NUMERICAL STUDY OF FLOW INHOMOGENEITY AND HEAT TRANSFER ENHANCEMENT IN STRUCTURED PACKED BEDS
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Packed beds are widely used in engineering applications due to their high specific surface area and good heat transfer characteristics. A grille-sphere composite packed bed is proposed previously and has been proved to have higher overall heat transfer coefficient than the simple cubic packing structure. In the present paper, the flow inhomogeneities in both grille-sphere composite packed bed and the simple cubic packing are studied and the relationship between the flow inhomogeneity and the heat transfer characteristics is revealed by numerical simulations. The simulations are performed on ANSYS FLUENT software. The turbulence flow is modeled by the Renormalization Group $k$-$\varepsilon$ model. Both dispersion of the velocity distribution and the residence time distribution are employed to assess the flow maldistribution. When inlet velocity equals 2.17 m/s, the variance of the residence time distribution of the composite packed bed is 5.91\% smaller than that of the simple cubic packing while the Nusselt number is 10.64\% higher. The results indicate that less flow maldistribution can lead to heat transfer enhancement.
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1. Introduction

Packed beds are widely used in a variety of industries, such as high temperature gas cooled reactors [1], energy storage systems [2] and catalytic packed bed reactors [3]. Due to the complexity of pore structure, the flow inhomogeneity in packed beds is significant and the flow will further influence the heat and mass transfer characteristics. Computational fluid dynamics (CFD) has become a powerful tool to study the fluid flow in packed beds and the particle-resolved simulation can provide the most rigorous description of packed beds [4]. For example, Wu et al. [5] employed the Discrete element method combined with CFD (DEM-CFD) simulation to investigate the helium flow characteristics in randomly packed beds at rather low Reynolds numbers and they studied the relationship between the local velocity and the pore structure. The similar numerical method was used by Zhang et al. [6] and their results showed that the local packing-structure parameters have significant effects not only on the
local velocity and pressure fields but also on macroscopic quantities, such as the average pressure gradient along the flow direction of the packed bed. Dixon [7] studied the local transport and reaction rates in a fixed bed reactor with methane steam reforming reaction by the particle-resolved simulation. Dong et al. [8] carried out the particle-resolved CFD simulations to have insights of the temperature profiles in fixed bed reactors.

Research has shown that the flow inhomogeneity in packed beds can have a significant influence on macroscopic parameters, such as the pressure drop, heat transfer and mass transfer performances. The study of the flow inhomogeneity is therefore important. The investigations of the flow inhomogeneity mainly contain two methods, one is the direct way and the other is the indirect way.

In the direct way, the dispersion of velocity on the cross sections along the flow direction is evaluated. In this area, Petrova et al. [9] reviewed the estimation methods of gas flow maldistributions in packed beds and recommended the equations to calculate the maldistribution factor. Marek [10] studied the flow maldistributions in packed beds with different particle shapes and inlet configurations by calculating the velocity deviation. In the indirect way, residence time distribution (RTD) is a useful method to assess the flow maldistribution. This method is based on the study of transient state. After obtaining the steady flow field, a non-diffusive tracer was injected into the packed bed and the tracer concentration on the outlet was monitored. The flow inhomogeneities were evaluated by the RTD curve. For instance, Atmakidis and Kenig [11] studied the RTD in packed beds with small tube-to-particle ratios to assess the influence of wall effect. Pawlowski et al. [12] studied RTD in monolithic porous columns reconstructed from X-ray tomography data and compared it with the experimental results. The RTD in multi-orifice baffled tubes was numerically studied where the concentration-time profile of the tracer was analyzed [13]. Guo et al. [14] revealed that there is a relationship between the velocity distribution on a cross section and the RTD curve. Wang et al. [15] studied the RTD in three typical structured packed bed and reported a relationship between the RTD and the heat transfer. Stepanov et al. [16] studied the residence time by Lagrange particle tracking method in CFD to determine the influence of baffles in a combustion chamber. Tomanovic et al. [17] studied the gas desulfurization process also by Lagrange particle tracking method and found that the distribution, dispersion and residence time of sorbent particles in the furnace have a considerable influence on the desulfurization process.

From above, it can be seen that the flow maldistribution is closely related to the heat/mass transfer. Better flow homogeneity can lead to stronger heat transfer performance. In our previous study [18], we designed a grille-sphere composite packed bed (GSCPB) and studied the particle-to-fluid heat transfer characteristics by experiments. Besides, the Nusselt number in GSCPB is compared to that of a simple cubic (SC) packed bed with the same particle diameter since these two structures are almost the same expect for the grille wall (as shown in Fig. 1). The experimental results showed that the Nusselt number in GSCPB is higher than the SC packing structure. As a continuation of the previous study, the present paper will study the flow inhomogeneity in these two packing structures and try to reveal the relationship between the flow inhomogeneity and the heat transfer. The flow inhomogeneity is investigated by both the direct way and the indirect way. The study is carried out by ANSYS FLUENT 17.0.
2. Model description

From Fig. 1(a), it can be seen that, in GSCPB, the whole flow channel is divided into several parallel sub-channels and each sub-channel behaves the same theoretically. Therefore, only one channel is chosen in the numerical study so as to reduce the computational time. Here, the grille wall is considered to be adiabatic and the thickness of the grille wall is neglected. Besides, only ten particles are stacked since ten particles can guarantee the fully developed flow [19]. The diameter of the particle is 12 [mm], which is the same as the experiment [18]. The simplified geometry of GSCPB is shown in Fig. 2, where a clear inlet section and an outlet section are added to make the velocity uniform and to avoid backflow. The lengths of the inlet section and the outlet section are 30 [mm] and 80 [mm], respectively.

As for SC packing shown in Fig. 1(b), the geometry is periodic and thus one channel can represent the whole structure [20]. Again ten particles are used in the simulation. The simplified computational model is the same with GSCPB except for the boundary conditions of the walls around, which are symmetric boundaries in SC packing.

3. Numerical method

In the present work, the continuity equation, three-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations and energy equation are employed for the simulations. The finite volume analysis software ANSYS FLUENT 17.0 is used to solve the equations. The studied Reynolds number ($Re_v=\rho v_d d/\mu$) in two structures are both larger than 300, where the flow would be turbulent flow inside [21]. The
Renormalization Group (RNG) $k$-$\varepsilon$ model and the scalable wall-function treatment with $y^+>11.225$ (dimensionless distance of the wall grid elements) are adopted for the simulation. The RNG $k$-$\varepsilon$ turbulence model is applicable to the small scale eddies, which are independent of the larger-scale phenomena that create them, and it is more suitable for modeling turbulent flow in packed beds [22].

The conservation equations for mass, momentum, and energy are as follows (Eqs. (1-3)):

\[ \nabla \cdot (\rho \vec{v}) = 0 \]  
\[ \nabla \cdot (\rho \vec{w}) = -\nabla p + \nabla \cdot \mu_{\text{eff}} \left( \nabla \vec{v} + (\nabla \vec{v})^T \right) \]  
\[ \nabla \cdot (\rho \vec{h}) = \nabla \cdot \left[ \alpha c_p \mu_{\text{eff}} \nabla T \right] \]

The transport equations for RNG $k$-$\varepsilon$ model are as follows (Eq. (4)):

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{k} & : \rho \dot{\vec{v}} \cdot \nabla k = \nabla \cdot \left[ \alpha_k \mu_{\text{eff}} \nabla k \right] + P_k - \rho_k \varepsilon \\
\varepsilon & : \rho \dot{\vec{v}} \cdot \nabla \varepsilon = \nabla \cdot \left[ \alpha_\varepsilon \mu_{\text{eff}} \nabla \varepsilon \right] + \frac{c_{\varepsilon^2} \varepsilon}{k} P_k - c_{\varepsilon \varepsilon} \rho_k \varepsilon^2 
\end{align*}
\]

The details of the equations can be found in the Theory Guide of ANSYS FLUENT [23].

In the simulations, the inlet velocity and temperature of air are fixed ($v_{in}=2.17$ m/s, $T_{in}=300$ K). The outlet flow and heat transfer of air are fully developed. All particle surfaces are set to non-slip wall boundary conditions. The 7th particle is supposed to have a constant temperature of 333 K while others are adiabatic. By doing so, the heat transfer characteristics in the fully developed region can be obtained. In GSCPB, the surrounded walls are set to non-slip wall boundary conditions while in SC packing, the surrounded walls are set as symmetric boundary conditions.

The SIMPLE algorithm is employed to couple the velocities and pressure. The second-order upwind scheme is selected for the convective terms in the momentum, energy and turbulence equations. The residual of the calculation is less than $10^{-6}$ to guarantee convergence of the steady state.

After the fluid flow of the steady state is obtained, the species transport equation at the transient state is activated to calculate the residence time distribution. In order to imitate a Dirac pulse, the tracer concentration of the inlet is set to unity at the first time step and then reduced to zero at the following time step. The tracer concentration of the fluid domain is calculated and followed until it completely exits the outlet. The duration time of the tracer injection should be lower than 1% of the whole mean residence time [15]. The time step used in the present study is $5 \times 10^{-5}$ s. The convergence of each time step is reached when the residual of the tracer concentration is less than $10^{-6}$ and the total time step of the calculation is 10000. From the tracer concentration averaged over the cross section ($C_{ave}$), the RTD function can be calculated using the following equation (Eq. (5)) [11]:

\[
E(t) = \frac{C_{ave}(t)}{\int_0^\infty C_{ave}(t)dt}
\]

The mean residence time (MRT) $\tau$ and the variance of the residence time distribution (VRTD) $\sigma$, can be calculated by the following equations (Eqs. (6-7)). Here, VRTD is used to quantify the flow
maldistribution in the packed bed where smaller value corresponds to better velocity uniformity at the cross sections [11].

\[
\tau = \frac{\int_{0}^{\infty} tC_{ave}(t)dt}{\int_{0}^{\infty} C_{ave}(t)dt}
\]

and

\[
\sigma_{j} = \frac{\int_{0}^{\infty} (t-\tau)^{2} C_{ave}(t)dt}{\int_{0}^{\infty} C_{ave}(t)dt} = \frac{\int_{0}^{\infty} t^{2} C_{ave}(t)dt}{\int_{0}^{\infty} C_{ave}(t)dt} - \tau^{2}
\]

All computations are launched on a workstation with Intel® Xeon™ E5-2695 v4 CPU and 128 GB RAM. The computational time is around 6 hours for the steady state and about 72 hours for the transient state when 20 cores are used.

In the grid generation process, unstructured tetrahedral mesh is applied. All particles are shrunk to 99% of the original size to avoid the low mesh quality at the contact points. The grid independence test and model validation test can be found in our previous study [18] and will not be repeated here.

4. Results and discussion

In this section, the flow field in the steady state and the residence time distribution in the transient state are analyzed to evaluate the flow inhomogeneity in both structures. The heat transfer characteristics are also introduced.

4.1. Flow field

The streamline in the SC packing is displayed in Fig. 3. A higher velocity can be found at the corners of the square channel whereas backflow appears between particles. The streamline in GSCPB has a similar feature which is not shown here. The flow maldistribution is obvious in packed beds.

![Figure 3. Streamline in the SC packing](image)

In order to quantitatively analyze the flow maldistribution inside the packed bed, the average velocity and the standard deviation of the velocity on the cross sections are calculated. Here, the velocity refers to the streamwise component (X-velocity, \(u_x\)). Marek [10] has pointed out that using the streamwise component instead of flow velocity magnitude makes it more sensitive to flow non-uniformity. A series of cross sections along the flow direction is used for the analysis. 20 equally spaced sections in one particle cell are created and there are totally 201 sections in the packed section. The standard deviation of the velocity in each cross section (\(std(u_x)\)) is calculated by the following equation (Eq. (8)).
\[
\text{std}(u_x) = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_i (u_x - u_{x,\text{ave}})^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_i}}, \quad u_{x,\text{ave}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} u_x A_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_i} \tag{8}
\]

where \(n\) is the cell number of a certain cross section and \(A_i\) is the area of the cell.

The obtained average X-velocity \((u_{x,\text{ave}})\) and standard deviation of X-velocity \(\text{std}(u_x)\) of the cross sections along the flow direction are shown in Fig. 4. It can be seen that the X-velocities averaged over the cross sections in GSCPB and SC packing are the same because the average velocity in the cross section is only dependent on the flow area, which has the same value in both configurations. However, the variations of the standard deviation of the X-velocity along the axial direction are not the same. From the variations of the standard deviation, the entrance effect can be found in the first three layers and from that on, the standard deviation of velocity shows a periodic trend, which indicates the fully developed flow. In the fully developed region, the std\((u_x)\) in GSCPB is smaller than that of SC packing, especially in the windward side.

![Figure 4. Average X-velocity and standard deviation of X-velocity of cross sections along the axial direction in GSCPB and SC packing](image)

In the present paper, the flow inhomogeneity index \((I)\) is introduced, which has the following expression (Eq. (9)).

\[
I = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m} \text{std}(u_x)}{\bar{v}_{in}} \tag{9}
\]

where \(m\) is the number of the cross sections.

The flow inhomogeneity indexes in the fully developed region of GSCPB and SC packing are 1.34 and 1.42, respectively. This indicates that the velocity field in GSCPB is more uniform.

For a clear look of the flow maldistribution, X-velocity contours of several typical cross sections are shown. Fig. 5 demonstrates the position of the cross sections and Fig. 6 shows the X-velocity contours in both structures where S denotes Slice for short. The velocity distribution of Slice 5(S5) is not shown since it is the same as Slice 1(S1). A much more uniform velocity field can be found in GSCPB, especially through S3.
Figure 5. Positions of five slices in GSCPB and SC packing

![Positions of five slices in GSCPB and SC packing](image)

Figure 6. X-velocity distributions in four slices in GSCPB and SC packing

(a) GSCPB  
(b) SC

4.2. RTD analysis

The RTD curves of Slices 1-5 in both structures are shown in Fig. 7. In general, since the RTD curve is a reflection of the cumulative flow inhomogeneity of whole flow passage, the RTD curve of cross sections should be wider and lower as the flow advances. This can be found from S1 and S5. Although S1 and S5 in one structure has the same velocity distributions, the RTD curve of S5 is lower and wider than that of S1. On the other hand, the RTD curve is related to the flow inhomogeneity of that slice, where higher and thinner curve is supposed to have more uniform velocity distribution, therefore, it can be learned that S3 has the most uniform velocity distribution in both structures. This can be verified by the velocity contours shown in Fig. 6.

To compare the flow maldistribution in the two structures, the RTD curves of the same position are used. Here, S1, S5 and the outlet are chosen, as shown in Fig. 8. It can be seen that at the same position, the RTD curve of GSCPB is a little higher and thinner than that of SC packing, indicating that the flow inhomogeneity is more significant in SC packing. The variances of the residence time distribution (VRTD) of the selected slices in both structures are listed in Tab. 1. From here, one can know that the VRTD is becoming larger when the flow advances, indicating that the flow maldistribution is getting more obvious. Besides, for S1, S5 and the outlet, the VRTDs decreased by 31.27%, 31.82% and 5.91%, respectively in GSCPB compared with SC packing. The results prove that the flow
maldistribution is less worse in GSCPB. The results obtained here coincide with the flow inhomogeneity index.

![RTD curves in GSCPB and SC packing](image1.png)

**(a) GSCPB**

![RTD curves in GSCPB and SC packing](image2.png)

**(b) SC**

**Figure 7. RTD curves in GSCPB and SC packing**

![Comparison of RTD curves in GSCPB and SC packing](image3.png)

**Figure 8. Comparison of RTD curves in GSCPB and SC packing**

**Table 1. VRTD in GSCPB and SC packing (Unit: [s^2])**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S1 (x=72 mm)</th>
<th>S5 (x=84 mm)</th>
<th>Outlet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GSCPB</td>
<td>6.55E-05</td>
<td>7.50E-05</td>
<td>1.91E-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>9.53E-05</td>
<td>1.10E-04</td>
<td>2.03E-04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.3. Heat transfer**

The wall heat flux distributions on the “active” sphere (7th) surface in both structures are displayed in Fig. 9. From the figure, similar wall heat flux distributions can be found in both structures where high heat flux appears at the windward side and low heat flux occurs at the leeward side. The maximum wall heat flux in GSCPB is 6009 [W/m^2] while the maximum value in SC packing is 5343 [W/m^2]. Besides, the region with high values covers a larger percentage of the surface area in GSCPB than that in SC packing. From the results, one can know that the heat transfer between the particle and the fluid is stronger in GSCPB. The particle-to-fluid Nusselt numbers \( (Nu_{st}=qd_p/(T_w-T_f)) \) in GSCPB and SC are 49.93 and 45.13, respectively, where the Nusselt number in GSCPB is 10.64% higher.
From the velocity and heat transfer results, one can find that better flow uniformity leads to stronger heat transfer when the pore structures are the same. This can be helpful for structural design of packed bed.

Figure 9. Comparison of wall heat flux in GSCPB and SC packing

5. Conclusions

In the present paper, the flow maldistribution and heat transfer in the grille-sphere composite packed bed (GSCPB) and the simple cubic (SC) packing were numerically studied. The velocity distributions of the steady state and the residence time distributions (RTD) of the transient state were analyzed to evaluate the flow maldistribution. The main conclusions are as follows:

1. The flow inhomogeneity index, which is introduced in the present paper, is 1.34 for GSCPB and 1.42 for SC packing. The results reveal that the velocity distribution is more uniform in GSCPB.

2. The variance of the residence time distribution (VRTD) of the outlet in GSCPB is 5.91% smaller than that of SC packing under the same inlet velocity, which proves that the flow inhomogeneity in SC packing is more serious.

3. The particle-to-fluid Nusselt number of GSCPB is 10.64% higher than that of the SC packing under the same inlet velocity, which indicates that the reduction of flow inhomogeneity can lead to heat transfer enhancement when the pore structures are the same.
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Nomenclature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$A_i$</td>
<td>cell area, [m$^2$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{ave}$</td>
<td>average mass fraction of tracer, [-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d_h$</td>
<td>hydraulic diameter, [m]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d_p$</td>
<td>particle diameter, [m]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I$</td>
<td>flow inhomogeneity index, [-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_w$</td>
<td>temperature of the particle surface, [K]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$u_x$</td>
<td>velocity in X direction, [m/s]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$u_{x,ave}$</td>
<td>average velocity in X direction, [m/s]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_{in}$</td>
<td>inlet velocity, [m/s]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$y^+$</td>
<td>dimensionless distance of the wall grid elements, [-]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\[
m \quad \text{number of cross sections, [-]} \\
n \quad \text{cell number, [-]} \\
N_{ud} \quad \text{particle-to-fluid Nusselt number, [-]} \\
q \quad \text{heat flux, [Wm}^{-2}\text{]} \\
Re_h \quad \text{hydraulic Reynolds number, [-]} \\
\text{std}(u_x) \quad \text{standard deviation of velocity in X direction, [m/s]} \\
T_{in} \quad \text{inlet temperature, [K]} \\
T_t \quad \text{temperature of the air, [K]} \\
\]

**Greek symbols**

\[
\phi \quad \text{porosity, [-]} \\
\lambda \quad \text{heat conductivity, [Wm}^{-1}\text{K}^{-1}\text{]} \\
\mu \quad \text{dynamic viscosity, [kgm}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}\text{]} \\
\rho \quad \text{air density, [kgm}^{-3}\text{]} \\
\sigma_r \quad \text{variance of residence time distribution, [s}^2\text{]} \\
\tau \quad \text{mean residence time, [s]} \\
\]
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