# FEDSM-ICNMM2010-30677

# THE PRESSURE DROP AND DYNAMIC CONTACT ANGLE OF MOTION OF TRIPLE-LINES IN HYDROPHOBIC MICROCHANNELS

Dongin Yu<sup>1</sup> Department of Mechanical Engineering miyu8202@postech.ac.kr

Chiwoong CHOI<sup>2</sup> Department of Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering cwchoi@ucla.edu

Moohwan Kim<sup>1</sup> Department of Mechanical Engineering mhkim@postech.ac.kr

<sup>1</sup>Pohang University of Science and Technology, Pohang, Republic of Korea <sup>2</sup>University of California, Los Angeles, United States of America

#### ABSTRACT

At two-phase flow in microchannels, slug flow regime is different for wettability of surface. A slug in a hydrophilic microchannel has liquid film. However, a slug in a hydrophobic microchannel has no liquid film instead, the slug has triplelines and makes higher pressure drop due to the motion of the triple-line. In previous researches, pressure drop of triple-line is depended of dynamic contact angle, channel diameter and fluid property. And, dynamic contact angle is depended of static contact angle, superficial velocity and fluid property. In order to understand the pressure drop of motion of triple-lines, pressure drop of slug with triple-lines in case of various diameters (0.546, 0.763, 1.018, 1.555, 2.075 mm), various fluids (D.I.water, D.I.water-1, 5, 10% ethanol mixture) and various superficial velocity (j=0.01~0.4 m/s) was measured. Dynamic contact angle was calculated from relation of the pressure drop of slug with triple-lines. Comparing with previous dynamic contact angle correlations, previous correlation underestimated dynamic contact angle in the region of this study.  $(10^{-4} \le Ca \le 10^{-3}, 10^{-2} \le We \le 10^{-1}, 68^{\circ} \le \theta_{S})$  $\leq 110^{\circ}$ )

# NOMENCLATURE

- Р pressure [Pa]
- superficial velocity [m/s] i
- D conduit diameter [m]
- *Ca* capillary number [dimensionless]
- L length [m]
- C coefficient
- $k_{\rm B}$  Boltzman constant [J/K]

- absolute temperature [K]
- We Weber number

## Greek symbols

- $\Delta$  difference
- θ contact angle [radian]
- $\sigma$  surface tension [N/m]
- μ viscosity [Pa.s]
- f friction factor [d  $\rho$  density [kg/m3] friction factor [dimensionless]
- $\kappa^{\circ}$  characteristic frequency [s-1]
- characteristic length [m] λ

#### **Subscripts**

- TL triple-line
  - LG liquid-gas phase
  - L liquid phase
  - G gas phase
  - TP two-phase
  - GS gas slug
  - LS liquid slug
  - SP single phase
  - D dvnamic
  - А advancing (dynamic)
  - R receding (dynamic)
  - S static
  - m molecular

#### **1. INTRODUCTION**

Two-phase flow regime in microchannels is influenced on wettability of channel [1]. Especially, according to wettability of channel, slugs of different form are generated: in hydrophilic

microchannels, slugs with the liquid film are generated, but hydrophobic microchannels, slugs with triple-lines are generated. In the hydrophilic case, area change of liquid flow at nose and tail of slugs generate dominant two-phase pressure drop. However, motion of triple-lines generate dominant twophase pressure drop. Comparing the pressure drop of each case, slug with triple-line generate higher pressure drop than slug with liquid film [2]. Because, comparing liquid slugs smoothly move on the liquid film in hydrophilic microchannels, liquid slugs move by dragging triple-lines on the dry surface in hydrophobic microchannel.

In the past, many researchers interested dynamic contact angle rather than pressure drop of triple-lines [3] ~ [8]. And, many researchers investigated dynamic contact angle and reported that dynamic contact angle was affected on static contact angle and capillary number. However, previous researches were carried out in low superficial velocity region (j=0~0.04m/s) than slug flow regime region (j=0.05~0.43m/s), because the fluid of oil type was used by working fluid in the experiments.

Recently, P.Rapolu et al. developed the equation of pressure drop of triple-line that adopted dynamic contact angle on Young's equation [9]. In the equation, pressure drop of triple-line affected on channel diameter, dynamic contact angle and fluid property. Lee and Lee was calculated pressure drop of triple-line using experimentally measured pressure drop of slug with triple-line. And, they developed dynamic contact angle correlation that enabled to predict pressure drop of triple-line with P.Rapolu et al.'s equation [10]. But, parameter study about pressure drop of triple-lines was not conducted yet. Also, understanding of dynamic contact angle was lack to develop the correlation about pressure drop of triple-lines in the slug flow regime region.

In this present research, we conducted the experimental study of parameters that affect on pressure drop of triple-lines based on P.Rapolu et al.'s equation. And, to understand of dynamic contact angle that is dominant parameters that affect on pressure drop of triple-lines, the previous researches of dynamic contact angle was investigated and compared with calculated dynamic contact angle using measured pressure drop of slug with triple-lines in the slug flow regime region.

#### 2. EXPERIMENTS

#### **2.1 EXPERIMENTAL CONDITION**

P.Rapolu et al. suggested the equation of pressure drop of triple-line ( $\Delta P_{TL}$ ). According to the equation,  $\Delta P_{TL}$  was affected on channel diameter, dynamic contact angle ( $\theta_D$ ) and fluid property. Many theoretical and experimental researches of  $\theta_D$  were reported. The well-known theoretical analysis of  $\theta_D$  was hydrodynamic model and kinetic molecular model [11]. Hydrodynamic model focuses on the viscous force in the wedge adjacent to moving triple-lines. This force is generated by viscous bending between the moving triple-line and the no-slip region. Kinetic molecular model focuses on the friction at the moving triple-line. This friction is generated by attachment and detachment of molecules in the triple-line. Each model was different approaches to  $\theta_D$ . But, they have common opinion that  $\theta_D$  was affected on static contact angle ( $\theta_S$ ), superficial velocity and fluid property. The opinion was accepted on the

experimental analysis. Finally, according to above,  $\Delta P_{\rm TL}$  was affected on diameter and superficial velocity and fluid property.

$$\Delta P_{\rm TL} = -\frac{4\sigma}{D} \left( \cos \theta_{\rm A} - \cos \theta_{\rm R} \right) \tag{1}$$

$$\theta_{\rm A}^3 - \theta_{\rm S}^3 = 9Ca \ln\left(\frac{\rm L}{\rm L_m}\right) \tag{2}$$

$$j = 2\kappa^{\circ} \lambda \sinh \left[ \sigma \left( \cos \theta_{\rm A} - \cos \theta_{\rm S} \right) \lambda^2 / 2k_{\rm B} \mathrm{T} \right]$$
(3)

To understand the parameters that were diameter, fluid property and superficial velocity, pressure drop of slug with triple-lines was measured in various diameters (0.546, 0.763, 1.018, 1.555, 2.075 mm), fluids (D.I.water, D.I.water-1, 5, 10% ethanol) and superficial velocity (0.01~0.43m/s). Experimental range of superficial velocity was based on slug flow regime region of Lee and Lee experimental data.

## 2.2 EXPERIMENT PREPARATION

In our experiments, two-phase flow was composed of nitrogen and D.I.water-ethanol mixture. Density, viscosity, surface tension and static contact angle of D.I.water-ethanol mixture were respectively measured using the electric balance (Sartorius, 1600S), the Cannon Fenske kinematic viscometer (Cannon, 50), the surface tension meter (ITOH, 514-A) and sessile drop method. And, values of measured properties were compared with previous researches [12]  $\sim$  [14]. To analysis fluid property effect, we adopted characteristic velocity that was defined in Eq.3 by de Genne [15]. Each property is summarized in Table.1.

$$j^* = \frac{\sigma}{\mu}, \ Ca = \frac{\mu j}{\sigma} = \frac{j}{j^*}$$
 (4)

Before conducting the experiments, test sections were cleaned by the following methods. Organic matters in the test sections were cleaned to orderly inject acetone, methanol and D.I.water. Subsequently, the wet in the test section were cleaned to blow using nitrogen gun and make vacuous along 24 hours in chamber.

## 2.3 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

Figure.1 is the schematic diagram of our experimental loop. Test sections were conventional round minimicrochannels (HANEOL, HE-02, UPCHURCH, 1512L / 1514L / 1507L, SWAGELOK, Q02309). Test sections were made on hydrophobic material (PFA: Perfluoroalkoxy). The length of test section was 8 m to secure the fully developed region.

Table.1 D.I.water-ethanol					
Dronartias	ethanol mole fraction				
Flopenties	0%	1%	5%	10%	
ρ [kg/m <sup>3</sup> ]	997.05	997.27	977.08	963.38	
σ[N/m]	0.073	0.064	0.046	0.038	
μ [mPa.s]	0.1046	0.1160	0.1651	0.2186	
j* [m/s]	69.86	55.55	27.94	17.35	
$ heta_{S}$ [°]	110	85	77	68	



Using the micro liter syringe, liquid slug was injected into the test sections. The length of test section was 8 m to secure the fully developed region. The length of liquid slug was larger than 5 times of channel diameters. Subsequently, the electronic regulators (SMC, ITV1010-211CS5 / ITV1030-211CS5) and the power supply (VUPOWER, AK-3003DD) controlled pressure of nitrogen bomb and made the steady two-phase flow. At upstream of the test section, the gas flow rate was measured using the gas mass flow meters (OMEGA, FMA-2615A / 2604A) and the pressure drop of two-phase flow and single phase flow were measured using the pressure transducers (SETRA, 209, SMC, PSE550). All measured data were gathered using personal computer and data acquisition system (GRAPHTEC, WS450) every second.

#### **3. DATA REDUCTION**

In experiments, pressure drop of two-phase ( $\Delta P_{\rm TP}$ ), single phase ( $\Delta P_{\rm SP}$ ) and gas flow rate were measured. In figure.2, when liquid slug passed the test section,  $\Delta P_{\rm TP}$  and gas flow rate were measured. Subsequently, when liquid slug went out the test section,  $\Delta P_{\rm SP}$  and gas flow rate were measured.

At slug with triple-lines, to conserve continuity equation, gas slug, liquid slug, triple-lines superficial velocity at the slug flow with triple-lines were equivalent because of gas slug with no liquid film. Also, geometrically, the length of the test section is equal to the sum of length of liquid slug and gas slug.

$$\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{G}} = \mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{L}} = \mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{TL}} = \mathbf{j} \tag{5}$$

$$L_{\rm T} = L_{\rm L} + L_{\rm G} \tag{6}$$

 $\Delta P_{\rm TP}$  is composed of pressure drop of liquid slug ( $\Delta P_{\rm LS}$ ), gas slug ( $\Delta P_{\rm GS}$ ) and  $\Delta P_{\rm TP}$ . Therefore,  $\Delta P_{\rm TL}$  is equivalent that  $\Delta P_{\rm TP}$  subtracted  $\Delta P_{\rm LS}$  and  $\Delta P_{\rm GS}$  Friction factor was calculated using Eq.7

$$\Delta P_{\rm TP} = \Delta P_{\rm LS} + \Delta P_{\rm GS} + \Delta P_{\rm TL} \tag{7}$$

$$\Delta P_{\rm TL} = \Delta P_{\rm TP} - f_{\rm L} \frac{L_{\rm L}}{2D} \rho_{\rm L} j^2 - f_{\rm G} \frac{L_{\rm T} - L_{\rm L}}{2D} \rho_{\rm G} j^2$$
(8)

$$f_{\rm L} \frac{\rho_L j \rm D}{\mu_L} = f_{\rm G} \frac{\rho_G j \rm D}{\mu_G} = 64$$
<sup>(9)</sup>

 $\theta_A$  was calculated using pressure drop of triple-lines. First of all, we adopted Lee and Lee's assumption that difference with  $\theta_S$  and advancing and receding dynamic contact angle  $(\theta_A, \theta_R)$  were similar at front and front of slug with triple-line. Finally, inserting Eq. 9 to Eq. 1,  $\theta_A$  was calculated using Eq. 10.

$$\theta_{\rm A} - \theta_{\rm S} \approx \theta_{\rm R} - \theta_{\rm S} \tag{10}$$

$$\theta_{\rm A} = \arccos\left[-\frac{C_{\rm I}C_{\rm 2}}{C_{\rm 2}^{2} + C_{\rm 3}^{2}} \pm \sqrt{\left(\frac{C_{\rm I}C_{\rm 2}}{C_{\rm 2}^{2} + C_{\rm 3}^{2}}\right)^{2} - \left(\frac{C_{\rm 1}^{2} - C_{\rm 3}^{2}}{C_{\rm 2}^{2} + C_{\rm 3}^{2}}\right)}\right]$$
$$\left(C_{\rm 1} = \frac{\Delta P_{\rm TL}D}{\sigma}, C_{\rm 2} = 4\left(1 - \cos\theta_{\rm S}\right), C_{\rm 3} = 4\sin\theta_{\rm S}\right)$$
(11)

#### 4. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

First of all, experiments were carried out to investigate whether  $\Delta P_{GS}$ ,  $\Delta P_{LS}$  and  $\Delta P_{TL}$  was independent of the length of liquid slug. In the test section (D=1.555mm), experiments were carried out in cases of various liquid lengths. (D.I.water, 0.5, 1.0, 2.0cm)  $\Delta P_{TL}$  at different liquid lengths were equivalent within 4% in figure.3.  $\Delta P_{TL}$  could be considered independent of the length of liquid slug.

 $\Delta P_{\text{TL}}$  increased as channel diameter decreased (figure.4). This trend is agreement that  $\Delta P_{\text{TL}}$  is inversely proportional to diameters in Eq.8.

 $\Delta P_{\text{TL}}$  increased as superficial velocity increased (figure.5). According to Eq.1,  $\Delta P_{\text{TL}}$  increases as  $\theta_A$  increased, also  $\theta_A$  increased as superficial velocity increased in Eq.2, 3. Eventually,  $\Delta P_{\text{TL}}$  in the channel axis-direction increased as  $\theta_A$  increased alike experimental results.

As ethanol mole fraction increased, density and surface tension of D.I.water-ethanol mixture decreased smoothly, but the viscosity of the mixture increased in the experimental range. Eventually, j\* was decreased as ethanol mole fraction increased. Over the range of conditions used in this study,  $\Delta P_{TL}$ decreased and the slopes of the relationship between  $\Delta P_{TL}$  and j increased as j\* decreased, however the slopes of the relationship between  $\Delta P_{TL}$  and Ca similar in all j\*. Through the results, we could know that  $\Delta P_{TL}$  is well-correlated of Ca (figure.6)

 $\theta_A$  of various fluids increased with similar slope as Ca increased, but  $\theta_A$  differed among the various fluids because



Figure.3  $\Delta P_{TL}$  of various lengths of liquid slug



Figure.4  $\Delta P_{TL}$  of various channel diameters



Figure 5  $\Delta P_{TL}$  of superficial velocity



their  $\theta_S$  were different. (figure.7)  $\theta_A$  were independent of channel diameter. (figure.8)



Figure.8  $\theta_A$  of various channel diameters

# 5. COMPARISON WITH PREVIOUS RESEARCHES

 $\Delta P_{\text{TL}}$  of our research compared with Lee and Lee's data. Because, Lee and Lee were recently carried out the trailblazing research about  $\Delta P_{\text{TL}}$  and  $\theta_A$ . In a water-air-polyurethane system ( $\theta_S = 77^\circ$ ) and a water-air-teflon system ( $\theta_S = 110^\circ$ ), they measured  $\Delta P_{\text{TP}}$  in the slug flow regime. Comparing with our data (D.I.water, D.I.water-5% ethanol), their data was agreed within 25%. (figure. 9)

 $\theta_A$  of our research compared with previous  $\theta_A$  correlations. Previous correlations have been based on the Jiang et al.'s universal correlation (H) (Eq. 11). Only, previous researchers presented the different coefficient (a, b) of H according to their experimental data. Their coefficients were summarized in Table.2.

$$H = \frac{\cos\theta_{\rm s} - \cos\theta_{\rm A}}{1 + \cos\theta_{\rm s}} = aCa^b \tag{10}$$

In figure.10, Lee and Lee's correlations was well-predicted  $\theta_A$  of our research in the cases of  $\theta_S = 110^\circ$  and 77°, however other correlations was underestimated  $\theta_A$  of our research.

Table.2 Coefficients of H in	previous $\theta_A$ correlations
------------------------------	----------------------------------

Dagaarahag	Coeffici	0 rongo	
Researches	а	b	$\theta_{\rm S}$ range
Jiang et al.	4.96	0.702	All
Bracke et al.	2	0.5	All
Seebergh et al.	2.24	0.54	All
Lee and Lee (1)	0.82	0.118	$\theta_{S} = 110^{\circ}$
Lee and Lee (2)	2.48	0.328	$\theta_{S}=77^{\circ}$



Figure.9 Comparison  $\Delta P_{TL}$  with Lee and Lee correlation (a) D.I.water, (b) D.I.water+5%ethanol



Figure.10 Comparison of  $\theta_A$  of data and correlations

Tueres enaberneurien er men er nyuna gab meertaee				
	dominant forces			
interfacial/viscous	interfacial/viscous /gravitational	interfacial/viscous /inertial		
Jiang et al.	Bracke et al.	Lee and Lee		
	Seebergh et al.	Our research		

Table.3 Classification of movement of liquid-gas interface

Also, Lee and Lee correlations and  $\theta_A$  of our research were dependent of  $\theta_S$  unlike that other correlations were independent of  $\theta_S$ .

#### 6. DISCUSSIONS

In previous researches of  $\theta_A$ , Hoffman developed the curve that  $\theta_A$  was depended of *Ca* and shift factor. Shift factor was

depended of  $\theta_s$ . Also, he classified movement of liquid-gas interface in horizontal capillary tubes. In [3], the movements were dependent of viscous force, inertial force, interfacial force at the liquid-gas interface and at the liquid-gas-solid junction. Criteria to classify the movements were based on the dimensionless numbers *Ca* and *We*, and he roughly derived that criterion of *We* was 0.015. Because his experiments were carried out over a low range of *We* ( $5.4 \times 10^{-11} \le We \le 1.6 \times 10^{-5}$ ), the applicability of his correlation was limited to the movement dominated by interfacial and viscous forces. Instead, he conjectured movement of liquid-gas interface in the high range of *We*. According to his conjectures, liquid-gas interface would be disturbed by inertial force and shift factor would be depended not  $\theta_s$  but  $\theta_4$  in the high *We* range.

According to Hoffman's criteria, we could classify previous researches. (Table.3) Most of other previous research was conducted using working fluid of viscous oil type, and movement of liquid-gas interface could be nearly influenced on inertial forces. But, Lee and Lee, our research were carried out using working fluid of water type, movement of liquid-gas interface could be dominantly influenced on inertial forces.

Considering Hoffman's conjectures, we could infer the reasons for the difference  $\theta_A$  between our research and previous correlation. In the high *We* range, interface of liquid-gas could be more convex because, inertial force distorted interface shape. Therefore,  $\theta_A$  could be higher than predicted  $\theta_A$  using previous correlation that was developed in the low *We* range.

Also, we could infer the reasons that the coefficients of H were depended of static contact angle. Jiang et al. generated H to take a nonlinear regression Hoffman's curve that  $\theta_A$  was depended of  $\theta_S$  and shift factor. Merit of H was that  $\theta_A$  could be predictable using only  $\theta_A$  and Ca. Shift factor that a priori was not given was not necessary. H of Jiang et al. was taken a nonlinear regression over a low *We* range. Therefore, it may be that H wasn't well taken a nonlinear regression over a high *We* range.

Eventually, we developed a corrected H over a high We range. The new correlation predicted  $\Delta P_{TL}$  which agreed with experimentally-measured  $\Delta P_{TL}$  within 26% and  $\theta_A$  which agreed with measured  $\theta_A$  within 5%. This correlation is limited on the conditions  $10^{-4} \le Ca \le 10^{-3}$ ,  $10^{-2} \le We \le 10^{-1},68^{\circ} \le \theta_S \le 110^{\circ}$ 

$$H^* = \frac{\cos\theta_{\rm s} - \cos\theta_{\rm A}}{\left(1 + \cos\theta_{\rm s}\right)^{0.128}} = 0.8Ca^{0.399} \tag{10}$$

## 7. CONCLUSIONS

In this research, we carried up the experimental research about  $\Delta P_{TL}$  and  $\theta_A$ . We measured pressure drop of slug with triple-line in a hydrophobic microchannel. To understand the parameters that effected  $\Delta P_{TL}$ , we experiment in various diameters, fluids and superficial velocities.  $\Delta P_{TL}$  and  $\theta_A$  was calculated using measured  $\Delta P_{TP}$  and equations. Through the experiments, we investigated that  $\Delta P_{TP}$  is increased as diameter decreased, j\* and superficial velocity increased, and this trends are agreement with equations of previous researchers.

Subsequently,  $\Delta P_{TL}$  and  $\theta_{A of}$  our research were compared with previous researches. We discovered previous  $\theta_A$ 

correlations were underestimated  $\theta_A$  of our research. We conjectured the reason of difference with previous  $\theta_A$  correlations and our research was that previous correlations couldn't consider the inertia effect at the triple-line and interface. Finally, we developed the correlated H over a high *We* range.

## 8. REFERENCES

[1] A. M. Barajas and R. L. Panton, The effects of contact angle on two-phase flow in capillary tubes, *International Journal of Multiphase Flow*, vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 337-346, 1993

[2] C. Y. Lee and S. Y. Lee, Influence of interfacial tensions on transition of two-phase flow pattern in mini-channels.  $6^{th}$  *International Conference on Multiphase Flow*, Leipzig, Germany, July 9-13, 2007

[3] R. L. Hoffman, A study of the interface: I. The interface shape in liquid-gas systems. *Journal of Colloid and Interface Science*, vol. 50, No.2, pp. 228-241, 1975

[4] T. S. Jiang, S. G. Oh, J. C. Slattery, Correlation for dynamic contact angle, *Journal of Colloid and Interface Science*, vol. 94, No. 2, pp. 470-486, 1983

[5] W. Rose and R. W. Heins, Moving interface and contact angle rate-dependency, *Journal of Colloid Science*, vol. 17, pp. 39-48, 1962

[6] G. E. P. Elliott and A. C. Riddiford, Dynamic contact angles: I. The effect of impressed motion, *Journal of Colloid Science*, vol. 23, pp. 389-298, 1967

[7] J. E. Seebergh and J. C. Berg, Dynamic wetting in the low capillary number regime, *Chemical Engineering Science*, vol. 47, No. 17/18, pp. 4455-4464, 1992

[8] M. Bracke, F. De Voeght, P. Joos, The kinetics of wetting : the dynamic contact angle, *Progress in Colloid and Polymer Science*, vol. 49, pp. 142-149, 1989

[9] P. Rapolu and S. Y. Son, Capillarity effect on two-phase

flow resistance in microchannels, the 18<sup>th</sup> International Symposium on Transport Phenomena, No.186, pp. 1431-1436, 2007

[10] C. Y. Lee and S. Y. Lee, Pressure drop of two-phase dryplug flow in round mini-channels: effect of moving contact line, *Experimental Thermal Fluid Science*, vol. 34, pp. 1-9, 2010

[11] T. D. Blake, The physics of moving wetting lines, *Journal of Colloid and Science*, vol.209, pp. 1-13, 2006

[12] D. Pecar and V. Dolecek, Volumetric properties of ethanol-water mixtures under high temperatures and pressures, *Fluid Phase Equilibria*, vol. 230, pp. 36-44, 2005

[13] A. Li and B. C. Y. Lu, A molecular model for representing surface tension for polar liquids, *Chemical Engineering* 

Science, vol.56, pp. 6977 ~ 6987, 2001

[14]. M. Yusa, G. P. Mathur, R. A. Stager, Viscosity and compression of ethanol-water mixtures for pressure up to 40000 Psig, *Journal of Chemical and Engineering Data*, vol.22, pp. 32-35, 1977

[15] P. G. de Gennes, F. Brochard-Wyart, D. Quere, Capillarity and wetting phenomena, *Springer*, 2003