Abstract
In this study the eruption patterns of a continuous stream of bubbles were simulated using the Discrete Element Model (DEM). The dimensions of the simulated bed were $532.8 \times 200.1 \times 9.6$ mm and the fluidized particles had a diameter $d_p = 1.2$ mm and density $\rho_p = 2600 \text{ kg/m}^3$. In total 250000 particles were simulated. The bubble eruption patterns and profiles of the gas velocity in the freeboard obtained from the numerical simulations were compared to the experimental Particle Image Velocimetry (PIV) and acetone planar laser induced fluorescence (PLIF) measurements of Müller et al. [11]. In the DEM simulations the velocity of the gas leaving an erupting bubble was homogeneously distributed along the bubble dome. The time-averaged gas velocity profile revealed that, in the freeboard, the lowest velocity in the vertical direction was in the centre of the bed, whereas the highest was in vicinity to the walls.

Introduction
Gas-fluidized beds are widely used in industry, e.g. in catalytic cracking, granulation, drying of agricultural goods, or the gasification and combustion of coal and biomass. However, despite their widespread use in industry, various fluid-dynamic phenomena that occur in gas-fluidized beds, such as the formation, coalescence, splitting and eruption of bubbles, are still poorly understood. The eruption of bubbles at the surface of the bed and the subsequent mixing of the gas which originated from the erupting bubble with the gas in the freeboard is of particular importance for gasification and combustions processes using low-rank coal or biomass. For these fuels a considerable proportion of their total carbon content is released as volatile matter [1]. Due to insufficient gas exchange between the bubble and particulate phases, volatiles contained in bubbles do not react completely within the bed. Thus, a considerable portion of the released volatile matter reacts via homogeneous combustion in the freeboard of the bed. Consequently, the gas mixing in the freeboard, induced by the eruption of bubbles, can often be the rate limiting step. The situation is further complicated if biomass is fed from the top. Owing to their small density, biomass particles tend to float on the surface of the bed resulting in an almost complete release of un-combusted volatiles into the freeboard [2]. So far, most studies dealing with bubble eruption have concentrated on the entrainment and elutriation of the fluidized particles [3-5], whereas investigations concerning the gas phase dynamics are comparatively sparse. Currently, there exist three main models describing the bubble eruption and subsequent disturbance of the gas phase in the freeboard. The pulsed jet theory, proposed by Zenz and Weil [6] assumes that the bubbles that erupt at the surface behave like intermittent jets. Consequently, a highly irregular profile of the gas velocity across the column diameter would be expected. Later, based on measurements of the dynamics of bubbles erupting at the top of a fluidized bed, Pemperton and Davidson [7] proposed the so-called ghost bubble theory. In this model, it is assumed that, after eruption, the bubble retains its shape, forming a “ghost bubble”. The third eruption model has been...
proposed initially by Levy and Lockwood [8]. Here, the ejected particles reverse their flow direction and fall back into the bed, the drag force of these falling particles is sufficient to cause a reversal of the flow of the surrounding gas. This downward gas flow induces the formation of a toroidal vortex, which moves initially towards the walls. Subsequently, the vortex is carried upwards with the main flow in the fluidized bed. Using particle image velocimetry (PIV) and acetone-planar laser induced fluorescence (PLIF) measurements, Solimene et al. [9], Yorquez-Ramirez and Duursma [10] and Müller et al. [11] confirmed the formation of a toroidal vortex, however different mechanisms of gas release during the eruption process were reported. For example, Solimene et al. [9] observed the formation of a “nose pocket” of gas which is released at the center of the dome. The modified Levy and Lockwood [8] model, proposed by Solimene et al. [9] is shown in Fig.1: the main difference between the models of Levy and Lockwood [8] and Solimene et al. [9] is the formation of a nose pocket. However, subsequent Acetone-PLIF measurements by Hartung et al. [12] reported that the release of acetone during bubble eruption can occur in 5 different patterns, ranging from the formation of a nose-pocket, over a homogeneous release of acetone along the entire dome surface, to the majority of the acetone being released at the sides of the erupting dome. The different release patterns were attributed to the inhomogeneity of the thickness of the dome during bubble eruption. Yorquez-Ramirez and Duursma [10] confirmed the existence of different acetone release patterns, proposing an evenly distributed release of gas along the dome upon bubble eruption.

With respect to the flow velocity profile in the freeboard, Levy and Lockwood [8] were the first to report that the maxima of the gas velocities were found near the walls and not in the centre of the bed. More recently, PIV has been applied to image the flow pattern in the freeboard above an erupting bubble [11,13]. In agreement with earlier investigations, it was found that the maxima of the gas velocities were located near the walls. In contrast, the velocity in the centre of the freeboard was, depending on vertical position in the freeboard, negative or close to zero.

The objective of this study is to investigate for the first time the gas dynamics in the freeboard of a gas-fluidized bed using the discrete element model (DEM). The simulation results are compared with the experimental measurements of Müller et al. [11]. However, owing to the large number of particles in the system used by Müller et al. [11], it was not possible to simulate exactly the experimental set-up. The fluidized bed simulated was modified to reduce the number of particles to a manageable magnitude. Thus, only a qualitative comparison between the experimental and numerical results is possible.

Numerical

The simulations reported in this work were performed using a two-phase discrete element model based on the work of Tsuji et al. [14]. This method combines a discrete description of the solid phase [15] with the volume-averaged description of the fluid-phase derived by Anderson and Jackson [16]. The interaction between the fluid and particle phases is modelled using a momentum exchange coefficient, $\beta$, such that the motion of the particles is governed by:

$$m_p \frac{d\mathbf{v}_p}{dt} = -\mathbf{V}_p \cdot \nabla p + \frac{V_p \beta}{(1-\varepsilon)} \left( \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}_p \right) + m_p \mathbf{g} + \mathbf{F}_c \quad (1)$$

$$I_p \frac{d\mathbf{w}_p}{dt} = \mathbf{L}_c \quad (2)$$

where $m_p$, $I_p$, $\mathbf{v}_p$, $\mathbf{w}_p$, $V_p$, $\mathbf{u}$, $p$, $\mathbf{F}_c$, $\mathbf{L}_c$, $\mathbf{g}$, and $\varepsilon$ are, respectively, the mass, moment of inertia, translational velocity, rotational velocity, and volume of the particle; the velocity and pressure of the gas; the net force and torque acting on the particle due to collisions; the acceleration
due to gravity; and the voidage. The forces due to collisions are modelled using damped, linear springs and the force in the tangential direction is limited by Coulomb’s law. The volume-averaged Navier-Stokes equations are:

$$\frac{\partial (\varepsilon \rho_f \mathbf{u})}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\varepsilon \rho_f \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}) = -\varepsilon \nabla p - \nabla \cdot (\varepsilon \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}) - \mathbf{F}_p + \varepsilon \rho_f \mathbf{g}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

where $\mathbf{\tau}_f$ is the viscous stress tensor, $\mathbf{F}_p$ is the rate of exchange of momentum between the particulate and fluid phases and $\rho_f$ is the density of the fluid phase. The fluid was assumed to be Newtonian; thus, the viscous stress tensor is given by:

$$\mathbf{\tau}_f = -\left(\lambda_f + \frac{2}{3} \mu \right) (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}) \mathbf{I} - \mu \left( (\nabla \mathbf{u}) + (\nabla \mathbf{u})^T \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

where $\lambda_f$ and $\mu$ are the bulk and shear viscosity of the fluid and $\mathbf{I}$ is the identity matrix. The momentum exchange between the fluid and particulate phases is calculated by adding up the fluid forces acting on the individual particles in a fluid cell:

$$\mathbf{F}_p = \frac{1}{V_{\text{cell}}} \sum_{n=1}^{N_{\text{p}}} \frac{V_p}{(1-\varepsilon)} \left( \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}_p \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

where $V_{\text{cell}}$ is the volume of a fluid cell. The momentum exchange coefficient was calculated using the correlation proposed by Beetstra et al. [17].

The spatially averaged continuity and momentum equations for the gas phase were solved using an approach based on the SIMPLE algorithm and the equations of motion of the particles were integrated using a third-order Adams-Bashforth scheme. Table 1 summarises the parameter values used for the simulations reported here.

**Table 1.** Parameters values used for the simulation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bed</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>200.1 mm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Height</td>
<td>532.8 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thickness</td>
<td>9.6 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orifice width</td>
<td>9.84 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particles</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>250000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diameter</td>
<td>1.2 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Density</td>
<td>2600 kg/m$^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normal stiffness</td>
<td>1000 N/m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tangential stiffness</td>
<td>500 N/m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficient of normal restitution</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficient of friction</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluid</td>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>298.15 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Viscosity</td>
<td>$1.8\times10^{-3}$ kg/(m s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Molecular weight</td>
<td>28 kg/kmol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cells in $x$-direction</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cells in $y$-direction</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cells in $z$-direction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following system was studied numerically. At the bottom of the fluidized bed, gas of minimum fluidization velocity entered the bed homogeneously. Once the bed was incipiently fluidized, a separate flow of gas through the central orifice was specified.

Experimental
The fluidized bed used by Müller et al. [11] was of square cross-section with side length 200 mm. The distributor consisted of a perforated aluminium plate of 1.5 mm thickness, containing 81 holes, each of 0.5 mm dia. oriented in a square array. Such a distributor is expected to provide a very homogenous gas inlet, similar to a porous plate. Glass ballotini of size 150 – 250 µm were fluidized by air. Single bubbles or a stream of bubbles were injected into the incipiently fluidized bed via a nozzle of 10 mm i.d. The bed height at incipient fluidization was 250 mm. Assuming a bed voidage of 0.4 at incipient fluidization, the number of particles in the experimental set-up of Müller et al. [11] was ~ $1.6 \times 10^9$, which is roughly 3-4 orders of magnitude more than what could be simulated reasonably using the DEM.

Results

![Figure 1](image)

**Figure 1.** (a) Bubble eruption model proposed by Solimene et al. [9], (b,c) Simultaneous PIV (vector) and PLIF (color) measurements showing two different stages of bubble eruption patterns of single bubbles injected into an incipiently fluidized bed.
To aid the comparison between the experimental and numerical results, we first present the main results of the experimental study of Müller et al. [11]. Figures 1(b,c) show snapshots of simultaneous PIV and acetone-PLIF measurements at two different stages of the eruption process of a stream of bubbles formed at the orifice. The vectors represent the gas velocity and the colour gives the acetone concentration. The fluidized bed was held at minimum fluidization. In Fig. 1(b) the early stage of a bubble eruption event is shown. Here, the acetone originally present in the erupting bubble is released almost homogenously throughout the bubble dome. This was one of five possible acetone release pattern reported by Hartung et al. [12]. The velocity of the gas at the top of the bubble dome is fairly constant along the bubble dome and directed radially into the freeboard. On the other hand, Fig. 1(c) shows the gas velocity profile and the acetone concentration towards the end of a bubble eruption event. Here, the dome is already collapsing, i.e. the particle velocity is directed downwards. The downwards moving particles induce a downwards motion of the gas phase, labeled “A”, and induces the formation of a toroidal vortex wall just above the surface of the fluidized bed, labeled “B”. This vortex is initially carried horizontally towards the walls. In a vertical cross-section, as shown here, the toroidal vortex appears as two vortex rings at the left and right of the erupting bubble. The left and right vortices rotate clockwise and anti-clockwise, respectively. Subsequently, the vortex is carried upwards with the main flow of the fluidized bed. The vorticity of the vortex decreases during the transport in the vertical direction.

Figure 2 shows the time averaged gas velocity profiles in the freeboard. The vectors indicate the direction of the flow, whereas the colour represents the magnitude of the velocity. The averaging time was ~ 30 s and the flow rate through the orifice was 71 cc/s, corresponding to an orifice velocity of $U_0 = 0.90$ m/s. Interestingly, and somewhat counter-intuitively, the time averaged velocity is directed downwards in the centre of the fluidized bed, whereas the velocity is upwards at the walls only. Consequently, there is also a strong
horizontal motion toward the walls in the vicinity of the surface of the fluidized bed. Müller et al. [11] reported that increasing the orifice velocity from 0.6 m/s to 1.1 m/s resulted in a small

**Figure 3.** Typical snap-shot of a DEM simulation showing both the instantaneous particle distribution and the corresponding gas velocity pattern around a rising bubble. The bed was held at minimum fluidization velocity and the orifice velocity was $U_0 = 5.64$ m/s: (a) Instantaneous particle distribution and (b) vectors show the superficial gas velocity, the colour represents the solid fraction.

**Figure 4.** Typical snap-shot of a DEM simulation showing both the instantaneous particle distribution and the corresponding gas velocity pattern around an erupting bubble. The bed was held at minimum fluidization velocity and the orifice velocity was $U_0 = 5.64$ m/s: (a) Instantaneous particle distribution and (b) vectors show the superficial gas velocity, the colour represents the solid fraction.
increase in upward and downward velocities near the walls and the centre of the freeboard, respectively.

Turning now to the results of the DEM simulations. A typical snap-shot of the instantaneous particle distribution and gas velocity for a simulation with an orifice velocity of \( U_0 = 5.64 \) m/s is shown in Figs. 3(a) and (b), respectively. The bed was held at minimum fluidization. Figure 3(a) shows the rise of a single bubble through the fluidized bed. At the same time a new bubble forms at the orifice. In Fig. 3(b) the corresponding superficial gas velocity is shown as vectors, while the colour represents the solid fraction. The velocity vectors representing the flow of gas around and through the rising bubble show that the gas uses the bubble as a low-pressure drop short cut. A snap-shot of the instantaneous particle distribution of an erupting bubble and the corresponding flow field of the gas are shown in Figs. 4(a) and (b), respectively. In Fig. 4(b) the vectors represent the superficial gas velocity, whereas the colour corresponds to the solid fraction. Figure 4(a) shows clearly that the erupting bubble strongly increases its horizontal dimension during bubble eruption. This behaviour can also be observed experimentally in 2D beds of similar geometric dimensions. However, it is somewhat doubtful whether bubbles expand horizontally to the same extent in a 3D fluidized bed. From Fig. 4(b) it can be seen that gas velocity is (i) fairly constant along the dome of the erupting bubble and (ii) directed radially into the freeboard. Keeping the differences in the set-up of the systems for the numerical simulations and the experimental measurements in mind, the gas velocity profile shown in Fig. 4(b) shows qualitative good

**Figure 5.** (a) Time-averaged interstitial gas velocity for \( U_0 = 5.64 \) m/s (b) Plots of the vertical velocity versus horizontal position for different orifice velocities at \( y = 0.28 \) m.
agreement with the profile shown in Fig. 1(a). However, it has to be mentioned that, unlike in the experimental measurements, in the numerical simulations no toroidal vortex was observed in the freeboard.

Figure 5(a) shows the time-averaged gas-velocity in the fluidized bed for an orifice velocity of $U_0 = 5.64$ m/s. In Fig. 5(a) the vectors indicate the direction of the flow, whereas the colour represents the vertical component of the interstitial velocity. Within the bed, i.e. $y < 0.23$ m for $U_0 = 5.64$ m/s, the highest gas velocities can be found in the centre of the bed. However, in the freeboard, i.e. $y > 0.23$ for $U_0 = 5.65$ m/s, the behaviour reverses, i.e. the gas velocity is smallest in the centre and highest in vicinity of the walls. This rather intriguing flow characteristic is maintained throughout the entire freeboard, albeit the differences between the gas velocities in the centre and close the walls decrease with height. Similar to the time-averaged PIV measurements, a horizontal velocity component directed towards the walls can be observed close to the top of the bed. The vertical velocity component as a function of horizontal position at $y = 0.28$ m is plotted in Fig. 5(b) for all three orifices velocities investigated.

Fig. 5(b) shows that increasing the velocity of the jet from 3.64 m/s to 5.64 m/s causes a decrease in the velocity in the centre of the freeboard and increases the velocity in the vicinity of the walls. However, when the jet velocity is increased further to 8.64 m/s this trend is reversed such that, compared to the case of a jet velocity of 5.64 m/s, the velocity in the centre of the freeboard is higher, while the velocity near the walls is decreased.

**Discussion**

The simulated bubble eruption pattern shown in Fig. 4 is in qualitative agreement with the experimental measurements of Müller et al. [11], given in Figs. 1(b,c), i.e. the velocity of the gas released during the bubble eruption process is fairly constant along the dome of the erupting bubble. According to Hartung et al. [12], the homogeneous release of gas at the dome of an erupting bubble is one of five possible eruption patterns. However, it has to be mentioned that the pattern in which most of the gas escapes at the outer margins of the dome upon its collapse has been identified as the most common by Hartung et al. [12]. An important feature of the bubble eruption model of Levy and Lockwood [8] and Solimene et al. [9] is the formation of a toroidal vortex upon dome collapse. It was proposed that the falling particles cause a reversal of the flow of the surrounding gas, which induces the formation of a toroidal vortex, moving initially towards the walls. The formation of a toroidal vortex could not be observed in the DEM simulations. Currently, we cannot give a confident explanation why we do not see a toroidal vortex, however, we believe that the fact that our simulations were (i) 2D while the experimental measurements were 3D and (ii) that the fluidized particles differed in size, i.e. 1.2 mm compared to 150 – 250 µm in the experimental measurements may have contributed to the observed differences. For example, it is known that if a stream of bubbles is injected into a bed of large particles, a higher rate of gas leakage into the particulate phase is observed than for bubbles injected into a bed of small particles [18]. The higher rate of gas leakage in beds of larger particles may, thus, also influence the release of gas from an erupting bubble.

Turning now to the time-averaged gas velocity measurements, Fig. 5(a) demonstrates convincingly that the vertical velocity in the freeboard of a fluidized bed which is held at minimum fluidization and into which a stream of bubbles is released, is lowest in the centre of the bed and highest in the vicinity of the walls. Such gas characteristics have been observed experimentally by Duursma et al. [13] and Müller et al. [11]. The only difference, between the numerical and experimental studies is the fact that in the numerical studies the vertical velocity in the centre of the fluidized bed is directed upwards, whereas in experimental studies the time-averaged vertical velocity is negative, i.e. directed downwards. Again, we can
only speculate as to the reason for this discrepancy is and suspect that the differences in (i) geometry (2D versus 3D) and (ii) particle size are the main reasons for the observed difference. We are currently performing simulations with smaller particles unequivocally to answer the question of how the particle size influences the gas dynamics in the freeboard.

When the jet velocity is increased from 3.64 m/s to 5.64 m/s, the vertical velocity in the centre of the freeboard decreases, which is in agreement with the experimental measurements of Müller et al. [11]. When the gas velocity is further increased to 8.64 m/s, however, the velocity in the centre of the freeboard increases again. One explanation for this behaviour may be that the erupting bubbles direct gas towards the walls causing a decrease in the velocity in the centre of the freeboard and an increase in the velocity near the walls. Increasing the jet velocity from 3.64 m/s to 5.64 m/s increases the bubble frequency, causing more gas to be diverted towards the sidewalls. The reversal in the trend when the jet velocity is 8.64 m/s may be due to the stronger jet forcing more gas through the centre of the bed, or may be due to a change in the nature of the bubbles, which become larger as the jet velocity is increased.

Another interesting feature of gas flow in a fluidized bed, i.e. the gas flow through a rising bubbles, was well simulated with the DEM. Figure 3(b) shows the gas uses the rising bubble as a low pressure-drop short cut. Such a gas velocity profile is expected for slow bubbles, i.e. for bubbles whose rise velocity $U_b$ is less than the interstitial minimum fluidization velocity [18]. For the bubble shown in Fig. 3(b), the bubble rise velocity was determined as 0.55 m/s, whereas the interstitial minimum fluidization velocity was 1.68 m/s, i.e. the bubble is a slowly rising bubble.

**Conclusions**

Discrete Element Model (DEM) simulations were used to study the eruption patterns of bubbles and the gas velocity profile in the freeboard of a fluidized bed which was held at minimum fluidization and a continuous stream of bubbles was released through a central orifice. The results of the numerical simulations were compared to experimental Particle Image Velocimetry (PIV) and acetone planar laser induced fluorescence (PLIF) measurements of Müller et al. [11]. In the DEM simulations the velocity of the gas leaving an erupting bubble was homogeneously distributed along the bubble dome, one of five possible eruption patterns reported by Hartung et al. [12]. The time-averaged gas velocity profile revealed that, in the freeboard, the lowest velocity in the vertical direction was in the centre of the bed, whereas the highest was in vicinity to the walls, in agreement with results reported by Duursma et al. [13] and Müller et al. [11]. However, unlike in experimental measurements, the vertical velocity of the gas was still directed upwards in the centre of the freeboard.
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