Granular segregation in circular tumblers: Theoretical model and scaling laws
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We model bidisperse size segregation of granular material in quasi-2D circular tumbler flow using the advection-diffusion transport equation with an additional term to account for segregation due to percolation. Segregation depends on three dimensionless parameters: the ratio of segregation to advection, Λ, the ratio of advection to diffusion, Pe, and the dimensionless flowing layer depth, ϵ. The degree of segregation in steady state depends only on the ratio of segregation effects to diffusion effects, ΛPe, and the degree of segregation increases as ΛPe is increased. The transient time to reach steady state segregation depends only on advection, which is manifested in ϵ and Pe when ΛPe is constant. This model is also applied to unsteady tumbler flow, where the rotation speed is varied with time.

1. Introduction

Segregation of dense, sheared, granular mixtures of different-sized particles occurs widely in both nature and industry. Examples include particle sorting during debris flow (Hutter et al. 1996) and particle separation in rotating tumbler mixers (Ottino & Khakhar 2000; Meier et al. 2007). In most circumstances, size segregation is undesirable and even destructive. Therefore, a model that can quantitatively predict size segregation is useful. This model should be capable of predicting two aspects of the process: i) the final particle configurations when segregation reaches steady state and ii) the transient behavior of size segregation that influences the efficiency of various industrial processes (e.g. segregation and mixing rate). While several models have been developed to predict size segregation in recent years (Shinohara et al. 1972; Bouteaux 1998; Khakhar et al. 2001; Gray & Thornton 2005; Gray & Chugunov 2006; Gray et al. 2006; Shearer et al. 2008; Thornton & Gray 2008; Gray & Ancey 2009; May et al. 2010; Fan & Hill 2011; Fan et al. 2014a; Woodhouse et al. 2012; Tunuguntla et al. 2014), most consider less complicated granular flows, such as plug, annular shear, or chute flow. Although some of these studies (Gray & Thornton 2005; Gray et al. 2006; Gray & Ancey 2009; Shearer et al. 2008; Thornton & Gray 2008; Gray & Ancey 2009; Woodhouse et al. 2012) considered time-dependent segregation problems, the time-dependent segregation models in these papers were for relatively simple flows and were not compared with or validated by experiments.
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In this paper, we use rotating tumbler flow, a flow with relatively complicated kinematics, as a model flow to develop a continuum model that quantitatively predicts both steady and transient size segregation.

A schematic of continuous quasi-2D circular tumbler flow is shown in figure 1. As the tumbler rotates at angular velocity $\omega$, most particles are in solid body rotation (below the dashed curve in figure 1) rotating with the tumbler. In the flowing layer (above the dashed curve), particles quickly flow down the slope and re-enter solid body rotation in the downstream (right) half of the flowing layer (see the streamlines in figure 1). For a size bidisperse system, small particles (with diameter $d_s$) in the flowing layer fall between large particle voids, percolate downward, and enter solid body rotation towards the center of the tumbler. Large particles (with diameter $d_l$) segregate upward, are advected to the end of the flowing layer, and enter solid body rotation near the cylindrical tumbler wall (Williams 1968; Drahun & Bridgwater 1983; Savage & Lun 1988; Ottino & Khakhar 2000).

Various segregation patterns are observed in tumbler flow when the tumbler geometry or operating conditions are varied. For less than 50% full circular tumblers rotating with a constant angular velocity, radial segregation patterns in which small particles accumulate in the middle of the bed of particles, while large particles accumulate near the outer tumbler walls have been observed in both experiments (Cantelaube & Bideau 1995; Metcalfe 1996; Hill et al. 1999; Jain et al. 2005; Meier et al. 2007; Gray & Ancey 2011) and simulations (Dury & Ristow 1997, 1999; Pereira & Cleary 2013; Arntz et al. 2014; Alizadeh et al. 2014). In addition to radial segregation patterns, lobed segregation patterns...
patterns are observed for circular tumblers more than 50% full (Gray & Hutter 1997; Hill et al. 2004; Meier et al. 2007, 2008), circular tumblers with a non-uniform rotation speed (Fiedor & Ottino 2005), and in steadily rotating non-circular tumblers (Hill et al. 1999; Ottino & Khakhar 2000; Cisar et al. 2006; Meier et al. 2006, 2007).

To model the segregation patterns observed in experiments and computational simulations, several theoretical approaches have been developed. Poincaré sections have long been used to explain the segregation patterns that occur in tumbler flows (Hill et al. 1999; Cisar et al. 2006; Meier et al. 2007, 2008). Cisar et al. (2006) developed a Lagrangian segregation model that incorporated the mean velocity of small and large particles, as well as a segregation velocity and a Langevin term to represent diffusion. From an Eulerian point of view, strange eigenmodes have been used to combine advection and diffusion to explain segregation patterns in non-circular tumblers (Christov et al. 2011).

While results from these studies qualitatively matched experiments and DEM simulations, the methods used in them alone cannot predict the segregation patterns and the degree of segregation based on the particle sizes, the rotation speed, and the tumbler radius.

Several continuum models have been proposed for size segregation in tumblers (Prigozhin & Kalman 1998; Chakraborty et al. 2000; Khakhar et al. 2001). However, these approaches have major shortcomings, such as assuming the flowing layer depth to be infinitely thin (Prigozhin & Kalman 1998), completely separating the small particles and large particles (Khakhar et al. 2001), and assuming large and small particles are approximately the same size, so the variation in small and large particle concentrations is small (Chakraborty et al. 2000). These assumptions oversimplify the effect of key physical properties of segregation, so that it is difficult to predict and understand segregation patterns quantitatively across a broad range of physical parameters.

In this paper, we use a continuum approach based on the generic transport equation to model bidisperse size segregation in rotating circular tumblers. This continuum model has been developed and used by several research groups (Bridgwater et al. 1985; Savage & Lun 1988; Dolgunin & Ukolov 1995; Gray & Thornton 2005; Gray & Chugunov 2006; Gray & Ancey 2009; May et al. 2010; Fan & Hill 2011; Marks et al. 2012) in different flow geometries and has achieved success in modelling size segregation qualitatively. Most recently, within this theoretical framework, we developed a model that considers the roles of three mechanisms: advection, shear-dependent percolation, and collisional diffusion (Fan et al. 2014a). The model predicted size bidisperse segregation in bounded heap flow quantitatively and revealed that all the three mechanisms are important when modelling size segregation in complex granular flows. Specifically, using this approach, we found that the segregation patterns in bounded heaps depend on two dimensionless parameters: a parameter related to advection and segregation, Λ, and a Péclet number, Pe, related to advection and collisional diffusion. In tumbler flow, in addition to Λ and Pe, segregation also depends on a third dimensionless parameter, , the dimensionless depth of the flowing layer. Using this continuum equation approach, we parametrically study segregation patterns in 50% full circular tumblers as a function of these three dimensionless parameters.

In contrast to quasi-2D bounded heaps (the system considered by Fan et al. (2014a)), tumbler flow presents new challenges. First, in tumbler flow, the flowing layer depth varies with streamwise position, while the flowing layer in the bounded heap is assumed to have a constant depth. Second, as the segregation pattern develops, tumbler flow is time-dependent, while in bounded heaps it is sufficient to consider steady state flow. The time-dependent model allows the study of modulated flow, where the rotation speed varies with time.
2. Modelling Tumbler Flow

Here, for simplicity, we consider only half full tumblers (sketched in figure 1), but the approach can readily be applied to other fill levels. Additionally, we consider only continuously flowing material for which the surface of the flowing layer is flat (figure 1), which occurs when the Froude number, \( Fr = \frac{\omega^2 R_0}{g} \), which represents the ratio of inertial to gravitational forces, is in the range \( 10^{-4} < Fr < 10^{-2} \) (Mellmann 2001; Meier et al. 2007). For Froude numbers not in this range, either avalanching, cataracting, or centrifuging occurs, and different segregation mechanisms and patterns are possible (Meier et al. 2007).

There have been many previous studies of flow kinematics in tumblers (Makse 1999; Orpe & Khakhar 2001; Jain et al. 2002; Bonamy et al. 2002; Alexander et al. 2002; Meier et al. 2007). The velocity field in the flowing layer can be assumed to have a constant shear rate (Jain et al. 2004; Meier et al. 2007), yielding the velocity field:

\[
\begin{align*}
    u(x, z) &= \begin{cases} 
    \omega \left( \frac{R_0^2}{\delta_0^2} - 1 \right) (z + \delta(x)) & \text{if } z > -\delta(x) \\
    \omega z & \text{if } z \leq -\delta(x),
    
    w(x, z) &= \begin{cases} 
    \omega \left( 1 - \frac{\delta(x)}{R_0^2} \right) \frac{x z}{\delta(x)} & \text{if } z > -\delta(x) \\
    -\omega x & \text{if } z \leq -\delta(x),
    
    \end{cases}
    
    \end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]

(2.1)

where \( R_0 \) is the tumbler radius, \( u \) and \( w \) are the velocity components in the streamwise \( (x) \) and normal \( (z) \), respectively, and \( \omega \) is the rotation rate. \( \delta(x) \) is the flowing layer thickness at streamwise location \( x \) and is defined as (Makse 1999; Meier et al. 2007)

\[
\delta(x) = \delta_0 \sqrt{1 - \left( \frac{x}{R_0} \right)^2},
\]

(2.2)

where \( \delta_0 \) is the maximum thickness of the flowing layer. It is important to note that the velocity field given in equation (2.1) is an approximation. This is evident as there is a discontinuity at the bottom of the flowing layer \( (z = -\delta(x)) \). However, since the particle velocity in solid body rotation near the bottom of the flowing layer is small if \( \delta_0/R_0 \) is not too large, the discontinuity is inconsequential for the purposes of this approach, and equation (2.1) well describes the velocity of particles in a tumbler.

From equation (2.1), the surface velocity is

\[
u(x, 0) = \omega \left( \frac{R_0^2}{\delta_0} - \delta_0 \right) \sqrt{1 - \left( \frac{x}{R_0} \right)^2}.
\]

(2.3)

The velocity field, given by equation (2.1), is determined by \( R_0, \omega, \) and \( \delta_0 \). While previous work (Pignatel et al. 2012) has extensively studied the relationship between \( \delta_0 \) and the system parameters, here we measure \( \delta_0 \) from discrete element method (DEM) simulations. In addition to determining \( \delta_0 \), DEM simulations are used to validate our theoretical modeling.

In DEM simulations, to compute the interactions between particles, we use a linear spring-dashpot force model for normal forces and a linear spring model with Coulomb friction for tangential forces. Details and validation of the DEM model appear in Fan et al. (2013). In the simulations presented here, particles are mm-sized spheres with density \( \rho_p = 2500 \text{ kg/m}^3 \) and restitution coefficient 0.8. Particle-particle and particle-wall friction coefficients are set to \( \mu_p = 0.4 \). The binary collision time is set to \( t_c = 10^{-3} \text{ s} \) for...
greater computational efficiency, yet sufficient for modelling hard spheres (Silbert et al. 2007). An integration time step of $\Delta t = t_c/100 = 1 \times 10^{-5}$ s is used to assure numerical stability. To reduce particle ordering, particles of each species are given a uniform size distribution between $0.9d_i$ and $1.1d_i$, where $d_i$ is the mean particle diameter for each species $i$.

The simulated tumblers have two flat, frictional endwalls separated by $4.33d_i$. The tumbler radius is $R_0 = 75$ mm, and the rotation speeds are 0.25 rad/s, 0.5 rad/s, and 0.75 rad/s. The steady state for kinematics of the mixture is assumed to occur when the dynamic angle of the repose, $\alpha$, the surface velocity at the origin, and the degree of segregation no longer vary with time. Then the steady state values of kinematic variables are measured by averaging over one rotation. Figure 2 shows profiles from DEM simulations of the surface velocity in the streamwise direction and the streamwise velocity profile in the depth direction at the steady state. To determine $\delta_0$, a nonlinear least-squares regression was implemented in MATLAB to fit the surface velocity from DEM simulations (figure 2(a)) to equation (2.3). As shown in figure 2(a), the surface velocity from the DEM simulations matches equation (2.3) reasonably well. In figure 2(b), the streamwise velocity $u$ is plotted as a function of $z$ for the same four DEM simulations shown in figure 2(a). The streamwise velocity decreases approximately linearly as $z$ decreases, justifying the form of the velocity field in equation (2.1). While the streamwise velocity in the DEM simulations does not decrease to 0 at the bottom of the flowing layer as indicated by equation (2.1), it is close enough (between 5% and 20% of the surface velocity) that the velocity field given by equation (2.1) provides a reasonable approximation to the flow for use in the theoretical model. This discrepancy is likely due to the discontinuity in the streamwise velocity $u$ in equation (2.1), as discussed previously.
3. Segregation model

To model segregation in tumbler flow, the transport equation model (Fan et al. 2014a) is applied to the flowing layer:

\[
\frac{\partial c_i}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (uc_i) + \frac{\partial}{\partial z}(w_{p,i} c_i) = \nabla \cdot (D \nabla c_i), \quad x \in [-R_0, R_0], \quad z \in [-\delta(x), 0].
\] (3.1)

The second term on the left-hand side represents advective transport due to the mean flow of particles, while the third term represents transport normal to the free surface due to segregation (it is assumed that both species have the same velocity in the streamwise direction). The right-hand side of the equation represents collisional diffusion. In bidisperse mixtures, \(i\) refers to the small or large particles (i.e. \(i = s\) or \(i = l\)), and no subscript is used for variables representing the combined flow. The concentration of species \(i\) is defined as \(c_i = f_i/f\), where \(f_i\) is the volume fraction of species \(i\) and \(f = f_s + f_l\).

\(u = u\hat{x} + v\hat{y} + w\hat{z}\) is the mean velocity field of the flow (both species), \(D\) is the diffusion coefficient, and \(w_{p,i}\) is the percolation velocity of species \(i\), which accounts for the relative motion of the two species in the normal direction. Below the flowing layer, particles are assumed to be in solid body rotation, so no segregation or diffusion occurs (equation (3.1) with \(w_{p,i} = 0\) and \(D = 0\)).

The percolation velocity of each species in a bidisperse mixture can be approximated as a linear function of the shear rate and the concentration of the other species (Savage & Lun 1988; Gray & Thornton 2005; Fan et al. 2014a):

\[
w_{p,s} = -S\dot{\gamma}(1 - c_s), \quad w_{p,l} = S\dot{\gamma}(1 - c_l),
\] (3.2)

where \(\dot{\gamma}\) is the shear rate and \(\dot{\gamma} = \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial w}{\partial z} \approx \frac{\partial u}{\partial x}\), since \(u \gg w\) in most of the flowing layer if \(R_0 \gg \delta_0\). \(S\) is the percolation length scale, which depends on the particle sizes and the particle size ratio (Fan et al. 2014a). While it would be possible to measure \(S\) directly from the tumbler simulations using the methodology described in Fan et al. (2014a) and Schlick et al. (2014), it would be necessary to do so during the unsteady portion of the flow when segregation is not complete. At steady state segregation, it is not possible to get a reliable value for the percolation velocity because small and large particles are almost completely separated. Since steady state segregation occurs quickly (after about 1 rotation), it is difficult to obtain a time-averaged value for the percolation velocity, and it is not possible to accurately estimate \(S\) from the tumbler simulation without running a large number of DEM simulations. In contrast, segregation occurs continuously in steady state in the flowing layer of bounded heaps (as explored in Fan et al. (2014a) and Schlick et al. (2014)), making it quite easy to measure the percolation velocity, and thus \(S\), in steady state. Since the percolation velocity accounts for local particle segregation under shear, it depends only on the local kinematics. For this reason, we use the relation for \(S\) from DEM simulations of quasi-2D bounded heap flow (of mm-sized spherical glass particles) (Schlick et al. 2014). This further allows us to explore the general applicability of particle segregation results obtained with one flow system to segregation in another.

The relation for \(S\) (Schlick et al. 2014) is:

\[
S(d_s, d_l) = 0.26d_s \log \left( \frac{d_l}{d_s} \right).
\] (3.3)

To nondimensionalize equation (3.1), lengths are scaled by \(R_0\) and time is scaled by \(1/\omega\). Dimensionless variables are denoted with a tilde. The dimensionless velocities in
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the flowing layer \((-\epsilon\sqrt{1-\hat{x}^2} < \hat{z} < 0)\) are

\[
\begin{align*}
\hat{u}(\hat{x}, \hat{z}; \epsilon) &= \frac{1 - \epsilon^2}{\epsilon^2} \left( \hat{z} + \epsilon\sqrt{1-\hat{x}^2} \right), \\
\hat{w}(\hat{x}, \hat{z}; \epsilon) &= \frac{1 - \epsilon^2}{\epsilon} \frac{\hat{z}\hat{x}}{\sqrt{1-\hat{x}^2}},
\end{align*}
\]  

(3.4)

where \(\epsilon \equiv \delta_0/R_0\) is the dimensionless flowing layer depth.

Averaging over the spanwise \((y)\) direction, neglecting diffusion in the streamwise \((x)\) direction (as we are primarily interested in diffusion acting in opposition to segregation), assuming diffusion is constant in the flowing layer (as in Fan et al. (2014a)), and changing to dimensionless variables, equation (3.1) becomes

\[
\frac{\partial c_i}{\partial t} + \hat{u} \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial \hat{x}} + \hat{w} \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial \hat{z}} = \pm \Lambda c_i \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial \hat{z}} [c_i(1 - c_i)] = \frac{\epsilon^2}{\text{Pe}} \frac{\partial^2 c_i}{\partial \hat{z}^2},
\]

(3.5)

where the “+” sign is taken for large particles and the “−” sign is taken for small particles. \(\Lambda = S(1 - \epsilon^2)/R_0 \nu^3\) is the ratio of the advection time scale to the segregation timescale \((\Lambda = (1/\omega)/\langle \delta_0/w_p, t \rangle = (1/\omega)/\langle \delta_0/S \gamma \rangle)\), and \(\text{Pe} = \omega R_0^2 \epsilon^2 / D\) is the ratio of the diffusion time scale to the advection time scale \((\text{Pe} = \langle \delta_0^2 / D \rangle / (1/\omega))\). The numerical method used to solve this equation (with proper boundary conditions (Gray & Chugunov 2006)) is described shortly. Note that \(\epsilon\) appears in equation (3.5) apart from the parameters \(\Lambda\) and \(\text{Pe}\) since, for the same values of \(\Lambda\) and \(\text{Pe}\) but different \(\epsilon\), the ratio among the three timescales remains the same, which is discussed later in this section.

The dimensionless parameters \(\epsilon, \Lambda, \) and \(\text{Pe}\) determine the time evolution of the segregation in circular tumbler flow. \(\Lambda\) and \(\text{Pe}\) are functions of both control parameters (tumbler radius \(R_0\), rotation rate \(\omega\), and small and large particle diameters \(d_s\) and \(d_l\)) and kinematic parameters (percolation length scale \(S\), maximum flowing layer depth \(\delta_0\), and diffusion coefficient \(D\)), which can be difficult to measure. Previous results have been used to express these kinematic parameters in terms of the control parameters: \(S\) is a function of \(d_s\) and \(d_l\) only (see equation (3.3)) (Fan et al. 2014a; Schlick et al. 2014), \(D\) is related to the particle sizes and the shear rate (Fan et al. 2014a,b), and \(\delta_0\) is a function of the tumbler radius, the particle sizes, and the rotation velocity (Pignateli et al. 2012).

The segregation model, given by equation (3.5), has been previously applied to bounded heap flow in steady state, and good agreement between the model, DEM simulations, and experiments was observed (Fan et al. 2014a; Schlick et al. 2014). Tumbler flow, however, is more challenging since there is an initial transient as the initially mixed particles segregate. Moreover, the flowing layer depth for bounded heaps can be assumed to be constant, while the flowing layer depth for tumblers varies with position, further complicating the application of equation (3.5). Nevertheless, equation (3.5) can be solved to give particle concentrations at any time during the initial transient through formation of the steady state segregation pattern.

To solve equation (3.5) in the flowing layer, boundary conditions are required. At the bottom and top of the flowing layer \((\hat{z} = -\delta(x), 0)\), the segregation flux is equal to the diffusive flux (Gray & Chugunov 2006),

\[
\pm \Lambda c_i (1 - c_i) = \frac{\epsilon^2}{\text{Pe}} \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial \hat{z}}.
\]

(3.6)

The boundary condition at the bottom of the flowing layer requires that particles do not leave the flowing layer due to diffusion or segregation, but leave due to advection alone, so that the mass of each species is conserved in the entire tumbler. For more details on the validity of this boundary condition, see Fan et al. (2014a).
Equation (3.5) is solved with an operator splitting scheme (Christov et al. 2011; Schlick et al. 2013) which solves the advection step and the segregation/diffusion step separately. The advection step is solved with a matrix mapping method (Singh et al. 2009), and the segregation/diffusion step is solved with the implicit Crank-Nicolson method. The numerical method is detailed in our previous work (Fan et al. 2014a).

To justify including $\epsilon$ as a separate parameter in addition to $\Lambda$ and $Pe$ in equation (3.5), consider the segregation/diffusion step in the operator splitting scheme:

$$\frac{\partial c_i}{\partial t} \pm \Lambda c_i \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{z}} [c_i(1-c_i)] = \frac{\epsilon^2}{Pe} \frac{\partial^2 c_i}{\partial \tilde{z}^2}, \quad (3.7)$$

where $-\epsilon \sqrt{1-x^2} < \tilde{z} < 0$. Let $\tilde{z}' = \tilde{z}/\epsilon$, so that equation (3.7) is transformed to

$$\frac{\partial c_i}{\partial t} \pm \Lambda c_i \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{z}'} [c_i(1-c_i)] = \frac{1}{Pe} \frac{\partial^2 c_i}{\partial \tilde{z}'^2}, \quad (3.8)$$

where $-\sqrt{1-x^2} < \tilde{z}' < 0$. Since equation (3.8) no longer depends on $\epsilon$, it would be expected that, for $\Lambda$ and $Pe$ constant, similar segregation patterns should occur for different $\epsilon$. Note that it is not expected that the segregation patterns (nor the time to reach steady state) should be identical, since the velocity field and the geometry of the flowing layer depend on $\epsilon$. The effect of $\epsilon$ on segregation patterns is discussed in detail in section 5.1.

4. Model predictions

Figure 3 shows the evolution of the small particle concentration for three different values of $\Lambda$ for an initially mixed ($c_s = c_l = 0.5$ everywhere), clockwise rotating tumbler with $Pe = 10$ and $\epsilon = 0.1$. In each case, the small particles fall to the bottom of the flowing layer as they move downstream in the flowing layer (left to right in figure 1), and gather in the center of the bed of particles in the tumbler; large particles rise to the top of the flowing layer as they move downstream, and accumulate near the cylindrical wall of the tumbler.

Segregation is stronger in the first column of figure 3 than in the other two columns, since $\Lambda$ is larger. At 1/4 rotation, approximately half the particles have transited the flowing layer, while the other half have not. Particles that have not yet transited the flowing layer remain well-mixed, while particles that have gone through the flowing layer have begun to segregate. This is evident in a close-up of the flowing layer for this case (1st column of figure 3 after 1/4 rotation) in figure 4. Particles (which have not yet gone through the flowing layer) enter the flowing layer mixed (orange) on the left, and as they flow down the flowing layer (left to right in figure 4), they segregate.

After 1/2 rotation in the first column of figure 3, most of the particles have passed through the flowing layer once and have begun to segregate; after 1 rotation, most of the particles have passed through the flowing layer twice, and the segregation is enhanced compared to 1/2 rotation. The system has reached steady state after about 1 rotation, since there is not a large difference in the amount of segregation after 1 rotation compared to after 4 or 8 rotations. At a reduced $\Lambda$ (second column of figure 3), segregation takes longer and is not as strong, and steady state requires about 4 rotations to be reached. At the smallest value of $\Lambda$ (final column of figure 3), there is little segregation, except for a small core comprised of a slightly higher concentration of small particles, which appears after about 4 rotations. The steady state segregation pattern and the time it takes to achieve steady state is discussed in further detail in section 5.

To validate the theoretical model, we compare particle concentrations from theory
Figure 3. Theoretical predictions of small particle concentrations (solution to equation (3.5)) in the particle filled portion of the tumbler for three different flow and segregation conditions at various times. Dashed curves indicate the bottom of the flowing layer. $\text{Pe} = 10$ and $\epsilon = 0.1$.

Figure 4. Close-up of the tumbler flowing layer after 1/4 rotation for the case shown in the first column of figure 3. Dashed curve indicates the bottom of the flowing layer. Streamlines for the mean particle flow shown as solid black curves. The colormap is the same as in figure 3.
and DEM simulation for 1 mm and 3 mm diameter particles and 1 mm and 1.5 mm diameter particles in a tumbler with radius $R_0 = 75$ mm and rotation rates of $\omega = 0.75$ rad/s and $\omega = 0.25$ rad/s for the two simulations respectively in figure 5. For these two flow conditions, the diffusion coefficient is calculated directly from the DEM simulation using the method described in Fan et al. (2014a), and $S$ is determined from the particle sizes as described by Schlick et al. (2014). For both flow conditions, the steady state theoretical predictions qualitatively match the steady state concentrations from simulations, as shown in the first two rows of figure 5. Furthermore, the model predictions quantitatively match the DEM simulations reasonably well, as shown in the last row of figure 5 which depicts the small particle concentration along a radial slice through the domain at $x = 0$.

To compare results from the segregation model to experiments without using data from DEM simulations, it is necessary to know the flowing layer depth $\delta_0$, the diffusion coefficient $D$, and the percolation length scale $S$. The flowing layer depth $\delta_0$ was extracted from videos of the experiment itself and confirmed by a previous empirical relation Pignatel et al. (2012); the diffusion coefficient $D$ was based on the dependence of $D$ on the shear rate in bounded heap flow Fan et al. (2014a) using the average shear rate according to the velocity field (2.1) occurring in the tumbler; and the segregation coefficient $S$ was based on the relation for steady segregation in bounded heap flow Fan et al. (2014a); Schlick et al. (2014). Thus, $\Lambda$, $Pe$, and $\epsilon$ are determined in terms of $d_s$, $d_l$, $R_0$, and $\omega$, and the concentration evolution can be estimated based on the control parameters.
Experiment

Theory

Initial condition 1/4 rotation 1/2 rotation 3/4 rotation 1 rotation

Figure 6. Segregation patterns in the particle filled portion of the tumbler for experiment (first row) and theory (second row). \( d_s = 1 \) mm (black particles), \( d_i = 3 \) mm (clear particles), \( \omega = 0.4 \) rad/s, \( R_0 = 140 \) mm, \( S = 0.29 \) mm, \( \delta_0 = 21.98 \) mm, \( D = 2.56 \) mm²/sec; \( \epsilon = .157 \), \( \Lambda = 0.52 \), \( \text{Pe} = 75.49 \). \( D \) and \( \delta_0 \) estimated from Fan et al. (2014b) and Pignatel et al. (2012), respectively. The “initial condition” in the experiment is actually obtained a very short amount of time after the tumbler has begun to rotate, so the concentration discontinuity has already formed. Experimental images courtesy of Steve Meier.

only. Figure 6 compares theory to experiment for 3 mm clear and 1 mm black spherical glass beads rotated in a tumbler of radius \( R_0 = 140 \) mm at \( \omega = 0.4 \) rad/s. Note that the experiments were performed with black and clear particles in a tumbler with finite thickness. Because of the clear particles, what appears as black in the experiment is actually a mixture of clear and black particles. Thus, it is difficult to visually differentiate black and clear particles for the clear particle concentration, \( c_{\text{clear}} \), near 0.5, as is evident in the experimental initial condition which is nearly all black for \( c_{\text{clear}} = 0.5 \) throughout the tumbler. Nevertheless, there is qualitative agreement between theory and experiment as a similar radial segregation pattern is observed in both. In addition, a discontinuity in the small particle concentration is observed in both experiment and theory for 1/4 and 3/4 rotation, representing the location of the initial segregation of particles when the tumbler begins to rotate. Note that there are no arbitrarily adjustable fitting parameters in the model. In fact, the velocity field and \( S \) come directly from well-established relations or previous results (for an entirely different flow field in the case of \( S \)). The similarity between the experiments and theory demonstrates the power of this segregation modelling approach.

5. A parametric study of \( \epsilon, \Lambda, \) and \( \text{Pe} \)

Since equation (3.5) predicts segregation patterns in tumbler flow consistent with DEM simulations and experiments, it is now possible to parametrically study the effects of \( \epsilon, \Lambda, \) and \( \text{Pe} \). Section 5.1 explores the effect of \( \epsilon \), and section 5.2 explores the effect of \( \Lambda \) and \( \text{Pe} \).

5.1. Effect of \( \epsilon \) on segregation

The effect of the flowing layer thickness, \( \epsilon = \delta_0/R_0 \), on the system is shown in figure 7. For the same values of \( \Lambda \) and \( \text{Pe} \), but different \( \epsilon \), the steady state segregation patterns are qualitatively similar, as predicted in section 3, since the ratio between the segregation timescale and the diffusion timescale remains constant. The quantitative difference is shown in figure 8(a), which plots the small particle concentration at \( x = 0 \) for the three cases shown in figure 7. The three curves match reasonably well in the fixed bed, \( z/R_0 < -\epsilon \). The major difference in the concentration occurs for values of \( z/R_0 \) near 0, due to the difference in flowing layer thickness.
To further assess the mixing and segregation in tumbler flow, we use the intensity of segregation (Danckwerts 1952)

\[ I_d(c) = \frac{1}{\bar{c}(1-\bar{c})} \frac{\int_\Omega (c-\bar{c})^2 d\Omega}{\int_\Omega d\Omega}, \tag{5.1} \]

where \( \Omega \) is the domain (particle filled portion of the tumbler) and \( \bar{c} = 0.5 \) is the average concentration. For a completely mixed state, \( c = \bar{c} \) everywhere, and \( I_d = 0 \); for a completely segregated state, \( c = 0 \) or \( c = 1 \) everywhere, and \( I_d = 1 \). Since \( c \) is a function of time, \( I_d \) is a function of time as well.

In figure 8(b), \( I_d(t) \) is plotted for the three cases shown in figure 7. \( I_d = 0 \) initially, and \( I_d \) increases as \( t \) increases and particles segregate more. As \( t \to \infty \), \( I_d \) approaches approximately the same value (\( \approx 0.3 \)) for all three cases. When time is scaled by \( 1/\epsilon \), all three curves collapse well. To understand this scaling, consider the surface velocity, \( \tilde{u}(x,0) \approx (1/\epsilon)\sqrt{1-\epsilon^2} \). As \( \epsilon \) decreases, the surface velocity increases, meaning that each particle spends less time in the flowing layer, and thus has less time to diffuse and segregate. In order to reach steady state, the particles must make more passes through the flowing layer. Therefore, since the surface velocity is inversely related to \( \epsilon \), scaling time by \( 1/\epsilon \) effectively keeps the time each particle spends in the flowing layer the same across different values of \( \epsilon \).
5.2. Effect of Λ and Pe on segregation

The effect of Λ and Pe on segregation is revealed by multiplying each term in equation (3.5) by Pe:

\[
\frac{\partial c_i}{\partial (\tilde{t}/Pe)} + \text{Pe} \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla c_i \pm \Lambda Pe \frac{\partial}{\partial z} [c_i(1 - c_i)] = \epsilon^2 \frac{\partial^2 c_i}{\partial z^2} \tag{5.2}
\]

In this equation, time is rescaled by Pe (\(\tilde{t} \rightarrow \tilde{t}/Pe\) and \(\mathbf{u} \rightarrow \text{Pe} \mathbf{u}\)). When \(\epsilon \ll 1\), the velocity field in the flowing layer is \(\mathbf{u} \approx (1/\epsilon^2)(\tilde{z} + \epsilon \sqrt{1 - \tilde{z}^2})\mathbf{e}_x\). At steady state, the concentration is primarily a function of \(z\) in the flowing layer, and only weakly depends on \(x\). Therefore, since \(\partial c/\partial x \approx 0\) and \(w \approx 0\), \(\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla c \approx 0\). Thus, in steady state,

\[
\pm \Lambda Pe \frac{\partial}{\partial z} [c_i(1 - c_i)] \approx \epsilon \frac{\partial^2 c_i}{\partial z^2} \tag{5.3}
\]

In the entire flowing layer, and the product \(\Lambda Pe = S \omega R_0 (1 - \epsilon^2)/\epsilon D\) determines the steady state concentrations for \(\epsilon \ll 1\). Physically, \(\Lambda Pe\) represents the ratio of the diffusion timescale to the segregation timescale. If \(\Lambda Pe\) is small, the granular mixture in the tumbler is well-mixed in steady state because diffusion dominates in the flowing layer; if \(\Lambda Pe\) is large, segregation dominates in the flowing layer, and the granular mixture in the tumbler is segregated in steady state.

As shown in section 5.1, the steady state concentration depends weakly on \(\epsilon\) provided \(\Lambda\) and \(Pe\) remain constant. Thus, for any \(\epsilon\), \(\Lambda Pe\) determines the steady state concentration. Therefore, we set \(\epsilon = 0.1\) and examine only the effects of varying \(\Lambda\) and \(Pe\) in the rest of this section. Figure 9 shows steady state concentration configurations for different values of \(\Lambda\) and \(Pe\). For \(\Lambda Pe\) constant (columns), the steady state concentration contours are nearly identical for different values of \(Pe\), as expected from equation (5.3). Furthermore, the concentrations of small particles through a radial slice (at \(x = 0\)) in the domain are shown in the bottom row of figure 9. For \(\Lambda Pe\) constant, particle concentrations in steady state are quantitatively similar.

To emphasize the equivalence of segregation with equal \(\Lambda Pe\), figure 10 shows \(I_d\) as a function of time for different values of \(\Lambda\) and \(Pe\). Motivated by equation (5.2), time is rescaled by \(Pe\), similar to figure 8(b), where time is rescaled by \(1/\epsilon\). At steady state, the largest \(\Lambda Pe\) gives the strongest segregation, and \(I_d\) is the largest in this case. In figure 10, this rescaling causes data with constant \(\Lambda Pe\) to collapse. Thus, the value of \(\Lambda Pe\) determines the steady state concentration configuration (and the ultimate value for \(I_d\)), and \(Pe\) (or, alternatively, \(\Lambda\)) determines the time to achieve steady state when \(\Lambda Pe\) is constant.

To examine the effect of \(\Lambda Pe\) on the segregation in tumbler flow further, figure 11 plots the steady state value of \(I_d\) as a function of \(\Lambda Pe\). For each value of \(\Lambda Pe\), six different \(\Lambda\) and \(Pe\) combinations are considered. For \(\Lambda Pe\) constant, all of the different combinations of \(\Lambda\) and \(Pe\) give approximately the same value for \(I_d\), as expected from figures 9 and 10. As \(\Lambda Pe\) increases, \(I_d\) increases as a power law for \(\Lambda Pe < O(1); I_d \sim (\Lambda Pe)^2\). This scaling of \(I_d\) for small values of \(\Lambda Pe\) is investigated through an asymptotic analysis in appendix A. As \(\Lambda Pe\) continues to increase, \(I_d\) asymptotically approaches \(I_d = 1\), which represents perfect segregation (\(c_s = 0\) or \(c_s = 1\) everywhere).

The steady state concentration in tumbler flow depends only on the relative strength of segregation and diffusion, determined by the parameter \(\Lambda Pe\), which represents the ratio of the diffusion timescale to the segregation timescale. For comparison, the steady state concentration for bounded heap flow depends on the effects of advection, as well as diffusion and segregation, as shown in Fan et al. (2014a). If advection effects are strong in bounded heaps, the inlet condition is preserved, as particles traverse the entire length.
of the flowing layer quickly with little time to diffuse or segregate. In the tumbler, if advection is strong particles do not have time to segregate or diffuse much during any single pass through the flowing layer. However, as particles pass through the flowing layer many times, steady state is ultimately reached as a result of an equilibrium between the effects of segregation and diffusion alone. Therefore, the steady state segregation pattern depends on only the product $\Lambda Pe$, in contrast to bounded heaps where it depends on
both $\Lambda$ and Pe. While $\Lambda\text{Pe}$ controls the steady state concentration, the time to steady state depends on $\epsilon$ and Pe, as shown in figures 8(b) and 10.

6. Modulated flow

Fiedor & Ottino (2005) experimentally studied segregation patterns for modulated flow in a tumbler by varying $\omega$ sinusoidally with time. In their study, both lobe segregation patterns and radial segregation patterns were obtained, depending on the period of the modulation of $\omega$. If the period of the tumbler rotation (i.e. time to complete one rotation) divided by the period of the modulation is even, then lobe segregation patterns occur, and if the period of the tumbler divided by the period of the modulation is odd, then radial segregation patterns occur. To further demonstrate the capability of our approach to unsteady flow and to better understand the underlying mechanisms, we apply our model to modulated tumbler flow.

Implementing modulated flow by varying the rotation speed directly in the theory is quite difficult, because the dimensionless parameters $\Lambda$, Pe, and $\epsilon$, and thus the velocity field $\tilde{u}$, all vary continuously with time. However, Fiedor & Ottino (2005) postulated that lobe patterns occur due to the changing flowing layer depth. To test this hypothesis, we consider a step function for varying $\epsilon$, while leaving $\Lambda$ and Pe constant:

$$
\epsilon(t) = \begin{cases} 
0.1 & \text{if } \mod(t, T_{\omega}) < T_{\omega}/2, \\
0.05 & \text{if } \mod(t, T_{\omega}) \geq T_{\omega}/2,
\end{cases}
$$

(6.1)

where $T_{\omega} = 2\pi/f_E$ is an integer multiple of the tumbler rotation period, and $f_E$ is the
forcing frequency of the modulation. In an experiment or DEM simulation, it would be quite difficult to vary $\epsilon$ while $\Lambda$ and Pe remain constant, as each are functions of the rotation speed, the tumbler radius, and the particle diameters in nontrivial ways. However, in this section, we only seek to test the hypothesis that lobe patterns in a flow with modulated rotation speed occur due to the varying flowing layer depth, and that the other factors that come about in modulated flow (such as varying of $\Lambda$ and Pe or the acceleration of particles in the flowing layer due to the change in rotation speed) play a minimal role in the final segregation pattern. Moreover, applying the segregation model to modulated flow further demonstrates the power that this approach has to unsteady flows.

Figure 12 shows small particle concentration for different values of $f_E$ for theory (first row) and experiment (Fiedor & Ottino 2005) (second row). For the experiment and the theory, the images are obtained after a few rotations, and these patterns do not change substantially as the tumbler continues to rotate. $\Lambda$ and Pe were chosen such that segregation is strong, and are not meant to exactly match the experimental conditions. The segregation patterns observed in both the theory and experiment are qualitatively similar, with lobe patterns occurring for $f_E$ even and radial patterns occurring for $f_E$ odd. While there is more complex structure associated with the theory compared to the experiment (probably due to the step change in $\epsilon$ rather than the smoothly varying $\epsilon$ in the experiments), the qualitative agreement between the two is remarkable given the simplicity of the underlying assumptions. Thus, this confirms the hypothesis of Fiedor & Ottino (2005) that the lobe patterns are caused by variation in the flowing layer depth.

For $f_E$ even in figure 12, the lobe segregation patterns that occur have $f_E/2$ lobes; for $f_E$ odd, radial segregation patterns without distinct lobes occur. For any $f_E$, when there is an abrupt switch from $\epsilon = 0.1$ to $\epsilon = 0.05$, the small particles at the bottom of the flowing layer when $\epsilon = 0.1$ are immediately switched to solid body rotation, creating a region in the solid body of mostly small particles. The flowing layer, at this point, is mostly large particles, and thus a region of large particles immediately follows the small particles in solid body rotation. When $f_E$ is even, particles enter the flowing layer at approximately the same time in each cycle, and this effect is reinforced. Thus, the lobe pattern is stabilized. For $f_E$ odd, particles enter the flowing layer half a period removed from the previous cycle, and the effect is diminished. Consequently, only radial segregation patterns occur, though there are still slight incursions of large particles into the small particle regions, consistent with the experiments.

7. Conclusion

Using the continuum transport equation model of Fan et al. (2014a) we have developed a theoretical approach for predicting granular segregation patterns in bidisperse tumbler flow. In contrast to bounded heap flow, the system studied by Fan et al. (2014a), tumbler flow offers new challenges, such as a varying flowing layer depth and an unsteady transient. Theoretical predictions are consistent with results from experiments and discrete element method simulations. The model utilizes three dimensionless parameters: a parameter related to the segregation, $\Lambda$, a Péclet number, Pe, related to collisional diffusion, and the dimensionless flowing layer depth, $\epsilon$. Steady state particle concentrations are determined primarily by the product $\Lambda$Pe and are insensitive to $\epsilon$. However, for $\Lambda$Pe constant, the time to steady state depends on $\epsilon$ and Pe. Using this model, modulation of the rotational speed of the tumbler can be simulated by varying the parameter $\epsilon$. Both lobe and radial segregation patterns are obtained depending on the frequency of the modulation, similar to experiments (Fiedor & Ottino 2005).
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Much work remains for modeling tumbler flows. First, it would be useful in many industrial applications to relate segregation patterns to the control parameters of the system (such as the rotation speed, the tumbler radius, and the particle sizes) instead of the dimensionless parameters ($\Lambda$, $Pe$, and $\epsilon$). Additionally, while only 50% full circular tumblers were considered here, this approach can be generalized to non-half full circular tumblers, as well as tumblers with non-circular cross-sections.
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Appendix A. Asymptotic analysis of $I_d$ in tumbler flow for $\Lambda\text{Pe}$ small

In figure 11, it was shown that $I_d \sim (\Lambda\text{Pe})^2$ for $\Lambda\text{Pe} < O(1)$. Here, this relationship is verified using an asymptotic analysis.

It was shown that, in the flowing layer for $\epsilon \ll 1$,

$$\pm \Lambda\text{Pe} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{z}} [c_i(1 - c_i)] \approx \epsilon \frac{\partial^2 c_i}{\partial \tilde{z}^2}, \quad (A\ 1)$$

where the “+” sign is used for large particles and the “−” sign is used for small particles. In order to simplify the complex dynamics of tumbler flow, consider this simple one dimensional problem at $\tilde{x} = 0$ and $-\epsilon < \tilde{z} < 0$. Defining $\tilde{z}' = \tilde{z}/\epsilon$ (so $-1 < \tilde{z}' < 0$) and applying no flux boundary conditions at $\tilde{z}' = -1$ and $\tilde{z}' = 0$, equation (A 1) becomes

$$\pm \Lambda\text{Pe} c_i(1 - c_i) = \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial \tilde{z}'} \quad (A\ 2)$$

Also, let

$$\int_{-1}^{0} c_i(\tilde{z}') d\tilde{z}' = \frac{1}{2}, \quad (A\ 3)$$

so that the average small and large particle concentrations are equal in the domain.

For $\Lambda\text{Pe} = 0$, $c_s = c_l = 0.5$ for $-1 \leq \tilde{z}' \leq 0$. For $\Lambda\text{Pe} \ll 1$, expand $c_i$ about 0.5:

$$c_i(\tilde{z}') \sim 0.5 + (\Lambda\text{Pe}) \xi_i(\tilde{z}') + \ldots \quad (A\ 4)$$

Substituting this expression into equation (A 2) yields

$$\pm \Lambda\text{Pe} [0.25 - (\Lambda\text{Pe})^2 \xi_i^2] + \ldots = (\Lambda\text{Pe}) \frac{\partial \xi_i}{\partial \tilde{z}'} + \ldots \quad (A\ 5)$$

The $O(\Lambda\text{Pe})$ equation is

$$O(\Lambda\text{Pe}) : \quad \pm 0.25 = \frac{\partial \xi_i}{\partial \tilde{z}'} \quad (A\ 6)$$

Solving this gives $\xi_i = \pm 0.25 \tilde{z}' + A_i$, where $A_i$ is a constant. From equation (A 3), $A_i = \pm 1/8$, giving

$$c_i(\tilde{z}') = 0.5 + (\Lambda\text{Pe}) \left( \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{4} \tilde{z}' \right) + O((\Lambda\text{Pe})^2), \quad (A\ 7)$$

$$c_s(\tilde{z}') = 0.5 - (\Lambda\text{Pe}) \left( \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{4} \tilde{z}' \right) + O((\Lambda\text{Pe})^2).$$

In this simplified problem, $I_d$ can be defined as

$$I_d(c) = \frac{1}{\bar{c}(1 - \bar{c})} \int_{-1}^{0} (c - \bar{c})^2 d\tilde{z}', \quad (A\ 8)$$

where $\bar{c} = 0.5$. Substituting equation (A 7) into this expression yields

$$I_d(c_i) \sim (\Lambda\text{Pe})^2, \quad (A\ 9)$$

which is the same scaling that was found in figure 11.