



**HAL**  
open science

## Size-independent phase distinction in dispersed two-phase flows

David de Souza, Till Zürner, Romain Monchaux

► **To cite this version:**

David de Souza, Till Zürner, Romain Monchaux. Size-independent phase distinction in dispersed two-phase flows. 2020. hal-03026261v1

**HAL Id: hal-03026261**

**<https://hal.science/hal-03026261v1>**

Preprint submitted on 26 Nov 2020 (v1), last revised 8 Dec 2020 (v2)

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Size-independent phase distinction in dispersed two-phase flows

David De Souza · Till Zürner · Romain Monchaux

Received: date / Accepted: date

**Abstract** In the study of dispersed two phase flows, having access to the velocities of both phases is necessary to fully understand and study the behaviour of these complex systems. While all data can be obtained in numerical simulations, this can prove more difficult to perform with experimental measurements. In this article, a new method to separate inertial particles from tracers in a two-dimensional laser sheet is described. By using a two camera acquisition system in conjunction with an optical filter, the two phases can successfully be segregated, without relying on an apparent size or intensity difference between inertial particles and tracers. This allows for the velocities and positions of the particles to be measured in conjunction with the velocity field of the carrying phase. A series of tests are performed on the method. In addition to ensuring that the method functions in a satisfactory manner, these tests give indications on how to use the method properly. As an example, measurement results of ceramic particles settling in still water are presented.

**Keywords** Particle laden flow · PIV · PTV · Dyed tracers · Optical filtering

---

This work was supported by the French Direction Générale de l'Armement (DGA) through the Agence de l'Innovation de Défense (AID).

---

D. De Souza · T. Zürner · R. Monchaux  
Institut des Sciences de la Mécanique et Applications Industrielles (IMSIA),  
ENSTA-Paris / CNRS / CEA / EDF / Institut Polytechnique de Paris,  
828 Boulevard des Maréchaux, 91120 Palaiseau, France  
E-mail: romain.monchaux@ensta-paris.fr

## 1 Introduction

Particle laden flows are ubiquitous in natural and industrial systems and have received much attention in the last decades. When particle inertia is different from that of the fluid, the particle dynamics deviate from that of tracers which exactly follow fluid elements and are usually used in fluid metrology to gain access to the fluid velocity field. Inertial particle trajectories sample the flow non-uniformly (Maxey and Corrsin, 1980), leading to preferential concentration, some regions of the flow being more visited than others due to their local properties (high/low strain or vorticity, vanishing acceleration...). When the particle loading is high enough, preferential concentration can lead to the formation of denser regions where particles accumulate as originally found by Brown and Roshko (1974). This so called clustering can also be a consequence of the path history of particles and can thus occur in any region of the flow, regardless of its local properties (Gustavsson and Mehlig, 2011). The high intermittency in the concentration field due to clustering and/or preferential concentration can be an issue in many applications (e.g. for pollutant, plankton dispersion, mixing or fuel combustion in engines), but it may also have dramatic impacts on other relevant issues of particle laden flows: collisions, settling velocity alteration and carrier phase modulation. The collision probability depends on both the local particle concentration field and on the local velocity gradients (Falkovich et al., 2002). The settling velocity is altered as soon as the carrier flow is turbulent (Maxey and Corrsin, 1980) but also when the local particle concentration is dense enough (Aliseda et al., 2002; Monchaux and Dejoan, 2017; Huck et al., 2018). Both cases depend non-trivially on many physical parameters (e.g. volume loading, phase density ra-

tios, turbulence level or particle size). How the back reaction by the particles on the continuous phase modifies the carrier flow is just as complex and sensitive to the same parameters (Elghobashi and Truesdell, 1993; Eaton, 2009).

As direct on site measurements of these processes (e.g. in clouds, marine snow, ash clouds or combustion chambers) are rarely possible, model experiments and numerical simulations are traditionally used to investigate the very rich physics of these flows. Due to the complexity of solving the flow in the vicinity of large numbers of finite sized particles, this kind of direct approach is still limited (Homann and Bec, 2010; Lucci et al., 2010). Usually, the Navier-Stokes equations are solved for the fluid and model equations are used for the particles. Unfortunately, the available analytical model equations for the dynamics of inertial particles are obtained under the limiting assumptions of point particles and very large density ratio (Maxey and Riley, 1983; Gatignol, 1983) and involve many terms that are most of the time neglected in numerical studies. In addition, to reduce the computation time required to explore the wide parameter space described above, most numerical studies do not consider the back reaction particles exert on the fluid. Providing empirical models that allow the back reaction of the particles on the fluid being taken into account without solving the whole velocity field in their neighbourhood is thus an essential challenge for the coming years.

To address this challenge, as well as providing model free data to understand the complex and intricate roles of the large number of parameters controlling particle laden flows, experiments have to provide detailed measurements in both phases, at the same time and location. Such measurements thus provide us with the slip velocity between the two phases, fluid-particle correlations or at least fluid statistics at the particle positions. All these quantities are key ingredients to understand the mechanisms at work in preferential concentration and clustering, settling velocity and collision alteration and carrier phase modulation. Even though the development of such simultaneous measurements in both phases has started two decades ago (Towers et al., 1999) it is still far from being routinely used in laboratories and no commercial solution is available yet.

Fluid flow measurements are now available in any dimensions. Three dimensional (3D) Eulerian velocity fields are accessible through particle image velocimetry (PIV) that can even be time-resolved in certain conditions. Using particle tracking velocimetry (PTV), Lagrangian particle trajectories can also be measured at sufficiently high time resolutions to allow acceleration statistics to be computed (Ouellette et al., 2008).

The main drawback of the 3D measurements is its usually very limited volume. Probing wider regions of flows from both PIV and PTV is still the private preserve of two dimensional (2D) systems. Pointwise (0D) systems are also often employed in multiphase flow studies, particularly in wind tunnels to collect one dimensional (1D) data sets under Taylor hypothesis assumptions. These systems can be intrusive (hot wires, optical probes) or not (Laser Doppler anemometer, phase Doppler particle analysis), some of them being able to discriminate between phases, see for example Muste et al. (1998). However, it has been recently shown that the acquired 1D data may suffer from very strong biases that are difficult to overcome (Mora et al., 2018). In the following we will focus on 2D systems.

Most 2D systems can be equally used to perform measurements on fluid tracers or on inertial particles. Indeed, as they are usually designed to see and/or follow tracers that are smaller than inertial particles, it is thus quite simple to use these same systems to image and/or track inertial particles that are often more visible on the acquired images than the tracers. The difficulty in measuring both phases thus mainly relies on the simultaneity, as these systems are usually not made to perform PIV on the fluid and PTV on the inertial particles at the same time. Several groups have designed such coupled measurement systems (see next two paragraphs) but, as mentioned above, it still remains a challenging issue. As both independent measurements are well developed, the key issue for simultaneously probing both phase is to manage the segregation between tracers and inertial particles. Depending on the carrier fluid, usually air or water, the tracer characteristics can be quite different. In water they are typically almost neutrally buoyant spherical particles whose diameters can range between 5 to 30  $\mu\text{m}$ . In air, 1 to 2  $\mu\text{m}$  oil droplets are traditionally used but start being replaced by 300  $\mu\text{m}$  inflated neutrally buoyant soap bubbles. Regarding inertial particles, the range of particle size used by the different authors varies on orders of magnitude according to the wide range of corresponding applications. Larger particles are usually sand or beads whose diameters can be as large as a few millimetres while the smallest can be even smaller than tracers. While PIV tracers are designed to diffuse as much light as possible, inertial particles in general cannot be tailored to this purpose and come as they are. According to their size and material they may scatter very little light.

Most successes in simultaneous fluid/particle measurements have been obtained when a large scale separation exists between particles and tracers. In this case, a classical 2D PIV/PTV system is sufficient and particles and tracers are acquired on the same image by a

single camera. Different authors designed different post-processing algorithms to achieve the segregation: simple discrimination by spot sizes has been used since the early two phase measurements by Chen and Fan (1992) or Hassan et al. (1992) but more sophisticated algorithms taking into account the relative brightness of tracers and particles (Khalitov and Longmire, 2002) or filtering the tracers as a high frequency noise (Kiger and Pan, 2000) have for example been proposed. In many cases, the material and size differences between tracers and particles are obviously used in the separation algorithms.

In the absence of scale separation, a relevant idea is to use fluorescent dye. Under Laser illumination, dyed tracers will emit light at a shifted wavelength while particles will only diffuse the incoming light as is. This seems to provide an easy way to perform the segregation. Single camera acquisitions can still be relevant if a colour camera is used. With 532 nm Laser light and rhodamin coated tracers (a classical configuration), the green channel ideally will only see the particles while the red channel would only see the tracers. See Towers et al. (1999) for a more sophisticated application where both phases are dyed differently and a triple pulse Laser is used to discriminate them. Unfortunately, the low resolution of colour cameras, the interpolation schemes used to compensate for the colour filtered array of pixels and the high level of induced pixel locking incite to avoid colour cameras. The obvious alternative is to use two cameras equipped with colour filters and aiming at the same field of view. The main issue then becomes the difficulty in matching the acquired fields of view. This can be achieved by using beam splitters or by positioning both cameras very close to each other, aiming at almost the same field of view and using a stereoscopic PIV calibration procedure to match the fields of view (the latter being our proposition). The use of a beam splitter avoids sophisticated calibration procedures since both cameras actually aim (theoretically) at the same field of view but it implies a somewhat complex mounting and more importantly the loss of half the light budget, which may be an issue when particles do not diffuse much light. This was nonetheless successfully implemented by Elhimer et al. (2017). In their study, a “cross-talk” between the two cameras remained. In fact, the inertial particles used were much larger than the tracers (more than 1 mm in diameter) and, due to their size, faint images of the inertial particles could be seen on the tracer images, as the fluorescent light emitted by the tracers was also scattered by the particles. This was solved with an additional post processing to separate particles from tracers thanks to their difference in intensity. The unusual use of a stereo-

scopic PIV system is made more appropriate and accurate nowadays with the recent development of so-called self-calibration algorithms that allow to almost perfectly match both fields of views. For more details on this calibration procedure see Wieneke (2005). In any case (colour or grey level cameras, beam splitters or not), experimentalists are left with two sets of images. On the “red” one, only dyed tracers are visible, the flow field is thus easily accessible. However, on the “green” one, it might be more complicated. Indeed, the efficiency of the absorption and emission of the incoming wavelength by the dyed tracers is not 100%. As a result, tracers also directly scatter a portion of the Laser light and are thus visible on the “green” images alongside the particles. Poelma et al. (2007) refer to this as “cross-talk” between images. In their study, they manage to get rid of this cross-talk because, due to scale and brightness separation, the tracers’ grey level is within background noise on the “green” images. When particles and tracers have similar sizes and when the particle material does not scatter much light, a way to remove tracers from these images has to be found.

In this article, we propose a method to achieve simultaneous velocity measurements of particles and tracers when no scale or brightness separation is present, by masking the tracers on images with inertial particles. The method developed here is generic and can be applied by most experimentalist with standard stereoscopic PIV systems. Section 2 describes this method and outlines its potential pitfalls. To ensure that the method works and to examine its limitations, various tests are performed. These testing procedures and their results are presented in section 3. Finally, section 4 gives recommendations on the method application and showcases some results from real-life experiments before concluding in section 5.

## 2 Tracer masking method

### 2.1 Method description

An overview of the method can be found in figure 1. The method starts from two synchronised image sources: one camera that records both particles and tracers, and one camera where only tracers are visible. In the following these are denoted as particle camera and tracer camera, respectively. Both cameras record grayscale images, giving the light intensities  $I_P(x, y)$  for the particle camera and  $I_T(x, y)$  for the tracer camera.

The fluid velocity field can be calculated directly from  $I_T$  using PIV. To perform PTV on  $I_P$ , inertial particles have to be distinguished from tracers. This is




Fig. 1: Flowchart of the method for simultaneous particle tracking and fluid velocity measurements by tracer masking. The illustration frames display particle and tracers with exaggerated color and size difference for easier distinction only.

achieved by creating a tracer mask from  $I_T$  that effectively removes the tracers from  $I_P$ . The inertial particles can then be tracked on the resulting filtered images. The characteristics on how to perform a good PIV or PTV will not be discussed in this article, and the parameters involved in these techniques will only be mentioned when relevant to the topic.

A flow chart of the mask creation process can be found in figure 2. The goal is to set the intensities of all pixels belonging to a tracer in  $I_P$  to zero. The first step is to detect the tracers on  $I_T$ . This is done by turning  $I_T$  into a binary image  $B_T$  that sets all pixels that belongs to a tracer in  $I_T$  with zero:

$$B_T(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1, & I_T(x, y) < th_T \\ 0, & I_T(x, y) \geq th_T \end{cases}, \quad (1)$$

where  $th_T$  is the intensity threshold defining whether a pixel belongs to a tracer or not. Using the colour code of figure 2, the area of interest here becomes a white background, while the black spots of the tracers are the regions that will be discarded. However, depending on the configuration of the image sources, small discrepancies in shape, intensity, or even positions of the tracers might exist between  $I_P$  and  $I_T$ . These are further discussed in section 2.2. To accommodate for these




Fig. 2: Flowchart of the mask creation process. On  $B_T$  and  $M$ , areas in white represent pixel values of one and areas in black are pixel values of zero.

discrepancies, the second step of the mask creation process increases the area of the tracers in  $B_T$ . This is done by performing an erosion of the white background around the black tracer spots using a structuring element  $S$ . This erosion is a morphological operation that will widen every area of  $B_T$  where pixels are at zero, i.e., marked as a pixel position. Examples of structuring elements can be found in figure 3. The larger  $S$  is, the more the black area will widen. For example,  $S_1$  does not change  $B_T$ ,  $S_5$  sets to zero all pixels vertically or horizontally adjacent to a zero,  $S_9$  adds all pixels diagonally adjacent, etc. More details on such morphological operations can be found in Haralick et al. (1987). The result of the erosion of  $B_T$  by  $S$  is the final tracer mask  $M$ .

The tracers are then removed from  $I_P$ . This removal is done by applying  $M$  to  $I_P$  with a simple pixel-wise multiplication:

$$I_M(x, y) = I_P(x, y)M(x, y), \quad (2)$$

where  $I_M$  is the final particle image, without tracers. The positions and velocities of the inertial particles can finally be obtained by performing PTV on  $I_M$ .

## 2.2 Error assessment

Generally speaking, errors resulting from the application of this method can have two main origins. The discrepancies in the tracers properties between the two source images  $I_P$  and  $I_T$  constitute one of these origins. For example, if a system with two cameras is used, a




Fig. 3: Examples of structural elements, which are usually small binary sets. Each sub-square represents a pixel, zeros are in black, ones are in white. For the purpose of this article, they are designated by the number of pixels having a value of one. Essentially, for an erosion, any pixel that is at zero will result in all neighbouring pixels to be turned to zero to match the shape of  $S$ . For a given reference pixel at zero:  $S_1$  does not change the image,  $S_5$  turns all pixels vertically and horizontally adjacent to the reference pixel to zero,  $S_9$  does the same but also sets pixels diagonally adjacent to zero, and so on. The structural elements represented here are also the ones used in the testing procedures of section 3.

tracer can be projected onto each camera with different intensities, shapes and positions. A difference in intensity is not an issue for the method presented here, as the choice of  $th_T$  is informed by the intensities of tracers in  $I_T$  only, and tracers masked in  $I_T$  will be removed from  $I_P$  regardless of their intensities. However, differences in shape or position may lead to  $M$  not properly covering the tracers in  $I_P$ . In this instance, tracers detected in  $I_T$  may remain in  $I_M$  and particles might have been erroneously deleted by the mask. The second category of error sources is an inadequate choice of the method parameters  $th_T$  and  $S$ . Going to extreme cases, if  $th_T$  is low enough to catch the background noise level of  $I_T$ , pixels that are not from tracers will be set to zero in  $B_T$ , resulting in an unnecessary loss of data in  $I_M$ . Conversely, putting  $th_T$  too high will leave all tracers in the image. For  $S$ , if it is too small, the erosion will not make up for the discrepancies between  $I_P$  and  $I_T$ . But picking one that is too big will end up with a mask that deletes portions of the image that could have been kept.

From these two origins, three main errors can occur: tracers can remain in  $I_M$ , particles can be completely removed when applying the mask or they can be partially removed. These errors will be referred to as false particle error, erased particle error and altered particle error respectively. First, the false particle error adds false positives, which can skew the tracking results as tracers are mistaken as particles. Second, the erased particle error leads to false negatives, resulting in a loss of data. Finally, the altered particle error can either lose a particle completely or change its detected position, as altering the shape of a particle will change




Fig. 4: Experimental set-up: (a) overview without the cameras, (b) top view.

where the center of the particle is detected. In addition to their effects on the trajectories computed by PTV, these errors will influence the apparent concentration field, which is crucial to understanding the mechanics of dispersed two-phase flow systems.

### 3 Method Validation

To evaluate the response of the method to the errors outlined in section 2.2, two testing procedures have been devised. These procedures involve images from experiments as the basis of the tests. This section first describes the experimental set-up used to obtain these images before covering each testing procedure and their results.

#### 3.1 Experimental set-up

An illustration of the experimental set-up can be found in figure 4. The main part is a tank of dimension  $350 \times 480 \times 350 \text{ mm}^3$ . A column, of square cross-section with side length 130 mm and height 410 mm, sits on top of it. This structure is filled with water. On top of the column, a vibrating sieve serves as the seeding system for the apparatus. Particle injection is controlled by pouring particles onto the sieve and turning the vibration on.

Observations are done in the main tank. Images are recorded with a LaVision stereo PIV acquisition system of two VC-Imager SX 4M cameras synchronised with a vertical pulsed Laser sheet of wavelength 532 nm produced by an Nd:YAG Dual Power 135-15 Laser from Dantec Dynamics. The tracers used are coated in rhodamine. Accordingly, the tracer camera is equipped with an optical filter that lets the fluoresced light emitted by the rhodamine of wavelength above 570 nm pass

through and blocks the Laser wavelength. Both cameras are calibrated on the same area of the Laser sheet using a dotted plate and the self-calibration method previously mentioned.

The two cameras record two images or frames each, in quick succession, and the time in-between the two frames can range from 10 to 30000  $\mu$ s. These double frames from both cameras are recorded with an acquisition frequency of up to 15 Hz. After applying the tracer removal method, the instantaneous particle instantaneous positions and velocities, and the fluid velocity field are obtained. However, the maximal sampling frequency of the system does not allow to track particles between double frames, i.e., long-term particle trajectories are not accessible in the present experiments. In other terms, PTV is performed on each double frame recorded as if it were independent of the previous and following double frames in the experiment. However, the method presented in this article does not depend on the acquisition frequency and can be applied to systems with higher sampling rates.

The images have a resolution of 1700 by 2375 pixels, with each pixel having an intensity ranging from 0 to 4095. Overall the acquisition system has a scaling factor of 13.7 p/mm which then corresponds to an area of 124 by 173 mm of the laser sheet used for observation. For each experiment, an image of the minimal intensities observed on the experimental run is computed and then subtracted from all images to increase the signal to noise ratio. After this operation, the images typically have a background noise below 10 in pixel intensity. On both  $I_P$  and  $I_T$ , particles and tracers have strong signals over 1000 in pixel intensity. The apparent diameter in pixels of the particles obviously depend on their size and the material they are made of but the smallest tested up to now spanned 4 to 5 pixels. The rhodamine coated tracers have an apparent diameter of 2 to 3 pixels.

### 3.2 Tracer removal test procedure

The first testing procedure is a tracer elimination check done mainly to test the method's response to the errors from the discrepancies between  $I_P$  and  $I_T$ , and how its parameters can be tuned to yield reliable results. A flowchart of this procedure can be found in figure 5. It is designed to ensure that the method removes all tracers while deleting as little of the image as possible. The test images  $I_P$  and  $I_T$  used here contain only tracers. That way when applying the tracer masking method, the resulting  $I_M$  should ideally be empty. Then, by applying PTV on  $I_M$ , any particle detected will in fact be a tracer that was not removed. The images  $I_P$  and  $I_T$  used were taken from experiments con-




Fig. 5: Flowchart of the testing procedure on errors coming from discrepancies between  $I_P$  and  $I_T$ .

ducted on the device described in section 3.1. For a given pair of tracer-only images  $I_P$  and  $I_T$ , the only other inputs for the testing procedure are  $th_T$  and  $S$ , the parameters of the tracer removal method. A particle detection (i.e., the first step of PTV) is performed on the tracer-only particle image  $I_P$  and on the masked image  $I_M$ , resulting in a number of detected particles for each of these images. These numbers will respectively be called  $N_P$  and  $N_M$ . A tracer elimination rate  $e$  is then computed as  $e = (N_P - N_M)/N_P$ . In addition, the fraction  $d$  of the image deleted by the method can also be computed from the mask itself as the number of pixels at zero in the mask over the total number of pixels. An overview of the inputs used for this testing procedure can be found in table 1.

Both  $e$  and  $d$  take values between zero and one. Ideally,  $e$  should be as close to one as possible and  $d$  should remain close to zero. In figure 6,  $e$  is plotted against  $d$ , separated and coloured by values of  $th_T$  used in the tests.  $th_T$  is shown to have a clear impact on both  $e$  and  $d$ . The observed response can be explained as follows. Taking a value for  $th_T$  that is too low will identify the background noise of the image as tracers and extend the area removed by the mask to regions where there are in fact no tracers. This results in all tracers being removed but at the cost of deleting a large portion of the image,

Table 1: Overview of the parameters tested in the tracer removal test procedure (section 3.2), and of the characteristics of the images tested. For an illustration of the structuring elements' shapes, see figure 3. All the images used are from different experimental runs. The tracer brightness given is for well lit tracers in the Laser sheet, i.e. tracers that are fully in the Laser sheet.

Parameter	Values, range or number	Unit
$th_T$	{5; 10; 20; 35; 50; 70}	grayscale intensity
Structuring elements' shapes	$S_1, S_5, S_9, S_{13}, S_{21}$	-
Number of images	77	-
Tracer diameter	2 to 3	pixel
Tracer center brightness	< 100	grayscale intensity




Fig. 6: Scatter plots of  $e$  against  $d$ , distinguished by values of  $th_T$ , for all  $S$ . These are spread in three figures for clarity. Among the tested thresholds,  $th_T = 20$  results most consistently in low  $d$  and high  $e$ . [Add \(a\), \(b\) and \(c\) labels.](#)




Fig. 7: Scatter plots of  $e$  against  $d$ , for  $th_T = 20$ , distinguished by  $S$ . These are spread in three figures for clarity.  $S_5$  and  $S_9$  lead to the best results on terms of  $e$  and  $d$ . [Add \(a\), \(b\) and \(c\) labels.](#)



thus in high  $e$  and high  $d$ . On the other hand, setting a value for  $th_T$  that is too high will miss a lot of the tracers in  $I_T$ , causing them to remain after  $M$  has been applied, as described in section 2.2. As fewer tracers are marked for removal, a smaller fraction of the image will be deleted, which leads to both low  $e$  and low  $d$ .  $th_T$  needs to be selected carefully in order to get appropriate results, i.e. high  $e$  and low  $d$ . In the tests presented here,  $th_T = 20$  (squares in figure 6) seems to achieve the best results in terms of high tracer elimination  $e$  and low image deletion  $d$ . Note that this value is specific to the images tested here, and depends on the image acquisition system and potential post-processing applied to the image (such as background image subtraction or noise filtering). The method may still perform well for  $th_T < 20$ , as, even if more of the image is deleted, more tracers will be removed without necessarily diminishing the number of inertial particles that can still be found by the method.

The impact of  $S$  can then be seen in figure 7, where  $e$  is plotted against  $d$  for a fixed  $th_T = 20$ , separated and coloured by  $S$ .  $S_1$ , which in fact corresponds to no erosion being performed at all, does not remove all tracers but keeps  $d$  at low values. Increasing the size of the structuring element to  $S_5$  and  $S_9$ ,  $e$  gets higher without deleting too much of the image yet. Beyond that for  $S_{13}$  and  $S_{21}$ ,  $e$  remains in the same range but  $d$  increases. Overall, this is because larger  $S$  widen the areas detected as tracers more than smaller  $S$  when applying the erosion. This results in smaller  $S$  deleting less of  $I_P$  than larger ones but also being less likely to catch discrepancies between the position or shape of a tracer in  $I_T$  and in  $I_P$ . The images  $I_P$  and  $I_T$  used in these tests match one another with a precision of  $\pm 1$  pixel. This explains the better results obtained for  $S_5$  and  $S_9$  as these two elements extend the areas detected as tracers in  $B_T$  over that  $\pm 1$  pixel range for the final mask  $M$ .

This procedure confirms the trends mentioned in section 2.2 on the influence of the choice of  $th_T$  and  $S$ . These parameters need to be chosen carefully and tuned according to the images and the system used.

### 3.3 Particle matching test procedure

The second procedure is designed to test errors resulting specifically from an inadequate choice of the parameters  $th_T$  and  $S$ . A flowchart of this procedure can be found in figure 8. The objective here is to ensure that tracked particles can faithfully be recovered after the method has been applied, while still removing the tracers. To separate this test from errors coming from discrepancies between  $I_P$  and  $I_T$ , it is performed on images with a perfect superposition between the two cam-




Fig. 8: Flowchart of the testing procedure on inadequate parameter choice.

eras. To achieve this, an image where only particles are visible  $I_{P0}$  is taken and combined with a tracer image  $I_T$  into a synthetic image  $I_C$ .  $I_C$  is made by taking the maximal intensity between  $I_{P0}$  and  $I_T$  for each pixel:  $I_C(x, y) = \max(I_{P0}(x, y), I_T(x, y))$ . By doing so,  $I_C$  has both particles and tracers, tracers perfectly match between  $I_T$  and  $I_C$ , and  $I_{P0}$  gives access to what  $I_C$  looks like without tracers. The goal is then to recreate  $I_{P0}$  by applying the tracer removal method to  $I_C$  and see if tracking results are the same when PTV is performed on  $I_{P0}$  and on  $I_C$  after removing the artificially added tracers. The tracer removal method is used on  $I_C$  which results in a masked image  $I_M$ , and PTV is then performed on  $I_{P0}$  and  $I_M$ . This gives access to the positions  $r_{P0}$  and  $r_M$  of particles successfully tracked in these images (i.e. particles for which a track has been found, providing both particle position and velocity). A particle matching is then performed, by comparing the particle positions  $r_{P0}$  and  $r_M$ , pairing particles in  $I_{P0}$  and  $I_C$  with a maximal distance between them of  $\Delta r_{\max}$ . Overall, the inputs of this testing procedure for a given

pair of images  $I_{P0}$  and  $I_T$  are the method parameters  $th_T$  and  $S$ , and the matching parameter  $\Delta r_{\max}$ . After the particle matching is done, particles can be divided into three categories: particles only found in  $I_{P0}$ , particles only found in  $I_M$ , and particles that have been successfully matched between  $I_{P0}$  and  $I_M$ . The number of particles in each of these categories are denoted as  $N_{P0}$ ,  $N_M$  and  $N_b$ , respectively. The rate of particle recovery  $r$  is then computed as:  $r = N_b / (N_b + N_{P0})$ .  $r$  then varies between zero and one, with zero meaning that all initially tracked particles in  $I_{P0}$  were lost while going through the test, and one meaning that all of them were recovered. In the same manner, the tracers left in  $I_M$  appear as new created particles, and correspond to the number  $N_M$ . Accordingly, the creation of false particles is computed by the creation rate  $c$ , given by:  $c = N_M / (N_b + N_{P0})$ . Additionally, the particle matching gives the misplacement  $\Delta r$  for each particle detected in both  $I_{P0}$  and  $I_M$ , that is to say  $\Delta r = \|\mathbf{r}_M - \mathbf{r}_{P0}\|$ .

An overview of the input parameters used in this procedure is presented in table 2. Although tests have been performed for all the structuring elements  $S$  presented in figure 3, the best results were systematically obtained with  $S_{-1}$ , which is equivalent to not applying any erosion when making the mask. This is in line with the fact that, in this testing procedure, the images have a perfect superimposition, and the areas of the mask that will remove the tracers do not need to be extended to cover any discrepancies between the particle image and the tracer image. All data presented in this section hereafter is obtained using  $S_{-1}$  as the structuring element.

As  $\Delta r_{\max}$  fixes the maximum misplacement error that can be measured in these tests, its value may influence the results obtained by the procedure. To avoid the introduction of biases, the mean recovery and creation rates  $\langle r \rangle$  and  $\langle c \rangle$  (averaged over all test cases for a given  $th_T$ ) are plotted against  $\Delta r_{\max}$  in figure 9. For  $\Delta r_{\max}$  between 1 and 2 pixel,  $\langle r \rangle$  and  $\langle c \rangle$  saturate on plateaus whose values depend mainly on the chosen threshold  $th_T$ . This fixes an upper limit to the misplacement of particles by the method to 2 pixels, as increasing  $\Delta r_{\max}$  beyond this value does not change the results. This limit can be high depending on the resolution of the system, but will be discussed further at a later point in this section. To further study  $r$  and  $c$ ,  $\Delta r_{\max} = 2$  pixels will be used in the following analysis.

For this procedure, a good parameter choice should result in high  $r$  and low  $c$ . Here, again,  $th_T$  is shown to be crucial. Scatter plots of  $r$  against  $c$  distinguished by  $th_T$  are represented in figure 10. Over these plots, as  $th_T$  increases,  $r$  increases overall to values getting

closer to one. The values of  $c$  start spread over a 0 to 0.1 range for  $th_T = 10$ . That range first decreases as  $th_T$  increases, reaching a minimal spread for  $th_T = 35$ . For  $th_T$  values above that, the range of  $c$  values increases again. This confirms yet again that picking too low or too high of a value for  $th_T$  leads to poorer performance for the method, as low values generate masks that cover a larger area than necessary and high values fail to remove some tracers. Over the tests presented here,  $th_T = 35$  seems to achieve the best results.

By design of the test method, for each set of given inputs,  $\Delta r \leq \Delta r_{\max}$ . To obtain a finer measure of the misplacement error of the method, the distribution of  $\Delta r$  has to be studied. The misplacements  $\Delta r$  of all detected particles have been compiled in histograms such as the one presented in figure 11. All histograms obtained are heavily skewed toward low values for  $\Delta r$ , typically less than 0.1 pixel. To have a better estimation of the misplacement error, the median and 90<sup>th</sup> percentile of the distribution of  $\Delta r$  have been computed for every test case. Figure 12 shows these quantities averaged for a given  $th_T$  and  $\Delta r_{\max}$ . Both the median and 90<sup>th</sup> percentile of  $\Delta r$  have a minimal value reached for  $th_T = 35$  in the tested cases, confirming the previous result that this is the best value for  $th_T$  over the tests made in this procedure. In this case, half of the particles are on average not misplaced by more than 0.05 pixel by the method, and 90% by no more than 0.21 pixel. These results are also stable for  $\Delta r_{\max} > 2$  pixel, while values lower than that lead to slightly lower values of the median and 90<sup>th</sup> percentile.

## 4 Method results

### 4.1 Recommendations

The starting step to use the method is to acquire the images. First, the tracer images should be suitable to perform PIV. This means having a sufficient tracer seeding in regard to the image resolution and the PIV interrogation windows, typically 3 to 5 tracer per interrogation window. However, as the method removes the part of the image that corresponds to tracers, it is recommended to aim at the lowest possible density in tracers that still allows PIV to be performed. This will of course be dependent on the acquisition system and on the PIV algorithm used. Secondly, the particle images should also enable PTV to be performed. Overall, this also translates to having a good resolution of the particles on the images to accurately find particle positions. Once again this will depend on the systems and algorithms used. For the acquisition system presented

Table 2: Overview of the parameters tested in the particle matching test procedure. For an illustration of the structuring elements' shapes, see figure 3. The images  $I_T$  and  $I_{P0}$  come from various experiments using tungsten carbide particles of diameter comprised between 63  $\mu\text{m}$  and 75  $\mu\text{m}$  and ceramic particles with diameters between 180  $\mu\text{m}$  and 200  $\mu\text{m}$ .

Parameter	Values, range or number	Unit
$th_T$	{10; 20; 35; 50; 70}	grayscale intensity
$\Delta r_{\max}$	0.2 to 5	pixel
Structuring elements' shapes	$S_1, S_5, S_9, S_{13}, S_{21}$	-
Number of $I_T$	6	-
Number of $I_{P0}$	75	-
Tracer diameter	2 to 3	pixel
Particle diameter	4 to 7	pixel
Tracer and particle center brightness	< 100	grayscale intensity




Fig. 9: Averages of  $r$  and  $c$ , as functions of  $\Delta r_{\max}$ , coloured and separated by  $th_T$ . Only some values of  $th_T$  are presented here to show the general trends. The error bars are of one standard deviation above and below the mean value. Both  $\langle r \rangle$  and  $\langle c \rangle$  stabilise at plateau values reached generally between 1 to 2 pixels for  $\Delta r_{\max}$ . These plateau values are mainly influenced by  $th_T$ . (a) and (b) labels




Fig. 10: Scatter plots of  $r$  against  $c$  for  $\Delta r_{\max} = 2$  pixel, distinguished by values of  $th_T$ . The threshold that reaches high  $r$  and low  $c$  most consistently is  $th_T = 35$ . (a), (b), (c) labels




Fig. 11: Typical example of an histogram of  $\Delta r$ . The counts are normalised by the total number of samples (i.e. the number of particles successfully matched  $N_b$ ) to obtain a relative frequency. This histogram comes from a test case with  $th_T = 35$  and  $\Delta r_{\max} = 2$  pixels. The median and 90<sup>th</sup> percentile of the distribution are marked by vertical lines.

in section 3.1, having an apparent diameter of 5 pixels was enough to detect particle centers with sub-pixel precision. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, both image sources must be synchronised and calibrated in a way that allows them to be superposed. The superposition should be as accurate as possible, to allow for a smaller structuring element  $S$  to be used which reduces the risk of erroneously deleting particles with the tracer mask (see section 3.2).

To use the method itself, the choice of  $th_T$  is the most important parameter to decide on, as evidenced by the tests of sections 3.2 and 3.3.  $th_T$  should be chosen so that it is above the background noise of  $I_T$ , to avoid the removal of portions of the image where no tracers are present. Other than that, we recommend to set  $th_T$  as low as possible to ensure all tracers are removed. Typically, for the images obtained from the experimental set-up described in section 3.1,  $th_T = 10$ , when paired with  $S_9$  results in almost all tracers being eliminated from  $I_P$  while still being able to track at the very least 80% of inertial particles.

The choice of the structuring element  $S$  is then also important. This will depend on how well  $I_P$  and  $I_T$  can be superimposed. In the case of a perfect superposition, (i.e., all tracers in both images perfectly overlap) no erosion ( $S_1$ ) is required for the method to work correctly. Otherwise, a measure of how much disparity remains between  $I_P$  and  $I_T$  is needed to choose the




Fig. 12: Mean of the median and 90<sup>th</sup> percentile over the tested cases against  $th_T$ , and separated by  $\Delta r_{\max}$ . Three  $\Delta r_{\max}$  have been chosen here to showcase the trends observed. The results for  $\Delta r_{\max} = 2$  (in red) and  $\Delta r_{\max} = 2$  (in green) are almost superimposed.

structuring element. A simple approach is to perform a cross-correlation on sub-areas of images  $I_P$  and  $I_T$  when only tracers are visible. This is in fact similar to how the correction from the self-calibration method is computed (Wieneke, 2005), and akin to how PIV is performed in general. The resulting disparity map gives the remaining local misplacement between  $I_P$  and  $I_T$ . Then the larger the disparities are, the larger  $S$  will have to be. For example, for differences of  $\pm 1$  pixels,  $S_9$  would be a good choice, as this element will cover all disparities in that range.

Finally, we would like to point that the structuring elements tested here were chosen to have no preferential orientation. This is because the present discrepancies between  $I_P$  and  $I_T$  did not show any preferred axis. However, depending on the experimental set-up, anisotropic distortions can occur and remain consistent through time. Examples of such distortions include curved windows between the cameras and the Laser sheet (e.g. cylindrical tank) or astigmatism which can be induced by some optical filters. When such time-

consistent distortions occur,  $S$  can also be deformed and stretched along the direction of these distortions.

## 4.2 Example results

This section showcases some results obtained with the tracer removal method. Those results come from an experiment where ceramic particles with diameters between 160 nm and 180 nm are settling in water. The fluid is initially quiescent and seeded with tracers coated in rhodamine. The experiment is performed in the experimental set-up described in section 3.1. The recording starts as soon as the seeding system is turned on ( $t = 0$  s).

Figure 13 shows the evolution of the vertical velocity  $v_z$  of the detected particles over time. Histograms of  $v_z$  have been computed for each timestep and compiled into a colour plot. Additionally, the mode of the histogram is shown as a solid line. Negative values of  $v_z$  denote a downward motion of the particles. In the first instants, the particles have not reached the field of view of the cameras so any detected particles are false positives from tracers, which explains the histograms' modes lingering around  $v_z = 0$ . At  $t = 12$  s particles start passing in the camera field of view and can be detected. The first cloud of particles falls with a settling speed of  $v_z \approx -0.32$  m/s. In their wake, subsequent particles are accelerated to velocities of  $v_z \approx -0.42$  m/s ( $t \approx 40$  s). Finally, the particles reach a stationary behaviour ( $t > 90$  s) while falling with a velocity of  $v_z \approx -0.34$  m/s.

Figure 14 shows two examples of instantaneous particle velocities and fluid vertical velocity fields from the same experiment. They were taken at  $t = 20$  s for figure 14a and  $t = 60$  s for figure 14b to have similar average particle velocities. Figure 14a shows the particles settling in a column with a downward fluid flow. The same can be said for figure 14b, however the number of particles is smaller and the downward fluid flow is more intense and localised in the column of settling particles. The evolution of the fluid velocity flow suggest the development of large scale flows in the experimental set-up.

The tracer removal method could then give access to data from both phases simultaneously and showcase the importance of having access to both velocity fields to better study dispersed two-phase flow systems. Statistics on the evolution of other relevant quantities such as the local slip velocity (i.e. the difference between the particle velocity and the fluid velocity at the position of the particle) are still being computed.

## 5 Conclusion

A method to distinguish particles from tracers in the study of dispersed two phase flow has been developed. This method relies on the use of both optical filtering paired with adequately dyed tracers (rhodamin coated tracers in this case) and post-processing operations to segregate inertial particles from tracers. This tracer removal method can function properly even when particles and tracers are undistinguishable in size or intensity through usual visualisation techniques. The method was tested to ensure its proper operation, and to assess its response to various input parameters. From these tests, suitable parameters for the method were found. Although these parameters are specific to the experimental set-up on which the method is used, general rules on how to properly choose them have been provided. This method is easier to use than others (e.g. beam splitting method) while achieving similar results, and can work on a variety of particle material and size.

## Acknowledgements

## Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

## References

- Aliseda A, Cartellier A, Hainaux F, Lasheras JC (2002) Effect of preferential concentration on the settling velocity of heavy particles in homogeneous isotropic turbulence. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 468:77–105
- Brown GL, Roshko A (1974) On density effects and large structure in turbulent mixing layers. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 64:775–816
- Chen R, Fan LS (1992) Particle image velocimetry for characterizing the flow structure in three-dimensional gas-liquid-solid fluidized beds. *Chemical Engineering Science* 47(13-14):3615–3622
- Eaton JK (2009) Two-way coupled turbulence simulations of gas-particle flows using point-particle tracking. *International Journal of Multiphase Flow* 35(9):792–800
- Elghobashi S, Truesdell G (1993) On the two-way interaction between homogeneous turbulence and dispersed solid particles. i: Turbulence modification. *Physics of Fluids A: Fluid Dynamics* 5:1790
- Elhimer M, Praud O, Marchal M, Cazin S, Bazile R (2017) Simultaneous PIV/PTV velocimetry tech-




Fig. 13: Temporal histogram the vertical velocity  $v_z$  for ceramic particles of diameters between 160 nm and 180 nm settling in quiescent water. The black line corresponds to the mode of the histogram at each instant in time. The vertical axis  $z$  of the experiment is oriented upward, so falling particles have negative velocities.




Fig. 14: Instantaneous particle velocities (arrows) and fluid vertical velocity fields  $u_z$  (color-plot) at (a)  $t = 20$  s and (b)  $t = 60$  s, of the same experiment shown in figure 13. Arrows of the average velocity magnitude of the particles are in the top-left corners of each plot for scale.

- nique in a turbulent particle-laden flow. *Journal of Visualization* 20(2):289–304
- Falkovich G, Fouxon A, Stepanov MG (2002) Acceleration of rain initiation by cloud turbulence. *Nature* 419:151–154
- Gatignol R (1983) The Faxen formulae for a rigid particle in an unsteady non-uniform Stokes flow. *Journal de Mécanique Théorique et Appliquée* 2:143–160
- Gustavsson K, Mehlig B (2011) Ergodic and non-ergodic clustering of inertial particles. *Europhysics Letters* 96(6):60012
- Haralick RM, Sternberg SR, Zhuang X (1987) Image Analysis Using Mathematical Morphology. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence PAMI-9*(4):532–550
- Hassan Y, Blanchat T, Seeley Jr C, Canaan R (1992) Simultaneous velocity measurements of both components of a two-phase flow using particle image velocimetry. *International Journal of Multiphase Flow* 18(3):371–395
- Homann H, Bec J (2010) Finite-size effects in the dynamics of neutrally buoyant particles in turbulent flow. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 651:81–91, 0909.5628
- Huck P, Bateson C, Volk R, Cartellier A, Bourgoïn M, Aliseda A (2018) The role of collective effects on settling velocity enhancement for inertial particles in turbulence. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 846:1059–1075
- Khalitov D, Longmire E (2002) Simultaneous two-phase piv by two-parameter phase discrimination. *Experiments in Fluids* 32(2):252–268
- Kiger K, Pan C (2000) PIV technique for the simultaneous measurement of dilute two-phase flows. *Journal of Fluids Engineering* 122(4):811–818
- Lucci F, Ferrante A, Elghobashi S (2010) Modulation of isotropic turbulence by particles of Taylor length-scale size. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 650:5
- Maxey M, Corrsin S (1980) Stokes spheres falling under gravity in cellular flow-fields. *APS Bulletin* 25:paper EA6
- Maxey MR, Riley JJ (1983) Equation of motion for a small rigid sphere in a nonuniform flow. *Physics of Fluids* 26:883–889
- Monchaux R, Dejoan A (2017) Settling velocity and preferential concentration of heavy particles under two-way coupling effects in homogeneous turbulence. *Physical Review Fluids* 2(10):104302
- Mora DO, Aliseda A, Cartellier A, Obligado M (2018) Pitfalls measuring 1d inertial particle clustering. In: *iTi Conference on Turbulence*, Springer, pp 221–226
- Muste M, Fujita I, Kruger A (1998) Experimental comparison of two laser-based velocimeters for flows with alluvial sand. *Experiments in Fluids* 24(4):273–284
- Ouellette NT, OMalley P, Gollub JP (2008) Transport of finite-sized particles in chaotic flow. *Physical Review Letters* 101(17):174504
- Poelma C, Westerweel J, Ooms G (2007) Particlefluid interactions in grid-generated turbulence. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 589:315–351
- Towers D, Towers C, Buckberry C, Reeves M (1999) A colour piv system employing fluorescent particles for two-phase flow measurements. *Measurement Science and Technology* 10(9):824
- Wieneke B (2005) Stereo-PIV using self-calibration on particle images. *Experiments in Fluids* 39(2):267–280