbf{n}_{AB} \quad (20)$$

and the normal relative velocity as

$$\mathbf{u}_{AB,n} = (\mathbf{u}_{AB} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{AB}) \mathbf{n}_{AB} \quad (21)$$

The unit vector between the center of particle A and B is given by

$$\mathbf{n}_{AB} = \frac{\mathbf{p}_B - \mathbf{p}_A}{|\mathbf{p}_B - \mathbf{p}_A|}, \quad (22)$$

Where \mathbf{p} presents the position vector of particle.

For the tangential component of the contact force a Coulomb-type friction law is used (see Deen et al., 2007):

$$\mathbf{F}_{p_A \rightarrow p_{B,t}} = \begin{cases} -k_t \delta_t - \eta_t \mathbf{u}_{AB,t} & \text{if } |\mathbf{F}_{p_A \rightarrow p_{B,t}}| \leq |\mathbf{F}_{p_A \rightarrow p_{B,n}}| \\ -\mu_{fr,p \rightarrow p} |\mathbf{F}_{p_A \rightarrow p_{B,n}}| \mathbf{t}_{AB} & \text{if } |\mathbf{F}_{p_A \rightarrow p_{B,t}}| > |\mathbf{F}_{p_A \rightarrow p_{B,n}}| \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

where k_t , δ_t , η_t , $\mu_{fr,p \rightarrow p}$ and \mathbf{t}_{AB} are the tangential spring stiffness tangential displacement, tangential damping coefficient, friction coefficient, and tangential unit vector, respectively.

The tangential displacement is given as

$$\delta_t = \mathbf{u}_{AB,t} \cdot \Delta \mathbf{t} \quad (24)$$

The tangential velocity $\mathbf{u}_{AB,t}$ can be calculated as follows:

$$\mathbf{u}_{AB,t} = \mathbf{u}_{AB} - \mathbf{u}_{AB,n} \quad (25)$$

The tangential damping coefficient is expressed as follows:

$$\eta_t = -2 \ln(e_{t,p \rightarrow p}) \frac{\sqrt{(2/7)m_{AB}k_t}}{\sqrt{\pi^2 + (\ln(e_{t,p \rightarrow p}))^2}} \quad (26)$$

In this expression, $0 < e_{t,p \rightarrow p} < 1$ is the tangential coefficient of restitution. The tangential unit vector is calculated using the tangential velocity,

$$\mathbf{t}_{AB} = \frac{\mathbf{u}_{AB,t}}{|\mathbf{u}_{AB,t}|} \quad (27)$$

The particle–wall collision is handled by treating the walls as particles with an infinite mass, a zero radius (ie., $m_{AB}=m_A$), and a zero angular velocity. In Eq. (23), the tangential force at the wall is calculated using the wall friction coefficient $\mu_{fr,p-w}$ between the interacting particle and the wall.

For implementing cohesion between particles the additional cohesive force F_{va} , was introduced. For dry particles, the cohesive force between two agglomerates is predominantly the van der Waals force. According to Israelachvili's theory of intermolecular and surface forces, the van der Waals force between two spherical agglomerates of diameter d_{a1} and d_{a2} is given as,

$$F_{va} \approx \frac{A}{12\delta^2} \frac{d_{a1}d_{a2}}{d_{a1}+d_{a2}} \quad (28)$$

where δ is the distance between two particles, d_{a1} and d_{a2} are the diameter of particles and A is Hamaker constant, taken as 10^{-19} J.

3.4 Particle-coating modeling

The spray nozzle is modeled by defining a conical spray zone located inside the fluid bed on the bottom. In the spray nozzle, which is assumed to be a single point, many rays originate. The size of the resulting spray zone depends on the opening angle of the cone. Each of the rays detects intersecting particles. Particles hit by these rays increase their radii according to their residence time in the spray zone. The spraying is done in every single DEM-timestep.

3.5 CFD-DEM model

The gas and the solid phases are coupled via the source term \mathbf{S}_p and the gas volume fraction ϵ_f (Eqs. (1) and (2)). To avoid the issue in the time-consuming data exchange between the CPU-based CFD-code and the GPU-based DEM-code, the amount of data exchanged must be kept to a minimum in order to minimize the global communication overhead. In Fig. 2, the scheme of the coupling between

both, the interpolation of the fluid velocity vectors, to establish the fluid velocities at the centers of the regular DEM grid. It also performs the mapping of the force field back to the CFD code. Although the mapping operation is time-consuming, it has to be executed only once at the beginning.

The ACCI link stores and provides the required mapping coefficients as long as both codes (CFD and DEM) are running. The drag-force calculation is only performed by GPUs, where particle data are already available. The gas/solid fraction (which is in our code related to the DEM-cell) is only calculated by GPUs. Simultaneously with the drag force calculation, the coupling source term \mathbf{S}_p for each DEM-cell is also obtained by GPUs together with the gas void fraction ε_f is transferred via ACCI. Furthermore, the transfer of the particle data from the GPUs to the CPUs memory is avoided. The transferred data amount is only dependent on the number of the DEM-cells and not on the number of particles. Considering that the number of DEM-cells usually does not exceed $O(10^6)$. The introduced coupling method is more efficient due to the minimized amount of the transfer data between CPUs and GPUs.

The DEM grid is regular and the velocity field data, as well as the inter-phase momentum source terms, are stored at the DEM grid's cell center. The fluid velocity used for the calculation of the drag force is interpolated to the particle position. The inter-phase momentum transfer source term is saved at the cell center of the DEM cell as well. An extrapolation scheme may be applied to distribute the drag force to all surrounding DEM cells, taking into account the distance between the particle and the cell centers of surrounding cells. However, a ratio of the particle diameter to DEM-cell size being too large can lead to numerical oscillations and instabilities (Pepiot and Desjardins, 2012). Thus, this concept was not implemented and the particle growth was kept zero to maintain a constant particle diameter to DEM-cell size ratio throughout the simulation for both cohesive and non-cohesive systems.

The gas phase modeling is based on locally volume-averaged quantities. Thus, the characteristic control volume V of the gas-phase numerical model must be at

least an order of magnitude larger than the particle volume V_p , which is, $V > 10V_p$. Since the gas phase is resolved in three dimensions, the mesh size Δx must be chosen such that $\Delta x > (10\pi/6)^{1/3}d_p > 1.74d_p$ for a valid coupled simulation when applying the point-particle approach.

The next limitation is associated with the time step, which must be selected such that the particle–particle interactions can be reproduced accurately. The time step should be sufficiently small to make sure that the contact lasts for a certain number of time steps to avoid problems concerning energy conservation due to the numerical integration. The contact time in the normal direction can be determined using expression according to Deen et al. (2007):

$$\tau_{col,n} = \left(m_{AB} \frac{\pi^2 + lne_{np \rightarrow p}^2}{k_n} \right)^{-1/2} \quad (29)$$

Analog to expression above, the time in the tangential direction is given by

$$\tau_{col,t} = \left(\frac{2}{7} m_{AB} \frac{\pi^2 + lne_{tp \rightarrow p}^2}{k_t} \right)^{-1/2} \quad (30)$$

According to Deen et al. (2007), to maintain the energy balance the normal and tangential contact times should be the same, which leads to following relation between k_n and k_t :

$$\frac{k_t}{k_n} = \frac{2}{7} \frac{\pi^2 + lne_{tp \rightarrow p}^2}{\pi^2 + lne_{np \rightarrow p}^2} \quad (31)$$

The normal stiffness can be determined from Young's modulus and it usually yields a very high value, which requires very small time step and it is undesirable from the computation time point of view. However, in this work the value of k_n was given by Van Buijtenen et al. (2011). The tangential stiffness k_t is calculated from Eq. (30).

4. Application of CFD-DEM Simulation

With the coupled CFD-DEM simulation a bottom spray Fluid Bed Coater with 200000 particles was simulated for a process time of 30 sec. for the simulation 4 CPUs and 1 GPU were used. The computational speed was about 3.5 sec/day.




Fig. 3. Sketch of the bottom spray fluid bed coater.

The fluid bed consists of a cone in which the particles are fluidized due to incoming air entering through a distributing plate. The operating mode of the coater is shown in Fig. 3. The particles are fluidized through the incoming air and are coated in the spray

zone, which is marked in red. Once the particles pass through the spray zone they change their color indicating they are coated.




Fig. 4. Sketch of the distribution plate.

The distributing-plate at the bottom (Fig. 4) consists of three different regions with different air velocities. The region in the middle is the nozzle for spray inlet. Surrounding it is zone 1 which has the fluidization gas entering at higher velocity in this region. After the particles are sprayed they must be dried and also fluidized. So a higher gas velocity leads to a circulation of particles through the fluid bed and efficiently dries them. In the annulus (zone 2), the gas velocity is much lower than zone 1 and zone 3. Near the wall, zone 3, the gas velocity is slightly larger than in the annulus to avoid dead zones, where the particles are not moving. Due to the high air velocity under the spray zone the particles get fluidized, move up through the bed, and are transported to the wall and recirculate downwards.

Table 1: DEM simulation parameter and material

Property	Value	Unit
$N_{p,total}$	200 000	-
N_x	92	-
N_y	156	-
N_z	92	-
d_p	0.0018	m
P_p	1800	Kg/m ³
k_p	1000	N/m
$e_{n,p \rightarrow p}$	0.5	-
$e_{n,p \rightarrow w}$	0.8	-
$e_{t,p \rightarrow p}$	0.2	-
$e_{t,p \rightarrow w}$	0.2	-
DEM time step	10^{-5}	sec
Particle mass	1.09	Kg
Spray rate	60	ml/min
Spray angle	20	Degree
Coating mass	0.027	Kg
t_{end}	30	sec

Table 1 lists the relevant simulation and material parameters used in the DEM-simulation. d_p is the diameter of a particle before it is coated and it remains constant throughout the simulation.

For analyzing the fluidization of cohesive and non-cohesive systems, four cases (case 1, case2, case 3 and case4) were considered. Table 2 lists the main simulation parameters used for the CFD-simulation for the above mentioned four cases.

Table 2. CFD simulation parameters

	Property	Value	unit
Case 1 Non-Cohesive	mass flow in zone 1	0.0099	kg/s
	mass flow in zone 2	0.0011	kg/s
	mass flow in zone 3	0.0094	kg/s
Case 2 Cohesive	mass flow in zone 1	0.009	kg/s
	mass flow in zone 2	0.001	kg/s
	mass flow in zone 3	0.0085	kg/s
Case 3 Cohesive	mass flow in zone 1	0.0099	kg/s
	mass flow in zone 2	0.0011	kg/s
	mass flow in zone 3	0.0094	kg/s
Case 4 Cohesive	mass flow in zone 1	0.0108	kg/s
	mass flow in zone 2	0.0012	kg/s
	mass flow in zone 3	0.0103	kg/s
	Number of cells	186 764	-
	CFD time step	10^{-3}	Sec

In the presented case the DEM-code XPS uses a time step size of 10^{-5} sec which, in this simulation, ensures that contacts between particles last for a certain number of time steps to resolve particle collisions. This avoids problems concerning energy conservation. For the CFD-code a bigger time step size of 10^{-3} sec was used.

5. Results and Discussions

The study was conducted in three stages. Firstly the cohesive force model was tested. In second stage, a comparative approach between coating of particles with and without cohesive force models. In both the cases all the DEM-simulation parameters, CFD-simulation parameters and particle parameters were kept same (see Case 1 and Case 3 in Table 2). In third stage, three cases of cohesive models have been considered (Case2, Case3 and Case 4). In each case the DEM-simulation parameters and particle parameter were same, but the CFD-simulation parameters were changed. The velocities in the three zones were changed in all three cases. They were selected such that case 2 gave minimum velocity for the fluidization. Though it might not provide enough fluidization for the system. Case 3 had 10% increment from Case 2 velocities. Similarly Case 4 had 10% increment to Case 3 velocities. With these parameters four sets of simulations were run for a simulation time of 30 sec each. Though 30 sec of simulation does not represent the whole coating process, due to long simulation of 3.5 sec/day, the simulation end time was limited to 30 sec.

In all stages the number of particles sprayed in every time step were monitored and a comparison was developed. Also the mean velocity of the system was monitored.

Fig. 5 shows a screenshot of Case 1 (see Table 1) simulation after a process time of 0.49 sec. The figure shows a cut through the YZ-plane of the simulation to allow a better insight into the process. Here the particles, which have not been coated, are grey. The ones, which are currently coated are green and those, which have already been coated are red.




Fig. 5. Screenshot of Case 1 simulation after a process time of 0.49 sec.


5.1 Implementing the Cohesive Force model

An agglomerate should be defined as a group of particles connected by contact points which can exist even when forces other than cohesion and repulsion are removed. Accordingly, all particle-to-particle contact points were scanned and judged if a pair of particles in a particular contact point are separated after collision or not if no other forces exist based on the following criterion:


$$\text{At contact point: } F_{rep,max} < F_{coh}, \quad (32)$$

Where $F_{rep,max}$ is the maximum repulsion force and F_{coh} is the maximum cohesion force by van der Waals force.

In numerical analysis an agglomerate is defined as a group of particles which are connected by preserved contacts. Fig. 6 shows the snapshots illustrating agglomerate formation of Case 3 simulation. Fig. 6(a) is for the case 1 of non-cohesive particles, where only those particles in collision are indicated. From Fig. 6, it can be confirmed that agglomerates size increase with longer simulation time.



(a) Simulation with Case 1 parameters - Bed of Non-Cohesive particles



(b) Simulation with Case 3 parameters- Agglomerating fluidized bed

Fig. 6. Snapshots of behavior of (a) Non-cohesive particles and (b) agglomerating fluidized bed

Simulation with Case 3 parameters Fig. 7 shows the snapshots of velocity distribution and agglomerates in the bed. Particles which are connected to other particles by cohesion force can be observed in huge lumps.




Fig. 7. Snapshots of velocity distribution (CFD-simulations) and corresponding particles (DEM-simulations) in the bed with Case 3 simulations.

The behavior of an agglomerate indicates that the agglomerate growth takes place below a rising bubble. On the other hand, the agglomerate breakage takes place above a bubble [Kenya kuwagi 2002]. This can be seen from Fig. 8 with Case 3 simulations. Fig. 9 shows particle growth and breakage with further magnification. In this case the simulation parameter taken are from Case 3 (Table 1).




Fig. 8. Snapshots of agglomerates growth and breakage.




Fig. 9. Snapshots of growth and breakage with further magnification.

5.2 Comparison between Cohesive and Non-Cohesive systems

To understand the difference between the behavior of cohesive and non-cohesive number of particles sprayed and mean velocities were monitored in both cases. The simulations were done with parameters in Case 1 and Case 2. Both CFD-simulation parameters and DEM-simulation parameters are same. Fig. 10 shows snapshots of behavior of particles in both systems at same time steps. The snapshots (Fig. 10) clearly show that the system of non-cohesive particles were better fluidized. Also, the non-cohesive system is more homogeneous (well mixed).






Fig. 10. Snapshots comparing the behavior of fluidized particles in a (a) cohesive and (b) non-cohesive models.

Graph 1 shows the number of particles sprayed through the simulation time. It can be seen that more number of particles are sprayed in a non-cohesive system than compared to a cohesive system at any point of simulation. This is because of better fluidization and free flow of particles through the bed. This can clearly be seen from Graph 1. In both the cases particles sprayed are increasing linearly with time but more number of particles are sprayed in the non-cohesive system.


Graph 1. Shows the number of particles sprayed through the simulation time.



To understand the fluidization of the system better the velocity of the system has been monitored and recorded, in m/sec. From Graph 2 and Fig. 11 it is understood that a cohesive system needs more fluidization velocity than compared to a non-cohesive system. Due to huge lump of agglomerate formation the amount of velocity required increases. Thus when handling cohesive particles more fluidization velocity is required for better fluidization. Also from Graph 2, the average velocity distribution of the non-cohesive system is steadier than cohesive system. These fluctuations in the fluid bed practically can cause much damage to the system, mainly when the fluidization air is hot. So careful monitoring is required.




(a) Velocity distribution in an agglomerating fluid bed with cohesive force model



(b) Velocity distribution in a fluid bed with no cohesive force model


Fig. 11. Velocity distribution in the fluid bed (a) with cohesive force model and (b) without cohesive force model.

Graph 2. Shows the mean velocities of both systems.




5.3 Comparison between different Cohesive systems


Further extending the study an attempt to understand the cohesive system was made by varying the fluidization air velocity. Starting from Case 2, which is has the minimum fluidization velocity, 10% increase in the velocity was made. The simulation time was 5 sec each. From Graph 3 and Fig. 12 we can conclude that better fluidization is achieved with greater fluidization velocity. When huge lump of agglomerates are formed the weight of the resulting is much heavier than individual particles and hence more air flow is required to move the particles around in the fluid and achieve better fluidization. Graph 13 shows snapshots of velocity distribution in the agglomerating fluid bed.



(a) Snapshots of particle distribution for simulation with parameters in Case 2




(b) Snapshots of particle distribution for simulation with parameters in Case 3




(c) Snapshots of particle distribution for simulation with parameters in Case 4

Fig. 12. Snapshots of particle distribution in an agglomerating fluid bed.

Graph 3. Number of particles sprayed in different cohesive systems.



Graph 4. Mean velocities of different cohesive systems.








Fig. 13. Snapshots of velocity distribution for different cases in a cohesive system.

6. Conclusions

The formation of agglomerates were observed with the new van der Waals cohesive force model implemented. A comparative study between a cohesive and non-cohesive system was carried out by monitoring the number of particles sprayed over the simulation time and mean velocity of the fluid bed over the simulation time. From the results of particles sprayed and velocity distribution it can be clearly seen that a non-cohesive powder are well suited for a fluidized bed. From the cohesive systems with different fluidization velocity we can conclude that for the fluidization of cohesive powders higher fluidization velocity is preferred.

7. References

- [1] Cole, G., Hogan, J., Aulton, M. E., & Twitchell, A. M. (2002). *Pharmaceutical Coating Technology*. (Graham Cole, Ed.). London: Taylor & Francis.
- [2] Geldart, D., Types of gas fluidisation, *Powder Technology* 7, p. 285-292 (1973)
- [3] Derjaguin, B.V. (1934). "Untersuchungen über die Reibung und Adhäsion, IV. Theorie des Anhaftens kleiner Teilchen" [Analysis of friction and adhesion, IV. The theory of the adhesion of small particles]. *Kolloid Z. (in German)* **69** (2): 155–164.
- [4] Lifshitz, E. M., *The theory of molecular attractive forces between solids*, *Soviet Phys. JETP (Engl. Transl.)* 2, p. 73-83 (1956).
- [5] Siegmann E, Radeke C, Fully coupled multiphase simulation of a bottom-spray wruster coater using hybrid CPU/GPU CFD/DEM approach. *International conference on CFD in oil & gas, metallurgical and process industries*, 2014
- [6] Brock, D., Zeitler, J. A., Funke, A., Knop, K., & Kleinebudde, P. (2012). A comparison of quality control methods for active coating processes. *Int J Pharm*, 439(1-2), 289–95.
- [7] Dubey, A., Boukouvala, F., Keyvan, G., Hsia, R., Saranteas, K., Brone, D., Muzzio, F. J. (2012). Improvement of tablet coating uniformity using a quality by Investigation of pharmaceutical tablet film coating processes using numerical simulations design approach. *AAPS PharmSciTech*, 13(1), 231–46.
- [8] Mauritz, J. M. A., Morrisby, R. S., Hutton, R. S., Legge, C. H., & Kaminski, C. F. (2010). Imaging pharmaceutical tablets with optical coherence tomography. *J Pharm Sci*, 99(1), 385–91.
- [9] D. Turki and N. Fatah. Behavior and fluidization of the cohesive powders: agglomerates size approach. *Brazilian Journal of Chemical Engineering*, Vol. 25, No. 04, pp. 697 - 711 , October - December, 2008
- [10] Zhou, T. and Li, H., Estimation of agglomerate size for cohesive particles during fluidization, *Powder Technology* 101, p. 57-62 (1999)
- [11] Jajcevic, D., Siegmann, E., Radeke, C., & Khinast, J. G. (2013). Large-scale CFD–DEM simulations of fluidized granular systems. *Chemical Engineering Science*, 98, 298–310.

- [12] Radeke, C. A., Glasser, B. J., & Khinast, J. G. (2010). *Large-scale powder mixer simulations using massively parallel GPU architectures*. *Chemical Engineering Science*, 65(24), 6435–6442.
- [13] Ketterhagen, W. R., am Ende, M. T., & Hancock, B. C. (2009b). *Process modeling in the pharmaceutical industry using the discrete element method*. *Journal of pharmaceutical sciences*, 98(2), 442–70
- [14] Yamane, K., Sato, T., Tanaka, T., & Tsuji, Y. (1995). *Computer simulation of tablet motion in coating drum*. *Pharmaceutical research*, 12(9), 1264–8.
- [15] Abedi, S., & Mirghasemi, A. A. (2011). *Particle shape consideration in numerical simulation of assemblies of irregularly shaped particles*. *Particuology*, 9(4), 387–397.