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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 **International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer 104 (2017) 533–536,** entitled **Effects of particle diameter on flow characteristics in sand columns,**by **Wan et al**. For easy reference to the reader, we print here in its entirety the abstract in the paper.

**Paper Abstract**

This work aims to investigate the effects of particle size on flow regimes and validation of Darcy law. Experiments were conducted in sand columns with five different particle sizes of silica sand in mean diameter 1.075 mm, 1.475 mm, 1.85 mm, 2.5 mm and 3.17 mm. Both pre-Darcy flow and post Darcy flow were identified but no obvious linear flow was observed, the Reynolds number of two flow regime are different with different grain sizes. Relative error was used to evaluate the experimental data and obtain that the values of Reynolds number at the demarcation point are 3.90, 7.08, 9.1 and 10.78. The values of Reynolds number of two flow regime increased gradually as the particle diameter increased. A new Reynolds number defined as ratio of inertia term and viscous term in Forchheimer equation can lead to a single criterion for determining the limit of validity of Darcy law. The recommended critical Reynolds number for non-Darcy flow is equal to 0.1, where the error of neglecting inertial effects in the hydraulic gradient will be less than 10%.

**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-1 herein, we show our analysis of the reported dataset for samples 1 through 5, utilizing the QFFM. Each sample plot contains 2 data sets; measured, QFFM calculated.

As can be seen from the plot, the fit between the data sets is excellent between the measured data and the calculated data based upon the QFFM for all 5 samples. In addition, we can report that values for external porosity had an average value of 0.399 for all 5 samples and a standard deviation of 5.9 %. This represents a decent packing procedure with reasonable reproducibility.

As is also shown in our Fig A-1, the dataset isalso accurately described in terms of the Q modified Ergun type equation with a value for A = 303 and a range of values for B whose average was = 2.48.

Fig. A-1



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 measurement technique used by the authors suffered from deficiencies related to accuracy and precision. In addition, the authors failed to properly apply the Laws of Continuity in addition to their efforts to align their measured data with conventional empirical permeability equations. Merely stating that the external porosity for all 5 columns was *approximately 4.0* does not square with the conclusions expressed by the authors concerning various criteria for Darcy and non-Darcy flow.

Accordingly, there is a mismatch between the apparent measured values for spherical particle diameter equivalent, 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. 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.

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.