Effect of Fluidized Bed Particle Size on Heat Transfer Coefficient at Different Operating Conditions

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to investigate the effect of gas flow velocity, size of sand particles, and the distance between tubes immersed in a fluidized bed on heat transfer coefficient. Experimental tests were conducted on a bundle of copper tubes of (12.5 mm) diameter and (320 mm) length arranged in a matrix (17x9) and immersed in a fluidized bed inside a plastic container. One of the tubes was used as a hot tube with a capacity of (122 W). (25 kg) of sand with three different diameters of sand particles (0.15, 0.3 and 0.6 mm) was used in these tests at ten speeds for gas flow (from 0.16 m/s to 0.516 m/s). The results showed a significant inverse effect of fluidized bed particles diameter on the heat transfer coefficient. Accordingly, the heat transfer coefficient for (0.15 mm) diameter sand was found to be higher than that of (0.3 mm) and (0.6 mm) sand by about (3.124) and (6.868) times respectively, in all tests. The results showed good agreement with results from other studies conducted under the same conditions but with different sand particle size.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Fluidized beds are widely used in industrial and physical processes such as coating, drying, mixing, granulating, heating, cooling and many other applications, due to the mixing ability of the fluidized bed. It is also used for chemical processes such as catalyst cracking, reactor composition, olyphine polymerization, silicon production, liquefied coke, flexible coke, and waste coal combustion (biomass) [1]. The earliest utilization of the fluidization technique was in gas production by the German chemist Fritz Winkler in 1922. In addition to gas production, this technique has been successfully utilized in thermal cracking processes in the United States in 1942 [2]. Nowadays, the fluidization technique is used widely in all industries such as oil and other industries, and is adopted intensively in the chemical industry as a viable and applicable technique since 1970. Furthermore, it is adopted as an auxiliary technique to help in combustion processes and gas production (gasification). In order to develop and benefit from this technique by improving the thermal performance of heat exchangers, many theoretical and
The amount of heat transfer increases with increases in gas velocity. Additionally, the increase in the frequency of particles striking the wall has led to an increase in the heat transfer coefficient without any noticeable effect on the depth of the fluidized bed. However, during turbulent flow, there was a noticeable effect of 25% between the first fluidized bed (1.2 m) and the second fluidized bed (0.8 m).

Habeeb and Al-Turaihi [6] experimentally investigated the behavior of gas-solid flow in the tubes of circular shape fluidized beds in 2 phases (air and sand) at steady and unsteady states in the vertical tube. Three different diameters of sand particles were used (300, 550 and 800 μm) as a fluidizing media at different air velocities ranging from 1.4 m/s to 2.1 m/s. The tests were conducted using an horizontal electrical heater with a diameter of 3.175 cm and three capacities (100, 140 and 180 W). The results were analysed using computational fluid dynamics (CFD) software (FLUENT) to determine the flow behavior and temperature distribution along the fluidized bed depth. The results showed that the temperature distribution along the column decreases with increases in particle size, and increases with increases in heat flow. On the other hand, Makkawi [7] experimentally measuring the heat transfer in a circulating fluidized-bed (CFB) using a fluidization column of 5.2 cm diameter and 163 cm length with maximum flow rate of 1300 lit/min. Two diameters of glass particles were used in the study (235 μm and 700 μm) with a mass of 10 kg. The results showed that the glass particles were stable during movement in small spaces, then quickly gained heat and became unstable. Furthermore, the heat transfer coefficient increases with decreases in particle diameter. Chourasia and Alappat [8] experimentally investigated the effects of operation time on the attrition and size distribution of sand particles in a circulating fluidized bed. The experiments were performed on the sand size ranging from (1 to 2) mm at ambient condition and superficial air velocity ranging from (7.13 to 9.16) m/s. It has been observed that the coefficient of uniformity and coefficient of curvature showed increasing patterns. It specifies that particles of different size ranges and fines were formed due to attrition of particles.

The aim of this study is to experimentally investigate the effect of fluidized bed sand particle diameters on the heat transfer coefficient under different operating conditions. These conditions include the hot tube’s location inside the first row of the tubes bundle and the velocity of the entering gas to the fluidized bed. Three fluidized bed’s sand particle diameters were used in these tests (0.15, 0.3 and 0.6 mm) to calculate the Nusselt number for the sand particles and the tube.

2. EXPERIMENTATION

2.1. Experimental Setup

The test rig shown in Fig. 1 was built to conduct the experiments. It consisted of 6 mm thick plastic container with dimensions of 30x60 cm and 100 cm installed on a structure of V-type iron bars (size 25 mm). A bundle of copper tubes of 12.5 mm diameter and 32 cm length was arranged inside the bed in a matrix of 9x17. One of these tubes which were used as a hot tube contained an electrical heater of 122 W capacities shown in Fig. 2. To ensure uniform air flow inside the container, a conical box had

---

**Nomenclature**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Surface area, (m²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D_t</td>
<td>Tube diameter, (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d_p</td>
<td>Sand particle diameter, (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Gravitational acceleration, (9.81 m/sec²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{h} )</td>
<td>Average heat transfer coefficient, (W/m²·°C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Convection heat transfer coefficient, (W/m²·°C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Pressure difference, (mm Hg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>Hot tube</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Tube length, (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_t )</td>
<td>Thermal conductivity of gas (W/m·°C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Heat transfer rate, (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S_L</td>
<td>Longitudinal distance, (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S_T</td>
<td>Lateral distance, (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_b</td>
<td>Local bed temperature, (°C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{T}_b )</td>
<td>Average bed temperature, (°C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_w</td>
<td>Wall temperature, (°C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{T}_w )</td>
<td>Average wall temperature, (°C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_f</td>
<td>Film temperature, (°C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Gas velocity, (m/sec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \vartheta_{g} )</td>
<td>Kinematic viscosity of gas, (m²/sec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \varphi )</td>
<td>Any property of air flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_1, X_2</td>
<td>Hot tube’s location</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dimensionless Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Re_t</td>
<td>Tube Reynolds number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Re}_{p} )</td>
<td>Particle Reynolds number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{N}<em>u</em>{t, p} )</td>
<td>Average tube Nusselt number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{N}<em>u</em>{p} )</td>
<td>Average particle Nusselt number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some experimental studies have been conducted by different researchers in this field. Some of these studies will be reviewed in this study. Wu et al. [3] conducted an experimental study to calculate the local and hydrodynamic heat transfer in a circulating fluidized bed. They used a fluidization column of 152 mm diameter and 9.3 m length, while the sand particle’s (Ottawa sand) diameter was 171 μm specify the types of circulation. The study results revealed that the voidage has a significant effect on the heat transfer within the circulating fluidized bed. Furthermore, the density of particles has an important impact on the heat transfer coefficient as it related directly to the void’s concentration during fluidization. Masoumifard et al. [4] introduced an empirical relationship for the heat transfer between the horizontal tube and the fluidized bed (gas-solid). In their study, a hot horizontal tube of 8 mm diameter was immersed in a fluidized bed. Three types of fluidized beds were used with different sand particle diameters of (280, 490 and 750) μm, using air as the fluidizing fluid. The results showed that the heat transfer coefficient increases with decreases in the size of sand particles, while increases and then slightly decrease with increases in air flow velocity to the highest value. The effect of sensors location on the heat transfer coefficient is found to be slight. Stefanova et al. [5] conducted an experimental study to calculate the heat transfer from a tube immersed in a fluidized bed consisting of particles in the region from a transition fluidization flow to a turbulent fluidization flow. The tests were conducted in a glass column of 0.29 m diameter and 4.5 m length to measure the heat transfer in the fluidized bed using fluid cracking catalytic (FCC) of 70 μm diameter. The results showed that
been manufactured and fixed to the bottom of the container. The conical box contained:

a- A layer of commercial sponge to prevent the leakage of sand particles from the container to the box.
b- Paper filters (to prevent the entry of sand particles into the air blower).
c- An air distributor made of a wooden board with dimensions of \(56 \times 26\) cm and 2 cm thickness which contain 263 holes of 10 mm diameter to ensure equal air distribution within the whole fluidized bed.
d- Four channels to transmit air into the air distribution plate (to give a steady flow of air to the fluidization region to prevent unstable flow (air jets)).

Three types of sand were used in the tests after washing, drying and sifting depending on the diameters required. Two sensors for measuring pressure difference were used; one on the orifice disk to measure the air velocity, and the other inside the fluidized bed to measure the pressure difference within the bed. A data logger with 22 channels was used to collect temperature data through K-type thermocouples distributed as follows:

1. Five thermocouples fixed on the hot tube (HT).
2. Fifteen thermocouples distributed within the fluidized bed in different places.
3. Two thermocouples fixed on the entry and exit of air into the fluidized bed.

2.2. Experimental Procedures

1. Install the container in the test rig tightly to prevent the leaking of sand particles into the box or out of the container, and then insert the tubes in the desired place and fix it on the container wall.
2. Insert the hot tube in location \(X_1\) as shown in Fig. 3.
3. Fill the plastic container with sand (0.15 mm diameter) to the height of the first row of tubes which requires 25 kg of sand.
4. Connect the electrical power to the hot tube using the power supply, and wait for a period of time until the heater surface reaches a temperature of 200 °C.
5. Run the air blower, with the main valve and gate installed at the air entrance to the blower closed at the beginning.
6. Run the air blower and control the air flow velocity from the main valve and gate installed at the air entrance. Choose four speeds for each particle diameter as follows:

---

**Fig. 1.** Experimental test rig.

**Fig. 2.** Schematic of a hot tube (a) Details of the hot tube and (b) Thermocouples location.
The average of convective heat transfer coefficient is calculated using the average of the local values of the five angles on the surface of the hot tube from the mathematical relation in Eq. (3).

\[
\bar{h} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{5} h_j}{5}
\]

The air properties (k, \(\varrho\)) are found at \(T_f\) using the air physical properties table at atmospheric pressure [9]:

\[
T_f = \left[ \frac{T_w + T_b}{2} \right] + 273
\]

where

\[
\bar{T}_w = \frac{\sum T_w}{5}
\]

and

\[
\bar{T}_b = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{15} T_{b,i}}{15}
\]

Then, the Nusselt number for the tube and sand particles (\(Nu_t\ & Nu_p\)) are calculated from the following relations [10]:

\[
Nu_t = \frac{\bar{h} D_t}{k_g}
\]

(7)

\[
Nu_p = \frac{\bar{h} d_p}{k_g}
\]

(8)

2. The Reynolds number for the tube and sand particles (\(Re_t\ & Re_p\)) are calculated as follows [10]:

\[
Re_t = \frac{U D_t}{\varrho g}
\]

(9)

\[
Re_p = \frac{U d_p}{\varrho g}
\]

(10)

To find gas velocity, Bernoulli’s law is used to convert the pressure difference into velocity [11]:

\[
U = \sqrt{2gH}
\]

(11)

\section*{2.4. Experimental Error Analysis}

The results should be tested for uncertainty using the experimental error method because they contain three types of error, as instrument calibration, bias errors, and random errors [13]. The following is a summary of the uncertainty of the use of measuring devices and experimental data.

1. Measurements uncertainty

The bias error is calculated from [12] for the following measuring instruments used in this study.

\[
B = \pm \left[ \left( \frac{1}{2} \times \text{Resolution} \right)^2 + \left( \text{Accuracy} \right)^2 \right]^{1/2}
\]

(12)

2. Dimension uncertainty

- Hydraulic diameter \(\pm 0.29\%\).
- Outer surface area \(\pm 0.55\%\).

3. The relative pressure drop uncertainty \(\pm 0.653\%\).


The uncertainty estimation of these properties has been calculated based on the following relation [12]:

\[
\varphi = \pm \frac{1}{2} \left[ \varphi(T_{in} + T_w)_{max} - \varphi(T_{in} + T_w)_{min} \right]
\]

(13)

\begin{table}[h]
 \centering
 \caption{Measuring devices uncertainty.}
 \begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|}
 \hline
 Device & Resolution & Accuracy & Bias error (B) \\
 \hline
 Caliper & 0.01 mm & \(\pm 0.02\) mm & \(\pm 0.0206\) mm \(\pm 0.0112\) W & \(\pm 0.0632\) psi & \(\pm 0.206\) °C \\
 Power meter & 0.01 W & (0.01\%\%\%) W & & & & \\
 Differential pressure meter & 0.04 psi & \(\pm 0.06\) psi & & & & \\
 Temperature data logger & 0.1 °C & 0.2 °C & & & & \\
 \hline
 \end{tabular}
 \end{table}
Table 3
Uncertainty estimation of air properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Air properties</th>
<th>Uncertainty ratio (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>±1.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific heat</td>
<td>±0.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal conductivity</td>
<td>±1.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic viscosity</td>
<td>±0.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prandtl number</td>
<td>±2.663</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Uncertainty for Reynolds number ± 1.707%.
2. Uncertainty for Nusselt number ± 3.163%.
3. Uncertainty for heat transfer coefficient ± 3.391%.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The value of heat transfer coefficient (h) between the fluidized bed and the hot tube immersed in it was affected by the bubble destroying behavior and the movement of the fluidized bed particles due to the gas flowing through the bed [13]. The effect of individual behavior of thermocouples locations which were installed on the hot tube was determined at different gas velocities. Then, the average of the Nusselt number was calculated for both the tube and sand particles from the experimental data using Eqs. (1)-(7). A graph is used to represent the relation between the average \( \overline{Nu} \) and \( Re \) for the tube and particles at different gas velocities. Figs. 4-6 illustrate the effect of each of the hot tube position and Reynolds number on the tube’s average Nusselt number for sand samples 0.15, 0.3, and 0.6 mm. Figs. 7-9 show the effect of each of the hot tube position and Reynolds number on the Nusselt number for sand particle samples 0.15, 0.3, and 0.6 mm. As observed from these figures, in general, \( \overline{Nu} \) increases with increases in \( Re \). For the influence of the hot tube location, it is clearly obvious for each case, where the maximum value of \( \overline{Nu} \) was observed for the 0.15 mm sand sample at location X1. Furthermore, the maximum value of \( \overline{Nu} \) at \( Re=200 \) was about 235, an increase by 15% compared to the other locations (X3 and X5) as shown in Fig. 4. As for the 0.3 mm sand sample, it is observed in Fig. 5 that the \( \overline{Nu} \) values are lower than that of the previous sand sample, where the maximum values at locations X2 and X3 did not exceed 25% of the achieved value in the previous sample. It was also observed in Fig. 4 that the values of \( \overline{Nu}_t \) at these two locations were significantly influenced by the increase in \( Re \) compared to locations X1, X4 and X5 where there was less effect of \( Re \) on \( \overline{Nu}_t \). However, when the 0.6 mm sand sample was used, the tests results showed that the value of \( \overline{Nu}_t \) in this case is less than the calculated value from the previous sand samples in all the locations of the hot tube. The maximum value of \( \overline{Nu}_t \) calculated at the location of X3 was about 35 to 37 for a range of \( Re \) of 180 to 300 as shown in Fig. 6. This value of \( \overline{Nu}_t \) is lower than the maximum value of \( \overline{Nu}_t \) obtained for the 0.15 mm sand sample by 5 times. Although the ranges of \( Re \) for the 0.15 mm sand sample are less than the other sand samples, the value of \( \overline{Nu}_t \) is higher. The analysis of the tests results based on the molecular diameter of sand are illustrated in Figs. 7-9 for sand sizes 0.15, 0.3, and 0.6 mm respectively. It is observed from these figures that the values of \( Nu_p \) is much lower compared to that of \( Nu_t \) and did not exceed more than 3 in its best case. It was observed in the 0.15 mm sand sample that the maximum value of \( Nu_p \) had ranged between 2.5 to 3 at location X1, while at the other locations, there is a significant effect of \( Re \) on the changing values of \( \overline{Nu}_t \) as shown in Fig. 7. On the other hand, Fig. 8 shows the test results for the 0.3 mm sand sample. It is obvious that the obtained values for \( Nu_p \) are much lower compared to that of the 0.15 mm sand sample with a maximum reduction of 30%. Fig. 9 shows the test results for the 0.6 mm sand sample. It is obvious that the obtained values for \( Nu_p \) are lower than the corresponding.
values of the 0.3 sand samples. It is also observed that the 
values of $Re_p$ for the 0.6 mm sand sample are higher than 
that of 0.3 mm; furthermore, the values of $Re_p$ for the 0.3 
mm sand samples is higher than that of 0.15 mm; due to 
the difference in gas velocity. The diameter of sand 
particles which has a significant effect on the coefficient of 
heat transfer, since smaller particle diameter increases the 
coefficient of heat transfer. The heat transfer coefficient for 
the 0.15 mm sand particles was found to be 3.124 times 
higher than that of the 0.3 mm sand particles, and 6.868 
times higher than that of the 0.6 mm sand particles at the 
same operating conditions.

4. CONCLUSION

From the discussion of results obtained from tests on 
the three sand samples at different hot tube locations, it was 
shown that the $Nu$ average increases with increases in $Re$ 
at all distances within the three sand samples due to:
1. The heat transfer coefficient which increases with 
increasing gas velocity.
2. The Nusselt number increases with increases in 
Reynolds number.
3. The effect of tube location was observed clearly since 
none of the tubes had the same values at different 
locations.

The results from the present study are compared with 
those obtained by Moawed [11] and had shown good 
agreement in terms of application, but at varying sand 
particle diameters.
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