**Universal Published Paper Review**

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 of Hydrodynamic Continuity, 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 “Normalized pressure” and the “fluid current” and which we denote with the symbols PQ and CQ, respectively.

Any given combination of the underlying variables prescribed by the QFFM will have a unique pressure drop at any given flow rate, *all as dictated by the Conservation Laws of Nature.* 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 simply means that the left hand side of the pressure gradient versus flow rate equation must be correctly balanced on the right hand side of the equality sign by all the individual variables which constitute the relationship. 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 demonstrably commensurate with the measured pressure drops and fluid flow rates. The discrete values of the many conduit/fluid variables underlying any measured data set of pressure gradient and flow rate are dictated by the Conservation Laws of Nature which are generally referred to as Laws of Continuity when the principle of conservation is applied in the context of a moving entity, in this case, the fluid flowing through the conduit. Accordingly, a differentiating element of the QFFM from all other popular models is its built-in capability to insure that continuity is always preserved in any reported experiment. This distinguishing feature of the QFFM will almost invariably generate a conflict with other empirical models which do not recognize the principle of continuity because a practitioner’s ability to measure accurately and precisely the underlying variables is almost always trumped by the *inherent precision* of continuity. 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 for continuity usually pertains to the more difficult-to-measure variables which are typically, average particle *diameter*, particle *sphericity*, and conduit *external porosity*. On the other hand, inner wall *roughness* is also difficult to measure, but its impact is on pressure drop reconciliation, which is on the opposite side of the ledger to continuity, in the pressure flow relationship.

Consequently, the 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.

REVISION 1

QFFM Continuity Ranking Index Comparison

Beginning in January, 2018, we are adding a new feature to our Universal Published Paper Reviews. In order to provide a frame of reference familiar to the practitioner, we will include in our reviews a direct comparison of our analysis of an author’s results under the QFFM with an analysis under one or more conventional models. For example, when the fluid regime is confined to laminar flow, we will utilize Poiseuille’s accepted model for flow in empty conduits to provide a calibration against the QFFM in the empty conduit counterpart of the packed conduit under study. Likewise, when the fluid regime is other than laminar, we will utilize a quadratic representation of the pressure flow relationship in the mode taught originally by Reynolds and more recently by Forscheimer to accommodate kinetic contributions. Finally, if appropriate, we may provide a comparison of an analysis under the QFFM with an analysis under a Q modified Ergun type model.

In addition, in order to inform the reader as to the relative merit of the experimental protocol used in a particular experiment, we will rank each experiment based upon a comparison of the measured result to that predicted by the QFFM using a quadratic frame of reference. We will accomplish this calculation by evaluating the reported pressure drop as an absolute percentage at each reported flow rate (average) of what the QFFM predicts. For instance, as shown in the Table below, if the reported pressure drop had an average discrepancy of 2 % (absolute) based upon the average calculated discrepancy at each flow rate reported, the experiment would be assigned a rank of A+; similarly, if the reported pressure drop had an average discrepancy of 20% based upon the average calculated discrepancy at each flow rate reported, the experiment would be assigned a rank of B. We will assign a ranking to each experiment based upon the following hierarchy of results and report the results in a comparison Table on this web site for easy reference by a practitioner.

QFFM Ranking System

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rank | % Discrepancy | Description |
| A+ | 0-5 % | Excellent |
| A | 5-10 % | Very Good |
| B+ | 10-15 % | Good |
| B | 15-20 % | Fair |
| C+ | 20-25 % | Poor |
| C | 25-30 % | Inadequate |
| D | 30-35% | Unacceptable |
| F | > 35 % | Fail |

Our Rev-1 is totally consistent with our previous methodology; it is simply designed to corroborate our analysis under the QFFM by giving the practitioner an additional way in which to view the author’s data through the lens of more well understood and accepted models and to provide an index of relative merit for the accuracy and precision of the underlying experimental methodology.

Paper Summary

We review here a published article in the **Journal of Chromatography A, 1355 (2014) 179–192,** entitled **Particle size distribution and column efficiency. An ongoing debate revived with 1.9 m Titan-C18 particles** by **Gritti et al**. For easy reference to the reader, we print here in its entirety the abstract in the paper.

**Paper Abstract**

The mass transfer mechanism in four prototype columns (2.1 and 3.0 × 50 mm, 2.1 and 3.0 × 100 mm) packed with 1.9 m fully porous Titan-C18particles was investigated by using two previously reported home-made protocols. The first one was used to measure the eddy dispersion HETP of these new columns, the second one to estimate their intrinsic (corrected for HPLC system contribution) HETPs. Titan particles are fully porous particles with a narrow particle size distribution (RSD of 9.2%). The mean Sauter diameter (dSauter = 2.04 m) was determined from Coulter counter measurements on the raw silica material (before C18 derivatization) and in the absence of a dispersant agent (Triton X-100) in a 2% NaCl electrolyte solution. The results show that these RPLC Titan columns have intrinsic minimum reduced HETPs ranging from 1.7 to 1.9 and generate up to 290,000 plates per meter. The 3.0 mm i.d. columns are more efficient than the 2.1 mm i.d. ones and short columns are preferred to minimize efficiency losses due to frictional heating at high speeds. This work also revealed that (1) the lowest h values of the Titan columns are observed at low reduced velocities (opt = 5); (2) this is due to the unusually small diffusivity of analytes across the porous Titan-C18particles; and (3) the Titan columns are not packed more uniformly than conventional columns packed with fully porous particles. Earlier and recent findings showing that the PSD has no direct physical impact on eddy dispersion and column efficiency are confirmed by these results.

**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.

The publication contains 4 experiments relating to the use of Titan C18 particles having a Sauter-mean diameter of 2.04 micron. For ease of description we designate them based upon their column dimension, and numbered 1 through 4 as follows;

1. Titan C18 particles; 0.21 x 10 cm column

2. Titan C18 particles; 0.30 x 10 cm column

3. Titan C18 particles; 0.21 x 5 cm column


4. Titan C18 particles; 0.21 x 5 cm column

1. **Corroborating the QFFM in Laminar Flow (Fig. A-1)**

In our Fig.A-1 herein we evaluate the packed conduit under study by hypothetically removing all the particles from the column and evaluating the empty conduit using the same fluid as reported in the paper but at very low flow rates. This technique removes all the uncertainty associated with the measurement of particle size, particle shape and packed conduit external porosity, the three variables which are the most challenging from a measurement perspective. Additionally, our analysis compares the calculated pressure gradient generated by the QFFM and the Poiseuille model at values of the flow rate *close to zero*, i.e. laminar flow. We can legitimately do this for *any* experiment because the value of zero flow rate (q = 0) and its corresponding counterpart zero pressure drop (P = 0) represent *the* universal fluid dynamic calibration point which grounds *in reality* all mathematical constructs, be they *dimensional* or *dimensionless*. In this way we can establish for the reader a *demonstrable* calibration of the QFFM against Poiseuille’s equation for the *dimensional* manifestation of the QFFM.

As shown in our Fig. A-1, we use a quadratic frame of reference to compare both flow models plotting the pressure gradient on the y axis and the superficial linear velocity on the x axis. As can be seen from the plot, both models are virtually identical when the calculated flow rate is very close to zero, but the QFFM model has a slight deviation as the flow rate increases. This deviation is caused by *kinetic* contributions as the modified Reynolds number increases. Such contributions are not recognized by Poiseuille’s model since it does not contain a kinetic term, i.e. it only captures *viscous* components of energy dissipation. Accordingly, as shown in the plot, the QFFM is virtually equivalent to the Poiseuille model for flow in this conduit when the fluid flow regime is confined to laminar and, moreover, is structured to capture kinetic contributions should the measured flow rates *reported for this packed conduit* extend beyond the laminar flow regime, something Poiseuille is incapable of accomplishing.

Fig A-1




1. **Quantification of the embedded discrepancy in the reported experiment (Fig. A-2).**


In our Fig.A-2 herein, we include the raw data provided in the paper as our baseline and we use our QFFM, again in a quadratic frame of reference, to demonstrate the discrepancy embedded in the reported data for the packed conduit. In addition, we also show the QFFM corrected data by using its inherent architectural design to identify the correct combination of the packed conduit sensitive variables of particle sphericity (p), spherical particle diameter equivalent (dp), channel wall roughness profile

(w) and conduit external porosity (0), underlying the reported values for pressure gradient and fluid flow rate. Finally, in addition to the correlation shown between the reported results and the QFFM corrected results, we include a Q modified Ergun model equivalent with identified viscous and kinetic constants of A and B, respectively.


Fig. A-2




In the case of experiment 1, note the apparent correlation between the measured values (just a single point!) and the authors’ reported values. On the contrary, however, our analysis demonstrates that while maintaining the particle shape at that of a perfect sphere (p = 1.00), the external porosity was 44 %, which is 11.36 % larger than that reported by the authors. Note that the conduit to particle diameter ratio (D/dpm) = 1029 was very large corresponding to a value of 0 for w in the QFFM. Finally, although our identified Q modified Ergun constants are 268 and 1.87 for A and B, respectively, there was no apparent kinetic contribution to energy dissipation in this experiment because the flow regime was definitively in the laminar region.



In the case of experiment 2, note the apparent correlation between the measured values (just a single point!) and the authors’ reported values. On the contrary, however, our analysis demonstrates that while maintaining the particle shape at that of a perfect sphere (p = 1.00), the external porosity was 43.1 %, which is 10.67 % larger than that reported by the authors. Note that the conduit to particle diameter ratio (D/dpm) = 1471 was very large corresponding to the value of 0 for w in the QFFM. Finally, although our identified Q modified Ergun constants are 268 and 1.99 for A and B, respectively, there was no apparent kinetic contribution to energy dissipation in this experiment because the flow regime was definitively in the laminar region.



In the case of experiment 3, note the apparent correlation between the measured values (just a single point!) and the authors’ reported values. On the contrary, however, our analysis demonstrates that while maintaining the particle shape at that of a perfect sphere (p = 1.00), the external porosity was 42.8 %, which is 13.79 % larger than that reported by the authors. Note that the conduit to particle diameter ratio (D/dpm) = 1029 was very large corresponding to the value of 0 for w in the QFFM. Finally, although our identified Q modified Ergun constants are 268 and 2.03 for A and B, respectively, there was no apparent kinetic contribution to energy dissipation in this experiment because the flow regime was definitively in the laminar region.




In the case of experiment 4, note the apparent correlation between the measured values (just a single point!) and the authors’ reported values. On the contrary, however, our analysis demonstrates that while maintaining the particle shape at that of a perfect sphere (p = 1.00), the external porosity was 42.8%, which is8.41 % larger than that reported by the authors. Note that the conduit to particle diameter ratio (D/dpm) = 1029 was very large corresponding to the value of 0 for w in the QFFM. Finally, although our identified Q modified Ergun constants are 268 and 2.03 for A and B, respectively, there was no apparent kinetic contribution to energy dissipation in this experiment because the flow regime was definitively in the laminar region.

1. **Corrected Data Reduced Parameters-Quinn’s Law**

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 CQ, 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 CQ , 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 measurement technique used by the authors suffered from serious deficiencies related to accuracy and precision in all four experiments. Nevertheless, the authors conspired to make it appear as though their measured values were correlated perfectly with the empirical Kozeny/Carman model (Fig. A-2) without doing any due diligence with respect to particle porosity or considering its implications with respect to the Laws of Continuity, corroborating information that was independently available to them for all the porous particles used in their experiments. On the contrary, they accomplished this misrepresentation by inappropriately adjusting *apriori* the viscous constant in that model for each of the 4 experiments, 158, 164, 142, 183, , respectively, something that is totally incompatible with the model. Fortunately, our QFFM ranking system herein is ideally suited to shine light on this *invalid* methodology. Accordingly, based upon our ranking system, we assign the failing rank of F to all 4 experiments.

Accordingly, there is a mismatch between the measured values related to particle morphology, the reported values for column external porosity and the measured pressure drop and flow rates. This mismatch is only *apparent and quantifiable* in the context of the QFFM and, therefore, can only be corrected using this model. The QFFM follows a rigid procedure of establishing the value of underlying variables *independently* in the laminar, transitional and fully turbulent regimes, a technique which results in a single analytical solution. 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 present it in the published paper. The 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.

Since all four experiments in this paper involved a fluid flow regime of laminar only, and the conduit to particle diameter was large, no significant wall effect is apparent.

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.