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**Abstract:** New data for pressure drop, void fraction and flow pattern in a vertical riser using air–silicone oil as the system fluid are reported in this work. A differential pressure cell (DP cell) was used to measure the pressure drop. In addition, void fraction data was recorded simultaneously using an electrical capacitance tomography (ECT) and wire mesh sensor (WMS). The flow patterns were determined using probability density function (PDF) of void fraction and also using a reported flow pattern map. A comparison between present experimental data and reported air–water data was carried and different levels of agreement were achieved. The PDF obtained from the output of the DP cell for spherical cap bubble and slug flows were significantly different those obtained from the ECT and WMS. A comparison between experimental data of void fraction and pressure gradient against some 10 selected empirical correlations was carried out using statistical analysis, Mean Square Error (MSE), Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) and Mean Absolute Percentage Error (MAPE), and different levels of agreement were obtained. The Greskovich and Cooper correlation gave the least MSE, RMSE and MAPE values of 0.0007908, 0.013 and 3.05%, respectively for slug flow.
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**1. Introduction**

The simultaneous flow of liquid and gas otherwise known as two-phase gas–liquid flow is a common occurrence in power generation in nuclear plants, oil and gas and chemical processes (Abdulkadir [1]). For several decades, a considerable amount of effort has been dedicated by many researchers to understanding and confronting the underlying physics of two-phase gas–liquid flow phenomena. It is worth mentioning that it is unfeasible to appreciate gas–liquid flow phenomena without a clear understanding of the flow patterns encountered. It is anticipated that the flow patterns will impact the void fraction or liquid holdup, pressure drop, heat and mass transfer during the heat and mass transfer processes. The ability to accurately determine the flow pattern is essential before related calculation procedures can be established. Conversely, most of the flow pattern transition criteria were developed for air–water system and small diameter pipes, hence the accuracy can be uncertain when the criteria are applied to modelling of two-phase flow in medium or large dimeter pipes. A small diameter pipe according to Wang et al [2] and Waltrich et al. [3] is 9-55 mm, 67 mm is defined as medium pipe diameter according to Azzopardi et al. [4] and a large diameter according to Omebere-Iyari and Azzopardi [5], Ali [6], van der Meulen [7] and Abdulkadir et al. [8] is 127 mm.

A substantial number of studies have been carried out and are still on going in an effort to accurately predict flow pattern. Some of the early works concerned with the determination of flow patterns includes that of Nichols [9], Wallis [10], Govier and Aziz [11], Crawford [12], Mandhane et al. [13], Nguyen [14], Yamazaki and Yamaguchi [15], Mukherjee [16], Taitel et al. [17], Su and Metcalfe [18], Omebere-Iyari and Azzopardi [19], Furukawa and Fukano [20] and Hanratty et al. [21]. One common feature from the findings of these researchers is the fact that gas–liquid flow is a complex phenomenon and that the complex nature of these flows gave rise to what is called flow patterns. They concluded that the flow pattern is influenced by several flow parameters such as void fraction and pressure drop amongst others. The common flow patterns found in a vertical gas–liquid are as follows:

**Bubbly flow**: in bubbly flow, the gas phase is distributed as discrete bubbles in the continuous liquid phase as shown in Figure 1a. The number of bubbles increases with an increase in gas superficial velocity and thus collisions between the bubbles occur more often. This accounts for a rise in the observed bubble coalescence.

**Spherical cap bubble flow:** In this flow regime as shown in Figure 1b, there are swarms of small bubbles as the gas superficial velocity increases. These bubbles in time form larger ones, but not big enough to cover the pipe diameter. As a result of coalescence and velocity differences, the bubbles are not uniformly distributed along the pipe.

**Slug flow**: is categorized by large bullet shaped bubbles as shown in Figure 1c which occupy essentially the whole cross-section of the tube. These bubbles are surrounded by a thin film of falling liquid, and are separated from each other by regions of liquid. These intermediate regions of liquid flow may or may not contain small gas bubbles distributed in the slug following the large bubble.

**Churn flow**: is a highly disturbed flow of gas and liquid in which an increase in the gas superficial velocity causes the liquid slug to become unstable, leading to break-up and fall. This liquid merges with the approaching slug, which then resumes its upward motion until it becomes unstable and after which it falls once again as shown in Figure 1d.

**Annular flow**: this flow pattern represented in Figure 1e is categorized by a central core of fast flowing gas and a slower moving liquid film that moves around the pipe wall. Small amplitude waves on the liquid surface, known as ripples are produced owing to the shearing action of the gas at the gas–liquid interface.
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**Figure 1:** Typical flow patterns in a vertical gas–liquid flow (a) bubbly flow (b) spherical cap bubble flow (c) slug flow (d) churn flow and (e) annular flow

On the matter of industrial applications where the flow of a mixture of two or more phases can occur, the task of sizing the equipment for gathering, pumping and transporting of such phases requires the challenging task of determining the void fraction based on the prevailing operating conditions. Void fraction describes the volumetric gas fraction and is an important parameter for hydrodynamic and thermal design in various two-phase gas–liquid systems. A vast number of studies have been carried out and are still on going in an effort to accurately predict the void fraction. Notable amongst them are: Sokolov et al. [22], Beggs [23], Clarks and Flemmer [24], Spedding et al. [25], Yijuan and Rezkallah [26], Woldesemayat and Ghajar [27], Bhagwat and Ghajar [28] and Abdulkadir et al. [29-30]. Owing to the complexity and lack of understanding of the basic underlining physics of the problem, the majority of the analyses are more motivated towards empirical correlations. The harsh truth is that most of the void fraction empirical correlations are restricted to an air–water or steam–water flow in pipes, and the correlations that are specifically established for liquids with higher viscosity than water are relatively scarce.

Considering the fact that the accuracy of pressure drop prediction in ﬂowing wells has a signiﬁcant inﬂuence on the ﬂuid ﬂow measurement, the two-phase pressure drop prediction using empirical correlations has been investigated by: Lockhart and Martinelli [31], Orkiszewski [32], Chisholm [33] and Friedel [34]. The empirical correlations are valid only for some speciﬁc conditions. This is due to the complexity of two-phase ﬂow analysis. In some conditions, owing to the slippage between the gas and the liquid phases, the gas travels at a much higher velocity than the liquid. The determination of the mixture density depends on the accuracy of the void fraction or liquid holdup. In addition, the flow velocity and flow pattern needs to be known a priori in most pressure drop prediction. Unfortunately, it is still a problem to design a combination sensor system for correctly determining flow pattern, void fraction and pressure drop of an air–silicone oil flow in a vertical pipe. According to Griffith [35], the difference in velocity and ﬂow pattern of the two phases strongly affect pressure gradient computations.

In this study, a combination of differential pressure transducer and advanced instrumentation, electrical capacitance tomography (ECT), wire mesh sensor (WMS) were deployed to measure pressure drop, void fraction and flow pattern in vertical air–silicone oil flows. A comparison between the present experimental void fraction data involving air–silicone oil was made against reported air–water data of Hernandez-Perez [66]. In addition, the measured pressure drop, void fraction and flow pattern were compared against available models reported in the literature. The comparison was with consideration for flow patterns to confirm whether or not the candidate model can be applied to a nearly universal database, at least dealing with vertical up flows. Determination of the fluid flow phenomena inside the medium large diameter pipe using a liquid with a viscosity 5.25 times that of water and improving the prediction accuracy of pressure drop, flow pattern and void fraction are important in particular for applications involving hydrocarbon transportation. It is worthy of mention that this work is also devoted to support the computational fluid dynamics (CFD) code validation and theoretical model development by producing high quality experimental database of gas–liquid flow in a vertical pipe.

**2.0 Experimental methodology**

The present experimental campaign was carried out using an inclined closed pipe flow rig shown schematically in Figure 2 that was reported previously by Abdulkadir et al. [29-30, 36-37]. The technical details can be found in the reported papers. However, for sake of completeness, a short description of the experimental rig is presented here. The rig works as follows: The experimental rig entails a main test pipe section constructed from see-through poly (methyl methacrylate) glass. The 6 m test pipe section has an internal diameter of 0.067 m. Mounted on a rigid steel frame was a test pipe section that may be rotated and allowed to be fixed between -5o to 90o as shown in Figure 2. Silicone oil and air were used as the system fluids. The air is supplied from the laboratory main compressor, which maintains 6 bar, however a pressure regulation valve is used to regulate the air supply to 2 bar. The discharge is open to atmosphere, so the outlet pressure is near 0 Psig. At the inlet, the pressure varies depending on the flow conditions, due to the pressure drop. As a result, the pressure gage located after and next to the gas rotameters ranges from 0.5 to 8.9 Psig. The rest of the pressure drop occurs across the valve that controls the flow. purpose

The design of the inlet section was such that it allows the injected air to be well mixed and equally spread across the cross-section of the pipe. According to Abdulkadir et al. [36], it was predetermined that the mixing of the air and silicone oil phases took place in such a manner as to reduce flow instability. Flow stability was accomplished by using a built mixing unit (annular section), providing maximum time for the two-phases to develop. The mixing section is made from polyvinyl chloride (PVC) pipe as shown in Figure 2b. The silicone oil was fed into the mixing chamber from one side and it then flows around a perforated cylinder via which the air was fed through a distributor with 100 holes with each hole having a diameter of 3 mm, thus creating a more even circumferential mixing section

The two parallel air flow rotameters as shown in the figure were used to measure the flow rates. The gas and liquid superficial velocities deployed were 0.05–6.20 m/s and 0.05–0.52 m/s, respectively. The physical properties of the air–silicone oil system are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1:** Properties of the fluids at 1 bar and at the operating temperature of oC

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Fluid** | **Density (kg/m3)** | **Viscosity (kg/ms)** | **Surface tension (N/m)** |
| **Air** | 1.18 | 0.000018 |  |
| **Silicone oil** | 900 | 0.00525 | 0.02 |

In order to measure the void fraction, liquid holdup, and pressure drop along the length of the pipe, a sequence of experiments was carried out in this study using WMS, ECT, and DP Cell, respectively. The data were obtained with a data acquisition frequency of 1000, 200 and 200 Hz for the WMS, ECT and DP Cell, respectively. In total, 143 runs were carried out and the results of these experiments are presented and discussed in Section 3. It is worth mentioning that the development lengths for establishing steady-state conditions of fully developed two-phase flow in a 67 mm diameter pipe according to Abdulkadir et al. [37] is 4 m (60 diameters). It is against this background that the measuring stations were located at: ECT-plane 1, ECT-plane 2, WMS, DP cell-tapping 1 and DP cell-tapping 2 at 4.4 (66 diameters), 4.489 (67 diameters), 4.92 (73 diameters), 4.5 (67 diameters) and 5.36 m (80 diameters), respectively. At these measuring stations, it is expected that steady-state conditions have been established and instabilities and transients will be disregarded.
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Figure 2: (a) Experimental facility employed in this work. The exact measurement locations of the ECT plane 1, ECT plane 2 and WMS are 4.4 m, 4.489 m and 4.92 m, respectively. On the other hand, the exact measurement locations for the DP cell are 4.5 and 5.36 m (b) picture of the gas–liquid mixing section (c) schematic diagram of the gas–liquid mixing section including the porous pipe section.

**2.1 Advanced instrumentation**

**2.1.1 Electrical Capacitance Tomography (ECT)**

Figure 3 shows the ECT system used in this work. It was supplied by Process Tomography Limited. The name of the model is PTL-300 system and is made up of a data processing unit PC, DAM-200 data acquisition unit and a capacitance sensor. The PC works using the Windows XP operating system and in addition runs the twin-plane ECT software designed for the PTL-300 system and the ECT 32 program. The ECT 32 program permits one or two ECT sensor planes to be controlled either independently or simultaneously, the data are captured and can be played back at different frame rates. The measurement data can be revealed as permittivity images, normalised capacitances or a combination of both.
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**Figure 3:** The electrical capacitance tomography (ECT) sensor (a) layout of driven guard electrodes (b) An image reconstruction algorithm which translates the measurement data into the cross-sectional data into the cross-sectional concentration map (c) layout of driven guard electrodes (d) picture of the ECT

The main goal for using ECT according to Bolton et al. [38] is to deliver images of phase distribution by using differences in electrical permittivity between the phases of a multiphase flow mixture within a pipeline. Multiple electrodes are arranged around the boundary of the zone in order to ease measurements all over the sensing zone. According to Wang et al. [39] and Yang [40], the sensor usually consists of 8 or 12 electrodes mounted round, peripherally around the sensing zone. In this work, the number of sensor consist of 8 electrodes. A vital necessity of the imaging system is that the measuring circuit should only measure the capacitance between the selected pair of electrodes and that it should be unaffected by stray capacitance between the measuring electrodes and earth. Therefore, to satisfy these requirements a stray immune capacitance measuring circuit that was developed by Xie et al. [41] which uses switched-capacitor charge transfer, was adopted in this work.

1. **ECT Calibration procedure, reconstruction algorithm and data processing:**

The calibration for the ECT system involved filling the sensor with the low permittivity material (air has a relative permittivity value of ) and taking a complete set of measurements followed by filling the sensor with the high permittivity material (silicone oil with a relative permittivity value of 2.7) and taking a complete set of measurements. This sets the lower and upper limits for all subsequent measurements.

It can be observed from equation (4) that when the sensor is full of air, the silicone oil’s volume fraction will be zero and when it is full of silicone oil the volume fraction will be one. When the sensor contains both air and silicone oil the volume fraction is calculated by assuming it is a linear function between the lower and upper limits set during calibration. This method has been successfully applied to a number of engineering applications including fluidized bed rig Wang et al. [39] and Azzi et al. [42], gas/liquid flow in pipes Azzopardi et al. [43], gas–liquid flow in bends Abdulkadir et al. [44], slug flow in horizontal and vertical pipes Abdulkadir et al. [36,45] and void fraction distribution Abdulkadir et al. [30].

When silicone oil is introduced into air within the sensing zone the capacitance measurements between electrode pairs will increase. The ECT system measures these capacitance changes and reconstructs a cross-sectional image from the capacitance data. The capacitance measurements were then converted to normalized capacitance data for image reconstruction based on a parallel capacitance model (Abdulkadir [1]).

In order to represent the mathematical model for the process, it was assumed that:

1. The capacitances when the whole sensor is completely filled with air and silicone oil are *Coi* and *Cmi*, respectively.
2. The capacitance plate area is unity
3. The mixture of air and silicone oil between the plates has a silicone oil fraction of .
4. That the dielectric distribution is independent of the sensitivity function *Si*

As, there are 28 independent capacitance measurements between any of the 8 electrodes in all likely combinations, the value of the *ith* capacitance *Ci* can be written based on Huang et al. [46] as

 *i = 1, 2,... 28* (1)

Where

*D* is the cross-sectional diameter of the pipe (image area),

In addition, since capacitance is proportional to capacitor plate area, the capacitance due to the silicone oil filled part of the sensor is and the capacitance due to the air filled part of the sensor is (Bolton et al. [47]). Since the air and silicone oil are in a parallel arrangement, thus the total parallel capacitance *Ci* is equal to the sum of these two capacitances, i.e.

 (2)



Rearranging this gives the normalized capacitance measurements *Cri,*

 (3)

As capacitance is proportional to material permittivity Bolton et al. [47], permittivity was substituted for capacitance as follows:

 (4)

Where

*Coi* is the *ith* measured capacitance when the pipe is filled with air. In this case,, and according to equation (1).

*Cmi* is the value of the *ith* capacitance when the pipe is completely filled with silicone oil. In this case,, and .

is the dielectric constant (permittivity) of air

 is the dielectric constant (permittivity) of silicone oil

Thus, equation (3) according to Abdulkadir [1] can be written as

 (5)

 (6)

2.1.2 Wire Mesh Sensor (WMS):

The WMS is well-known as a valuable research tool that can give significant amount of data, both spatially and temporally. The resolution of the sensor is superior to many other advanced instrumentations like the ECT. Conversely, this comes with accompanying shortcoming that the sensor is intrusive. The intrusiveness effect of WMS has been extensively investigated in the past, for instance Wangjiraniran et al. [48] evaluated it against high-speed filming, Prasser et al. [49] appraised it against a fast x-ray tomography system and Sharaf et al. [50] assessed it against gamma-ray densitometry. The findings from their results showed that the sensor produces images of an undisturbed flow, uncertainty was found to be in the 10% range for void fraction measurement. Da Silva et al. [51] concluded therefore that the WMS is an excellent tool to experimentally investigate two-phase gas–liquid flows.

The WMS was placed some distance after the ECT, which is a non-intrusive instrument at a height of 4.92 m from the mixing section. Local time varying void fractions were then acquired by using the WMS measurement transducer developed by Da Silva et al. [52]. In this study, a 2424 wire configuration sensor was used that had been earlier dedicated for conductivity measurements but now modified for capacitance measurements. The sensor shown in Figure 4 was manufactured by Helmholtz–Zentrum Dresden–Rossendorf (HZDR). It is made up of two planes of 24 stainless steel wires of 3 mm wire separation within each plane, and 3 mm axial plane distance. The wires are uniformly distributed over the circular pipe cross-section and in addition the spatial resolution of the images created by the sensor is about 3 mm across the full diameter, which corresponds to the wire separation within a single plane. The WMS works at frequencies of 5000 frames/seconds which permits small bubbles to be identified. In this work, data was acquired at a frequency of 1000 frames/seconds for a 60 seconds experimental run period. A poly (methyl methacrylate) frame supports the sensor and permits fixation into the text flow pipe section. Details of the WMS methodology can be found in Abdulkadir et al. [25].
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**Figure 4:** Wire Mesh Sensor (WMS) used during experimentation

It is worthy of mention that an associated electronic sensor measures the local permittivity in the gaps of all crossing points by successfully applying an excitation voltage (sine wave of 5 MHz) to each one of the sender electrodes at one wire plane whilst measuring in parallel the current flowing toward receiver electrodes at the other wire plane. The non-activated transmitter wires are grounded. This step guarantees that the electrical field distribution is concentrated along the activated wire and permits for a sampling of only a well-defined section within the pipe, so that the measured currents are explicitly related to the corresponding crossing point. For the permittivity measurements a sinusoidal alternating voltage is applied and a demodulation scheme is subsequently applied. After digitizing, the measured data are sent to a computer where they are processed and displayed. The method is able to generate up to 7,000 images per second. Details of the electronic circuits used may be found in Da Silva et al. [52].

**WMS calibration procedure, reconstruction algorithm and data processing:**

According to Da Siva et al. [52], the output reading of a wire mesh sensor is in the form of a data matrix *V* (*i, j, k*) representing the voltage measured at each (*i, j*) crossing point with and and at a given time step *k*. These voltage readings are proportional to the relative permittivity of two-phase mixture 

 (7)

Where *b* and *c* are constants that incorporate the specific parameters of the electronics. Reference measurements are required to determine the constants *b* and *c* of equation 7, which in turn allows for the calculation of mixture permittivity at every crossing point. First, the sensor measures the empty pipe, i.e., air (), providing the reference data matrix, which is usually an average of the raw data over an appropriate temporal range to subdue noise. The procedure is then repeated with the entire cross-section covered with the liquid phase having a permittivity value full pipe, which gives another reference data matrix denoted by. Finally, on the basis of equation (7) for the two described conditions, the measured mixture permittivity is calculated by

 (8)

subject to the boundary conditions:

; 

; 

The values of the boundary conditions are then substituted into equation (8) and solving simultaneously to obtain the values of the constants, *b* and *c* as:

 (9)

 (10)

Substituting equations (9) and (10) into (8) to obtain 

 (11)

The void fraction based on the parallel model is obtained from the measured permittivity  according to

 (12)  
Where is the liquid permittivity and is the gas permittivity

Quantitative insights of the flow are obtained by averaging the measured void fraction in space and/or in time, yielding a time series of void fraction or mean void fraction over the entire measurement.

**2.1.3. Pressure drop measurement using a differential pressure transducer (DP Cell):**

Figure 5 shows a DP cell (Rosemount 1151 smart model) with a range of 0–37.4 kPa, output voltage of 1 to 5 volts and a data acquisition frequency of 200 Hz that was used to measure the pressure drop in this work. Both the sensitivity and range were taken into consideration in the selection of the DP cell. The DP cell was used to measure the time varying two-phase total pressure drop across the test section. In order to achieve this, two pressure tapping were provided, located in the vertical pipe. The particular axial locations of the tappings are 4.5 and 5.36 m from the foot of the test section. Hence, the total pressure drop was measured concurrently with the void fraction and liquid holdup.

Before the commencement of making measurements of pressure drop, the DP cell had to be calibrated using the procedure shown in Figure 5. The calibration exercise carried out established the link between the output voltage of the DP cell and the differential pressure. It can be observed from Figure 6 that the calibration curve is linear.

C:\Users\Dr Muktar\Desktop\PRESSURE GRADIENT 2018\FIGURE 2.tif

**Figure 5:** (a) An image of the DP cell arrangement (b) A detailed arrangement for carrying out DP cell calibration and (c) A detailed DP cell purging arrangement
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**Figure 6:** A detailed plot of DP cell calibration curve

It is worthy of mention that for accurate pressure drop measurements, it is essential for the pressure tappings in gas–liquid flow to be purged frequently. Otherwise, pressure fluctuations will introduce a two-phase mixture into the DP cell lines triggering incorrectness in the measured pressure drop as a consequence of surface tension effects and indefinite hydrostatic head. It was against this backdrop that a purging system was used to keep an uninterrupted liquid line (silicone oil) to the DP cell from the pressure tapings.

Purging was carried out before the commencement of each run via opening and closing of the valve from the liquid line. The separation distance between the tappings was 86 cm. In order to activate the purging system, a high purging rate was fixed to liberate any available bubbles in the purging lines. An optimum purging rate which was suggested by Holt [53] to be <5% of the total liquid flow rate was used.

## 2.2 Empirical void fraction correlations:

In this work, ten void fraction prediction models available in the literature were chosen for evaluation. They are shown in Table 2 in chronological order. The selection considered factors such as pipe characteristics, flow orientation, pipe inclination and fluids involved. Statistical analysis of the empirical correlations performance was carried out to find the candidate correlation. Equations [13-23] were used to calculate values of average void fraction and the obtained values are presented in Table 3.

**Table 2:** The list of 10 selected empirical correlations

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Serial Number | Empirical model | Model equation | System | Equation |
| 1 | Hughmark [54] |  | Mercury–nitrogen | [13] |
| 2 | Nicklin et al. [55] |  | Air–water | [14] |
| 3 | Neal and Bankoff [56] |  | Mercury–nitrogen | [15] |
| 4 | Greskovich and Cooper [57] |  | Air–water | [16] |
| 5 | Jowitt et al. [58] |  | Rod bundle | [17] |
| 6 | Clark and Flemmer [24] |  | Air–water | [18] |
| 7 | Hassan and Kabir [59] |  | Air–water | [19]  [20] |
| 8 | Kokal and Stanislav [60] |  | Air–oil | [21] |
| 9 | Coddington and Macian [61] |  | Air–water | [22] |
| 10 | Hassan [62] |  | Air–water; Air–oil; Air–lube oil | [23] |

**3.0 Results and discussion**

The gas and liquid superficial velocities deployed in this work are 0.05-6.2 m/s and 0.05-0.52 m/s, respectively. The ensuing flow patterns detailed for liquid and gas superficial velocities of 0.05–0.52 m/s and 0.05–0.288 m/s, 0.05–0.52 m/s and 0.34–0.95 m/s and 0.05–0.52 m/s and 1.42–6.2 m/s are spherical cap bubble, slug, and churn flows, respectively.

**Flow pattern map under current experimental conditions**

Figure 7 shows the flow pattern map for the present experimental campaign concerning vertical gas–liquid flow. The transition lines as depicted in the figure were obtained using the mechanistic models recommended by Taitel et al.[17] model for bubbly/slug transition, the Jayanti and Hewitt [63] slug/churn transition model and the Pereyra and Torres [64] model. It can be observed from the figure that the Pereyra and Torres [64] model predicts spherical bubble as bubble flow and for the bubble/slug flow transition, the Taitel et al.[17] transition line performs reasonably well by predicting the conditions studied. In contrast, the Jayanti and Hewitt transition over-predicts the transition from slug/churn flow at all the gas and liquid superficial velocities considered. Also imbedded in the flow pattern map are schematic representation of the flow patterns and 2 dimensional slice views of the void fraction seen for different liquid and gas superficial velocities. It is established that these observations corroborate the results presented on the map. At low gas superficial velocities of 0.05 to 0.29 m/s, bubbles of large size can be seen even though not as large as the pipe diameter. These bubbles are referred to as spherical cap bubbles based on the definition of Costigan and Whalley [65]. After the gas superficial velocity is increased to 0.34–0.70 m/s, the merging of these spherical cap bubbles facilitates the formation of slug flow. When the gas superficial velocity is between 1.2 – 6.2 m/s, the unstable slug flow is seen to transform to churn flow. These observations can be seen to be in good agreement with the flow pattern map shown on the same plot, Figure 7.
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**Figure 7:** Flow pattern map under current experimental conditions predicted by Pereyra and Torres [64] and reconstructed images of the air–silicone oil flow evolution from spherical cap bubble to churn flow.

**Comparison between present study and that of Hernandez-Perez [66]:**

A comparison between the present study and that of Hernandez-Perez [66] will be made based on void fraction. Hernandez-Perez [66] carried out experimental work on a vertical 67 mm internal diameter pipe and the fluids employed were air and water. He deployed conductance WMS to obtain void fraction.
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**Figure 8:** Comparison between present void fraction data for air–silicone oil against air–water experimental data of Hernandez-Perez [66] at liquid superficial velocity of 0.2 m/s and gas superficial velocity of 0.28–3.6 m/s.

The plot shows the same tendency, though the values of void fraction from the work of Hernandez-Perez [66] at higher gas superficial velocities of 1.4 to 3.6 m/s, are higher than The results of the comparison presented in Figure 8 are carried out at the same liquid superficial velocity of 0.2 m/s and gas superficial velocity of 0.28–3.6 m/s. those of present study. This behaviour can be attributed to the effect of fluid properties. Interestingly, at lower gas superficial velocities of 0.28 to 1.1 m/s, both the Hernandez-Perez [66] air–water data and present data depict same values. This implies that at these gas superficial velocities, the fluid properties have no effect on void fraction.

**Comparison of time series and PDFs of void fraction for the WMS, ECT and DP cell for the vertical pipe:**

The PDFs of void fractions has been used to categorize the flow patterns in the same way as Abdulkadir et al. [29, 36-37] and Costigan and Whalley [49]. A PDF according to Abdulkadir et al. [29] can be defined as the variation of the probability that the void fraction values lie within a certain range () versus void fraction. It was determined by counting the number of data points in data bins of width 0.01 centred on void fractions from 0.005, 0.015 ...0.995, and then dividing each sum by the total number of data points. They confirm the dominant void fractions which are observed for each flow condition.

Figure 9 presents a comparison between the PDFs of void fraction for the ECT, WMS and DP cell for the same liquid and gas superficial velocities in a vertical pipe. It is worth mentioning that the time-averaged pressure drop was converted into normalized probability density function (PDF). The relative frequency count data of the normalized pressure drop data was then calculated using the bin size of 0.02. Then the relative frequency data was fitted with normalized Gaussian to obtain PDF plots. Thus, the normalized pressure drop is approximately equal to the void fraction in the measurement section.

A single peak at low void fraction complemented by a widening tail, the signature of spherical cap bubble as described by Abdulkadir et al. [29, 36-37] and Costigan and Whalley [65] can be seen from the ECT and WMS measurements, Figure 9(a-b). Thus, the results show that both instruments predict similar flow pattern signatures. On the contrary, a single peak can be seen at low void fraction from the DP cell measurement. This according to Costigan and Whalley [65] characterizes bubble flow.
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**Figure 9:** PDF of void fraction and dimensionless pressure gradient for (a-b) spherical cap bubble flow (c-d) slug flow and (e-f) churn flow at liquid superficial velocity of 0.05 m/s and various gas superficial velocities of 0.05 to 4.74 m/s.

The PDF of void fraction as observed from the WMS and ECT data shown in Figure 9(c-d) displays a double peak feature with one at higher void fraction whilst the other at a lower void fraction. This denotes slug flow according to Abdulkadir et al. [29, 36-37] and Costigan and Whalley [65]. The DP cell data conversely depicts the features of unstable slug flow with a mean peak at a void fraction of 0.65, but with two tails down to 0.38 and 0.96. The observed difference between the results from the 3 measuring instruments can be attributed to the fact that the measurements are averaged over a different length for each case. For the ECT, the measurements are averaged over a section of 0.089 m, which is the length of the electrodes. For the WMS, the measurements are more localised, as they are taken over the separation between the two planes of wires, which is 0.003 m. For the DP cell, the distance is much bigger, 0.86 m, therefore more averaged.

The PDF graphs of void fraction from the ECT, WMS and DP cell data shown in Figure 9(e-f) displays the characteristic features of churn flow according to Abdulkadir et al. [29, 36-37] and Costigan and Whalley [65]; a single peak at a high void fraction accompanied by a widening end down to lower void fraction. The result depicts that the three measuring instruments predict similar flow regime signatures.

**Total, gravitational and frictional pressure gradients**

The DP transducer placed in between the twin-plane ECT was used to measure the total pressure gradient while the frictional pressure gradient on the other hand was achieved by deducting the hydrostatic (gravitational) term from the experimentally determined total pressure gradient. The distance between the pressure tappings is 0.86 m. The total pressure gradient was determined by dividing the measured pressure drop by 0.86 m, the gravitational pressure and frictional pressure gradients were then deduced (as described earlier in the text). Figures 10(a-c) show a plot of the effect of the variation of gas superficial velocity on total, gravitational and frictional pressure gradients with liquid superficial velocity as a parameter.
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**Figure 10:** Variation of gas superficial velocity on (a) total pressure gradient (b) gravitational pressure gradient and (c) frictional pressure gradient with liquid superficial velocity as a parameter

Figure 10(a) shows that the total pressure gradient drops with a rise in gas superficial velocity for a given liquid superficial velocity. This decrease can be ascribed to the fact that the flow is gravity dominated as also shown in Figure 10(b) and that a rise in gas superficial velocity provokes a growth in void fraction thus reduces the two-phase mixture density. In addition, the velocities met are not sufficient to provoke high frictional pressure gradient and as such a rise in gas superficial velocity will bring about a consistent decrease in total pressure gradient.

Conversely, the frictional pressure gradient generally rises with an increase in gas superficial velocity as shown in Figure 10(c). The rise in frictional pressure gradient according to Abdulkadir et al. [36] can be attributed to the fact an increase in gas superficial velocity causes higher assembly of gas bubbles, which sequentially raises the true liquid velocity due to an increase in void fraction.

**Comparison of average void fraction from experimental data (base case) and selected empirical correlations with consideration for flow patterns**

The experimental data is sorted at first here according to the prevailing flow patterns into spherical cap bubble, slug and churn flows. The performance of the ten selected empirical correlations is then tested against experimental data using statistical analysis, Mean Square Error (MSE), Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) and Mean Absolute Percentage Error (MAPE), in order to select the candidate correlation. The Mean Square Error (MSE), Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) and Mean Absolute Percentage Error (MAPE) are defined mathematically as:

 [24]

 [25]

 [26]

Where *N* is the number of experimental data points.

Equations [24-26] were used to determine the MSE, RMSE and MAPE, respectively and the obtained values are presented in Tables 3–5.

Figure 11(a) presents a cross plot of the experimental (base case) average void fraction against the predicted values from the ten selected empirical correlations with emphasis on flow pattern dependency. On the other hand, Figure 11(b) presents a cross plot of the experimental (base case) average pressure gradient band against the predicted values from the ten selected empirical correlations.

**Table 3:** Performance of empirical models based on flow pattern: **Spherical cap bubble**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Spherical cap bubble flow | | | |
|  | ε | MSE | RMSE | MAPE (%) |
| Base case | 0.106 |  |  |  |
| Hughmark [55] | 0.362 | 0.06693 | 0.256 | 241.51 |
| Nicklin et al. [56] | 0.125 | 0.0007780 | 0.019 | 17.92 |
| Neal and Bankoff [57] | 0.125 | 0.004340 | 0.007 | 6.604 |
| Greskovich and Cooper [58] | 0.126 | 0.001234 | 0.025 | 23.58 |
| Jowitt et al. [59] | 0.169 | 0.0007798 | 0.055 | 51.89 |
| Clark and Flemmer [24] | 0.126 | 0.0008214 | 0.057 | 53.77 |
| Hassan and Kabir [59] | 0.0807 | 0.0009542 | 0.019 | 17.92 |
| Kokal and Stanislav [60] | 0.0995 | 0.0001911 | 0.02 | 18.87 |
| Coddington and Macian [61] | 0.092 | 0.0007435 | 0.014 | 13.21 |
| Hassan [62] | 0.0515 | 0.003661 | 0.023 | 21.70 |

**Table 4:** Performance of empirical models based on flow pattern: **Slug flow**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Slug flow | | | |
|  | ε | MSE | RMSE | MAPE (%) |
| Base case | 0.425 |  |  |  |
| Hughmark [55] | 0.709 | 0.08272 | 0.284 | 66.82 |
| Nicklin et al. [56] | 0.503 | 0.006257 | 0.078 | 18.35 |
| Neal and Bankoff [57] | 0.503 | 0.03518 | 0.071 | 16.71 |
| Greskovich and Cooper [58] | 0.505 | 0.0007907 | 0.013 | 3.05 |
| Jowitt et al. [59] | 0.612 | 0.006272 | 0.11 | 25.88 |
| Clark and Flemmer [24] | 0.530 | 0.006608 | 0.147 | 34.59 |
| Hassan and Kabir [59] | 0.438 | 0.01126 | 0.078 | 18.35 |
| Kokal and Stanislav [60] | 0.354 | 0.008923 | 0.08 | 18.82 |
| Coddington and Macian [61] | 0.457 | 0.001415 | 0.032 | 7.53 |
| Hassan [62] | 0.315 | 0.01266 | 0.105 | 24.71 |

**Table 5:** Performance of empirical models based on flow pattern: **Churn flow**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Churn | | | |
|  | ε | MSE | RMSE | MAPE (%) |
| Base case | 0.734 |  |  |  |
| Hughmark [55] | 0.793 | 0.01019 | 0.059 | 8.04 |
| Nicklin et al. [56] | 0.728 | 0.00469 | 0.006 | 0.817 |
| Neal and Bankoff [57] | 0.728 | 0.01563 | 0.295 | 40.19 |
| Greskovich and Cooper [58] | 0.729 | 0.00664 | 0.045 | 6.131 |
| Jowitt et al. [59] | 0.838 | 0.00469 | 0.108 | 14.714 |
| Clark and Flemmer [24] | 0.776 | 0.1680 | 0.037 | 5.04 |
| Hassan and Kabir [59] | 0.779 | 0.00633 | 0.006 | 0.817 |
| Kokal and Stanislav [60] | 0.439 | 0.09673 | 0.005 | 0.68 |
| Coddington and Macian [61] | 0.755 | 0.1789 | 0.021 | 2.86 |
| Hassan [62] | 0.626 | 0.01620 | 0.042 | 5.72 |

For spherical cap bubble flow regime as depicted in Table 3, the Hughmark [55] correlation show the biggest MSE, RMSE and MAPE values of 0.06693, 0.256 and 241.51%, respectively. On the other hand, the Neal and Bankoff [56] correlation shows the smallest RMSE and MAPE values of 0.007 and 6.607%, respectively. It is worth mentioning that the Kokal and Stanislav [60] correlation show the smallest MSE value of 0.0001911.

On the matter of slug flow as shown in Table 4, the Greskovich and Cooper [57] correlation shows the smallest MSE, RMSE and MAPE values of 0.0007908, 0.013 and 3.05%, respectively. For the biggest values, the Hughmark [54] correlation shows MSE, RMSE and MAPE values of 0.08272, 0.284 and 66.82%, respectively.

According to Table 5 on the matter of churn flow, the Kokal and Stanislav [60] correlation shows the smallest RMSE and MAPE values of 0.005 and 0.68%, respectively. From the table, the Jowitt et al. [58] and Nicklin et al. [55] correlations show the smallest MSE value of 0.000469. On the other hand, the biggest values for the RMSE and MAPE are 0.295 and 40.19%, respectively for the Neal and Bankoff [56] correlation. Interestingly, the Coddington and Macian [61] correlation depicts the largest MSE value of 0.1789.

Here, criteria that the average predicted void fraction is within with a 30% spread are used to consider the predictive performance of a correlation as satisfactory. Therefore, at void fraction less than 0.2 as shown in Figure 11(a), Neal and Bankoff [56] correlation falls within the acceptable limit but completely falls outside the -15% width as the void fraction increases above 0.4. This is because the model does not account for drift velocity. Kokal and Stanislav [60] correlation on the other hand gives excellent prediction at higher values of void fraction greater than 0.5, indicating its good performance for gas-dominated flows. However, the Coddington and Macian [61] correlation gives values of void fraction within +15% band for all void fraction above 0.3. Greskovich and Cooper [57] correlation continued to show excellent prediction within the +15% limit.
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**Figure 11:** (a) Comparison between experimental average void fraction against predicted values with no flow pattern consideration using error limit. (b) Comparison between experimental pressure gradient against predicted values with no flow pattern consideration using and ) error limits.

From Figure 11(b), the Greskovich and Cooper [57] correlation gives the best match for the range of 4000 to 6000 Pa/m but under-estimates at lower pressure gradient values. Since the pressure gradient profile of two-phase systems declines with increasing void fraction it implies that, Greskovich and Cooper [57] correlation performs better in a low gas dominated flow. Also from Figure 11(b), it can be seen that the Greskovich and Cooper [57] correlation slightly over-predicts higher pressure gradients. It can therefore be concluded that the Greskovich and Cooper [57] correlation gives the best performance for slug flow regime. Hassan [62] correlation on the other hand, continues to show the tendency for under-predicting pressure gradient, but gives an excellent match at the higher pressure gradients between 7500 to 8500 Pa/m. Furthermore, Nicklin et al. [55] correlation gives a good agreement from 2000 to 4000 Pa/m then under-predicts and again gives a good prediction at much higher pressure gradient from 7500 Pa/m and above. This tendency from the Nicklin et al. [55] correlation can be attributed to the presence of drift flux velocity term in the model equation which depends solely on the pipe diameter without considering the fluid characteristics. This is why the performance of the model remains fairly constant and is not sensitive to flow pattern variations.

**Prediction of pressure gradient for bubble, slug and churn flows**

All the curves in Figure 12 show that the pressure gradient decline as the void fraction increases. This behaviour is expected as the system under study is a vertical pipe; the primary contributor to the overall pressure gradient is the gravitational pressure which depends on the density of the fluids. Since air (the gas phase in this study) is lighter than silicone oil (the liquid phase in this study), as expected, the hydrostatic head will decline with increasing gas superficial velocity. Nicklin et al. [55], Hassan and Kabir [59], Kokal and Stanislav [60], and Hassan [62] empirical correlations all under-predict the pressure gradient for all three flow patterns being considered. However, the Coddington and Macian [61] correlation intersects the base case pressure gradient at about 8000 Pa/m and progressively over-predict the pressure gradient as the void fraction increases.

C:\Users\Dr Muktar\Documents\PRESSURE GRADIENT 2018\4.tif

**Figure 12:** Prediction of pressure gradient for (a) bubble flow (b) Slug flow and (c) Churn flow

Figure 12(b) shows that the slope of the decline is 8564 Pa/m which is less than the observed slope in Figure 12(a), 8825 Pa/m. This reduction in pressure gradient is expected as the two-phase flow moves from a predominantly liquid dominated flow (bubble) to a flow with increasing gas population (slug flow). All the empirical correlations performed fairly well in this regime as they all show nearly the same tendency in the pressure decline (the curves approximate parallel lines). But Greskovich and Cooper [57] correlation gives the best match to the pressure gradient base case.

It is worth mentioning that there is a further decline in the slope of pressure gradient graph (slope = 8198 Pa/m) with an increase in void fraction as shown in Figure 12(c). This is because gas population increases rapidly with the expense of the liquid phase and this leads to the reduction in the pressure gradient. It can be seen from the figure that the plots do not give perfect straight lines as in Figures 12(a-b). This deviation from straight line relation suggests a consideration of the onset of significant friction forces with increased gas superficial velocity. The clustering of the points without a well-defined pattern shows the presence of uncertainties and instabilities which clearly indicates the presence of churn flow. Considering the distribution of the points around the base case, it can be inferred that the Nicklin et al. [55] correlation seems suitable for the pressure gradient prediction.

4. Conclusion:

Experimental characterization of two-phase air–silicone oil flows in a vertical 67 mm internal diameter pipe has been successfully carried out using a differential pressure transducer and advanced instrumentation, electrical capacitance tomography (ECT) and wire mesh sensor tomography (WMS). The characterization focused on pressure drop, void fraction and flow pattern in a range of gas superficial velocities from 0.05 to 6.2 m/s and liquid superficial velocities from 0.05 to 0.52 m/s. To the best of the knowledge of the authors, no similar experimental work has been reported in the open literature, even though they might be typically encountered in particular for applications involving hydrocarbon transportation. That the following conclusion can be drawn:

* The observed flow patterns using a reported flow pattern map are bubble, slug and churn flows and were found to be consistent with those reported in the literature except where it predicted spherical cap bubble as bubble flow.
* The values of void fraction from the work of Hernandez-Perez [66] for air–water system at higher gas superficial velocities of 1.4 to 3.6 m/s, are higher than those of present study. At gas superficial velocities of 0.28 to 1.1 m/s, the values of void fraction from both the Hernandez-Perez [66] and present data depict same values.
* The PDF from the output of the DP cell for spherical cap bubble and slug flows regimes were significantly different from those obtained from the ECT and WMS.
* The PDF of void fraction obtained from the outputs of the WMS, ECT and DP cell can be used to predict churn flow with confidence.
* The total and gravitational pressure gradients were observed to decrease with an increase in gas superficial velocity while in contrast, the frictional pressure gradient increases with gas superficial velocity.
* Neal and Bankoff [56] correlation gave the best match for void fraction in spherical cap bubble flow. The prediction from this correlation shows a fairly constant average RMSE of about 6.604%.
* Greskovich and Cooper [57] correlation showed the best prediction for average void fraction in slug flow regime with least MSE, RMSE and MAPE values of 0.0007908, 0.013 and 3.05%, respectively. Also within the slug flow regime, the Coddington and Macian [61] correlation gave a very good fit for pressure gradient prediction with MAPE value of 13.85% when compared to the pressure gradient obtained from experiments.
* Kokal and Stanislav [60] correlation showed progressively higher accuracy and stability in the direction of increasing gas rate with RMSE and MAPE values of 0.005 and 0.68%, respectively, in the churn flow regime. Hence, it is a good correlation for transitional flow region.
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