

# Bubble formation from sub-millimeter orifices: experimental analysis and modeling

E. Mohseni<sup>a,b,\*</sup>, M. Eduarda Chiamulera<sup>b</sup>, S.F. Reinecke<sup>b</sup>, U. Hampel<sup>a,b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Helmholtz-Zentrum Dresden-Rossendorf, Institute of Fluid Dynamics, Bautzner Landstraße 400, 01328 Dresden, Germany

<sup>b</sup>Chair of Imaging Techniques in Energy and Process Engineering, Technische Universität Dresden, Dresden, 01062, Germany

---

## Abstract

We developed a theoretical model that estimates the bubble size from sub-millimeter orifices under *variable gas flow conditions*. The model is successfully tested for orifices with diameters in the range of 0.2 mm to 1 mm under both quasi-static and dynamic bubbling regimes. The model is able to predict the final bubble radius with an accuracy better than 20% compared with the experimental results. Moreover, we explicitly look into the influence of the gas reservoir volume  $V_c$  upstream of the orifice on the gas reservoir pressure  $P_c$  by simultaneously monitoring the events, i.e. changes in the state of bubble, upstream and downstream of orifices. We found that, variations in  $P_c$  reduce as  $V_c$  increases. Analysis of the dynamics of the dominating forces acting on a bubble show that, enlarging  $V_c$  mainly amplifies the gas momentum force and the liquid inertia force. Hence, the bubble detachment mechanism may no longer be only buoyancy driven.

*Keywords:* Bubble formation, Sub-millimeter orifice, Gas reservoir, Bubble dynamics, Modeling

---

## 1. Introduction

Gas bubble dispersion is involved in many industrial processes that deal with heat or mass transfer as well as particle separation [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]. In such processes, efficiency strongly depends on the available gas-liquid interfacial area and therefore the bubble size. It is often required to reduce the bubble size in order to enhance process efficiency. This is achievable by scaling down the opening from which bubbles are generated. Accordingly, sub-millimeter orifices are currently of high interest in the industrial sector. Aside from the orifice size, the bubble volume depends on various parameters [6]. Among others, the volume of the gas reservoir  $V_c$  upstream of the orifice has a decisive effect on the bubble formation process as it defines the gas flux  $q$  through the orifice into the bubble.

The gas feed and the orifice are hydraulically connected via the gas reservoir. For a very small  $V_c$ , a high-pressure

---

\*Corresponding author

Email address: ehsan.mohseni@tu-dresden.de (E. Mohseni)

URL: www.hzdr.de (E. Mohseni)

drop develops between the gas feed and the orifice. If the pressure drop is substantially higher than the pressure fluctuations due to the bubble formation,  $q$  can be assumed constant. In this case events upstream of the reservoir do not interact with the events at the other end of the reservoir, where bubbles form because of the high flow resistance. This condition is referred to as bubbling under *constant gas flow conditions* CGFC. The latter can be realized by using a long capillary between the orifice and the gas reservoir [7, 8]. On the contrary, when  $V_c$  is not negligible,  $q$  varies during the bubble formation. This is referred to as the bubbling under *variable gas flow conditions* VGFC. Tadaki [9] defined the criterion at which the transition from CGFC to VGFC occurs using the dimensionless capacitance number:

$$N_c = \frac{4V_c g \rho_l}{\pi d_{or}^2 P_{or}}. \quad (1)$$

Here,  $P_{or}$  is the pressure at the orifice plate. According to Tadaki [9], for  $N_c > 1$  formation of bubbles occurs under VGFC. In practice, most of the bubble generators operate under VGFC since maintaining such a small  $V_c$  that satisfies the requirement of CGFC is not feasible. A further condition can arise when  $V_c$  is substantially larger than the generated bubble volumes  $V_b$ . In this case, the pressure fluctuations due to gas flux through the orifice results in a minor change in the gas reservoir pressure  $P_c$ . This condition is widely recognized as the bubble formation under *constant gas pressure conditions* CGPC and it occurs at  $N_c > 9$  [9].

Depending on  $V_c$ ,  $V_b$  can be calculated theoretically if the volumetric gas flow rate to the reservoir  $Q$  and the orifice diameter  $d_{or}$  are known. For that, several theoretical models are available, which provide information about the bubble dynamics as well as the bubble size during the formation. These models can be broadly classified into spherical and non-spherical models. While non-spherical models require extensive computational effort, spherical models have shown to be accurate in a wide range of operating conditions while being less computationally expensive [10, 11, 12]. Therefore, these models remain thoroughly practical.

A summary of available spherical models for VGFC is given in Table 1. In the table, principal attributes of each model are provided. VGFC models are divided into two categories. In the first category, the gas pressure level in the reservoir is assumed constant and bubbles are generated under CGPC, i.e.  $N_c > 9$ . In this case, models consider various forces on a bubble and apply the equation of motion to calculate the bubble volume. Detailed expressions of acting forces are provided in Table 2. Hayes et al. [13] were the first to propose a model for CGPC. In their model, the equation of motion is derived for a bubble which, in the first stage undergoes a radial expansion and in the second stage experiences a translational movement. Davidson and Schuler [14] approximated the volumetric gas discharge  $q$

through the orifice from the orifice equation:

$$q = \frac{dV_b}{dt} = K \sqrt{P_c - P_{atm} - \rho_l g h - \frac{4\sigma_{lg}}{d_{or}} + \rho_l g s_b}, \quad (2)$$

where,  $K$  is an orifice constant. In Equation (2), the effects of liquid viscosity and liquid kinetic energy are neglected. Moreover, the viscous drag force is also excluded from the equation of motion of the bubble. Satyanarayan et al. [15] used the same approach and calculated the bubble volume within two stages. They calculated  $q$  from Equation (2). However, they considered a constant gas flow rate for the second stage with a value calculated at the end of  
 25 the first stage.

In the second category of VGFC models,  $q$  and  $P_c$  are assumed variable. In this case, different approaches are proposed to account for the change in  $q$ . While Khurana and Kumar [16] used an electrical analogy to obtain  $q$ , Swope [17] used a modified average volumetric gas flow rate  $Q$  entering the gas reservoir. Swope [17] multiplied  $Q$  to the ratio of the bubbling time  $t_b$  over the sum of  $t_b$  and the waiting time  $t_w$ . Park et al. [18] applied a material balance in the  
 30 gas reservoir and the ideal gas law for an adiabatic condition to correlate  $P_c$  and  $V_c$ . Subsequently, the bubble volume  $V_b$  is calculated since the gas flow rate is equal to the change of  $V_b$ .

More recent VGFC models use the application of the potential flow theory to account for the liquid flow velocity surrounding a bubble. This theoretical approach was first used by McCann and Prince [19]. They modeled the motion of a bubble which experiences a radial expansion and translational motion through an unbounded surrounding liquid. In this case, the velocity potential  $\phi$  can be described as follows:

$$\phi = \phi_T + \phi_E = \frac{r_b^3}{2r^2} \left( \frac{ds_b}{dt} \right) \cos \delta + \frac{r_b^2}{r} \left( \frac{dr_b}{dt} \right). \quad (3)$$

Here,  $r$  is the length of an imaginary line between a given point in the liquid and the center of the bubble, and  $\delta$  is the angle between this line and a virtual line perpendicular to the orifice plate. Subsequently, the pressure in the liquid phase is calculated via the unsteady form of Bernoulli's equation:

$$\frac{P_l}{\rho_l} = \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} - \frac{U_l^2}{2} - g s_b + \frac{P_{or}}{\rho_l}. \quad (4)$$

In a similar approach, Kupferberg and Jameson [20] considered the effect of the adjacent orifice wall. To account for the influence of the adjacent wall, the method of images from Lamb [21] is adopted in the potential function:

$$\phi = \frac{ds_b}{dt} \left[ \frac{r_b^3}{2r^2} + \frac{rr_b^3}{8s_b^3} + \frac{r_b^6}{16s_b^3 r^2} + \frac{rr_b^6}{64s_b^6} + \frac{r_b^9}{128s_b^6 r^2} + \dots \right] \cos \delta + \frac{dr_b}{dt} \left[ \frac{r_b^2}{r} + \left( \frac{rr_b^2}{4s_b^2} + \frac{r_b^5}{8s_b^2 r^2} + \frac{rr_b^5}{32s_b^5} + \frac{r_b^8}{64s_b^5 r^2} + \dots \right) \cos \delta \right]. \quad (5)$$

By substituting Equation (5) into Equation (4), it is possible to calculate the liquid pressure at the bubble interface. Accordingly, the bubble pressure can be calculated using a pressure jump at the interface due to the effect of surface tension. Moreover,  $q$  is calculated using the law of conservation of mass and the first law of thermodynamics.

35 Eventually, a system of ordinary differential equations is solved to calculate  $V_b$ .

McCann and Prince [19] included the effect of liquid inertia due to the bubble translational motion. They also considered the wake effect from the preceding bubble. Kupferberg and Jameson [20] proposed a criterion for liquid weeping into the orifice. Tsuge and Hibino [22] considered an empirical coefficient to incorporate the effect of liquid viscosity. Dias [23] accounted for the influence of the gas kinetic energy which was neglected in the model proposed  
40 by Kupferberg and Jameson [20]. Zhang and Tan [24] used Oseen's modification to the potential flow theory to provide a more realistic prediction of the wake pressure of the preceding bubble. Later on, they proposed a model including the effect of liquid phase cross-flow [25]. Ruzicka et al. [26] used the mass balance and the Hagen–Poiseuille equation to calculate the gas flow rate into the bubble. Besides, they used the Rayleigh–Plesset equation to relate the change of bubble size to the pressure change in the reservoir and the bubble.

45 According to Table 1, sub-millimeter orifices have not been considered in any models under VGFC. This limitation is believed to be due to  $V_c$ . According to Equation 1,  $V_c$  is directly proportional to the squared  $d_{or}$ . Therefore, by changing the orifice size from the millimeter range to the sub-millimeter range under VGFC,  $V_c$  has to be significantly reduced. In this context, we provide a model based on the prior works of Kupferberg and Jameson [20] and Dias [23] with certain modifications. The model is presented in Section 2 and later it is validated experimentally. The experi-  
50 mental setup is presented in Section 3. Aside from the model, we had a close look at the simultaneous developments of pressure variations in the gas reservoir and the bubble interface at different levels of  $V_c$ . Moreover, the leverage of various forces acting on a bubble under VGFC are discussed. These parameters, as well as the validation of the model, are presented in Section 4.

Table 1: Spherical models for bubble formation under variable gas flow conditions VGFC.

Reference	Method	$d_{or}$ (mm)	$E\ddot{o}$	$We \times 10^3$	$Nc$	Detachment criterion
Hayes et al. [13]	equation of motion	0.79-6.35	0.08-2.04	1-35	4-261	exp. observation
Davidson and Schuler [14]	orifice equation and equation of motion	0.52,0.64	0.05-0.08	0-31	$(1.6-2.5) \times 10^4$	$s_b = r_b + r_{or}$
Satyanarayan et al. [15]	orifice equation and equation of motion	0.51-4	0.04-5.29	4.1-86	293-18046	$s_b = r_b + r_{or}$
Potter [27]	force balance, equation of motion			No validation		$l_n = r_{or}$
Khurana and Kumar [16]	force balance, equation of motion	2.7	1.72	0.16-2.48	0.9-10	$s_b = r_b + r_{or}$
McCann and Prince [19]	Bernoulli equation, orifice equation, potential flow theory	4.76-9.52	3-12.1	0.47-136.8	2.9-150	$s_b = r_b$
Kupferberg and Jameson [20]	force balance, orifice equation, potential flow theory	3.17-6.35	1.35-5.41	0.02-21.78	0.06-60	$s_b = r_b + r_{or}$
Swope [17]	orifice equation	1.345	0.24	$(0.05-0.28) \times 10^{-3}$	3.5	analytical solution
Park et al. [18]	material balance, application of ideal gas law	1.21-3.3	0.13-7.18	0-0.09	0.09-84	$\Delta P_c = 4\sigma_{lg}/d_{or}$
Tsuge and Hibino [22]	orifice equation, modified potential flow theory	1.08-2.12	0.16-0.81	0-7.47	1-75	$l_n = d_{or}$
Dias [23]	mass and energy balance, orifice equation, potential flow theory	3.2	1.39	$6 \times 10^{-5}$	5	$s_b = 1.55r_b$
Zhang and Tan [24]	mass and energy balance, orifice equation, potential flow theory	3.2-9.6	1.39-12.55	< 93	1.4-26	$s_b = r_b$
Zhang and Tan [25]	mass and energy balance, orifice equation, potential flow theory	4.8-6.4	3.14-6.4	0.41-0.98	25-45	$s_b = r_b + (1 - 0.02U_l)d_{or}$
Ruzicka et al. [26]	mass balance, orifice equation, Rayleigh-Plesset equation, equation of motion	1.6	0.35	$(0.14-1.55) \times 10^{-2}$	17	$s_b = r_b + d_{or}$

Table 2: Detailed expression for the forces acting on a bubble.

Forces	Expressions	Direction	Units
Buoyancy force	$F_B = g(\rho_l - \rho_g)V_b - \rho_l g h \pi r_d^2$	Upward	$[m \cdot \frac{N}{m}]$
Pressure force	$F_P = \left( \frac{2\sigma_{lg}}{r_b} + \rho_g g h \right) \pi r_d^2$	Upward	$[m^2 \cdot \frac{N}{m^2}]$
Gas momentum force	$F_M = \rho_g \frac{q^2}{\pi r_{or}^2}$	Upward	$[\frac{kg}{m^3} \frac{m}{s} \frac{m^2}{s}]$
Surface tension force	$F_S = 2\pi\sigma_{lg}r_d \sin \vartheta$	Downward	$[\frac{N}{m} \cdot m]$
Drag force	$F_D = \frac{1}{2}\rho_l C_D A_b U_b^2$	Downward	$[m^2 \cdot \frac{N}{m^2}]$
Liquid inertia force	$F_{LI} = \left( \frac{11}{16}\rho_l + \rho_g \right) \left[ V_b \frac{dU_b}{dt} + U_b \frac{dV_b}{dt} \right]$	Downward	$[\frac{kg}{m^3} \cdot \frac{m^4}{s^2}]$

## 2. Modeling

55 The new model solves the bubble volume in two consecutive stages: the expansion stage and the elongation stage. In the former stage, the bubble grows in the radial direction while it remains attached to the orifice. Hence, the axial elevation of the bubble in this stage is due to the radial expansion. The termination of this stage occurs when the forces acting on the bubble are at equilibrium. During the elongation stage, the bubble undergoes a translational motion while it radially expands as well. The termination of this stage is defined based on the detachment criterion proposed by  
60 Mohseni et al. [28]. The model bases on the following assumptions:

- The bubble remains spherical throughout the formation process except at the bubble base, which can freely expand on the orifice surface.
- The equilibrium contact angle remains constant throughout the formation process.
- The submergence level of the orifice is much larger than the size of the bubble and the wall effect is negligible.
- 65 • The gas phase is assumed to be ideal and obeying an adiabatic equation of state.
- The liquid phase is assumed inviscid, irrotational and incompressible.
- The wake of the leading bubble does not affect the formation of the bubble.

A schematic of the stages of the model is illustrated in Figure 1.




Figure 1: Schematic of the expansion stage (left) and the elongation stage (right) of a bubble in the model.

Change in the reservoir pressure due to the discharge of the gas through the orifice can be expressed using the continuity equation and the equation of state of an ideal gas. Considering a control volume CV enclosed in a control surface CS for the gas reservoir, the continuity equation can be written as follows:

$$\int_{CS} \rho_g \vec{U} \cdot \hat{n} dS + \int_{CV} \frac{\partial \rho_g}{\partial t} dV_c = 0. \quad (6)$$

Here,  $\vec{U}$  is fluid velocity and  $\hat{n}$  is the unit exterior normal to the CS. Assuming that gas enters the reservoir at the inlet and exits from the orifice, and assuming that the density and the pressure of gas are uniformly distributed in the reservoir at all times, Equation (6) becomes:

$$-\rho_g U_i S_i + \rho_g U_{or} S_{or} + \frac{d\rho_g}{dt} V_c = 0. \quad (7)$$

Here,  $S_i$  and  $S_{or}$  are the cross-sectional area of reservoir inlet and outlet, respectively. The equation of state of a perfect gas in the reservoir can be written as follows:

$$P_c = \frac{\rho_g c^2}{\gamma}. \quad (8)$$

Here,  $c$  is the speed of sound in the perfect gas and  $\gamma$  is the heat capacity ratio of the gas ( $\gamma = C_p/C_v$ ). Since  $c$  and  $\gamma$  can be assumed constant, Equation (8) can be written as follows:

$$\frac{d\rho_g}{dt} = \frac{\gamma}{c^2} \frac{dP}{dt} \quad (9)$$

By inserting Equation (9) in Equation (7), we arrive at the following:

$$P_c - (P_c)_{t=0} = -\frac{c^2 \rho_g}{\gamma V_c} [V_b - (V_b)_{t=0} - Qt]. \quad (10)$$

Here,  $t = 0$  indicates the initial condition of the corresponding parameter.

A mass balance for an imaginary control volume limited by the gas reservoir cross-section  $S_c$  and the outer cross-section of the orifice  $S_{or}$  yields:

$$U_c = U_{or} \frac{S_{or} \rho_{or}}{S_c \rho_c}. \quad (11)$$

It is assumed that the gas in the orifice is incompressible. For the highest gas flow rate through the smallest orifice in our experiments, the Mach number  $Ma$  did not exceed 0.09. This is far below  $Ma = 0.3$  beyond which the compressibility effects of the fluid becomes important [29]. Hence, the assumption of incompressibility of the gas in the orifice seems to be adequate. Therefore, the gas density in the orifice  $\rho_{or}$  is equal to  $\rho_c$ . Moreover, assuming the flow of gas to be isentropic, steady, and irrotational, the macroscopic energy balance for the aforementioned imaginary control volume leads to the Bernoulli's equation:

$$P_c + \frac{1}{2} \rho_c U_c^2 = P_{or} + \frac{1}{2} \rho_{or} U_{or}^2. \quad (12)$$

The above correlation describes the relationship between the pressure in the gas reservoir  $P_c$  and the orifice  $P_{or}$ . Assuming that the latter is equal to the bubble pressure  $P_b$  and substituting Equation (11) in Equation (12),  $q$  can be

calculated as follows:

$$q = C_d S_{or} \sqrt{\frac{2(P_c - P_b)}{\rho_c \left[1 - \left(\frac{S_{or}}{S_c}\right)^2\right]}}. \quad (13)$$

Here,  $C_d$  is the orifice discharge coefficient which accounts for the jet-contraction (*vena contracta*) and non-uniformity of gas flow velocity across the orifice. The orifice discharge coefficient is calculated according to the ratio of the orifice cross-section to the gas reservoir cross-section  $\beta$  and the Reynolds number of the gas flowing in the reservoir  $Re_c = \rho_g d_c U_c / \mu_g$  as follows:

$$C_d = 0.5959 + 0.0312\beta^{2.1} - 0.184\beta^8 + \frac{91.71\beta^{2.5}}{Re_c}. \quad (14)$$

70 According to the experimental values, the orifice discharge coefficient usually lays within the range 0.6 and 0.62 [30, 31].

Since the liquid flow field around the bubble is assumed to be inviscid and irrotational, the potential flow solution can be applied. For the case in hand, the influence of the orifice wall is considered and the zero normal velocity at the wall is satisfied. Accordingly, the wall effect can be simulated using the potential flow solution for the fluid around two equisized spheres, which simultaneously expand and move away from each other along the same axis. This is represented by Equation (5) given  $s_b \geq r_b$ . Hence, it can only be used from the termination of the expansion stage. The liquid pressure around the bubble can be described using the unsteady form of Bernoulli's equation:

$$\frac{P_l}{\rho_l} = \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} - \frac{U_l^2}{2} - g(s_b + r \cos \delta) + \frac{P_{or}}{\rho_l}, \quad (15)$$

where  $P_{or} = P_{atm} + \rho_l g h$  and,

$$U_l^2 = \left(\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial r}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \delta}\right)^2. \quad (16)$$

By using the the potential function provided in Equation (5), the liquid pressure at the bubble interface  $P_{int}$  at  $r = r_b$  can be calculated as follows:

$$P_{int} = P_{atm} + \rho_l g h + \rho_l \left[ \left( r_b \frac{d^2 r_b}{dt^2} \right) + \frac{3}{2} \left( \frac{dr_b}{dt} \right)^2 - g s_b + \Gamma_1 \cos \delta + \Gamma_2 \cos^2 \delta + \Gamma_3 \sin^2 \delta \right]. \quad (17)$$

The coefficients  $\Gamma_1$ ,  $\Gamma_2$ , and  $\Gamma_3$  are provided in Appendix A. Subsequently, the bubble pressure is  $P_b = P_{int} + 2\sigma_{lg}/r_b$  by considering the surface tension pressure. As mentioned earlier, it is assumed that the bubble maintains a spherical shape. The pressure gradients travel with the speed of sound within the bubble. Hence, the bubble pressure can be taken constant, and yet it is independent of  $\delta$ . Hence, the term with  $\cos \delta$  in Equation (15) can be disregarded. The



final equation for the bubble expansion stage can be obtained by substituting for  $P_c$  and  $P_b$  from Equations (10) and modified (17) in Equation (13) as follows:

$$\frac{d^2 r_b}{dt^2} = g \frac{s_b}{r_b} - \frac{3}{2r_b} \left( \frac{dr_b}{dt} \right)^2 - \frac{c^2 \rho_g}{r_b \gamma V_c \rho_l} [V_b - (V_b)_{t=0} - Qt] - \frac{\rho_g \left( \frac{dV_b}{dt} \right)^2}{\rho_l r_b C_d^2 S_{or}^2} + \frac{2\sigma_{lg}}{r_b \rho_l} \left( \frac{1}{(r_b)_{t=0}} - \frac{1}{r_b} \right). \quad (18)$$

The system of equations is numerically solved to calculate  $r_b$ ,  $\frac{dr_b}{dt}$ , and time  $t_{ex}$  at the end of the expansion stage using the standard Runge-Kutta fourth-order scheme given the following initial conditions:

$$(r_b)_{t=0} = \frac{d_{or}}{2 \sin \vartheta}, \quad (19)$$

$$\left( \frac{dr_b}{dt} \right)_{t=0} = 0, \quad (20)$$

$$(P_c)_{t=0} = P_{atm} + \rho_l g h + \frac{2\sigma_{lg}}{(r_b)_{t=0}}, \quad (21)$$

$$(P_b)_{t=0} = P_{atm} + \rho_l g h + \frac{2\sigma_{lg}}{(r_b)_{t=0}}. \quad (22)$$

In the experimental setup, the ratio of the diameter of the orifice to the one from the gas reservoir is less than 0.03. Hence, the ratio of  $S_{or}/S_c$  in Equation (13) is assumed to be negligible. In the presented model, the bubble base expansion is enabled, hence the bubble instantaneous volume can be calculated as follows:

$$V_b = \frac{4}{3} \pi r_b^3 - \frac{1}{3} \pi r_b^3 (1 - \cos \vartheta)^2 (2 + \cos \vartheta). \quad (23)$$

The expansion stage concludes when the sum of all forces on the bubble is equal to zero. This criterion is satisfied when the integration of the liquid force on the bubble interface in the vertical direction from Equation (17) is zero and  $s_b = r_b \cos \vartheta$ :

$$\int_0^\pi (2\pi P_{int} r^2 \sin \delta \cos \delta)_{r=r_b} = 0. \quad (24)$$

The mathematical derivation of Equation (24) is provided in Appendix B. During the elongation stage, the bubble acceleration is neglected. The bubble, however, has a radial expansion and translational motion. Therefore, the condition  $s_b = r_b \cos \vartheta$  no longer holds and the system of equations needs to account for an additional correlation regarding

the unknown  $s_b$ . This is obtained by substituting for  $P_{int}$  in Equation (24) from Equation (17):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2 s_b}{dt^2} = & \left[ \left( g - \left[ \frac{3}{8} \left( \frac{r_b}{s_b} \right)^2 + \frac{3}{64} \left( \frac{r_b}{s_b} \right)^5 \right] \frac{d^2 r_b}{dt^2} \right) - \left( \frac{1}{r_b} \left[ \frac{3}{8} \left( \frac{r_b}{s_b} \right)^2 + \frac{9}{8} \left( \frac{r_b}{s_b} \right)^5 \right] \left( \frac{dr_b}{dt} \right)^2 \right) + \right. \\ & \left. \left( \frac{1}{r_b} \left[ \frac{9}{16} \left( \frac{r_b}{s_b} \right)^4 + \frac{9}{64} \left( \frac{r_b}{s_b} \right)^7 \right] \left( \frac{ds_b}{dt} \right)^2 \right) - \left( \frac{1}{r_b} \left[ \frac{3}{2} - \frac{9}{128} \left( \frac{r_b}{s_b} \right)^6 \right] \left( \frac{dr_b}{dt} \right) \left( \frac{ds_b}{dt} \right) \right) \right] \\ & \left( \frac{1}{2} + \frac{3}{16} \left( \frac{r_b}{s_b} \right)^3 + \frac{3}{128} \left( \frac{r_b}{s_b} \right)^6 \right)^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Here again, the system of equations is solved using the standard Runge-Kutta fourth order method with following initial conditions:

$$(r_b)_{t_{el}=0} = r_e, \quad (26)$$

$$\left( \frac{dr_b}{dt} \right)_{t_{el}=0} = \left( \frac{dr_b}{dt} \right)_{t=t_{ex}}, \quad (27)$$

$$(s_b)_{t_{el}=0} = r_e \cos \vartheta, \quad (28)$$

$$\left( \frac{ds_b}{dt} \right)_{t_{el}=0} = \left( \frac{dr_b}{dt} \right)_{t=t_{ex}}. \quad (29)$$

The elongation stage terminates using the detachment criterion proposed by Mohseni et al. [28]. This criterion relates the non-spherical geometry of a bubble prior to the detachment to its equivalent spherical shape. The criterion is as follows:

$$\frac{s_b}{d_{or}} = D_1 \left( \frac{d_b}{d_{or}} \right)^{D_2} + D_3. \quad (30)$$

Here, coefficients  $D_1$  to  $D_3$  are as follows:

$$D_1 = 0.2453, D_2 = 1.279, D_3 = 1.485. \quad (31)$$

### 3. Experimental methods

A detailed description of the experimental setup is given in Mohseni et al. [28]. Hence, only necessary information is provided here. Table 3 provides the specifications of both phases. A bubble column made of acrylic glass with dimensions (80×80×1000 mm<sup>3</sup>) was filled up to 800 mm with deionized water. Local bubble rising induced liquid velocity in the column is suppressed using three wire-mesh baffles at 100 mm above the orifice plate with 150 mm spacing be-

tween the baffles. Stainless-steel circular orifice plates with 0.5 mm thickness and roughness of  $R_z = 1 \pm 0.03 \mu\text{m}$  are mounted on a gas reservoir. Each plate contains a single perforation in the middle. The volume of the gas reservoir is accurately adjusted using a precision linear-stage with less than 25  $\mu\text{m}$  positioning error in 100 mm displacement. The dynamic pressure fluctuations in the gas reservoir are monitored using a sensitive microphone, model 106B52 from series 106B microphones of PCB Group, Inc. The resolution of the sensor is 1.3  $\mu\text{bar}$  and a response time of 12.5  $\mu\text{s}$ . The signal of the dynamic pressure sensor was recorded synchronously to the camera by a transient data recorder, LTT24 from Labortechnik Tasler GmbH, at a sample rate of 1 MHz. Consequently, the changes in the reservoir pressure were tracked simultaneously to the bubble growth.

Table 3: Characteristics of the continuous phase and the dispersed phase.

Medium	$\kappa \left(\frac{\mu\text{S}}{\text{cm}}\right)$	$\rho \left(\frac{\text{kg}}{\text{m}^3}\right)$	$\mu \left(\frac{\text{kg}}{\text{ms}}\right)$	$T \left(^{\circ}\text{C}\right)$
Deionized water	34.1	998.2	$8.9 \times 10^{-4}$	25
Air	$3 \times 10^{-11}$	1.184	$1.84 \times 10^{-5}$	25

Table 4 provides information regarding the range of experiments. The surface tension coefficient and the apparent contact angle were measured at 0.072 N/m and  $74^{\circ} \pm 0.7$ , respectively. For each orifice, two gas flow rates corresponding to the quasi-static bubbling regime and the dynamic bubbling regime are studied [8]. The transition from the quasi-static regime to the dynamic regime is indicated by the critical volumetric gas flow rates  $Q_c$  as follows [32]:

$$Q_c = \pi \left( \frac{16}{3g^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{6}} \left( \frac{\sigma_{lg} d_{or}}{2\rho_l} \right)^{\frac{5}{6}}. \quad (32)$$

Accordingly, the normalized rates of  $Q/Q_c = 0.5$  and  $Q/Q_c = 1.5$  were fed to each orifice to generate bubbles under the quasi-static regime and the dynamic regime, respectively. The influence of  $V_c$  can be represented by the capacitance number  $Nc$ . Previous studies defined the range  $1 < Nc < 10$  in which the influence of  $V_c$  should be considered [33, 16]. However, this range is mostly validated for millimeter-sized orifices. In the current investigation, a wide range of  $0.2 \leq Nc \leq 50$  is covered within two sets of experiments. The first set of experiments covers a comparable range of  $Nc$  as previous investigations. Accordingly, the influence  $V_c$  on the bubble formation is studied at constant gas flow rates of  $Q/Q_c = 0.5$  and  $Q/Q_c = 1.5$  in a range of  $0.2 < Nc < 15$  for all orifices. The corresponding measurement matrix is provided in Figure 2 (left). In the second set of experiments, the range of  $Nc$  is extended for the orifices smaller than 0.5 mm up to  $Nc = 50$ , see Figure 2 (right). The gas flow rate for this set of measurements is kept constant at  $Q/Q_c = 0.5$ . To investigate the bubble dynamics, videometry with a back-light technique is utilized. The processing of the images is done using a proprietary image processing algorithm developed by Ziegenhein [34]. Detailed explanation of the optical measurement technique as well as the image processing method are explained in

Table 4: Characteristics and operating conditions at various orifices operating under VGFC.

ID	$d_{or} (\mu\text{m})$	$Q (\frac{\text{S mL}}{\text{min}})$	$Q_c (\frac{\text{S mL}}{\text{min}})$	$E\ddot{o} (\times 10^{-3})$	$We (\times 10^3)$	$Nc$
O-200	207	9.95 , 29.8	19.9	5.770	0.22 , 1.94	0.2 ... 50
O-300	315	14.1 , 42.3	28.2	13.32	0.11 , 1.11	0.2 ... 50
O-400	412	17.6 , 52.8	35.3	22.82	0.08 , 0.77	0.2 ... 50
O-500	488	20.3 , 60.9	40.6	32.01	0.07 , 0.62	0.2 ... 50
O-600	614	24.5 , 73.6	49.0	50.30	0.05 , 0.44	0.2 ... 15
O-700	699	27.4 , 82.2	54.8	65.59	0.04 , 0.38	0.2 ... 15
O-800	788	30.3 , 90.8	60.5	83.31	0.04 , 0.32	0.2 ... 15
O-900	887	33.4 , 100	66.8	105.7	0.03 , 0.28	0.2 ... 15
O-1000	993	36.7 , 110	73.4	132.3	0.03 , 0.24	0.2 ... 10




Figure 2: Data points for the investigations on bubble formation under VGFC, up to  $Nc = 15$  (left) and up to  $Nc = 50$  (right).

## 4. Results and discussion

### 4.1. Pressure variations in the gas reservoir

Pressure variations in the gas reservoir  $\Delta P_c$  are explained using the exemplary orifice O-300 operating at a low gas flow rate  $Q/Q_c = 0.5$  with small, medium, and large values of  $V_c$ . Figure 3 shows development of  $\Delta P_c$  in a small  $V_c$  for three consecutive bubbles. In this case, after bubble detachment, the gas-liquid interface enters into the orifice. Due to the liquid weeping,  $V_c$  reduces. The latter, along with simultaneous gas feed into the reservoir  $Q$ , results in a sharp increase in  $\Delta P_c$  up to the point (I) in Figure 3. From this point,  $\Delta P_c$  linearly increases, although the gas-liquid interface is still inside the orifice. Tracking the curvature of the bubble-cap from point (II) to point (III) suggests that, the radius of the bubble-cap within this period remains constant, see Figure 4. This radius is equal to the orifice radius and it is known as the critical radius. Considering the similar trend of the pressure evolution before and after point (II), one can assume that the critical radius is already achieved at point (I). From this point, the gas pocket is rising

through the orifice. There is no simple explanation for the behavior of the gas-liquid interface for the period before  
 110 point (I). However, the influence of the liquid weeping and consequently the effect of the liquid inertia and the liquid  
 viscosity in such a small gas reservoir is believed to be highly relevant.




Figure 3: Pressure evolution in the gas reservoir for three consecutive cycles (left) and the first cycle only (right) of bubble formation from O-300 at  $Q/Q_c = 0.5$  with  $V_c = 0.003 \text{ cm}^3$  and  $N_c = 0.5$ .




Figure 4: Evolution of the bubble-cap prior to the spontaneous growth,  $t = 61 \text{ ms}$  and  $t = 66 \text{ ms}$  refer to the points (II) and (III) in Figure 3, respectively.

By increasing  $V_c$ , the range of  $\Delta P_c$  reduces. The value of  $\Delta P_c$  in the case of the bubble in Figure 5 is 0.15 kPa, compared to 0.65 kPa in the case of the bubble in Figure 3. Liquid weeping also occurs in this case, although no sharp increase in  $\Delta P_c$  can be observed after the departure of the leading bubble. In comparison to the case with smaller  $V_c$ ,  
 115 the duration of the formation cycle is almost half and  $\Delta P_c$  decreases linearly during the gas discharge to the bubble.




Figure 5: Pressure evolution in the gas reservoir for three consecutive cycles (left) and the first cycle only (right) of bubble formation from O-300 at  $Q/Q_c = 0.5$  with  $V_c = 11.8 \text{ cm}^3$  and  $N_c = 15$ .

By further increasing  $V_c$ ,  $\Delta P_c$  decreases even more. In this case, the volumetric gas discharge into the bubble  $q$  becomes so high that it causes a change in the bubbling regime. However, even with a new bubbling regime, the maximum  $\Delta P_c$  remains lower than for smaller reservoirs. As it can be seen in Figure 6,  $\Delta P_c$  drops quickly in the course of spontaneous bubble formation. The first bubble is generated within less than 10 ms, Figure 6 point (II). Subsequently, the secondary bubble grows and reaches out to the leading bubble. The growth of the secondary bubble is believed to be due to the high gas kinetic energy during the discharge process, re-establishment of a spherical gas pocket after the bubble detachment, and the influence of the wake of the leading bubble by establishing a low-pressure area above the secondary bubble.




Figure 6: Pressure evolution in the gas reservoir for three consecutive cycles (left) and the first cycle only (right) of bubble formation from O-300 at  $Q/Q_c = 0.5$  with  $V_c = 15.77 \text{ cm}^3$  and  $N_c = 20$ .

Figure 7 shows the trend of maximum pressure variations in the reservoir  $\Delta P_{c,max}$  with regard to  $V_c$  and therefore  $N_c$ . In this figure,  $\Delta P_{c,max}$  is normalized using the capillary pressure of the orifice  $P_{cap} = 4\sigma_{lg}/d_{or}$ . According to

Equation 22 and for a similar experimental conditions, the minimum required  $P_c$  for formation of bubbles from various orifices depends only on  $P_{cap}$  and consequently  $d_{or}$ . Hence,  $\Delta P_{c,max}/P_{cap}$  in Figure 7 not only indicates the trend of maximum pressure variations but also its portion with regard to  $d_{or}$ . In general,  $\Delta P_{c,max}$  reduces as  $Nc$  increases. By increasing  $Nc$ ,  $\Delta P_{c,max}$  initially remains constant or slightly increases and reaches to a maximum. From this point  
130 onward, the influence of  $V_c$  becomes important. For  $O$ -200, the maximum  $\Delta P_{c,max}$  is only about 20% of  $P_{cap}$  and the influence of  $V_c$  can be seen even with the smallest reservoirs. However,  $Nc \geq 20$ ,  $\Delta P_{c,max}$  seems to be independent of  $Nc$  for  $O$ -200. In the case of  $O$ -300,  $\Delta P_{c,max}$  initially increases, which is due to the increase in the size of generated bubbles, and then it gradually reduces to about  $Nc = 11$ . At this point,  $\Delta P_{c,max}$  increases again which is due to the change in the regime of bubbling from single bubbling to double bubbling. For orifices larger than  $O$ -300, the magnitude of  $\Delta P_{c,max}$   
135 due to the bubble formation increases. Moreover, the trend of the evolution of  $\Delta P_{c,max}$  by increasing  $Nc$  becomes similar among the orifices. However, the local maximums of  $\Delta P_{c,max}$  occurs at slightly different  $Nc$ .

Above observations suggest that, for sub-millimeter orifices the range of  $Nc$  within which the influence of  $V_c$  on bubble formation should be considered, varies with the orifice size. In other words, VGFC can be achieved in different ranges of  $Nc$  for sub-millimeter orifices. This is in contrary to observations from millimeter orifices where the lowest  
140 and the highest limits of VGFC reported to be  $Nc = 1$  and  $Nc = 10$ , respectively [9, 18]. Moreover,  $\Delta P_{c,max}$  is directly related to the size of the orifice  $d_{or}$ , the rate of volumetric gas flow  $Q$ , the size of the gas reservoir  $V_c$ , and consequently the diameter of bubbles  $d_b$  generated from the orifice. Hence, to interpret the behavior of  $\Delta P_{c,max}$ , the influence of these parameters should be considered simultaneously.




Figure 7: Pressure variation in the gas reservoir due to bubble formation at  $Q/Q_c = 0.5$  at various capacitance numbers.


#### 4.2. Forces acting on a bubble

Figure 8 illustrates the typical evolution of the acting forces on the bubble during the formation from  $O-1000$  and  $O-600$  at  $Q/Q_c = 0.5$ . The magnitude of individual forces is calculated from the expressions provided in Table 2. In the calculation of forces, the influence of the dynamic apparent contact angle  $\vartheta$  and the bubble base expansion are included. In the case of orifices in Figure 8, the dominant forces are respectively the buoyancy force  $F_B$  and the liquid inertia force  $F_{LI}$  in upward and downward directions. Moreover, depending on the size of the gas reservoir  $V_c$ , the gas momentum force  $F_M$  and the surface tension force  $F_S$  can be relatively important. For the bubble generators with a small  $V_c$  corresponding to  $Nc = 0.2$ ,  $F_S$  remains important throughout the formation of the bubble, except shortly after the beginning of the formation. As the bubble starts to expand, the apparent contact angle temporarily reduces to nearly zero. Hence, the magnitude of  $F_S$  reduces accordingly. By increasing  $V_c$ , the duration in which the apparent contact angle  $\vartheta$  is negligible prolongs toward the later stage of the formation. Hence, the contribution of  $F_S$  on the formation process becomes less important. The magnitude of  $F_{LI}$  increases with  $V_c$ . It is previously explained that one of the circumstances of increasing  $V_c$  is the generation of larger bubbles. This increase in the bubble volume is a result of the excessive  $q$ , which in turn amplifies  $F_M$  and consequently enhances  $F_{LI}$ . The latter is related to the velocity and acceleration of the bubble, see Table 2. For the given range of orifices and gas flow rates, the influence of the drag



force  $F_D$  is negligible. Similarly, the influence of the pressure force  $F_P$  is insignificant except at the very beginning of  
 160 the formation process.

*O-1000*



*O-600*




Figure 8: Typical evolution of forces acting on a growing bubble for *O-1000* and *O-600* at  $Q/Q_c = 0.5$  with various gas reservoir sizes (legend:  $\circ F_B$ ,  $\blacktriangleright F_P$ ,  $\diamond F_M$ ,  $\square F_S$ ,  $\triangle F_D$ ,  $\nabla F_{LI}$ ).

By reducing  $d_{or}$ , the influence of the gas kinetic energy becomes more important. Hence,  $F_M$  acts effectively and  
 pushes the bubble in the axial direction. On the contrary, the  $F_{LI}$  resists this bubble elongation and becomes the only  
 dominant downward force during the formation. As it can be seen in Figure 9, both  $F_{LI}$  and  $F_M$  grow in magnitude  
 as  $Nc$  increases. On the upward direction and by increasing  $Nc$  or reducing  $d_{or}$ ,  $F_M$  takes over  $F_B$  and becomes the  
 165 dominant upward force. Moreover, by reducing  $d_{or}$ , the influence of  $F_P$  becomes stronger as a result of the formation of  
 smaller bubbles. Similar to the larger orifices, the contribution of  $F_D$  is negligible regardless of the size of the orifice.




Figure 9: Evolution of forces acting on a growing bubble for *O-400* and *O-200* at  $Q/Q_c = 0.5$  with various gas reservoir sizes (legend:  $\circ F_B$   $\triangleright F_P$   $\diamond F_M$   $\square F_S$   $\triangle F_D$   $\nabla F_{LI}$ ).

### 4.3. Model validation

The presented model solves the bubble volume from a spherical submerged orifice with a diameter in the range of  $0.2 < d_{or} < 1$  mm in the range of  $0.5 \leq Q/Q_c \leq 1.5$  under VGFC. The model is limited to the prediction of the bubble size that is resulted from a single detachment from the orifice. As  $V_c$  can alter the bubbling regime, the limit of the presented model, is in the range of  $1 \leq N_c \leq 10$ . Figure 10 compares the solution of the model with the experimental data from various orifices and volumetric gas flow rates. As it can be seen, the increasing trend of  $r_b/r_{or}$  with  $N_c$  from the model agrees with experimental results. Moreover, the agreement remains consistent when the normalized gas flow rate  $Q/Q_c$  is tripled.




Figure 10: Comparison between the solution of the model (dashed-lines) and experimental data (scattered points) for various orifices at  $Q/Q_c \leq 0.5$  (left) and  $0.5 \leq Q/Q_c \leq 1.5$  (right).

175

The model predicts the final bubble radius with an accuracy better than 20% compared with the experimental results. Figure 11 reports on the deviation of the solution of the model from experimental data. Accordingly, Figure 11 (left) compares the cumulative data from all the studied orifices in the range of the model validation,  $0.5 \leq Q/Q_c \leq 1.5$ . Figure 11 (right) depicts the averaged relative error and standard deviation calculated based on the solution of the model and experimental data.




Figure 11: Parity plot of the model prediction and experimental bubble radius (left), and deviation between the model predictions and experimental data for different orifice sizes (right).

## 180 5. Conclusion

We studied the formation of bubbles from sub-millimeter orifices submerged in deionized water under VGFC. Accordingly, we conducted a study on influential parameters, namely the orifice diameter  $d_{or}$ , the volume of the gas reservoir  $V_c$ , and pressure attributes in the reservoir  $P_c$ . Moreover, we developed a theoretical model that accurately estimates the bubble size from sub-millimeter orifices under VGFC. A summary of the main findings is as follows:

- 185 • For sub-millimeter orifices and during the formation of a bubble, enlarging  $V_c$  results in formation of larger bubbles. In this case, as  $V_c$  increases,  $q$  progressively increases during the formation process.
- The range of variation of the dynamic pressure in the gas reservoir due to the bubble formation reduces as  $V_c$  increases.
- Analysis of various forces acting on a bubble during its formation indicates a decisive influence of  $V_c$  on the arrangement of dominant forces on the bubble. Increasing  $V_c$  enhances  $q$ , which in turn amplifies the gas momentum force and the liquid inertia force. For  $d_{or} < 0.4$  mm, however,  $q$  is dominated by  $d_{or}$  and it is less influenced by  $V_c$ .
- 190 • The presented model predicts the detachment bubble volume from a sub-millimeter submerged orifice under VGFC. Compared to the earlier models, the model includes the influence of the apparent contact angle and the expansion of the bubble base. Moreover, the model uses a new detachment criterion which correlates the non-spherical bubble shape from the experiments to the spherical bubble volumes calculated from the theoretical model. Incorporating these parameters yields an accurate estimation of the bubble volume within the validation range of the present study.

Clearly,  $V_c$  has a substantial effect on the bubble size from single sub-millimeter orifices. For the future works, it is suggested to characterize the effect of this parameter in the case of adjacent orifices that are hydraulically connected via the same reservoir. Moreover, the effect of the gas pressure fluctuation on the bubble formation worth investigating.

## Acknowledgment

This work is partly funded by the European Social Fund and the Free State of Saxony, reference number: 100284305 and the Initiative and Networking Fund of the Helmholtz Association in the frame of the Clean Water Technology Lab CLEWATEC- a Helmholtz Innovation Lab.

## Appendix A. Coefficients in Equation (17)

The detailed description of the coefficients in Equation (17) are given below. As the distance of the bubble's center of mass to the orifice plate is equal or more than the bubble radius, the terms smaller than  $r_b^7/s_b^7$  are neglected.

$$\Gamma_1 = r_b \frac{d^2 r_b}{dt^2} \left[ \frac{3 r_b^2}{8 s_b^2} + \frac{3 r_b^5}{64 s_b^5} \right] + r_b \frac{d^2 s_b}{dt^2} \left[ \frac{1}{2} + \frac{3 r_b^3}{16 s_b^3} + \frac{3 r_b^6}{128 s_b^6} \right] + \left( \frac{dr_b}{dt} \right)^2 \left[ \frac{3 r_b^2}{8 s_b^2} + \frac{9 r_b^5}{8 s_b^5} \right] - \left( \frac{ds_b}{dt} \right)^2 \left[ \frac{9 r_b^4}{16 s_b^4} + \frac{9 r_b^7}{64 s_b^7} \right] + \frac{dr_b}{dt} \frac{ds_b}{dt} \left[ \frac{3}{2} - \frac{9 r_b^6}{128 s_b^6} \right] - gr_b, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$\Gamma_2 = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{ds_b}{dt} \right)^2, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$\Gamma_3 = - \left( \frac{ds_b}{dt} \right)^2 \left[ \frac{5}{8} + \frac{9 r_b^3}{32 s_b^3} + \frac{6.75 r_b^6}{128 s_b^6} \right] - \left( \frac{dr_b}{dt} \right)^2 \left[ \frac{g r_b^4}{128 s_b^4} + \frac{2.25 r_b^7}{128 s_b^7} \right] - \frac{dr_b}{dt} \frac{ds_b}{dt} \left[ \frac{9 r_b^2}{16 s_b^2} + \frac{9 r_b^5}{63 s_b^5} \right]. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

## Appendix B. Termination of the expansion stage

210

Mathematical derivation of Equation (24) is provided here. By substituting  $P_{int}$  in Equation (24) using Equation (17) and expanding the integral, Equation (24) can be written as follows:

$$\int_0^\pi 2\pi r_b^2 \sin \delta \cos \delta \left[ p_{atm} + \rho_l gh + \rho_l \left[ \left( r_b \frac{d^2 r_b}{dt^2} \right) + \frac{3}{2} \left( \frac{dr_b}{dt} \right)^2 - g s_b \right] \right] d\delta + \int_0^\pi 2\pi r_b^2 \Gamma_1 \rho_l \sin \delta \cos^2 \delta d\delta + \int_0^\pi 2\pi r_b^2 \Gamma_2 \rho_l \sin \delta \cos^3 \delta d\delta + \int_0^\pi 2\pi r_b^2 \Gamma_3 \rho_l \sin^3 \delta \cos \delta d\delta = 0. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

In the above equation, only the second term on the left hand side of the equation has a non-zero value equal to  $\frac{2}{3}$ . Hence, to satisfy Equation (B.1),  $\Gamma_1$  has to be zero. Moreover, at the end of the expansion stage  $s_b = r_b \cos \vartheta$ ,  $\frac{ds_b}{dt} = \frac{dr_b}{dt} \cos \vartheta$ , and  $\frac{d^2 s_b}{dt^2} = \frac{d^2 r_b}{dt^2} \cos \vartheta$ . Hence, the condition for termination of the expansion stage is expressed as follows:

$$(\Gamma_1)_{r=r_b} = r_b \frac{d^2 r_b}{dt^2} \left[ \left( \frac{3}{8} \cos^2 \vartheta + \frac{3}{64} \cos^5 \vartheta \right) + \left( \frac{1}{2} + \frac{3}{16} \cos^3 \vartheta + \frac{3}{128} \cos^6 \vartheta \right) \right] (1 + \cos \vartheta) + \left( \frac{dr_b}{dt} \right)^2 \left[ \left( \frac{3}{8} \cos^2 \vartheta + \frac{9}{8} \cos^5 \vartheta \right) - \left( \frac{9}{16} \cos^4 \vartheta + \frac{9}{64} \cos^7 \vartheta \right) + \left( \frac{3}{2} - \frac{9}{128} \cos^6 \vartheta \right) \right] (1 + \cos \vartheta + \cos^2 \vartheta) - gr_b \cos \vartheta = 0. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

## Nomenclature

### *Dimensionless groups*

$Ma$	Mach number, ( $= U/c$ )
215 $Nc$	capacitance number, ( $= 4V_c\rho_l/\pi d_{or}^2 P_{or}$ )
$Re_c$	gas Reynolds number in the reservoir, ( $= \rho_g d_c U_c / \mu_g$ )

### *Latin symbols*

$A$	bubble surface area, $m^2$
$A_b$	cross-sectional area of bubble, $m^2$
220 $c$	sound velocity, $\frac{m}{s}$
$C_d$	orifice discharge coefficient
$C_D$	drag coefficient
$C_P$	heat capacity at constant pressure
$C_V$	heat capacity at constant volume
225 $d_b$	bubble diameter, m
$d_c$	gas reservoir diameter, m
$d_{or}$	orifice diameter, m
$d_{32}$	Sauter mean diameter, m
$f$	bubble formation frequency, $\frac{1}{s}$
230 $F$	force, N
$f^*$	quasi-static bubble formation frequency, $\frac{1}{s}$
$g$	gravitational acceleration, $\frac{m^2}{s}$
$h$	submergence depth, m
$K$	orifice constant
235 $l_n$	length of the bubble neck, m
$P_{atm}$	atmospheric pressure, Pa

	$P_b$	pressure inside a bubble, Pa
	$P_c$	pressure in gas reservoir, Pa
	$P_{cap}$	capillary pressure, Pa
240	$P_{crt}$	critical pressure in gas reservoir, Pa
	$P_{int}$	pressure at the bubble interface, Pa
	$P_l$	pressure in liquid phase, Pa
	$P_{or}$	pressure at the orifice plate, Pa
	$q$	volumetric gas flow rate through orifice, $\frac{m^3}{s}$
245	$Q$	volumetric gas flow rate into the gas reservoir, $\frac{m^3}{s}$
	$Q_c$	critical volumetric gas flow rate, $\frac{m^3}{s}$
	$r_b$	bubble radius, m
	$r_d$	bubble base radius, m
	$r_e$	bubble radius at the end of radial expansion stage, m
250	$r_{or}$	orifice radius, m
	$R_Z$	arithmetic average roughness, m
	$S$	cross-sectional area, $m^2$
	$s_b$	distance from bubble's center of mass to the orifice plate, m
	$S_c$	cross-sectional area of gas reservoir, $m^2$
255	$S_i$	cross-sectional area of gas reservoir inlet, $m^2$
	$S_{or}$	cross-sectional area of orifice, $m^2$
	$t$	time, s
	$t_b$	bubbling time, s
	$t_d$	bubbling detachment time, s
260	$t_{ex}$	time of the expansion stage, s
	$t_{el}$	time of the elongation stage, s
	$t_w$	waiting time, s

$T$	absolute temperature, °K
$U$	gas velocity, $\frac{m}{s}$
265 $U_b$	bubble rising velocity, $\frac{m}{s}$
$U_c$	average gas bulk velocity in the reservoir, $\frac{m}{s}$
$U_i$	average gas velocity entering the reservoir, $\frac{m}{s}$
$U_l$	liquid velocity, $\frac{m}{s}$
$U_{or}$	average gas velocity through orifice, $\frac{m}{s}$
270 $V_b$	bubble volume, $m^3$
$V_c$	volume of gas reservoir, $m^3$

*Greek symbols*

$\beta$	ratio of the orifice cross-section to reservoir cross-section
$\gamma$	specific heat ratio
275 $\delta$	angle in Figure 1, °
$\theta$	contact angle, °
$\kappa$	electrical conductivity, $\frac{S}{m}$
$\mu_l$	liquid dynamic viscosity, Pa.s
$\mu_g$	gas dynamic viscosity, Pa.s
280 $\rho_c$	gas density in the reservoir, $\frac{kg}{m^3}$
$\rho_l$	density of liquid, $\frac{kg}{m^3}$
$\rho_g$	density of gas, $\frac{kg}{m^3}$
$\rho_{or}$	density of gas through orifice, $\frac{kg}{m^3}$
$\sigma_{lg}$	liquid-gas surface tension, $\frac{N}{m}$
285 $\phi$	potential function, $\frac{m^2}{s}$
$\phi_E$	potential function of expanding bubble, $\frac{m^2}{s}$
$\phi_T$	potential function of translating bubble, $\frac{m^2}{s}$



## References

- [1] S. J. Y. Lee, H. An, P. C. Wang, J. G. Hang, S. C. M. Yu, Effects of liquid viscosity on bubble formation characteristics in a typical membrane bioreactor, *International Communications in Heat and Mass Transfer* (2020) 105000.
- [2] P. Painmanakul, K. Loubiere, G. Hebrard, P. Buffière, Study of different membrane spargers used in waste water treatment: characterisation and performance, *Chemical Engineering and Processing: Process Intensification* 43 (11) (2004) 1347–1359.
- [3] Y. T. Kang, T. Nagano, T. Kashiwagi, Visualization of bubble behavior and bubble diameter correlation for nh<sub>3</sub>–h<sub>2</sub>o bubble absorption, *International journal of refrigeration* 25 (1) (2002) 127–135.
- [4] R. Lau, R. Mo, W. S. B. Sim, Bubble characteristics in shallow bubble column reactors, *Chemical Engineering Research and Design* 88 (2) (2010) 197–203.
- [5] C. Ribeiro Jr, P. Lage, Experimental study on bubble size distributions in a direct-contact evaporator, *Brazilian journal of chemical engineering* 21 (1) (2004) 69–81.
- [6] A. A. Kulkarni, J. B. Joshi, Bubble formation and bubble rise velocity in gas- liquid systems: a review, *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research* 44 (16) (2005) 5873–5931.
- [7] A. Wraith, Two stage bubble growth at a submerged plate orifice, *Chemical Engineering Science* 26 (10) (1971) 1659–1671.
- [8] E. Mohseni, R. Herrmann-Heber, S. Reinecke, U. Hampel, Bubble generation by micro-orifices with application on activated sludge wastewater treatment, *Chemical Engineering and Processing-Process Intensification* 143 (2019) 107511.
- [9] T. Tadaki, The size of bubbles from single orifices, *Kagaku Kogaku Ronbunshu* 27 (1963) 147–155.
- [10] A. Marmur, E. Rubin, A theoretical model for bubble formation at an orifice submerged in an inviscid liquid, *Chemical Engineering Science* 31 (6) (1976) 453–463.
- [11] W. Pinczewski, The formation and growth of bubbles at a submerged orifice, *Chemical Engineering Science* 36 (2) (1981) 405–411.
- [12] H. Tsuge, Y. Nakajima, K. Terasaka, Behavior of bubbles formed from a submerged orifice under high system pressure, *Chemical engineering science* 47 (13-14) (1992) 3273–3280.

- 315 [13] W. Hayes III, B. W. Hardy, C. D. Holland, Formation of gas bubbles at submerged orifices, *AIChE Journal* 5 (3) (1959) 319–324.
- [14] J. Davidson, Bubble formation at an orifice in an inviscid liquid, *Transactions of the Institution of Chemical Engineers* 38 (1960) 335–342.
- [15] A. Satyanarayan, R. Kumar, N. Kuloor, Studies in bubble formation—ii bubble formation under constant pressure  
320 conditions, *Chemical Engineering Science* 24 (4) (1969) 749–761.
- [16] A. Khurana, R. Kumar, Studies in bubble formation?iii, *Chemical Engineering Science* 24 (11) (1969) 1711–1723.
- [17] R. D. Swope, Single bubble formation at orifices submerged in viscous liquids, *The Canadian Journal of Chemical Engineering* 49 (2) (1971) 169–174.
- [18] Y. Park, A. L. Tyler, N. de Nevers, The chamber orifice interaction in the formation of bubbles, *Chemical Engi-  
325 neering Science* 32 (8) (1977) 907–916.
- [19] D. J. McCann, R. Prince, Bubble formation and weeping at a submerged orifice, *Chemical Engineering Science* 24 (5) (1969) 801–814.
- [20] A. Kupferberg, Bubble formation at a submerged orifice above a gas chamber of finite volume, *Trans. Int. Chem. Engrs.* 47 (1969) 241–250.
- 330 [21] H. Lamb, *Hydrodynamics*, Cambridge university press, 1993.
- [22] H. TSUGE, S.-I. HIBINO, Bubble formation from an orifice submerged in liquids, *Chemical Engineering Com- munications* 22 (1-2) (1983) 63–79.
- [23] M. Pereira Dias, Bubble formation at a multiple orifice plate submerged in quiescent liquid (1999).
- [24] W. Zhang, R. Tan, A model for bubble formation and weeping at a submerged orifice, *Chemical engineering  
335 science* 55 (24) (2000) 6243–6250.
- [25] W. Zhang, R. Tan, A model for bubble formation and weeping at a submerged orifice with liquid cross-flow, *Chemical engineering science* 58 (2) (2003) 287–295.
- [26] M. Ruzicka, M. Vecer, S. Orvalho, J. Drahoš, Effect of surfactant on homogeneous regime stability in bubble column, *Chemical Engineering Science* 63 (4) (2008) 951–967.

- 340 [27] O. Potter, Bubble formation under constant-pressure conditions, *Chemical Engineering Science* 24 (11) (1969) 1733–1734.
- [28] E. Mohseni, T. Ziegenhein, S. Reinecke, U. Hampel, Bubble formation from sub-millimeter orifices under variable gas flow conditions, *Chemical Engineering Science* 242 (2021) 116698.
- [29] F. M. White, *Fluid mechanics*, Tata McGraw-Hill Education, 1979.
- 345 [30] J. H. Perry, *Chemical engineers' handbook* (1950).
- [31] P. J. Pritchard, R. W. Fox, A. T. McDonald, *Introduction to fluid mechanics*, John Wiley & Sons, 2010.
- [32] H. N. Oguz, A. Prosperetti, Dynamics of bubble growth and detachment from a needle, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 257 (1993) 111–145.
- [33] O. S. Gokhale, M. A. Jog, R. M. Manglik, Experimental study of chamber volume effect on bubble formation from orifice plates submerged in water, in: *ASME International Mechanical Engineering Congress and Exposition*, Vol. 52101, American Society of Mechanical Engineers, 2018, p. V007T09A013.
- 350
- [34] T. Ziegenhein, *Fluid dynamics of bubbly flows*, PhD Thesis (2016).