Revisiting Low-Fidelity Two-Fluid Models for Gas-Solids Transport

Najeem Adeleke^{a,*}, Michael Adewumi^{a,*}, Thaddeus Ityokumbul^a

^a*Department of Energy and Mineral Engineering, The Pennsylvania State University,
University Park, PA 16801*

Abstract

Two-phase gas-solids transport models are widely utilized for process design and automation in a broad range of industrial applications. Some of these applications include proppant transport in gaseous fracking fluids, air/gas drilling hydraulics, coal-gasification reactors and food processing units. Systems automation and real time process optimization stands to benefit a great deal from availability of efficient and accurate theoretical models for operations data processing. However, modeling two-phase pneumatic transport systems accurately requires a comprehensive understanding of gas-solids flow behavior. In this study we discuss the prevailing flow conditions and present a low-fidelity two-fluid model equation for particulate transport. The model equations are formulated in a manner that ensures the physical flux term remains conservative despite the inclusion of solids normal stress through the empirical formula for modulus of elasticity. A new set of Roe-Pike averages are presented for the resulting strictly hyperbolic flux term in the system of equations, which was used to develop a Roe-type approximate Riemann solver. The resulting scheme is stable regardless of the choice of flux-limiter. The model is evaluated by the prediction of experimental results from both pneumatic riser and air-drilling hydraulics systems. We demonstrate the effect and impact of numerical formulation and choice of numerical scheme on model predictions. We illustrate the

*Corresponding authors

Email addresses: najm@psu.edu / nadeleke@gmail.com (Najeem Adeleke), m2a@psu.edu (Michael Adewumi)

capability of a low-fidelity one-dimensional two-fluid model in predicting relevant flow parameters in two-phase particulate systems accurately even under flow regimes involving counter-current flow.

Keywords: approximate Riemann solver, two-fluid model, multiphase, compressible flow, pneumatic conveying, hyperbolic systems

2015 MSC: 00-01, 99-00

1. Introduction

Particulate transport in fluid media is common in many industrial processes. Designing such processes to predefined capacity limits can be abstruse and highly dependent on the ability to model and simulate them. Furthermore,
5 real-time mechanistic model simulation coupled to model parameter tuning algorithms that take advantage of available operations data is crucial for efficient process control automation. Process automation frameworks aid the seamless real-time optimization of engineering operations and industrial processes using measured operations data. Stand alone commercial and open-source simulators
10 like FLUENT, Star-CCM+ and OpenFOAM are capable of modeling particulate transport at high fidelity. However, they are inefficient for real-time process optimization and capacity design as they are built with the flexibility for dynamic data utilization while run perpetually on a remote server with little or no human interaction. Hence the need for lower fidelity models that are fast,
15 accurate and robust.

Some well known computational models, such as K-FIX [1], MULTIFIX [2, 3], FORSIM [4], OLGA [5], TACITE [6], PLAC and TUFFP [7], TRAC [8], RELAP [9, 10, 11] and CATHARE [12] are examples of lower fidelity models for multiphase flow systems. However, these tend to suffer from frontal smear-
20 ing, which ultimately affects parameter predictions when applied to two-phase particulate transport systems. This fact led some authors [13] to the conclusion that such lower fidelity models are incapable of making accurate parameter predictions when applied to two-phase particulate transport systems.

Toumi and Kumbaro [14] noted that the smearing of the fronts observed in
 25 the earlier models are due to the description of the mathematical model and the
 numerical method adopted. They presented an approximate Riemann solution
 on a modified set of isentropic equal pressure two-fluid model equation that
 included the virtual mass effect proposed by Drew and Lahey [15, 16] in order
 to ensure hyperbolicity.

30 Tsuo and Gidaspow [13] presented a set of strictly hyperbolic model equa-
 tions for gas-solids flow in circulating fluidized beds where the pressure gradient
 of the particulate phase is expressed in terms of an empirically determined mod-
 ulus of elasticity. They simulated both one- and two-dimensional flow using an
 earlier extension of K-FIX by Syamlal [2] in an effort to replicate the experimen-
 35 tal results of Luo [17, 18]. Their one-dimensional numerical simulation showed
 signs of significant frontal smearing [13, 19] and poor steady-state solids con-
 centration (volume fraction) predictions. They concluded that one-dimensional
 models can not be used to predict solids concentrations accurately in two phase
 gas-solid transport even for vertical flow. They made particular reference to flow
 40 regimes that experience clustering and counter-current annular flow. Interest-
 ingly, their two-dimensional simulation results also indicated poor steady-state
 solids concentration predictions as well. However, they attributed the discrep-
 ancy in the numerical predictions relative to experimental measurements to the
 inaccuracies of the x-ray densitometer used in Luo’s experiment [17] to measure
 45 the solids concentrations.

Syamlal [20] also presented a new set of two-fluid model equations that are
 hyperbolic under a wide range of flow conditions by including a bouyant force
 term that accounts for relative velocity between the fluid and solids phases. He
 expressed the flow equations using primitive variables and also showed through
 50 characteristic analysis, where various sets of flow equations lose hyperbolicity.
 However, Hou and Le Floch [21] have shown that numerical formulations such
 as those that employ primitive variables do not converge to the correct solution
 when discontinuities are present.

Hudson and Harris [22] also presented a high resolution scheme for gas-solids

55 two-phase isentropic flow. Both of Gidaspow's [23] non-hyperbolic (Model A)
 and strictly hyperbolic (Model B) equations were evaluated. Model C, which
 is also non-hyperbolic was analyzed but not evaluated as it displayed a larger
 region of non-hyperbolicity relative to Model A. They utilized a conservative
 finite volume scheme and a Roe-type approximate Riemann solver. They pre-
 60 sented a set of Roe-Pike averages for their system of equations and solved these
 equations using conserved variables. They however reported some instability in
 their numerical scheme which they attributed to sensitivity to the choice of flux-
 limiter used. It should be noted that the observation of numerical instabilities
 when solving strictly hyperbolic systems, as is the case for model B, reported
 65 by Hudson and Harris point to flaws in the numerical scheme itself.

Kamath and Du [24] presented an approximate Riemann solver for granu-
 lar gas flow proposed by Goldshtein and Shapiro [25]. Kamath and Du pre-
 sented a Roe-type algorithm for the hyperbolic system, which included non-
 conservative terms. The non-conservative terms introduce non-isentropic ef-
 70 fects in acoustic-wave propagation within granular media and contribute to the
 Rankine-Hugoniot relations across discontinuities. They reported stable and
 accurate results for a one-dimensional test case for shocks with the flow features
 of a fluidized region downstream of the shock and a compacted solid-block re-
 gion adjacent to the wall. They concluded that the Roe-type scheme they had
 75 presented may be relevant in the investigation of two-phase flows.

Ibraheem and Adewumi [26] also studied two-phase gas-solids transport for
 the initiation stage of hydrate formation and transport in natural gas pipelines.
 They utilized a conservative finite volume scheme and applied a Roe-type ap-
 proximate Riemann solver using the set of Roe-Pike averages they had presented.
 80 While their model was reported stable, they had excluded any normal stresses
 associated with the solids phase completely.

While there has been many studies related to the construction of high reso-
 lution schemes for gas-solids two phase flow [20, 22, 24, 27], there has not been
 enough effort in investigating the overarching benefit of improved resolution
 85 of discontinuous fronts on parameter predictions in gas-solids systems. In this

study, we present a new set of Roe-Pike averages for a system of strictly hyperbolic two-fluid gas-solids flow model equation of the form of Gidaspow’s Type-B model [23]. The resulting numerical scheme is insensitive to the choice of flux-limiters. We also show that the inaccuracies observed in parameter predictions
90 in one-dimensional two-fluid gas-solids models are highly dependent on the numerical formulation and the capability of the numerical method of choice to capture and fully resolve discontinuities in the solution of the model equations.

2. Background

Most process optimization scenarios involve minimizing power requirements
95 while maintaining adequate gas flow for particulate transport. This typically translates to minimizing pressure drop in the system while maintaining a particular flow condition or regime suitable for the specific operation. Gas-solid models developed for process automation frameworks need to be accurate under the broad spectrum of flow regimes expected under dilute and dense phase
100 flow conditions but simple enough to minimize computational costs. For a vertical pneumatic transport system, Fig. 1 shows the typical curves of pressure drop as a function of superficial gas velocity at fixed solid mass feed rates (W_{s1} , W_{s2} , W_{s3}) also known as the flow characteristics curve (FCC) or Zenz state diagram [28].

105 Between AB, fluid-wall viscous/frictional resistance contribution to the pressure drop in the conduit predominates. In this section, annular pressure drop is directly proportional to gas velocity. Therefore, as gas velocity decreases, pressure drop decreases and vice-versa. Region (AB) is also known as the dilute flow region. The flow characteristic behavior of the fluid mixture while within
110 region AB is similar to the behavior of single phase gas flow ($W_{s0} = 0$). Between BC, pressure drop due to head loss and cloud particle drag are dominant. In this region, there exists an inverse relationship between superficial gas velocity and pressure drop in the conduit. This is due to the fact that as gas velocity is reduced below a critical value (point B), the rate of solid accumulation in

Figure 1: Flow regimes and transitions between dense and dilute phase flow conditions [Modified from Cheremisinoff et al. (1984)]

115 the conduit is higher, which ultimately translates to higher pressure difference across the conduit as a result of the higher hydrostatic head loss and cloud particle drag effects.

Fig. 1 also shows the various flow regimes experienced under both dilute and dense flow for vertical pneumatic transport. At point A (relatively higher
120 superficial gas velocities), solids concentration is distributed uniformly therefore the flow remains uniform. If superficial gas velocity is reduced (Between A and B), particles cluster around the pipe wall forming annular flow whereby higher

solids concentration is formed near the walls of the conduit with particles near the wall moving in the opposite direction relative to the gaseous phase (counter-current flow). At even lower superficial gas velocities, a transitional state is observed whereby the annular regions grows until it closes in on itself (Point B). At even lower superficial gas velocities (Between B and C), we begin to observe slug flow, whereby bubbles of particles moving with same orientation as the gaseous phase struggle to move through particles moving in the opposite direction. Here significant pressure oscillations is usually observed. If superficial gas velocity is lowered to point C, packed flow may be observed.

The idea behind a low-fidelity model is the ability to capture the prevailing flow conditions (i.e. pressure drop, solid concentrations and average phase velocities within the conduit) under varying flow regimes using empirical constitutive relations in a one dimensional two-fluid model.

3. The Mathematical Model

A one dimensional isothermal two-phase Eulerian-Eulerian transport equation may be expressed as follows:

$$\mathbf{U}_t + \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U})_x = \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{U}), \quad (1)$$

where:

$$\mathbf{U} = \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon \rho_g \\ (1 - \varepsilon) \rho_s \\ \varepsilon \rho_g v_g \\ (1 - \varepsilon) \rho_s v_s \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}) = \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon \rho_g v_g \\ (1 - \varepsilon) \rho_s v_s \\ \varepsilon \rho_g v_g^2 + p_g \\ (1 - \varepsilon) \rho_s v_s^2 + p_s \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{U}) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ F_{gg} + F_{wg} - F_d \\ F_{gs} + F_{ws} + F_d \end{bmatrix}$$

Subscripts g and s represents the gas and dispersed solids phases respectively. ρ, v and p are density, velocity, and pressure. ε is the gas volume fraction, which

is constrained by $\varepsilon_{min} < \varepsilon < 1$. The source term (**B**) contains analytical and
140 empirical relations for determining forces (per unit volume) due to gravity (F_{gi}),
wall friction (F_{wi}) and fluid-particle drag (F_d), where $i = g, s$. Eq. 1 contains
mass and momentum conservation for both the dispersed and carrier phases.
Since solid density (ρ_s) is a known constant, we have six unknowns and four
equations so far. However, the pressure of the gas and particulate phases may
145 be expressed as a function of gas density and particle concentration (volume
fraction) as follows.

Gas pressure is related to gas density and temperature by the following EOS:

$$p_g = \frac{RT}{M_g} \rho_g \quad (2)$$

where R , M_g and T are the universal gas constant ($R = 8.314 \times 10^3 \frac{J}{kmolK}$),
molecular mass of the gas phase ($M_{air} = 28.97 \frac{kg}{kmol}$) and fluid temperature.
For this isothermal system, pressure of the carrier phase is directly proportional
150 to its density with the proportionality constant $\frac{RT}{M_g}$.

The solid pressure is expressed in terms of a modulus of elasticity, $G(\varepsilon)$,
which is assumed to be a function only of the local value of the voidage. The
solid pressure gradient represents the normal stresses due to particle-particle
interactions. Its inclusion helps to prevent the solid phase from reaching unre-
alistic low values of void fraction in addition to helping to ensure strict hyper-
bolicity, which though not necessary for stability is a desirable characteristic. It
is expressed as follows:

$$\nabla p_s = G(\varepsilon) \nabla(1 - \varepsilon). \quad (3)$$

In order to maintain the conservative form of the physical flux as expressed in
Eq. 1 we re-write Eq. 3 as follows:

$$\nabla p_s = G(\varepsilon) \nabla(1 - \varepsilon) = \nabla((1 - \varepsilon)G(\varepsilon)) - (1 - \varepsilon) \nabla G(\varepsilon) \quad (4)$$

where the last term on the right hand side is the non-conservative contribution,
which is evaluated algebraically and treated as a forcing function.

A number of empirical correlations for the modulus of elasticity, $G(\varepsilon)$ have been proposed and several comparative studies [29, 30] have been carried out to test their efficacy. In this paper we adopt one proposed by Gidaspow and Ettehadieh [31]:

$$G(\varepsilon) = 10^{-8.76\varepsilon+5.43} \quad (5)$$

Eq. 1 can be expressed as:

$$\mathbf{U}_t + \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U})_x = \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{U}), \quad (6)$$

where:

$$\mathbf{U} = \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon \rho_g \\ (1 - \varepsilon) \rho_s \\ \varepsilon \rho_g v_g \\ (1 - \varepsilon) \rho_s v_s \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}) = \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon \rho_g v_g \\ (1 - \varepsilon) \rho_s v_s \\ \varepsilon \rho_g v_g^2 + a^2 \rho_g \\ (1 - \varepsilon) (\rho_s v_s^2 + G(\varepsilon)) \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{U}) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ F_{gg} + F_{wg} - F_d \\ (1 - \varepsilon) G(\varepsilon)_x + F_{gs} + F_{ws} + F_d \end{bmatrix}$$

a is the constant speed of sound determined as follows:

$$a = \sqrt{\frac{dp_g}{d\rho}} = \sqrt{\frac{RT}{M_g}} \quad (7)$$

The gravitational force per unit volume is determined as follows:

$$F_{gg} = \varepsilon \rho_g g, \quad F_{gs} = (1 - \varepsilon) (\rho_s - \rho_g) g \quad (8)$$

where g is the gravitational acceleration ($9.8 \frac{m}{s^2}$). The viscous force per unit volume is determined as follows:

$$F_{wi} = \frac{4}{d} \left(\frac{1}{2} \rho v_i^2 \right) f_i \quad i = g, s. \quad (9)$$

The parameters d and f are the pipe diameter and dimensionless friction factor respectively. For the gas phase friction factor, f_g , is a function of pipe roughness

(ϵ) and Reynolds number (Re):

$$\text{Re} = \frac{\epsilon \rho_g v_g d}{\mu_g} \quad (10)$$

where μ_g in Eq. 10 is the gas viscosity and may be determined from well known correlations (e.g. for dry air see Kadoya et al. [32]) at local temperatures and pressures or determined at operating temperature and assumed constant.

The coefficients of friction for the gas phase, f_g , is estimated from the fanning equation for laminar flow ($\text{Re} < 2100$) and Chen's [33] friction factor equation for turbulent flow conditions ($\text{Re} > 2100$) as expressed in Eq. 11.

$$f_g = \begin{cases} \frac{16}{\text{Re}} & \text{for Re} < 2100, \\ \frac{1}{16} \left(\log \left[\frac{(\frac{\epsilon}{d})}{3.7065} - \frac{5.0452}{\text{Re}} \log \left(\frac{(\frac{\epsilon}{d})^{1.1098}}{2.8257} + \frac{5.8506}{\text{Re}^{0.898}} \right) \right] \right)^{-2} & \text{for Re} > 2100. \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

The dispersed phase friction factor, f_s , is determined by the empirical correlation of Yang [34]:

$$f_s = \begin{cases} 0.00315 \frac{1-\epsilon}{\epsilon^3} \left((1-\epsilon) \frac{v_T}{v_g - v_s} \right)^{-0.979} & \text{for vertical flow} \\ 0.0293 \frac{1-\epsilon}{\epsilon^3} \left((1-\epsilon) \frac{v_g}{\sqrt{g D_h}} \right)^{-1.15} & \text{for horizontal flow,} \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

where terminal velocity of a single particle (v_T) is defined as:

$$v_T = \sqrt{\frac{4 (\rho_s - \rho_g) g d_p}{3 C_d \rho_g}} \quad (13)$$

The fluid-particle drag force (F_d) is estimated using Eq. 14. The inter-phase friction coefficient (β) is estimated using the drag equation in particle-laden fluid [35, 36, 37] expressed in Eq. 15.

$$F_d = \beta (v_g - v_s) \quad (14)$$

$$\beta = \frac{3}{4} \frac{C_d (1-\epsilon) \rho_g |v_g - v_s|}{d_p} g(\epsilon) \quad (15)$$

The parameters d_p and C_d are the weighted average particle diameter and dimensionless single sphere drag coefficient respectively. The voidage function,

$g(\varepsilon)$, accounts for the effects of neighboring particles on the drag of individual particles. For Wen and Yu [35], $g(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon^{-2.65}$. Di Felice [36] developed an improved correlation for the voidage function using the empirical correlation of Richardson and Zaki [38], which relates the fluidized flux velocity to the void fraction under varying flow regimes. Di Felice's voidage function is of the form:

$$g(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon^\eta \quad (16)$$

where:

$$\eta = 3.7 - 0.65 \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} (1.5 - \log Re_r)^2 \right].$$

Single sphere drag coefficient (C_d) is estimated with the correlation of Turton and Levenspiel [39]:

$$C_d = \begin{cases} \frac{24}{Re_r} + \frac{4.152}{Re_r^{0.343}} + \frac{0.413}{1+16300Re_r^{-1.09}} & \text{if } Re_r < 1 \times 10^5 \\ 0.44 & \text{if } Re_r > 1 \times 10^5 \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

where:

$$Re_r = \frac{\varepsilon \rho_g |v_g - v_s| d_p}{\mu_g}.$$

3.0.1. Characteristic Analysis

Eq. 6 may be expressed in it's quasi-linear form as follows:

$$\mathbf{U}_t + \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{U})\mathbf{U}_x = \mathbf{B}, \quad (18)$$

where the flux Jacobian matrix, $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{U})$, expressed in terms of primitive variables is as follows:

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -v_g^2 + \frac{a^2}{\varepsilon} & \frac{a^2 \rho_g}{\varepsilon \rho_s} & 2v_g & 0 \\ 0 & -v_s^2 + \frac{G(\varepsilon)}{\rho_s} & 0 & 2v_s \end{bmatrix} \quad (19)$$

The eigenvalues and eigenvectors of Eq. 19 and therefore Eq. 6 are as follows:

$$\Lambda = \begin{bmatrix} v_g - \frac{a}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & v_g + \frac{a}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & v_s - \sqrt{\frac{G(\varepsilon)}{\rho_s}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & v_s + \sqrt{\frac{G(\varepsilon)}{\rho_s}} \end{bmatrix} \quad (20)$$

$$\kappa_{1,2} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ v_g \mp \frac{a}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \kappa_{3,4} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \frac{\varepsilon \left(\sqrt{G(\varepsilon)} \pm \sqrt{\rho_s} (v_g - v_s) \right)^2 - a^2 \rho_s}{a^2 \rho_g} \\ v_s \mp \sqrt{\frac{G(\varepsilon)}{\rho_s}} \\ \frac{\left(v_s \sqrt{\rho_s} \mp \sqrt{G(\varepsilon)} \right) \left[\varepsilon \left(\sqrt{G(\varepsilon)} \pm \sqrt{\rho_s} (v_g - v_s) \right)^2 - a^2 \rho_s \right]}{a^2 \rho_g \rho_s} \end{bmatrix} \quad (21)$$

From characteristic analysis, it can be observed that Eq. 6 has real and distinct eigenvalues and is therefore strictly hyperbolic.

4. Numerical Method

The presence of shocks or discontinuities not only pose strict restrictions on the mathematical formulation of hyperbolic problems but also on the discretization techniques and numerical schemes necessary to resolve the physical phenomena accurately. Point wise approximations of the differential form of the conservation equations typically breakdown at discontinuities. This is because conservation laws of the form in Eq. 1 are derived from the integral form:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}}^{x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}} u(x, t) dx = -f(u(x, t)) \Big|_{x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}}^{x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}} \quad (22)$$

160 with the assumption that u and $f(u)$ are sufficiently smooth. However, this assumption breaks down when discontinuities are present in the solution. Eq. 22 implies that the rate of change of the substance (u) at any given time (t) is only due to the fluxes at the edges $x_{i \pm \frac{1}{2}}$.

A numerical discretization approach that is based on solving the integral form of conservation laws and thereby offering a better approximation of the physical system is the Finite Volume Method (FVM). The FVM formulation is obtained by integrating Eq. 22 from t^n to t^{n+1} to obtain:

$$\int_{x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}}^{x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}} u(x, t^{n+1}) dx - \int_{x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}}^{x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}} u(x, t^n) dx = - \int_{t^n}^{t^{n+1}} f(u(x, t)) \Big|_{x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}}^{x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}} dt. \quad (23)$$

The time integral on the right hand side of Eq. 23 cannot be evaluated exactly since the physical flux function, $f(u(x_{i\pm\frac{1}{2}}, t))$, varies with time. Thus the flux function is approximated numerically using an average value, $F_{i\pm\frac{1}{2}}$, within time interval t^n to t^{n+1} at the cell interfaces $x_{i\pm\frac{1}{2}}$. Eq. 23 may also be expressed as:

$$U_i^{n+1} = U_i^n + \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x} \left(F_{i-\frac{1}{2}} - F_{i+\frac{1}{2}} \right) \quad (24)$$

where:

$$U_i^n = \frac{1}{\Delta x} \int_{x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}}^{x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}} u(x, t^n) dx$$

$$F_{i\pm\frac{1}{2}} \approx \frac{1}{\Delta t} \int_{t^n}^{t^{n+1}} f(u(x_{i\pm\frac{1}{2}}, t)) dt.$$

U_i^n is the spatial average of the solution in the grid cell $x_i \in [x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}, x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}]$ at time t^n .

165

Eq. 24 is a fully discretized finite volume formulation and applicable to both scalar and systems of conservation laws. However, we may also adopt a semi-discrete formulation by integrating Eq. 1 only along its spatial dimension to obtain the ODE:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{U}(t) = R_i(\mathbf{U}) \quad (25)$$

where

$$R_i(\mathbf{U}) = \frac{1}{\Delta x} \left(F_{i-\frac{1}{2}} - F_{i+\frac{1}{2}} \right).$$

Eq. 25 is a semi-discrete formulation and it permits the use of higher-order time integration methods in propagating the solution in time. It also remains a finite volume formulation if $\mathbf{U}(t)$ is taken to be the average values of the conserved variables in each grid cell $x_i \in [x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}, x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}]$ at time t . Note however, that the numerical fluxes ($F_{i\pm\frac{1}{2}}$) in Eq. 25 are different from those of Eq. 24. Instead of time averages, $F_{i\pm\frac{1}{2}}$ in Eq. 25 are evaluated at time, t .

170

The numerical flux averages are sensitive to time step sizes especially in the explicit formulation of Eq. 24 . Therefore, in order to remain within the domain of dependence in every block at each time step, the following limitation are applied:

$$\Delta t = CFL \frac{\Delta x}{(\lambda_{\Omega}^n)_{max}} \quad (26)$$

where $(\lambda_{\Omega}^n)_{max}$ is the maximum λ across the spatial domain at t^n and the Courant-Friedrichs-Lewy (*CFL*) number [40] is a dimensionless quantity. The CFL number may be regarded as the ratio of $(\lambda_{\Omega}^n)_{max}$ to the grid speed $(\Delta x/\Delta t)$ and determined by the choice of numerical scheme employed in approximating the numerical fluxes as well as the choice of numerical integrator in the case of the semi-descrete formulation of Eq 25.

4.1. Monotone Schemes

Any choice of numerical flux that satisfies the consistency condition will result in a conservative scheme. The consistency property is met if for a constant value of U whereby $U_i = U_{i+1} = U$, then:

$$F_{i+\frac{1}{2}} = F_{i+\frac{1}{2}}(U_i, U_{i+1}) = F(U). \quad (27)$$

A detailed account of numerical schemes for hyperbolic systems is beyond the scope of this study but may be found in the works of Trangenstein [41], LeVeque [42], Toro [43], Barth and Deconinck [44] and Hirsch [45] among others. However, we would discuss the few relevant to the current study.

A tempting but naive approximation for the numerical flux function is the arithmetic average of the fluxes between two neighboring cells that produces a centered 2nd-order scheme. However, the resulting scheme is unconditionally unstable regardless of the size of the time step adopted. Another centered scheme that's similar but conditionally stable for $0 < CFL < 1$ is the Lax-Friedrich (LxF) method:

$$F_{i+\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{1}{2}(F_i + F_{i+1}) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\Delta x}{\Delta t} (U_i - U_{i+1}) \quad (28)$$

The last term on the right hand side is known as the numerical viscosity term. Although the viscous term is necessary for stability, it artificially smears (or
185 spreads) discontinuities in the solution thereby affecting how accurately shocks are captured. The front smearing, also known as numerical diffusion, is typical of most first-order monotone schemes including those that take into account the physics of propagating wave contributions such as flux vector splitting (FVS) methods [46, 47], Kinetic-FVS [48, 49], Godunov-type schemes [50, 51, 52, 53, 54]
190 and other approximate Reimann solvers [55, 56, 57, 58]. However, it is important to note that the later are significantly less diffusive relative to the LxF scheme.

Perhaps the most widely accepted of the aforementioned schemes is that of Roe [52, 53, 54]. For this reason, it has enjoyed extensive application and several improvements have been made to resolve a number of its short-comings since it was first introduced. One such short-coming is the generation of unphysical rarefaction shocks, which violate the entropy condition (see [59, 60, 61]). Roe's method solves the non-linear local Riemann problem by approximating it with a linearized cell-edge-average constant-coefficient linear system of the form:

$$\mathbf{U}_t + \tilde{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{U}_x = 0, \quad 0 < x < L, \quad t > 0 \quad (29)$$

$$\text{I.C.: } \mathbf{U}(x, 0) = \mathbf{U}^0(x) = \begin{cases} U_L & \text{if } x < x_0 \\ U_R & \text{if } x > x_0, \end{cases}$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \tilde{\mathbf{A}}(U_L, U_R)$ is evaluated at cell edges and must satisfy both the consistency and conservation properties expressed as follows:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{U}) = \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{U}) \quad (30)$$

$$\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_R) - \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}_L) = \tilde{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{U}_R - \mathbf{U}_L) \quad (31)$$

Roe developed a method for determining the cell-edge-average matrix, $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$, by introducing an intermediate variable ($\mathbf{Q}$), such that $\mathbf{U}$ and $\mathbf{F}$ can be expressed in terms of $\mathbf{Q}$ with the aid of transformation matrices as follows:

$$\Delta \mathbf{U} = \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\mathbf{Q})\Delta \mathbf{Q}, \quad (32)$$

$$\Delta \mathbf{F} = \tilde{\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{Q})\Delta \mathbf{Q} \quad (33)$$

From Eqs. 32 and 33 we obtain the following:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \tilde{\mathbf{C}}\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^{-1}. \quad (34)$$

Roe and Pike [54] later presented a more efficient approach to determining $\tilde{\kappa}_i$, $\tilde{\lambda}_i$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_i$. It involves obtaining what is known as the Roe-Pike averages, which are then used to evaluate $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$ or $\tilde{\kappa}_i$, $\tilde{\lambda}_i$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_i$ at cell edges. The numerical flux for Roe scheme with entropy correction typically takes the form:

$$F_{i+\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{1}{2}(F_i + F_{i+1}) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^m \tilde{\alpha}_j \psi(\tilde{\lambda}_j) \tilde{\kappa}_j \quad (35)$$

In this study we were able to develop a new set of Roe-Pike averages for the non-linear hyperbolic system expressed in Eq. 6 by introducing the intermediate variable ($\mathbf{Q}$) of the form:

$$\mathbf{Q} = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\varepsilon \rho_g} \\ \sqrt{(1-\varepsilon)\rho_s} \\ v_g \sqrt{\varepsilon \rho_g} \\ v_s \sqrt{(1-\varepsilon)\rho_s} \end{bmatrix} \quad (36)$$

The resulting Roe-Pike averages are as follows:

$$\tilde{\varepsilon} = 1 - \frac{1}{4} \left(\sqrt{1-\varepsilon_L} + \sqrt{1-\varepsilon_R} \right)^2 \quad (37)$$

$$\tilde{\rho}_g = \frac{1}{4\tilde{\varepsilon}} \left(\sqrt{\varepsilon_L \rho_{gL}} + \sqrt{\varepsilon_R \rho_{gR}} \right)^2 \quad (38)$$

$$\tilde{v}_g = \frac{v_{gL} \sqrt{\varepsilon_L \rho_{gL}} + v_{gR} \sqrt{\varepsilon_R \rho_{gR}}}{\sqrt{\varepsilon_L \rho_{gL}} + \sqrt{\varepsilon_R \rho_{gR}}} \quad (39)$$

$$\tilde{v}_s = \frac{v_{sL} \sqrt{1-\varepsilon_L} + v_{sR} \sqrt{1-\varepsilon_R}}{\sqrt{1-\varepsilon_L} + \sqrt{1-\varepsilon_R}} \quad (40)$$

4.2. Higher-Order Monotonicity Preserving Schemes

The disadvantage of the monotone schemes presented here is that they experience smearing or numerical diffusion at discontinuities. Higher-order schemes,

195 which include those of Lax-Wendroff (LW) [62], Richtmyer [63], MacCormack [64], weighted-average flux (WAF) [65], [66] and those based on MUSCL-reconstruction [67], [68], [69], [70], [71], resolve discontinuous fronts better but produce spurious oscillations at sharp gradients. These non-physical oscillations also referred

to as numerical dispersion exist as numerical artifacts in the solution. In an
 200 effort to combine the benefits of higher-order schemes with the monotone nature of first-order schemes, higher-order monotonicity preserving schemes were developed. Schemes based on ensuring the Total Variation Diminishing (TVD) property and Essentially Non-Oscillatory (ENO) type [72], help to limit the numerical dispersion experienced with higher-order schemes.

In this study we apply the following Roe-type higher-order TVD scheme:

$$F_{i+\frac{1}{2}} = F_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^{Roe} + \Psi^- (F_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^{Roe} - F_i) \quad (41)$$

where:

$$F_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^{Roe} = \frac{1}{2}(F_i + F_{i+1}) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^m \tilde{\alpha}_j \psi(\tilde{\lambda}_j) \tilde{\kappa}_j$$

$$\Psi^- = \frac{1}{2} \left(\phi_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^- - \frac{\phi_{i+\frac{3}{2}}^-}{r_{i+\frac{3}{2}}^-} \right)$$

$$r_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^+ = \frac{F_{i+2} - F_{i+\frac{3}{2}}^{Roe}}{F_{i+1} - F_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^{Roe}}$$

$$r_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^- = \frac{F_{i-1} - F_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^{Roe}}{F_i - F_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^{Roe}}$$

$\psi(\tilde{\lambda}_j)$ is the entropy fix [59, 60, 61] and ϕ are flux limiters.

205 All the limiters listed in Table 1 were tested and the resulting HO-TVD Roe-type scheme utilized in this study was found to be stable regardless of the choice of flux-limiter applied.

4.3. Initial and Boundary Specifications

Typically, the superficial gas velocity, v_{gs} , solids mass flux, W_s , and solids
 210 concentration, $1 - \varepsilon_{in}$, are known at the conduit inlet terminal and can be specified. In addition, the outlet pressure, p_{out} , is also usually known and can also be specified. We have assumed that the conduit was free of solids and under no flow condition for all of the simulation conducted in this study. Initial and boundary conditions were therefore specified as follows:

Limiter Name	Limiter	$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \phi$	Reference
van Leer	$\phi_{vl}(r) = \frac{r+ r }{1+ r }$	2	van Leer, 1974
MC***	$\phi_{mc}(r) = \max[0, \min(2r, 0.5(1+r), 2)]$	2	van Leer, 1977
van Albada	$\phi_{va}(r) = \frac{r^2+r}{r^2+1}$	1	van Albada et al., 1982
Minmod	$\phi_{mm}(r) = \max[0, \min(1, r)]$	1	Roe, 1982
SuperBee	$\phi_{sb}(r) = \max[0, \min(2r, 1), \min(r, 2)]$	2	Roe, 1983
Osher**	$\phi_{os}(r) = \max[0, \min(r, \beta)]^*$	β	Chakravathy & Osher, 1983
Sweby	$\phi_{sw}(r) = \max[0, \min(\beta r, 1), \min(r, \beta)]^*$	β	Sweby, 1984
Ospre	$\phi_{op}(r) = \frac{1.5(r^2+r)}{(r^2+r+1)}$	1.5	Waterson & Deconinck, 1995
* $1 \leq \beta \leq 2$ ** <i>Assymmetric Limiter</i> *** <i>Monotonized Central (MC)</i>			

Table 1: Example of limiters from literature

I.C.:

$$[\varepsilon, \rho_g, v_g, v_s]_{t=0} = \begin{cases} \varepsilon_{in}, \frac{p_{out} M_g}{RT}, \frac{v_{gs}}{\varepsilon_{in}}, \frac{W_s}{(1-\varepsilon_{in})\rho_s} & \text{for } x = 0 \\ 1, \frac{p_{out} M_g}{RT}, 0, 0 & \text{for } x > 0 \end{cases}$$

B.C.:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon \\ v_g \\ v_s \\ \frac{\partial \rho_g}{\partial x} \end{bmatrix}_{x=0} = \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_{in} \\ \frac{v_{gs}}{\varepsilon_{in}} \\ \frac{W_s}{(1-\varepsilon_{in})\rho_s} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}; \quad \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial x} \\ \frac{\partial v_g}{\partial x} \\ \frac{\partial v_s}{\partial x} \\ p \end{bmatrix}_{x=H} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ p_{out} \end{bmatrix};$$

215 where H is the height of the conduit.

5. Results and Discussion

We begin by replicating the one-dimensional simulation conducted by Tsuo and Gidaspow [13]. They simulated the vertical transport of 520 micron diameter glass beads with density of 2.62 g/cm^3 using air flowing at superficial gas velocity of 5 m/s and a solids flux of $25 \text{ kg/m}^2/\text{s}$ in a grounded 7.62 cm diameter acrylic plastic pipe. Boundary specifications were as follows:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 - \varepsilon_{in} \\ v_{gs} \\ W_s \\ p_{out} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.0246 \\ 4.979 \frac{\text{m}}{\text{s}} \\ 25 \frac{\text{kg}}{\text{m}^2 \text{s}} \\ 1 \text{ atm} \end{bmatrix}$$

Figure 2: One-dimensional transient simulation of vertical gas-solids flow [Tsuo and Gidaspow (1990)]

Fig. 2 (a) shows the computed solids concentration profile at one second intervals. The dashed lines are simulation results from Tsuo and Gidaspow [13] while solid lines were generated using the HO-TVD Roe scheme from the current study. Figs. 2 (b-d) represent the corresponding pressure and solids velocity and gas interstitial velocity profiles respectively. Fig. 2 (b) illustrate the effect of the invasion of solids on pressure drop before the entire conduit was completely invaded by solids. Fig. 2 (c) illustrates the corresponding velocity of the invading solids as they propagate along the conduit. And Fig. 2 (d) illustrates the turbulent changes in gas velocity at the early time period prior to its stabilization after about 3 seconds.

Tsuo and Gidaspow [13] reported their computed solids concentration in the fully developed region under steady-state flow is 0.0065. This result shows a 43.5 % prediction error relative to Luo's [17] measured experimental data. Computed solids concentration in the fully developed region from the current study is 0.0088 indicating a 23.5 % error relative to Luo's measured data. However, considering the comments from Tsuo and Gidaspow [13] about the inaccuracies of the x-ray densitometer utilized by Luo for his measurements, we have decided to estimate the solids concentration at steady-state analytically.

Under steady-state flow, the mass flux of both gas and particulate phases (W_g and W_s) as well as slip velocity (v_{slip}) between phases may be assumed constant. Therefore, the slip velocity under steady-state flow may be expressed as follows:

$$v_{slip} = v_g - v_s = \frac{W_g}{\varepsilon \rho_g} - \frac{W_s}{(1 - \varepsilon) \rho_s} \quad (42)$$

The slip velocity may also be roughly estimated using the terminal velocity (v_T) of individual particles [73] for relatively low solids concentrations as follows:

$$v_T = \sqrt{\frac{4}{3} \frac{d_p(\rho_s - \rho_g)g}{\rho_g C_d}} \quad (43)$$

Setting v_{slip} to v_T and combining the expression in Eqs. 42 and 43, we obtain the following quadratic expression:

$$\varepsilon^2 - \left(1 + \frac{W_g}{\rho_g v_T} + \frac{W_s}{\rho_s v_T}\right) \varepsilon + \frac{W_g}{\rho_g v_T} = 0 \quad (44)$$

In order to ensure $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, Eq. 44 may be solved to obtain the steady-state solids concentration ($1 - \varepsilon_{ss}$) as follows:

$$\varepsilon_{ss} = \frac{1}{2} \left(-b - \sqrt{b^2 - 4c} \right) \quad (45)$$

where:

$$b = -\left(1 + c + \frac{W_s}{\rho_s v_T}\right)$$

$$c = \frac{W_g}{\rho_g v_T} \approx \frac{v_{gs}}{v_T}$$

235 Using the analytical expression in Eq. 45, we obtain a steady-state concentration of 0.0091. Comparing the solids concentrations obtained from simulation to that obtained from the analytical expression, we find that Tsuo and Gidaspow [13] were off by 22.6 %. However, the solids concentration prediction from the current study were within 2.6 % of the estimated value.

240 The accuracy of the HO-TVD scheme even for flow conditions experiencing annular counter-current flow lies not only in its capacity to capture discontinuous fronts. The improvement in accuracy observed in this study is also due to the conservative finite volume formulation (Eqs. 24 and 25) employed. This

is because we are not computing the primitive variables $(\varepsilon, \rho_g, v_g, v_s)$ directly,
 245 but rather we compute the volume averages of the conserved variables and we
 later decompose them into the primitive variables seen in Fig. 2. This way we
 are somewhat implicitly accounting for counter-current flow through the vol-
 ume average formulation, which ensures that the conserved variables remain
 conserved. The application of this numerical approach as a building block for
 250 two- and three-dimensional models for compressible multiphase flow problems
 would significantly improve the accuracy of such high-fidelity models as well.
 However, it is important to note that the conservative formulation alone is not
 sufficient for model prediction accuracy.

Figure 3: Solids concentration profiles at different inlet specifications using LxF (a & c) and HO-TVD Roe (b & d) schemes

In order to further illustrate the effect of the numerical scheme on solids
 255 concentration predictions we simulate the same conditions specified previously
 using the highly diffusive Lax-Friedrich (LxF) scheme. Fig. 3 (a) shows the
 computed solids concentration profiles at one second interval obtained using
 the LxF scheme. Solid concentration was over-predicted by the LxF scheme
 with 47.8 % and 68.7 % error relative Luo's measurement and the analytical

260 expression of Eq. 45 respectively. Fig. 3 (b) is exactly the same as Fig. 2 (a) and only included in Fig. 3 for comparison.

Furthermore, we test the sensitivity of computed solids concentration in the fully developed region to the specified inlet solids concentration. Fig. 3 (c and d) show simulation results with inlet solids concentration of 0.042 while 265 keeping the total mass flux of solids (W_s) and superficial gas velocity (v_{gs}) unchanged. It can be observed that the computed solids concentration in the fully developed region obtained using the dissipative LxF scheme is significantly influenced by the inlet specification. However, the opposite is the case for the solutions obtained using the HO-TVD Roe scheme. This is not surprising due 270 to the fact that the total amount of solids entering the conduit remained the same for all results in Fig. 3. The inlet solids concentration specified would only affect the inlet phase velocities to ensure that the total mass flux of solids (W_s) does not change under the specified superficial gas velocity (v_{gs}) as shown in Section 4.3 under boundary specifications. Therefore, the steady-state solids 275 concentration in the fully developed region should not be influenced by inlet solids concentration if the solids mass flux and superficial gas velocity specified at the inlet remains the same. This concept may also be explained through the analytical expression for steady-state solids concentration (Eq. 45). It can be observed that ε_{ss} is dependent on W_s and v_{gs} but not a function of the inlet 280 solids concentration.

The criticism of Luo's measurement technique was that it was inaccurate under annular flow regime where the solids concentration in the center of the conduit drops significantly below solids concentrations in the near-wall region. However, Luo's measurement technique would be relatively accurate in regions where annular segregation is not likely. An example of that would be the pipe inlet region where the particulate phase is still fully dispersed as they are injected into the acrylic pipe. Therefore, we decided to investigate the accuracy of the current model in predicting void fraction at the pipe inlet region. The system is similar to that investigated in Tsuo and Gidaspow's study however,

the boundary specifications were as follows:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_{in} \\ v_{gs} \\ W_s \\ p_{out} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.975 \\ 11.2 \frac{m}{s} \\ 34.81 \frac{kg}{m^2 s} \\ 1.068 atm \end{bmatrix}$$

Figure 4: Inlet profiles at steady-state [Luo (1987)]

Fig. 4 (a-d) represent gas velocity, pressure, solids velocity and void fraction (ε) profiles respectively. Figs. 4 (b and d) illustrate the agreement between the results obtained using the HO-TVD Roe scheme and Luo's measurement. However, the results obtained using the dissipative LxF scheme showed poor agreement with Luo's measurement even for a refined grid size of 300 grid cells (or blocks) for the less than one meter inlet section. It can also be observed that 100 grid cells were more than sufficient for simulating the inlet section of the pipe when using the HO-TVD Roe scheme since there seems to be barely any noticeable change in the voidage profile when the number of grid cells were increased to 300.

An additional experimental dataset for dry air drilling operations conducted in the Drilling Hydraulics Research Center at The Pennsylvania State University

between 1990 and 2003 was also studied. Temple et al. [74, 75] set out to
 295 determine the optimum circulation air velocity for efficient wellbore cleaning.
 They obtained flow characteristic curves (FCCs) under constant solid mass feed
 rates and fixed average particle sizes in a closed loop system. They concluded
 that the optimum annular flow velocity corresponds to the point of minimum
 pressure differential in their FCC plots.

300 Their experimental results indicated that solids volume fraction (or solids
 concentration) depends primarily on annular air velocity and solids mass feed
 rate, which is in concurrence with the findings this study. Their results also
 show that the steady-state solids concentration in the fully developed region is
 independent of particle size. However, they showed that the point of minimum
 305 pressure drop on the FCC plot is highly dependent on particle diameter, and
 to a lesser degree, on solids mass feed rate. Figs. 5 and 6 show a comparison
 of our simulation with Temple's [74, 75] experimental data around the region
 of minimum pressure difference where counter-current flow may be observed.
 In order to use the current one-dimensional model to simulate annular flow we
 310 defined the conduit hydraulic diameter as the difference between the wellbore ID
 and drill pipe OD [76]. Solids mass feed rate, $W_s \approx 15 \frac{g}{s}$ and volume averaged
 particle diameter, $\bar{d}_p \approx 346.5 \mu m$ for both simulations. Boundary specifications
 were defined as follows:

Simulation 1:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_{in} \\ v_{gs} \\ W_s \\ p_{out} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.998 \\ 7.22 \frac{m}{s} \\ 15.29 \frac{g}{s} \\ 0.9568 \text{ atm} \end{bmatrix}$$

Simulation 2:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_{in} \\ v_{gs} \\ W_s \\ p_{out} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.998 \\ 6.15 \frac{m}{s} \\ 15.4 \frac{g}{s} \\ 0.9541 \text{ atm} \end{bmatrix}$$

Figure 5: Inlet profiles at steady-state for Simulation 1

Figure 6: Inlet profiles at steady-state for Simulation 2

Temple [75] reported that they experienced small fluctuations in the particle flow rates due to operational limitations of the L-valve used to introduce solids into the wellbore. The sensitivity of the diaphragm-type differential pressure manometers combined with the flow fluctuations created significant pressure oscillations during their experiments. Although the observed oscillations were

somewhat dampened by their use of sintered brass inserts in the pressure taps, Temple recorded an experimental error of $\pm 25\%$ for their differential pressure readings. Temple et al. [74, 75] also reported that their recorded solids concentrations were estimated using the following expression:

$$(1 - \varepsilon) = \frac{q_s}{q_s + q_g} \quad (46)$$

where q_s and q_g represent solids volumetric rate and annular air flow rates respectively.

It is not likely that Eq. 46 would provide accurate estimates of solids concentration in the annulus as it does not take into consideration fluid compressibility and slip velocity between phases. As a result, Eq. 46 is expected to underestimate solids concentration. However, despite the reported measurement error in pressure readings and estimated solids concentration using Eq. 46, our simulation results appear to match Temple's data satisfactorily.

6. Conclusions

In this study we presented a set of flow equations and constitutive relations for a one-dimensional two-fluid gas-solids flow model. The model equations are formulated in a manner that ensures the physical flux of the hyperbolic system remains conservative despite the inclusion of solids normal stress through the empirical formula for modulus of elasticity. From characteristic analysis, we showed that the physical flux and thereby the flow equation maintains strict hyperbolicity and we presented a set of Roe-Pike averages for the hyperbolic system of equations. The resulting Roe-Pike averages were used to construct a Roe-type approximate Riemann solver that is stable regardless of the choice of flux-limiter applied. A higher-order total variation diminishing (HO-TVD) Roe-type scheme was used to compute the solution of the two-fluid system using a conservative finite volume formulation. An analytical expression for steady-state solids concentration was also presented and used to validate the numerical solution in addition to experimental data. The following conclusions may be inferred from the analysis presented here:

1. The higher-resolution conservative scheme based on the computation of volume averages of the conserved variables employed in this study helped
340 to improve the accuracy of model predictions significantly even for regimes where counter-current flow is present.
2. Solids concentration at steady state is primarily dependent on solids mass feed rate and superficial gas velocity.
3. Solids concentration in the fully developed region is independent of inlet
345 solids concentration.
4. Grid-refinement requirements were reduced when the HO-TVD Roe-type scheme is used compared to more dissipative schemes like Lax-Friedrich.
5. The numerical approach presented here would serve as a good building block for two- and three-dimensional forms of gas-solids two-phase flow
350 modeling.

7. Future Studies

While we have illustrated the accuracy of the use of conservative variables and the HO-TVD scheme in improving model predictions in low-fidelity models such as the one-dimensional isothermal two-fluid model for pneumatic convey-
355 ing, there is still much to be studied. Most importantly, the current study focuses primarily on vertical pneumatic conveying. However, this model is most likely insufficient for transient flow studies in horizontal and angular gas-solids flow systems due to solids deposition. Solids deposition produces a different kind of segregated flow phenomena that can neither be resolved simply by high-
360 resolution schemes nor the computation of volume averages of conserved variables. This is because it involves the static accumulation of solids along sections of the conduit, which is different from the segregated flow observed in vertical pneumatic conveying systems.

Another important area of study not addressed here is supercritical fluid
365 conveying. This is when the carrier fluid is allowed to transition into supercritical phase as would be observed when fluids like CO_2 or N_2 are used in

conveying proppants downhole while pressurizing a hydrocarbon reservoir during hydraulic fracking. Here, a thermodynamic model must be used to account for the properties of the carrier phase as transitions from gas to gas-like and/or liquid-like supercritical fluid.

Futhermore, the current study is focused on isothermal conveying conditions. However, this assumption might be inappropriate for certain practical applications of gas-solids flow.

8. Acknowledgment

This research was sponsored by Penn State, Department of Energy and Mineral Engineering in the College of Earth and Mineral Sciences.

References

- [1] W. Rivard, M. Torrey, K-fix: A computer program for transient, Two-dimensional, Two-Fluid Flow (Report LA-NUREG-6623, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, 1977).
- [2] M. Syamlal, Multiphase hydrodynamics of gas-solids flow, Ph.D. thesis, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago (1985).
- [3] M. Syamlal, W. Rogers, T. J. OBrien, Mfix documentation: Theory guide, National Energy Technology Laboratory, Department of Energy, Technical Note DOE/METC-95/1013 and NTIS/DE95000031.
- [4] H. Arastoopour, P. Pakdel, M. Adewumi, Hydrodynamic analysis of dilute gassolids flow in a vertical pipe, Powder Technology 62 (2) (1990) 163 – 170. doi:[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0032-5910\(90\)80080-I](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0032-5910(90)80080-I).
- [5] K. H. Bendiksen, D. Maines, R. Moe, S. Nuland, et al., The dynamic two-fluid model olga: Theory and application, SPE production engineering 6 (02) (1991) 171–180.

- [6] C. Pauchon, H. Dhulesia, et al., Tacite: A transient tool for multiphase pipeline and well simulation, in: SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition, Society of Petroleum Engineers, 1994.
- 395 [7] F. Vigneron, C. Sarica, J. Brill, Experimental analysis of imposed two-phase flow transients in horizontal pipelines, in: 7th International Conference, Multiphase, Vol. 95, 1995, pp. 199–217.
- [8] NREG/CR-3858, L.A-10157-MS, 1986 (unpublished).
- [9] V. H. Ranson, NUREG/CR-1826, 1982 (unpublished).
- 400 [10] V. Ransom, R. Wagner, J. Trapp, Relap5 two-phase fluid model and numerical scheme for economic lwr system simulation, Tech. rep., Idaho National Engineering Lab., Idaho Falls (USA) (1981).
- [11] V. Ransom, R. Wagner, J. Trapp, The relap5 two-phase fluid model and numerical scheme for economic lwr system simulation, in: Transient two-
405 phase flow, 1983.
- [12] J. C. Micaelli, 87-58, CEA, France, 1987 (unpublished).
- [13] Y. P. Tsuo, D. Gidaspo, Computation of flow patterns in circulating fluidized beds, AIChE Journal 36 (6) (1990) 885–896.
- [14] I. Toumi, A. Kumbaro, An approximate linearized riemann solver for a
410 two-fluid model, Journal of Computational Physics 124 (2) (1996) 286–300.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jcph.1996.0060>.
- [15] D. Drew, L. Cheng, R. Lahey, The analysis of virtual mass effects in two-phase flow, International Journal of Multiphase Flow 5 (4) (1979) 233–242.
- [16] R. Lahey, L. Cheng, D. Drew, J. Flaherty, The effect of virtual mass on the
415 numerical stability of accelerating two-phase flows, International Journal of Multiphase Flow 6 (4) (1980) 281–294.

- [17] K. M. Luo, Dilute, dense-phase and maximum solids-gas transport, Ph.D. thesis, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago (1987).
- [18] K. M. Luo, Experimental gas-solid vertical transport, Tech. rep., Illinois
420 Inst. of Tech., Chicago (USA). Dept. of Chemical Engineering (1987).
- [19] D. Gidaspow, Y. Tsuo, K. Luo, Computed and experimental cluster formation and velocity profiles in circulating fluidized beds, 1989.
- [20] M. Syamlal, A hyperbolic model for fluid–solids two-phase flow, Chemical Engineering Science 66 (19) (2011) 4421–4425.
- 425 [21] T. Y. Hou, P. G. Le Floch, Why nonconservative schemes converge to wrong solutions: error analysis, Math. Comput. 62 (206) (1994) 497–530.
doi:10.2307/2153520.
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2153520>
- [22] J. Hudson, D. Harris, A high resolution scheme for eulerian gassolid two-
430 phase isentropic flow, Journal of Computational Physics 216 (2) (2006) 494 – 525. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2005.12.010>.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0021999105005620>
- [23] D. Gidaspow, Hydrodynamics of fluidization and heat transfer: Supercom-
435 puter modeling, Applied Mechanics Reviews 39 (1) (1986) 1–23.
- [24] H. Kamath, X. Du, A roe-average algorithm for a granular-gas model with non-conservative terms, Journal of Computational Physics 228 (21) (2009) 8187 – 8202. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2009.08.005>.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0021999109004422>
440
- [25] A. Goldshtein, M. Shapiro, Mechanics of collisional motion of granular materials. part 1. general hydrodynamic equations, Journal of Fluid Mechanics 282 (1995) 75–114.

- [26] S. Ibraheem, M. Adewumi, J. Savidge, Numerical simulation of hydrate
445 transport in natural gas pipeline, *Journal of energy resources technology*
120 (1) (1998) 20–26.
- [27] D. Mao, J. R. Edwards, A. V. Kuznetsov, R. K. Srivastava, Development
of low-diffusion flux-splitting methods for dense gas–solid flows, *Journal of
Computational Physics* 185 (1) (2003) 100–119.
- [28] F. A. Zenz, Two-phase fluid-solid flow, *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry*
450 41 (12) (1949) 2801–2806.
- [29] M. Massoudi, K. Rajagopal, J. Ekmann, M. Mathur, Remarks on the
modeling of fluidized systems, *AIChE Journal* 38 (3) (1992) 471–472.
doi:10.1002/aic.690380317.
455 URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/aic.690380317>
- [30] D. Patil, M. van Sint Annaland, J. Kuipers, Critical comparison of
hydrodynamic models for gas-solid fluidized beds - Part I : bubbling
gassolid fluidized beds operated with a jet, *Chemical Engineering Science*
60 (1) (2005) 57 – 72. doi:10.1016/j.ces.2004.07.059.
460 URL [http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/
S0009250904005007](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0009250904005007)
- [31] D. Gidaspow, B. Ettehadieh, Fluidization in two-dimensional beds with a
jet. 2. hydrodynamic modeling, *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Fun-
damentals* 22 (2) (1983) 193–201. arXiv:[http://pubs.acs.org/doi/pdf/
10.1021/i100010a008](http://pubs.acs.org/doi/pdf/10.1021/i100010a008), doi:10.1021/i100010a008.
465 URL <http://pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/i100010a008>
- [32] K. Kadoya, N. Matsunaga, A. Nagashima, Viscosity and thermal conduc-
tivity of dry air in the gaseous phase, *Journal of physical and chemical
reference data* 14 (4) (1985) 947–970.
- [33] N. H. Chen, An explicit equation for friction factor in pipe, *Indus-
470 trial & Engineering Chemistry Fundamentals* 18 (3) (1979) 296–297.

arXiv:<http://pubs.acs.org/doi/pdf/10.1021/i160071a019>, doi:10.1021/i160071a019.

URL <http://pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/i160071a019>

- 475 [34] W. C. Yang, A unified theory on dilute phase pneumatic transport, *Journal of Powder and Bulk Solids Technology* 1 (1977) 89–95.

- [35] C. Wen, Y. Yu, A generalized method for predicting the minimum fluidization velocity, *AIChE Journal* 12 (3) (1966) 610–612. doi:10.1002/aic.690120343.

480 URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/aic.690120343>

- [36] R. D. Felice, The voidage function for fluid-particle interaction systems, *International Journal of Multiphase Flow* 20 (1) (1994) 153 – 159. doi:[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0301-9322\(94\)90011-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0301-9322(94)90011-6).

URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301932294900116>

- [37] N. Epstein, The voidage function for the drag force ratio in a liquid-fluidized bed, *The Canadian Journal of Chemical Engineering* 83 (3) (2005) 566–572. doi:10.1002/cjce.5450830321.

URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/cjce.5450830321>

- 490 [38] J. F. Richardson, W. N. Zaki, Sedimentation and fluidization: part i., *Trans. Instn. Chem. Engrs* 32 (1954) 35–53.

- [39] R. Turton, O. Levenspiel, A short note on the drag correlation for spheres, *Powder Technology* 47 (1) (1986) 83 – 86. doi:10.1016/0032-5910(86)80012-2.

495 URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0032591086800122>

- [40] R. Courant, K. Friedrichs, H. Lewy, On the partial difference equations of mathematical physics, *IBM Journal of Research and Development* 11 (2) (1967) 215–234.

- 500 [41] J. A. Trangenstein, Numerical solution of hyperbolic partial differential equations, Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [42] R. J. LeVeque, Finite volume methods for hyperbolic problems, Vol. 31, Cambridge university press, 2002.
- [43] E. F. Toro, Riemann solvers and numerical methods for fluid dynamics: a practical introduction, Springer, Berlin, 1999.
- 505 [44] T. J. Barth, H. Deconinck, High order methods for computational physics, Vol. 9, Springer, 1999.
- [45] C. Hirsch, Numerical computation of internal and external flows, volume 2: Computational methods for inviscid and viscous flows, vol. 2 (1990).
- 510 [46] J. L. Steger, R. Warming, Flux vector splitting of the inviscid gasdynamic equations with application to finite-difference methods, Journal of Computational Physics 40 (2) (1981) 263 – 293. doi:10.1016/0021-9991(81)90210-2.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0021999181902102>
- 515 [47] B. van Leer, Flux-vector splitting for the euler equations Technical Report, NASA Langley Research Center.
URL <http://ntrs.nasa.gov/search.jsp?R=19840052563>
- [48] J. Mandal, S. Deshpande, Kinetic flux vector splitting for euler equations, Computers & Fluids 23 (2) (1994) 447 – 478. doi:10.1016/0045-7930(94)90050-7.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0045793094900507>
- 520 [49] N. Anil, N. Rajan, S. Deshpande, Modified kinetic flux vector splitting (m-kfvs) method for compressible flows, Computers & Fluids 48 (1) (2011) 137 – 149. doi:10.1016/j.compfluid.2011.04.005.

URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S004579301100137X>

- [50] S. K. Godunov, A finite difference method for the computation of discontinuous solutions of the equations of fluid dynamics, *Mathematicheskii sbornik* 47 (1959) 357–393.
- [51] S. K. Godunov, A difference scheme for numerical solution of discontinuous solution of hydrodynamic equations, *Mat. Sb.* 47 (1969) 271–306, (translated, US Joint Publ. Res. Service, JPRS 7226).
- [52] P. Roe, Approximate riemann solvers, parameter vectors, and difference schemes, *Journal of Computational Physics* 43 (2) (1981) 357 – 372. doi:10.1016/0021-9991(81)90128-5.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0021999181901285>
- [53] P. Roe, Approximate riemann solvers, parameter vectors, and difference schemes, *Journal of Computational Physics* 135 (2) (1997) 250 – 258. doi:10.1006/jcph.1997.5705.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0021999197957053>
- [54] P. Roe, J. Pike, Efficient construction and utilization of approximate riemann solutions, *Computing Methods in Applied Sciences and Engineering* 6 (1984) 499–518.
- [55] A. Harten, P. Lax, B. Leer, On upstream differencing and godunov-type schemes for hyperbolic conservation laws, *SIAM Review* 25 (1) (1983) 35–61. arXiv:<http://epubs.siam.org/doi/pdf/10.1137/1025002>, doi:10.1137/1025002.
URL <http://epubs.siam.org/doi/abs/10.1137/1025002>
- [56] S. Davis, Simplified second-order godunov-type methods, *SIAM Journal on Scientific and Statistical Computing* 9 (3) (1988) 445–473. arXiv:[http:](http://)

- 555 [//epubs.siam.org/doi/pdf/10.1137/0909030](http://epubs.siam.org/doi/pdf/10.1137/0909030), doi:10.1137/0909030.
 URL <http://epubs.siam.org/doi/abs/10.1137/0909030>
- [57] B. Einfeldt, On godunov-type methods for gas dynamics, SIAM Journal on
 Numerical Analysis 25 (2) (1988) 294–318. arXiv:<http://epubs.siam.org/doi/pdf/10.1137/0725021>, doi:10.1137/0725021.
 560 URL <http://epubs.siam.org/doi/abs/10.1137/0725021>
- [58] E. Toro, M. Spruce, W. Speares, Restoration of the contact surface in the
 hll-riemann solver, Shock waves 4 (1) (1994) 25–34.
- [59] A. Harten, J. M. Hyman, Self adjusting grid methods for one-dimensional
 hyperbolic conservation laws, Journal of Computational Physics 50 (2)
 565 (1983) 235 – 269. doi:10.1016/0021-9991(83)90066-9.
 URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0021999183900669>
- [60] F. Dubois, G. Mehlman, A non-parameterized entropy correction for roe’s
 approximate riemann solver, Numerische Mathematik (Germany) 73 (2)
 570 (1996) 169–208.
 URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s002110050190>
- [61] F. Rieper, A low-mach number fix for roes approximate riemann
 solver, Journal of Computational Physics 230 (13) (2011) 5263 – 5287.
 doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2011.03.025>.
 575 URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0021999111001689>
- [62] P. Lax, B. Wendroff, Systems of conservation laws, Communications on
 Pure and Applied Mathematics 13 (2) (1960) 217–237. doi:10.1002/cpa.
 3160130205.
 580 URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/cpa.3160130205>
- [63] R. Richtmyer, A survey of difference methods for non-steady fluid dynam-
 ics, Tech. rep. (1962). doi:10.5065/D67P8WCQ.

URL <http://nldr.library.ucar.edu/repository/collections/TECH-NOTE-000-000-000-050>

585 [64] R. W. MacCormack, The effect of viscosity in hypervelocity impact cratering, AIAA paper 69 (1969) 354.

[65] E. Toro, A weighted average flux method for hyperbolic conservation laws, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and Physical Sciences 423 (1865) (1989) pp. 401–418.

590 URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2398565>

[66] E. Toro, The weighted average flux method applied to the euler equations, Philosophical Transactions: Physical Sciences and Engineering 341 (1662) (1992) pp. 499–530.

URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/54156>

595 [67] B. van Leer, Towards the ultimate conservative difference scheme i. the quest of monotonicity 18 (1973) 163–168. doi:10.1007/BFb0118673.

URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BFb0118673>

[68] B. van Leer, Towards the ultimate conservative difference scheme. ii. monotonicity and conservation combined in a second-order
600 scheme, Journal of Computational Physics 14 (4) (1974) 361 – 370. doi:10.1016/0021-9991(74)90019-9.

URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0021999174900199>

[69] B. V. Leer, Towards the ultimate conservative difference scheme iii. upstream-centered finite-difference schemes for ideal compressible flow,
605 Journal of Computational Physics 23 (3) (1977) 263 – 275. doi:10.1016/0021-9991(77)90094-8.

[70] B. V. Leer, Towards the ultimate conservative difference scheme. iv. a new approach to numerical convection, Journal of Computational Physics 23 (3)
610 (1977) 276 – 299. doi:10.1016/0021-9991(77)90095-X.

- [71] B. V. Leer, Towards the ultimate conservative difference scheme. v. a second-order sequel to godunov's method, *Journal of Computational Physics* 32 (1) (1979) 101 – 136. doi:10.1016/0021-9991(79)90145-1.
- [72] A. Harten, S. Osher, Uniformly high-order accurate nonoscillatory schemes. i, *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis* 24 (2) (1987) 279–309. arXiv:<http://epubs.siam.org/doi/pdf/10.1137/0724022>, doi:10.1137/0724022.
URL <http://epubs.siam.org/doi/abs/10.1137/0724022>
- [73] C. Machado, C. Ikoku, Experimental determination of solids fraction and minimum volumetric requirements in air and gas drilling, *Journal of Petroleum Technology* 34 (11) (1982) 2645–2655.
- [74] R. C. Temple, R. Watson, M. Adewumi, et al., An experimental study of pneumatic transport of solids in a vertical wellbore annulus, in: *SPE Eastern Regional Meeting*, Society of Petroleum Engineers, 1996.
- [75] R. Temple, An experimental study of pneumatic transport of solids in a vertical wellbore annulus, *Pennsylvania State University*, 1995.
URL <https://books.google.com/books?id=4FpQAQAIAAJ>
- [76] R. Angel, Volume requirements for air or gas drilling, *Petroleum Transactions*, AIME 210 (1957) 325–330.