

Energetic coefficient of restitution of binderless elasto-plastic granules

Alexander Russell, Peter Müller and Jürgen Tomas Chair of Mechanical Process Engineering, Otto von Guericke University of Magdeburg, Germany

WCPT7 2014 – 7th World Congress on Particle Technology 19th to 22nd May 2014 at Beijing, China



Problem

- Distributed micro-mechanical properties throughout the structural volume of a single granule
- Inhomogeneous structure with randomly packed highly poly-disperse primary particles
- Almost always anisotropic and history-dependent behavior

Methodical Approach

- the energetic coefficient of Evaluation of restitution which characterizes the strain energy dissipation i.e. inelastic deformation work of particle contact
- Comprehensive analysis of the trending energetic coefficient of restitution due to dominant influences of:

content

Model Test Material

Almost spherical (99%), porous (50–53%), elasto-plastic and binderless millimeter-sized zeolite 4A granules with micron-sized primary particles



SEM:

Goal

reduce undesired inelastic deformation of То single granules in bulk assemblies by predicting macro-behavior from micro-mechanical properties



Contact Models

"Dissipative elasto-plastic" Linear elasto-plasticity according to Walton-Braun [1] $F_{el-pl,load} = k_{load} \cdot s$ (1) $F_{el-pl,unload} = k_{unload} \cdot (s - s_{max})$ (2)The energetic coefficient of restitution follows [2] $\mathbf{e}_{E_{W-B}} = \sqrt{\frac{k_{unload} \cdot (\mathbf{s}_{max} - \mathbf{s}_{unload})^{2}}{k_{unload} \cdot \mathbf{s}_{max}^{2}}} = \sqrt{\frac{k_{load}}{k_{unload}}}$ (3)



Results non-linear F(s) Δ **□** 0.8 linear F(s) distribution 0 0.6 normal distribution probability 0.4 as found by by Müller et al. [6] 02 using impact tests



Conclusions

The energetic coefficient of restitution is: independent of the granule size \propto 1/moisture content e_E

"Stiff particles with soft healing contacts"
Non-linear elasticity according to Hertz [3]

$$F_{el,load} = \frac{4}{3} \cdot \frac{E_{gran}}{(1 - v_{gran}^2)} \cdot \sqrt{R_{gran}} \cdot \left(\frac{s}{2}\right)^3 \qquad (4)$$
Non-linear elasto-plasticity according to Tomas [4]

$$F_{el-pl,load} = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \pi \cdot \lambda_{fit} \cdot p_{yield} \cdot R_{gran} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{3} \cdot \frac{s}{\sqrt{\frac{s_{yield}}{s}}}\right) \cdot s \qquad (5)$$
Non-linear elasticity according to Hertz [3]

$$F_{el,unload} = \frac{4}{3} \cdot g_{fit} \cdot \frac{E_{gran}}{(1 - v_{gran}^2)} \cdot \sqrt{R_{gran}} \cdot \left(\frac{s - s_{unload}}{2}\right)^3 \qquad (6)$$
The energetic coefficient of restitution follows [5]

$$e_{E_{H-T}} = 2 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{F_{el,unload}}{F_{yield}}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{s_{max} - s_{unload}}{4s_{yield} + 15\kappa_A} \frac{s_{max}}{s_{yield}} (s_{max} - s_{yield})} \qquad (7)$$

Test Method

Quasi-static uniaxial compression



 \propto no. of preloads until crack initiation

The energetic coefficient of restitution found by compression tests are always lower than the kinematic coefficient of restitution found by impact tests due to the high difference in the "strain rate"

References

- O.R. Walton and R.L. Braun, <u>J. Rheol. 30</u>, 949–980 (1986) [1]
- J. Tomas, Vorlesungsmanuskript 1–108 (2014) [2]
- H. Hertz, J. Reine Angew. Math. 92, 156–171 (1882) [3]
- [4] J. Tomas, <u>Chem. Eng. Sci. 62</u>, 1997–2010 (2007)
- A. Russell, P. Müller and J. Tomas, <u>Chem. Eng. Sci. 114</u>, 70–84 (2014) [5]
- [6] P. Müller, S. Antonyuk, M. Stasiak, J. Tomas and S. Heinrich, Granul. Matter 13, 455–463 (2011)

Contact

40

M.Sc. Alexander Russell Dr.-Ing. Peter Müller Prof. Dr.-Ing. habil. Jürgen Tomas Address:

50

alexander.russell@ovgu.de peter.mueller@ovgu.de juergen.tomas@ovgu.de MVT/IVT, O.-v.-G.-U.-Magdeburg Universitätsplatz 2, P.O. Box 4120 D–39106 Magdeburg, Germany www.mvt.ovgu.de

