Reynolds number effects on mixing and reaction in a turbulent pipe flow
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Abstract

A new Lagrangian mixing model is presented that describes the turbulent mixing of reacting scalars as a cascade process from large to small scales. The model is derived by applying guidance of Eulerian multi-scale mixing models. Compared to these models, the essential advantage of the derived Lagrangian model is given by the fact that approximations are restricted to the simulation of mixing processes, i.e., chemical transformations are treated exactly. In contrast to previously applied Lagrangian methods for scalar fields, the model presented here is shown to be applicable to inhomogeneous reacting liquid-phase flows. This is of relevance to important practical applications and further developments of models for the scalar mixing in multi-phase flows. Evidence for the derived mixing model in its general formulation is provided for different flows through its full consistency with well-tested Eulerian transport equations. Applications to different homogeneous flows reveal essential features of the mixing model. Two new theoretical findings are presented: First, the appearance of scalar gradients may lead to a significant reduction of the composition frequency. Second, the model structure presented here permits the derivation of an algebraic model for the composition frequency by relatively weak assumptions. The good performance of that algebraic version of the general mixing model is demonstrated by simulating mixing and parallel chemical reactions in a turbulent pipe flow. It is shown that the error of conventional techniques that neglect Reynolds number effects may amount to 50\% for the considered case. These errors may be larger if more complex reaction mechanisms have to be considered. © 2001 Elsevier Science Ltd. All rights reserved.
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1. Introduction

The calculation of turbulent reacting flows by probability density function (PDF) methods offers significant advantages compared to the application of Reynolds-averaged equation methods, because essential closure problems do not appear that have to be handled in those approaches. Importantly, turbulence--chemistry interactions can be calculated in the PDF approach without having to make assumptions on chemical conversions, i.e., approximations are restricted to the description of turbulent mixing (Pope, 1985, 2000; Fox, 1996; Baldyga & Bourne, 1999). Nevertheless, the simulation of these mixing processes represents an intricate problem: they take place at various scales and their intensity may vary over orders of magnitude. The energy-containing and inertial subranges (see Fig. 1), where mixing is driven through inhomogeneities of mean fields (Pope & Chen, 1990; Pope, 1991; Van Slooten, Jayesh, & Pope, 1998; Heinz, 1998), usually present the most important parts of the spectrum of mixing processes. The consideration of mixing processes at the Kolmogorov and Batchelor scales is often restricted to the modelling of their dissipative influence on the large scales, but their explicit resolution may also be essential for both velocity and scalar fields.

With reference to flow fields, the simulation of mixing processes at the Kolmogorov-scale is especially important near solid walls, where the viscous transport dominates the balance of the turbulent kinetic energy (TKE). Different approaches had been presented to consider these Reynolds number effects in PDF methods. The consideration of the motion of fluid particles leads to
complicated non-Markovian stochastic equations for particle velocities, because the finite correlation of their accelerations has to be taken into account (Sawford, 1991; Heinz, 1997). These problems can be avoided by considering the motion of stochastic particles (Dreeben & Pope, 1997a, 1998). Such particles undergo both convective and molecular motion, i.e., the increments of the particle position depend on the velocity field and the kinematic viscosity. A simpler method to take the effect of a wall into account consists in the reflection of its influence through adopting suited conditions near boundaries (Dreeben & Pope, 1997b), which corresponds with the application of wall-functions in Reynolds-stress closure models.

With reference to scalar fields, mixing processes at the Kolmogorov and Batchelor scales are especially important for high-Schmidt number (Sc) reacting flows (liquids). Fig. 1 shows that the Kolmogorov-scale wavenumber $k_K$ and the Batchelor-scale wavenumber $k_B = Sc^{1/3}k_K$ are well separated in that case, i.e., the characteristic transport time from the smallest to the largest wavenumbers is significantly larger than for small-Sc flows (gases) so that there is a remarkable delay of the onset of chemical conversion processes. In dependence on the reaction scheme, this fact may lead to phenomena that are more difficult to predict than the influence of Kolmogorov-scale processes on the structure of velocity fields. That is relevant to many applications in the chemical process industry, where high-Sc flows often appear.

By adopting concepts developed within the Eulerian framework (Fox, 1995), the consideration of Reynolds number effects in Lagrangian simulations of the evolution of scalar fields has been considered previously by Fox (1997, 1999). From a methodological point of view, this approach represents a substantial progress due to its systematic nature of describing the transport of scalar energy as a cascade process from large to small scales. Fox’s Lagrangian spectral relaxation (LSR) model describes the multi-scale transport of scalars in gases in a very good agreement with direct numerical simulation (DNS) data. However, comparisons of predictions of the LSR model with DNS or experimental data are not available for Schmidt numbers Sc greater than unity (Fox, 1997), i.e., the model is not tested for that case.

The present paper addresses in particular for high-Schmidt number flows ($Sc \geq 1$) the question, in which way mixing processes at the Kolmogorov and Batchelor scale can be taken into account in Lagrangian PDF methods. The approach is developed by adopting guidance of the Eulerian mixing model of Baldyga to construct the Lagrangian equations (Baldyga & Bourne, 1984a-c, 1988, 1989, 1999; Baldyga, 1989). This model differs considerably from that of Fox: it applies as parameters only three characteristic times related to the mixing at different stages of the spectrum, and it is based on scaling arguments so that no assumptions are required on the shape of spectral functions. Baldyga’s model is applicable to the description of the mixing of different scalars in in-homogeneous and instationary flows, and proved for a variety of problems (Baldyga, 1994; Baldyga & Henczka, 1995, 1997; Kruis & Falk, 1996; Baldyga & Bourne, 1999).

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, Lagrangian models for the flow field and scalar transport and reaction are presented in order to provide a frame for the model development. In Section 3, the new mixing model is derived by the constraint that the Lagrangian stochastic composition model has to satisfy the Eulerian transport equations of Baldyga’s turbulent mixer model. Essential features of that multi-scale mixing model are discussed for homogeneous flows: decaying turbulence and turbulence with local equilibrium are investigated. The performance of a simple algebraic version of this mixing model is illustrated in Section 4, where simulations of mixing and parallel chemical reactions of species in a turbulent pipe flow are compared to measurements.
Finally, the scope of the presented methodology and the differences to other methods are summarized.

2. Lagrangian flow and composition models

In Section 2.1, simple Lagrangian stochastic models for the velocity and mass fractions of species are considered. These models provide a suited frame for the following developments, and they are convenient for the applications considered in Section 4. But in fact, the methodology presented here can also be applied in conjunction with other Lagrangian models (Pope, 1994a; Fox, 1996; Wouters, Peeters, & Roekaerts, 1996). In Section 2.2, Eulerian transport equations for the means and variances of the velocity-composition fields are derived from the Lagrangian models presented in Section 2.1. These budget equations reveal the relationship to usually applied Reynolds-averaged equations and provide the basis for the estimation of the composition frequency in Section 3.

2.1. Lagrangian stochastic models

The simplified Langevin model represents the most simple way of representing Eulerian transport equations in terms of a Lagrangian stochastic model (Pope, 1985, 1994a). It describes the change in time of positions \( x_i(t) \) and velocities \( U_i(t) \) of a fluid particle moving with the flow by (\( i = 1, 2, 3 \))

\[
\frac{dx_i}{dt} = U_i^e, \tag{1a}
\]

\[
\frac{dU_i}{dt} = - \rho^{-1} \frac{\partial p}{\partial x_i} - \frac{1}{\tau} \left( \frac{3}{4} C_0 + 1 \right) (U_i^e - \langle U_i \rangle) + \sqrt{C_0 \frac{q^2}{2\tau}} \frac{dW_i}{dt} \tag{1b}
\]

Here, \( p \) is the Reynolds-averaged pressure, \( \rho \) the averaged fluid density, \( q^2 = \langle u_i u_i \rangle \) twice the TKE and \( \tau = q^2/(2\alpha) \) the dissipation time scale of turbulence, where \( \alpha \) is the mean dissipation rate of TKE. Eulerian velocity fluctuations are denoted by \( u_i = U_i - \langle U_i \rangle \), and summation is assumed for repeated subscripts. The Reynolds-averaged Eulerian velocity \( \langle U \rangle(x^e, t) \) is written without a star in contrast to Lagrangian quantities. The last term in Eq. (1b) describes the influence of random accelerations. This term is characterized by the white noise \( dW_i/dt \), which is a Gaussian process with vanishing mean values, \( \langle dW_i/dt \rangle = 0 \), and with uncorrelated values at different times, \( \langle dW_i/dt \rangle \langle dW_j/dt \rangle = \delta_{ij} \delta(t - t') \). The symbol \( \delta_{ij} \) is the Kronecker delta and \( \delta(t - t') \) the delta function. For the parameter \( C_0 \) we apply \( C_0 = 3.5 \) (Dreeben & Pope, 1997b; Heinz, 1998).

Further, we use the often applied ‘interaction by exchange with the mean’ (IEM) model to simulate the mixing of species. In accord with the treatment of the velocity field, no attempt is made to include molecular transport explicitly (Dreeben & Pope, 1997a, 1998; Colucci, Jaberi, Givi, & Pope, 1998). This approach is justified for the applications considered below and keeps the development of the methodology simple. For other applications involving simulation of the scalar distribution near walls, the consideration of these effects could be essential. The micromixing of the mass fraction \( \Phi^e_x \) of a scalar \( x \) is described by the IEM model as (Pope, 1985)

\[
\frac{d\Phi^e_x}{dt} = - C_s (\Phi^e_x - \langle \Phi^e_x \rangle) + \rho^{-1} r_x, \tag{1c}
\]

where \( C_s \) is an unknown coefficient, which is often modelled by \( C_s = C_o/(2\tau) \), i.e. the composition frequency \( C_s \) is taken proportional to the turbulence frequency \( \tau^{-1} \). \( C_o \) is a constant with a standard value \( C_o = 2.0 \) (Pope, 1985). The first term on the right-hand side of Eq. (1c) models the scalar micromixing in a formal correspondence to that of momentum in Eq. (1b). The second term \( \rho^{-1} r_x (\Phi^e) \) describes chemical transformations exactly, where the fluid density \( \rho \) is assumed to be constant for simplicity. In contrast to subscripts \( i, j, k \) applied above, no summation convention is used for repeated Greek subscripts.

2.2. Relationship to Reynolds-averaged equations

The Eqs. (1a)–(1c) can be transformed into a Fokker–Planck equation for the one-point velocity-composition PDF. From that equation, transport equations can be derived for all moments of this PDF by multiplication with the corresponding variables and integration (Gardiner, 1983; Risken, 1984). By invoking the incompressibility constraint \( \partial U_i / \partial x_i = 0 \) and the definition of the concentration \( C_x = \Phi_x \), a scalar, these equations read for the mean velocity and concentration

\[
\frac{\partial\langle U_i \rangle}{\partial t} + \langle \langle U_j \rangle \partial x_j \rangle + \frac{\partial \langle u_i u_j \rangle}{\partial x_j} = - \rho^{-1} \frac{\partial p}{\partial x_i}, \tag{2a}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial\langle C_x \rangle}{\partial t} + \langle \langle U_j \rangle \partial x_j \rangle + \frac{\partial \langle u_i c_x \rangle}{\partial x_j} = \langle r_x \rangle. \tag{2b}
\]

These relations correspond to the exact Reynolds-averaged equations if the acceleration due to gravity and molecular transport terms are neglected. In the same way, budget equations for the variances of the velocity-composition fields can be derived from the Eqs. (1a)–(1c),

\[
\frac{\partial \langle u_i u_j \rangle}{\partial t} + \langle \langle U_k \rangle \partial x_k \rangle + \frac{\partial \langle u_i u_k \rangle}{\partial x_k} + \frac{\partial \langle u_k u_j \rangle}{\partial x_k} = - \frac{1}{\tau} \left( \frac{3}{2} C_0 + 1 \right) \langle u_i u_j \rangle + C_0 \frac{q^2}{2\tau} \delta_{ij}. \tag{3a}
\]
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\[
\frac{\partial \langle u_ic_i \rangle}{\partial t} + \langle U_k \rangle \frac{\partial \langle u_ic_i \rangle}{\partial x_k} + \frac{\partial \langle u_iu_jc_i \rangle}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial \langle u_iu_jc_j \rangle}{\partial x_i} + \langle u_jr_i \rangle = 0,
\]

(3a)

where \(c_i = C_x - \langle C_x \rangle\) denotes Eulerian concentration fluctuations and the composition variance \(\sigma^2_i = \langle c^2_i \rangle - \langle c_i \rangle^2\) is introduced to simplify the notation applied below.

Eq. (3a) represents a model for the turbulent transport of momentum, which, adopting Kolmogorov’s (1942) theory for the dissipation, is fully consistent with Rotta’s (1951) turbulence model. A corresponding comparison between the \(\sigma^2_i\)-transport equation derived from the Lagrangian equation (1c) and equations derived within the Eulerian framework is considered in Section 3. This is done, in particular, to estimate the unknown coefficient \(G_s\) in Eq. (1c) in terms of the characteristic quantities of the inertial-convective, viscous-convective and viscous-diffusive subranges: \(\tau\), the Kolmogorov time scale \(\tau_{K}\) and the Schmidt number \(Sc\). Provided that these quantities and boundary and initial conditions are given (see Section 4), Eqs. (1a)–(1c) appear in a closed form because the Eulerian mean velocities, compositions, the mean pressure gradient and the TKE can be evaluated from particle properties; kernel estimates provide weighted means of properties of particles in the vicinity of a point considered, see Pope (1985, 2000) for details.

3. Lagrangian multi-scale mixing model

In Section 3.1, the multi-scale turbulent mixer model of Baldyga (1989) is presented. This model is used in Section 3.2 to estimate the coefficient \(G_0\) in Eq. (1c) through the constraint of consistency between the composition covariance transport equation (3c) and Baldyga’s model. The composition frequency \(G_s\) is provided in that way by means of a system of partial differential equations. In Section 3.3, an algebraic version of that general model is derived, which is of special relevance to practical applications. That model is discussed in Section 3.4: homogeneous, decaying turbulence and turbulence with local equilibrium are investigated.

3.1. Eulerian multi-scale turbulent mixer model

A typical multi-scale micromixing model follows, in a Lagrangian frame, a lump of fluid that mixes with its environment by the following serial steps (Fox, 1996):

1. Reduction in size down to the Kolmogorov scale, with no change in reactant concentrations, at a rate dependent on the initial fluid particle size relative to the Kolmogorov scale.
2. Further reduction in size down to the Batchelor scale, with negligible change in reactant concentrations, at a rate proportional to \(\tau_{K}^{-1}\), and
3. Molecular diffusion and reaction in Batchelor-scale lamellar structures.

The model of Baldyga (1989) reflects these serial steps in a simple way, where only a few parameters are applied. The covariance \(\sigma^2_i\) of a non-reacting scalar is considered as superposition of three parts: \(\sigma^2_i = \sigma^2_{i1} + \sigma^2_{i2} + \sigma^2_{i3}\). These three contributions to \(\sigma^2_i\) represent the integrals of the spectral scalar density function (see Fig. 1) in the energy-containing and inertial-convective subrange (\(\sigma^2_{i1}\)), the viscous-convective subrange (\(\sigma^2_{i2}\)) and the viscous-diffusive subrange (\(\sigma^2_{i3}\)) of the scalar spectrum. They satisfy the transport equations

\[
\frac{\partial \sigma^2_{i1}}{\partial t} + \langle U_i \rangle \frac{\partial \sigma^2_{i1}}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \left[ D_T \frac{\partial \sigma^2_{i1}}{\partial x_j} \right] + 2\langle u_i c_i \rangle \frac{\partial \sigma^2_{i1}}{\partial x_j} = C_\sigma \sigma^2_{i1},
\]

\(\text{(4a)}\)

\[
\frac{\partial \sigma^2_{i2}}{\partial t} + \langle U_i \rangle \frac{\partial \sigma^2_{i2}}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \left[ D_T \frac{\partial \sigma^2_{i2}}{\partial x_j} \right] = C_\sigma \sigma^2_{i2},
\]

\(\text{(4b)}\)

\[
\frac{\partial \sigma^2_{i3}}{\partial t} + \langle U_i \rangle \frac{\partial \sigma^2_{i3}}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \left[ D_T \frac{\partial \sigma^2_{i3}}{\partial x_j} \right] = E \sigma^2_{i3} - G \sigma^2_{i3},
\]

\(\text{(4c)}\)

where \(C_\sigma = 2.0, E = 0.058/\tau_{K}\) and \(G = (0.303 + 17050/Sc)E\). The Schmidt number is defined by \(Sc = v/D_m\), where \(D_m\) is the molecular diffusivity and \(v\) the kinematic viscosity, and the Kolmogorov time scale by \(\tau_{K} = (v/D_m)^{1/2}\). In general, one has to consider the sum of the molecular and turbulent diffusivity, \(D_m + D_T\), instead of \(D_T\), but \(D_m\) is neglected here for simplicity, which is justified for the applications considered below.

The description of viscous-convective and -diffusive mixing processes through Eqs. (4a)–(4c) is adequate when the turbulent Reynolds number \(Re_t = \tau_{K}/\tau_{K}\) and the Schmidt number \(Sc\) fall in a certain range. These two non-dimensional parameters determine the ratios of \(E\) to \(C_\sigma/\tau_{K}\) and \(G\) to \(E: Re_t/C_\sigma = 0.029Re_t\) and \(G/E = (0.303 + 17050/Sc)\). The first condition for the validity of Eqs. (4a)–(4c) is \(Re_t \geq 11.6\), or \(Re_t \geq 30\) in terms of the Taylor-scale Reynolds number \(Re_t = 2.582Re_{1}\) (Baldyga, 1999). This constraint ensures that the Kolmogorov and Obukhov–Corrsin constants, which are applied to the estimation of the constants which appear
in Eqs. (4a)-(4c), can be considered as practically constant, i.e., as independent of Re$_c$ (Sreenivasan, 1996). The second condition for the validity of Baldyga’s model (Eqs. (4a)-(4c)) is a large Schmidt number, Sc $\gg$ 1 (liquids), so that a well-developed viscous-convective subrange exists, see Fig. 1.

In the preparation of the comparison with the $\sigma^2_2$-transport equation (3c), we derive a formally closed equation for $\sigma^2_4$ by taking the sum of Eqs. (4a)-(4c),

$$\frac{\partial \sigma^2_4}{\partial t} + \langle U \rangle \frac{\partial \sigma^2_4}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial \langle uc_2^2 \rangle}{\partial x_j} + 2\langle uc_4 \rangle \frac{\partial \langle C_x \rangle}{\partial x_j} = - GS_{x3} \sigma^2_2,$$

(5a)

where $S_{x3} = \sigma^2_2/\sigma^2_4$ is introduced and the definition of $D_T$ through $D_T \frac{\partial \sigma^2_4}{\partial x_j} = - \langle uc_4 \rangle$ is applied. Relation (5a) reveals that molecular diffusion is the only mechanism of mixing on the molecular scale. However, the mixing frequency $GS_{x3}$ depends strongly on the rates of inertial and viscous convective mixing. It can be proved by Eqs. (4a)-(4c) that $S_{x3}$ satisfies the equation system

$$\frac{\partial \sigma^2_4}{\partial t} + \left[ \langle U \rangle - \frac{2}{\sigma^2_2} \frac{\partial \sigma^2_4}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial \sigma^2_4}{\partial x_j} \right] = E S_{x2} + S_{x3} \left[ GS_{x3} - \gamma_s - G \right],$$

(5b)

$$\frac{\partial S_{x2}}{\partial t} + \left[ \langle U \rangle - \frac{2}{\sigma^2_2} \frac{\partial \sigma^2_4}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial \sigma^2_2}{\partial x_j} \right] = S_{x2} \left[ GS_{x3} - \gamma_s - E - \frac{C_w}{\tau} \right]$$

$$+ \frac{C_w}{\tau} \left( 1 - S_{x3} \right) .$$

(5c)

Here, the abbreviations $S_{x2} = \sigma^2_2/\sigma^2_4$ and $\gamma_s = - 2 \langle uc_4 \rangle \langle \partial \langle C_x \rangle/\partial x_j \rangle/\sigma^2_4$ are introduced. By adopting algebraic expressions for $\langle uc_4 \rangle$ and $\langle U u_i \rangle$ according to Eqs. (3a)-(3b) with $r_s = 0$, the expression $\gamma_s$ related to the scalar gradient can be simplified to $\gamma_s = \lambda q^2/\sigma^2_4 \langle \partial \langle C_x \rangle/\partial x_j \rangle^2$, where $\lambda = 8 C_0 / [(3 C_0 + 2)(3 C_0 + 2 + 4G_s)]$.

It is worth noting that the Eulerian model (Eqs. (5a)-(5c)), which is used in Section 3.2 for the derivation of the Lagrangian multi-scale mixing model, differs from the spectral relaxation (SR) model, which was used by Fox as a guideline for the construction of his LSR model (Fox, 1995, 1997). Due to the reference to the Kolmogorov and Obukhov–Corrsin constants, the allowed Re$_c$-range is approximately the same in both models (the SR model is applicable if Re$_c$ $\geq$ 8, or, Re$_c$ $\geq$ 20.7), but the model of Fox may be applied to both small- and large-Sc flows. The concept to construct a multi-scale mixing model for both gases and liquids is attractive, but, in contrast to Baldyga’s model, comparisons of the predictions of Fox’s model with experimental results for large-Sc flows are presently not available. The assessment of mixing models for such flows through DNS appears to become feasible, but presently, suitable DNS data do not exist. A significant progress has been achieved recently by Chasnov (1998), who performed DNS of flows with Sc-variations between 1 $\leq$ Sc $\leq$ 10$^3$. The turbulent Reynolds number varied in these simulations between 12.5 $\leq$ Re$_c$ $\leq$ 32.5. These DNS data reveal that there is a remarkable effect of Sc on the mixing. However, the present computer resources limit these DNS calculations to two-dimensional flows and do not allow the resolution of the scalar spectrum for Sc $\geq$ 20 in such a way that the characteristic mixing time could be derived properly.

### 3.2. Multi-scale Lagrangian mixing model

The comparison of the composition covariance transport equation (3c) derived from the Lagrangian model and Baldyga’s equation (5a) for a non-reacting scalar ($r_s = 0$) reveals that both equations are identical provided that

$$G_s = 0.5 GS_{x3} .$$

(6)

Combined with suited initial and boundary conditions, the Lagrangian equation (1c) in conjunction with Eqs. (6) and (5b)-(5c) represents our Lagrangian multi-scale mixing model. With reference to its IEM-structure, we denote it as multi-scale interaction by exchange with the mean (MSIEM) model. We note that this generalization of the IEM model is essentially different from the generalized IEM model introduced by Tsai and Fox (1995). The latter model relates the composition frequency to the change of a shadow scalar field, which is not determined through the model and has to be provided as an input. In contrast to that, the MSIEM model calculates the composition frequency in dependence on the characteristic mixing times of the processes involved.

According to Pope (1983, 1985), there are the following modelling guiding principles: (i) dimensional consistency, (ii) coordinate system independence, (iii) Galilean invariance, (iv) realizability, (v) linearity and independence of conserved passive scalars and (vi) boundedness of composition. Apparently, the MSIEM model satisfies the first three principles. Realizability is ensured by the fact that the Lagrangian mixing frequency $G_s$ is positive definite and bounded, provided that $G$ is evaluated as a bounded, positive definite quantity ($0 \leq G_{x3} \leq 1$ by definition).

The fifth principle states that arbitrary (non-singular) linear combinations of non-reacting scalars with equal molecular diffusivities should mix according to the same model. The MSIEM model satisfies that constraint provided that all the scalars have the same mixing properties, i.e., if $G_{x}$ is the same for each scalar. However, in general, the MSIEM model calculates the mixing specifically for each scalar (in dependence on its mean gradients, initial and boundary conditions), such that the fifth
modeling guiding principle is not always satisfied. But, for the set of scalars considered, it is ensured that the scalars evolve independently: Eqs. (5b)–(5c) and (1c) depend for a non-reacting scalar only upon a single scalar subscript (z).

The sixth principle states that at any time, all physical bounds of the scalars should be respected. It is satisfied if the modelled mixing process at any time only generates new states inside the convex region in the sample space which is already occupied by the scalars. As a consequence of considering $G_s$ to be specific for each scalar, the latter property is not always ensured. However, the MSIE model satisfies the boundedness constraint in its weak formulation: if the initial and boundary values of $\phi_i$ lie within a given range $\phi_{i,\text{min}} \leq \phi_i \leq \phi_{i,\text{max}}$, then $\phi_i(x,t)$ for all $(x,t)$ also lies in this range. The latter property limits the possible deviations from the ideal behaviour of a mixing model.

3.3. Algebraic multi-scale Lagrangian mixing model

For applications, an algebraic expression for the mixing frequency $G_s$ is of special interest in order to reduce the computational effort. Such a model is obtained by neglecting in Eqs. (5b)–(5c) the terms on the left-hand side. First, it is worth emphasizing that the neglect of changes of $S_{s2}$ and $S_{s3}$ in time and space represents a much weaker assumption than to neglect changes of $\sigma_{s1}^2$, $\sigma_{s2}^2$ and $\sigma_{s3}^2$: only the changes of their ratios to the total composition variance are assumed to be small compared to the other contributions in their transport equations. An algebraic approximation for $G_s$ corresponds to the consideration of the mixing frequency $G_s$ as a property of the flow field: the effects of initial and boundary conditions of $S_{s2}$ and $S_{s3}$ on the mixing are neglected, i.e., the mixing frequency is assumed to be controlled by the diffusive flow motion. The neglect of the effects of the $S_{s2}$- and $S_{s3}$-initial conditions is justified for the consideration of mixing for times much longer than the initial stage of mixing, i.e., at least for all statistically stationary flows. The neglect of the dependence of $G_s$ on the boundary values of $S_{s2}$ and $S_{s3}$ can be expected to be a valid approximation if the scalar distribution near walls does not cause significant effects, e.g., on mixing and reaction within reaction zones.

To see the relevant effects most clearly, we introduce dimensionless variables: the scalar production-to-dissipation ratio $p_s = \gamma_s/(GS_{s3})$, and the TKE-to-scalar dissipation time scale ratio $R_s = \tau_s/\tau$, where $\tau_s = (GS_{s3})^{-1}$. By neglecting the left-hand sides in Eqs. (5b)–(5c) and replacing $S_{s2}$ in Eq. (5b) through a function of $S_{s3}$ according to Eq. (5c), the following equation for $R_s$ can be obtained:

$$0 = R_s^2 - \frac{A_1}{1 - p_s} R_s + \frac{A_2}{(1 - p_s)^2} R_s - \frac{A_3}{(1 - p_s)^2}, \quad (12)$$

where $A_1 = E\phi + G\tau + C_0$, $A_2 = E\phi^2 + C_\phi E\tau + C_\phi G\tau$ and $A_3 = C_\phi E\phi G\tau^2$. Eq. (12) is solved by $(k = 0, 1, 2)$

$$R_s = \frac{A_1}{3(1 - p_s)} + \frac{2\sqrt{A_1^2 - A_2} \cos \left(\varphi + 2k\pi \right)}{3 |1 - p_s|}, \quad (13)$$

where $\varphi = \text{Arccos} \left[\frac{A_1^2 - 4.5A_1A_2 + 13.5A_3(1 - p_s)}{(A_1^2 - 3A_2)^{-1/2}} \right] \text{Arccos}(1 - p_s)^{-1} - 3].$

Relation (13) permits up to three real and positive solutions, such that the question appears as to which of these solutions will be realized by the general Eqs. (5b)–(5c). It will be shown in the next section that the minimum of the real and positive solutions which are provided by Eq. (13) will be realized if there is no scalar production, i.e., $p_s = 0$. By extending that analysis, it can be shown numerically (for all initial values $0 \leq S_{s2}, S_{s3} \leq 1$) that the same behaviour is found for a non-vanishing $p_s$. Hence, the algebraic solution of Eqs. (5b)–(5c) is given through the minimum of all real and positive solutions which are provided by Eq. (13). We denote that model as algebraic multi-scale interaction by exchange with the mean (AMSIEM) model.

3.4. Homogeneous, decaying and local equilibrium turbulence

To assess the behaviour of the AMSIEM model, we consider it for two important cases: homogeneous, decaying ($p_s = 0$) and local equilibrium turbulence ($p_s = 1$).

To investigate the first case of homogeneous, decaying turbulence, we neglect all the spatial gradients in Eqs. (5b)–(5c) including $\gamma_s$. Under these conditions, the non-linear and coupled Eqs. (5b)–(5c) can be rewritten into linear equations for combinations of $S_{s2}$ and $S_{s3}$,

$$\frac{d}{dt}(S_{s2}/(S_{s3} - 1) + 1)^{-1} = E \left[\frac{C_\phi}{E\tau} - 1 \right] \left(\frac{S_{s2}}{S_{s3} - 1} + 1 \right)^{-1} + 1 \right], \quad (14a)$$

$$\frac{d}{dt}(S_{s3} - 1)^{-1} = - G \left[\frac{E}{GS_{s3}} \left(\frac{S_{s2}}{S_{s3} - 1} + 1 \right) \left(S_{s3} - 1 \right)^{-1} + 1 \right]. \quad (14b)$$

Eq. (14a) is closed in the function $S_{s2}/(S_{s3} - 1) + 1$, which is very helpful for the calculation of the asymptotic features of the model. Expression $S_{s2}/(S_{s3} - 1) + 1$ may be written as $S_{s1}/(S_{s1} + S_{s2})$, where $S_{s1} = \sigma_{s2}^2/\sigma_{s3}^2$. This shows that $S_{s2}/(S_{s3} - 1) + 1 \geq 0$. The coefficient $C_\phi/(E\tau)$ on the right-hand side of Eq. (14a) reveals, that two cases have to be distinguished in order to assess the asymptotic features of the model: $C_\phi/(E\tau) \geq 1$ and $C_\phi/(E\tau) \leq 1$. For $C_\phi/(E\tau) \geq 1$, we find the derivative of
\[ \frac{S_{s2}/(S_{s3} - 1)}{1} \] to be always positive. Thus, \[ \frac{S_{s2}/(S_{s3} - 1) + 1}{1} \rightarrow \infty \], that means \( S_{s2}/(S_{s3} - 1) \rightarrow -1 \) for \( t \rightarrow \infty \). For \( C_\phi/(Et) \leq 1 \), the function \( \frac{S_{s2}/(S_{s3} - 1) + 1}{1} \) will grow (decrease) for an initially positive (negative) derivative, till both the terms on the right-hand side balance each other. Hence, we find

\[ S_{s2}/(S_{s3} - 1) \rightarrow - C_\phi/(Et) \] in that case.

With reference to Eq. (14b), we observe that the derivative of \( (S_{s3} - 1) \) is negative if \( (E/G)S_{s2}/(S_{s3} - 1) + 1 \leq 0 \) (we note that \( S_{s3} - 1 \leq 0 \)). In that case, we find \( (S_{s3} - 1)^{-1} \rightarrow - \infty \) asymptotically, that means \( S_{s3} \rightarrow 1 \). For \( (E/G)S_{s2}/(S_{s3} - 1) + 1 \geq 0 \), the function \( (S_{s3} - 1)^{-1} \) will grow (decrease) for an initially positive (negative) derivative, till the terms on the right-hand side of Eq. (14b) balance each other. Thus, we find \( S_{s3} \rightarrow - (E/G)S_{s2}/(S_{s3} - 1) \) in that case. By adopting the asymptotic values of \( S_{s2}/(S_{s3} - 1) \), and \( - C_\phi/(Et) \) for \( C_\phi/(Et) \geq 1 \) and \( C_\phi/(Et) \leq 1 \), respectively, these results are summarized by

\[
S_{s3} = \begin{cases} 
\text{for } \frac{C_\phi}{E_\tau} \geq 1 \text{ and } \frac{E}{G} \geq 1 \\
\text{or } \frac{C_\phi}{E_\tau} \leq 1 \text{ and } \frac{C_\phi}{G_\tau} \geq 1 
\end{cases}
\]

\[ S_{s3} = \begin{cases} 
\frac{E}{G} \text{ for } \frac{C_\phi}{E_\tau} \geq 1 \text{ and } \frac{E}{G} \leq 1 \\
\frac{C_\phi}{G_\tau} \text{ for } \frac{C_\phi}{E_\tau} \leq 1 \text{ and } \frac{C_\phi}{G_\tau} \leq 1 
\end{cases}, \quad (15)
\]

which leads (independent of the chosen initial values for \( S_{s2} \) and \( S_{s3} \)) after multiplication with \( G_\tau \) to the asymptotic (normalized) mixing frequency

\[ R_s = \text{Min}(G_\tau, E_\tau, C_\phi). \quad (16) \]

That is a plausible result: the turbulence only dissipates if there is no production, i.e., the mixing intensity \( R_s \) will become minimal asymptotically. The value of \( R_s \) becomes controlled by the slowest step.

For the second case of local equilibrium turbulence \( (p_s = 1) \) we obtain

\[ R_s^{-1} = C_\phi^{-1} + (E_\tau)^{-1} + (G_\tau)^{-1}. \quad (17) \]

That relation simply states that under local equilibrium conditions the characteristic (normalized) mixing time \( R_s^{-1} \) is given through the sum of characteristic mixing times of the three considered stages of the scalar spectrum.

By involving the definitions \( E = 0.058/\tau_\eta \) and \( G = (0.303 + 17050/Sc)E \), \( R_s \) is determined through Eq. (13) as a function of \( R_{e\tau}, Sc \) and \( p_s \). Fig. 2 illustrates these dependencies for a range of (high) \( Sc \) and \( p_s \). Findings (16) and (17) are presented in Fig. 2a and c, respectively. These curves quantify our expectation: For growing turbulent Reynolds numbers \( R_{e\tau} \), the mixing frequency \( R_s \) approaches \( C_\phi \) asymptotically. An increase of the scalar production-to-dissipation ratio \( p_s \) may be seen as an increased production with reference to a (fixed) dissipation, which causes a higher value of \( \sigma_{s1}^2 \), see Eq. (4a). For unaffected \( \sigma_{s2}^2 \) and \( \sigma_{s3}^2 \), \( S_{s3} = \sigma_{s2}^2/(\sigma_{s1}^2 + \sigma_{s2}^2 + \sigma_{s3}^2) \) has to decrease. Due to the increased total variance, the characteristic scalar dissipation time \( \tau_s = (GS_{s3})^{-1} \) becomes larger, that means the TKE-to-scalar dissipation time scale ratio \( R_s = \tau/\tau_s \) has to decrease for growing \( p_s \). Corresponding findings for gas-phase mixing were reported by Sirivat and Warhaft (1983). The effect of the Schmidt number \( Sc \) is consistent with Fig. 1: higher values of \( Sc \) increase the characteristic mixing time \( R_s^{-1} \).

4. Application to mixing and parallel chemical reactions in a pipe

The MSIEEM model represents a Lagrangian stochastic model that satisfies exactly the transport equations of Baldyga, which are tested for different flows (Baldyga, 1994; Baldyga & Henczka, 1995, 1997; Kruis & Falk, 1996; Baldyga & Bourne, 1999). This fact provides evidence for its good performance. We illustrate this performance here for the pipe flow experiments of Baldyga and Henczka (1997) for two reasons: first, to demonstrate the applicability of the algebraic version AMSIEM of the MSIEEM model, and second, to show the remarkable effect of the consideration of mixing processes at the Kolmogorov and Batchelor scale. The simulations of the pipe flow and the mixing and parallel chemical reactions are described in Sections 4.1 and 4.2. The results are summarized in Section 4.3.

4.1. Pipe flow simulation

Experimental investigations were carried out in a tubular reactor with an inner diameter of \( D = 32 \) mm equipped with a concentrically located tube with an inner diameter of 1.81 mm and an outer diameter of 2.52 mm, see Fig. 3. The mean pipe velocity \( \langle U_1 \rangle \) varied from 0.469 to 2.19 m s\(^{-1}\), which corresponds to a change of the pipe Reynolds number \( Re = \langle U_1 \rangle D/\nu \) from 15000 to 70000, where the kinematic viscosity \( \nu = 10^{-6} \) m\(^2\) s\(^{-1}\) (Baldyga & Henczka, 1997).

To describe this pipe flow, the Lagrangian equation (1a)–(1c) have to be closed by models for the turbulence time scale \( \tau \) and the Kolmogorov time scale \( \tau_\eta \), which are required to estimate the frequencies \( C_\phi/\tau \), \( E \) and \( G \). The Schmidt number \( Sc \), which appears in \( G \), is taken to be \( Sc = 800 \). Transport equations for \( \tau \) in conjunction with Lagrangian flow models were presented for different flows (Pope & Chen, 1990; Dreeben & Pope, 1997b; Heinz, 1998). However, pipe flow simulations in that way were not performed previously. The experience obtained
The normalized composition mixing frequency $R_a$ in dependence on $Re$ for different $Sc$ and $p_a$, where $C_o = 2.0$. In Fig. 2a, the curves for $Sc = 10^2, 10^3$ and $10^4$ coincide.

through channel flow simulations led to the conclusion that standard methods have to be extended by the consideration of additional terms (Dreeben & Pope, 1997b). Here our primary interest is in the mixing of species in the reaction zone. In the conditions that will be calculated there is a negligible influence of mean velocity gradients in that zone (Baldyga & Henczka, 1997). Therefore, we derive $\tau$ and $\tau_n$ from the TKE, which is provided by the Lagrangian equations (1a)-(1b), through an algebraic relation. This approach is advantageous to look at the impact of the variations with $Re$ considered below, because the ratio of these time scales $Re_1 = \tau/\tau_n$ is found as a robust function of the TKE. Correspondingly, we apply $\tau = C_r D(q^2/2)^{-1/2}$. In that way, $\tau$ is calculated as the ratio of the length scale $C_r D$ to the characteristic turbulence velocity $(q^2/2)^{1/2}$. The good performance of this model for mixing simulations was tested by Tsai and Fox (1994). $C_r$ is an open parameter, which may be expected to have a value between 0.057, which arises from the ratio of the two pipe diameters, and 1. We found that the value $C_r = C_D = 0.09$ brings the best agreement between our flow field simulations, measurements and DNS (Eggels, 1994; Eggels et al., 1994; Toonder & Nieuwstadt, 1997). By calculating the dissipation rate of TKE according to $\varepsilon = q^2/(2\tau)$, the model $\tau = C_r D(q^2/2)^{-1/2}$ implies a similar simple expression for the Kolmogorov time scale $\tau_q = (C_r D\nu)^{1/2}(q^2/2)^{-3/4}$. 
Further, boundary conditions for particle velocities have to be provided. As mentioned in Section 2, no attempt is made to include viscous transport in the Lagrangian velocity equation, that means to calculate the wall behaviour explicitly (Dreeben & Pope, 1997a, 1998), because our primary interest is in the study of Reynolds number effects on mixing and reaction. The effect of the pipe wall is taken into account here by adopting boundary conditions which reflect the wall influence (Dreeben & Pope, 1997b). This corresponds with the application of wall-functions in Reynolds-stress closure models. The purpose of this approach is to avoid the computational expense which is required to resolve the steep gradients of statistics that appear in the viscous sublayer, while nevertheless correctly represents the well-known near-wall features. These characteristic features of the wall layer have been found to be reasonably robust for flows in channels, pipes, and boundary layers: In the inertial sublayer, the profile of mean velocity is a logarithmic function of the wall-normal distance, the dissipation varies inversely with that distance, and the production and dissipation of TKE are approximately equal to one another (Dreeben & Pope, 1997b). This corresponds with the approach of Dreeben and Pope (1997). According to the approach of Dreeben and Pope (1997b), the following boundary conditions are applied to the streamwise \( U_1 \) and radial \( U_r \) particle velocities:

\[
U_{1i0}^* = -U_{i0}^* \quad \text{and} \quad U_{1r0}^* = U_{1i0}^* + 2U_{r0}^*,
\]

where the subscripts \( I \) and \( R \) denote the values before and after reflection, respectively. The coefficient \( \alpha \) determines the correlation coefficient at the reflection plane, \( \alpha = -2\langle u_1 u_r \rangle/\langle u_r^2 \rangle \). In accord with pipe measurements and DNS (Eggels, 1994; Eggels et al., 1994; Toonder & Nieuwstadt, 1997), we applied \( \alpha = 0 \) at the centreline, and at the outer pipe radius we used \( \alpha = 1 \).

The simulations were carried out by means of the code PDF2DV (Pope, 1994b). Only the domain between symmetry axis and wall is considered. The domain is discretized into (radial) 18 and (streamwise axial) 75 cells. The radial extent of the source corresponds to the radius of the first grid cell. A non-uniform grid spacing was applied in the streamwise direction, so that the ratio between the length of the first cell (at the inlet) to that of the last cell was 1/5. With that spacing, the length of the first cell was approximately of the same size as the radial cell length. It was proved that a higher spatial resolution (a ratio of 1/10 between the lengths of the first and last cells in the streamwise direction and 50% more grid points) had no influence on the results. The extent of the computational domain was 10\( D \) in the streamwise direction. The mean particle streamwise velocity at the inlet region was derived from the Reynolds number by \( \langle U_1 \rangle = \text{Re}v/D \), and the radial mean particle velocity was set to zero. For the turbulence intensity we applied, independent of \( Re \), 0.16 at the inlet region (Eggels, 1994; Eggels et al., 1994; Toonder & Nieuwstadt, 1997). The influence of variations of 50% of this value on the results presented in Section 4.3 is lower than 0.2%. The initial values for \( r \) and \( \tau \) were chosen according to their relation with the TKE. The latter results from the specified \( \langle U_1 \rangle \) and the turbulence intensity.

The radial profile of the mean streamwise velocity obtained with these initial and boundary conditions is compared to the results of measurements in Fig. 4. This figure shows the correct simulation of the velocity field. It was proved that the other flow field quantities were obtained in accord with the features found in measurements and DNS (Eggels, 1994; Eggels et al., 1994; Toonder & Nieuwstadt, 1997). A detailed description of the performance of the same code for similar conditions can be found elsewhere (Dreeben & Pope, 1997b).

### 4.2. Simulation of mixing and parallel chemical reactions

The experimental investigations of the mixing and reaction of species were carried out by introducing a premixture of hydrochloric acid (B = HCl) and ethyl chloroacetate (C = CH₂CICOOC₂H₄) over the reactor cross-sectional area. A solution of sodium hydroxide (A = NaOH) was fed through the concentrically located injector, see Fig. 3. These species react according to

\[ A + B \rightarrow \text{P}_1, \quad A + C \rightarrow \text{P}_2, \tag{18} \]

where \( k_1 \rightarrow \infty, \ k_2 = 23 \text{ dm}^3/(\text{mol s}) \) at a temperature \( T = 293 \text{ K} \). \( \text{P}_1 \) and \( \text{P}_2 \) are the reaction products. Such parallel chemical reactions were proposed to characterize mixing by Baldyga and Bourne (1990). This reaction scheme represents the structure of many important chemical process engineering or environmental applications.
(Fox, 1996; Baldyga & Bourne, 1999). As shown below, the efficiency of chemical conversions according to Eq. (18) may depend very sensitively on mixing. This quantity can be evaluated through the final selectivity \( X_s \) of forming \( P_2 \), which is proportional to the decrease of the \( C \)-concentration along the reactor

\[
X_s = \frac{C_{C,\text{in}} - C_{C,\text{out}}}{C_{A,\text{in}}},
\]

(19)

where \( C_{C,\text{in}} \), \( C_{A,\text{in}} \), and \( C_{C,\text{out}} \) are the inlet concentrations of \( C \) and \( A \) and \( C \) at the outlet concentration of \( C \), respectively, averaged over the outlet diameter. These quantities were measured chromatographically (Baldyga & Henczka, 1997).

The calculation of the reaction between \( A, \) \( B \), and \( C \) requires an appropriate handling of the infinitely fast reaction between \( A \) and \( B \). These species cannot coexist, i.e., the consideration of their difference is sufficient. Therefore, instead of \( C_A, C_B \), and \( C_C \) we consider only two dimensionless concentration differences:

\[
\Phi_Z = \frac{C_A - C_B}{C_{A,\text{in}}},
\]

(20a)

\[
\Phi_B = \frac{C_A - C_B - C_C + C_{B,\text{in}} + C_{C,\text{in}}}{C_{A,\text{in}} + C_{B,\text{in}} + C_{C,\text{in}}},
\]

(21a)

where \( C_{A,\text{in}}, C_{B,\text{in}} \), and \( C_{C,\text{in}} \) are the initial concentrations of \( A \), \( B \), and \( C \). Relation (18) reveals that the reaction rate of \( \Phi_B \) is zero. The reaction rate \( \rho^{-1} r_Z \) of \( \Phi_Z \) is zero for negative \( \Phi_Z \) and otherwise given by

\[
\rho^{-1} r_Z = -k_2 C_{A,\text{in}} \Phi_Z (\Phi_Z - \Phi_Z^*).
\]

In Eq. (21), \( \Phi_Z^* = \Phi_B (C_{A,\text{in}} + C_{B,\text{in}} + C_{C,\text{in}}) / C_{A,\text{in}} \) is used, which is \( \Phi_Z \) for \( k_2 = k_1 \rightarrow \infty \). The consideration of \( \Phi_B \) and \( \Phi_Z \) is sufficient for the calculation of \( X_s \), because the concentration \( C_C \) is determined by these quantities,

\[
C_C = C_{A,\text{in}} (\Phi_Z - \Phi_Z^*).
\]

Calculations of \( X_s \) according to Eq. (19) were performed for \( Re \)-variations between 15000 and 70000 and various initial concentrations for \( A, \) \( B \), and \( C \): (a) \( C_{A,\text{in}} = 0.45 \text{ mol/dm}^3 \), \( C_{B,\text{in}} = C_{C,\text{in}} = 0.009 \text{ mol/dm}^3 \), (b) \( C_{A,\text{in}} = 0.9 \text{ mol/dm}^3 \), \( C_{B,\text{in}} = C_{C,\text{in}} = 0.018 \text{ mol/dm}^3 \), (c) \( C_{A,\text{in}} = 0.45 \text{ mol/dm}^3 \), \( C_{B,\text{in}} = C_{C,\text{in}} = 0.014 \text{ mol/dm}^3 \). The mixing of \( \Phi_B \) and \( \Phi_Z \) was calculated by the AMSEIM (13), where the expression \( \gamma_a = \lambda (q^2/\sigma_x^2) \left[ \hat{e}(C_x) / \hat{e}(X) \right]^2 \) was applied to estimate \( \gamma_a \).

4.3. Results

The results of the simulations described in Sections 4.1 and 4.2 are presented in Fig. 5. The fact that in this experiment the selectivity \( X_s \) depends on the Reynolds number \( Re \) can be explained as follows. Close to the injector, there is a lot of \( A \) compared to \( B + C \). After consumption of part of \( A \) by the reaction with \( B \) there remains \( A \) to participate in the second reaction. The higher \( Re = \langle U_1 \rangle / D / \nu \) (or the inlet flow velocity, respectively), the smaller is the selectivity \( X_s \) due to the slower chemistry between \( A \) and \( C \). This dependence of the chemistry on the Reynolds number can be made explicit by means of the Damköhler number \( Da_C = 2k_2 C_A \tau / R_C \) (\( R_C \) is written for \( R_s \) here) for the reaction between \( A \) and \( C \). By means of \( \tau = C_D D (q^2/2)^{-1/2} \) and \( \langle U_1 \rangle \) = \( \text{Re} \nu / D \) we find \( Da_C = 2k_2 C_A C_D D^2 (\nu (\nu R_C)^{-1}) \). This quantity is independent of \( Re \) (Eggels, 1994; Eggels et al., 1994; Toonder & Nieuwstadt, 1997), so that \( Da_C \) is found to be inversely proportional to \( \nu R_C \) (\( R_C \) grows with increasing \( Re \), see Fig. 6). The effect of \( Da_C \) can also be observed by comparing Figs. 5a and 5b. Due to the chosen initial concentration of \( A \), the Damköhler number \( Da_C \) related to Fig. 5b is twice the value of \( Da_C \) related to Fig. 5a. At \( Re = 15000 \), the inlet values of these Damköhler numbers are \( Da_C = 0.38 \) and 0.19, respectively.

The comparison with the measurements reveals the good performance of the AMSEIM model: all calculated results are within the range of accuracy \( \pm 0.007 \) practically independent of \( Re \) (Baldyga, 1999)) of the experimental data. The neglect of Re-effects, i.e., the calculation of the mixing with the usually applied mixing rate \( C_o / \tau \) instead of \( R_s / \tau \), leads to a remarkable underestimate of the selectivity \( X_s \), which amounts to approximately 50% for \( Re = 15000 \). The reason for this difference is given by the fact that \( C_o / \tau \) provides a too strong mixing between \( A \) and \( B + C \). In that case, \( X_s \) decreases due to the infinitely fast destruction of \( A \) through reaction with \( B \), i.e., there is less \( A \) left to participate in the reaction with \( C \). The overprediction of mixing through \( C_o / \tau \) is illustrated in Fig. 6, where \( E \tau / C_o \) = 0.029 \( Re_\epsilon \) and \( R_s / C_o \) are shown along the centreline for \( Re = 15000 \) and 70000. The normalized composition frequency of the model that applies \( C_o / \tau \) as mixing rate is given by 1. The values of \( E \tau / C_o \) indicate for the different Reynolds numbers the relevance of Re-effects and demonstrate the applicability of Baldyga’s approach because \( Re_\epsilon \geq 11.6 \). For \( \gamma_a = 0 \), the calculated mixing frequency \( R_s / \tau \) would be equal to \( E \), but the appearance of a streamwise scalar gradient in conjunction with small values for the variance of \( \Phi_T \) results in values of \( \gamma_a \tau / C_o \) near 0.5 in the reaction zone, which leads to a smaller mixing frequency \( R_s / \tau \).

5. Summary

We presented a new Lagrangian mixing model that simulates in accord with Eulerian transport equations for means and variances the turbulent mixing of reacting scalars as a cascade process from large to small scales. Close to the description of these processes in the
Fig. 5. Product distribution $X_a$ vs. Reynolds number $Re$. The initial feed concentrations of A, B and C are: (a) $C_A = 0.45 \text{ mol/dm}^3$, $C_B = C_C = 0.009 \text{ mol/dm}^3$, (b) $C_A = 0.9 \text{ mol/dm}^3$, $C_B = C_C = 0.018 \text{ mol/dm}^3$, (c) $C_A = 0.45 \text{ mol/dm}^3$, $C_B = C_C = 0.014 \text{ mol/dm}^3$. The dashed line gives the result of the model that applies $C_a/\tau$ as mixing rate. The error bars denote the accuracy of these measurements.

Eulerian framework, no closure assumptions on mean reaction rates are required in the Lagrangian approach applied here, i.e., approximations are restricted to the simulation of mixing processes. In contrast to previously applied methods in the Lagrangian approach, the derived mixing model is shown to be applicable to the calculation of the multi-scale turbulent mixing in inhomogeneous liquid-phase reacting flows. This is of relevance to both chemical engineering applications and the further development of models that describe multi-scale mixing in multi-phase flows.

Two new findings are presented here, which are of interest from a theoretical point of view: First, it has been demonstrated that scalar gradients (the scalar production-to-dissipation ratio) may lead to a significant reduction of the composition frequency. Second, it has been shown that simple algebraic models for the composition frequency, which are of special relevance to the evaluation of complex turbulence-chemistry interactions, can be derived by means of relatively weak assumptions, see Section 3.3. The methodology used here to construct the mixing model can be applied in consistency with other Eulerian variance transport equations and other Lagrangian (frame) models than the simple models used here to illustrate the approach. Additionally, the presented description of micromixing can be adopted in computationally less-demanding PDF methods as the multi-environment CFD micromixing model (Fox, 1998).
The MSIEM model can be seen as proved for different flows through its full consistency with the well-tested transport equations of Baldyga. The good performance of its algebraic version, i.e., of the AMSIEM model, was illustrated in Section 4. It was shown that in the simulations of the tubular reactor experiments of Baldyga and Henczka (1997) the inclusion of Reynolds number effects leads to good results in contrast with the use of the standard mixing frequency of the large-scale turbulence that results in errors up to 50%. The errors of calculations where mixing at the Kolmogorov and Batchelor scale is not accounted for may be much larger, if more complex reaction mechanisms have to be considered.

Notation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( A_1, A_2, A_3 )</td>
<td>parameters in the AMSIEM model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, B, C</td>
<td>species involved in the reactor chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_0 )</td>
<td>parameter in the Lagrangian velocity equation ( (= 3.5) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_\phi )</td>
<td>parameter in the Lagrangian species equation ( (= 2.0) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_\tau )</td>
<td>parameter in the ( \tau )-equation ( (= C_\mu = 0.09) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_{A_x}, C_{B_x}, C_{C_x} )</td>
<td>initial species concentrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_{C_{out}} )</td>
<td>outlet concentration of ( C )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( D )</td>
<td>reactor diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( D_m, D_T )</td>
<td>molecular and turbulent diffusivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( D_{ac} )</td>
<td>Damköhler number ( (= 2k_2C_x/\tau R_c) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( E )</td>
<td>characteristic frequency in the multiscale model ( (= 0.058/\tau_n) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( E_u, E_\phi )</td>
<td>velocity and scalar spectral density functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( G )</td>
<td>characteristic frequency in the multiscale model ( (= 0.303 + 17 050 (Sc)E) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( G_s )</td>
<td>mixing frequency in the Lagrangian species equation ( (= Re_\phi/\tau) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P_1, P_2 )</td>
<td>reaction products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( Re )</td>
<td>Reynolds number ( (= \langle U \rangle D/v) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( Re_\epsilon )</td>
<td>turbulent Reynolds number ( (= \tau/\tau_n) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( Re_\lambda )</td>
<td>Taylor-scale Reynolds number ( (= 2.582 Re_1) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R_x )</td>
<td>TKE-to-scalar dissipation time scale ratio ( (= \tau_\lambda/\tau_s) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R_c )</td>
<td>( R_c ) for the substance ( C )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( Sc )</td>
<td>Schmidt number ( (= v/D_m) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( S_{si} )</td>
<td>( i = 1, 2, 3 ) ( (=\sigma^2_{c_i}/\sigma^2_c \text{ where } i = 1, 2, 3) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T )</td>
<td>temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( U_i^c )</td>
<td>( i )-th component of the Lagrangian velocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( U_i^r )</td>
<td>radial Lagrangian velocity component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( U_i )</td>
<td>( i )-th component of the Eulerian velocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( W_i )</td>
<td>( i )-th component of a Wiener vector process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( X_s )</td>
<td>selectivity of forming the reaction product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( c_x )</td>
<td>Eulerian concentration fluctuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( i )</td>
<td>( (q^2/2)^1/2 \langle U_i \rangle )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k )</td>
<td>wavenumber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_0 )</td>
<td>peak wavenumber of the energy spectrum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_K )</td>
<td>Kolmogorov-scale wavenumber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_B )</td>
<td>Batchelor-scale wavenumber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_1, k_2 )</td>
<td>reaction constants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( p )</td>
<td>mean pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( p_s )</td>
<td>scalar production-to-dissipation ratio ( (= \gamma_s/(G_{s_x})) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( q^2 )</td>
<td>twice the TKE ( (= \langle u_i u_i \rangle) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( r )</td>
<td>radial distance from the reactor centreline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( r_s )</td>
<td>chemical source term in the Lagrangian concentration equation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( t )</td>
<td>time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( u_i )</td>
<td>( i )-th component of the Eulerian velocity fluctuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( u_r )</td>
<td>radial component of the Eulerian velocity fluctuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( x_i^p )</td>
<td>( i )-th component of the particle position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( x_i )</td>
<td>( i )-th component of the position vector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Greek letters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \alpha )</td>
<td>( (-2\langle u_1 u_2 \rangle/\langle u^2 \rangle) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \delta_{ij} )</td>
<td>Kronecker symbol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \delta(t) )</td>
<td>delta function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \varepsilon )</td>
<td>mean dissipation rate of TKE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \gamma_s )</td>
<td>scalar gradient term in the MSIEM model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \lambda )</td>
<td>( (= 8C_0/[(3C_0 + 2)(3C_0 + 2 + 4G_s \tau)]) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \nu )</td>
<td>kinematic viscosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \rho )</td>
<td>mean fluid density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma^2_s )</td>
<td>scalar variance ( (= \langle c^2 \rangle) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma^2_{si} )</td>
<td>( i )-th spectral contribution to ( \sigma^2 = \sigma^2_{s1} + \sigma^2_{s2} + \sigma^2_{s3} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \tau )</td>
<td>( c_bar ) time scale of TKE dissipation ( (= q^2/(2\nu)) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \tau_n )</td>
<td>Kolmogorov time scale ( (= (\nu/\epsilon)^{1/2}) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \tau_s )</td>
<td>scalar time scale ( (= (G_{s_x}^{-1})^{-1}) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \varphi )</td>
<td>parameter in the AMSIEM model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \phi_s^x )</td>
<td>Lagrangian mass fraction of the scalar ( x )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \phi_f )</td>
<td>Eulerian mass fraction of the scalar ( x )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \phi_{j}^x )</td>
<td>dimensionless concentration difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \phi_{k}^x )</td>
<td>dimensionless concentration difference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Symbols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \langle \epsilon \rangle )</td>
<td>Reynolds-averaged variable ( \epsilon )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{Q} )</td>
<td>( Q ) averaged over the reactor diameter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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