



**HAL**  
open science

## **A meshless Radial Basis Method (RBM) for solving the detailed population balance equation**

Samer Alzyod, Sophie Charton

► **To cite this version:**

Samer Alzyod, Sophie Charton. A meshless Radial Basis Method (RBM) for solving the detailed population balance equation. *Chemical Engineering Science*, 2020, 228, pp.115973. <10.1016/j.ces.2020.115973>. <hal-03492234>

**HAL Id: hal-03492234**

**<https://hal.science/hal-03492234v1>**

Submitted on 22 Aug 2022

**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.



Distributed under a Creative Commons CC BY-NC 4.0 - Attribution - Non-commercial use - International License

**Title:**

**Investigation of a granular Bond number based rheological model for polydispersed particulate systems**

**Authors:**

Martin GIRAUD<sup>a,b</sup>, Cendrine GATUMEL<sup>a</sup>, Stéphane VAUDEZ<sup>b</sup>, Guillaume BERNARD-GRANGER<sup>b</sup>, Jeremy NOS<sup>c</sup>, Thierry GERVAIS<sup>d</sup>, Henri BERTHIAUX<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Laboratoire RAPSODEE, UMR CNRS 5302, IMT Mines Albi, Campus Jarlard, 81013 Albi Cedex 09, France

<sup>b</sup> CEA, DEN, DMRC, Université de Montpellier, Marcoule, France

<sup>c</sup> Orano, 125 avenue de Paris, 92320 Châtillon, France

<sup>d</sup> Orano Melox, Les Tourettes, D138A, 30200 Chusclan, France

**Corresponding author:**

Henri BERTHIAUX<sup>a</sup> – [henri.berthiaux@mines-albi.fr](mailto:henri.berthiaux@mines-albi.fr)

**Abstract:**

Granular materials are used in many industrial processes among various fields, such as pharmaceutical, food, metallurgy or nuclear fuel production. However, compared to other commonly used media, such as liquids, powders are known to behave unpredictably, leading to uncontrolled process operations. Since the flow behavior of the powders originates from interparticle forces, we suggest a model, linking the macroscopic flowability of powder beds, and the properties of the microscopic particles constituting the powder. A population dependent granular Bond number (Capece et al., 2016), that takes into account the particles properties such as the particles' true density, surface energy, rugosity and the whole particle size distribution, is used. This non-dimensional number was found to correlate well with the flowability of polydispersed powder bed, which can be measured by shear testing with a Freeman FT4® powder rheometer. The results found in previous studies (Bernard-Granger et al., 2019; Capece et al., 2016) are extended and discussed using five different oxide powders exhibiting various flow behaviors. In particular, a short sensitivity analysis of the model is carried out. The results show that the fraction of fine particles within a polydispersed powder is a critical parameter for the flowability of the powder bed. Finally, the Rumpf's theory is used to suggest a physical meaning for the model parameters.

**Keywords:**

Powder rheology – flowability – shear test – population dependent granular Bond number

## Glossary

Notation	Parameter	Usual units
$\rho_s$	True density	$\text{g.cm}^{-3}$
$S_A$	Specific surface area	$\text{m}^2.\text{g}^{-1}$
$\gamma_s^d$	Dispersive surface energy	$\text{mN.m}^{-1}$
$\gamma_l^d$	Liquid surface tension	$\text{mN.m}^{-1}$
$\pi_e$	Equilibrium spreading pressure	$\text{mN.m}^{-1}$
$\theta$	Contact angle between solid and liquid surfaces	$^\circ$
$w_{SL}$	Work of adhesion between liquid and solid phases	$\text{mN.m}^{-1}$
$D_0$	Cut off distance	nm
$A$	Hamaker constant	$10^{-19}.\text{J}$
$C$	Surface electrostatic charge of a particle	$\mu\text{C.m}^{-2}$
$\epsilon_0$	Vacuum dielectric constant	$\text{C}^2.\text{N}^{-1}.\text{m}^{-2}$
$\epsilon_r$	Relative dielectric constant of the medium	-
$d$	Particle diameter	$\mu\text{m}$
$d_{asp}$	Particle asperity size	nm
$z_0$	Interparticle distance	Nm
$g$	Gravity constant	$\text{m.s}^{-2}$
$\epsilon$	Powder bed porosity	-
$\kappa$	Powder bed coordination number	-
$f_s(x)$	Surface fraction of size $x$	-
$D_s$	Sauter mean diameter	$\mu\text{m}$
$span$	Span distribution parameter	-
$x_0$	Rosin-Rammler location parameter	-
$n$	Rosin-Rammler spread parameter	-
$\tau$	Shear stress	kPa
$\sigma$	Normal stress	kPa
$\sigma_c$	Pre-consolidation stress	kPa
$c$	Cohesion parameter	kPa
$\varphi$	Angle of internal friction	$^\circ$
$\mu$	Friction coefficient	-
$\sigma_1$	Major consolidation stress	kPa
$\sigma_3$	Minor consolidation stress	kPa
$f_c$	Cohesion stress	kPa
$ff_c$	Flow index	-
$F_{el}$	Electrostatic force	$\mu\text{N}$
$F_{vdW}$	Van der Waals force	$\mu\text{N}$
$W$	Weight	$\mu\text{N}$
$Bo_g$	Granular Bond number	-
$\overline{Bo}_g$	Mean granular Bond number	-
$Bo_G$	Population dependent granular Bond number	-

## 1. Introduction

Flow behavior of powders is critical in many industrial processes involving granular materials such as pharmaceutical and chemical production or metal and mineral processing. Indeed, a poor flowability may lead to various problems such as segregation, agglomeration or arching during bulk powder handling or processing.

Up to now, the link between the physicochemical properties of the individual particles and the flowability of bulk powders is still unclear. This is because granular materials exhibit highly variable and unpredictable behaviors. It is generally considered that under a certain size, around 100  $\mu\text{m}$ , interparticle attractive forces start to overcome particles' weight, resulting in cohesive behaviors (Aulton, 2002). However, flowability is not only correlated to particles' size but is also influenced by particles' shape (Cleary, 2008; Podczeczek and Mia, 1996), surface energy, mechanical properties (Tomas, 2001), environmental conditions (Tomasetta et al., 2014) and polydispersity of the particle size distribution (Vlachos and Chang, 2011).

Since a cohesive behavior originates from interparticle attractive forces, many efforts are undertaken in order to correlate intermolecular forces, such as Van der Waals, capillarity and electrostatic forces, to the bulk powder behavior. Therefore, flowability criteria based on the preponderance of either gravity or interparticle forces between individual particles were proposed (Li et al., 2004; Liu et al., 2008). Models assessing the flow performance of powders from the force balance at an individual particle level were then derived (Li et al., 2004; Liu et al., 2008; Tomasetta et al., 2014). Although these models seem to be in good agreement with empirical data, they are not commonly used for predictions since they involve very specific particles' properties, such as the Poisson's ratio or the Young's modulus, which are not always measurable. It can also be noticed that most of these models are based on the assumption that the particle properties are identical within the whole powder. However, in most granular mediums, various particle properties, such as the size, shape or surface energy, may be actually distributed (Arai, 1996).

The granular Bond number is defined as the ratio between interparticle forces and gravity contribution between two particles, A and B on Figure 1 for example. It can be computed from quite simple particle properties, such as size distribution, particles' rugosity, surface energy and true density, which are easily measurable or documented in the literature. Assuming that the electrostatic and capillary forces can be neglected, the interparticle forces are equal to the Van der Waals forces developed between the particles. The granular Bond number between particles A and B ( $Bo_{g,AB}$ ) can then be expressed using equation (1):

$$Bo_{g,AB} = \frac{F_{vdw,AB}}{W_{AB}} \quad (1)$$

where  $F_{vdw,AB}$  is the Van der Waals force and  $W_{AB}$  is the weight of the particles. The Van der Waals force can be assessed from particle properties using commonly known cohesion force models (Hamaker, 1937; Rumpf, 1990; Xie, 1997; Chen et al., 2008; Rabinovich et al., 2000; Johnson Kenneth Langstreth et al., 1971; Derjaguin et al., 1975). In particular, the Van der Waals Force between two spherical particles may be estimated using equation (2) from the Hamaker theory (Hamaker, 1937):

$$F_{vdw,AB} = \frac{\sqrt{A_A A_B} d_A d_B}{12z_0^2 d_A + d_B} \quad (2)$$

where  $A_A$  and  $A_B$  are the Hamaker constants of particles A and B respectively,  $d_A$  and  $d_B$  are the diameter of particles A and B respectively, and  $z_0$  is the distance between the two particles in close contact which can be assumed to be  $z_0 = 0.4 \text{ nm}$  (Israelachvili, 2011a). Since real powders are rarely constituted of spherical and smooth particles, the rugosity of particles A and B can be taken into

account by using the modified Rumpf equation (3), which shows a better agreement with empirical data (Chen et al., 2008):

$$F_{vdw,AB} = \frac{\sqrt{A_A A_B}}{12z_0^2} \left( \frac{\hat{d}}{2 \left(1 + \frac{\hat{d}_{asp}}{2z_0}\right)^2} + \frac{3\hat{d}_{asp}\hat{d}}{\hat{d}_{asp} + \hat{d}} \right) \quad (3)$$

In the above equation,  $\hat{d}$  is the harmonic mean diameter of particles A and B. Similarly,  $\hat{d}_{asp}$  is the harmonic mean of the size of asperities of particles A and B. It was shown in the literature that  $\hat{d}_{asp} = 200 \text{ nm}$  is a reasonable approximation for the size of natural roughness of powders (Capece et al., 2015).

The geometric mean of the weight of particles A and B is used to represent the weight of both particles ( $W_{AB}$ ) in equation (1) (Capece et al., 2016). The true density of particles A and B, respectively  $\rho_{s,A}$  and  $\rho_{s,B}$ , allow to compute the weight of the particles, represented by the powder's true density, as shown in equation (4):

$$W_{AB} = \frac{\pi}{6} g \sqrt{\rho_{s,A} \rho_{s,B} d_A^3 d_B^3} \quad (4)$$

where  $g = 9.81 \text{ m} \cdot \text{s}^{-2}$  is the gravity constant.

In case of two particles in close contact within a mono-constituent powder, particles A and B are of the same chemical nature, which means that they share approximately the same Hamaker constant, true density and asperity diameters. The granular Bond number between these two particles can then be computed using equation (5):

$$Bo_{g,AB} = \frac{A}{2\pi\rho_s g z_0^2} \times \frac{\hat{d}}{\sqrt{d_A^3 d_B^3}} \left( \frac{1}{2 \left(1 + \frac{\hat{d}_{asp}}{2z_0}\right)^2} + \frac{3\hat{d}_{asp}}{\hat{d}_{asp} + \hat{d}} \right) \quad (5)$$

where  $A$  is the Hamaker constant of the powder,  $\rho_s$  is its true density and  $\hat{d} = 2 \frac{d_A d_B}{d_A + d_B}$ .

Despite the fact that it only accounts for individual interparticle cohesion, and not for the whole bulk powder bed structure, the granular Bond number was shown to correlate well with the flow behavior for cohesive powders. Castellanos (Castellanos, 2005) noticed a link between the granular Bond number and the bulk properties of powders, such as the gas velocity over which the fluidized bed exhibits non-bubbling regime. He also proposed an agglomerate Bond number, which takes into account the agglomeration events occurring within fine powders. This concept of granular and agglomerate Bond numbers are also used by Huang (Huang et al., 2015) who showed that the flow function coefficient, measured with a powder shear tester, evolves with the Bond number according to a power law. The same type of correlation was highlighted and further explored by Capece (Capece et al., 2015). In particular, a population dependent granular Bond number was developed (Capece et al., 2016) in order to take into account the whole particle size distribution of the powder investigated. Indeed, the granular Bond number allows to consider distributed properties, while most anterior models only considered means or median properties, assuming that particles' size or shape are identical for all the particles constituting the powdered medium. Finally, Capece's granular Bond number and population dependent granular Bond number have also been extended to multi-component mixture of powders (Capece et al., 2015).

The correlation obtained by Capece between the flow function coefficient and the granular Bond number of pharmaceutical powders, is a power law given by equation (6). In this equation, the empirical parameters  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are supposed to be material independent.  $ff_c$  corresponds to the flow function coefficient, also denoted as the flow index in this paper, and  $Bo_g$  is the granular Bond number.

$$ff_c = \alpha \cdot Bo_g^{-\beta} \quad (6)$$

Such a correlation has also been verified experimentally by investigating the rheological behavior of powder mixtures constituted by different amounts of two alumina powders (Bernard-Granger et al., 2019).

The correlation represented by equation (6) was obtained by Capece for various pharmaceutical powders and with multi-component mixtures involving these powders. Although the powders investigated exhibit different flow behaviors, from very poor flowability to free flowing, most of them share a similar true density, between 1 and 3 g.cm<sup>-3</sup> while powders used in other fields may be heavier. Moreover, Capece used an RST-XS® Schulze shear tester to measure the flowability of the powders, while different equipment, such as the FT4® Freeman's rheometer, are becoming commonly used (Leturia et al., 2014). Even if these two equipment are based on the same principle, it is well known that they differ in some aspects that may affect the results (Koynov et al., 2015). Among other things, the RST-XS® Schulze and the FT4® Freeman rheometer cannot apply the same pre-consolidations stress, although it was shown that the consolidation state of the powder might affect the flowability measurements (Legoix et al., 2017). Thereby, it appears that the correlation found by Capece needs to be verified and extended using different powders and different types of rheometer.

Since most investigations focus only on the Van der Waals force contributions for the calculation of interparticle forces, Bernard-Granger attempted to take also into account the capillary forces in the calculation of the granular Bond number (Bernard-Granger et al., 2019). However, this study was done with alumina powders that appear to be sparsely sensitive to relative humidity. Then, the influence of capillary forces has to be discussed for powders that are more sensitive to humidity as well.

Both authors show that the correlation (6) obtained between the granular Bond number and the flowability of powders has a strong potential for predicting the flowability of powder mixtures according to their formulation (Bernard-Granger et al., 2019; Capece et al., 2015). However, despite its good ability to predict the flowability of powders and mix of powders, the physical meaning of the correlation has never been investigated extensively. In particular, the value of the correlation parameters  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , that are supposed to be material independent, is poorly discussed. Besides, it is well known that the consolidation state of a powder bed affects significantly the flowability measurements (Legoix et al., 2017; Tomasetta et al., 2014). Then, the effect of the pre-consolidation stress, applied to the powder during shear testing, on the correlation parameters has to be investigated. Finally, a sensitivity analysis of the correlation has never been carried out in the literature although it has to be done out in order to evaluate the relevance of the predictive model. In particular, since the granular Bond number depends on various particle's properties, it would be of a great interest to assess which parameter is the most influent on its value, and therefore on the flowability of the bulk powder medium.

In this paper, Capece's model will be extended, by comparing experimental results obtained with an FT4® powder rheometer, to the model predictions for non-pharmaceutical powders exhibiting various properties in terms of flow behavior, true density, particle size distributions or sensibility to relative humidity. Besides, a sensitivity analysis of the granular Bond number will be carried out in order to investigate the influence of different powder properties on the value of the granular Bond number. First, the influence of non-distributed properties, such as the true density, will be studied. Then, the influence of distributed properties, such as particle size distribution, will be investigated in order to

take into account the polydispersity of real powders. Then, the physical meaning of the correlation (6) linking the flowability of bulk powders and the granular Bond number, will be discussed. In particular, a physical interpretation of the value of empirical parameters  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , involving the state of consolidation of the powder, will be suggested.

## 2. Materials and Methods

### 2.1. Powders

Five different powders have been used for this work. They were chosen because they all exhibit different properties in terms of flow behavior, particle size and shape distribution, true density and bed porosity:

- Two different grades of alumina powder (GE15 and CR6) from Baikowski®, Poisy, France.
- Two different grades of zirconia powder (GY3Z-R60 and CY3Z-RA) from Saint Gobain®, Courbevoie, France.
- An yttrium oxide powder (grade C) from H.C. Starck®, Newton, USA.

In this paper, alumina GE15, alumina CR6, zirconia GY3Z-R60, zirconia CY3Z-RA and yttria grade C will be referred as  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$  G,  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$  C,  $\text{ZrO}_2$  G,  $\text{ZrO}_2$  C and  $\text{Y}_2\text{O}_3$  C respectively.

### 2.2. Characterization methods

Each powder has been characterized in terms of flow behavior, particle size distribution, true density and surface energy. Then, the granular Bond number has been computed for all powders using the methodology described in section 2.3.

#### 2.2.1. Powder flowability

The flowability of the powders was assessed from the yield locus measured with a powder rheometer FT4® (Freeman, Tewkesbury, UK). Measurements were performed using a 10 mL cylindrical cell in which powder is pre-consolidated under a 9 kPa normal stress. Shear tests are then performed successively at 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 kPa normal stresses following the Jenike standard procedure (EFCE Working Party on the Mechanics of Particulate Solids. and Institution of Chemical Engineers (Great Britain), 1989). According to the Mohr's theory, the five points obtained should be aligned on the yield locus line, represented on Figure 2, whose parametric equation is given by equation (7):

$$\tau = \mu\sigma + c \quad (7)$$

where  $\tau$  and  $\sigma$  are respectively the shear and the normal stresses.  $c$  gives the cohesion of the powder in kPa, and  $\mu$  is the friction coefficient from which the angle of internal friction  $\varphi$  can be deduced using equation (8). The friction coefficient comes from friction between the surfaces of the particles while cohesion originates from interparticle forces taking place between particles.

$$\mu = \tan \varphi \quad (8)$$

The Mohr circles can then be constructed from the yield locus curve, as shown on Figure 2. The small Mohr circle is tangent to the yield locus and passes through the origin while the large Mohr circle is tangent to the yield locus and passes through the pre-consolidation point. The cohesion stress  $f_c$  and the major consolidation stress  $\sigma_1$  corresponds to the shear stress values of the highest intersections between the x-axis and the small and large Mohr circles respectively. The flow index, which is given by equation (9), is used in order to assess the flowability of a powder, the classification given in Table 1 being commonly used in the literature to classify the flow behavior of a given powder (Leturia et al., 2014).

$$ff_c = \frac{\sigma_1}{f_c} \quad (9)$$

The flow index  $ff_c$  and cohesion  $c$ , measured by shear tests for each powder, are reported in Table 2. Each measurement was performed at least twice with different samples, the incertitude given in the table corresponding to the standard deviation. The first column shows results for powders in ambient conditions, while the second column shows results obtained for the same powders after drying in a stove at 110 °C for 24 h. The humidity content of the powders in ambient conditions was measured with an MB90® moisture analyzer (Ohaus, Parsippany, USA) by heating the samples at 110 °C for two minutes. The results showed that all the powders had a humidity content between 0.2% and 0.5% in natural ambient conditions. The flow index of the dry ZrO<sub>2</sub> G powder was not calculated because its flowability is too high for the equipment under that level of consolidation. Indeed, for this specific powder, the rheometer gives a cohesion parameter slightly below zero, which has no physical meaning. Thus, the cohesion of the ZrO<sub>2</sub> G was assumed to be 0 kPa, corresponding to a free flowing powder, and its flow index is not calculated. Concerning the other powders, it can be noted that the flowability of the dry and ambient powders are very similar for alumina and yttrium oxide while it differs significantly for both zirconia powders. This means that powders of different nature may react differently to ambient humidity. For this reason, all the samples were conditioned in a stove before any measurement with the rheometer. Figure 3 shows the flow index of each dry and wet powders according to their cohesion. It seems that these two parameters are strongly correlated according to a power law which parameters are given in equation (10), where the cohesion parameter  $c$  is in kPa, through a determination coefficient of  $R^2 = 0.9993$ .

$$ff_c \approx 4.66 \times c^{-0.90} \quad (10)$$

#### 2.2.2. True density

The true density of the particles  $\rho_s$  was measured using a helium pycnometer AccuPyc II 1340® (Micromeritics, Mérignac, France) in a 10 mL cell. Five samples per powder were taken and measured, the average result being kept for each powder. Between three and six cycles including of 25 purges and 25 measurements were performed on each powder at 23 °C and 19.6 PSI (135 kPa). Results are given in Table 4 where the incertitude corresponds to the standard deviations between different samples.

#### 2.2.3. Particle size distribution

Particle size distributions of the powders were measured with a LASER diffraction equipment Mastersizer 3000® (Malvern, Malvern, UK) using a liquid dispersion unit (Hydro MV®) in order to obtain adequate dispersion of the agglomerated powders. Dry dispersion (Aero S®) has also been performed but the particle size distribution is too variable and highly dependent on the transport pressure through the venturi. The Mie theory was used in order to compute the size of the particles. Ten samples per powder were analyzed and a measurement was taken ten times for each sample. The Sauter mean diameter and the span of the distributions are given in Table 4. The average of each measurements was kept and the incertitude intervals correspond to the standard deviation. The particle size distribution of each powder is given on Figure 4. It should be noted that the powders exhibiting the worse flowability values in Table 2 (Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> C and Y<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> C) are those containing the largest fraction of very fine particles, under 10 µm. On the contrary, the only free flowing powder according to Table 2 (ZrO<sub>2</sub> G) is also the only one that exhibits the most significant fraction of particles larger than 100 µm. Finally, Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> G and ZrO<sub>2</sub> C both have intermediate flow behavior and also intermediate particle size distributions, as compared to the other ones. The link between particle size distribution and flowability will be further explored in next sections.

#### 2.2.4. Particle surface energy

Dynamic vapor sorption was performed with a DVS system (SMS, London, UK) in order to measure surface energy of the particles. The device, illustrated on Figure 5, is constituted of a micro-balance (5) placed in a thermal chamber (6), here regulated at 25 °C. Around 100 mg of powder (2) and a reference sample (3) are placed on both sides of the balance and are swept by a gas, here nitrogen. The humidity

of the gas (heptane vapor) is controlled by two valves and a humidifier (1) and measured with two probes (4) on each sides of the chamber. The humidity of the gas varies from 0 % to 95 % relative humidity and the mass loss is measured, giving the sorption and desorption isotherms.

The dispersive surface energy is then computed using the method described in SMS application note 17 (Levoguer and Williams, n.d.). This method was shown to give similar results than invers gas chromatography for alumina powders (Tisserand et al., 2009). Knowing the specific surface area of the sample, the equilibrium spreading pressure  $\pi_e$  can be deduced from the adsorption isotherm of the sample, using Gibbs theory. The value of  $\pi_e$  allows then to compute the work of adhesion between the liquid and solid phases  $w_{SL}$  from solid/liquid interaction theory described by Young's equation:

$$w_{SL} = \gamma_l^d (1 + \cos \theta) + \pi_e \quad (11)$$

Where  $\gamma_{lv}$  is the liquid surface tension and  $\theta$  is the angle of contact between the droplet and the solid surface. For heptane, the surface tension is well known ( $\gamma_l^d = 19.68 \text{ mN} \cdot \text{m}^{-1}$ ) and the contact angle can be assumed to be null. Finally, the dispersive surface energy of the sample  $\gamma_s^d$  is computed from the Fowkes model represented by equation (12), which is valid since the van der Waals of the powders used in this study are London dispersive interactions.

$$w_{SL} = 2\sqrt{\gamma_l^d \cdot \gamma_s^d} \quad (12)$$

The Hamaker constant can then be computed using the Frenkel equation (Israelachvili, 2011b, p. 13):

$$A = 24\pi D_0^2 \gamma_s^d \quad (13)$$

where  $D_0 \approx 0.165 \text{ nm}$  is a cut off distance.

DVS measurements are carried out on two different samples for  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$  G and  $\text{ZrO}_2$  G, other powders being measured only once. The values obtained by DVS for each powders are given in Table 3 and the average Hamaker constant values and the corresponding standard deviations are summarized in Table 4. The values obtained from this method are consistent with those that can be computed from the Lifshitz theory (Bernard-Granger et al., 2019; Lifshitz and Hamermesh, 1992).

### 2.3. Population dependent granular Bond number calculation

#### 2.3.1. Interparticle forces

In this study, the capillary forces have been neglected since all the samples have been dried before rheological measurements. The electrostatic forces have been measured by a tribo-electrification technique: a few grams of powder is introduced in a cylindrical vessel made of INOX, oriented at  $40^\circ$  from the horizontal, isolated from the ground and rotating at 92 rotations per minute. The total charge acquired or conceded by the powder after a certain amount of time is obtained by placing the sample in a Faraday cage, linked to an electrometer. The magnitude of the specific charge acquired or conceded by the samples never exceeds one micro Coulomb per kilogram except from the  $\text{Y}_2\text{O}_3$  C powder, which reaches  $-3.8 \mu\text{C} \cdot \text{kg}^{-1}$  after 15 minutes of rotation. Finally, the magnitude of the electrostatic forces within the powder, assuming that particles are in close contact, can then be estimated using equation (14), where  $C$  is the surface charge of the particle, obtained from the specific charge of the powder and the specific surface area of the particles (Bernard-Granger et al., 2019). However, it should be noted that in this technique, the charge measured corresponds to the total charge of the sample and does not account for the individual particle electrostatic charges. Thus, this method only allows to get an order of magnitude of the effective electrostatic forces.

$$|F_{el}|^{max} = \frac{\pi C^2 d^2}{4\epsilon_r \epsilon_0} \quad (14)$$

here,  $\varepsilon_0 = 8.90 \times 10^{-12} \text{ C}^2 \cdot \text{N}^{-1} \cdot \text{m}^{-2}$  is the vacuum dielectric constant and  $\varepsilon_r = 1$  is the relative dielectric constant of the air.

Figure 6 shows the evolution of the electrostatic forces (equation (14)), the weight (equation (4)) and Van der Waals forces (equation (3)), according to the particle diameter of  $\text{Y}_2\text{O}_3$  C powder, which is the powder where the electrostatic forces are the most significant. It appears clearly that the magnitude of the electrostatic forces is negligible compared to other forces acting on the particles. Thus, the van der Waals forces are the only interparticle force taken into account for the evaluation cohesive forces in this study.

### 2.3.2. Calculation method of population dependent granular Bond number accounting for size polydispersity

For real powders, it was shown that the Sauter mean diameter can be used in order to represent the particle size of one powder exhibiting poorly dispersed size distribution (Capece et al., 2015). However, this approximation becomes questionable when the powders exhibit more complex particle size distributions. Therefore, Capece developed a population dependent granular Bond number  $Bo_G$  allowing to take into account the whole size distribution of a powder. This population-dependent granular Bond number consists of a weighted harmonic mean of all the potential individual granular Bond numbers within the powder as shown in equation (15) (Capece et al., 2016).

$$Bo_G = \left( \sum_{k=1}^M \sum_{l=1}^M \frac{f_s(x_k) \cdot f_s(x_l)}{Bo_{g,kl}} \right)^{-1} \quad (15)$$

where all size classes are indexed from 1 to  $M$ ,  $x_k$  and  $x_l$  correspond to the size of the classes  $k$  and  $l$  respectively and  $f_s(x_{k,l})$  is the surface distribution function according to the size  $x_{k,l}$  which can be obtained from the volume distribution given by LASER diffraction, assuming that the particles are spherical. Finally,  $Bo_{g,kl}$  is the individual granular Bond number between particles of size  $x_k$  and  $x_l$  computed as shown in equation (5).

In order to compute the population dependent granular Bond number, using equations (5) and (15), the true density, the Hamaker constants and the size distribution of each powder were measured. All the results are summarized in Table 4. As explained in the introduction, the asperity size can be reasonably assumed to be around 200 nm. AFM measurements, were carried out in contact mode with a confocal Raman microscope alpha300 R (WITec®, Ulm, Germany), the root mean squares observed on the surface of several particles are given in Table 5, the incertitude given corresponds to the standard deviation between several particles of the same powder (between three and six particles per powder). Despite the large deviations between different measurements and the low amount of particles analyzed, the results showed that 200 nm is reasonable for all the powders investigated. The last column of Table 4 gives the population dependent granular Bond number calculated for each powder. In particular, the whole granulometric distribution was used to compute the population dependent granular Bond number, but some key parameters of the size distributions are given in Table 4. The high standard deviation on the  $\text{Y}_2\text{O}_3$  C Bond number comes from the poor repeatability of the particle size measurements for this powder, due to its very wide distribution.

## 3. Theoretical developments

### 3.1. Sensitivity analysis of the population dependent granular Bond number

As shown in the introduction section 1, the granular Bond number seems to be correlated to the flowability of the powders. Besides, the population dependent granular Bond number, computed in section 2.3.2, depends on various particle properties, such as the Hamaker constant, the true density, the particle size distribution and the particles' rugosity. It is then of great interest to investigate the ranking of these different input factors according to their relative influence on the Bond number

variability. Indeed, such a study would allow to identify which particle properties have the most significant impact on the population dependent granular Bond number calculated, and therefore on the powder flow behavior, according to relation (6).

The sensitivity analysis of a model consist in investigating how the variation of the output of the model can be attributed to the variations of the input factors. In particular, it can be used in order to identify the parameters that might have a significant, or negligible, influence on the output variability (Pianosi et al., 2016). Applied to this study, it allows assessing which particle properties are the most critical on the powder macroscopic flow behavior. In this section, we provide a brief local sensitivity analysis, meaning that the variations of the input factors are investigated around a specific value, and not all the space of variability. A “one-at-a-time” (OAT) perturbation and derivative method is used for its simplicity (Norton, 2015). Even if this method provides relevant information as a first approach, it should be noted that it does not take into account the interactions between input factors and considers local sensitivity only.

The granular Bond number, as defined by equations (5) and (15), depends on four physical particle properties: the true density  $\rho_s$ , the Hamaker constant  $A$ , the particle asperity size  $d_{asp}$  and the particle size distribution. Among these input properties, the particle size is a distributed parameter, while the other three properties are non-distributed. Rigorously, the surface energy and the particles’ rugosity should be distributed as well as they might depend on the size of the particles. However, much further characterizations would be needed in order to take these specifications into account, making the model way more difficult to use for quick predictions. In a first step, an analysis is carried out considering only non-distributed properties. Then, in a second step, the particle size distribution is considered.

### 3.1.1. Non-distributed properties

As a first approach, we will consider that the particle size can be represented by the Sauter mean diameter  $D_s$ , as it was already done in previous studies (Capece et al., 2015). The mean granular Bond number  $\overline{Bo}_G$  of a mono-constituent powder can then be defined, using equation (16), as a continuous function, depending on four non-distributed variables:  $\overline{Bo}_G = f(A, \rho_s, D_s, d_{asp})$ .

$$\overline{Bo}_G = \frac{A}{6\pi g \rho_s z_0^2} \times \frac{1}{D_s^2} \left( \frac{1}{2 \left(1 + \frac{d_{asp}}{2z_0}\right)^2} + \frac{3d_{asp}}{d_{asp} + D_s} \right) \quad (16)$$

The sensitivity of the mean granular Bond number according to each parameter is investigated by analyzing the variation induced by a perturbation, one at a time, of each individual parameter (Pianosi et al., 2016). For example, The variation induced by a perturbation of the true density  $\Delta\rho_s$  can be expressed as:

$$\Delta_{\rho_s} \overline{Bo}_G = \frac{\overline{Bo}_G(\rho_s, A, D_s, d_{asp}) - \overline{Bo}_G[(\rho_s + \Delta\rho_s), A, D_s, d_{asp}]}{\overline{Bo}_G(\rho_s, A, D_s, d_{asp})} \quad (17)$$

Then, the normalized sensitivity factor of first order,  $s_{\rho_s}$  related to the true density is defined as the ratio between the variation induced by the perturbation and the initial perturbation itself as shown by equation (18). Thus, a sensitivity factor  $s_\chi = 1$  means that a perturbation on the parameter  $\chi$  will produce a perturbation of the same magnitude on the mean granular Bond number. Likewise, a sensitivity factor  $s_\chi \gg 1$  means that the mean granular Bond number is highly sensitive to the parameter  $\chi$ .

$$s_{\rho_s} = \left| \frac{\Delta_{\rho_s} \overline{Bo}_G}{\Delta\rho_s} \right| \quad (18)$$

The sensitivity factors of each parameter were computed for perturbations in a range of -20% to +20% around a nominal value. The measured properties of the Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> G powder are chosen as the nominal values because this powder exhibits an intermediate flow behavior and granular Bond number compared to the other powders investigated ( $\rho_s = 4.107 \text{ g.cm}^{-3}$ ,  $A = 1.57 * 10^{-19} \text{ J}$ ,  $D_s = 23.1 \text{ }\mu\text{m}$  and  $d_{asp} = 200 \text{ nm}$ ). Figure 7 shows the sensitivity factors obtained for each parameter and for different initial perturbations. The results indicate that the sensitivity factor corresponding to the Sauter mean diameter is significantly higher compared to those related to other parameters. Besides, the sensitivity factors related to the true density and the Hamaker constant appears to be equal to one. This is perfectly consistent with equation (16) in which the mean granular Bond number appears to be proportional to the Hamaker constant, and inversely proportional to the true density. Finally, the sensitivity parameter of the particle asperity size is also close to one, assuming that its value is around 200 nm.

The sensitivity analysis of non-distributed parameters shows that all the particles properties considered in this paper have significant influence on the value of the mean granular Bond number computed. However, among these properties, the particle size is the most critical one. According to relation (6), this means that particles' size, density, surface energy and rugosity have an effect on the macroscopic flow behavior of the powders, but particle size seems to be of first importance. This result is perfectly consistent with most experimental studies reported in the literature (Fu et al., 2012; Tomas, 2001; Yu et al., 2011).

### 3.1.2. Distributed properties

Previous section showed that the size of the particles is the most important particle parameter regarding the mean granular Bond number. However, the population dependent granular Bond number uses the whole size distribution instead of the Sauter mean diameter. In order to investigate the influence of the particle size distribution on the population dependent granular Bond number, different volume particle distributions  $F_{RR}(x)$  were artificially created using the Rosin-Rammler law, given by equation (19). This law, commonly used for distribution simulation (Vesilind, 1980), uses two parameters:  $x_0$  which is the location parameter of the distribution, and  $n$  which is the spread parameter. A high value of  $n$  corresponds to a narrow distribution.

$$F_{RR}(x) = 1 - e^{-\left(\frac{x}{x_0}\right)^n} \quad (19)$$

Eleven artificial particle size distributions were made up and the population dependent granular Bond number was computed for each distribution using the Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> G powder properties ( $\rho_s = 4.107 \text{ g.cm}^{-3}$ ,  $A = 1.57 * 10^{-19} \text{ J}$ ,  $d_{asp} = 200 \text{ nm}$  and  $z_0 = 0.4 \text{ nm}$ ). However, the same results were obtained using the properties of the other powders investigated in this study. The spread and location parameters of the distributions are shown in Table 6. These parameters were chosen in order to obtain distributions in the same range than those corresponding to the real powders, given on Figure 4. Table 6 shows also the population dependent granular Bond number computed from these distributions. The decile ( $d_{10}$ ,  $d_{50}$ ), the Sauter mean diameter  $D_s$  and the span parameter of the distributions were also calculated and are given in the same Table 6. Distributions AA1 and AA2 are created from a linear combination of two Rosin-Rammler distributions in order to obtain bimodal distributions.

The curves corresponding to the distributions of Table 6 are shown on Figure 8. Distributions A1, A2, A3 and A4 share the same location parameter  $x_0 = 55 \text{ }\mu\text{m}$  but have different spread parameters  $n$  (Figure 8 (a)). Whereas distributions A2, A5 A6 and A7 share the same spread parameter  $n = 3.0$  with different location parameters (Figure 8 (b)). Finally, distributions A3, A8, AA1 and AA2 almost share the same median diameter  $d_{50}$  around  $32.5 \text{ }\mu\text{m}$ , but have different span parameters (Figure 8 (c)). In that case, the distributions AA1 and AA2 are bimodal, while A3 and A8 are monomodal. In particular, one can notice that A8 and AA1 have the same median diameter and almost the same span parameter

but with different modalities (bimodal or monomodal). The median diameter and the span are used instead of  $x_0$  and  $n$  for these distributions because AA1 and AA2 are not Rosin-Rammler type distributions.

The population dependent granular Bond number corresponding to each distribution of Table 6 were computed using the  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$  G powder properties. The values obtained are plotted against the spread parameter  $n$ , the location parameter  $x_0$ , the span and the median diameter  $d_{50}$  on Figure 9 (a), (b), (c) and (d) respectively.

Figure 9 (a) shows that, for a given location parameter, the Bond number becomes smaller when the spread parameter is higher. This result implies that the cohesive forces become less important when the distribution is narrower. However, Figure 9 (a) also shows that two distributions sharing the same spread parameter can demonstrate very different Bond numbers depending on their location parameter (A5 and A7 for example). Figure 9 (b) represents the population dependent granular Bond number as a function of the Rosin-Rammler location parameter  $x_0$ . For a given spread parameter ( $n = 3.0$  for this example), the Bond number decreases when the position parameter increases. Indeed, the cohesion forces are expected to become less influent than the weight of the particles as their size increases. However, it also appears that two distributions having the same location parameter can show significantly different Bond number depending on their spread parameter. Figure 9 (a) and (b) show that both location and spread of the distributions have an influence on the population dependent granular Bond number.

Figure 9 (c) and (d) show the evolution of the population dependent granular Bond numbers according to the span parameter and to the median diameter  $d_{50}$  of the distributions, respectively. The span and the median diameter are used instead of the Rosin-Rammler parameters in order to include the bimodal distributions AA1 and AA2 that cannot be described using two simple Rosin-Rammler parameters. The observations made on Figure 9 (a) and (b) also applies to Figure 9 (c) and (d): the Bond number seems to be higher for more disperse and smaller particle sizes, but both parameters seem to be interdependent. We can also note on Figure 9 (c) that distributions AA1 (bimodal) and A8 (monomodal) have very different Bond numbers despite the fact that they almost share the same span and median diameters. This suggests that the span and the median diameter might not be the most relevant parameters to assess the population dependent granular Bond number, especially for polydispersed powders. However, we can notice a global trend on Figure 9 (d) suggesting that the Bond number decreases with the median diameter even if there is still significant differences between some distributions having different spreads.

Considering that the Bond number is correlated to the flowability, Figure 9 suggests that the flowability increases when the distribution becomes narrower and when the mean particle diameter increases. This is consistent with many theoretical and experimental studies found in the literature (Fu et al., 2012). However, it is not possible to assess which is the most influent parameter among the location and the spread of the distribution from this data. One possible explanation for these results is that the finest particles of the distribution are the most influent on the computed Bond number. Indeed, the amount of fine particles within a given distribution depends simultaneously on its location and its spread: it increases when the location parameters,  $x_0$  and  $d_{50}$  decrease and when the distribution becomes more disperse ( $n$  decreases and *span* increases). This would be consistent with Hamaker's theory suggesting that the Van der Waals force applied to two particles in interaction is dominated by the size of the smallest particle (Hamaker, 1937). Applied to a polydispersed mixture, that would imply that the flowability of the whole powder is mostly controlled by the contribution of the finest particles.