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## Overall Sumary

This annual report on the hydrodynamic behavior of multiphase reactors is divided into four sections.

Section 1 deals with the measurement of gas holdup and dispersion coefficients in a cocur'rent continuous bubble column. Three systems, namely alcohol solutions, carboxy methyl cellulose (CMC) solutions, and electrolytic solutions have been studied. The range of gas velocity covered is $2-30 \mathrm{~cm} / \mathrm{s}$ while the range of liquid velocity was varied from $0-15 \mathrm{~cm} / \mathrm{s}$.

Section 2 deals with the measurement of gas holdup and bubble rise velocity in a batch bubble column. The systems studied were glycerine, CMC and alcohol solutions with and without solids. The range of gas velocity covered is $2-30 \mathrm{~cm} / \mathrm{s}$.

Section 3 covers the aspects of mass transfer in a mechanically agitated contactor at high pressure in the presence of solids. The range of variables covered were pressure $400-1400 \mathrm{psig}$, speed of agitation 400-1000 rpm, solid concentration of $0-30$ volume percent and particle size in the range 75-500 microns.

Section 4 deals with the continuous cocurrent downflow column which is a recent addition to the multiphase flow processing laboratory at the University of Pittsburgh. This unit has been erected and is in the process of debugging for minor practical problems.
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## 1. CONTINUOUS COCURRENT BUBBLE COLIMN

### 1.1 Incroduction

Bubble columns have many important industrial applications, though their scaleup and the design is difficult because of the complexity of the flow pattern characteristics. The aim of these epxeriments was to study the hydrodynamic and mixing characteristics in a . 152 m diameter by 3.35 m tall, cocurrent, continuous bubble column. This was done by measuring the phase holdup and the axial heat dispersion coefficient, respectively. The holdup was analyzed using the hydrostatic head techniques, and the dispersion coefficients were analyzed using an axial dispersion model. The effect of a wide range of physical parameters, such as gas velocity, liquid velocity, surface tension, viscosity, and electrolytes concentrations were studied. The data were compared to the existing data wherever possible, and they were analyzed with the help of flow regime characteristics.

### 1.2 Experimental Setup and Procedure

### 1.2.1 Experimental Setup

The experiments are carried out in a . 152 meter diameter *3.35 meter tall bubble colum. The schematic diagram of the setup is shown in Figure 1.1. The abbreviations of the figure are explained in Tabie 1.1. The bubble column has four major sections:

1. Conical bottom section for gas inlet and uniform distribution.
2. . 3 meter long calming section filled with copper Raschig rings for mixing of gas and slurry.
3. Main test section.
4. Heat source at the top.


|  | DEFINITIOAS FOR FIGURE 1.1 |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | Agitator |
| B1, 82 | Ball Valves |
| $B F 1, B F 2$ | Backflushing System |
| C | Condensate |
| CBS | Conical Bottom Section |
| CS | Calming Section |
| CWI. CWO | Cooling hater Inlet and Outlet |
| D1. D2 | Distributor Plates |
| G1. G2 | Pressure Gauges |
| HE | Shell and Tube ileat Exchanger $1^{\prime \prime}$ UD SS tubes on the tube (slurry side) Heat triensfer area $25 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ $14^{\prime \prime} 00,6 \mathrm{ft}$ long Black iron shell side (cooling wàter) |
| LT-L5 | 2 '0D, Schedule 80, PVC pipes |
| M1, M2 | Manometers |
| P | Galigher Horizontal Centrifugal Pump |
| Pl-P6 | Fressure Taps |
| R | feservoir (550 liter, plastic) |
| RR | Gas Rotameter |
| S1 | Steam Inlet |
| S1-S6 | Sampling Taps |
| TS | Main Test Section |
| T, FI | Transducer and Flow Indicator (ultrasonic) |
| 4 | Thermocouple Holes |

Two perforated plate distributors are provided. One having holes of 0.5 mm diameter, is used between the conical bottom section and the calming section, while the one having 1.0 cm holes is fitted between the calming section and the test section.

Four pressure taps, two at the bottom and two at the top; each pair .61 meter ( 2.0 ft ) apart, are provided. Each pair is attached to different mercury manometer to avoid any dynamic lag. To overcome the difficulty of plugging these manometer lines a water backflushing system is used. In addition to the pressure taps, six sampling tubes, .61 meter apart from each other, are inserted to collect solid-1iquid samples. Each tube has five holes of 5 mo diameter each, along the length to ensure radially averaged phase concentration at each location. The solid phase concentration will be measured gravimetrically.

For heat tracer experiments, ten iron-constantan thermocouples are connected to the test section. First eight are .3 m ( 1 ft) apart and the last three are .15 m apart from each other. In addition to the above mentioned thermocouples, the inlet and outlet temperatures of liquid, inlet and outlet temperatures of heat exchanger cooling water are also measured with the help of thermocouples. All the thermocouples are connected to a digital display meter which is capable of reading the temperatures up to first digit. A stainless steel coil heated with steam is used to provide 74 kilowatts of heat into flowing fluid.

The gas phase used is always air. Air inlet pressure is maintained constant with the help of pressure regulator. The gas phase flow rate is measured with the help of calibrated rotameter, while the liquid flow rate is measured with the help of an ultrasonic flow measuring device. Colum is insulated with fiberglass insulation material to prevent the heat

10sses. All the experiments are carried out near atmospheric pressure, in a continuous and steady state manner.

The surface tension is measured by du-Nouy method. (1.B1) In this method a platinum-iridium ring of precisely known dimensions is suspended from counter-balanced lever-arm. The arm is held horizontal by torsion applied to a taut stainless steel wire, to which it is clamped. Increasing the torsion in the wire raises the arm and the ring, which carries with it the film of liquid in which it is inmersed. The force necessary to pull the test ring free from the surface film is measured directly in dynes/cm. This "apparent" reading is converted to "absolute" value by a correction chart. The viscosity is measured on Brookfield LVT type viscometer. This instrument rotates the spindle in the fluid at a constant speed, and measures the torque necessary to overcome the resultant viscous drag. For given speed and spindle, it produces dial readings proportional to the viscosity. $(1.32,1.33)$

### 1.2.2 Analysis

The analysis of the raw data has been done separately for the holdup and the axial dispersion coefficient as described below.

### 1.2.2.1 Holdup

To determine the gas holdup, the manometer readings are first converted to absolute pressure by a simple hydrostatic head technique. To get the values of gas holdup in gas-liquid systems, two equations are used.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon_{G}+\varepsilon_{L}=1.0 \tag{1.2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\frac{d p}{d x}=\left(\varepsilon_{G} \rho_{G}+\varepsilon_{L} \rho_{L}+\varepsilon_{s} \rho_{s}\right)+\Delta p_{t p} \tag{1,2,2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\Delta p_{t p}$ is the frictional pressure drop and $d p / d x$ is the pressure gradient. It is found that the frictional pressure drop is negligible and pressure shows linear dependency with length. To ensure this, gas holdup is calculated in two ways. One is already mentioned above. In the other method, the holdup is calculated in the following manner
where $H H$ is the hydrostatic head. The holdup values calculated by both the methods match well (within $\pm 1 \%$ ) indicating a negligible frictional pressure drop and negligible linear variation in holdud values.

To determine the solid and liquid holdup in three phase systems, solid-liquid samples will be collected at several locations along the length of the column. By measuring the weight and the volume of the slurry, density will be obtained. After filtering and drying the samples, it is possible to calculate the relative volume fraction of liquid and the solid. By knowing this quantity, following three equations will be solved simultaneously to get the values of individual phase holdup.

$$
\begin{gather*}
\varepsilon_{G}+\varepsilon_{L}+\varepsilon_{s}=1.0  \tag{1.2.4}\\
-\mathrm{dp} / \mathrm{dx}=\varepsilon_{G} \rho_{G}+\varepsilon_{L} \rho_{L}+\varepsilon_{s} \rho_{s}  \tag{1.2.5}\\
\varepsilon_{s} / \varepsilon_{L}=\text { known quantity } \tag{1.2.6}
\end{gather*}
$$

### 1.2.2.2 Axial Dispersion Coefficient

The axial dispersion coefficient is analyzed using the axial dispersion model, using heat as a tracer. The method involves a continuous addition of heat as a tracer under steady state conditions. In some cases, significant fluctuations are observed in temperature. These fluctuations are more pronounced in the upper section of the column. To take Into account the fluctuations, the average of 25 to 30 values noted at one point, are taken.

The overall energy balance on three phase system, based on the following assumptions can be written as:

1. Heat losses from tube wall are negligible:
2. At any given point, gas, liquid, and solid phase tempratures are the same.
3. Constant physical properties.
4. Steady state flow.
5. The thermal conductivity and the density of the gas phase are small compared to that of liquid and solid, and therefore can be neglected.
6. The molecular thermal conductivity is negligible compared to axial dispersion coefficient of heat.
7. No chemical reaction is occurring.
8. The latent heat of vaporization is negligible.
9. Gas phase backmixing is relatively small.
1.0. Solid-liquid mixture behaves as a homogeneous slurry.

Based on these assumptions, the following equation is obtained:

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\left(D_{S L}{ }^{p}{ }_{S L} c_{P S L} \varepsilon_{S L}\right) \frac{d^{2} T}{d x}+\left(p_{S L} v_{S L} c_{P S L}\right) \frac{d T}{d x}=0 \tag{1.2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

For gas-liquid systems, the equation simplifies to:

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\left(D_{L} \rho_{L} C_{P_{L}} \varepsilon_{L}\right) \frac{d^{2} T}{d x^{2}}+\left(\rho_{L} V_{L} c_{P_{L}}\right) \frac{d T}{d x}=0 \tag{1.2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Solution of this equation is obtained using the boundary conditions,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { 1) at } x=x_{c}, T=T_{c} \quad \text { 2) at } x=x_{h}, T=T_{h} \tag{1.2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

The equation is solved numerically by a pattern grid search method available as a package program on University of Pittsburgh computer library.

### 1.3 Results and Discussion

As indicated in the last report, the experiments are being carried out in a cocurrent, continuous bubble column, having diameter of .152 m . The phase holdups and the axial heat dispersion coefficients are measured with the help of the hydrostatic head technique, and the axial dispersion model respectively.

The effect of the liquid properties have been studied using different alcohol solutions, carboxy methyl cellulose (CMC) solutions, and electrolyte solutions. The results obtained are summarized in the following sections.

### 1.3.1 Effect of Surface Tension

The effect of surfactants is not clearly understood. Many investigators have tried different surfactants with entirely opposite conclusions. While Botton et al. ${ }^{(1.1)}$ and Miller ${ }^{(1.2)}$ reported no effect of surface tension, Schugerl et al., (1.3) Todt et al. ${ }^{(1.4)}$ observed a significant
increase in the gas holdup with a decrease in the surface tension. Recently Oels et al. ${ }^{(1.5)}$ carried out experiments with dilute solutions of alcohols and found a significant increase in the values of gas holdup. Bach and Pilhofer ${ }^{(1.6)}$ observed no effect of surface tension on gas holdup for pure liquids but they noted a different behavior for liquid mixtures and electrolyte solutions. The addition of electrolytes increases the gas holdup as noted by Akita and Yoshida, (1.7) Hikita et al., (1.8) Freedman and Davidson, (1.9) etc. Freedman and Davidson observed that the addition of electrolytes postponed the appearance of large bubbles in the colum. Electrolytes and/or alcohol additives probably stabilize the bubble size by formation of an ionic and/or polar double layer at the interface which depresses the coalescence rate.

In SRC-II reaction, where the surface tension of the liquid phase Is very low, there is a possibility that the value of the gas holdup and the dispersion coefficient may show entirely different behavior in the presence of long chain carbon molecules. It is assumed that, the surface tension behavior in the $S R C-I I$ reactor can be fairly simulated by $C_{3}-C_{4}$ alcohols. In addition, the bubble columns have been recently used as bioreactors for the production of alcoholic beverages, and single cell proteins. The substrate in these reactors can be fairly simulated with the help of alcohol solutions. (1.3)

The alcohol solution studied and their physical properties are tabulated in Table 1.2. All the concentrations of the alcohol solutions mentioned hereafter are in vol \%.

TABLE 1.2
PHYSICAL PROPERTIES: ALCOHOL SOLUTIONS

|  | $\rho_{L}$ | $\sigma_{L}$ | $\mu_{L}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{cc}$ | dynes/cm | cP |

The only work reported on these type of culture media, is by Schugerl and coworkers. ( $1.3,1.4,1.5$ ) But the relative range of gas and ifquid velocities studied is low $\left(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{G}}<6.0 \mathrm{~cm} / \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{L}}<3.0 \mathrm{~cm} / \mathrm{s}\right)$.

The experiments were carried out at atmospheric pressure, at gas velocities ranging from $3.0-30.0 \mathrm{~cm} / \mathrm{s}$, and the $1 q i u i d$ velocities ranging from $2 \cdot 0-15.0 \mathrm{~cm} / \mathrm{s}$. Following results are obtained.

### 1.3.1.1 Gas Holdup

Gas holdup shows an increase with an increase in the gas velocity, but shows a decrease with an increase in the liquid velocity, as illustrated in Figure 1.2, but the effect of liquid velocity becomes insignificant at higher liquid velocities. The effect of alcohol concentration on the gas holdup is observed to be insignificant as shown in Figure 1.3, but the effect of the type of alcohol is predominant as shown in Figure 1.4. The gas holdup increased in the following order,

```
methanol < ethanol < propanol < butanol
```
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The experimental data are compared with the values calculated with the help of different existing correlations, and all the tabulated results are shown in Appendix 1.I. The values are compared with the values obtained with the correlations by Akita and Yoshida, (1.7) Hikita et al., (1.8) Kumar et al., (1.10) Miller, (1.2) and Schugerl et al. (1.3) It is generally observed that none of the correlation was satisfactory in predicting the values of gas holdup. The equation by Schugerl et al. (103) predicts reasonable values for low gas velocity range, but is not applicable for high gas velocities. A typical comparison plot is shown in Figure 1.5. To study this strange behavior, flow regimes are tested, and some surprising results are found.

### 1.3.1.2 F1ow Regimes

The gas holdup depends on the physical properties of the liquid phase, bubble density, bubble size and the coalescence rate. Schugerl et al. (1.3) observed that in the presence of alcohol solutions, the effect of distributor plate is also important. Present experiments are carried out with perforated plates having holes of 0.5 m diameter. Berghmans (1.11) has derived a criterion for the stability of the bubbles for small viscosity liquids. He based his criterion on relative magnitude of buoyancy, interfacial and gravitational forces. For this perforated plate, it is observed that the bubbles are below the boundary of stable and unstable region indicating that the bubble size is not solely governed by the dynamic equilibrium. Therefore, the bubble size depends essentially on the type of system being used. This observation is also supported by Schugeri et al., (1.3) who indicated that for perforated plate distributors having holes of diameter greater than 0.5 mm , will be on the boundary of the stable and unstable region.


FIGURE 1.5

To see the regime ini which most of the data lie, the flow regime diagrams are prepared, where drift flux as a function of gas holdup is plotted. As shown in Figure 1.6, the drift flux diagram clearly shows the transition. For methanol solution, the transition from the bubbly flow is much earlier than the propanol solution. The dotted line indicates the direction of the probable points, if flooding is avoided and the bubbly flow regime can be maintained. It should be noted that both the alochols are hardly distinguishable from each other in the bubbly flow regime but their behavior is drastically different in the churn turbulent regime. Also, it is interesting to note that the surface tension for both the solutions is almost equal to each other. When the same drift flux graph is plotted for three different solutions of propanol, as shown in Figure 1.7 , it can be easily seen that they cannot be distinguished from each other. The surface tension for these three solutions varies from 44 to 68 dynes/cm. Therefore, it can be concluded that the surface tension is not the deciding criterion in these solutions.

In alcohol solutions it is generally believed that the coalescence rate is reduced due to a layer of oriented dipole molecules at the surface of the bubble. The rise velocity of the same diameter bubble may not be the same in the presence of surfactants. The tinterface of the bubble is mobile, and an internal circulation movement exists in a bubble which always reduces the drag on the bubble. Therefore, the velocity predicted by Stoke's law may not be a correct indication of true value. Oels et al. (1.5) have explained the behavior of bubbles in water containing surfactants. They reported that the surfactants are absorbed at the top of the bubble and are being transported to the rear by an interfacial flow. Therefore, surfactant gets enriched at the rear and a surface tension

gradient is formed. They categorized the bubbles in three regions depending upon their circulation. The surface tension gradient of the bubble essentially depends on the type of the alcohol, and as the chain length of the alcohol increases, the rigidity of bubble will increase, causing a reduction in the bubble rise velocity, and hence an increase in the gas holdup.

From the flow regime charts, it is observed that most of the data lie in the churn turbulent regime. To analyze these data, a theory by Zuber and Findiey ${ }^{(1.12)}$ is used which is designed for the churn turbulent regime.

The drift flux of the gas is defined as the volumetric flux of gas relative to the surface moving at an average velocity. If the total phase velocity $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{T}}$, is defined as

$$
\begin{equation*}
v_{T}=V_{G}+v_{L} \tag{1.3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Drift filux can be defined as,

$$
\begin{equation*}
v_{C D}=v_{G} \pm \varepsilon_{G} v_{G} \tag{1.3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

or,

$$
\begin{equation*}
v_{C D}=v_{G}\left(1-\varepsilon_{G}\right) \pm v_{L} \varepsilon_{G} \tag{1:3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where + ve sign corresponds to the countercurrent flow and the - ve sign corresponds to the cocurrent flow. Zuber and Findley ${ }^{(1.12)}$ modified this approach for the churn turbulent flow. For cocurrent flow, equation (1.s.2) can be written as,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{v_{G}}{\varepsilon_{G}}=V_{T}+v_{C D} \tag{1.3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

or,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\left\langle v_{G}\right\rangle}{\left\langle\varepsilon_{G}\right\rangle}=\frac{\left\langle V_{T} \varepsilon_{G}\right\rangle}{\left\langle\varepsilon_{G}\right\rangle}+\frac{\left\langle v_{C D} \varepsilon_{G}\right\rangle}{\left\langle\varepsilon_{G}\right\rangle} \tag{1.3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where < > bracket indicates the average value along the cross section. If we define

$$
\begin{equation*}
C_{0}=\frac{\left\langle\varepsilon_{G} V_{T}\right\rangle}{\left\langle\varepsilon_{G} V_{T}\right\rangle} \tag{1.3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

as a distribution parameter, which is a rough indication of nonuniform radial distribution, equation (1.3.5) can be written as,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\left\langle\nabla_{G}\right\rangle}{\left\langle\varepsilon_{G}\right\rangle}=C_{0}\left\langle V_{T}\right\rangle+\frac{\left\langle\varepsilon_{G}{ }_{C D}\right\rangle}{\left\langle\varepsilon_{G}\right\rangle} \tag{1.3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

If the value of drift flux velocity is constant, or very small compared to the value of $\left\langle V_{T}\right\rangle$, by plotting the graph of $V_{G} / \varepsilon_{G}$ versus $V_{T}$, the value of $C_{0}$ can be obtained.

Figure 1.8 shows the graph of bubble rise velocity as a function of total velocity for $0.5 \%$ butanol. It can be easily seen that most of the data can be linearly correlated. At low gas velocity, it shows a maximur. with respect to the bubble rise velocity indicating a transition from bubble flow to the churn turbulent flow. Figure 1.9 shows the same graph for all the propanol solutions. It can be easily seen that just one line can be drawn through all the data. When the data for all the four alcohols are fitted with the following equation,



FIGURE 1.9

$$
\begin{equation*}
v_{G} / \varepsilon_{G}=c_{1}+c_{0}\left(v_{G}+v_{L}\right) \tag{1.3.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $C_{1}$ is a constant, the following values as indicated in Table 1.3 are obtained. From this table it can be clearly seen that the values of the distribution parameter increase significantly with a decrease in the chain length.
table 1.3
COEFFICIENTS OF ZUBER-FINDLEY'S EOUATION

|  | $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Butano1 | 1.23 | .095 |
| Propanol | 1.28 | .095 |
| Ethanol | 1.66 | .086 |
| Methanol | 2.41 | .071 |

It can, therefore, be concluded that the increase in the nonuniformity of the distribution causes a decrease in the holdup value. Though it cannot be proved at the moment, it is believed that the value of $C_{1}$ is some indication of the bubble size. It is interesting to note that the value of $C_{1}$ essentially remains independent of the type of the alcohol. Zuber and Findley ${ }^{(1.12)}$ have reported that if the value of $C_{1}$ is much less than ( $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{G}}+\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{L}}$ ), gas holdup can be calculated by a simple relationship as follows,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon_{G}=\frac{v_{G}}{C_{0}\left(V_{G}+V_{L}\right)} \tag{1.3.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is observed that for this set of experiments, the value of $C_{1}$ is signifficantly less than $\left(V_{G}+V_{L}\right)$. The holdup values calculated, based on the
above correlation, reasonably ( $\pm 10 \%$ ) matched with the experimental data.
Since the effect of surface tension on the holdup has been found to be negligible, the gas holdup is empirically correlated with the superficial gas velocity and the carbon number, which is the number of carbon atoms in the alcohol. The following equation is obtained.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon_{G}=.75\left(V_{G}\right) .557\left(C_{N}\right) .26 \tag{1.3.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

The parity plot for this correlation is shown in Figure 1.10. The data fits reasonably well with the equation. After application of the statistical $F$ test, it is found that $90 \%$ of the data fit within the range of $\pm 5 \%$. When the data by Schugerl et al. (1.3) for perforated plates is tested, it is found that their data fit within $\pm 10 \%$ range.

### 1.3.1.3 Dispersion Coefficient

The heat dispersion coefficients are obtained using a steady state method. The dispersion coefficients showed a very strange behavior. The dispersion coefficients for $3.0 \%$ propanol solution are shown in Figure 1.11. The dispersion coefficients are shown as a function of superficial gas velocity. It can be easily seen that the value of dispersion is negifgible at low gas velocities, and can be approximated as zero. The value is very low at very low gas velocities due to the suppression of coalescence. But once the flow enters in the heterogeneous or churn turbulent regime, the value of dispersion coefficient suddenly shoots up. Though it should be noted that the behavior of dispersion coefficient in bubbly flow regime is unpredictable. Especially at low liquid velocities, dispersion coefficient shows a maximum with respect to gas velocity. The
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effect of liquid velocity at high gas flow rates, however, is insignificant. In the case of homogeneous flow, where very high values of gas holdup exist, and the distribution of bubbles is almost uniform (as in the case of butanol or propanol as explained in the previous section, there is hardly any liquid recirculation due to the lack of nonunfform radial distribution. Therefore the value of the dispersion remains low. Still, the existence of a maximum at low Ilquid velocity cannot be explained satisfactorily. Recently Konig et al. (1.13) explained the maximum based on the fact that at low gas velocities, the bubble density in the swarm is low, therefore eddies due to single bubbles can propagate for longer ilstances and may overlap. Hence, the intensity of backmixing is higher than that at higher bubble density. Probably, at high Iiquid velocitiles, the bubbles do not have an opportunity to form eddies and propagat:e, and therefore, they just rise in uniform fashion. The effect of concentration on the backmixing is negligible. The datal for methanol solution is shown in Figure 1.12. The behavior is similar to water, indicating an absence of radial uniformity throughout the range of gas velocity under consideration: The effect of Ilquid velocity is also negligible. The values for the methanol solution are lower than the propanol solutions at high gas velocities. It should be noted that the dispersion coefficient values are based on the overall cross sectional area. When the values of dispersion coefficients are calculated based on the available liquid area ( $D_{L} X \varepsilon_{L}$ ), and compared with each other, it is found that the effect of the type of alcohol is also insignificant, at higher gas velocifies.

The values of the experimental data have been compared with the values predicted by the correlations of Baird and Rice, (1.14) Joshi, (1.15)

figure 1.12

Deckwer et al., (1.16) and Field and Davidson. (1.17) The values do not match with any of the correlations at low gas velocities, but at high gas velocitles, the values based on the total cross sectional area match reasonably well with correlation by Baird and Rice. An empirical correlation, similar to Baird and Rice is fitted, and the following equation is obtained

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{L} \varepsilon_{L}=1.42 d_{c}^{1.33}\left(V_{G}-\frac{\varepsilon_{G} V_{L}}{\left(1-\varepsilon_{G}\right)}\right) \tag{1.3.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

The parity plot is shown in Figure 1.13. The data fit reasonably well. The statistical F test shows that $90 \%$ of the data fits within $\pm \mathbf{~} 4 \%$ region.

It is interesting to note that when the data for the gas velocity greater than $8.0 \mathrm{~cm} / \mathrm{s}$ are correlated with a similar type of equation, the error is reduced to $\pm 9 \%$, indicating a relative uncertainty in the bubbly flow regime in alcohol solutions.

### 1.3.2 Effect of Viscosity

An increase in the viscosity for Newtonian liquids, normally decreases the gas holdup. Most of the work has been carried out with glycerol solutions or sugar solutions. Many investigators have reported a maximum with respect to viscosity near the vicinity of three centiooise (Eissa and Schugerl, (1.18) Bach and Pilhofer, (1.6) Buchholz et al. (1.20) This is explained on the basis of hindered gas bubble motion in the viscous fluids, in which at relatively low viscosities, drag forces are not large enough to cuase bubble coalescence. These moderate forces contribute to more uniform distribution of bubbles and hence higher holdup. Nishikawa

et al., (1.21) and Nakanoh and Yosh1da ${ }^{(1.22)}$ have reported the holdup values in the non-Newtonian medium. They observed higher values of gas holdup with respect to the values predicted by Akita and Yoshida's ${ }^{\text {(1.7) }}$ correlation. No explanation is given.

Cova ${ }^{(1.23)}$ and Aoyama et al. ${ }^{(1.24)}$ reported that the axial dispersion coefficient is Independent of the viscosity, while Pilhofer et al. (1.25) noted a dependency of dispersion coefficient on the liquid viscosity in the two phase systems. Towell and Ackerman ${ }^{(1.26)}$ also indicated that an increase in the ilquid viscosity reduces the dispersion. The effect of non-Newtonian medium has been recently studied by tibrecht and Baykara, (1.27) but their analysis is restricted to dilute polymer solutions. They concluded that the terminal mixing time is a function of the liquid rheological properties.

To study the effect of viscosity, present experiments were carried out with carboxy methyl cellulose (CMC) solutions in water, ranging from 50 ppm to 2300 ppm . The solutions behave as non-Newtonian liquids, and the:lr flow behavior index and the consistency index were calculated with the help of Brookfield LVT type viscometer as explained in the experimental section. The values of the consistency index and flow behavior index are given in Table 1.4

The rheological properties of the solutions are sensitive to the mixing techniques and therefore the same ppm solution can give different viscosity values. The type of CMC used was 7 H 4 (high molecular weight). The densities and surface tensions of the solutions are similar to water and therefore are not mentioned. The apparent viscosity is calculated with the help of the equation derived by Nashikawa et al. (1.21) They reported

TABLE 1.4
RHEOLOGICAL PROPERTIES OF CMC SOLUTIONS

| Solution | Consistency Index <br> $\left.\mathrm{K} \mathrm{(Nt} \mathrm{Bec/m}^{2}\right)$ | Fiow Behavior <br> Index (n) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 50 ppm | .002 | 1.000 |
| 500 ppm | .0045 | 1.000 |
| 1000 ppm | .0076 | 1.000 |
| $1200 \mathrm{ppm} \mathrm{@} 25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | .0116 | 1.000 |
| @ $35^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | .0147 | 1.000 |
| $1800 \mathrm{ppm} \mathrm{@} 25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | .0324 | 0.964 |
| C $35^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | .0262 | 0.966 |
| 2300 ppm @ $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | .0598 | 0.952 |
| @ $35^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | .038 | 0.946 |

that the average shear rate in the bubble colum is calculated by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\dot{\nu}=50 \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{G}} \tag{1.3.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $V_{G}$ is in $\mathrm{cm} / \mathrm{s}$. The apparent viscosity is calculated by the equation,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mu=k(\dot{v})^{n-1} \tag{1.3.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

The following results are obtained.

### 1.3.2.1 Gas Holdup

The gas holdup shows an increase with an increase in the gas velocity, but remains essentially independent of the liquid velocity as shown in Figure 1.14. For all the solutions, from 50 ppm to 2300 ppm, the gas holdup shows the same behavior. When gas holdup is plotted as a function apparent viscosity, it is observed that the gas holdup shows a maximum with respect to the viscosity in the vicinity of 3 cP . The value is close to the one observed by other Investigators $(1.18,1.19,1.20)$ for Newtonian
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FIGURE 1.14
liquids. The similar observation is probably a result of Newtonian liquidIIke behavior of CMC solution at low concentrations. From Figure 1.15, it can be seen that the maximum shifts on the right side as the gas velocity Increases. The gas holdup data are compared with the values obtained with the help of different correlations. A typical comparison is shown in Figure 1.16. It can be seen that the values observed for 50 ppm solutions are higher than predicted by Akita and Yoshida, (1.7) and Hikita et al., (1.8) as reported earlier. ( $1.21,1.22$ ) The correlation proposed by Schumpe and Deckwer ${ }^{(1,28)}$ is strictly applicable for the CMC solutions, but it is IImited to gas velocity of $15 \mathrm{~cm} / \mathrm{s}$. They observed a negligible effect of the viscosity on the gas holdup. The values predicted by their equation, match reasonably well at low gas velocities, but predict much higher values at high gas velocities. The comparison of the holdup values with different correlated values is shown in Appendix 1.1, in tabulated form.

### 1.3.2.2 Flow Regimes

To analyze the data, flow regime maps are prepared as shown in Figure 1.17. In this figure, the drift flux is plotted as a function of the gas holdup. It can be easily seen that the transition from homogeneous to heterogeneous flow drastically changes the value of drift flux. There is a point of inflection where this transition takes place. For the 2300 ppm solution, the transition is earlier than the 50 ppm solution. It should be noced that the data points for both solutions cannot be distinguished from each other in the homogeneous flow regime. The transition Is within the range of 7 to $15 \%$ holdup value.

Since most of the data lie in the churn turbulent regime, it was decided to use the theory developed by Zuber and Findley. (1.12) The



FIGTRE 1.16
bubble rise velocity $\left(u_{G} / \varepsilon_{G}\right)$ is plotted as a function of the total phase velocity, $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{T}}$, as shown in Figures 1.18 and 1.19 , for 50 ppm solution and 2300 ppm solution respectively. It can be seen that the data show fajrly Inear relationship, but the fluctuation along the Iine are much more compared to the alcohol solutions for 2300 ppm solution, the fluctuations are comparatively less. When the data for all the solutions are fitted with a linear relationship, with the help of least squart fit, following coefficients are obtained as shown in Table 1.6. It is observed that the value of the distribution parameter $C_{0}$ remains essentially independent of the concentration of the CMC. This indicates that the radial distribution does not change with the change in the CMC concentration. However, the value of $C_{1}$, which is an indication of the bubble size, increases sipnificantly with an increase in the concentration. The value of $C_{1}$ changes from . 104 for 50 ppm to 0.328 for 2300 ppm . This is in agreement with the

TABLE 1.5
ZUBER-FINDLEY'S COEFFICIENTS FOR CMC SOLUTIONS

| Concentration <br> (ppm) | $C_{0}$ | $C_{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 50 | .104 | 2.36 |
| 500 | .116 | 2.93 |
| 1000 | .138 | 2.76 |
| 1200 | .260 | 2.64 |
| 1800 | .288 | 2.75 |
| 2300 | .328 | 2.72 |

work reported earlier by Bach and Pilhofer, (1.19) that the bubble size shows an increase with an increase in the viscosity of the solution.
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FIGURE 1.19

### 1.3.2.3 Dispersion Coefficient

The aispersion coefficient values for 50 ppm solution are plotted as a function of the gas velocity in Figure 1.20. The values show an increase with an increase in the gas velocity, but show no effect of the liquid velocity. The values of dispersion coefficient are slightly higher than the values of air-water. When the values of dispersion coefficient are plotted as a function of the apparent viscosity, it is observed that a maximum exists with respect to the apparent viscosity in the vicinity of 4.5 cP (Figure 1.21). This can be qualitatively explained with the help of distribution parameters. The axial backmixing in the bubble columns is caused by two phenomena. One, the bubbles carry large amounts of dead water in their wakes, and when the bubbles leave the top surface, that liquid is recirculated. Second, nonunfform radial distribution of the gas holdup causes recirculation eddies in the liquid phase and hence causes a backmixing. As the bubble size increases, the amount of water carried in the form of wakes decreases, causing a reduction in the value of the dispersion coefficient. If Table 1.6 is observed carefully, it can be seer that the value of $C_{1}$ increases with an increase in the concentration, indicating an increase in the bubble size, but the value of $C_{0}$ shows a maximum for 500 ppm solution, after which the value essentially remains constant. An increase in the value of $C_{0}$, is a direct indication of the nonuniform distribution. Comparative increase in the value of $C_{0}$ is much more than the increase in the value of $C_{1}$, when the concentration is increased from 50 ppm to 500 ppm , indicating that the increase in the viscosity (or increase in the bubble diameter) is more than compensated by an increase in the nonuniform distribution causing a maximum with respect to the apparent viscosity. It can be seen that the peak is much more
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sharp at the low gas velocity after which it tends to flatten out.
The values of the dispersion coefficients are compared with the values obtained by different correlations that have been reported earlier. The values show slightly higher values than the ones predicted by neckwer et al. (1.16) and Baird and Rice. (1.14) The comparisons of the values are tabulated along with the slip velocity and the single bubble rise velocity (calculated with the help of the method proposed by Clift et al.) (1.29) and shown in the Appendix 1.2.

### 1.3.3 Effect of Electrolyte Solutions

The effect of the electrolyte solutions on the gas holdup has been studied by many investigators. Akita and Yoshida ${ }^{(1.7)}$ have reported overall $25 \%$ increase in the holdup values after the addition of an electrolyte, for otherwise identicial physical properties. Hikita et al. (1.8) have correlated their holdup data with the ionic strength of the electrolyte solution. Freedman and Davidson ${ }^{(1.9)}$ reported that an addition of electrolyte postponed the appearance of large bubbles in the colum and is reflected by the increased voidage at the values of $V_{G}$ between 5 and $10 \mathrm{~cm} / \mathrm{s}$. This is supported by Braulick et al. (1.30) who observed swarms of minute or 'ionic' bubbles in the presence of electrolytes, whose extent of the formation is function of both concentration and gas velocity. It is generally believed that the addition of the electrolyte into a solution Induces a non-coalescing behavior, by virtue of an ionic double polar layer between the gas phase and the liquid phase. Schugerl et al. (1.3) measured the values of dispersion coefficients in the presence of $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ solutions, but the results are inconclusive.

Present experiments are carried out to see the effect of electrolyte solutions as a non-coalescing medium on the gas holdup and axial dispersion coefficient. The study is done with the help of four different solutions of sodium chloride. The concentration ranges from .05 molar to 1.0 molar solution. The physical properties of the solutions are given in Table 1.6.

TABLE 1.6
PHYSICAL PROPERTIES OF NaCI SOLUTIONS

| Concentration | $\rho_{L}$ <br> $(\mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{cc})$ | $\sigma_{L}$ <br> $($ dynes $/ \mathrm{cm})$ | $\mu_{L}$ <br> $(\mathrm{cP})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.05 M | 0.998 | 70.50 | 1.05 |
| 0.2 M | 1.018 | 72.15 | 1.22 |
| 0.5 M | 1.045 | 71.25 | 1.23 |
| 1.0 M | 1.065 | 73.50 | 1.29 |

The following results are obtained.

### 1.3.3.1 Gas Holdup

Gas holdup shows an increase with an increase in the gas velocity, but shows an independence with respect to the liquid velocity. The values of the gas holdup for .05 M solution are shown in Figure 1.22. The gas holdup values also remain independent of the concentration. The experimental values are compared with different correlations in Figure 1.23. The values reasonably match with the correlations by Akita and Yoshida ${ }^{(1.6)}$ and Hikita et al. (1.7)

### 1.3.3.2 Flow Regimes

The flow regime maps are prepared with the help of drift flux thoery. The drift flux plotted as a function of the gas holdup is shown In Figure 1.24. The transition from the bubbly flow regime to the churn



FIGURE 1.23

turbulent regime can be clearly seen. There is some effect of concentration on the transition, where for .05 M solution, the transition is eariler than . 5 M solution. Up to the transition region, both the solutions show aimilar behavior. The value of the gas holdup at which the transition takes place, ranges from $15 \%$ to $20 \%$, as opposed to $6 \%$ to $10 \%$ for CMC solution. This is a clear indication of the non-coalescing behavior of the solution, where even at high values of gas holdup bubble size essentially remains dependent on the gas distributor size rather than the dynamic equilibrium.

Since all the data lie in the churn turbulent regime, ZuberFindley's ${ }^{(1.12)}$ approach is employed again. Figure 1.25 shows the plot of the bubble rise velocity as a function of the total phase velocity for .05 M NaCl solution. A linear straight line can be easily fitted through all the points irrespective of the liquid velocity. When the same graph is prepared for .05 M and 0.5 M solutions together, it is observed that the effect of concentration on the bubble rise velocity is negligible (Figure 1.26). A stralght line can be easily fitted through all the points. The Zuber-Findley coefficients are calculated by using a least square fit and following values as indicated in Table 1.7 are obtained.

It can be seen from the table that the values of $C_{0}$ and $C_{1}$ do not change significantly with change in the concentration. Therefore an overall straight line is fitted, and the coefficients are calculated. From the values of the coefficients, it is observed that the values of $C_{1}$ are relatively smaller than the ones obtained in the case of alcohol solutions. This is a probable indication of smaller bubble size than
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bubble rise velocity vs tvg+VLi to.05 and 0.5 m nacl solution]
FIGIRE 1.26

TABLE 1.7
ZUBER-FINDLEY COEFFICIENTS FOR NaC1 SOLUTIONS

| Concentration | $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 0.05 M | 2.76 | .028 |
| 0.2 M | 3.07 | .026 |
| 0.5 M | 2.67 | .019 |
| 1.0 M | 2.28 | .017 |
| Overal1 | 2.76 | .020 |

the alcohol solutions. The values of $C_{o}$ are however, much larger than propanol or butanol solutions, indicating a nonuniform radial distribution of the bubbles. The values of $C_{1}$ show a steady increase in the value with decrease in the concentration, but apparently this does not reflect in the holdup values.

### 1.3.3.3 Dispersion Coefficient

The values of dispersion coefficient for .05 M are plotted as a function of the gas velocity in Figure 1.27. The dispersion coefficients show an increase with increasing gas velocity but remain independent of the liquid velocity. The dispersion coefficient values for 1.0 M NaCl solution are compared with the air-water data in Figure 1.28. It can be seen that the values of NaCl are slightly higher than the alr-water data. As indicated earlier in the Section 1.3.1, these values are based on the overall cross sectional area of the column. If the values are calculated based on the cross sectional area available to the Ifquid phase ( $D_{L} E_{L}$ ), both the systems show comparable values.


figure 1.28

It is interesting to note that though both electrolyte and alcohol solutions produce small bubbles due to non-coalescing tendencies, the dispersion coefficints show an entirely different trend. Higher alcohol (Propanol and butanol) solutions show almost zero values of the dispersion coefficlents at low gas velocities, while the electrolyte solutions behave similar to the air-water system. This can be explained on the basis of the dist:ribution parameter. If the values of the $C_{0}$ for propanol and butanol solutions and the electrolyte solutions are compared with each other, f.t can be clearly seen that along with producing small bubbles, the alcohol solutions also maintain a uniform radial distribution, which is a significant contributing factor for the dispersion, while NaCl solutions have highly nonuniform radial distribution causing a significant increase in the value of the dispersion coefficient. It should be clarified that though it is mentioned earlier that the small bubbles can carry more water In the form of wakes, and hence create a higher backmixing, a special situation is created when relatively large values of holdups are obtained at low gas velocities. Due to high density of small bubbles, the microscopic eddies created by these bubbles do not propagate. In addition, if the bubbles have uniform radial distribution, the two phase flow behaves as a single phase flow causing a negligible backmixing.

## APPENDIX 1.1
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conparisom of the holour data hith existimg correlations

| NSM/S) | (4. (H/S) | Expri | AMITA/YOSHIDA <br>  |  | MERSMmen | NLTAR | MILLER | SCHUEERL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.02776 | 0.06261 | 0.09 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.05339 | 0.06261 | 0.09845 | 0.07221 | 0.07855 | 0.07475 | 0.11250 | 0.04034 | 0.19706 |
| 0.08567 | 0.05251 | 0.231039 | 0.11437 | 0.11420 | 0.11877 | 0.19294 | 0.07122 | 0.37546 |
| 0.12154 | 0,06261 | 0.39802 | 0.190 | 0.14965 | 0.15880 | 0.26516 | 0.10403 | 0.62958 |
| 0.15983 | 0.06261 | 0.43776 | . 21 | 0.18299 | 0.19200 | 0.31623 | 0.13418 | 0.95675 |
| 0.20175 | 0.06261 | 0.44999 | 0.23834 |  | 0.21327 | 0.34059 | 0.16406 | 1.37627 |
| 0.24635 | 0.06261 | 0.46772 | 0.23971 | 0.27713 | 0.24377 | 0.34219 | 0.18334 | 1.87095 |
| 0.26989 | 0.06261 | 0.49156 | 0.26961 | 0.29241 | 0.26477 | 0.32670 | 0.21971 | 2.45394 |
| 0.02750 | 0.09473 | 0.09662 | 0.07168 | 0.07836 | 0.27459 | 0.31561 | 0.22961 | 2.74025 |
| 0.05301 | 0.09473 | 0.19016 | 0.11443 | 0.11446 | 0.1178 | 0.11155 | 0.03418 | 0.20452 |
| 0.08412 | 0.09473 | 0.27575 | 0.15240 | 0.14996 | 0.15587 | 0.19189 | 0.06058 | 0.38997 |
| 0.11843 | 0.09473 | 0.33627 | 0.18415 | 0.18330 | 0.18762 | 0.26328 | 0.08990 | 0.65858 |
| 0.15598 | 0.09473 | 0.38580 | 0.21157 | 0.21538 | 0.21497 | 0.31302 | 0.11916 | 0.98980 |
| 0.19566 | 0.09473 | 0.41573 | 0.23910 | 0.24650 | 0.23814 | 0.33927 | 0.14657 | 1.38895 |
| 0.23876 | 0.09473 | 0.42859 | 0.25634 | 0.27728 | 0.25913 | 0.37006 | . 19634 | 1.63721 |
| 0.26094 | 0.09473 | 0.44510 | 0.26595 | 0.23242 | 0.26854 | 0.31988 | 0.20595 | 2.71112 |
| 0.02794 | 0.13183 | 0.08500 | 0.07256 | 0.07952 | 0.07536 | 0.11313 | 0.03006 | 0.21736 |
| 0.05286 | 0.13183 | 0.13514 | 0.11423 | 0.11476 | 0.11711 | 0.19151 | 0.05423 | 0.45386 |
| 0.08350 | 0.13183 | 0.21278 | 0.15175 | 0.15027 | 0.15458 | 0.28213 | 0.07925 | 0.67241 |
| 0.11673 | 0.13183 | 0.29287 | 0.18277 | 0.18342 | 0.18523 | 0.31119 | 0.10527 | 1.09944 |
| 0.15311 | 0.13183 | 0.34361 | 0.20968 | 0.21538 | 0.21184 | 0.33814 | 0.12968 | 1.40809 |
| 0.19077 | 0.13183 | 0.35012 | 0.23216 | 0.24586 | 0.23359 | 0.34378 | 0.15216 | 1,86872 |
| 0.23173 | 0.13183 | 0.37479 | 0.25312 | 0.27634 | 0.25422 | 0.33298 | 0.17562 | 2.47624 |
| 0.02731 | 0.15326 | 0.09479 | 0.07132 | 0.07839 | 0.07336 | 0.11090 | 0.02757 | 0.20258 |
| 0.05197 | 0.15326 | 0.16142 | 0.11295 | 0.11467 | 0.11503 | 0.18903 | 0.04982 | 0.41751 |
| 0.08140 | 0.15326 | 0.22073 | 0.14950 | 0.14977 | 0.15117 | 0.25811 | 0.07450 | 0.68063 |
| 0.11407 | 0.15326 | 0.28370 | 0.18055 | 0.18278 | 0.18195 | 0.30820 | 0.09805 | 0.98847 |
| 0.14925 | 0.15326 | 0.33444 | 0.20708 | 0.21441 | 0.20807 | 0.33641 | 0.12208 | 1.37722 |
| 0.18477 | 0.15326 | 0.35339 | 0.22908 | 0.24436 | 0.22924 | 0.34406 | 0.14408 | 1.82452 |
| 0.22226 | 0.15326 | 0.38457 | 0.24864 | 0.27363 | 0.24804 | 0.33853 | 0.16364 | 2.28392 |





| 0.02790 | 0.06274 | 0.09764 | 0.07354 | 0.08070 | 0.07643 | 0.11685 | 0.04012 | 0.21030 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.05370 | 0.06274 | 0.21819 | 0.11686 | 0.11742 | 0.12109 | 0.1994 | 0.07186 | 0.39745 |
| 0.08642 | 0.06274 | 0.33690 | 0.15651 | 0.15390 | 0.18193 | 0.27349 | 0.10401 | 0.66399 |
| 0.12161 | 0.06274 | 0.40421 | 0.18860 | 0.18816 | 0.19409 | 0.32080 | 0.13610 | 1.00785 |
| 0.16087 | 0.06274 | 0.44337 | 0.21668 | 0.22117 | 0.22246 | 0.34248 | 0.16418 | 1.44117 |
| 0.2044 | 0.06274 | 0.47397 | 0.24176 | 0.25322 | 0.24811 | 0.33964 | 0.19176 | 1.98021 |
| 0.24790 | 0.06274 | 0.49783 | 0.26245 | 0.28506 | 0.26808 | 0.32147 | 0.21745 | 2.55659 |
| 0.26839 | 0.06274 | 0.49906 | 0.27108 | 0.30043 | 0.27591 | 0.31136 | 0.23108 | 2.85440 |
| 0.02762 | 0.09626 | 0.11049 | 0.07297 | 0.08057 | 0.07556 | 0.11581 | 0.03422 | 0.21817 |
| 0.05314 | 0.09626 | 0.18942 | 0.11606 | 0.11789 | 0.11555 | 0.19789 | 0.06106 | 0.41405 |
| 0.08445 | 0.09676 | 0.28611 | 0.15444 | 0.15421 | 0.15627 | 0.26991 | 0.08944 | 0.68801 |
| 0.11632 | 0.09626 | 0.34508 | 0.18427 | 0.18909 | 0.18836 | 0.31555 | 0.11677 | 1.0005 |
| 0.15663 | 0.09626 | 0.35281 | 0.21394 | 0.22162 | 0.21768 | 0.34144 | 0.14394 | 1.46451 |
| 0.19588 | 0.09626 | 0.42807 | 0.23723 | 0.25349 | 0.24048 | 0.34183 | 0.16973 | 1.94485 |
| 0.23902 | 0.09626 | 0.47152 | 0.25850 | 0.28505 | 0.26154 | 0.32578 | 0.19350 | 2.46704 |
| 0.26108 | 0.09626 | 0.47213 | 0.26806 | 0.30058 | 0.27087 | 0.31495 | 0.20806 | 2.80765 |
| 0.02809 | 0.12974 | 0.08050 | 0.07392 | 0.08073 | 0.07705 | 0.11755 | 0.03017 | 0.23235 |
| 0.05311 | 0.12974 | 0.18147 | 0.11602 | 0.11797 | 0.11928 | 0.19782 | 0.05477 | 0.42107 |
| 0.08339 | 0.12974 | 0.25551 | 0.15332 | 0.15429 | 0.15635 | 0.26794 | 0.08062 | 0.70514 |
| 0.11628 | 0.12974 | 0.31487 | 0.18424 | 0.18821 | 0.18682 | 0.31551 | 0.10549 | 1.04548 |
| 0.15251 | 0.12974 | 0.34302 | 0.21122 | 0.22095 | 0.21351 | 0.34015 | 0.13122 | 1.48004 |
| 0.19100 | 0.12974 | 0.37300 | 0.23501 | 0.25292 | 0.23707 | 0.34264 | 0.15501 | 1.98076 |
| 0.23261 | 0.12974 | 0.42012 | 0.25558 | 0.28395 | 0.25718 | 0.32877 | 0.17808 | 2.59783 |
| 0.02747 | 0.16136 | 0.07071 | 0.07268 | 0.08035 | 0.07500 | 0.11528 | 0.02705 | 0.23489 |
| 0.05209 | 0.16136 | 0.16495 | 0.11454 | 0.11784 | 0.11690 | 0.19494 | 0.04892 | 0.42108 |
| 0.08132 | 0.16136 | 0.25674 | 0.15109 | 0.15384 | 0.15295 | 0.26401 | 0.07234 | 0.66357 |
| 0.11252 | 0.16136 | 0.25612 | 0.18106 | 0.18714 | 0.18219 | 0.31140 | 0.09481 | 1.04873 |
| 0.14626 | 0.16136 | 0.29468 | 0.20696 | 0.21904 | 0.20748 | 0.33766 | 0.11696 | 1.47395 |
| 0.18335 | 0.16136 | 0.32465 | 0.23027 | 0.25039 | 0.23044 | 0.34376 | 0.14027 | 1,98263 |
| 0.22292 | 0.16136 | 0.36566 | 0.25100 | 0.28118 | 0.25082 | 0.33301 | 0.16100 | 2.48748 |

COMPARISOM OF The holdip data MITH EXistimg correlations

| Ve(H/S) <br>  | U(M/S) | EXPTL | MITA/YOSHIDA | HIRITA | NERSHAKN | RUMAR | HILLER | SCHLEETL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.02821 | 0.05324 | 0.11437 | 0.07585 | 0.08417 |  |  | 0.040es |  |
| 0.05424 | 0.06324 | 0.23039 | 0.11993 | 0.08417 | 0.07933 | 0.12396 | 0.04085 | 0.22013 |
| 0.08649 | 0.06324 | 0.32678 | 0.15928 | 0.16040 | 0.16504 | 0.20343 | 0.07243 | 0.42915 |
| 0.12132 | 0.06324 | 0.38571 | 0.19129 | 0.19634 | 0.19678 | 0.37665 | 0.10428 | 0.72905 |
| 0.16233 | 0.06324 | 0.43052 | 0.22070 | 0.23050 | 0.22740 | 0.34395 | 0.15829 | 1.10359 |
| 0.20379 | 0.06324 | 0.44894 | 0.24480 | 0.26401 | 0.25098 | 0.33586 | 0.19460 | 2.16804 |
| 0.24863 | 0.06324 | 0.48332 | 0.26601 | 0.29701 | 0.27216 | 0.31391 | 0.22101 | 2.81177 |
| 0.27211 | 0.06324 | 0.49069 | 0.27584 | 0.31337 | 0.28185 | 0.30256 | 0.23084 | 3.16727 |
| 0.02841 | 0.10463 | 0.07017 | 0.07625 | 0.08423 | 0.07997 | 0.12471 | 0.03375 | 0.30263 |
| 0.05348 | 0.10463 | 0.18435 | 0.11886 | 0.12280 | 0.12283 | 0.20739 | 0.06011 | 0.45125 |
| 0.08467 | 0.10483 | 0.27582 | 0.15736 | 0.16082 | 0.16154 | 0.27908 | 0.08736 | 0.75935 |
| 0.11920 | 0.10463 | 0.32678 | 0.18956 | 0.19656 | 0.19378 | 0.32483 | 0.11456 | 1.15254 |
| 0.15843 | 0.10463 | 0.35808 | 0.21688 | 0.23084 | 0.22089 | 0.34332 | 0.14188 | 1.62835 |
| 0.19729 | 0.10463 | 0.40781 | 0.24115 | 0.26447 | 0.24506 | 0.33828 | 0.18615 | 2.18262 |
| 0.23733 | 0.10463 | 0.43237 | 0.26097 | 0.29650 | 0.26403 | 0.31982 | 0.19097 | 2.75457 |
| 0.25962 | 0.10463 | 0.41865 | 0.27071 | 0.31271 | 0.27363 | 0.30834 | 0.20071 | 3.19186 |
| 0.02776 | 0.12722 | 0.08244 | 0.07493 | 0.08107 | 0.07784 | 0.12223 | 0.03055 | 0.24596 |
| 0.05280 | 0.12722 | 0.17944 | 0.11786 | 0.12280 | 0.12116 | 0.20543 | 0.05411 | 0.45311 |
| 0.08209 | 0.12722 | 0.23899 | 0.15458 | 0.16016 | 0.15735 | 0.27434 | 0.07958 | 0.77017 |
| 0.11381 | 0.12722 | 0.33169 | 0.18505 | 0.19491 | 0.18723 | 0.31972 | 0.10505 | 1.12540 |
| 0.14948 | 0.12722 | 0.35484 | 0.21222 | 0.22879 | 0.21420 | 0.34187 | 0.12972 | 1.49348 |
| 0.16646 | 0.12722 | 0.36729 | 0.23520 | 0.26124 | 0.23667 | 0.34149 | 0.15270 | 2.09277 |
| 0.22659 | 0.12722 | 0.39001 | 0.25597 | 0.29335 | 0.25706 | 0.32538 | 0.17597 | 2.67078 |
| 0.24743 | 0.12722 | 0.40597 | 0.26548 | 0.30919 | 0.28639 | 0.31453 | 0.18548 | 2.98004 |
| 0.02705 | 0.16893 | 0.07938 | 0.07348 | 0.08368 | 0.07589 | 0.11953 | 0.02598 | 0.24200 |
| 0.05123 | 0.16893 | 0.15857 | 0.11556 | 0.12233 | 0.11784 | 0.20092 | 0.04681 | 0.44827 |
| 0.08044 | 0.16893 | 0.20277 | 0.15278 | 0.15982 | 0.15456 | 0.27120 | 0.07028 | 0.77023 |
| 0.11019 | 0.16893 | 0.27828 | 0.18193 | 0.19377 | 0.18270 | 0.31589 | 0.09193 | 1.09319 |
| 0.14363 | 0.16893 | 0.32739 | 0.20816 | 0.22693 | 0.20843 | 0.33999 | 0.11316 | 1.48936 |
| 0.18043 | 0.16893 | 0.36177 | 0.23172 | 0.25966 | 0.23166 | 0.34278 | 0.13672 | 1.99639 |
| 0.22177 | 0.16893 | 0.39737 | 0.25366 | 0.23250 | 0.25362 | 0.32778 | 0.15866 | 2.59005 |

COMPARISOM OF THE HOLDRP RATA HITH EXISTING CORRELATIONS 0.5 I ETHANRL SRUUTION

COMPARISDM OF THE hOLDUP DATA MITH EXISTIGG CORRELATIONS


## COAPARISD OF THE hOLDUP DATA MITH EXISTHM CORRELations

## 50 PM CHC SOLUTLON

## 



| 0.02798 | 0.00000 | 0.12137 | 0.08485 | 0.07477 | 0.05770 | 0.11260 | 0.06485 | 0.05163 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.04545 | 0.00000 | 0.20813 | 0.09326 | 0.08858 | 0.09710 | 0.1693 i | 0.09326 | 0.09172 |
| 0.05885 | 0.00000 | 0.25301 | 0.12345 | 0.12505 | 0.12823 | 0.23083 | 0.12345 | 0.12899 |
| 0.05354 | 0.00000 | 0.28714 | 0.14895 | 0.14863 | 0.15454 | 0.27865 | 0.14895 | 0.16576 |
| 0.11836 | 0.00000 | 0.32127 | 0.17107 | 0.17081 | 0.17735 | 0.31311 | 0.17107 | 0.20243 |
| 0.14630 | 0.00000 | 0.35026 | 0.19050 | 0.19155 | 0.15753 | 0.33435 | 0.15050 | 0.23819 |
| 0.17441 | 0.00000 | 0.39928 | 0.20815 | 0.21137 | 0.21566 | 0.34347 | 0.20815 | 0.27626 |
| 0.26354 | 0.03374 | 0.29535 | 0.25339 | 0.27430 | 0.25001 | 0.31712 | 0.21835 | 0.39371 |
| 0.24532 | 0.03374 | 0.28287 | 0.24367 | 0.28000 | 0.25036 | 0.32756 | 0.20857 | 0.35545 |
| 0.20135 | 0.03374 | 0.25850 | 0.22288 | 0.23213 | 0.22983 | 0.34254 | 0.18288 | 0.31080 |
| 0.15777 | 0.03374 | 0.20547 | 0.19807 | 0.20206 | 0.20400 | 0.33951 | 0.15807 | 0.25447 |
| 0.11945 | 0.03374 | 0.21275 | 0.17157 | 0.17204 | 0.17678 | 0.31324 | 0.12867 | 0.20261 |
| 0.08505 | 0.03374 | 0.95572 | 0.14072 | 0.14055 | 0.14625 | 0.26355 | 0.10078 | 0.15338 |
| $0.0535 E$ | 0.03374 | 0.18963 | 0.10454 | 0.10776 | 0.10914 | 0.15235 | 0.96554 | 0.10453 |
| 0.02789 | 0.03374 | 0.10795 | 0.05477 | 0.07467 | 0.05747 | 0.11225 | 0.04040 | 0.06145 |
| 0.02745 | 0.05451 | 0.08724 | 0.06395 | 0.07470 | 0.06612 | 0.11073 | 0.03461 | 0.05065 |
| 0.05232 | 0.05451 | 0.17317 | 0.10265 | 0.10835 | 0.10586 | 0.18857 | 0.05038 | 0.10253 |
| 0.08374 | 0.05451 | 0.18389 | 0.13942 | $0.14: 86$ | $0.1432 E$ | 0.26145 | 0.09942 | 0.15137 |
| 0.11798 | 0.05451 | 0.21340 | 0.16956 | 0.17333 | 0.17400 | 0.31163 | 0.11498 | 0.2005 ! |
| 0.15537 | 0.05451 | 0.22132 | 0.19654 | 0.20356 | 0.200 E 3 | 0.33881 | 0.14154 | 0.25125 |
| 0.19573 | 0.05451 | 0.29506 | 0.2185 | 0.23314 | $0.2235 E$ | 0.34337 | 0.16496 | 0.36362 |
| 0.23522 | 0.05451 | 0.28044 | 0.24055 | 0.26234 | 0.24455 | 0.33050 | 0.19055 | 0.35792 |
| 0.26157 | 0.05451 | 0.25019 | 0.25052 | 0.27673 | 0.25420 | 0.32047 | 0.20052 | 0.385 5 5 |
| 0.02716 | 0.07543 | 0.07331 | 0.05344 | 0.07459 | 0.06528 | 0.10957 | 0.03000 | 0.05013 |
| 0.05222 | 0.07543 | 0.17581 | 0.10275 | 0.10976 | 0.10539 | 0.18870 | 0.05400 | 0.10278 |
| 0.08234 | 0.07843 | 0.19085 | 0.1385 i | 0.14238 | 0.14157 | 0.25993 | 0.0758 E | 0.15018 |
| 0.11550 | 0.07943 | 0.18231 | 0.16880 | 0.17395 | 0.17167 | 0.31001 | 0.10380 | 0.1984 |
| 0.15311 | 0.07943 | 0.22437 | 0.19509 | 0.20438 | 0.19776 | 0.33767 | 0.12759 | 0.24823 |
| 0.19275 | 0.07943 | 0.23938 | 0.21838 | 0.23412 | 0.22084 | 0.34369 | 0.15088 | 0.29887 |
| 0.23515 | 0.07843 | 0.27617 | 0.23917 | 0.26323 | 0.24141 | 0.33228 | 0.17417 | 0.35298 |
| 0.25748 | 0.07943 | 0.27190 | 0.24853 | 0.27772 | 0.25098 | 0.32240 | 0.18393 | 0.38924 |
| 0.02726 | 0.12895 | 0.05288 | 0.08361 | 0.07471 | 0.06547 | 0.10985 | 0.02486 | 0.05030 |
| 0.05127 | 0.12885 | 0.15495 | 0.10145 | 0.10997 | 0.10309 | 0.1850 E | 0.04458 | 0.10124 |
| 0.08072 | 0.12896 | 0.17439 | 0.13634 | 0.14246 | 0.13775 | 0.25556 | 0.06534 | 0.14688 |
| 0.11212 | 0.12896 | 0.20182 | 0.18525 | 0.87351 | 0.16589 | 0.30484 | 0.08775 | 0.19230 |
| 0.14716 | 0.12855 | 0.20974 | 0.18117 | $0.203 E 2$ | 0.19161 | $0.3348!$ | 0.10867 | 0.24034 |
| 0.18578 | 0.12895 | 0.27800 | 0.21455 | 0.23353 | 0.21484 | 0.34406 | 0.12959 | 0.29098 |
| 0.23280 | 0.12898 | 0.25179 | 0.23348 | 0.26162 | 0.23277 | 0.33650 | 0.14848 | 0.33771 |
| 0.24316 | 0.12795 | 0.26337 | 0.24273 | 0.27572 | 0.24176 | 0.32881 | 0.15773 | 0.36280 |



## COMPARISON Of THI HOLDUP bata uIth Existimg correlations

## 500 PPM CHC SOLUTIDN



| Von/S | UL (M/S) | EXPTL | AMITA/YOSHIDA | HIKITA | MERSMAN | RLutar | HILIER | BECKHER |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.04518 | 0.00000 | 0.16740 | 0.08289 | 0.09359 | 0.09652 | 0.16791 | 0.08299 | 0.09127 |
| 0.06862 | 0.00000 | 0.18514 | 0.11122 | 0.11876 | 0.11590 | 0.22932 | 0.11122 | 0.12857 |
| 0.09308 | 0.00000 | 0.19371 | 0.13523 | 0.14132 | 0.14065 | 0.27724 | 0.13523 | 0.16511 |
| 0.11858 | 0.00000 | 0.25351 | 0.15625 | 0.16223 | 0.16234 | 0.31178 | 0.15623 | $0.20: 45$ |
| 0.14539 | 0.00000 | 0.29345 | 0.17497 | 0.18197 | 0.18189 | 0.33349 | 0.17497 | 0.23795 |
| 0.17287 | 0.00000 | 0.30447 | 0.19169 | 0.20088 | 0.19850 | 0.34315 | 0.19169 | 0.27427 |
| 0.16735 | 0.00000 | 0.32833 | 0.19966 | 0.21005 | 0.20709 | 0.34405 | 0.15966 | 0.25258 |
| 0.02777 | 0.02312 | 0.11171 | 0.05703 | 0.07053 | 0.05956 | 0.11139 | 0.03515 | 0.06123 |
| 0.05225 | 0.02312 | 0.14252 | 0.09218 | 0.10204 | 0.09589 | 0.18814 | 0.05093 | 0.10282 |
| 0.08238 | 0.02312 | 0.20044 | 0.12586 | 0.13328 | 0.13039 | 0.25932 | 0.08711 | 0.15025 |
| 0.11725 | 0.02312 | 0.22798 | 0.15516 | 0.16259 | 0.16032 | 0.31027 | 0.11266 | 0.19848 |
| 0.15483 | 0.02312 | 0.25123 | 0.18097 | 0.19081 | 0.18658 | 0.33811 | 0.13597 | 0.25057 |
| 0.19562 | 0.02312 | 0.28182 | 0.20400 | 0.21835 | $0.2098{ }^{\circ}$ | 0.34345 | 0.15800 | 0.30354 |
| 0.23948 | 0.02312 | 0.29345 | 0.22472 | 0.24546 | 0.23081 | 0.33053 | 0.18222 | 0.35630 |
| 0.26259 | 0.02312 | 0.29529 | 0.23437 | 0.25891 | 0.24052 | 0.32054 | 0.19437 | 0.38642 |
| 0.02953 | 0.03033 | 0.11538 | 0.06162 | 0.07196 | 0.06627 | 0.11808 | 0.03662 | 0.06439 |
| 0.05608 | 0.03033 | 0.13680 | 0.09532 | 0.10385 | 0.10615 | 0.19521 | 0.06307 | 0.10895 |
| 0.09505 | 0.03033 | 0.19677 | 0.13449 | 0.13572 | 0.14264 | 0.27118 | 0.09189 | 0.15921 |
| 0.12541 | 0.03033 | 0.21880 | 0.16446 | 0.16560 | 0.17336 | 0.31916 | 0.11898 | 0.21080 |
| 0.16561 | 0.03033 | 0.22581 | 0.19155 | 0.19450 | 0.20139 | 0.34212 | 0.14405 | 0.26610 |
| 0.20852 | 0.03033 | 0.26102 | 0.21432 | 0.22250 | 0.22414 | 0.34081 | 0.16682 | 0.32043 |
| 0.25526 | 0.03033 | 0.28611 | 0.23512 | 0.25014 | 0.24504 | 0.32336 | 0.19012 | 0.37754 |
| 0.27890 | 0.03033 | 0.29712 | 0.24451 | 0.26378 | 0.25430 | 0.31222 | 0.19951 | 0.40598 |
| 0.02784 | 0.05585 | 0.10520 | $0.0573 i$ | 0.07075 | 0.05016 | 0.11197 | 0.02794 | 0.06154 |
| 0.05350 | 0.05585 | 0.18453 | 0.09374 | 0.10277 | 0.09798 | 0.18156 | 0.04998 | 0.10484 |
| 0.08395 | 0.05595 | 0.20778 | 0.12675 | 0.13432 | 0.13123 | 0.26115 | 0.07179 | 0.15169 |
| 0.11831 | 0.05595 | 0.23960 | 0.15597 | 0.16417 | 0.16009 | 0.31142 | 0.09557 | 0.20097 |
| 0.15567 | 0.05585 | 0.25612 | 0.18149 | 0.15295 | 0.18623 | 0.33845 | 0.11649 | 0.25169 |
| 0.19736 | 0.05585 | 0.24938 | 0.20488 | 0.22127 | 0.20988 | 0.34328 | 0.13739 | 0.30575 |
| 0.24109 | 0.05595 | 0.27203 | 0.22542 | 0.24898 | 0.23025 | 0.33026 | 0.16042 | 0.36027 |
| 0.26327 | 0.05595 | 0.28469 | 0.23465 | 0.26271 | 0.23924 | 0.32022 | 0.16865 | 0.38724 |
| 0.62855 | 0.08305 | 0.08846 | 0.05989 | 0.07170 | 0.06356 | 0.11464 | 0.02624 | 0.06264 |
| 0.05473 | 0.08305 | 0.13864 | 0.08766 | 0.10451 | 0.10280 | 0.19583 | 0.04766 | 0.1058 : |
| 0.08685 | 0.08305 | 0.16984 | 0.13243 | 0.13684 | 0.13836 | 0.26729 | 0.06553 | 0.15555 |
| 0.12221 | 0.04305 | 0.19371 | 0.16211 | 0.16718 | 0.16838 | 0.31605 | 0.05911 | 0.20638 |
| 0.15089 | 0.09305 | 0.21145 | 0.18812 | 0.19842 | 0.19455 | 0.34059 | 0.11312 | 0.25856 |
| 0.20170 | 0.011305 | 0.23532 | 0.21089 | 0.22475 | 0.21693 | 0.34245 | 0.13589 | 0.31124 |
| 0.24611 | 0.03305 | 0.25123 | 0.23141 | 0.25278 | 0.23763 | 0.32740 | 0.15541 | 0.36679 |
| 0.25526 | 0.01305 | 0.26224 | 0.23677 | 0.26619 | 0.24036 | 0.32148 | 0.16177 | 0.38239 |

comparison of the hoinup data uith existing correlatidns
1000 PPK CNC SOLUTION
\&


| 0.02917 | 0.02567 | 0.10001 | 0.04087 | 0.05153 | 0.04850 | 0.11673 | 0.01712 | 0.05974 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.05501 | 0.02567 | 0.16266 | 0.06856 | 0.08862 | 0.07414 | 0.19625 | 0.03043 | 0.10725 |
| 0.08703 | 0.02567 | 0.16813 | 0.08617 | 0.11573 | 0.10311 | 0.26749 | 0.04555 | 0.15623 |
| 0.12373 | 0.02567 | 0.19572 | 0.12184 | 0.14126 | 0.13024 | 0.31750 | 0.05058 | 0.20845 |
| 0.16227 | 0.02567 | 0.22227 | 0.14416 | 0.15572 | 0.15306 | 0.34097 | 0.07511 | 0.26040 |
| 0.20775 | 0.02567 | 0.25207 | 0.16826 | 0.18978 | 0.17657 | 0.34123 | 0.09126 | 0.31853 |
| 0.25468 | 0.02557 | 0.27823 | 0.18553 | 0.21339 | 0.19852 | $0.323 E 1$ | 0.10563 | 0.37708 |
| 0.27853 | 0.02557 | $0.2570 E$ | 0.19459 | 0.22509 | 0.20577 | 0.31201 | 0.11218 | 0.40674 |
| 0.02541 | 0.04582 | 0.08602 | 0.03596 | 0.05145 | 0.04296 | 0.11407 | 0.01485 | $0.0623 E$ |
| 0.05414 | 0.04682 | 0.13346 | 0.06772 | 0.08302 | 0.07241 | 0.19393 | 0.02547 | 0.10585 |
| 0.08591 | 0.04682 | 0.1814 | 0.09530 | 0.11646 | 0.10112 | $0.2 E 547$ | 0.04030 | 0.15453 |
| 0.12152 | 0.04682 | $0.1809 i$ | 0.12043 | 0.14228 | 0.12718 | 0.31532 | 0.05356 | 0.20542 |
| 0.15985 | 0.04682 | 0.2143 E | 0.14276 | 0.16708 | 0.14989 | 0.34016 | 0.05551 | 0.25695 |
| $0.20: 58$ | 0.04662 | 0.23382 | 0.16346 | 0.19132 | 0.17089 | 0.34250 | 0.07971 | 0.31109 |
| 0.24611 | 0.046 E 2 | 0.25572 | 0.18224 | 0.21516 | 0.18882 | 0.32761 | 0.09345 | $0.3684:$ |
| 0.26900 | 0.04682 | 0.27640 | 0.19050 | 0.22652 | C. 19851 | 0.31696 | 0.09965 | 0.35413 |
| 0.02805 | 0.07654 | 0.05272 | 0.03954 | 0.06136 | 0.04228 | 0.11284 | 0.01286 | 0.06175 |
| 0.05365 | 0.07654 | 0.12677 | 0.06728 | 0.0853 | 0.07142 | 0.19271 | 0.02353 | 0.10513 |
| 0.08538 | 0.07654 | 0.14745 | 0.09489 | 0.11704 | 0.10002 | 0.26448 | 0.03551 | 0.15390 |
| 0.12001 | 0.07654 | 0.17968 | 0.11547 | 0.14256 | 0.12511 | 0.31378 | 0.04758 | 0.20335 |
| 0.15773 | 0.07654 | 0.20349 | 0.14173 | 0.16753 | 0.14764 | 0.33950 | 0.05048 | 0.25441 |
| 0.19899 | 0.07654 | 0.20767 | 0.16228 | 0.19235 | 0.16642 | 0.34253 | 0.07228 | 0.30781 |
| 0.24287 | 0.07654 | 0.23555 | 0.18057 | 0.21632 | 0.18720 | 0.32503 | 0.08472 | 0.35246 |
| 0.26549 | 0.07654 | 0.25587 | 0.18951 | 0.22810 | 0.19577 | 0.31882 | 0.08361 | $0.3859!$ |
| 0.02 E 24 | 0.09612 | 0.05500 | 0.03875 | 0.06140 | 0.04263 | 0.11345 | 0.01154 | 0.06207 |
| 0.05354 | 0.05812 | 0.10305 | 0.05714 | 0.08946 | 0.07110 | 0.19230 | 0.02183 | 0.10495 |
| 0.08482 | 0.098:2 | 0.14684 | 0.08445 | 0.11713 | 0.09922 | $0.2 E 347$ | 0.03320 | 0.15239 |
| 0.11871 | 0.09612 | 0.16327 | 0.11862 | 0.14297 | 0.12357 | 0.31241 | 0.04487 | 0.20152 |
| 0.15518 | 0.05612 | 0.18577 | 0.14034 | 0.16772 | 0.14543 | 0.33853 | 0.05534 | 0.25103 |
| 0.19823 | 0.09812 | 0.20545 | 0.16153 | $0.1821 E$ | 0.16787 | 0.34304 | 0.06818 | 0.30685 |
| 0.23603 | 0.09812 | 0.21923 | 0.17823 | 0.21504 | 0.18327 | 0.33192 | 0.07823 | 0.3540 E |


CTiparism of the holdup data hith existimg correlailans

COAPRAISOW OF THE hCidup data hith exisilimg correlaticus

| 0.02949 | 0.02445 | 0.07377 | 0.04897 | 0.105571 | 0.05315 | 0.11763 | 0.02459 | 0.06433 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.05496 | 0.02445 | 0.09947 | 0.08015 | 0.09459 | 0.08598 | 0.19582 | 0.04328 | 0.10718 |
| 0.09776 | 0.02445 | 0.12395 | 0.11163 | 0.12371 | 0.11912 | 0.26844 | 0.06413 | 0.15731 |
| 0.12411 | 0.02445 | 0.16372 | 0.13955 | 0.15107 | 0.14830 | 0.31788 | 0.08455 | 0.20943 |
| 0.16454 | 0.02445 | 0.19677 | 0.16441 | 0.17740 | 0.17403 | 0.34150 | 0.10441 | 0.26339 |
| 0.20850 | 0.02445 | 0.22309 | 0.18697 | 0.20312 | 0.19734 | 0.34117 | 0.12197 | 0.31983 |
| 0.25592 | 0.02445 | 0.23654 | 0.20746 | 0.22844 | 0.21838 | 0.32340 | 0.14246 | 0.37835 |
| 0.28025 | 0.02445 | 0.25735 | 0.21679 | 0.24094 | 0.22778 | 0.31198 | 0.15179 | 0.40760 |
| 0.02804 | 0.04190 | 0.05092 | 0.04554 | 0.05462 | 0.04831 | 0.11208 | 0.01960 | 0.05171 |
| 0.05311 | 0.04190 | 0.09335 | 0.07605 | 0.09364 | 0.08013 | 0.19015 | 0.03543 | 0.10421 |
| 0.09461 | 0.04190 | 0.11538 | 0.10633 | 0.12262 | 0.11147 | 0.26199 | 0.05258 | 0.15266 |
| 0.11931 | 0.04190 | 0.14414 | 0.13305 | 0.14984 | 0.13881 | 0.31218 | 0.07056 | 0.20235 |
| 0.15717 | 0.04150 | 0.16128 | 0.15699 | 0.17607 | 0.16309 | 0.33889 | 0.08699 | 0.25367 |
| 0.15905 | 0.04190 | 0.15065 | 0.17906 | 0.20176 | 0.18561 | 0.34312 | 0.10406 | 0.30789 |
| 0.24472 | 0.04190 | 0.14659 | 0.19938 | 0.22712 | 0.20037 | 0.32896 | 0.12188 | 0.36471 |
| 0.26647 | 0.04190 | 0.23104 | 0.20801 | 0.23948 | 0.21468 | 0.31902 | 0.12801 | 0.39109 |
| 0.02881 | 0.07193 | 0.03276 | 0.04802 | 0.06574 | 0.05146 | 0.11524 | 0.01833 | 0.06310 |
| 0.05465 | 0.07193 | 0.10131 | 0.07981 | 0.09543 | 0.08478 | 0.19496 | 0.03356 | 0.10568 |
| 0.086993 | 0.07193 | 0.11844 | 0.11092 | 0.12508 | 0.11697 | 0.26695 | 0.04967 | 0.15608 |
| 0.12248 | 0.07193 | 0.14598 | 0.13822 | 0.15293 | 0.14485 | 0.31600 | 0.06697 | 0.20675 |
| 0.16100 | 0.07193 | 0.17168 | 0.16240 | 0.17972 | 0.16928 | 0.34048 | 0.08365 | 0.25872 |
| 0.20294 | 0.07193 | 0.19860 | 0.18433 | 0.20592 | 0.19139 | 0.34233 | 0.09933 | 0.31281 |
| 0.24812 | 0.07193 | 0.22675 | 0.20432 | 0.23173 | 0.21148 | 0.32696 | 0.11682 | 0.36836 |
| 0.27101 | 0.07193 | 0.22859 | 0.21333 | 0.24440 | 0.22036 | 0.31629 | 0.12333 | 0.39655 |
| 0.02737 | 0.08893 | 0.04562 | 0.04462 | 0.06449 | 0.04661 | 0.10973 | 0.01556 | 0.06051 |
| 0.05294 | 0.08893 | -0.01740 | 0.07587 | 0.09432 | 0.07933 | 0.18967 | 0.02899 | 0.10393 |
| 0.08318 | 0.08893 | 0.10743 | 0.10510 | 0.12342 | 0.10885 | 0.25930 | 0.04385 | 0.15054 |
| 0.11777 | 0.08893 | 0.13313 | 0.13164 | 0.15095 | 0.13573 | 0.30998 | 0.05789 | 0.19952 |
| 0.15256 | 0.08893 | 0.15516 | 0.15430 | 0.17699 | 0.15808 | 0.33696 | 0.07305 | 0.24755 |
| 0.19217 | 0.08893 | 0.18086 | 0.17569 | 0.20274 | 0.17948 | 0.34384 | 0.08819 | 0.29914 |
| 0.23427 | 0.08893 | 0.19432 | 0.19501 | 0.22798 | 0.19869 | 0.33327 | 0.10251 | 0.35189 |
| 0.25683 | 0.08893 | 0.20044 | 0.20426 | 0.24059 | 0.20794 | 0.32352 | 0.10926 | 0.37945 |

COMPARISON OF THE HOLDAP DATA MITH EXistimg carpelatiows

| VG(H/S) | UL(H/S) | EXPIL | axita/yushida | hinjia | MERSMANM | кUKAR | MILIER | DECIUER |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.02934 | 0.02271 | 0.04650 | 0.04688 | 0.06462 | 0.05085 | 0.11683 | 0.02313 | 0.06405 |
| 0.05507 | 0.02271 | 0.09734 | 0.07763 | 0.09310 | 0.08351 | 0.18573 | 0.04076 | 0.10735 |
| 0.08769 | 0.02271 | 0.12981 | 0.10838 | 0.12176 | 0.11587 | 0.26791 | 0.06088 | 0.15720 |
| 0.12387 | 0.02271 | 0.14634 | 0.13565 | 0.14868 | 0.14425 | 0.31706 | 0.08065 | 0.20868 |
| 0.1634 | 0.02271 | 0.18065 | 0.16003 | 0.17460 | 0.16939 | 0.34108 | 0.09878 | 0.26194 |
| 0.20710 | 0.02271 | 0.21740 | 0.18240 | 0.19995 | 0.19252 | 0.34160 | 0.11740 | 0.31806 |
| 0.25401 | 0.02271 | 0.24374 | 0.20269 | 0.22487 | 0.21335 | 0.32458 | 0.13519 | 0.37603 |
| 0.27993 | 0.02271 | 0.25292 | 0.21263 | 0.23732 | 0.22376 | 0.31245 | 0.14513 | 0.40722 |
| 0.02775 | 0.04149 | 0.09918 | 0.04174 | 0.06277 | 0.04414 | 0.11101 | 0.01674 | 0.06119 |
| 0.05253 | 0.04149 | 0.10102 | 0.07036 | 0.09105 | 0.07389 | 0.18847 | 0.03036 | 0.10327 |
| 0.08340 | 0.04149 | 0.13226 | 0.09896 | 0.11927 | 0.10329 | 0.25964 | 0.04583 | 0.15087 |
| 0.11824 | 0.04149 | 0.15553 | 0.12508 | 0.14590 | 0.13018 | 0.31098 | 0.06133 | 0.20088 |
| 0.15609 | 0.04149 | 0.16594 | 0.14847 | 0.17153 | 0.15400 | 0.33844 | 0.07597 | 0.25225 |
| 0.19720 | 0.04149 | 0.20147 | 0.16980 | 0.19651 | 0.17560 | 0.34337 | 0.09230 | 0.30554 |
| 0.24186 | 0.04149 | 0.20147 | 0.18949 | 0.22128 | 0.19560 | 0.33023 | 0.10699 | 0.36122 |
| 0.26472 | 0.04149 | 0.25599 | 0.19849 | 0.23348 | 0.20456 | 0.31990 | 0.11349 | 0.38898 |
| 0.02851 | 0.06599 | 0.05998 | 0.04577 | 0.06443 | 0.04904 | 0.11396 | 0.01733 | 0.06257 |
| 0.05744 | 0.06598 | 0.08754 | 0.08013 | 0.09689 | 0.08506 | 0.20196 | 0.03325 | 0.11111 |
| 0.08653 | 0.06588 | 0.11327 | 0.10741 | 0.12306 | 0.11331 | 0.26584 | 0.04804 | 0.15550 |
| 0.12196 | 0.06598 | 0.14206 | 0.13434 | 0.15050 | 0.14086 | 0.53518 | 0.06434 | 0.20603 |
| 0.16059 | 0.06598 | 0.16594 | 0.15842 | 0.17695 | 0.16530 | 0.34022 | 0.08092 | 0.25819 |
| 0.20212 | 0.06598 | 0.18677 | 0.18004 | 0.20275 | 0.18705 | 0.34257 | 0.09504 | 0.31176 |
| 0.24656 | 0.06598 | 0.20576 | 0.19968 | 0.22812 | 0.20869 | 0.32793 | 0.11218 | 0.36697 |
| 0.27010 | 0.06598 | 0.22352 | 0.20836 | 0.24074 | 0.21597 | 0.31705 | 0.14896 | 0.39545 |
| 0.02708 | 0.08984 | -0.01108 | 0.04088 | 0.06272 | 0.04269 | 0.10865 | 0.01338 | 0.05998 |
| 0.05169 | 0.08984 | 0.02751 | 0.06949 | 0.09158 | 0.07204 | 0.18617 | 0.02449 | 0.10192 |
| 0.08168 | 0.08984 | 0.05989 | 0.09752 | 0.11997 | 0.10042 | 0.25636 | 0.03752 | 0.14832 |
| 0.11478 | 0.08984 | 0.08632 | 0.12271 | 0.14664 | 0.12575 | 0.30710 | 0.05021 | 0.19604 |
| 0.15077 | 0.08984 | 0.12552 | 0.14543 | 0.17233 | 0.14646 | 0.33609 | 0.06293 | 0.24517 |
| 0.15040 | 0.08984 | 0.11878 | 0.16551 | 0.19758 | 0.16951 | 0.34396 | 0.07651 | 0.29687 |
| 0.23281 | 0.08984 | 0.12000 | 0.18574 | 0.22237 | 0.18883 | 0.33388 | 0.09074 | 0.35010 |
| 0.25503 | 0.08584 | 0.11327 | 0.19478 | 0.23469 | 0.19782 | 0.32438 | 0.09728 | 0.37734 |

COMPGRISBM OF THE HOLDUP DATA HITH EXISTIMG CDRRELATIONS 0.05 M MACL SOLUTLON

| VG(H/S) | ULIM/S) | EXPTL: | AMITA/YOSHIDA | HIMITA | MERSMAMM | NUMAR | MILLER | PECKMED |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.02900 | 0.04357 | 0.12069 | 0.07258 | 0.07658 | 0.07681 | 0.11471 | 0.04570 | 0.06345 |
| 0.05573 | 0.04357 | 0.16874 | 0.11543 | 0.11095 | 0.12179 | 0.15609 | 0.07918 | 0.10841 |
| . 0.08921 | 0.04357 | 0.19672 | 0.15434 | 0.14522 | 0.16208 | 0.26912 | 0.11434 | 0.15944 |
| 0.12565 | 0.04357 | 0.22044 | 0.18632 | 0.17734 | 0.19452 | 0.31763 | 0.14632 | 0.21114 |
| 0.16572 | 0.04357 | 0.23991 | 0.21398 | 0.20830 | 0.22249 | 0.34128 | 0.17648 | 0.26493 |
| 0.20855 | 0.04357 | 0.25511 | 0.23793 | 0.23848 | 0.24642 | 0.34171 | 0.20293 | 0.31988 |
| 0.25542 | 0.04357 | 0.26657 | 0.25962 | 0.28827 | 0.26821 | 0.32504 | 0.22962 | 0.37774 |
| 0.28943 | 0.04357 | 0.28857 | 0.27320 | 0.28887 | 0.28165 | 0.30938 | 0.24820 | 0.41851 |
| 0.02790 | 0.06252 | 0.08541 | 0.07047 | 0.07658 | 0.07321 | 0.11089 | 0.03922 | 0.06147 |
| 0.05337 | 0.06252 | 0.16753 | 0.11218 | 0.11133 | 0.11601 | 0.18978 | 0.06843 | 0.10463 |
| 0.08476 | 0.06252 | 0.17969 | 0.14980 | 0.14574 | 0.15410 | 0.26110 | 0.09980 | 0.15286 |
| 0.11958 | 0.06252 | 0.19429 | 0.18153 | 0.17810 | 0.18605 | 0.31153 | 0.12903 | 0.20273 |
| 0.15783 | 0.06252 | 0.23200 | 0.20900 | 0.20929 | 0.21366 | 0.33868 | 0.15900 | 0.25454 |
| 0.19847 | 0.06252 | 0.24660 | 0.23271 | 0.23964 | 0.23718 | 0.34338 | 0.18521 | 0.30716 |
| 0.24279 | 0.06252 | 0.25329 | 0.25415 | 0.26959 | 0.25856 | 0.33055 | 0.20915 | 0.36235 |
| 0.26571 | 0.05252 | 0.28553 | 0.26390 | 0.28438 | 0.26818 | 0.32030 | 0.22350 | 0.39017 |
| 0.02822 | 0.08588 | 0.09879 | 0.07108 | 0.07636 | 0.07443 | 0.11199 | 0.03483 | 0.66204 |
| 0.05119 | 0.08589 | 0.15597 | 0.11331 | 0.11136 | 0.11789 | 0.19199 | 0.06206 | 0.10594 |
| 0.08604 | 0.08588 | 0.19611 | 0.15113 | 0.14586 | 0.15623 | 0.26346 | 0.09238 | 0.15478 |
| 0.12131 | 0.08588 | 0.21801 | 0.18291 | 0.17830 | 0.18823 | 0.31334 | 0.12041 | 0.20513 |
| 0.15362 | 0.08588 | 0.21801 | 0.21015 | 0.20948 | 0.21547 | 0.33936 | 0.14765 | 0.25691 |
| 0.20097 | 0.08588 | 0.23504 | 0.23402 | 0.23989 | 0.23923 | 0.34306 | 0.17402 | 0.31032 |
| 0.24492 | 0.08588 | 0.26241 | 0.25510 | 0.26971 | 0.26007 | 0.32965 | 0.20010 | 0.36496 |
| 0.26727 | 0.08588 | 0.28952 | 0.26453 | 0.28431 | 0.26927 | 0.31957 | 0.20553 | 0.39206 |
| 0.02740 | 0.10231 | 0.06169 | 0.06948 | 0.07633 | 0.07174 | 0.10911 | 0.03198 | 0.06056 |
| 0.05225 | 0.10231 | 0.13955 | 0.11060 | 0.11151 | 0.11322 | 0.18672 | 0.05685 | 0.10282 |
| 0.08281 | 0.10231 | 0.17361 | 0.14755 | 0.14594 | 0.15021 | 0.25704 | 0.08380 | 0.14969 |
| 0.11614 | 0.10231 | 0.18516 | 0.17873 | 0.17828 | 0.18130 | 0.30774 | 0.11123 | 0.19794 |
| 0.15224 | 0.10231 | 0.21375 | 0.20535 | 0.20926 | 0.20763 | 0.33629 | 0.13535 | 0.24713 |
| 0.19049 | 0.10231 | 0.22592 | 0.22840 | 0.23923 | 0.23025 | 0.34401 | 0.15840 | 0.29698 |
| 0.23172 | 0.10231 | 0.24650 | 0.24915 | 0.26875 | 0.25067 | 0.33489 | 0.18415 | 0.34875 |
| 0.25344 | 0.10231 | 0.28606 | 0.25878 | 0.28340 | 0.26016 | 0.32593 | 0.19378 | 0.37534 |

COMPARISOA OF THE HOLDUP DATA MITH EXISTIMG CORRELATIONS

Comparisom of the hoddup data hith existimg compelations

CDAPARISDA OF THE HDLDUP DATA WITH EXISIIAG CORRELATIDNS

COMParison of dispersian coefficient data hith different correations

| WG M/S | $\begin{gathered} n \\ n / s \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{DLL} \\ \mathrm{CHF}_{\mathrm{H}+2 / 2 / 5} \\ \text { EXPTL } \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{\text { DLD }}{\text { EM* } 2 / 5}$ DECKEER | $\begin{gathered} \text { DL } \\ \text { CH*2/S } \\ \text { ROIPD-RICE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DLJ } \\ \text { CYuz2/S } \\ \text { yロumi } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DLF } \\ \text { CWH2/S } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DNS } \\ & \text { H } \end{aligned}$ | UT M/S | US |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.05400 | 0.05919 | 700.00000 | 152.4423 | 170.58042 | 148.62058 | 97.48496 | 0.00566 | 0.23283 | 0.19781 |
| 0.08930 | 0.05919 | 117.60000 | 189.11582 273.26410 | 207.47033 | 195.20909 | 76.77676 | 0.00523 | 0.23460 | 0.16987 |
| 0.12240 | 0.05919 | 202.20000 | 24.2645950 | 273.52108 | 205.96676 | 177.37896 | 0.00492 | 0.23596 | 0.14724 |
| 0.16250 | 0.05919 | 318.50000 | 272.03171 | 302.83194 | 171.92164 | 274.26747 | 0.00474 | 0.23680 | 0.13559 |
| 0.20440 | 0.05919 | 601.10000 | 293.42466 | 327.42375 | 230.17558 | 349.43782 | 0.00458 | 0.23755 | 0.12850 |
| 0.24940 | 0.05919 | 561,60000 | 313.33849 | 356.31364 | 299.30417 | 398.01965 | 0.00446 | 0.23815 | 0.12016 |
| 0.27400 | 0.05919 | 679.60000 | 323.21804 | 368,04761 | 317.86837 | 416.17 | 0.00430 | 0.23869 | 0.11851 |
| 0.02800 | 0.10470 | 0.00000 | 152.26499 | 157.68746 | 176.82142 | 128.03522 |  | .2304 | 0.11525 |
| 0.05320 | 0.10470 | 0.00000 | 188.18662 | 151.76995 | 294.31120 | 242.76876 | 0.00524 | 0.23456 | 0.20132 |
| 0.08121 | 0.10812 | 371.80000 | 216.37598 | 215.04408 | 239.72503 | 99.93608 | 0.00498 | 0.23570 | 0.15305 |
| 0.02850 | 0.10470 | 0.00000 | 153.15696 | 159.28809 | 175.78616 | 122.69846 | 0.00565 | 0.23287 | 0.159136 |
| 0.05330 | 0.10470 | 0.00000 | 188.30328 | 190.00158 | 220.17823 | 142.53914 | 0.00524 | 0.23457 | 0.17756 |
| 0.08470 | 0.10470 | 219.50000 | 219.40142 | 224.26172 | 217.92247 | 126.91042 | 0.00496 | 0.23581 | 0.16079 |
| 0.11940 | 0.10470 | 265.00000 | 245.72500 | 254.41980 | 190.21729 | 214.59063 | 0.00476 | 0.23673 | 0.14850 |
| 0.15630 | 0.10470 | 255.70000 | 268.56189 | 283.78412 | 176.84500 | 277.33671 | 0.00460 | 0.23745 | 0.14106 |
| 0.19700 | 0.10470 | 700.00000 | 289.87568 | 307.15510 | 229.71539 | 317.66595 | 0.00448 | 0.23806 | 0.13224 |
| 0.23800 | 0.10470 | 575.60000 | 308.53775 | 332.83062 | 289.69780 | 361.95642 | 0.00438 | 0.23856 | 0.12840 |
| 0,26020 | 0.10470 | 700.00000 | 317.75275 | 342.12996 | 301.48908 | 376.19379 | 0.00433 | 0.23880 | 0.12448 |
| 0.02600 | 0.13240 | 0.00000 | 152.26499 | 149.29370 | 199.76671 | 144.14086 | 0.00566 | 0.23282 | 0.20251 |
| 0.05330 | 0.13240 | 0.00000 | 188.30328 | 189.66165 | 200.92609 | 88.76624 | 0.00524 | 0.23457 | 0.18528 |
| 0.08315 | 0.13240 | 0.00000 | 218.08826 | 209.42614 | 248.84705 | 120.91854 | 0.00497 | 0.23577 | 0.16344 |
| 0.11600 | 0.13240 | 290.00000 | 243.39355 | 238.08654 | 236.79163 | 163.86921 | 0.00477 | 0.23656 | 0.15162 |
| 0.15160 | 0.13240 | 343.90000 | 265.86958 | 270.24263 | 80.71558 | 251.32587 | 0.00462 | 0.23737 | 0.14563 |
| 0.19070 | 0.13240 | 611.50000 | 286.78315 | 291.53506 | 194.51557 | 289.296 .37 | 0.00450 | 0.23758 | 0.13626 |
| 0.23000 | 0.13240 | 572.80000 | 305.07604 | 318.84471 | 280.03330 | 339.60754 | 0.00440 | 0.23847 | 0.13314 |
| 0.25160 | 0.13240 | 607.30000 | 314.24793 | 324.94456 | 279.22346 | 347.78477 | 0.00435 | 0.23871 | 0.12782 |

comparison of dispersion coefficient data hith

| VG ${ }_{\text {W/S }}$ | $\underset{N / S}{u}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DL } \\ \substack{\text { CH+2/5 } \\ \text { EXPIL }} \end{gathered}$ | MLD Chatis DECMUER |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CHJJ } \\ & \text { CH*2/S } \\ & \text { JOSHI } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DLF } \\ \text { CMAR2/S } \\ \text { IELD-DANIDSDN } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { WNS } \\ \text { H } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { uT } \\ & n / \mathrm{S} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { US } \\ & \text { M/S } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.02825 | 0.05700 | 700.00000 | 152.71230 |  | 169.11221 |  | 151.38440 | 99.65033 | 0.00393 | 0.20900 | 0.17420 |
| 0.05450 | 0.05700 | 264.00000 | 189.69189 | 205.37882 | 156.33523 | 59.62758 | 0.00364 | 0.21054 | 0.14759 |
| 0.08650 | 0.05700 | 216.20000 | 220.92926 | 237.29465 | 207.65477 | 172.13863 | 0.00344 | 0.21161 | 0.12849 |
| 0.12300 | 0.05700 | 285.00000 | 246.14561 | 273.13563 | 95.92046 | 261.72309 | 0.00330 | 0.21242 | 0.12102 |
| 0.16200 | 0.05700 | 313.90000 | 271.75521 | 301.94321 | 200.41562 | 314.63023 | 0.00319 | 0.21306 | 0.11351 |
| 0.20400 | 0.05700 | 732.30000 | 293.23505 | 329.41006 | 262.50852 | 361.12048 | 0.00310 | 0.21358 | 0.10873 |
| 0.24900 | 0.05700 | 631.50000 | 313.17256 | 359.23396 | 323.64074 | 409.36534 | 0.00303 | 0.21403 | 0.10798 |
| 0.27300 | 0.05700 | 705.20000 | 322.82829 | 370.84345 | 339.80967 | 426.69185 | 0.00300 | 0.21424 | 0.10522 |
| 0.02840 | 0.12040 | 0.00000 | 152.97941 | 146.66372 | 203.07818 | 152.93094 | 0.00393 | 0.20901 | 0.17757 |
| 0.05620 | 0.12040 | 0.00000 | 191.62444 | 189.13397 | 213.01568 | 115.77373 | 0.00362 | 0.21061 | 0.15942 |
| 0.08310 | 0.12040 | 181.10000 | 218.02498 | 202.93609 | 254.91335 | 141.82691 | 0.00346 | 0.21152 | 0.14014 |
| 0.11540 | 0.14200 | 462,60000 | 242.97737 | 236.48051 | 203.16846 | 189.57397 | 0.00332 | 0.21228 | 0.13839 |
| 0.15030 | 0.14200 | 366.70000 | 265.11504 | 259.91825 | 154.01041 | 239.13083 | 0.00322 | 0.21289 | 0.12926 |
| 0.18800 | 0.14200 | 599.80000 | 285.43683 | 287.63877 | 235.94780 | 293.85680 | 0.00313 | 0.21339 | 0.12421 |
| 0.22680 | 0.14200 | 530.10000 | 303.66877 | 313.38134 | 294.83918 | 338.78134 | 0.00306 | 0.21362 | 0.12059 |
| 0.24760 | 0.14200 | 703.90000 | 312,58039 | 318.59769 | 293.57898 | 345.30414 | 0.00303 | 0.21402 | 0.11577 |

CDIPARISOM OF GISPERSIOM COEFFICIENT DATA WITH DIFFERENT CORRELATIDNS

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { VG } \\ & \mathrm{M} / \mathrm{S} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} u \\ \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{B} \\ \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{H}+2}+2 / \mathrm{S} \\ \text { EXPTL } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { MB } \\ \text { CHE2/S } \\ \text { BAIRD-RICE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Ril. } \\ \text { Chin2/5 } \\ \text { JOSHI } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { MLF } \\ \text { Chw+2/S } \\ \text { ELD-DAUIDSD } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Z}, \mathrm{~S} \\ \mathrm{n} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { UI } \\ & \text { H/S } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { US } \\ & \mathrm{H} / \mathrm{S} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $0.02700$ |  | 153.80000 | 150.44853 | 168.04842 | 142.91296 | 88.76789 | 0.00568 | 0.23272 | 0.20006 |
| 0.05340 | 0.06260 | 151.40000 | 188.41980 | 205.66017 | 195.06730 | 83.52803 | 0.00524 | 0.23457 | 0.17131 |
| 0.08567 | 0.06260 | 119.80000 | 220.22743 | 237.67255 | 214.56103 | 156.18750 | 0.00495 | 0.23585 | 0.14872 |
| 0.12200 | 0.06260 | 166.80000 | 247.47803 | 268.66993 | 191.95656 | 236.63004 | 0.00474 | 0.23679 | 0.13558 |
| 0.16000 | 0.05265 | 325,50000 | 270.64344 | 301.17527 | 183.42499 | 305.79681 | 0.00458 | 0.23751 | 0.13127 |
| 0.20200 | 0.06260 | 700.00000 | 292.28321 | 330.27637 | 261.47845 | 357.10175 | 0.00447 | 0.23813 | 0.12687 |
| 0.24640 | 0.06260 | 556.30000 | 312.08964 | 357.83634 | 316.01376 | 402.11720 | 0.00436 | 0.23866 | 0.12441 |
| 0.27000 | 0.06260 | 495.30000 | 321.65326 | 368.58791 | 329.60884 | 418.13236 | 0.00431 | 0.23850 | 0.12053 |
| 0.02750 | 0.08470 | 0.00000 | 151.36230 | 162.55630 | 149.40018 | 84.19381 | 0.00567 | 0.23277 | 0.20365 |
| 0.05300 | 0.09470 | 0.00000 | 187.95287 | 194.51547 | 208.22827 | 122.60170 | 0.00524 | 0.23455 | 0.17755 |
| 0.08400 | 0.05470 | 360.10000 | 218.80139 | 227.74814 | 208.80271 | 143.64178 | 0.00456 | 0.23579 | 0.15989 |
| 0.11800 | 0.09470 | 258.60000 | 244.77044 | 257.64989 | 176.55781 | 222.62356 | 0.00476 | 0.23670 | 0.14770 |
| 0.15600 | 0.09470 | 355.70000 | 268.39167 | 286.40536 | 171.17459 | 281.10905 | 0.00461 | 0.23745 | 0.13892 |
| 0.15660 | 0.09470 | 432.30000 | 289.38927 | 311.50389 | 237.49380 | 325.52613 | 0.00448 | 0.23805 | 0.13157 |
| 0.24000 | 0.05470 | 649.50000 | 309.39096 | 341.69330 | 308.10440 | 377.54041 | 0.00437 | 0.23859 | 0.12972 |
| 0.26000 | 0.09470 | 515.90000 | 317.67214 | 352.94849 | 327.53027 | 335.39738 | 0.00433 | 0.238180 | 0.12820 |
| 0.02790 | 0.13200 | 0.00000 | 152.08532 | 156.24467 | 165.16226 | 92.74608 | 0.00566 | 0.23281 | 0.20639 : |
| 0.05290 | 0.13200 | 0.00000 | 187.83577 | 200.04614 | 153.98159 | 159.09268 | 0.00524 | 0.23455 | 0.19435 |
| 0.08350 | 0.13200 | 289.20000 | 218.37074 | 212.01335 | 241.60240 | 93.70707 | 0.00496 | 0.23578 | 0.16436 |
| 0.11700 | 0.13200 | 277.00000 | 244.08397 | 262.84482 | 238.66746 | 260.28215 | 0.00477 | 0.23668 | 0.16732 |
| 0.15300 | 0.13200 | 533.10000 | 266.67733 | 272.00175 | 138.59791 | 255.46735 | 0.00462 | 0.23739 | 0.14564 |
| 0.19000 | 0.13200 | 531.80000 | 286.43534 | 300.39974 | 255.88632 | 310.77136 | 0.00450 | 0.23797 | 0.14137 |
| 0.23200 | 0.13200 | 428.30000 | 305.94894 | 333.87759 | 332.65170 | 369.96501 | 0.00439 | 0.23850 | 0.14169 |
| 0.02730 | 0.15300 | 0.00000 | 150.99814 | 141.02972 | 215.15734 | 155.11691 | 0.00568 | 0.23275 | 0.20364 |
| 0.05200 | 0.15300 | 0.00000 | 186.77512 | 181.54267 | 217.94130 | 123.40073 | 0.00525 | 0.23450 | 0.18842 |
| 0.08140 | 0.15300 | 0.00000 | 216.54291 | 209.28727 | 232.59120 | 44.61773 | 0.00498 | 0.23571 | 0.17116 |
| 0.11400 | 0.15300 | 475.30000 | 242.00654 | 231.1450i | 245.23960 | 143.85879 | 0.00478 | 0.23661 | 0.15592 |
| 0.14500 | 0.15300 | 700,00000 | 264.35613 | 261.68411 | 172.25913 | 234.07963 | 0.00463 | 0.23732 | 0.14887 |
| 0.18500 | 0.15300 | 364.60000 | 283.92562 | 290.32451 | 244.89270 | 293.37846 | 0.00451 | 0.23790 | 0.14445 |

COMPHISDM OF IISPERSION CDEFFICIENT OATA MITH

CCAFPARISDM DF DISPERSION COEFFICIEMT DATA MITH DIFFERENT CORRELATIONS

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { VG } \\ & \text { n/5 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { UL } \\ \text { H/S } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ML } \\ \text { CH*2/S } \\ \text { EXPTL } \end{gathered}$ | DLD Chne2/5 DECKMER | $\begin{gathered} \text { DLB } \\ \text { CKE:2/S } \\ \text { BAIRD-RICE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DLJ } \\ \text { CH:2/S } \\ \text { JOSHI } F 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DLF } \\ & \text { CM:2/S } \\ & \text { LD-DAVIDSON } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DVS } \\ \mathbf{n} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { UT } \\ & \text { W/S } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { US } \\ & \text { H/S } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.02820 | 0.06320 | 405.20000 | 152.62305 | 167.36712 | 162.27622 | 118.58634 | 0.00478 | 0.22158 | 0.18578 |
| 0.05420 | 0.08320 | 55.20000 | 189.34867 | 203.64575 | 203.00521 | 103.24977 | 0.00442 | 0.22324 | 0.15938 |
| 0.08650 | 0.06320 | 109.70000 | 220.92926 | 237.65254 | 206.14362 | 168.87726 | 0.00418 | 0.22442 | 0.14077 |
| 0.12130 | 0.06320 | 330.00000 | 247.00854 | 269.17301 | 158.35591 | 247.03933 | 0.00401 | 0.22526 | 0.13046 |
| 0.16230 | 0.06320 | 527.90000 | 271.92118 | 303.47360 | 213.71648 | 315.30297 | 0.00388 | 0.22599 | 0.12553 |
| 0.20400 | 0.06320 | 700.00000 | 293.23505 | 330.58453 | 270.03878 | 360.89441 | 0.00377 | 0.22655 | 0.11993 |
| 0.24860 | 0.06320 | 700.00000 | 313.00645 | 356.52004 | 315.99633 | 402.18600 | 0.00368 | 0.22704 | 0.11592 |
| 0.27200 | 0.06320 | 700.00000 | 322.43758 | 368.82012 | 335.67251 | 421.06368 | 0.00364 | 0.22726 | 0.11405 |
| 0.02840 | 0.10460 | 0.00000 | 152.97941 | 173.73742 | 185.32647 | 169.10043 | 0.00478 | 0.22160 | 0.20345 |
| 0.05350 | 0.10460 | 62.80000 | 188.53616 | 189.06127 | 217.09169 | 136.06482 | 0.00443 | 0.22321 | 0.16799 |
| 0.08470 | 0.10460 | 151.10000 | 219.40142 | 221.45918 | 220.34197 | 121.22842 | 0.00419 | 0.22437 | 0.15110 |
| 0.11900 | 0.10460 | 462.50000 | 245.45304 | 253.98340 | 170.11942 | 221.64891 | 0.00402 | 0.22522 | 0.14127 |
| 0.15640 | 0.10460 | 575.50000 | 268.61858 | 285.23793 | 209.91608 | 286.40084 | 0.00389 | 0.22590 | 0.13506 |
| 0.19730 | 0.10460 | 700.00000 | 290.02127 | 312.54336 | 269.34530 | 333.76224 | 0.00379 | 0.22647 | 0.12902 |
| 0.23700 | 0.10460 | 538.90000 | 308.10934 | 335.07010 | 307.48880 | 369.99113 | 0.00370 | 0.22692 | 0.12400 |
| 0.25960 | 0.10460 | 676.40000 | 317.51077 | 354.79235 | 350.81140 | 403.25685 | 0.00366 | 0.22715 | 0.12746 |
| 0.02780 | 0.12720 | 0.00000 | 151.90522 | 154.84210 | 168.19552 | 100.71696 | 0.00479 | 0.22155 | 0.19497 |
| 0.05280 | 0.12720 | 0.00000 | 187.71852 | 182.22058 | 224.03058 | 143.17116 | 0.00443 | 0.22318 | 0.17214 |
| 0.08210 | 0.12720 | 168.90000 | 217.15566 | 217.39754 | 206.16348 | 135.40521 | 0.00421 | 0.22429 | 0.15923 |
| 0.11400 | 0.12720 | 277.80000 | 242.00064 | 244.72342 | 178.16492 | 205.77121 | 0.00404 | 0.22511 | 0.14754 |
| 0.14950 | 0.12720 | 327.30000 | 264.64854 | 257.57878 | 225.84055 | 217.53317 | 0.00391 | 0.22578 | 0.13210 |
| 0.18650 | 0.12720 | 476.20000 | 284.68326 | 301.20588 | 269.33847 | 317.15477 | 0.00381 | 0.22633 | 0.13532 |
| 0.22660 | 0.12720 | 700.00000 | 303.58037 | 324.76101 | 308.95148 | 355.37098 | 0.00372 | 0.22681 | 0.12987 |
| 0.24740 | 0.12720 | 589.30000 | 312.50705 | 335.80105 | 325.95186 | 372.63020 | 0.00368 | 0.22703 | 0.12739 |
| 0.02710 | 0.16900 | 0.00000 | 150.63219 | 140.98993 | 205.86713 | 135.75360 | 0.00480 | 0.22148 | 0.15635 |
| 0.05120 | 0.16900 | 0.00000 | 185.82195 | 158.01877 | 265.18009 | 189.46072 | 0.00445 | 0.22310 | 0.17410 |
| 0.08044 | 0.16900 | 0.00000 | 215.69680 | 198.66994 | 250.41404 | 121.45009 | 0.00422 | 0.22424 | 0.16283 |
| 0.11020 | 0.16900 | 0.00000 | 239.30834 | 218.92680 | 260.39920 | 82.30593 | 0.00406 | 0.22503 | 0.14990 |
| 0.14360 | 0.16900 | 392.30000 | 261.15532 | 240.52654 | 254.69386 | 174.94453 | 0.00393 | 0.22568 | 0.13991 |
| 0.18040 | 0.16900 | 584.90000 | 281.57622 | 271.76824 | 135.78862 | 257.12576 | 0.00383 | 0.22625 | 0.13527 |
| 0.22200 | 0.16900 | 472.00000 | 301.53268 | 298.00228 | 257.75347 | 307.02291 | 0.00373 | 0.22676 | 0.12984 |

CONPARISDM DF VISPERSION CUEFFICIENT DATA WITH DIFFEREMT COMAELATIONS

| U |  | d | M0 | BLB | 日.J | M.F | WS | UT | US |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | CHEETS | CHE*2/S | CHNN2/5 | CH+2/2/5 | chareze/s | H | H/S | H/S |
| H/S |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { CHETS } \\ \text { EXPTL } \end{gathered}$ | DECRMER | BAIRD-RICE | NO5HI | 20-DAvtisman |  |  |  |
|  |  | Ex= | xıxx= |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.02860 | 0.04110 | 129.80000 | 153.68711 | 176.19319 | 153.99852 | 110.98754 | 0.00581 | 0.23501 | 0.19473 |
| 0.05516 | 0.04110 | 151.80000 | 190.44691 | 196.69672 | 275.60930 | 216.56134 | 0.00536 | 0.23878 | 0.14157 |
| 0.89170 | 0.04110 | 400.60000 | 471.10076 | 593.69709 | 637.47530 | 735.39407 | 0.00385 | 0.24422 | 0.14983 |
| 0.12700 | 0.04110 | 482.50000 | 250.78014 | 291.19699 | 178.43849 | 291.58283 | 0.00487 | 0.23506 | 0.14129 |
| 0.16600 | 0.04110 | 479.00000 | 273.95144 | 322.12350 | 255.77158 | 346.85643 | 0.00471 | 0.23978 | 0.13724 |
| 0.20400 | 0.04110 | 449.10000 | 293.23505 | 347.28879 | 293.97281 | 387.46946 | 0.00460 | 0.24033 | 0.13350 <br> 0.13242 |
| 0.27300 | 0.04110 | 457.50000 | 322.82829 | 387.57159 | 366.73126 | 449.83666 | 0.00414 | 0.24111 | 0.20555 |
| 0.02805 | 0.09750 | 0.00000 | 152.35467 | 163.35235 | 150.08120 | 82.03894 | 0.00583 | 0.235673 | 0.18910 |
| 0.05400 | 0.09750 | 0.00000 | 189.11582 | 205.78224 | 100.73116 | 151.38386 145.51310 | 0.00510 | 0.23799 | 0.16138 |
| 0.08567 | 0.09750 | 166.30000 | 220.22743 | 228.72632 | 209.89891 | 145.513.84311 | 0.00490 | 0.23892 | 0.15226 |
| 0.12060 | 0.09750 | 241.80000 | 246.53724 | 263.12385 | 70.46710 | 239.84311 299.54191 | 0.00474 | 0.23955 | 0.14552 |
| 0.15860 | 0.09750 | 275.10000 | 269.85966 | 293.97369 | 230.32276 | 358.14676 | 0.00461 | 0.24027 | 0.14440 |
| 0.15970 | 0.09750 | 335.40000 | 291.16076 | 326.62563 353.49177 | 305.33497 | 400.54941 | 0.00450 | 0.24079 | 0.14160 |
| 0.24260 | 0.09750 | 483.40000 | 310.49305 | 353.48177 362.01628 | 348.95200 | 411.70853 | 0.00445 | 0.24103 | 0.13593 |
| 0.26500 | 0.09750 | 577.00000 | 315.67528 | 362.01626 | 354.31502 | 41.1005 | 0.014 | 0.2103 |  |

Companisow of gispersion coefficient data uith alfferent cormelations


COMPARISON OF DISPERSIDN COEFFICIENT DATA Mith DIFFERENT CORRELATIONS

| VG <br> H/S | $\begin{gathered} \text { U } \\ M / S \end{gathered}$ | CHET2/S <br> EXPIL | DLD <br> CH+2/S <br> DECKHER | $\begin{gathered} \text { DLB } \\ \text { CMI+2/S } \\ \text { BAIRD-RICE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { D.J } \\ & \text { CM\&2/S } \\ & \text { J0SH11 } \end{aligned}$ | DLFCW+12/SFIELD-DAVIDSDA | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUS } \\ h \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { UII } \\ \text { M/S } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { US } \\ & \text { M/S } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.26900 | 0.03370 | 449.30000 | 321.25964 | 394.29646 | 395.58863 | 466.39113 | 0.00525 | 0.24916 | 0.16221 |
| 0.24530 | 0.03370 | 449.80000 | 311.62917 | 382.30246 | 382.41457 | 450.28198 | 0.00531 | 0.24892 | 0.16584 |
| 0.20140 | 0.03370 | 520.80000 | 291.93643 | 357.48341 | 352.96878 | 415.82638 | 0.00544 | 0.24838 | 0.17112 |
| 0.15800 | 0.03370 | 276.50000 | 269.52233 | 330.09747 | 326.92218 | 380.92214 | 0.00560 | 0.24772 | 0.18391 |
| 0.11950 | 0.03370 | 292.70000 | 245.78289 | 298.53278 | 276.77766 | 329,40406 | 0.00579 | 0.24696 | 0.18144 |
| 0.08570 | 0.03370 | 342.40000 | 220.25287 | 265.35926 | 224.28042 | 274.36051 | 0.00502 | 0.24605 | 0.18526 |
| 0.05360 | 0.03370 | 309.20000 | 188.65238 | 222.58599 | 75.73761 | 174.49689 | 0.00637 | 0.24475 | 0.18591 |
| 0.02790 | 0.03370 | 188.30000 | 152.08532 | 179.14981 | 106.84447 | 89.08739 | 0.00689 | 0.24293 | 0.20792 |
| 0.02750 | 0.05450 | 221.40000 | 151.36230 | 175.27712 | 96.68731 | 123.31043 | 0.00691 | 0.24289 | 0.21439 |
| 0.05230 | 0.05450 | 186.20000 | 187.13002 | 214.48516 | 101.56078 | 153.43664 | 0.00633 | 0.24469 | 0.19039 |
| 0.08370 | 0.05450 | 266.90000 | 218.54321 | 257.22416 | 217.01386 | 258.81541 | 0.00604 | 0.24599 | 0.18566 |
| 0.11800 | 0.05450 | 334.70000 | 244.77044 | 291.95863 | 274.86123 | 318.17670 | 0.00580 | 0.24693 | 0.18136 |
| 0.15500 | 0.05450 | 369.50000 | 267.82269 | 322.75985 | 321.29986 | 367.24012 | 0.00561 | 0.24767 | 0.17985 |
| 0.19600 | 0.05450 | 434.40000 | 289.38927 | 348.83960 | 337.84294 | 395.76753 | 0.00546 | 0.24831 | 0.16275 |
| 0.23900 | 0.05450 | 405.00000 | 309.96485 | 374.32204 | 381.19873 | 438.76846 | 0.00533 | 0.24885 | 0.16636 |
| 0.26200 | 0.05450 | 444.30000 | 318.47647 | 386.50011 | 356.08863 | 455.81914 | 0.00527 | 0.24909 | 0.16437 |
| 0.02716 | 0.07940 | 291.40000 | 150.74216 | 169.31981 | 105.44699 | 117.16176 | 0.00692 | 0.24286 | 0.21679 |
| 0.05220 | 0.07940 | 187.20000 | 187.01187 | 204.19930 | 169.87942 | 100.76735 | 0.00639 | 0.24468 | 0.18966 |
| 0.08290 | 0.07940 | 324.10000 | 217.85168 | 249.17370 | 210.78600 | 242.97418 | 0.00605 | 0.24596 | 0.18645 |
| 0.11650 | 0.07940 | 339.00000 | 243.73925 | 287.70543 | 290.59682 | 317.57110 | 0.00581 | 0.24689 | 0.18853 |
| 0.15300 | 0.07940 | 378.60000 | 266.67733 | 315.26101 | 319.94089 | 354.76506 | 0.00562 | 0.24764 | 0.17896 |
| 0.19300 | 0.07940 | 349.90000 | 287.91999 | 343.43917 | 358.02649 | 396.83519 | 0.00547 | 0.24827 | 0.17590 |
| 0.23500 | 0.00000 | 1.00000 | 307.24888 | 383.93877 | 461.02718 | 504.83678 | 119.34810 | 7.00978 | 6.25629 |



| VG n/5 | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{n} \\ \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{S} \end{gathered}$ | DL $\mathrm{CH}+42 / 5$ CHDTL <br> EXPTL |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DLF } \\ C^{x}+2 / 2 / S \\ E L:-3 A U Y \text { InSIN } \end{gathered}$ | DUS | $\begin{array}{ll} U T \\ M / S \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45 \\ & !/ / 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.02900 | 0.03030 | 263.90000 | 154.03249 | 182.2102: | 121.15731 | E4.59203 | 0.00893 | 0.25199 | 0.21396 |
| 0.05610 | 0.03030 | 358.00000 | 19!.54186 | 231.27945 | ! 19.53 ig ? | 225.50502 | 0.00756 | 0.25355 | 0.211820 |
| 0.08910 | 0.07930 | 221.00000 | 223.09897 | 259.97509 | 22E. Rga! ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $279.66!79$ | 0.00716 | 0.255is | 0.19147 |
| 0.12500 | 0.03030 | 318.00000 | 229.46584 | 303.93955 | 275.06:86 | 335.18098 | 0.00687 | 0.25609 | 0.19640 |
| 0.16700 | 0.03030 | 431.20000 | 274.45494 | 335.35982 | 325.91525 | 3E5.48922 | 0.00554 | 0.25699 | 0.18417 |
| 0.20900 | 0.03030 | 438.10000 | 295,58759 | 362.83055 | 356.3E615 | 422.09025 | 0.00EC6 | 0.25750 | 0.17679 |
| 0.25500 | 0.03030 | 409.60000 | 315.64301 | 388.16978 | 295.4053 | 457.24613 | 0.00631 | 0.25804 | 0.17120 |
| 0.27990 | 0.03030 | 404.20500 | 325.15265 | 200.21201 | 400.72278 | 473.86510 | $0.006 z^{4}$ | 0.25828 | 0.16883 |
| 0.02900 | 0.08310 | 207.20000 | 154.03349 | 171.73993 | 103.E3z07 | 90.53372 | $0.098 i 9$ | 0.25199 | 0.27209 |
| 0.05500 | 0.08310 | 232.20000 | 190.26443 | 215.67507 | 162.077 ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ | i86.16569 | 0.00758 | 0.25380 | 0.20754 |
| 0.08700 | 0.08310 | 343.20000 | 221.34987 | 256.19075 | 239.70241 | 262.53659 | 0.00718 | 0.25508 | 0.19934 |
| 0.12200 | 0.08310 | 321.00000 | 247.47603 | 250.71547 | 290.34025 | 317.939 ${ }^{10}$ | 0.00689 | 0.25602 | 0.19324 |
| 0.16100 | 0.08310 | 354.20000 | 271.20448 | 322.17208 | 333.83245 | 366.11445 | 0.00567 | 0.25676 | j. 18914 |
| 0.20200 | 0.08310 | 429.90000 | 292.28321 | 349.01161 | 366.39727 | 404.16528 | 1.00549 | 0.25741 | 0.18325 |
| 0.24600 | 0.06310 | 486.20000 | 311.92936 | 374.54134 | 398.23356 | 440.42406 | 0.00533 | 0.25794 | 0.17956 |
| 0.25960 | 0.08310 | 447.90000 | 317.268¢ | 350.92194 | 40c.65C91 | 488.7!09! | 0.80630 | 0.25808 | 0.17694 |

COMPARISOM OF DISPERSIOM COEFFICIENT DATA GITH DIFFERENT CORRELATIONS
1200 PPM CHC SOLUTIOW

|  |  | DL | DLD | DL. ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | MJ | MF | DVS | UT | US |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M/S |  |  |  |  | CHayls |  |  | H/5 | /5 |
|  | W/S | $\begin{array}{r} C_{H}+Z_{2 / 5} \\ \text { EXPIL } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CHFH2/S } \\ & \text { DECKUER } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CNAN2/S } \\ & \text { BAIRD-RICE } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CHA2/5 } \\ \text { JOSHI f } \end{gathered}$ | CIELD-DAVIDSDN | M |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 187 | 107.59277 | 145.36226 | 0.01059 | 0.26567 | 0.23278 |
| 0.02950 | 0.02040 | 147.40000 | 154.90390 | 187.77665 | 173.15447 | 219.91714 | 0.00982 | 0.26749 | 0.21778 |
| 0.05540 | 0.02040 | 221.60000 | 190.71996 | 272.47503 | 238.958232 | 289.77435 | 0.00929 | 0.28860 | 0.21099 |
| 0.08600 | 0.02040 | 231.80000 | 222.18626 | 305.56075 | 274.18908 | 335.32994 | 0.00891 | 0.26977 | 0.19729 |
| 0.12400 | 0.02040 | 237.20000 | 248.80957 272.58301 | 33.50301 | 323.35091 | 385.74903 | 0.00862 | 0.27054 | 0.19899 |
| 0.16350 | 0.02040 | 274.40000 395.80000 | 272.58301 295.68090 | 365.39916 | 356.01124 | 425.37352 | 0.00837 | 0.27122 | 0.15013 |
| 0.20320 | 0.02040 | 356.00000 329.20000 | 295.68090 315.39773 | 350.44223 | 386.94994 | 460.67625 | 0.00818 | 0.27176 | 0.18632 |
| 0.25440 | 0.02040 | 329.20000 358.20000 | 324.95874 | 402.37761 | 399.03439 | 476.18014 | 0.00809 | 0.27201 | 0.18120 |
| 0.27860 | 0.02040 | 198.20000 | 153.15696 | 171.65099 | 126.53556 | 57.74246 | 0.01063 | 0.26557 | 0.23406 |
| 0.02850 | 0.07810 | 194.20000 260.70000 | 189.85256 | 220.91118 | 200.55770 | 212.49384 | 0.00584 | 0.26745 | 0.22722 |
| 0.05464 | 0.07810 | 260.70000 253.20000 | 221.34987 | 264.84539 | 278.73555 | 294.74085 | 0.00930 | 0.26877 | 0.22834 |
| 0.08700 | 0.07810 | 253.20000 391.60000 | 247.85233 | 296.67601 | 309.35740 | 334.37601 | 0.00893 | 0.26974 | 0.21578 |
| 0.12256 | 0.07810 | 391.60000 400.70000 | 271.75521 | 327.23781 | 346.45544 | 377.75642 | 0.00863 | 0.27051 | 0.20987 |
| 0.16200 | 0.07810 | 400.70000 382.40000 | 292.90261 | 353.12272 | 373.63743 | 411.68139 | 0.00840 | 0.27114 | 0.20057 |
| 0.20330 | 0.07810 0.07810 | 382.40000 353.80000 | 313.17256 | 379.80454 | 407.57311 | 449.85858 | 0.00820 | 0.27170 | 0.19870 |
| 0.24900 | 0.07810 | 317.20000 | 322.04581 | 389,28620 | 413.44499 | 460.08732 | 0.00812 | 0.27193 | 0.18957 |
| 0.27100 | 0.07810 | 317.2000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |





COMPPRISDM OF DISPERSIDW COEFICIENT DATA MITH DIFFERENT COPRELAIIDNS


| 0.02500 | 0.04350 | 1.00000 | 154.03849 | 191.28236 | 227.87955 | 244.25239 | 473.13116 | 9.39212 | 9.39212 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.05570 | 0.04360 | 290.30000 | 191,06016 | 224.41348 | 147.09317 | 197.80340 | 0.00553 | 0.23884 | 0.18701 |
| 0.08920 | 0.04360 | 382.70000 | 223.18157 | 266.52134 | 233.16364 | 278.18111 | 0.00522 | 0.24014 | 0.18055 |
| 0.12560 | 0.04360 | 426.50000 | 249.86447 | 301.10752 | 289.59539 | 333.70596 | 0.00501 | 0.24104 | 0.17521 |
| 0.16570 | 0.04360 | 499.30000 | 273.78796 | 332.03600 | 326.57918 | 380.25787 | 0.00485 | 0.24183 | 0.17096 |
| 0.20860 | 0.04360 | 455.20000 | 295.40078 | 359.99212 | 362.98969 | 420.91324 | 0.00472 | 0.24246 | 0.16785 |
| 0.25540 | 0.04350 | 472.80000 | 315.80631 | 386.38142 | 396.37278 | 458.36379 | 0.00460 | 0.24300 | 0.16548 |
| 0.28940 | 0.04360 | 507.50000 | 329.10345 | 402.93637 | 414.50045 | 480.39563 | 0.00454 | 0.24334 | 0.16079 |
| 0.02820 | 0.08500 | 232.60000 | 152.62305 | 165.81167 | 150.89473 | 90.42148 | 0.00600 | 0.23655 | 0.20556 |
| 0.05420 | 0.08500 | 230.20000 | 189.34667 | 210.19087 | 111.63856 | 164.66191 | 0.00555 | 0.23877 | 0.15045 |
| 0.68600 | 0.08500 | 316. 10000 | 220.50701 | 250.61963 | 216.77067 | 246.64872 | 0.00525 | 0.24004 | 0.18065 |
| 0.12130 | 0.08500 | 374.00000 | 247.00854 | 286.54287 | 279.01112 | 309.27239 | 0.00503 | 0.24058 | 0.17574 |
| 0.15960 | 0.08500 | 373.10000 | 270.41987 | 319.93598 | 333.06573 | 364.40371 | 0.00487 | 0.24173 | 0.17628 |
| 0.20100 | 0.08500 | 470.10000 | 291.80492 | 347.96551 | 369.06562 | 405.09722 | 0.00474 | 0.24236 | 0.17254 |
| 0.24500 | 0.08500 | 500.40000 | 311.50335 | 372.63174 | 397.34764 | 438.83341 | 0.00453 | 0.24288 | 0.18653 |
| 0.28730 | 0.08500 | 522.90000 | 328.31345 | 392.43125 | 617.30101 | 464.58220 | 0.00454 | 0.24332 | 0.15852 |

COMHARISDM OF DISPERSION COEFFICIEMT DATA NITH DIFFERENT COMRELATIONS


[^0]

COMPARISON OF DISPERSION COEFFICIENT DATA MITH DIFFERENT CORRELATIOWS

| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{VG} / \mathrm{S} \end{aligned}$ | $u_{n / S}^{u}$ | $\begin{gathered} d \\ \text { Cnet2/S } \\ \text { EXPTL } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DLD } \\ \text { CH+2/S } \\ \text { DECRMER } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DLD } \\ \text { Chin } 2 / \mathrm{S} \\ \text { BAIRD-RICE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OL.J } \\ & \text { CHi+2/S } \\ & \text { JOSHI } f \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{MLF} \\ \text { CHFR2/S } \\ \text { ELD-DAUIDSD } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DNS } \\ \text { H } \end{gathered}$ | H/ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { us } \\ & \text { M/S } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.02890 | 0.05310 | 160.50000 | 153.86300 | 167.30572 | 196.95606 | 168.79139 | 0.00614 | 0.23690 | 0.19012 |
| 0.05497 | 0.05310 | 252.90000 | 190.23018 | 211.63307 | 191.84983 | 44. 18331 | 0.00569 | 0.23867 | 0.17160 |
| 0.08767 | 0.05310 | 325.60000 | 221.91096 | 255.18625 | 149.57730 | 235.37058 | 0.00538 | 0.23994 | 0.16473 |
| 0.12370 | 0.05310 | 355.50000 | 248.61076 | 292.24925 | 250.20644 | 309.67590 | 0.00516 | 0.24088 | 0.16272 |
| 0.16210 | 0.05310 | 370.80000 | 271.81055 | 323.18709 | 301.53505 | 359.52124 | 0.00500 | 0.24161 | 0.15878 |
| 0.20430 | 0.05310 | 465.70000 | 293.37728 | 351.75165 | 343.42265 | 403.36692 | 0.00486 | 0.24223 | 0.15602 |
| 0.02840 | 0.12460 | 167.90000 | 152.97341 | 163.47385 | 64.97109 | 88.87657 | 0.00616 | 0.23685 | 0.21232 |
| 0.05360 | 0.12460 | 215.80000 | 188.65238 | 188.42147 | 216.87159 | 129.72121 | 0.00570 | 0.23860 | 0.18592 |
| 0.08440 | 0.12460 | 361.40000 | 219.14468 | 232.74249 | 155.32936 | 199.65683 | 0.00540 | 0.23984 | 0.17818 |
| 0.11700 | 0.12460 | 355.40000 | 244.08397 | 261.05782 | 210.54952 | 249.75334 | 0.00519 | 0.24073 | 0.16607 |
| 0.15340 | 0.12460 | 403.40000 | 265.90720 | 295.95161 | 292.24640 | 316.25573 | 0.00503 | 0.24146 | 0.16396 |
| 0.19220 | 0.12460 | 444.30000 | 287.52561 | 325.29100 | 339.77219 | 363.98869 | 0.00489 | 0.24207 | 0.16110 |
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## 2. BATCH BUBBLE COLIMN

### 2.1 Introduction

The effect of the physical properties of the liquid phase on the hydrodynamics of bubble colums is not clearly understood. While Akita and Yoshida, (2.1) Hikita et al., (2.2) Bach and Pilhofer, (2.3) Ueyama and Miyauchi, (2.4) Schugerl et al., (2.5) and Oels et al. (2.6) have studied the effect of physical properties, a clear picture of the hydrodynamics, espec:lally of the bubble dynamics, has yet to emerge.

Aqueous solutions of alcohols have been used to lower the liquid surface tension. The operation of bioreactors and fermenters involves the use of alcohol solutions in the presence of other additives. It is desirable to know the hydrodynamics of an SRC-II reactor, where the surface tension of the liquid phase is believed to be very low. Akita and Yoshida, (2.1) Hikita et al., (2.2) and Kim et al. (2.7) have studied systems with a wide range of surface tensions ( $0.0124-0.0796 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{m}$ ) and have developed correlations for the gas holdup which show only a slight dependence on the surface tension. Botton et al. (2.8) and Miller, (2.9) using continuous flow systems, have found no effect of surface tension on gas holdup. Schugerl et al. (2.5) and Oels et al. (2.6) have studied aqueous solutions of alcohols and reported a significant increase in gas holdup as the surface tension is decreased. The SRC-II reaction medium may behave like aqueous solutions of higher alcohols and therefore the hydrodynamics of these alcohol solutions at higher gas velocities have been studied in the present work. Schugerl et al. (2.5) have studied the hydrodynamics of aqueous alcohol solutions in the bubbly flow regime. In the experiments reported here, the dynamic gas disengagement technique along
with the determination of gas holdup are used to gain better insight about the bubble rise velocities and relative holdups of small and large bubbles. It is easy to obtain this information using a transparent batch bubble column.

Akita and Yoshida ${ }^{(2.1)}$ and Hikita et al. ${ }^{(2.2)}$ have observed a decrease in gas holdup with an increase in viscosity in experiments which covered viscosities over the range of 0.001 to $0.070 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{m} \cdot \mathrm{sec}$. All of these experiments were carried out in an 0.152 m diameter column. The hydrodynamics of a bubble column operating in the churn-turbulent regime is more complex than that in the bubbly flow regime and is expected to depend on the column diameter. When the viscous forces predominate and the liquid has a coalescing tendency, the bubbles try to reach the equilibrium bubble size by coalescing. As a rule of thumb, the bubble size in the columi is independent of the initial bubble size if the perforated plate has holes of diameter greater than $10^{-3} \mathrm{~m}$. Thus, the bubbles grow to reach the dynamic equilibrium size as they move up the colum. For small diameter colums (diameter up to 0.15 m ), slugs are formed and the transition occurs from bubbly to slug flow. For a column diameter of 0.305 m , as used in the present work, the transition is from bubbly to churn-turbulent flow and the bubble clusters coalesce to form large, fast rising bubbles (but not slugs). The study of the hydrodynamics of large fast rising bubbles in the presence of small bubbles is only reported by Vermeer and Krishna. (2.10) Hills and Darton ${ }^{(2.11)}$ found the rise velocities of large bubbles to be as high as $1.0 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$. Schumpe ${ }^{(2.12)}$ studied the hydrodynamics of CMC solutions in the presence of large irregular bubbles, but slugs formed due to the small column diameter. In this work, glycerine and CMC solutions are used to stady the effect of viscosity
on gas holdup and the hydrodynamics of the fast rising bubbles in Newtonian and non-Newtonian solutions.

The effect of solids on the holdup is demonstrated by the use of coal and sand of various concentrations and sizes added to an air-water system. The main objective behind analyzing air-water-solid data is to have a reference for air-CMC or glycerine solution-solid systems.

The physical properties of the aqueous alcohol, CMC, and glycerine solutions are Ilsted in Tables 2.1-2.3. Properties of the coal slurries and the coal and sand particles are given in Tables 2.4-2.6.

TABLE 2.1
PHYSICAL PROPERTIES OF ALCOHOL SOLUTIONS

| Alcohol | Concentration <br> $w t \%$ | Density <br> $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ | Surface Tension <br> $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{m}$ | Viscosity <br> $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{m} \cdot \mathrm{s}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Methanol | 1.0 | 1006 | 0.06674 | 0.00100 |
|  | 5.0 | 1000 | 0.06143 | 0.00100 |
| Ethanol. | 1.0 | 995 | 0.06608 | 0.00100 |
| n-Propanol | 0.5 | 999 | 0.06416 | 0.00100 |
|  | 1.0 | 998 | 0.06091 | 0.00100 |
|  | 1.5 | 997 | 0.05615 | 0.00100 |
|  |  |  | 999 | 0.06319 |
| n-Butanol | 0.5 | 996 | 0.04823 | 0.00100 |
|  | 1.6 |  |  | 0.00100 |

TABLE 2.2
PHYSICAI PROPERTIES OF GLICERINE SOLUTIONS

| Glycerine Concentration <br> vol $\%$ | Density <br> kg/m | Surface Tension <br> $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{m}$ | Viscosity <br> $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{m} \cdot \mathrm{s}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | 1039 | 0.05860 | 0.00170 |
| 20 | 1071 | 0.05800 | 0.00221 |
| 30 | 1096 | 0.05760 | 0.00302 |
| 40 | 1124 | 0.05790 | 0.00423 |
| 50 | 1147 | 0.05890 | 0.00666 |
| 60 | 1168 | 0.05920 | 0.01140 |
| 70 | 1194 | 0.06720 | 0.02060 |
| 80 | 1216 | 0.06530 | 0.05040 |
| 85 | 1227 | 0.06450 | 0.05900 |
| 90 | 1228 | 0.06380 | 0.07620 |
| 95 | 1243 | 0.06410 | 0.14100 |
| 99.5 | 1249 | 0.06450 | 0.24600 |

TABLE 2.3
PHYSICAL PROPERTIES OF CMC SOLUTIONS

| Approximate <br> CMC Concentration <br> $w t \%$ | Density <br> $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ | Surface Tension | Consistency <br> Index <br> kg/m.8 | Flow <br> Behavior <br> Index |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $* 500 \mathrm{ppm}$ | 996 | 0.07090 | 0.00266 | 1.000 |
| $* 1000 \mathrm{ppm}$ | 996 | 0.06990 | 0.00455 | 1.000 |
| 0.05 | 1000 | 0.07030 | 0.00781 | 1.000 |
| 0.10 | 1001 | 0.06670 | 0.0266 | 1.000 |
| 0.15 | 1001 | 0.06800 | 0.0590 | 0.975 |
| 0.20 | 1002 | 0.07030 | 0.0943 | 0.067 |
| 0.25 | 1002 | 0.07130 | 0.161 | 0.943 |
| 0.30 | 1001 | 0.07000 | 0.232 | 0.952 |
| 0.40 | 1002 | 0.06500 | 0.738 | 0.931 |
| 0.50 | 1008 | 0.07210 | 1.728 | 0.913 |

[^1]TABLE 2.4
PHYSICAI PROPERTIES OF COAL SLURRIES

| Coal <br> Concentration <br> wt\% | Slurry Density | Surface Tension | Viscosity |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 | $\mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{m}$ | $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{m} \cdot \mathrm{s}$ |
| 18 | 1027 | 0.07095 | 0.00170 |
| 25 | 1047 | 0.07069 | 0.00202 |
| 30 | 1068 | 0.07084 | 0.00270 |

TABLE 2.5
PHYSICAI PROPERTIES OF COAL PARTICLES
Coal Density: $1373 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$
Particle Size Distribution, wt\%

| on 80 mesh | 0.0 |
| :--- | ---: |
| thru 80 on 200 mesh | 6.3 |
| thru 200 on 325 mesh | 21.1 |
| thru 325 on 625 mesh | 35.2 |
| thru 625 mesh | 37.4 |

TABLE 2.6
PHYSICAL PROPERTIES OF SAND PARTICLES

Sand Density: $2650 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$

```
Sand Size Range
    Concentrations Used in the
    m x 10-6
    74-149
    250-297
    590-710
        Bubble Colum, wt%
        18, 38,47
        10, 20, 30
    10, 20
```


### 2.2 Experimental Setup and Procedure

A schematic diagram of the experimental setup is shown in Figure 2.1. The glass column used in these experiments is 0.305 m in diameter and 2.44 m tall. The conical section below the column is 0.610 m in height and is packed with Berl saddles. This section acts as a calming section to give a uniform gas distribution. A perforated plate having a large number of $1.6 \times 10^{-3} \mathrm{~m}$ diameter holes serves as a gas distributor and separates the cone from the column. Air is used as the gas for all experiments. From the house line, the air passes through a filter, a pressure regulator, and a rotameter before entering the column. Superficial gas velocities of up to $0.38 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ can be achieved.

Pressure taps and sampling ports are located along the length of the column as shown. Pressure is measured using a transducer and chart recorder and is used in the calculation of holdup. The pressure measurement system is shown in Figure 2.2. The sampling ports allow samples to be taken directly from the column. The sampling tubes extend to the colum center and have openings along the radius of the column to take a representative sample. These are used to determine the solid fraction present in slurry systems as a function of height. Solid-liquid samples are weighed, dried in an oven to remove the liquid, and then reweighed. From the weights before drying and after drying, the ratio of solid to liquid can be found.

For each system studied, the liquid (or slurry) density, surface tension, and viscosity are measured. Densities are measured using a pycnometer. A Fisher Surface Tensiomat (Model 21) and a Brookfield Synchro-Lectric Viscometer (Model LVT) are used to measure the surface tension and viscosity, respectively.


Experimental situp.
Figure 2.1


Figure 2.2

The dynamic gas disengagement technique requires the measurement of the decilne of the aerated liquid height with time when the gas flow to the colum is suddenly stopped. This is done with the use of a video tape recorder (VTR), a color monitor and a camera. Frame-by-frame analysis is possible on a VTR with stop-action; by knowing the number of frames per second, one can determine the height as a function of time.

### 2.3 Analysis of Raw Data

### 2.3.1 Holdups

The pressure is measured at each tap along the length of the column and converted to absolute pressure by hydrostatic correction. For both the two- and three-phase systems studied, the pressure is found to vary linearly with height. Therefore, the pressure gradient can be determined by fitting a straight line through a plot of pressure vs. height.

For the gas-1iquid systems, the pressure gradient is given by:

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\frac{d P}{d x}=\varepsilon_{L} \rho_{L}+\varepsilon_{G} \rho_{G} \tag{2.3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $\rho_{G}$ is so small compared to $\rho_{L}$ and sum of the gas and liquid holdups must be 1.0 , equation (2.3.1) can be rewritten as:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon_{G}=I+\frac{1}{\rho_{L}} \frac{d P}{d x} \tag{2.3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

The use of equation (2.3.1) or (2.3.2) assumes no local variation of gas holdup and negligible frictional pressure drop.

For gas-liquid-solid systems, the pressure gradient is given by:

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\frac{d P}{d x}=E_{L} \rho_{L}+E_{S} \rho_{S}+\varepsilon_{G} \rho_{G} \tag{2.3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

As before, the term $E_{G} \rho_{G}$ can be neglected and Equation (2.3.3) rearranged to give:

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\frac{d P}{d x}=\varepsilon_{L}\left(\rho_{L}+\frac{\varepsilon_{s}}{\varepsilon_{L}} \rho_{s}\right) \tag{2.3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Sampling data provides the ratio of solid holdup to liquid holdup.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\text { solid volume }}{\text { Iiquid volume }}=\frac{\varepsilon_{s}}{\varepsilon_{L}} \equiv C \tag{2.3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

The last two equations can be combined to give $\varepsilon_{L}$.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon_{L}=\frac{-d P / d x}{p_{I}+C \cdot \rho_{B}} \tag{2.3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

From equation (2.3.5):

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon_{s}=C \cdot \varepsilon_{L} \tag{2.3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Finally, $\varepsilon_{G}$ is calculated by knowing that the sum of the three holdups is unity.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon_{G}=1-\varepsilon_{S}-\varepsilon_{L} \tag{2.3.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

### 2.3.2 Dynamic Gas Disengagement

Measurement of the gas holdup during gas disengagement (i.e., after the gas flow to the aerated bubble column is cut off) can provide some information about the size and distribution of the gas bubbles.

The following assumptions will be made to simplify the analysis.

1. The initial bubble size distribution is axially homogeneous.
2. No significant bubble coalescence or breakup occurs during disengagement.

In the gas-liquid dispersions, any sized bubble will have an equal chance of being at any point in the aerated liquid height at the point of gas cut off. Pictorally the liquid dispersion at the point of cut off is represented in Figure 2.3. The large bubbles which rise much faster than small bubbles will be the first to disengage. All bubbles of size $d_{b}$ rising with a rise velocity $u_{b r}$ will disengage in a time $t_{\max }$ where,

$$
\begin{equation*}
t_{\max }\left(d_{b}\right)=\frac{h(t)}{U_{b r}\left(d_{b}\right)} \tag{2.3.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

and, $h(t)$ is the height of the dispersion at time $t=t_{\text {max }}$.
At any time $t$, the fraction of bubbles of size $d_{b}$ still present in the dispersion after an elapsed time $t$ is given by ( $1-t / t_{\max }$ ).

Now we develop the relation between dynamic gas holdup $\varepsilon_{G}(t)$ and the static holdup $\varepsilon_{G}(0)$ for uniform sized bubbles, two sized bubbles and n sized bubbles.

For the case of uniform sized bubbles, the gas holdup will decline according to
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$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon_{G}(t)=\varepsilon_{G}(0)\left(1-t / t_{\max }\right) \tag{2.3.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

where, $t_{\max }=\frac{h i}{U_{b r}}$ and $h 1=$ unaerated liquid height. By plotting $\varepsilon_{G}(t)$ vs $t$ one can determine $t_{\max }$ and, therefore, $U_{b r}$.

When there are two classes of bubbles, large and small, $\varepsilon_{G}(t)$ will be given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon_{G}(t)=\varepsilon_{G, l}\left(1-\frac{t}{t_{\max , l}}\right)+\varepsilon_{G, s}\left(1-\frac{t}{t_{\max , s}}\right) \tag{2.3.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

when both size bubbles are disengaging and by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon_{G}(t)=\varepsilon_{G, s}\left(I-\frac{t}{t_{\max , s}}\right) \tag{2.3.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

when all of the large bubbles have disengaged. The rise velocity of the small bubbles is calculated from

$$
\begin{equation*}
t_{\max , s}=\frac{h i}{U_{b r, 5}} \tag{2.3.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

For the large bubbles, $t_{\text {max }, \ell}$ is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
t_{\max , l}=\frac{h(t)}{U_{b r, l}} \tag{2.3.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $h(t)$ is defined at the time when the expression for $E_{G}(t)$ switches from equation (2.3.11) to (2.3.12), i.e. when the last large bubble disengages. From the slope and intercept of equation (2.3.12), $\varepsilon_{G, s}$ and $U_{b r, s}$ can be calculated; with this information and the slope and intercept of equation (2.3.11), $\varepsilon_{G, \ell}$ and $U_{b r, \ell}$ are calculated.

This analysis can be extended to $n$ distinct bubble sizes for which $\varepsilon_{G}(t)$ will be given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon_{G}(t)=\sum_{i=1}^{n} \varepsilon_{G, i}\left(1-\frac{t}{t_{\max , i}}\right) \tag{2.3.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

when all bubble sizes are disengaging, by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon_{G}(t)=\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \varepsilon_{G, i}\left(1-\frac{t}{t_{\max , i}}\right) \tag{2.3.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

when the nth sized bubbles have disengaged and so on until all bubble sizes have disengaged.

An illustrative plot of $\varepsilon_{G}(t)$ vs. $t$ is shown in Figure 2.4 for the 5.0 wt\% methanol system. The sharp break in the curves clearly indicates the existence of two distinct bubble sizes.

### 2.4 Results and Discussion

### 2.4.1 Effect of Addition of Alcohols

Gas holdup increases with an increase in gas velocity and behaves completely different from air-water. The gas holdup can be two times that for air-water as evident from Figures 2.5 to 2.8 which depict a comparison between gas holdup data for alcohol solutions and for air-water. The gas holdup data for alcohols is compared with many existing correlations in Tables A.2.1 to A.2.8. Though Akita and Yoshida ${ }^{(2.1)}$ and Hikita et al. ${ }^{\text {(2.2) }}$ have included the effect of surface tension in their gas holdup correlations, their correlations fail to predict the observed values of high gas holdup. The semitheoretical equation proposed by Mersmann ${ }^{(2.13)}$ also fails to explain this high gas holdup. The equation proposed by Schugerl


Dymanic gas disengagement: gas holdup vs time for 5.0 wt methanol
Figare 2.4
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GAS HOLDUP VS.SUPERFICIAL GAS VELOCITY FOR PROPANOL-WATER.
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GAS HOLDUP VS.SUPERFICIAL GAS VELOCITY FOR BUTANOL-WATER.
Figure 2.8
et al. ${ }^{(2.5)}$ consistently predicts higher values of gas holdup than realized for any alcohol. Since it gives implausible values of gas holdup after $6-7 \mathrm{~cm} / \mathrm{sec}$, it is not valid outside the range of gas velocities they studied. The effect of alcohol concentration on the gas holdup is insignificant for propanol solutions where the surface tension varies from $0.06319 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{m}$ to $0.04823 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{m}$. The $1.6 \mathrm{wt} \mathrm{\%}$ butanol solution shows higher gas holdups than $0.5 \mathrm{wt} \mathrm{\%}$ butanol. The effect of concentration of alcohol on gas holdup can explain the results in Figure 2.5. $\quad E_{G}$ egainst $V_{G}$ data for ( $5 \mathrm{wt} \mathrm{\%}$ ) methanol lie above the data for $1 \mathrm{wt} \%$ methanol, but data taken at the end of the run are for a very low concentration of methanol, say *wt\%, (which is due to vaporization of methanol) and this data usually lie nearer to the air-water data. The gas holdup is greatly influenced by the type of alcohol added as shown in Figure 2.9. The gas holdup increases in the following order:

## methanol < ethanol < propanol < butanol

which is in agreement with Schugerl et al. ${ }^{(2.5)}$ and 0els et al. ${ }^{\text {(2.6) }}$ From Figure 2.9 it can be seen that 1.6 wt\% butanol shows the highest gas holdups followed by propanols and $0.5 \mathrm{wt} \mathrm{\%}$ butanol (which has a surface tension higher than propanols). 0.5 wt\% butanol is followed by 1 wt\% ethanol and methanols in the gas holdup curve. The systems below a surface tension of $0.048 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{m}$ have not been studied because of flooding and/or foaming observed at very low gas velocities.

This strange behavior of alcohols is explained with the help of the theoretical development of Oels et al., ${ }^{(2.6)}$ Schugerl et al., (2.5) flow regime charts, graphs of bubble rise velocities against gas velocity


Figure 2.9
and the information obtained from the dynamic gas disengagement method. The unusual increase in gas holdup based on the theoretical development of Oels et al. ${ }^{(2.6)}$ and Schugerl et al. ${ }^{(2.5)}$ has been explained in Section 1.3. It is important to note that alcohol solutions with larger chain lengths and lower surface tension will behave mostly like small rigid spheres rising with very low bubble rise velocity. For aqueous solutions of $C_{1}, C_{2}$, and $C_{3}$ alcohols as the gas velocity increases the bubbles coalesce and form fast rising large bubbles. The result is an increase in the rise velocity of bubble swarm as a whole and the leveling out of gas holdup. In the case of aqueous solutions of $C_{4}$ alcohols with low surface tension, the bubbles stay as small rigid spheres, they do not coalesce and hence the gas holdup keeps on increasing with a net reduction in bubble rise velocity. Because there is no transition from the bubbly flow regime to the churn turbulent regime flooding occurs. Occurrence of foaming acts as a booster for an early flooding point. For a soltuion similar to higher alcohol solutions with a very low surface tension (near 0.025$0.03 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{m}$ ) the evaluation of a flooding chart may be very useful information as far as the hydrodynamics is concerned. In the cocurrent bubble column for a similar $C_{4}$ alcohol solution, flooding was not observed, though there was considerable foaming. Probably, the point of flooding, enhanced by intense foaming, is present for $C_{5}$ or $C_{6}$ alcohols in the cocurrent bubble column.

Upon visual observation, the bubbles appeared to be small, spherical and uniformly distributed. Schugerl et al. (2.5) have reported that the size of bubbles in alcohol solutions, is mainly governed by the dynamic equilibrium between the pressure and surface tension forces, if the holes
of the perforated plate are $\geq 0.5 \mathrm{~mm}$ in diameter. As the energy input to the liquid phase is increased by increasing the superficial gas ve?r.f:y, even for a non-coalescing medium like alcohol solutions, large bubbles form and a transition from the bubbly flow regime to the churn turbulent regime is expected. Flow regime charts for alcohol solutions are shown in Figures 2.10-2.13. Data for $5 \mathrm{wt} \%$ methanol, $1 w t \%$ ethanol, $0.5 \mathrm{wt} \%$ propanol and $1.6 \mathrm{wt} \mathrm{\%}$ butanol lies solely in the bubbly flow regime. There is a transition from bubbly flow to churn turbulent flow at gas holdup of $28 \%$, $50 \%$, and $43 \%$ for $1 \mathrm{wt} \mathrm{\%}$ methanol, $1.0 \mathrm{wt} \%$ and $1.5 \mathrm{wt} \%$ propanol and $0.5 \mathrm{wt} \%$ butanol which is in agreement with the order in which gas noldup increases for these systems. Though the transition gas velocity for all the three cases lies near $0.10-0.12 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$. Dynamic gas disengagement data are avallable for methanols and butanols. For methanol, 1 wt\% and * wt\% (*: it behaves closer to the air-water data in gas holdup, drift fiux, bubble rise velocity charts), the transition from uniform bubbles to two gized bubbles occurs around $0.10 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ and $0.065 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ respectively. The sumarized gas disengagement data for alcohols is as shown in Table 2.7 and Figures 2.14 and 2.15. It can be seen that the relative fraction of large bubbles to small bubbles is constant for 1 wt\% methanol and levels out for * wt\%. The fraction of large bubbles for * wt\% case is larger than that for $1 w t \%$ and is closer to alr-water data. For $0.5 \mathrm{wt} \mathrm{\%}$ butanols all the data are taken in the bubbly flow regime.

The bubble rise velocity defined as $V_{M}=V_{G} / \varepsilon_{G}$ is plotted againgt: $V_{G}$ as shown in Figures 2.16-2.19 for the alcohols. It can be seen that $V_{M}$ is either remaining constant or increasing with gas velocity for methanal, propanol and 0.5 wt butanol. The same observation can be made looking at.

-

Fipure 2.13
TABLE 2.7

| $V_{G} \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ | DYNAMIC GAS D1.0 wt\% Methanol |  |  |  | IENT R | LTS FOR | ALCOHOL | OUTIO |  |  | 1.0 wt\% <br> Fthanol $0.035$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | * wt\% Methanol |  |  | 0.5 wt\% n-Butanol |  |  |  |
|  | 0.036 | 0.065 | 0.105 | 0.144 | 0.066 | 0.114 | 0.158 | 0.030 | 0.048 | 0.061 |  |
| $\varepsilon_{G}(0)$ | 0.133 | 0.188 | 0.288 | 0.348 | 0.164 | 0.246 | 0.280 | 0.130 | 0.287 | 0.355 | 0.148 |
| ${ }^{G} \mathbf{G , B}$ | $\} 0.133$ | 0.188 | 0.235 | 0.284 | 0.115 | 0.188 | 0.218 | 0.130 | 0.287 | 0.355 | 0.148 |
| ${ }^{\varepsilon}{ }_{G, \ell}$ |  |  | 0.053 | 0.064 | 0.049 | 0.058 | 0.062 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{br}, \mathrm{~s}}^{\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}}$ | $\} 0.226$ | 0.330 | 0.154 | 0.155 | 0.204 | 0.204 | 0.195 | 0.199 | 0.214 | 0.094 | 0.192 |
| $\mathrm{Ubr,}^{\text {d }} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}$ |  |  | 0.405 | 0.413 | 0.961 | 0.958 | 1.25 |  |  |  |  |
| $V_{G} / \varepsilon_{G}(0) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}$ | 0.270 | 0.346 | 0.365 | 0.414 | 0.402 | 0.463 | 0.564 | 0.231 | 0.168 | 0.172 | 0.239 |
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## Figure 2.19
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dynamic gas disengagement data. The foaming and/or flooding for 1.6 wt\% butanol is observed by presence of foam layer height decline. From disengagement analysis, $1 w t \%$ methanol and * wt\% methanol have bubble rise velocities uniformly increasing with gas velocity. The bubble rise velocity for * wt\% methanol being larger at any gas velocity. This observation can be confirmed from Figure 2.16. Surface tension of ethanol solutions showed unaccountable foaming tendency, which could have been because of presence of additives in the ethanol.

After analysis of all the holdup data points for alcohol solutions, the effect of surface tension is found to be negligible. The gas holdup is correlated with the gas velocity and the number of carbon atoms in the alcohol to yield an equation:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon_{G}=1.4156 V_{G}^{0.692}\left(c_{N}\right)^{0.213} \tag{2.4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

The overall percent error defined as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { Error }=\frac{\sum^{\operatorname{ABS}\left(\varepsilon_{\mathrm{GO}_{0}}-\varepsilon_{\mathrm{Gp}}\right)}}{\varepsilon_{\mathrm{Go}}} \quad * 100.0 \tag{2.4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Error $1 s 13 \%$ between the correlation and the data. When the correlation developed in Section 1.3 is used, it always tends to predict lower gas holdup values and the overall percent error is as high as $21 \%$. Figure 2.20 shows a plot of gas holdup predicted vs. gas holdup observed.

Thus, it is evident that most of the gas transported through the aqueous alcohol solutions, flows in the form of small bubbles. For lower alcohols the fraction of large bubbles is significant, being as high as
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[^1]:    *These solutions are prepared differently to yield different viscosities compared to $0.05 \mathrm{wt}, 0.1 \mathrm{wt}$ CMC solutions.

