Interaction between the Flow in Two Nearby Pores within a Porous Material during Transitional and Turbulent Flow
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ABSTRACT

The transition from laminar to turbulent flow in porous media is studied with a pore doublet model consisting of pipes with different diameter. The pressure drop over all pipes is recorded by pressure transducers for different flow rates. Results show that the flow in the parallel pipes is redistributed when turbulent slugs pass through one of them and six different flow zones were identified by studying the difference between the Re in the parallel pipes. Each flow zone starts when the flow regime of one of the pipe changes. Transitional flow of each pipe increases the correlation between different pipes pressure drop fluctuations. Frequency analysis of the pressure drops show that the larger pipe makes the system to oscillate by the presence of turbulent patches in its flow. However, when the flow in the smaller pipe enters into the transitional zone the larger pipe starts to follow the fluctuations of the smaller pipe.
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NOMENCLATURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>adjusting coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>differentiation sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>pipe roughness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>friction factor, frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>header pipe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>dummy variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>adjusting coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>permeability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>length, larger pipe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>adjusting coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m_n</td>
<td>normalized nth momentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M_n</td>
<td>data nth momentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>data variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m^2</td>
<td>mass flow rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>number of data point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P_x</td>
<td>frequency content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMM</td>
<td>poly methyl methacrylate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>mass flow rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re</td>
<td>Reynolds number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re_{diff}</td>
<td>difference between Re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>smaller pipe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>velocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x_i</td>
<td>i_th data point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X(f)</td>
<td>fourier transform of x(t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X(f)</td>
<td>mean value of data series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X(f)</td>
<td>conjugate of X(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y(t)</td>
<td>data point at moment (t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>difference operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μ</td>
<td>dynamic viscosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ρ</td>
<td>density</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 INTRODUCTION

Transitional flow is one of the most challenging problems of fluid mechanics, especially in porous media due to the often complex geometry encountered by the fluid. The first relationship describing fluid flow within porous media was based on Darcy’s pioneering experimental work on packed beds Darcy (1856). The by these experiments derived Darcy law (u = Δp/L - K/μ) states that the superficial velocity (u) is proportional to the pressure drop along a porous bed (Δp/L) where L, μ and K are the length of the porous bed, the dynamic viscosity and the permeability respectively. Darcy’s empirical law can be derived from the governing equations, i.e. the Navier–Stokes and continuity equations, by homogenization techniques Sanchez-Palencia (1980) or volume averaging
techniques Whitaker (1986). Darcy’s law is often said to be valid for Stokes flow \( \text{Re} < 1 \) (Lindquist 1933, Schneebeli 1955, Hubbert 1956, Scheidegger 1960, Chauvet and Thirriot 1967), but Hellström et al. (2010) have shown that it can be valid up to particle Reynolds number, \( \text{Re} \approx 10 \). The actual limiting value is dependent on how \( \text{Re} \) is defined. In 1863 Dupuit noticed that the linear Darcy’s law does not represent experimental data at higher flow rates. Following this observation Forchheimer (1901), added a quadratic correction term to Darcy’s law in order to capture the behavior of the experimental data at higher \( \text{Re} \). Later on other correction terms were proposed (Chauvet and Thirriot 1967, Muskat 1946, Skjetne 1999) and finally Darcy’s law was modified to the so called Ergun-Forchheimer equation that may be written in the following form: \( \Delta P = \frac{u^2}{k} + \frac{b u m}{k} \) where \( k, b \) and \( m \) are variables that should be chosen in a way that the equation fits to experimental data. By doing this the Equation captures the behavior of experimental data for \( \text{Re} > 10 \) (Seguin 1998, Comiti 2000, Papathanasiou 2001).

Several mechanisms have been suggested to cause the deviation from Darcy’s law such as:

- Loss of kinetic energy due to contraction and expansion of pore space Panfilov (2006)
- The effect of pore solid boundaries on pressure loss Hayes (1996)
- Microscopic inertial forces presented in the drag forces Ma (1993)
- Formation of inertia flows at the center of pores Dybbs (1984)
- Formation of a viscous boundary layer Whitaker (1996)
- The interstitial drag force (Hassanizadeh and Gray 1987, Ma and Ruth 1993)
- Singularity of streamline patterns Panfilov et al. (2003)
- Separation of flow (Skjetne and Auriault 1999b)
- Deformation of streamline patterns and formation of eddies (Fourar et al. 2004, McClure et al. 2010, Panfilov and Fourar 2006)

This, in essence, tells us that inertial forces result in the breakdown of Darcy’s law at modest \( \text{Re} \). However, at higher flow rates the flow eventually will become fully turbulent. The transition from inertia dominated to turbulent flow, which is proven to be continuous based on experimental data, can macroscopically be approximated by Forchheimer equation or extended forms of it Nemec (2005). Notice that this implies a continuous transition from laminar to turbulent flow Hellström (2010) that differentiates porous media flow from pipe flow where there is a non-continuous transition from laminar to turbulent flow Joseph and Yang (2010). Different authors have reported the presence of turbulence on pore scale Hlushkou (2006) but the effect of pore geometry on the actual state or distribution of turbulence has not been studied in detailed. For regular packing turbulence appears in all the neighboring pores at the same time. In fully random packing where there is no control of position or size of the pores formed the detailed geometry of most of neighboring pores affect the flow. Simplified geometries such as a unit cell (Wan 1996; Nordlund 2009) and a pore-doublet (Rose 1956; Sorbie 1995; Lundström 2008; Khayamyan et al. 2014) have been used to distill the geometrical effect. Following this trend we will continue to study the pore-doublet model presented in Khayamyan et al. 2013. This model was applied in order to take advantage of the well-studied pipe flow e.g. (Reynolds 1883, Wygnanski 1973, Gustavsson 1991).

In a previous study, Khayamyan et al. (2013), it was shown that the flow in the pipes is redistributed when transient slugs pass through one of them. The presence of the slugs in the pipes is revealed by positive skewness as well as an increase of the standard deviation of the pressure drops and correlation between pipes pressure drops. In the present paper the experimental investigation is considerably increased to higher Reynolds numbers and each measurement is done in a more proper way. The frequency content of the data is scrutinized and the results are interpreted in terms of a general porous media.

2. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP AND PROCEDURE

The flow around one particle within a porous medium is studied with a pore-doublet setup, see Khayamyan et al. (2014) for details. The flow geometry is represented by two straight and parallel glass pipes with diameters of 4.05 and 3.02 mm and lengths of 1100 mm. Water is supplied to the pipes from a third glass pipe with diameter of 9.05 mm and length of 750 mm connected via a Y-shaped splitter as shown in Fig. 1 & 2. The splitter is made of PMMA by machining the branches to 8 mm diameter. The angle between the branches is 50°, cf. Fig. 3. In order to keep the pipes horizontal and parallel they are aligned to an aluminum bar. The flow from the parallel pipes runs into two boxes. These two boxes and also the sliding tank providing the water to the pipes are of over-flow type so that the parallel pipes have equal pressure at their outlet and the driving pressure is kept constant during each run of the experiment.

![Fig. 1. Schematic drawing of flow model and experimental setup](image)

Each of the parallel pipes has pressure tap holes \( d = 1 \) mm positioned 20 mm after the splitter. There are also two pressure tap holes on the header pipe placed 700 mm from each other. Three differential pressure
transducers are used to record the pressure drop over each pipe during each run of the experiment. The transducers for the parallel and header pipes are from the OMEGA PX2300 series and LPM/LPX1000 series, respectively.

Each experiment was run during 60 minutes and the analog pressure drop signals from the pipes were converted to digital signals by an A/D converter and recorded with Signal Express into a computer at 40 Hz.

The flow rate through each parallel pipe was measured by collecting water 10 times for 60 seconds. The flow rate through the header pipe was then derived by usage of (1). The water temperature was 20\(^\circ\) ± 0.1\(^\circ\) during all runs. The position of the sliding tank was varied in a series of 144 runs with the header pipe Re, Re\(_H\), varying from 1100 to 3700.

### 2 Theory

For the system of pipes studied continuity yields that

\[ Q_L + Q_S = Q_H, \]

and thus

\[ (D Re)_L + (D Re)_S = (D Re)_H, \]

subscripts L, S and H refer to larger, smaller and header pipes respectively. The characteristic length scales for each pipe is its diameter. It is now assumed that the pressure drop from the splitter over the parallel pipes down to the free surface in the outlet box is identical. Thus for the two pipes,

\[ \Delta P_L = \Delta P_S. \]

The pressure drop, \( \Delta P \) in each section consists of a number of minor losses (which will be discussed later on) and a straight pipe loss which may be expressed as

\[ \Delta P = f \frac{L \rho U^2}{D} = f \frac{L \mu^2}{2D^2 \rho} Re^2, \]

Where L is the length of the pipe, U the mean velocity and \( f \) the friction factor, which is a function of Re Çengel and Cimbala (2010).

### 3 METHODS OF EVALUATION

#### 3.1 Statistical Analysis

The collected pressure data were processed in several ways and will be presented as

- Time averages and higher statistical moments (rms and skewness)
- Time series
- Correlations

The data presentation is a mixture between time averages and time resolved data. The ambition is to explain some of the statistical behavior from the time series which should better reflect the actual physical processes. The time average is defined as

\[ \bar{x} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} x_i}{N}, \]

Where \( N \) is the number of samples. The higher statistical moments are defined as

\[ M_n = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} (x_i - \bar{x})^n}{N}, \]

where \( n = 2, 3, \ldots \)

In this equation, \( n = 2 \) gives the variance and \( n = 3 \) the skewness. The standard deviation is the square root of the variance and is denoted rms. The skewness is normalized with the variance via

\[ m_n = \frac{M_n}{M_2^{1/2}}, \]

Where \( n = 3 \).

For the correlation, the Pearson correlation coefficient is applied to detect the relation between the pressure drops in the two pipes according to

\[ \text{Correlation} = \frac{\sum(x-\overline{x})(y-\overline{y})}{\sqrt{(M_x^{1/2})(M_y^{1/2})}} \]

#### 3.2 Frequency Domain Analysis

The experiments will yield time series of pressure. The relationship between two sets of time series, \( x(t) \) and \( y(t) \), can be scrutinized by computing the power spectral density function of the time series data, the gain factor, the phase difference and the coherency function. All of these methods are based on Fast Fourier Transform (FFT) of the time series data according to:
\[ X(f) = \int_0^\infty x(t)e^{-j2\pi ft} \, dt. \]  

(8)

Where \( X \) is data in the frequency plane, \( x \) the data in the real plane, \( f \) is frequency and \( t \) time.

### 3.3 Power Spectral Density Function

The power spectral density (PSD) is simply defined as:

\[ P_{xx} = |X(f)|^2 = X(f) \cdot \overline{X(f)}. \]  

(9)

The usage of this function is a practical way to recognize oscillatory signals in time series data. The function may also be used to find the amplitudes and the frequencies of the oscillations. PSD originally breaks down time series data into sets of sinusoidal waves of different frequencies and presents the strength or the energy of the signal at each frequency. The unit of PSD is energy per frequency and the energy of a frequency band is the area under the PSD plot within that frequency range.

### 3.4 Gain Factor

The gain factor, or the magnitude of the frequency response function, is the ratio of the Fourier transform of the data from two time series according to:

\[ \text{Gain factor} = \left| \frac{X(f)}{\overline{X(f)}} \right|. \]  

(10)

Hence it tells us which time series that dominates at a certain frequency.

The gain factor may disclose a correspondence between two sets of time series data and if they are following common trends. The important point to consider is that, even if the gain factor detect that there are common trends since the amplitudes of the variations might be small. Therefore, it is essential to investigate, at least, the power spectral density of one of the time series data to make sure that the amplitude of the coherent variations is large enough.

### 4 RESULTS

#### 4.1 Statistical Analysis

The flow through the parallel pipes is first evaluated as a function of \( \text{Re}_{li} \), cf. Fig. 4. The open symbols are from the current study and the filled from Khayamyan et al. (2014). Overall, the two series are in good agreement and the results from the two experimental series overlap in the laminar regime and also at the inflection point at \( \text{Re}_{li} \approx 2000 \). There are, however, some differences just after the inflection point. The maximum difference between the series for the larger and the smaller pipes are 2.1\% and 8.1\% which occur at \( \text{Re}_{li} \approx 1800 \) & 1750 respectively. These discrepancies may reflect the improved accuracy in the measurements (flow rate measured for longer time, from 10 (s) to 60 (s), more repetitions 4 times to 10 times and better temperature control). This indicates that the data in the second series are more reliable and they also cover larger range of \( \text{Re}_{li} \). Hence focus is now set on the second series of experiments.

When comparing \( \text{Re}_{li} \) as a function of \( \text{Re}_{li} \) for the parallel pipes it is obvious that there is a redistribution of the percentage flow between the pipes. Since the pipes face the same pressure drop the change in the slope of the curves is the result of alterations of the overall friction within the pipes when the flow changes characteristics.

To investigate this further, the difference between \( \text{Re} \) of the two parallel pipes, \( \text{Re}_{\text{diff}} \), is derived and plotted in Fig. 4. Based on the variation of the slope of this curve six ranges can be identified for which the flow regimes in the pipe network can be analyzed. In the first range (Range 1), \( \text{Re}_{li} \leq 1500 \), the flow is laminar in both pipes. \( \text{Re}_{\text{diff}} \) may therefore be expressed as:

![Fig. 4. Reynolds number for the two parallel pipes as a function of \( \text{Re}_{li} \).](image)

![Fig. 5. Normalized standard deviation of pressure drop along parallel pipes](image)

\[ \text{Re}_{\text{diff}} = \text{Re}_{li} - \text{Re}_{li} \]  

(11)

\[ f = \frac{64}{\text{Re}} \]  

(12)

which is generally true for \( \text{Re} < 2000 \). Using this relationship the slope of the curve \( \text{Re}_{\text{diff}} \) may readily be calculated to 1.0 (i.e. when only considering friction at the walls of the pipes) while the experimental data in Fig. 4 yields a slope of 0.68. However, when adding losses due to the bends in the splitter, the inlet and
outlet losses of the pipes and losses due to entrance length effects the slope is calculated to 0.73 which is much closer to the experimental value. This reveals that it is necessary to take into account all losses to have better estimation of flow distribution. By scrutinizing the slope of $\text{Re}_\text{eff}$ additional ranges can be defined. Range 2, $1500 < \text{Re}_H < 1800$, where $\text{Re}_\text{eff}$ is constant, Range 3, $1800 < \text{Re}_H < 2000$ where $\text{Re}_\text{eff}$ decreases, Range 4, $2000 \leq \text{Re}_H < 2300$, with a slight increase in $\text{Re}_\text{eff}$, Range 5, $2300 < \text{Re}_H < 2800$, where $\text{Re}_\text{eff}$ increases rapidly and Range 6, $\text{Re}_H > 2800$, where the slope of $\text{Re}_\text{eff}$ becomes somewhat smaller than in Range 5. The reasons for the changes in the slope of $\text{Re}_\text{eff}$ were partly explained in Khayamyan et al. (2014) and will be further analyzed in this investigation.

**Table 1 Flow regimes based on ReH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pipe</th>
<th>$\text{Re}_H$, Laminar</th>
<th>$\text{Re}_H$, Transient</th>
<th>$\text{Re}_H$, Turbulent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Header</td>
<td>2750</td>
<td>2750 – 3200</td>
<td>3200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1500 – 1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2000 – 2300</td>
<td>2300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When turbulent structures show up in a pipe there will be positive pressure peaks in the pressure drop along the pipe. Such features are disclosed by plotting the skewness for which the effect of smaller and symmetrically distributed amplitude fluctuations diminishes and larger, one-sided fluctuations are amplified. Figure 6a presents the normalized skewness of the pressure measurements in this study. Since most of the skewness values are concentrated around the x-axis, Fig. 6b focuses more on this part. As seen the skewness deviates from zero due to pressure fluctuations of the larger pipe at $\text{Re}_H \approx 1300$ and it reaches its peak at $\text{Re}_H \approx 1500$. Hence the start of the transition is not reflected in any major redistribution of the flow since Range 2 when $\text{Re}_\text{eff}$ becomes constant start at $\text{Re}_H \approx 1500$. The skewness of the header pipe behaves in an opposite manner, cf. Fig. 6a, and has negative values in this range to compensate the positive peaks in the parallel pipes (the total pressure drop is constant). After $\text{Re}_H \approx 1500$ the skewness of all three pipes go towards zero and at the end of Range 2 ($\text{Re}_H \approx 1800$) both the larger pipe and the header pipe have almost zero skewness, cf. Fig. 6b. Before entering into Range 4, $\text{Re}_H \approx 1900$, the skewness of the smaller pipe deviates from the larger pipe. It starts to grow and has its maximum at $\text{Re}_H \approx 2050$. The smaller pipes’ positive skewness shows that its pressure drop distribution has positive peaks that can be traced to the presence of turbulent slugs in its flow.

As before, the header pipe follows these pressure fluctuations since it does not have enough momentum to resist it. At $\text{Re}_H \approx 2800$ (start of Range 6) the header pipe’s skewness starts to grow and reaches its maximum around $\text{Re}_H \approx 2880$. The positive skewness within the header pipe does not have any noticeable effect on the flow in the parallel pipes.

To summarize, at $\text{Re}_H \approx 1500$ (start of Range 2) the flow in the larger pipe becomes transitional which is
denoted by increase in skewness and in the NRMSp, see Table 1. The pressure fluctuations in the larger pipe are reflected in the other two pipes where the flow is laminar. The flow in the larger pipe enters into the fully turbulent regime at ReH ≈ 1800 (start of Range 3) since its skewness goes to zero and NRMSp starts to decrease. Later, at ReH ≈ 2000 (start of Range 4) the flow in the smaller pipe becomes transitional since its NRMSp and skewness grows. The flow in the smaller pipe enters into the fully turbulent regime at ReH ≈ 2300 (start of Range 5) and the level of its NRMSp decreases. Finally at ReH ≈ 2800 (start of Range 6), the flow in the header pipe becomes transitional and its skewness and NRMSp grows. At ReH ≈ 3200 the level of the pressure fluctuations reaches its maximum indicating a transfer into fully turbulent flow in the header pipe. Another important issue is that ReH ≥ ReS, cf. Fig. 4, but the flow in the smaller pipe and the header pipe become transitional at ReS ≈ 2000 and 2800, respectively, cf. Fig. 4 & 5. This highlights the effect of the splitter and how it induces more disturbances at the inlet of both parallel pipes and triggers turbulent structures, puffs. This means Re is not the only parameter which determines the flow regime and the level of disturbances at the entrance of the pipe is an important factor as well. With knowledge of the basic stages of the system studied it is also of interest to find out how the pressure fluctuations correlate. The correlation of the pressure drop between the parallel pipes is initially weak for Range 1, but as ReH moves into Range 2 it has increases to a relatively high value, see Fig. 7. This implies that the correlation is, to start with, related to the turbulent spots disclosed by the skewness, cf. Fig. 6. In a similar manner the correlation values between any of the two parallel pipes and the header pipe increases. At ReH between 1900 – 2100 (Range 2-3) the correlation between the parallel pipes decreases. Hence the initial pressure fluctuations in the smaller pipe, found by the skewness, are not transformed to the larger pipe. However, the fluctuations in the smaller pipe are immediately reflected in the header pipe, see the increase in correlation between these pipes at ReH ≈ 2000, Fig. 7. At ReH ≈ 2900 the correlations between the header pipe and the parallel pipes reach a local minimum and then the correlation increases. Following the previous discussion this is due pressure fluctuations in the header pipe that actually start already at ReH ≈ 2800 but it does not impact the flow in the parallel pipes until ReH ≈ 2900, cf. Fig. 5. To summarize, pressure fluctuations caused by transitional flow are directly transferred to pipes with laminar flow. Such fluctuations are also eventually transferred to pipes with turbulent flow when the fluctuations become strong enough. The slope of ReH for the two parallel pipes in the turbulent regime, ReH ≥ 2300, is 0.21 by which only considers friction force from the walls of the pipes via Blasius’ formula

\[
f = \frac{0.316}{Re^{0.25}}.
\]

However, following the analysis of the laminar flow all sources to losses can be added to the calculations. When the pressure drop due to the other sources are included into the numerical calculation the slope of ReH will be 0.55 and 0.56 with Blasius and Colebrook friction factor, equations (13) and (14), respectively.

\[
\frac{1}{\sqrt{f}} = -2.0 \log \left( \frac{e/D}{3.7} + \frac{2.51}{Re^{0.25}} \right)
\]

The experimental data in Fig. 4 yields that ReH has two slopes in the turbulent regime which are 1.14 for ReH between 2300 and 2800 (Range 5) and 0.62 for ReH higher than 2800 (Range 6). The latter experimental slope is consequently rather close to the theoretically derived values. The larger slope of ReH for Range 5 means that a larger portion of the fluid passes the larger pipe in order to satisfy the equal pressure drop condition between the parallel pipes. This highlights the effect of the feeding flow into the parallel pipes because when laminar flow enters into pipes which are already in the turbulent regime it needs a distance for the turbulent structure to develop. The developing length should be longer for the larger pipe since the velocity is higher. Along the developing distance flow regimes are developing from laminar to transitional and finally turbulent at the end of it which makes the friction factor of this length smaller compare to fully turbulent flow.

4.2 Frequency Analysis
Figures 8-9 present the non-dimensionalized power spectra of the pressure drop fluctuations normalized with the average energy of the fluctuations, $\frac{1}{2}Prms^2$, for the larger and smaller pipe respectively.

Initially the power spectra have two peaks with relatively small amplitudes. This is an indication of turbulent patches in the flow which was already found by the skewness analysis, cf. Fig. 6a. At $Re_1$ from 1500 to 1850 (appr. Range 2) the low frequency peak of both pipes spectrum become more powerful driven by an increased number of turbulent patches in the larger pipe, cf. Fig.s 8-9 part b.

When $Re_1$ increases even more the low frequency peaks lose their power and move slightly to the right while the high frequency peaks gain power, cf. Fig. 8 part c (Range 3). The powerful high frequency fluctuations can distribute energy more uniformly among pressure drop oscillations therefore the level of fluctuations decreases within this range, cf. Fig. 5. In the range of $Re_1$ 1980 - 2060 the spectrum of both pipes is dominated by the high frequency peak, cf. Fig.s 8d. The powerful high frequency fluctuations cause the level of fluctuations of both pipes to become almost equal in this range, cf. Fig. 5. Here, also the skewness of the smaller pipe grows from negative values to positive values, cf. Fig. 6b, which is a sign of initiation of turbulent patches in the flow.

For $Re_1$ between 2120 and 2460 (appr. Range 4) turbulent spots form in the smaller pipe since a new low frequency peak appears in the spectrum of both pipes but more clearly in the smaller pipe, cf. Fig.s 8-9 e. For $Re_1$ between 2570 and 2780 (within Range 5) the spectrum of both pipes again is dominated by high frequency peaks, cf. Fig.s 8-9 f. The powerful high frequency band fluctuations, as it was explained before, are connected to uniform distribution of energy which lowers the level of fluctuations in this range. For $Re_1$ between 2800 and 3710 (Range 6) the spectrum of both pipes has only the high frequency peak and its power decreases by growth of the $Re_1$, cf. Fig.s 8-9 g.

![Fig. 9. Power spectra of pressure drop along the smaller pipe for $Re_1 = 1380, 1500, 1670, 1850, 1870, 1910, 1970, 2010, 2120, 2460, 2660$ and $3530$](image)

![Fig. 10. Gain factor of pressure drop along parallel pipes for $Re_1 = 1380, 1500, 1670, 1850, 1870, 1910, 1970, 2010, 2120, 2460, 2660$ and $3530$](image)

Table 3 Error estimation of measured quantities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Viscosity</th>
<th>Density</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Temperature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.56%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Error estimation of measured quantities for different pipe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Re</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Diameter</th>
<th>Pressure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larger pipe</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller pipe</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Header pipe</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>2.18%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10 presents the gain factor which is the square root of power ratio between two pipes; smaller/larger. For $Re_1$ between 1150 and 1970 (Ranges 1-3) the gain factor is less than one, cf. Fig. 10a-c. This means that both frequency bands originate in the larger pipe and the smaller pipe just follows them. This is expected since in this range turbulent patches only pass through the larger pipe. The results also indicates that the high frequency fluctuations force both pipes to have almost equal amplitudes while low frequency fluctuations caused due to turbulent patches make fluctuations have different amplitudes.

For $Re_1$ between 1980 and 2060 (Range 3-4) the gain factor at the low frequency band is more than unity which means that the low frequency band is caused by the smaller pipe fluctuations while the larger pipe causes the high frequency fluctuations, see Fig. 10d. Notice that the fluctuations in the smaller pipe could not be revealed from Fig. 8-9d. At $Re_1$ between 2120 and 3710 (Range 4-6) the gain factor is more than unity in the whole frequency range which means that all fluctuations are governed from the smaller pipe. This explains why the level of fluctuations of the smaller pipe is higher than the level in the larger pipe at $Re_1>2120$, cf. Fig. 5. At $Re_1$ between and 2810 and 3710 there is no sign of low band frequency events which are associated with the presence of turbulent patches and the gain factor has almost constant value at the low band. However, it starts to grow at high frequency band.
and it reaches its maximum at $f \approx 3$ (Hz) where however the power spectra is weak.

### 5.3 Estimation of Experimental Error

The average errors of measured quantities which are different for each pipe are listed in table 2. Also the error estimation of the general quantities of the experiment is listed in the table 3.

In order to see the effect of above mentioned quantities the following analysis is performed by using Taylor expansion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4 Error estimation of the measured variable on flow rate and Re</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error estimate of flow rate ($m^2/s$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error estimate of Re</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$Re = \frac{\rho U D}{\mu}$,  
$m^e = \rho \frac{U A}{\pi}$, 
$Re = \frac{4 m^e}{\pi D \mu}$, 
$dRe = \frac{4 dm^e D \mu - m^e (dD \mu + D d\mu)}{(D \mu)^2}$, 
$m^e = \frac{w}{t}$, 
$dm^e = \frac{1}{t^2}$. 

The results of the analysis are listed in following table.

### 6. Application to Porous Media Flow

In flow through porous media the Ergun equation can be fitted to experiments with very good agreement. From this Equation a so called Blake type of friction factor can be defined as:

\[ f' = 1.75 + \frac{150}{Re} \],  

where $Re$ is based on the hydraulic diameter of the porous media. As obvious from (21) $f'$ approaches a constant value as $Re$ increases, see Fig. 11. If we now treat the parallel pipes as a system its friction factor may be plotted and compared to the ones for the single pipes and $f'$ by usage of an equivalent diameter. As seen in Fig. 12 the system curve takes a form closer to the Ergun equation ($f'$) as compared to $f$ for the single pipes. This indicates that the continuous behavior seen in the experimental data can be traced to the mechanisms clarified in this work. It must, however, be noticed that the leveling out of the friction factor which indicated the start of turbulence takes place at a much higher $Re$ for $f$ than for $f'$. This is a topic for further studies and may be traced to the often very complex flow geometry in a porous media. The critical transitional $Re$ is very much dependent on the flow conditions and is, for instance, around 370 for couette flow, see Dou and Khoo (2011).

### 7. Conclusion

Six flow zones are identified. Each zone marks the change of flow regime in one of the three pipes. Knowing the flow regime in each pipe is important information for analyzing the pressure drop signals and interpreting them. The effect of the feeding flow regime into the parallel pipes is identified since transition in the header pipe results in a new flow distribution in the system. The numerical solution of the system highlights the importance of minor pressure losses in the splitter which could be the same in real porous media.

Correlation between parallel pipes fluctuations grows when any of them becomes transitional, but correlation decreases when the pipe becomes turbulent. The header pipe is more correlated with larger pipe when it causes fluctuations, $Re < 2000$. However at $Re > 2000$ where the smaller pipe causes the fluctuations the header pipe follows the smaller pipe. At $Re > 2800$ where the header pipe becomes transitional it follows the larger pipe better.

The frequency analysis revealed two distinct events in the pressure drop signals of the parallel pipes, low and high band frequency fluctuations. Low band frequency fluctuations are caused by presence of turbulent patches in the flow. The presence of low frequency patches are even present in low $Re$ flow, $Re < 1500$, but they are not as powerful as at higher $Re$.

The presence of turbulent patches causes fluctuations with low band frequencies. The gain factor shows that until $Re < 2000$ frequency fluctuations on both bands are triggered from the larger pipe. However, at $Re > 2000$ where the smaller pipe starts to become transitional the flow in the smaller pipe causes all fluctuations.

The gain factor depending on $Re$ has values different than unity in low band frequency which makes parallel

---

pipes fluctuate with different amplitudes than each other. However, in the high frequency band the gain factor goes towards unity and tries to equalize the amplitudes of both pipes fluctuations. During transition there are two kind of fluctuations in the system; low band frequency fluctuations which disturbing the system and high band frequency fluctuations which tries to return the system back to its initial undisturbed state.

The same discovered interaction between neighboring pores could be expected in real porous media, but transmitting the information of turbulent patches will be damped by going far from transitional pores.
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