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ABSTRACT

A Study of the Influence of Physical Parameters on the Drying of Porous Media

by

Jason C. Viggato

Dr. Robert Boehm, Examination Committee Chair
Professor of Mechanical Engineering
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

An experimental setup is developed to observe the mass transfer that occurs in the drying of saturated porous media due to bulk flow of gas. The analysis and equations are developed in a one-dimensional perspective, and focus on the convection and evaporation that results. Humidity readings are monitored at various locations and used in the analysis of the results. These procedures are used in test cases for Steel spheres and Ceramic beads both 4.5 mm in diameter at .25 L/min, .5 L/min, .75 L/min and 1 L/min flow rates.

Drying times and humidity plots versus time for both steel and ceramic are witnessed to be similar in nature. A correlation for the drying time is developed through use of Sherwood number, Reynolds number, and Schmidt number. This is achieved by using the non-dimensional quantities and acquiring a linear regression and equation. The coefficients and exponent values of the general equation for the Sherwood number are then solved.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>total surface area per unit volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>specific heat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_p$</td>
<td>specific heat at constant pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d_p$</td>
<td>diameter of particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_{12}$</td>
<td>coefficient of diffusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>gravitational constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>enthalpy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h_m$</td>
<td>mass transfer coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h_{vap}$</td>
<td>latent heat of evaporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>permeability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{rl}$</td>
<td>wetting phase relative permeability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{rg}$</td>
<td>non-wetting phase permeability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>thermal conductivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_e$</td>
<td>mass flow rate due to evaporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n_a$</td>
<td>evaporation rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_c$</td>
<td>capillary pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{sg}$</td>
<td>saturated vapor pressure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iv
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$P_{sg}$</td>
<td>saturated vapor pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>universal gas constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Re$</td>
<td>Reynolds number $= \rho u D / \mu$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$RH$</td>
<td>relative humidity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_l$</td>
<td>liquid phase saturation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_g$</td>
<td>gas phase saturation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S$</td>
<td>reduced saturation $(S-S_l)/(1-S_l-S_g)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_{bed}$</td>
<td>surface area of bed per unit volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Sc$</td>
<td>Schmidt number $= v / D_{12}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Sh$</td>
<td>Sherwood number $= h_m d_p / D_{12}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T$</td>
<td>temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$u$</td>
<td>critical bed velocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V$</td>
<td>volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\nu$</td>
<td>specific volume</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Greek Symbols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>volumetric thermal expansion coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\varepsilon$</td>
<td>phase volume fraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu$</td>
<td>dynamic viscosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\phi$</td>
<td>porosity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscript</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$g$</td>
<td>gas phase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
l  liquid phase
s  solid phase
0  reference
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The study of drying in porous media is becoming increasingly more important as society faces more intricate needs and problems related to energy consumption. Many areas of engineering such as catalytic converters, pharmaceutical products, waste disposal, water migration, geothermal energy management, insulation and oil and gas flows to list a few, all utilize the principles of combined heat and mass transfer, fluid flow or both through porous media. Keey (1992) states that the majority of industrialized countries consume between seven and fifteen percent of their total energy in drying processes.

Numerous studies involving heat and mass transfer with phase change have been conducted in various applications. Francis et al. (1996) have investigated jet impingement drying processes for semi-porous textile composites. Plumb et al. (1992) performed studies in heat and mass transfer in drying of packed beds. Keey et al. (1994) model the temperature profiles within boards during high temperature drying processes. It is postulated for heartwood that an evaporative plane moves through the board.

Recent development of the Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Repository has been the source for great debate and some concern over the accuracy and safety of performed studies and calculations. Boehm et al. (1995a, 1995b) studies indicate that the humidity values in vacant spaces near porous formations may be underestimated in sub-residual
conditions when arbitrarily fixed capillary pressures are used in numerical codes. The outlet humidities are considerably higher than those predicted using most repository codes.

Gong and Mujumdar (1994) study the influence of an impermeable surface on pore steam pressure during drying of refractory concrete slabs. In this study, a finite element model for the drying process is described. Tests indicate that an impermeable surface can produce very high pore pressure in the drying process, and the potential for explosive spalling is greatly increased.

Sun and Woods (1997) simulate the heat and moisture transfer processes during deep grain bed drying. Here a deep barley bed is used as an example of grain drying. It is witnessed that when the bed temperature approaches the drying temperature, the moisture removed by the drying air may cause a temperature drop in the bed due to evaporative cooling. Walker et al. (1997) studies the effect of humidity on NPK fertilizer drying. It is shown that the correlation between product temperature and moisture content can't be explained by the diffusion drying theory, but indicates evidence for the humidity drying theory.

Chou and Chua (1997) investigate the receding evaporation front in convective food drying. Observations are made that show the front moves faster at the early stage of drying. A longer time is required for the drying front to move the same distance as drying progresses. There comes a time when the front is stationary and the specimen may be regarded as having reached a quasi-thermal equilibrium with the air. As airflow increases, so does the moisture removal rate.
When the surface area of drying increases and other physical dimensions remain constant, the volume up to each depth sustains a higher amount of moisture. Moisture up to each depth has to be completely dried before the front may start to recede from the surface. The receding speed is found to be highly dependent on the exposed drying surface of the product and the drying conditions of the air. It is shown that the square root of the drying time varies linearly with the transient position of the front. The receding front is shown to be related to the drying rate of the product as the front decelerates inward to the center of the material.

La Comber et al. (1997) study the effects of particle size on the drying of milled peat. Studies from various sources indicate that the drying rate of peat in powder form on the surface of a bog is highly dependent on its particle size distribution. A drying chamber was constructed and small (2-5.6 mm), medium (5.6-9.5 mm) and large (9.5-16 mm) diameter particles are tested. Results show that large diameter particles dry 10-25% percent faster than the smaller particles depending on the peat type.

Bastian (1997) creates a synthesis of scientific activity in the area of heat and moisture transfers in capillary-porous medium. The transfers are characterized by two independent variables- temperature and water content. Parameters are set for various scenarios of porous drying through heat transfer and mass transfer. Bertmieu et al. (1997) develop a simulation through use of a mathematical model to design an industrial drier for natural rubber in granule form.

As good as the numerical codes such as FEHM are, there is still need for further experimental study of the heat and mass transfer phenomena that occur in porous media. This experimental study is performed to witness the effects of drying of residually
saturated granular porous media by bulk flow of nitrogen gas on humidity and temperature through use of different porous material types. Of the data collected, the most emphasis is put on the humidity readings of the gas flow exiting the porous continuum.

Humidity readings of the exit flow from the media are plotted versus time. These tests are performed from the time of residual saturation and ended at the time that the porous media is completely dried (when the humidity value reaches the humidity value of the incoming nitrogen gas). Tests are run for the materials using four different flow rates of nitrogen gas- 0.25 L/min, 0.5 L/min, 0.75 L/min and 1 L/min.

The results are then compared and a correlation for bed mass transfer rates is made from experimental values for both steel spheres and ceramic beads of 4.5 mm diameters. Empirical correlations are made for both the steel and the ceramic beads through use of Sherwood numbers, Reynolds numbers, and Schmidt numbers which are acquired through non-dimensionalization of the experimental data collected.
CHAPTER 2

EXPERIMENTAL STUDY

2.1 Experimental Setup

The experimental setup is shown in the schematic depicted in Figure 1. It consists of a nitrogen bottle that is the source of the flow for the gas that is used in the drying process. The flow runs through a servo valve into a Controller/Meter (error of ± 1%) connected to a computer data acquisition device that monitors the flow rate. Flow then proceeds into a cylindrical container that contains a capacitance humidity sensor with a maximum error of 1% and a thermocouple connected to the data acquisition to monitor inlet relative humidity readings and temperature at various time intervals.

After passing through the initial humidity sensor, the gas flows into the test section containing the porous media. The test section consists of a 0.406 m (16'') long aluminum cylinder, with an inside diameter of 0.0381 m (1.5'') and two windows for visual observations. The inside of the container walls contain thirteen 30 gauge K-type thermocouples that have a maximum error of 0.75%. The thermocouples are at various locations along the length of the cylinder. Gas and water vapor then flow out a tube, where another humidity sensor records the outlet readings. Figure 2 shows a cross sectional view of the test bed.

A thermocouple outside of the system is present and measures the ambient temperature. The data acquisition software LabView collects all the temperature and
Figure 1. Experimental Setup Schematic Diagram
Figure 2. Experimental Test Section Cross-Sectional View Diagram
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voltage readings (relative humidity) from the digital signal conditioning and data acquisition devices, and a digital scale is used to weigh the container dry and wet.

2.2 Experimental Procedure

The humidity sensors at the inlet and outlet of the test section are first calibrated using the ASTM E104-85 method. Since the sensors are so sensitive, the calibrations are performed before each run of the experiment. This is especially pertinent to the outlet sensor, because this sensor is exposed to the most change in ambient conditions; such as temperature and humidity changes. This calibration consists of using lithium chloride, sodium chloride, and potassium sulfate in saturated solutions at various temperatures.

Humidity sensors are placed just above the saturated solution, and readings are taken in the test tube for each material. The values for the corresponding relative humidity percentages for differing temperatures and substances may be viewed in Table 1 (ASTM Standard 1991).

The highest temperature available for calibration on the ASTM standard is 50°C, so a calibration at the boiling point is unavailable. This limitation doesn’t pose a problem in this experiment because the flows and medium are at room temperature, about 77°F.

After the calibration, the test section is weighed at both dry and wetted conditions. This will give an idea of how much water vapor has been displaced at the end of the experiment (porous bed is completely dry). To achieve wetted conditions, the test section is saturated by filling the porous medium with distilled water and then drained. All tubes are now connected and the power to the voltage regulator, data acquisition, and computers is turned on. The LabView data acquisition software is started for both the temperature readings and the voltage data, and then the nitrogen gas is allowed to enter
### Table 1: ASTM Standard: Relative Humidity Values for Saturated Aqueous Salt Solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temperature (°C)</th>
<th>Lithium Chloride</th>
<th>Potassium Acetate</th>
<th>Magnesium Chloride</th>
<th>Potassium Carbonate</th>
<th>Magnesium Nitrate</th>
<th>Sodium Chloride</th>
<th>Potassium Chloride</th>
<th>Barium Chloride</th>
<th>Potassium Nitrate</th>
<th>Potassium Sulfate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LiCl</td>
<td>KAc</td>
<td>MgCl₂</td>
<td>K₂CO₃</td>
<td>Mg(NO₃)₂</td>
<td>NaCl</td>
<td>KCl</td>
<td>BaCl₂</td>
<td>KNO₃</td>
<td>K₂SO₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.2 ± 0.5</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>33.7 ± 0.3</td>
<td>43.1 ± 0.7</td>
<td>60.4 ± 0.6</td>
<td>73.5 ± 0.3</td>
<td>88.6 ± 0.5</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>98.3 ± 2.9</td>
<td>98.8 ± 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.3 ± 0.5</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>33.6 ± 0.3</td>
<td>43.1 ± 0.5</td>
<td>58.9 ± 0.4</td>
<td>73.7 ± 0.3</td>
<td>88.7 ± 0.5</td>
<td>93 ± 2</td>
<td>98.3 ± 2.1</td>
<td>95.5 ± 0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.3 ± 0.4</td>
<td>23.4 ± 0.5</td>
<td>33.5 ± 0.2</td>
<td>43.1 ± 0.4</td>
<td>57.4 ± 0.3</td>
<td>73.7 ± 0.2</td>
<td>88.8 ± 0.4</td>
<td>93 ± 2</td>
<td>98.0 ± 1.4</td>
<td>98.2 ± 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.3 ± 0.4</td>
<td>23.4 ± 0.3</td>
<td>33.3 ± 0.2</td>
<td>43.2 ± 0.3</td>
<td>56.9 ± 0.3</td>
<td>73.8 ± 0.2</td>
<td>88.9 ± 0.3</td>
<td>92 ± 2</td>
<td>95.4 ± 1.0</td>
<td>97.9 ± 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.3 ± 0.3</td>
<td>23.1 ± 0.3</td>
<td>33.1 ± 0.3</td>
<td>43.3 ± 0.3</td>
<td>56.4 ± 0.2</td>
<td>73.5 ± 0.1</td>
<td>88.1 ± 0.3</td>
<td>91 ± 2</td>
<td>94.8 ± 0.7</td>
<td>97.6 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.3 ± 0.3</td>
<td>22.5 ± 0.3</td>
<td>32.8 ± 0.2</td>
<td>43.2 ± 0.4</td>
<td>52.9 ± 0.2</td>
<td>76.3 ± 0.1</td>
<td>84.3 ± 0.3</td>
<td>90 ± 2</td>
<td>93.8 ± 0.8</td>
<td>97.3 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>11.3 ± 0.2</td>
<td>21.8 ± 0.5</td>
<td>32.4 ± 0.1</td>
<td>43.2 ± 0.5</td>
<td>51.4 ± 0.2</td>
<td>75.1 ± 0.1</td>
<td>83.8 ± 0.3</td>
<td>89 ± 2</td>
<td>92.3 ± 0.5</td>
<td>97.0 ± 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.3 ± 0.2</td>
<td>21.1 ± 0.2</td>
<td>32.1 ± 0.1</td>
<td>48.9 ± 0.3</td>
<td>74.9 ± 0.1</td>
<td>83.9 ± 0.3</td>
<td>89 ± 2</td>
<td>90.8 ± 0.6</td>
<td>96.7 ± 0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>11.2 ± 0.2</td>
<td>31.0 ± 0.1</td>
<td>31.6 ± 0.1</td>
<td>48.4 ± 0.4</td>
<td>74.7 ± 0.1</td>
<td>82.3 ± 0.3</td>
<td>87 ± 2</td>
<td>90.0 ± 1.2</td>
<td>98.4 ± 0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>11.2 ± 0.2</td>
<td>31.1 ± 0.1</td>
<td>31.1 ± 0.1</td>
<td>48.9 ± 0.3</td>
<td>74.5 ± 0.2</td>
<td>81.7 ± 0.3</td>
<td>87.0 ± 1.0</td>
<td>98.1 ± 0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>11.1 ± 0.2</td>
<td>30.5 ± 0.1</td>
<td>30.5 ± 0.1</td>
<td>48.4 ± 0.6</td>
<td>74.4 ± 0.2</td>
<td>81.2 ± 0.3</td>
<td>84.9 ± 2.5</td>
<td>95.8 ± 0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*See the German standard, DIN 50008, Constant Climates Over Aqueous Solutions, (referenced in 2.2).
the system by opening the valve and regulator on the bottle. Flow of gas is continued until the porous medium is completely dried, or in other words, the relative humidity in the exiting flow is equal to the humidity of the inlet gas; approximately 5 to 9.5 percent.

Readings are taken every 20 minutes or every hour for the weight of the system depending on the flow rate. Smaller time intervals are used for high flow rates and larger intervals for the slower rates. This will indicate the amount of water evaporated over each time interval. The time for this condition to occur will vary according to the flow rate of the incoming gas. High flow rates such as 1 L/min may take around 2 hours and lower flow rates even longer.

Procedures listed above are done for two different materials. The first consists of steel spheres, the same used in BB guns, with a diameter of 4.5 mm. The BB’s have a thermal conductivity (k) of approximately 58.7 W/m·K at about 20°C. The ceramic beads are also spherical and hollow of 4.5 mm diameter, and have a thermal conductivity of approximately 0.1 W/m·K.
CHAPTER 3

DATA REDUCTION

Since there are numerous data points gathered over the course of one experiment, it is necessary to reduce them in a way that is easy to analyze the trends that occur. The best way to compare the results from the different materials used is to plot the data on similar scale graphs. This is done for the relative humidity readings from humidity sensors.

Before the humidity results can be plotted, a correlation between the voltage data and that of relative humidity must be established. This correlation goes back to the calibration of the humidity sensors prior to running the experiment. The voltages that were obtained during the calibration process correspond to relative humidities of the different substances at varying temperatures. A graph is then produced by plotting voltage versus the humidity listed in the ASTM standard for various temperatures that were calibrated. A linear regression is then used to smooth out any irregularity that may occur with the data points. This plot will then serve as a chart to convert voltage readings to relative humidity. Calibrations for both inlet and outlet sensors are shown in the appendices.

Values for humidities of the various test cases may now be plotted versus time using the equation acquired for the line of the voltage versus humidity calibration. All tests are then compared to one another and conclusions are made through analysis of the
plots for the varying flow rates. These plots are discussed in the following discussion and results section.

An empirical correlation is then made from the humidity plots to determine a general equation. This is accomplished by solving for values of Reynolds number and Sherwood number through known data. An evaporation rate is acquired from data and then a mass transfer coefficient may be obtained. This is done by creating a calibration plot of the mass of water lost versus time. The area of particular interest is the section of constant mass loss rate; in other words, the "flat" areas in the beginning and end of tests are neglected.

The calibration plot for the evaporation rate is established using the area of the curve described above, and a linear regression is performed to acquire an equation that is representative of the mass transfer per unit time (evaporation rate). The slope of the line will represent the mass divided by time, thus giving the evaporation rate. From these values, the mass transfer coefficient is determined and then a Sherwood number (Sh) value is known, and is plotted versus the Reynolds number on a log-log scale.

This procedure will non-dimensionalize the experimental parameters, and then produce a non-dimensional correlation, from which coefficients may be determined. After acquiring a plot and the corresponding equation to the curve, and coefficients, a correlation for the Sherwood number is then made from the data for both steel and ceramic packed beds. The equation for the Sherwood (Sh) number will give design parameters for mass transfer through use of the Reynolds number (Re) and the Schmidt number (Sc). A typical form of the Sherwood equation would look like:

\[ Sh = c \, Re^a \, Sc^b \]
where \( a, b \) and \( c \) are all values acquired through the equation given in the correlation of the data. Since all tests are performed at room temperature, the Schmidt number remains constant. The Sherwood number equation is then formulated in the following manner:

\[
Sh = (cSc^b) \text{Re}^a
\]

where \( cSc^b \) is a constant. This is done by comparing the equation of the curve of the log-log plot to that of a line with the equation:

\[
\log y = m\log x + \log k
\]

where \( \log y \) would correspond to the Sherwood number, \( m \) the exponent \( a \), of the Reynolds number (\( x \)) and \( k \) the Schmidt number to an exponent value multiplied by the constant \( c \).
CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION AND RESULTS

Many different phenomena are witnessed over the course of the experimental and correlation study. The nitrogen gas flowing from the inlet shows approximate values of 5 to 9.5 percent humidity at room temperature or about 24 °C. The Reynolds number for 1 L/min flow rate is 0.421, 0.75 L/min is 0.316, 0.5 L/min is 0.211 and 0.25 L/min is 0.105. The Reynolds number is calculated based on the diameter of the particle. The inlet and outlet humidity calibrations may be seen in Appendix II and III. As an example, a voltage of 2.142 V could be approximately 5 percent and 2.1395 V about 9.5 percent humidity depending on the individual calibrations. These values vary slightly from test to test, but in general it is known from various calibrations performed and Boehm et al. (1995a, 1995b) experiments, that humidity values of commercial grade bottled nitrogen gas at room temperature are in this range. All tests are run until values of about 5 to 9.5 percent are reached. When this value is reached, it is the humidity of the nitrogen gas that is being read by the humidity sensor, the lowest possible exit humidity attainable while gas flow exists. Evaporation rate plots are shown for both steel and ceramic in Figures 13 and 14.
4.1 Steel Sphere Tests

For the first test, steel at 0.25 L/min, .0197 kg of water was weighed initially. The test ended after 32,425 seconds (9.01 hours). The second test, steel at 0.5 L/min, the weight of the test section dry is 3.509 kg and wet is 3.529 kg. Therefore approximately .02 kg of water is evaporated during the drying process of the test section. The drying time for this test was 11,530 seconds (3.2 hours). Test run number three, 0.75 L/min, has a dry weight of 3.509 kg and wet is 3.5297 kg, thus having .0207 kg of water. The drying time for this test is 9,555 seconds (2.65 hours). For the fourth test, steel at 1 L/min, the dry weight is 3.509 kg and the wet is 3.5305, and about .0215 kg of water is evaporated. Drying occurred in 8,950 seconds (2.49 hours).

Figure 3 shows the outlet humidity versus time for the 0.25 L/min test. There are approximately one thousand seconds of constant humidity and then a fairly exponential decline occurs to ten thousand seconds. From this point to fifteen thousand seconds, there is a gradual increase in humidity and then constant decline to the end of the test. The inlet humidity is steady at approximately 6.5 percent throughout (Figure 3). The mass rate of the water lost through evaporation has a flat section in the first two hours and in the last two, with steady loss rate in the middle of the test (Figure 11).

In the second test, the steel at 0.5 L/min outlet humidity versus time may be viewed in Figure 4. The outlet humidity is 100% for about fifteen hundred seconds. After this the decline is fairly exponential over the entire test. Figure 4, the inlet humidity of nitrogen starts at 8 percent and indicates a decrease in humidity and then shows values of 6 percent throughout. The mass of water lost shows low rates of transfer up to the first forty minutes, and the last forty minutes of the experiment.
Experiment three, 0.75 L/min, shows once again a decay resembling an exponential curve (Figure 5). The first fifteen hundred seconds show values of high humidity and then a constant decline through about eight thousand seconds. The last sections of the test show very slow decline. The inlet humidity was 6 percent through most of the test. Figure 11 shows the mass of water lost and has flat sections in the first twenty minutes and last thirty.

Test four, steel 1 L/min, shows more of an exponential decay of humidity values over time (Figure 6). The inlet humidity of nitrogen is mostly constant, with the exception of about five spikes throughout the approximately 9000 seconds. The cause of these fluctuations is not known. One explanation could be the conditions the tank was filled at. A second is that as the test progresses, lower pressure of the contents results due to consumption. This may also have an effect on inlet humidity values. The mass transfer rate is low for the first twenty minutes and is flat in the region from one hundred to one hundred forty minutes.

4.2 Ceramic Bead Tests

Test number one has a dry weight of 2.631 kg and wet 2.669, having a weight of water .0386 kg. The drying time for this test is 33,725 seconds (9.37 hours). For the ceramic beads in test number two, the dry weight is 2.6308 and wet is 2.6694 kg. This test finished drying in 11,140 seconds (3.09 hours). The third test, 0.75 L/min, the weight of the water present is .039 kg. It is finished in 9980 seconds (2.77 hours). Test number four produces .0393 kg of water evaporated over the entire process. The drying time of test four is 9,325 seconds (2.59 hours) for the 1 L/min flowrate.
Test one, 0.25 L/min, shows similar characteristics of previous curves. Flat sections are evident in the beginning and consistent decay follows (Figure 7). Inlet humidity readings are six percent through the majority of the test. The mass lost is slow for the first and last two hours (Figure 12).

Figure 8 shows the outlet humidity of the ceramic bead test at 0.5 L/min. A very smooth decay is witnessed over most of the test. A look at Figure 8, the inlet humidity of nitrogen, shows a higher humidity for about 500 seconds (8 to 9 percent) and then is constant through out (6 percent). In Figure 12, similar mass lost trends are present.

In test number three, the first one thousand seconds are at 100 percent humidity and then a decline starts (Figure 9). There is a spike around three thousand seconds, and then the rest of the test is similar to previous runs. The inlet humidity is very consistent at about six percent. The mass loss chart (Figure 12) shows flat sections in the first twenty minutes and in the last twenty minutes.

The fourth and final test is that of ceramic beads at a flow rate of 1 L/min (Figure 10). The outlet humidity curve also shows a somewhat exponential decay, with one major spike around 7000 seconds. The inlet humidity is a bit unstable according to Figure 10. However, the plot looks worse than it is in actuality, because humidity readings only vary by 2 or 3 percent. As stated before, it is not known why this inlet humidity varies as much as it does. The transfer of water also is similar to previous tests conducted (Figure 12).
Figure 9. Inlet and Outlet Humidity vs. Time- Ceramic .75 L/min
Figure 10. Inlet and Outlet Humidity vs. Time - Ceramic 1 L/min
Figure 11. Mass of Water Lost vs. Time- Steel Test Flow Rates
Figure 12. Mass of Water Lost vs. Time- Ceramic Test Flow Rates
Figure 14. Evaporation Rate Regressions - Ceramic Flow Rates

\[
\begin{align*}
  y &= 0.000297x - 0.002160 \\
  y &= 0.000289x - 0.005520 \\
  y &= 0.00091x - 0.010761
\end{align*}
\]
4.3 Comparison of Steel and Ceramic Experiments

An analysis of all the humidity plots simultaneously for the most part shows similar plots throughout for both materials and all flow rates with few exceptions. Table 2 and Table 3 show the Reynolds number and Sherwood number values for each test.

All tests at the same flow rate, regardless of material, show extremely close drying times. In example, the 1 L/min steel and 1 L/min ceramic beads dried at nearly the same time and the same is true for the 0.5 L/min drying flow rates. Drying times for different flow rates for steel are listed Table 4 and values for ceramic in Table 5.

Some sources of problems encountered that are worth noting follow. The ceramic beads aren’t perfectly round like the spheres. This could form a slightly less than perfect bed and also cause some deviation in results. There is also some variation in the inlet humidity, mostly in approximately the first 500 seconds. It is not clear as to why only a few of the tests show jumps in the inlet humidity. This is most evident in the ceramic 1 L/min test, but as noted before, the variations aren’t as bad as they look. Even with the fluctuations, there shouldn’t be a great impact on drying times because the jumps are only a few percent change in humidity.

Compared to Boehm et al. (1995a, 1995b) experiments with glass beads of 1 mm diameter, outlet humidity curves vary. Previous experiments for the glass beads at room temperature with a Reynolds number of 0.868 show a constant outlet humidity of nearly 100 % for a little more than half of the drying time, and then a sharp decrease followed by constant decrease until completion. All tests observed regardless of material (steel or ceramic) showed short periods of 100% values and then constant decay. This is most
Table 2- Steel: Reynolds Numbers and Sherwood Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flow Rate</th>
<th>Reynolds Number</th>
<th>Sherwood Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.25 L/min</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>114.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5 L/min</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>305.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75 L/min</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>341.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 L/min</td>
<td>1.066</td>
<td>465.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3- Ceramic: Reynolds Numbers and Sherwood Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flow Rate</th>
<th>Reynolds Number</th>
<th>Sherwood Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.25 L/min</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>205.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5 L/min</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>506.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75 L/min</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>653.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 L/min</td>
<td>1.066</td>
<td>684.974</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4- Steel: Total Mass of Water and Drying Times

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flow Rate</th>
<th>Total Mass of Water</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.25 L/min</td>
<td>0.0197 kg</td>
<td>9.01 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5 L/min</td>
<td>0.02 kg</td>
<td>3.2 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75 L/min</td>
<td>0.0207 kg</td>
<td>2.65 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 L/min</td>
<td>0.0215 kg</td>
<td>2.49 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5- Ceramic: Total Mass of Water and Drying Times

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flow Rate</th>
<th>Total Mass of Water</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.25 L/min</td>
<td>0.0386 kg</td>
<td>9.37 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5 L/min</td>
<td>0.0386 kg</td>
<td>3.09 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75 L/min</td>
<td>0.039 kg</td>
<td>2.77 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 L/min</td>
<td>0.0393 kg</td>
<td>2.59 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
likely due to the use of 4.5 times larger spheres. Material may also play a role, because different materials have different values of surface tension.

4.4 Non-Dimensional Curvefit

The Reynolds numbers and Sherwood numbers acquired through the calculations from the data are used to obtain a correlation for both steel and ceramic materials. The Sherwood number is plotted versus the Reynolds number on a log-log scale for the 0.25 L/min, 0.5 L/min, 0.75 L/min and 1 L/min for steel and ceramic. A linear regression of the points is then taken and an equation in the form \( y = mx + k \) is achieved along with an \( R^2 \) value. These values may be seen in Figure 15 for steel and Figure 16 for ceramic tests. The steel test produced a \( R^2 \) value of .9445. The ceramic test had a slightly lower value of .9281. Both test values give fairly good fit values. Some possible reasons for less than perfect correlations may be the packing of the bed, irregularity of ceramic beads and variations in inlet humidity levels in a few tests. The ceramic also may have been able to hold more water, thus giving a state slightly beyond residually saturated.

After solving for the values of the coefficients, empirical equations are obtained for steel and ceramic spheres. For steel the following equation for the Sherwood number is obtained:

\[
Sh = 2.6613 Re^{0.942}
\]

The ceramic data yields a Sherwood number that looks like the following:

\[
Sh = 2.8729 Re^{0.988}
\]
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Figure 15. Dimensionless Representation of Mass Transfer Measurements for Steel

\[ y = 0.9842x + 2.6613 \]

\[ R^2 = 0.9445 \]
Figure 16. Dimensionless Representation of Mass Transfer Measurements for Ceramic
Both equations are valid in the ranges of $0.267 \leq Re \leq 1.066$. The above equations are derived through use of flow rates at room temperature conditions. Further study could improve on the accuracy and verify results found in this study.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Evaporative drying experiments are conducted for both steel and ceramic porous media fills. The inlet and outlet humidities have been monitored and plotted versus time. Most of the curves are similar in nature for drying rates of each material and flow rate. The drying times were extremely close at similar flow rates regardless of the material. A comparison of the mass of water and the drying times for each material and flow rate may be seen in Table 5. Thermocouple readings showed temperature changes in the media due to evaporative cooling only varying by a couple of degrees in the experiments performed. Empirical correlations for Sherwood number have been acquired for steel and ceramic spheres in the range of $0.267 \leq \text{Re} \leq 1.066$. The correlation for steel with a constant Schmidt number at room temperature is:

$$Sh = 2.6613 \text{Re}^{0.842}$$

The equation for ceramic was found to be:

$$Sh = .2872 \text{Re}^{0.988}$$
Although the test is experimental in nature, most of the theory presented is for background knowledge. However, several of the equations listed are used in the analysis, and may be seen in the calculations in Appendix VI, VII, and VIII. The model has been developed in a one-dimensional, two phase, transient flow with evaporative processes through a residually saturated porous medium.

Fluid flow through a porous media presents difficulties in solutions to governing equations due to the complex and changing geometry between the particles in which the fluid flows. To simplify the geometry, approximating equations were obtained by averaging quantities over a control volume that is large in comparison with the particles and interstices of the porous medium.

By applying the conservation of mass to the control volume, the continuity equation results.

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \rho u}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \rho v}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial \rho w}{\partial z} = 0$$

For the one-dimensional model the continuity equation takes the following form:
\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left[ \phi S_l \rho_l + \phi S_g \rho_g + (1 - \phi) \rho_s \right] + \nabla \cdot \left( \rho u_l + \rho_g u_g \right) + \dot{m}_e = 0 \]

where \( \phi \) is the porosity, \( S_l \) is the liquid phase saturation, \( S_g \) is the gas phase saturation, \( \rho_l \) is the liquid phase density, \( \rho_g \) is the gas phase density, \( \rho_s \) is the saturation density, \( u_l \) is the liquid phase velocity, \( u_g \) is the gas phase velocity and \( m_e \) is the mass flow rate.

According to Whitaker (1977) and Boehm et al. (1995a, 1995b), the above equation is used in conjunction with the following assumptions:

1. Viscous dissipation and work due to compression is negligible.
2. The medium through which flow occurs is homogeneous.
3. The streamwise component of mass diffusion is negligible compared to convection.
4. Thermophysical properties except nitrogen gas and water vapor are considered to be constant.
5. The solid matrix of the porous media is incompressible and no chemical reactions occur.
6. The system is free of bound moisture in the solid phase.
7. Water vapor and gas components can be treated as ideal gases.

For a one phase one-dimensional flow, the mass flow rate is defined as:

\[ \dot{m}_e = \rho \frac{\pi D^2}{4} u_d \]

where \( D \) is the diameter of the particle and the filter velocity \( u_d \) may be obtained from:

\[ \frac{dP}{dx} = \frac{\mu}{K} u_d \]
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The above equation represents the change in pressure (P) with respect to x, \( \mu \) the dynamic viscosity and \( K \) the permeability. The Reynolds number of the incoming gas is obtained through the following equation:

\[
Re = \frac{\rho u D}{\mu}
\]

After taking into consideration the more complex two-phase flow, the equations and analyses develop in the following. The gas velocity through the medium is:

\[
\mathbf{u}_g = -\frac{k_{rg} K}{\mu_g} (\nabla P_g - \rho_g g)
\]

where \( k_{rg} \) is the relative permeability of the gas, \( \mu_g \) is the dynamic viscosity of the gas, \( P_g \) and \( \rho_g \) are the pressure and density of the gas respectively, and \( g \) is the gravitational constant. The velocity of the liquid is represented by the same equation with the exception of properties values indicated by a subscript 1 where applicable. However, since the bed is assumed to be residually saturated, \( u_l \) is assumed to be nearly zero. Bejan (1992) after taking averages over an elemental volume of the porous medium, acquires for the solid phase:

\[
(1 - \phi)(\rho c) \frac{\partial T_s}{\partial t} = (1 - \phi) \nabla \cdot (k_s \nabla T_s) + (1 - \phi) q_s
\]

and for the liquid phase:

\[
\phi (\rho c_p) \frac{\partial T_l}{\partial t} + (\rho c_p) \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla T_l = \phi \nabla \cdot (k_l \nabla T_l) + \phi q_l
\]
where $\phi$ is the porosity, $T$ is the temperature, $t$ is the time and $q$ is the heat flux per unit volume. Setting $T_s=T_i=T$ and combining the previous two equations, the energy equation becomes:

$$(\rho c)_m \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} + (\rho c)_i \cdot \nabla T = \nabla \cdot (k \nabla T) + q$$

Taking into consideration pressure changes, then the term $\beta T(\partial P/\partial t + u \cdot \nabla P)$ is added to the left side of the above equation where:

$$\beta = -\frac{1}{\rho} \left( \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial T} \right)_p$$

$\beta$ is the volumetric thermal expansion coefficient and is a function of the change in density with respect to temperature at a constant pressure.

Boehm et al. derive the volume-average thermal energy equation for both phases and acquire the total thermal energy equations as:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left[ \phi S_i \rho hu + \phi S_e \rho e h_e + (1 - \phi) \rho_e h_e \right] + \nabla \cdot \left( \rho uhu + \rho_e u_e h_e \right)$$

$$- \nabla \cdot (k \nabla T) - \left[ \frac{\partial P}{\partial t} + (u + u_e) \cdot \nabla P \right] + m_e h_{\text{cp}}$$

The volume constraint equations are:

$$\phi = S + S_e$$
$$S = \phi S_i$$
$$S_e = \phi S_e$$
$$\omega = 1 - \phi$$
$$S_i + S_e = 1$$
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For multicomponent and multiphase flows the total mass is equal to the sum of all the individual masses combined ($m = \sum m_i$). Thus concentration is defined as:

$$C_i = \frac{m_i}{V}$$

and the aggregate density of the mixture is the sum of all the concentrations:

$$\rho = \sum C_i$$

As stated earlier, the water vapor and gas can be treated as ideal gases, therefore the gas law yields the equations:

$$PV = mRmT$$

or

$$PV = nRT$$

where the gas constant of the mixture ($R_m$) and the universal gas constant ($R$) are:

$$R = \frac{R_m}{M}$$

The term $n$ represents the number of moles in the mixture and $m$ is the mass. The partial pressure $P_i$ can be observed in the following two equations:

$$P_iV = m_iR_mT$$

or

$$P_iV = n_iRT$$

Summing these equations over $i$, Dalton's law results:

$$P = \sum P_i$$
Summing these equations over i, Dalton's law results:

\[ P = \sum P_i \]

In this experiment, there are two i components, the nitrogen gas and the water vapor.

From Kaviany's (1991) empirical correlations, the following relationships are used for the relative permeabilities for the gas and the liquid:

\[ k_{rl} = S^3 \]
\[ k_{rx} = 1.2984 - 1.9832S + .7432S^2 \]

Capillary pressure is defined as:

\[ P_c = P_g - P_l \]

Temperature relation can be derived from the combination of Kelvin's relation and the Clapeyron equation resulting in the equilibrium between liquid and gas phases:

\[ T = \frac{T_0(l + P_c / \rho h_{vap})}{1 - T_0(R_g / h_{vap}) \ln(P_g / P_0)} \]

where \( T_0 \) and \( P_0 \) are reference temperature and pressure respectively and \( P_{sg} \) is the saturated vapor pressure. Relative humidity values can be obtained from:

\[ P_g = P_{sg}RH \]

where \( P_g \) is the partial pressure of the gas and \( RH \) is the relative humidity. For mass transfer, the Sherwood number is defined as:

\[ Sh = \frac{h_m \cdot d_p}{Dn_2} \]
where $h_m$ is the mass transfer coefficient, $d_p$ is the diameter of the particle and $D_{12}$ is the binary diffusivity. The total surface area per unit volume of a porous bed is:

$$A = \frac{6}{d_p}$$

The equation for the Schmidt number is:

$$Sc = \frac{\nu}{D_{12}}$$

where $\nu$ is the kinematic viscosity.

A mass transfer coefficient may be obtained through use of the equation:

$$n_o = h_m A (\rho_{a, s} - \rho_{a, \infty})$$

where $n_o$ is the evaporation rate, $A$ is the total area of the porous bed, $\rho_{a, s}$ is the density of the water on the porous surface, and $\rho_{a, \infty}$ is the density of the bulk flow of gas. If the free stream water vapor is assumed to be an ideal gas

$$\phi_o = \frac{\rho_{a, \infty}}{\rho_{a, \text{sat}}(T_\infty)}$$

the relative humidity ($\phi_o$) of the bulk gas is represented in terms of the density of the gas ($\rho_{a, \infty}$) and the saturation density ($\rho_{a, \text{sat}}$) at the ambient temperature ($T_\infty$). When $\rho_{a, s}$ is equal to $\rho_{a, \text{sat}}(T_s)$ (the density of the liquid at the surface temperature), the following equation results:

$$n_o = h_m A (\rho_{a, \text{sat}}(T_s) - \phi_o \rho_{a, \text{sat}}(T_\infty))$$
APPENDIX II

HUMIDITY SENSOR CALIBRATIONS - STEEL
Figure 17. Inlet Humidity of Nitrogen Gas vs. Voltage Calibration - Steel Test #1

\[ y = -249.88x + 570.75 \]
Figure 18. Outlet Humidity vs. Voltage Calibration - Steel Test #1

\[ y = 1754.5x - 3696.2 \]
Figure 20.Outlet Humidity vs. Voltage Calibration—Steel Test #2

\[ y = 7059.2x - 15315 \]
Figure 21. Inlet Humidity of Nitrogen Gas vs. Voltage Calibration - Steel Test #3
\[ y = 8989.2x - 19494 \]

**Figure 22. Outlet Humidity vs. Voltage Calibration - Steel Test #3**
Figure 23. Inlet Humidity of Nitrogen Gas vs. Voltage Calibration - Steel Test # 4
Figure 24. Outlet Humidity vs. Voltage Calibration - Steel Test #4

\[ y = -7509.3x + 16019 \]

Humidity % vs. Voltage (V)
APPENDIX III

HUMIDITY SENSOR CALIBRATIONS- CERAMIC
$y = 3.5575x - 2.0489$

Figure 25. Inlet Humidity of Nitrogen Gas vs. Voltage Calibration - Ceramic Test #1
Figure 27. Inlet Humidity of Nitrogen Gas vs. Voltage- Ceramic Test #2
Figure 31. Inlet Humidity of Nitrogen Gas vs. Voltage Calibration - Ceramic Test # 4
Figure 32. Outlet Humidity vs. Voltage Calibration - Ceramic Test #4

The equation for the line is:

\[ y = -371.55x + 694.51 \]
APPENDIX IV

MASS OF WATER LOST CALIBRATIONS - STEEL
Figure 33: Mass of Water Lost vs. Time—Steel, 25 L/min
Figure 36. Mass of Water Lost vs. Time - Steel 1 L/min

The line on the graph is described by the equation:

\[ y = 0.000203x - 0.004800 \]
APPENDIX V

MASS OF WATER LOST CALIBRATIONS - CERAMIC
Figure 37. Mass of Water Lost vs. Time - Ceramic: 25 L/min

$y = 0.0000091x - 0.010761$
Figure 38. Mass of Water Lost vs. Time - Ceramic 5 L/min

\[ y = 0.000224x - 0.005921 \]
Figure 39. Mass of Water Lost vs. Time- Ceramic. 75 L/min
APPENDIX VI

REYNOLDS NUMBER CALCULATIONS
Reynolds Number Calculations

Calculations for .25 L/min Nitrogen Flow Rates

\( \phi = 0.395 \)  
Porosity (Kaviany 1995)

\( \rho = 1.142 \cdot 10^{-3} \text{ kg/m}^3 \)  
Density of Nitrogen gas at 24 degrees C

\( \mu = 17.84 \cdot 10^{-6} \text{ kg/m-sec} \)  
Dynamic viscosity of Nitrogen gas at 24 degrees C

\( D_{\text{bed}} = 0.0381 \text{ m} \)  
Diameter of tube for incoming Nitrogen gas

\( A = \pi \left( \frac{D_{\text{bed}}}{2} \right)^2 \)  
Area of tube for incoming Nitrogen gas

\( Q = 0.25 \text{ liter/min} \)  
Flow rate of incoming Nitrogen gas

\( Q = 4.167 \cdot 10^{-6} \text{ m}^3 \cdot \text{sec}^{-1} \)  
Flow rate of incoming Nitrogen gas

\( U = \frac{Q}{A \phi} \)  
Velocity of incoming Nitrogen gas

\( U = 9.252 \cdot 10^{-3} \text{ m/sec}^{-1} \)  
Velocity of incoming Nitrogen gas

\( D_{\text{sphere}} = 4.5 \text{ mm} \)

\( \text{Re}_D = \frac{\rho U D_{\text{sphere}}}{\mu} \)  
Reynolds number

\( \text{Re}_D = 0.267 \)  
Reynolds number
Calculations for .5 L/min Nitrogen flow Rates

\[ Q = \frac{.5 \text{ liter}}{\text{min}} \]  
Flow rate of incoming Nitrogen gas

\[ U = \frac{Q}{A \cdot \Phi} \]  

\[ U = 0.019 \text{ m} \cdot \text{sec}^{-1} \]  
Velocity of incoming Nitrogen gas

\[ Re_D = \frac{\rho U D_{sphere}}{\mu} \]  

\[ Re_D = 0.533 \]  
Reynolds Number

Calculations for .75 L/min Nitrogen flow Rates

\[ Q = \frac{.75 \text{ liter}}{\text{min}} \]  
Flow rate of incoming Nitrogen gas

\[ U = \frac{Q}{A \cdot \Phi} \]  

\[ U = 0.028 \text{ m} \cdot \text{sec}^{-1} \]  
Velocity of incoming Nitrogen gas

\[ Re_D = \frac{\rho U D_{sphere}}{\mu} \]  

\[ Re_D = 0.8 \]  
Reynolds Number

Calculations for 1 L/min Nitrogen flow Rates

\[ Q = \frac{1 \text{ liter}}{\text{min}} \]  
Flow rate of incoming Nitrogen gas

\[ U = \frac{Q}{A \cdot \Phi} \]  

\[ U = 0.037 \text{ m} \cdot \text{sec}^{-1} \]  
Velocity of incoming Nitrogen gas

\[ Re_D = \frac{\rho U D_{sphere}}{\mu} \]  

\[ Re_D = 1.066 \]  
Reynolds Number

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Steel Calculations

Test #1 Steel-.25 L/min

\[ d_p = 4.5 \text{ mm} \]

Diameter of individual particle in bed

\[ S_{\text{bed}} = \frac{6}{d_p} \]

Surface area of bed per unit volume

\[ S_{\text{bed}} = 1.333 \times 10^3 \text{ m}^{-3} \text{ m}^2 \]

Diameter of test section

\[ D_{\text{test}} = 0.0381 \text{ m} \]

Length of test section

\[ L_{\text{test}} = 0.4064 \text{ m} \]

Volume of test section

\[ V_{\text{test}} = \frac{\pi \cdot D_{\text{test}}^2}{2} \cdot L_{\text{test}} \]

\[ V_{\text{test}} = 4.633 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m}^3 \]

Total area of test bed

\[ A_{\text{test}} = S_{\text{bed}} \cdot V_{\text{test}} \]

\[ A_{\text{test}} = 0.618 \text{ m}^2 \]

Evaporation rate from Mass of Water Lost Calibration

\[ n_a = 8.36 \times 10^{-7} \text{ kg sec}^{-1} \]

Specific volume at 24 degrees C

\[ v_g = 45.54 \text{ m}^3 \text{ kg}^{-1} \]

Density at saturation temperature

\[ \rho_{\text{satTemp}} = \frac{1}{v_g} \]

\[ \rho_{\text{satTemp}} = 0.022 \text{ kg m}^{-3} \]

Humidity of incoming Nitrogen gas

\[ \phi_{\text{N2}} = 0.065 \]
\[ h_m = \frac{n_a}{A_{\text{test}} \rho \text{satTemp} \cdot l \cdot N2} \]

\[ h_m = 6.591 \cdot 10^{-5} \text{ m}^2 \text{sec}^{-1} \]

**Mass transfer coefficient**

\[ D_{12} = 2.6 \cdot 10^{-8} \text{ m}^2 \text{sec}^{-1} \]

**Binary diffusion coefficient**

\[ \text{Sh} = \frac{h_m d \rho}{D_{12}} \]

\[ \text{Sh} = 114.076 \]

**Sherwood number**
Test #2 Steel- .5 L/min

\[ d_p = 4.5 \text{ mm} \]

\[ S_{\text{bed}} = \frac{6}{d_p} \]

\[ S_{\text{bed}} = 1.33 \times 10^{-3} \cdot \text{m}^2/\text{m}^2 \]

\[ D_{\text{test}} = 0.0381 \text{ m} \]

\[ L_{\text{test}} = 0.4064 \text{ m} \]

\[ V_{\text{test}} = \pi \cdot \frac{D_{\text{test}}^2}{2} \cdot L_{\text{test}} \]

\[ V_{\text{test}} = 4.63 \times 10^{-4} \cdot \text{m}^3 \]

\[ A_{\text{test}} = S_{\text{bed}} \cdot V_{\text{test}} \]

\[ A_{\text{test}} = 0.618 \text{ m}^2 \]

\[ n_a = 2.25 \times 10^{-6} \text{ kg sec}^{-1} \]

\[ v_g = 45.54 \frac{\text{m}^3}{\text{kg}} \]

\[ \rho_{\text{satTemp}} = \frac{1}{v_g} \]

\[ \rho_{\text{satTemp}} = 0.022 \text{ kg m}^{-3} \]

\[ \phi_{\text{N2}} = 0.6 \]

Diameter of individual particle in bed

Surface area of bed per unit volume

Diameter of test section

Length of test section

Volume of test section

Total area of test bed

Evaporation rate from Mass of Water Lost Calibration

Specific volume at 24 degrees C

Density at saturation Temperature

Humidity of incoming Nitrogen gas
\[ h_m = \frac{n_a}{A_{\text{test}} \rho_{\text{satTemp}} (1 - \Phi N_2)} \]

\[ h_m = 1.764 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m}^2\text{sec}^{-1} \text{ Mass transfer coefficient} \]

\[ D_{12} = 26.10 \times 10^8 \text{ m}^2\text{sec}^{-1} \text{ Binary diffusion coefficient} \]

\[ \text{Sh} = \frac{h_m d_p}{D_{12}} \]

\[ \text{Sh} = 305.39 \text{ Sherwood number} \]
Test #3 Steel - .75 L/min

\[ d_p = 4.5 \text{ mm} \quad \text{Diameter of individual particle in bed} \]

\[ S_{\text{bed}} = \frac{6}{d_p} \]

\[ S_{\text{bed}} = 1.333 \times 10^3 \cdot \text{m}^{-3} \cdot \text{m}^2 \quad \text{Surface area of bed per unit volume} \]

\[ D_{\text{test}} = 0.0381 \cdot \text{m} \quad \text{Diameter of test section} \]

\[ L_{\text{test}} = 0.4064 \cdot \text{m} \quad \text{Length of test section} \]

\[ V_{\text{test}} = \pi \cdot \frac{D_{\text{test}}^2}{2} \cdot L_{\text{test}} \quad \text{Volume of test section} \]

\[ V_{\text{test}} = 4.633 \times 10^{-4} \cdot \text{m}^3 \]

\[ A_{\text{test}} = S_{\text{bed}} \cdot V_{\text{test}} \quad \text{Total area of test bed} \]

\[ A_{\text{test}} = 0.618 \cdot \text{m}^2 \]

\[ \alpha_a = 2.517 \times 10^{-6} \cdot \text{kg} \cdot \text{sec}^{-1} \quad \text{Evaporation rate from Mass of Water Lost Calibration} \]

\[ v_g = 45.54 \cdot \text{m}^3 \quad \text{Specific volume at 24 degrees C} \]

\[ \rho_{\text{satTemp}} = \frac{1}{v_g} \quad \text{Density at saturation temperature} \]

\[ \rho_{\text{satTemp}} = 0.022 \cdot \text{kg} \cdot \text{m}^{-3} \]

\[ \phi_{\text{N2}} = 0.06 \quad \text{Humidity of incoming Nitrogen gas} \]
\[ h_m = \frac{n_a}{A_{\text{test}} \rho_{\text{satTemp}} \cdot (1 - \phi_{\text{N2}})} \]

Mass transfer coefficient

\[ D_{12} = 2.6 \times 10^{-8} \text{ m}^2 \text{ sec}^{-1} \]

Binary diffusion coefficient

\[ Sh = \frac{h_m \cdot d \rho}{D_{12}} \]

Sherwood number

\[ Sh = 341.629 \]
Test #4 Steel- 1 L/min

\[ d_p = 4.5 \text{ mm} \quad \text{Diameter of individual particle in bed} \]

\[ S_{bed} = \frac{6}{d_p} \]

\[ S_{bed} = 1.333 \times 10^3 \text{ m}^{-2} \quad \text{Surface area of bed per unit volume} \]

\[ D_{test} = .0381 \text{ m} \quad \text{Diameter of test section} \]

\[ L_{test} = .4064 \text{ m} \quad \text{Length of test section} \]

\[ V_{test} = \pi \frac{D_{test}^2}{2} \cdot L_{test} \quad \text{Volume of test section} \]

\[ A_{test} = S_{bed} \cdot V_{test} \quad \text{Total area of test bed} \]

\[ a_a = 3.383 \times 10^{-6} \text{ kg sec}^{-1} \quad \text{Evaporation rate from Mass of water Lost Calibration} \]

\[ v_g = 45.54 \frac{\text{m}^3}{\text{kg}} \quad \text{Specific volume at 24 degrees C} \]

\[ \rho_{\text{satTemp}} = \frac{1}{v_g} \]

\[ \rho_{\text{satTemp}} = 0.022 \text{ kg m}^{-3} \quad \text{Density at saturation temperature} \]

\[ \phi_{N2} = .073 \quad \text{Humidity of incoming Nitrogen gas} \]
\[ h_m = \frac{n_a}{A_{test}\rho \text{satTemp} \cdot (1 - \phi)} \]  

\[ h_m = 2.69 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m sec}^{-1} \]  

\[ D_{12} = 2.6 \times 10^{-8} \text{ m}^2 \text{ sec}^{-1} \]  

\[ Sh = \frac{h_m d_p}{D_{12}} \]  

\[ Sh = 465.61 \]

**Mass transfer coefficient**

**Binary diffusion coefficient**

**Sherwood number**
APPENDIX VIII

CALCULATIONS- CERAMIC
Ceramic Calculations

Test #1 Ceramic- .25 L/min

\[ d_p = 4.5 \text{ mm} \]  
\[ S_{\text{bed}} = \frac{6}{d_p} \]  
\[ S_{\text{bed}} = 1.333 \times 10^3 \text{ m}^{-3} \text{ m}^2 \]  
\[ D_{\text{test}} = 0.381 \text{ m} \]  
\[ L_{\text{test}} = 0.4064 \text{ m} \]  
\[ V_{\text{test}} = \pi \left( \frac{D_{\text{test}}}{2} \right)^2 \cdot L_{\text{test}} \]  
\[ V_{\text{test}} = 4.633 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m}^3 \]  
\[ A_{\text{test}} = S_{\text{bed}} \cdot V_{\text{test}} \]  
\[ A_{\text{test}} = 0.618 \text{ m}^2 \]  
\[ n_a = 1.513 \times 10^{-6} \text{ kg} \cdot \text{sec}^{-1} \]  
\[ v_g = 45.54 \text{ m}^3 \text{ kg}^{-1} \]  
\[ \rho_{\text{satTemp}} = \frac{1}{v_g} \]  
\[ \rho_{\text{satTemp}} = 0.022 \text{ kg} \cdot \text{m}^{-3} \]  
\[ \phi_{\text{N2}} = 0.06 \]  

Diameter of individual particle in bed
Surface area of bed per unit volume
Diameter of test section
Length of test section
Volume of test section
Total area of test bed
Evaporation rate
Specific volume at 24 degrees C
Density at saturation temperature
Humidity of incoming Nitrogen gas
\[
\frac{h_m}{n_a} = \frac{A_{\text{test}} \rho_{\text{sat Temp}}}{1 - \phi N_2}
\]

\[h_m = 1.187 \cdot 10^{-4} \cdot \text{m}^2\text{sec}^{-1}\]  \hspace{1cm} \text{Mass transfer coefficient}

\[D_{12} = 26 \cdot 10^{-8} \cdot \frac{\text{m}^2}{\text{sec}}\]  \hspace{1cm} \text{Binary diffusion coefficient}

\[Sh = \frac{h_m d_p}{D_{12}}\]  \hspace{1cm} \text{Sherwood number}

\[Sh = 205.358\]
Test #2 Ceramic- .5 L/min

\[ d_p = 4.5 \text{ mm} \]

Diameter of individual particle in bed

\[ S_{bed} = \frac{6}{d_p} \]

Surface area of bed per unit volume

\[ S_{bed} = 1.333 \times 10^3 \cdot \text{m}^{-3} \cdot \text{m}^2 \]

Diameter of test section

\[ D_{test} = 0.0381 \cdot \text{m} \]

Length of test section

\[ L_{test} = 0.4064 \cdot \text{m} \]

Volume of test section

\[ V_{test} = \pi \cdot \frac{D_{test}^2}{2} \cdot L_{test} \]

Total area of test bed

\[ A_{test} = S_{bed} \cdot V_{test} \]

\[ A_{test} = 0.618 \cdot \text{m}^2 \]

Evaporation rate

\[ n_a = 3.733 \times 10^6 \cdot \text{kg} \cdot \text{sec}^{-1} \]

Specific volume at 24 degrees C

\[ v_g = 45.54 \cdot \frac{\text{m}^3}{\text{kg}} \]

Density at saturation temperature

\[ \rho_{satTemp} = \frac{1}{v_g} \]

Humidity of incoming Nitrogen gas

\[ \rho_{satTemp} = 0.022 \cdot \text{kg} \cdot \text{m}^{-3} \]

\[ \dot{N}_2 = 0.06 \]
\[ h_m = \frac{n_a}{A_{test} \rho_{satTemp} \cdot 1 - \phi \cdot N2} \]

\[ h_m = 2.927 \cdot 10^{-4} \text{ m}^2 \text{ sec}^{-1} \]  
**Mass transfer coefficient**

\[ D_{12} = 2.6 \cdot 10^{-8} \text{ m}^2 \text{ sec} \]  
**Binary diffusion coefficient**

\[ \text{Sh} = \frac{h_m d_p}{D_{12}} \]

\[ \text{Sh} = 506.676 \]  
**Sherwood number**
Test #3 Ceramic-.75 L/min

\[ d_p = 4.5 \text{ mm} \]

Diameter of individual particle in bed

\[ S_{\text{bed}} = \frac{6}{d_p} \]

Surface area of bed per unit volume

\[ S_{\text{bed}} = 1.333 \times 10^3 \text{ m}^{-2} \]

\[ \text{Diameter of test section} \]

\[ D_{\text{test}} = 0.0381 \text{ m} \]

\[ \text{Length of test section} \]

\[ L_{\text{test}} = 0.4064 \text{ m} \]

\[ V_{\text{test}} = \pi \cdot \frac{D_{\text{test}}^2}{2} \cdot L_{\text{test}} \]

Volume of test section

\[ V_{\text{test}} = 4.633 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m}^3 \]

\[ A_{\text{test}} = S_{\text{bed}} \cdot V_{\text{test}} \]

Total area of test bed

\[ A_{\text{test}} = 0.618 \text{ m}^2 \]

Evaporation rate

\[ n_a = 4.817 \times 10^6 \text{ kg sec}^{-1} \]

Specific volume at 24 degrees C

\[ v_g = 45.54 \text{ m}^3 \text{ kg}^{-1} \]

\[ \rho_{\text{satTemp}} = \frac{1}{v_g} \]

Density at saturation temperature

\[ \rho_{\text{satTemp}} = 0.022 \text{ kg m}^{-3} \]

Humidity of incoming Nitrogen gas

\[ \phi_{N_2} = 0.06 \]
\[ h_m = \frac{n_s}{A_{\text{test}} \cdot \text{satTemp} \cdot (1 - N2)} \]

\[ h_m = 3.778 \cdot 10^{-4} \cdot \text{m} \cdot \text{sec}^{-1} \]

**Mass transfer coefficient**

\[ D_{12} = 2.6 \cdot 10^{-8} \cdot \frac{\text{m}^2}{\text{sec}} \]

**Binary diffusion coefficient**

\[ Sh = \frac{h_m \cdot d_p}{D_{12}} \]

\[ Sh = 653.806 \]

**Sherwood number**
Test #4 Ceramic- 1 L/min

\( d_p = 4.5 \text{ mm} \)  
Diameter of individual particle in bed

\( S_{\text{bed}} = \frac{6}{d_p} \)

\( S_{\text{bed}} = 1.333 \times 10^3 \text{ m}^{-3} \cdot \text{m}^2 \)  
Surface area of bed per unit volume

\( D_{\text{test}} = 0.381 \text{ m} \)  
Diameter of test section

\( L_{\text{test}} = 0.4064 \text{ m} \)  
Length of test section

\( V_{\text{test}} = \pi \left( \frac{D_{\text{test}}}{2} \right)^2 \cdot L_{\text{test}} \)

\( V_{\text{test}} = 4.633 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m}^3 \)  
Volume of test section

\( A_{\text{test}} = S_{\text{bed}} \cdot V_{\text{test}} \)

\( A_{\text{test}} = 0.618 \text{ m}^2 \)  
Total area of test bed

\( n_a = 4.95 \times 10^{-6} \text{ kg} \cdot \text{sec}^{-1} \)  
Evaporation rate

\( v_g = 45.54 \text{ m}^3 \text{ kg}^{-1} \)

\( \rho_{\text{satTemp}} = \frac{1}{v_g} \)

\( \rho_{\text{satTemp}} = 0.022 \text{ kg} \cdot \text{m}^{-3} \)  
Density at saturation temperature

\( \phi_{\text{N}_2} = 0.078 \)  
Humidity of incoming Nitrogen gas
\[ h_m = \frac{n_a}{A_{\text{test}} p_{\text{sat Temp}} (1 - i N_2)} \]

\[ h_m = 3.958 \times 10^{-4} \cdot \text{m}^2\text{sec}^{-1} \quad \text{Mass transfer coefficient} \]

\[ D_{12} = 2.6 \times 10^{-8} \cdot \text{m}^2\text{sec}^{-1} \quad \text{Binary diffusion coefficient} \]

\[ \text{Sh} = \frac{h_m d p}{D_{12}} \]

\[ \text{Sh} = 684.974 \quad \text{Sherwood number} \]
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