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Introduction

The Quinn Fluid Flow Model (QFFM) is a totally new and novel theory of fluid dynamics in closed conduits. The underlying intellectual property is owned by The Wrangler Group LLC (TWG). It has been developed from first principles and applies to fluid flow in both packed and empty conduits across the entire fluid flow regime including laminar, transitional and turbulent. The model has been validated by applying it to classic studies in both categories of flow embodiments and, in each case, to studies in all fluid flow regimes.

The QFFM can be expressed in two formats. The first format is a dimensional manifestation in which the measured differential pressure across the ends of a conduit is compared to the measured resultant flow rate of the fluid according to the relationships dictated by the model among the many independent and dependent variables pertaining to the physical fluid flow embodiment and pertaining to the fluid itself. The second format is a dimensionless manifestation, which we call Quinn’s Law, where all the individual respective contributions to the pressure drop/fluid flow relationship have been normalized between the model’s two entities, which we call the “Quinn reduced pressure” and the “fluid current” and which we denote with the symbols PQ and Qc, respectively.

Any given combination of the underlying variables prescribed by the QFFM will have a unique pressure drop at any given flow rate. Accordingly, the QFFM is capable of distinguishing between *valid* and *invalid* data. In particular, the QFFM can identify a mismatch between a practitioner’s statement of the values he/she claims to have measured or calculated for the QFFM variables and the practitioner’s measured flow rate and pressure drop. We consider any mismatch to be an *invalid* empirical result. It follows that for every *invalid* empirical result there is but one *valid* corrected result.

Before one can apply Quinn’s Law to any given empirical result that result has to be validated using the dimensional manifestation of the QFFM. This, in turn, is because one cannot normalize properly for all the individual respective contributions unless all the variables are correctly identified and their values are commensurate with the measured pressure drops and fluid flow rates. In general, we can state that since most of the underlying variables pertaining to a fluid flow embodiment are relatively easy to measure, the correction usually pertains to the more difficult-to-measure variables. In the case of a packed conduit, the problematical measurements include particle sphericity, average particle diameter and conduit external porosity, In the case of an empty conduit, the weak link in terms of measurability is the conduit’s inner wall roughness.

QFFM is a unique and powerful new tool in the arsenal of the fluid flow practitioner. In particular, when experiments are conducted in the transitional and/or turbulent regimes, the conventional methodology does not provide any reliable way to verify the accuracy of the results across a broad spectrum of Reynolds numbers. Thus, it is in these regions of the fluid flow regime that the QFFM will be shown to be most useful. In fact, it is a direct consequence from the statements contained herein that one needs only to measure pressure drop and fluid flow rate to evaluate the quality of one’s experimental technique. This new development in fluid dynamics means that those of us who have spent our entire lives doing fluid flow measurements can now enjoy the same benefits as our counterparts within the field of electricity and magnetism.

Paper Summary

We review here a published article in **Powder Technology 187 (2008) 94–101**, entitled **a simplified correlation for fixed bed pressure drop**,by **Carpionlioglu et al**. For easy reference to the reader, we print here in its entirety the abstract in the paper.

**Paper Abstract**

An experimental study was conducted on the pressure drop characteristics of a variety of vertical packed beds in turbulent flow of air. The materials of different particle diameter, Dp, with a range of sphericity Φ, 0.55 ≤ Φ ≤1.00 were used in random loose packing to produce beds of different lengths, L, with a range of porosity, ε, and 0.36 ≤ ε ≤ 0.56. In the covered test cases the cross-sectional velocity distribution at the exit plane of the packed beds and the pressure drop ΔPBed were measured in a particle Reynolds number range of Rep, 675 ≤ Rep ≤7772. The particular emphasis of the study was given to determine the influence of ε, Φ, Dp, L, Rep on ΔPBed. In this respect the measurements of ΔPBed were compared with the well-known Ergun's Equation and the data were expressed in terms of correlations through introduced dimensionless parameters of pressure coefficient, ΔP⁎ and exit Reynolds number Reexit. The proposed correlations of ΔP⁎=ΔP⁎(εRepDp /L) and Reexit=Reexit (RepDp /L) are found to be appropriate for the determination of ΔPBed and mean exit velocity, U, respectively with an acceptable fit of experimental data in an error margin less than ±20%. The methodology is presented in this paper as an alternative approach to the available literature on packed beds.

**Data Analysis**

TWG has performed an extensive evaluation of the above referenced published article utilizing the QFFM. We commence our evaluation of the paper with an in-depth analysis of the reported data.

In our Fig. A herein, we show the results of our assessment of the data contained in Table 3 in the paper using the QFFM to back calculate for fluid flow rate. We present our analysis as a comparison between the superficial linear velocity in the packed bed, which is based upon the reported pressure drops in the bed and underlying conduit and fluid variables, and the superficial linear velocity reported in Table 3. We point out that, surprisingly, the author’s reported values for Reynolds number (Re) in Table 3 pertain to the empty conduit in which the particles are packed, but the pressure drop pertains to the packed bed. This technique of mixing up parameters in the same Table is disconcerting, at a minimum.

As shown in our Fig. A, there is a huge disconnecting between the superficial linear velocity in the packed bed and that in the empty conduit. This is because in the turbulent region of the fluid flow regime, the boundary layer development is completely different in a packed bed and an empty conduit.

**Fig. A**

In Fig. B herein, we have provided our validation of the papers corrected data by a comparison of the data to Quinn’s Law. This normalized relationship is presented herein in the form of a plot of PQ versus QC, whichis the frame of reference of Quinn’s Law. This frame of reference is a transformation derived from the dimensional fluid flow relationship embedded in the QFFM. The relationship between these two unique reduced Quinn parameters is *linear*. However, we chose to present it as a *log-log plot* herein to provide emphasis at both extremes of the fluid flow regime. This plot is based upon both our own experimental data and *independent accepted classical reference data* which cover flow in both packed and empty conduits, over the entire fluid flow regime. (Note that the three distinct flow regimes of laminar, transitional and turbulent are clearly marked in the log-log plot.) As can be seen, the data reported in this paper, as corrected and as displayed in the form of a plot of PQ versus QC , lines up perfectly with Quinn’s Law

Fig. B



[Note: we do not herein provide the back-up for the validation of the plot of Quinn’s Law depicted in our Fig. B. For a description of the sources, both personal to TWG and from independent accepted classical references, on the basis of which the Quinn’s Law plot was validated, see the general introduction to this Universal Published Paper Review tab.

 **Conclusion.**

We conclude that the results in this paper suffer from deficiencies in the conceptual basis of the author’s proposition of comparing fluid velocity within and without a packed bed at high Reynolds numbers. As a result, there is a mismatch between the measured variables and the measured pressure drop. This mismatch is only *apparent and quantifiable* in the context of the QFFM and, therefore, can only be corrected using this model. Accordingly, since the authors did not have access to Quinn’s Law when they wrote the paper, they *could not have* corrected the data before attempting to rationalize it by applying their conceptual model. This inherent tendency to *modify* existing equations to correlate *unsubstantiated* empirical measurements has long since contributed to the confusion that exists in this field of study and has had a tendency to create the *false illusion* that these so-called conventional equations are of some *value* when, in reality, they are nothing more than *invalid* relationships.

Finally, although a detailed evaluation of the experiments reported in the paper under review, including an identification and quantification of the specific variables in each fluid flow embodiment which we claim the QFFM prescribes need to be corrected, is clearly within the capability of TWG, concerns about maintaining the confidentiality of the QFFM and Quinn’s Law – which, at this time, are still proprietary - dictate that such a development is premature.