Modeling of inter- and intra-particle coating uniformity in a Wurster fluidized bed by a coupled CFD-DEM-Monte Carlo approach
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A coupled CFD-DEM and Monte Carlo approach was developed to investigate coating properties in a Wurster fluidized bed by considering gas flow, particle motion, droplet deposition, and the drying and solidifying of droplets on particle surfaces. Based on the spherical centroidal Voronoi tessellation (CVT), the Monte Carlo approach can model the deposition and splashing of spray droplets on the surface of individual particles. The capillary force induced by liquid bridges between particles was accounted in the DEM to investigate its influence on the coating and agglomeration behavior. The new model can provide information about the cycle time distribution, residence time distribution, coating coverage, uniformity of porosity (influenced by splashing) and layer thickness distributions on each individual particle (intra-particle) and in the particle population (inter-particle). The simulation results are compared with experimental data on residence time and intra-particle layer thickness distributions. Good agreement is observed between the simulation and the measurements.
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1. Introduction

Coating of particulate materials is widely applied in the pharmaceutical, food, cosmetic, and fertilizer industries. In pharmaceutical applications, polymer-based film coating is critical to control
and prolong the release of active ingredients (Suzzi et al., 2010). For instance, minimum thickness and the absence of cracks of the functional coating film are required to protect the active pharmaceutical ingredient (API) against the acid environment in the stomach. Besides, the amount of API is directly correlated to the coating layer thickness in the active coating process. In the food industries, potential applications of coating include the protection of ingredients from the environment, the stabilization of the core during processing, the improvement of flowability and compression properties, and many more (Werner et al., 2007).

Spray fluidized beds and rotating drum (perforated pan) coaters are mainly used to conduct particle coating (Turton, 2008). The
Wurster fluidized bed is an efficient device for film coating of particles, which has been widely used to precisely coat pellets and pharmaceutical tablets in batch mode (Rajniak et al., 2009; Heinrich et al., 2015) or continuous mode (Hampel et al., 2013; Müller et al., 2019). The high gas velocity in the internal annulus generates pneumatic transport of particles in the Wurster tube, resulting in relatively narrow residence time distributions (RTDs) in the spray zone and the Wurster tube, respectively. Simultaneously, particles are wetted by droplets sprayed from a nozzle located on the distributor plate in the Wurster tube. After leaving the tube, the particles lose kinetic energy in the fountain zone and fall down to the outer bed region, where they are horizontally transported due to the low gas velocity in the external annulus. One circulation is completed when particles enter the spray zone again through the partition gap. In addition to imposing a circulation motion on the particles, the drying capacities of the gases in different regions can be adjusted to control the overall coating performance (Peglow et al., 2011; Bück et al., 2016).

The uniformity of the coating layer among particles (inter-particle) and on a single particle (intra-particle), the integrity, and the porosity of the coating layer are important attributes of the final product quality, especially in the pharmaceutical coating process. The end point and (average) coating layer thickness can be estimated. As reviewed by Knoop and Kleinebudde (2013), experimental techniques to characterize coating attributes include visual imaging analysis, near infrared and Raman spectroscopy, terahertz pulsed imaging, and X-ray microtomography. Near-infrared and Raman spectroscopy rely on calibration models that require ongoing maintenance support. Sondej et al. (2015, 2016) investigated intra-particle coating layer morphology, the inter-particle coating thickness distribution and the porosity of coating layer by X-ray micro-computed tomography (μ-CT). By means of the same technique, Rieck et al. (2015) found a linear expression for the relationship between layer porosity and drying potential representing drying conditions in the fluidized bed. Laksmana et al. (2009) quantified the pore size distribution using confocal laser scanning microscopy. Schmidt et al. (2017) proposed a simple method to estimate layer porosity of particles coated with aqueous suspensions based on the size distribution (measured by a Camsizer, Retsch GmbH) and moisture content (measured by a drying oven) of particles before and after coating. Lin et al. (2017) reported the in-line measurement of intra-particle coating uniformity and inter-particle coating thickness distribution (in the range of 20 μm to above 300 μm) using combined terahertz and optical coherence tomography.

In addition to experiments, the discrete element method (DEM) is commonly used to predict the motion of particles in granular systems, due to its capabilities to simultaneously handle heat and mass transfer, cohesion force, non-spherical particles and poly-disperse particles. Coupling computational fluid dynamics (CFD) with DEM can be used to simulate particle–fluid systems in fluidized beds, cyclones, pneumatic conveying and channels (Zhou et al., 2010), involving non-spherical particles (Zhong et al., 2016a) and dense particulate system reactions (Zhong et al., 2016b). So far, most of CFD-DEM or DEM studies about wet coating and granulation processes investigated the residence time distributions (RTDs) in different zones of top-spray beds (Fries et al., 2011; Börner et al., 2017), Wurster coater, (Li et al., 2015b; Jiang et al., 2018a), prismatic shaped spouted bed (Fries et al., 2011), and high-shear wet granulator (Kulju et al., 2016). Then, RTDs can be used as the input parameters for macroscopic population balance modeling.

An essential part of wet particle formation processes is the generation of droplets by a nozzle (one or two-fluid), in which a liquid jet disintegrates into unstable sheets, then ligaments and finally droplets due to the combined effects of the turbulent (or cavitation) flow inside the nozzle, the high shear force induced by the interactions with the second fluid outside the nozzle, and the surface tension force and the viscosity force of the liquid (Hede et al., 2008; Pozesh et al., 2018). Owing to its great importance in environmental, chemical or medical applications and the inherently complex underlying physics, the modeling of the spraying and atomization process has always been at the leading edge of numerical simulations of multiphase flow (Jiang et al., 2010; Luo et al., 2019). Nevertheless, there is still no efficient numerical method to couple droplets into CFD-DEM accounting for the phenomena of, for instance, aggregation and breakage, the droplet deposition on particles, and drying and solidifying of droplets on particles or in the gas flow. As a common compromise, the droplets are treated as a type of solid discrete elements in CFD-DEM simulations, with the assumption that droplets are spherical, no aggregation and breakage occur, and certain simplified droplet coalescence and death criteria apply (Suzzi et al., 2010; Kieckhefen et al., 2019). Hilton et al. (2013) developed a method to map Stokesian solid-like droplets on individual particles based on the spherical harmonic formulation, which can predict the coating coverage and deposition volume at both intra-particle and inter-particle levels. The intra-particle coating variability of differently shaped particles was investigated by DEM simulations coupled with a graphical processing unit (GPU) based image analysis method in horizontal rotating pans (Freireich et al., 2015; Pei and Elliott, 2017). Specifically, as the particle appears in the predefined spray zone, the pixels in the image that are rendering the corresponding areas of the particles are considered to be coated. Askarshahi et al. (2017) used scalar transport equations to model the interaction between droplets and particles, and evaporation from the droplet in both, the spray and on the particle surface using an Euler–Lagrangian approach. Moreover, the Monte-Carlo approach can be used to model particulate processes in which a sequence of discrete events, e.g., droplet deposition (Freireich and Wassgren, 2010; Rieck et al., 2016), aggregation of particles (Terrazas-Velarde et al., 2011; Rieck et al., 2016), and breakage of particles (Zhao et al., 2007; Zhang and You, 2015), are applied to the particle population.

Since the multi-scale coating process in fluidized bed is highly complex, it is often operated inefficiently in industrial applications. A new numerical approach is required to not only simulate multi-scale particle dynamics in fluidized beds, but also to directly predict coating layer uniformity of each individual particle. In this work, a coupled CFD-DEM-Monte Carlo approach was developed to study the inter- and intra-particle coating coverage and layer thickness distributions in a Wurster fluidized bed. The deterministic CFD-DEM method was used to predict the circulation motion of particles in different processing zones. Based on the particle positions and particle velocities obtained from CFD-DEM simulations, the stochastic Monte Carlo approach was used to model the deposition, the splashing and the drying of droplets on the surface of each individual particle. Then, variations of particle size due to deposition and drying were given back to the CFD-DEM solver. This new coupled approach can be used to manipulate coating morphology towards designed product properties in a real 3D Wurster fluidized bed by adjusting operation conditions of the system. The outline of this contribution is as follows. Section 2 gives a short description of the CFD-DEM method and the capillary force model. In addition, the models used in Monte Carlo to describe microscopic processes and events on individual particles are introduced. Section 3 presents and discusses simulation results of one case with cohesion forces in the DEM and one case without cohesion forces. Furthermore, detailed comparisons in terms of the residence time distribution, coating coverage and coating layer thickness are performed with experiment data and analytic models. Section 4 offers conclusions and outlook on further research.
2. Modeling methodology

2.1. CFD-DEM simulation

All models, boundary conditions, and numerical techniques used in CFD-DEM simulations were previously published. A short overview of the entire CFD-DEM method, including the governing equations for the solid particles and the gas phase (Zhou et al., 2010), the drag model for the particle–fluid momentum exchange (Beetstra et al., 2007a; Beetstra et al., 2007b), the Hertzian spring-dashpot contact model (soft-sphere) (Antypov and Elliott, 2011), the rolling model (Ai et al., 2011), and the cohesion model for capillary force (Soulié et al., 2006), is given in Appendix A. In comparison with experiments, this simulation method has been successfully used to predict the residence time distributions in a Wurster fluidized bed and the mixing behavior of poly-disperse particle systems in a pseudo-2D fluidized bed in our previous works (Jiang et al., 2018a; Jiang et al., 2018b).

To investigate the effect of cohesion forces on particle circulation in the Wurster bed, the capillary force induced by liquid bridge, Eq. (A.21), was also taken into account in the DEM simulation. The capillary force was related to the separation (inter-particle) distance \(d_{\text{inter}}\), the surface tension of the liquid \(\gamma\), and the dimensionless regression parameters \(A, B, C\) obtained from the solution of the Laplace-Young equation (Soulié et al., 2006). Liquid bridges appear if the inter-particle distance between two particles is shorter than the rupture distance \(D_r\) or during the collision of two particles. Note that the inter-particle distance was considered zero in the latter case, where the magnitude of capillary force had a constant value. Moreover, the capillary force disappears when the separation distance increases to the point of bridge rupture. When implementing the liquid bridge force model into DEM simulations, some assumptions are used: i) the capillary force only exists in the Wurster tube and spray zone; ii) the volume of all individual liquid bridges is equal and constant (without effects of drying and bridge rupture); and iii) there is no capillary force during particle–wall interactions. The parameter \(\alpha\), which defines the ratio of the volume of liquid bridge \(V_l\) and the total volume of two primary particles \(2V_p\) (mono-disperse), was a model parameter to calculate the volume of liquid bridge.

2.2. Monte Carlo modeling

An overview of the integration of the Monte Carlo with CFD-DEM is given in Fig. 1. In each Monte Carlo time step \(\Delta t_m\), one event of droplet deposition is guaranteed to occur on the single particle in the Monte Carlo domain. Particle dynamics in the CFD-DEM simulation are used in the stochastic Monte Carlo approach to model microscopic processes including deposition and splashing of droplets and drying of droplets, as shown in Fig. 2. The time step \(\Delta t_m\) can be calculated from the number flow rate of droplets sprayed into the spray zone, expressed by:

\[
\Delta t_m = -\ln r_1 \left( \frac{6M_i}{\pi \rho_d d_d^3} \right)^{-1}
\]

where \(M_i\) is the mass flow rate of solution and \(r_1\) is a uniformly distributed random number from the interval \(\in (0, 1)\). The initial diameter of droplets \(d_d\) and mass density of droplets \(\rho_d\) are constant in the model. Once total Monte Carlo process time \(t_m\) becomes larger than \(\Delta t_m\) (Table 1), the new particle diameters \(d_p\) are given back to the CFD-DEM solver; and the CFD-DEM simulation is conducted for another time period of duration \(\Delta t_c\). Accordingly, the particles...
in the Monte Carlo domain are updated based on the new CFD-DEM data.

### 2.2.1. Particle selection

The Monte Carlo domain was set according to the geometry of the spray zone, as shown in Fig. 1. The number of particles in the Monte Carlo domain, \( N_{p,MC} \), was evaluated from the positions of individual particles in CFD-DEM simulations.

The probability of particle \( i \) to receive liquid droplets was related to the volume swept by this moving particle in the spray zone, which can be calculated by \( V_{s,i} = \pi \left( d_i/2 + d_j/2 \right)^2 t_p \Delta t_m \). In other words, the particles were weighted by the swept volumes and the probability of each particle to be selected was determined by its relative weight. Fig. 3 shows a straightforward algorithm: 1) calculate the cumulative sum of weights for each particle \( s(i) = \sum_{j=1}^{N_{p,MC}} V_{s,j} \) (particles are arranged in a sequence of 1 to \( N_{p,MC} \)), 2) select a random number \( r_2 \) from the interval \( (0, \sum_{i=1}^{N_{p,MC}} V_{s,i}) \), and 3) find the particle \( i \) that has a sum of weight larger than \( r_2 \), i.e., \( s(i) > r_2 > 0 \).

### 2.2.2. Particle surface discretization

The surface of each individual particle was divided into labeled panels with the same area that can be used to receive droplets.

```
\begin{align}
\text{Particle diameter } d_i & \quad \text{mm} \\
\text{Particle density } \rho_i & \quad \text{kg/m}^3 \\
\text{Number of particles } N_p & \quad \text{—} \\
\text{Coefficient of restitution } e & \quad \text{—} \\
\text{Young’s modulus } E & \quad 10^5 \text{ Pa} \\
\text{Poisson ratio } \nu & \quad 0.3 \\
\text{Friction coefficient } \mu_f & \quad 0.53 \\
\text{Rolling coefficient } k_r & \quad 0.1 \\
\end{align}
```

\[
\text{Surface tension } \gamma = 6.98 \times 10^{-2} \text{ N/m}
\]

\[
\text{Contact angle } \theta = 40^\circ
\]

\[
\text{Parameter } \alpha - V_i/(2V_p) = 0.1 \%
\]

#### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical properties of particles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particle diameter</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particle density</td>
<td>1420</td>
<td>kg/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of particles</td>
<td>50000</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient of restitution</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young’s modulus</td>
<td>10¹⁵</td>
<td>Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poisson ratio</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friction coefficient</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling coefficient</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supposed that droplets do not overlap, the number of panels per particle \( N_{dep,i} \) was calculated based on the surface area of each primary particle \( A_p \) and the mean contact area of single droplet deposition \( A_{contact} \) formed as

\[
N_{dep,i} = \frac{A_{p,i}}{A_{contact}}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, N_{p,MC}.
\]

The calculated number of panels per particle was then rounded to the next integer value. If the shape of deposited droplet is approximated as a truncated spherical cap and the ratio of particle diameter and droplet diameter is large enough, the diameter of contact area is given by (Rioboo et al., 2002; Yarin, 2005)

\[
d_{contact} = 2dd \left[ \frac{\sin^3 \theta}{2(1 - \cos \theta)(2 - \cos \theta - \cos^2 \theta)} \right]^{1/3},
\]

in which \( \theta \) is the contact angle between the liquid droplet and the solid particle. For the sake of simplicity, variations of contact angle depending on the surface wettability (Rioboo et al., 2002) in the spreading period were not considered and a constant contact angle was used in the model.

By spherical centroidal Voronoi tessellation (CVT) (Du et al., 1999), a set of \( N_{dep} \) points (centroids of panels) can be uniformly distributed on the surface of individual spherical particle. This problem is of great importance in many scientific and engineering applications (Koay, 2011). The main idea of centroidal Voronoi tessellation is that the points used as generators of Voronoi regions coincide with the mass centroids of those regions. In this work, the construction of spherical centroidal Voronoi tessellation was conducted by Lloyd iteration (Lloyd, 1982), as follows:

Step 1: Select a set of \( N_{dep} \) points \( r_{cen,j} \) on the surface of a unit sphere based on the standard normal distribution.

Step 2: Construct the Voronoi diagrams associated to the set of points \( r_{cen,j} \) as shown in Fig. 4a). The Voronoi regions \( V_i \) of \( \mathbb{R}^N \) corresponding to the generators \( r_{cen,j} \) are defined by \( V_i = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid |x - r_{cen,i}| < |x - r_{cen,j}|, j = 1, \ldots, k, j \neq i \} \),

in which \( | \cdot | \) denotes the Euclidean norm.
Step 3: Determine the mass centroids of all Voronoi polygonal regions \( r_{cv}^i \). Given a constant probability density function \( g(x) \) in Voronoi regions \( V_i \), the mass centroids are calculated by

\[
\mathbf{r}_{cv}^i = \frac{\int_{V_i} g(x) \mathbf{x} \, dx}{\int_{V_i} g(x) \, dx}.
\]

Then, these centroids \( \mathbf{r}_{cv}^i \) are used to form the new set of points \( \mathbf{r}_{cv} \) and the corresponding Voronoi regions \( V_i \).

Step 4: Check the coefficient of variation of areas of Voronoi polygonal regions, as depicted in Fig. 4b). If the Voronoi polygonal regions \( V_i \) generated by \( \mathbf{r}_{cv} \) meets the criterion that the coefficient of variation of areas less than 10\%, the iteration terminates; otherwise, return to step 2.

After the spherical centroidal Voronoi tessellation, the centroids of the labeled panels were \( \mathbf{r}_{cv} \), and the area of every labeled panel is approximately \( \pi d_{p,1}^2/4 \) (Fig. 4b) shows that the discrepancy between the normalized maximum and minimum areas of Voronoi tessellations is very small when satisfying the termination criterion. Given that the probability for each panel to get the droplet is the same in this work, a random integer \( r_5 \) from the interval \((1, N_{app})\) can be generated to select the deposition panel for each droplet. Moreover, all information about droplet deposition was stored in the labeled panels on each individual particle.

**Fig. 3.** The weighted random selection of particles based on the volumes swept by the moving particles.

**Fig. 4.** Centroidal Voronoi tessellation of a spherical particle: a) the set of 500 points (red points) generated via the proposed approach and corresponding Voronoi diagrams (at initial condition and after 50 iteration steps), and b) the normalized maximum and minimum areas of Voronoi tessellations (normalized by \( \pi d_{p,1}^2/4 \)) and the coefficient of variation of areas with respect to the number of iterations. The Voronoi first star structure is also depicted using the red lines. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)
2.2.3. Droplet deposition

The droplet deposition on each individual panel was affected by both the impact energy of a single droplet and the wetting condition of each individual panel. According to the method used by Jiang et al. (2018a), solid-like droplets with a diameter of 40 μm and a coefficient of restitution of 0.1 were injected in the spray zone of the CFD-DEM simulation to estimate the impact velocity between the particle and the droplet. The computational cost of this simulation is very high due to the required small DEM time step and the large number of particles and solid-like droplets. Based on the results of about 2 s CFD-DEM simulation, the distribution of normal impact velocity $v_{rel}$ between the particle and the droplet was assumed as a normal distribution with a mean of 13.13 m/s and a standard deviation of 3.58 m/s in the Monte Carlo model.

The impact of droplets on the dry particle surface exhibits very complex flow patterns, such as deposition, splashing (radial ejecting of secondary droplets due to breakup) and rebounding (partly or fully), which is affected by the droplet size, the impact energy of droplet and the wettability and roughness of the surface (Yarin, 2005; Josserand and Thoroddsen, 2016). The Weber number and Reynolds number characterizing the droplet impact dynamics are

$$W_e = \frac{\rho_d d_d v_{rel}^2}{\sigma} = \frac{\rho_d d_d v_{rel}^2}{\mu_d},$$

$$Re = \frac{\rho_d d_d v_{rel}}{\mu_d},$$

in which $\rho_d$ is the mass density of liquid droplet, $\gamma$ is the surface tension of droplet, $v_{rel}$ is the normal relative velocity between the particle droplet and the droplet, $d_d$ is the diameter of droplet, and $\mu_d$ is the dynamic viscosity of droplet. Regardless of surface roughness, the well-known parameter $K_d = W_e^{1/2}Re^{1/4}$ was used in this work to characterize the transition from deposition to splashing with a threshold value of $K_{ds} = 57.7$ (Mundo et al., 1995).

If $K_d < K_{ds}$, the impact was considered to result in normal deposition of the entire volume of the droplet on the deposition panel. If $K_d \gg K_{ds}$, splashing of the droplet occurred. The prompt or corona splashing of suspension droplets on the particle surface and the influence of drying during the impact are very complex. Droplets will break up, redistribute and reshape on the particle surface, and eject small secondary droplets to the surrounding (Josserand and Thoroddsen, 2016). Therefore, the splashing of droplets was regarded as a source of non-uniformity of porosity in the coating layer. In this work, only half of the droplet was assumed to deposit on the considered position, according to the measurement of the number and size distribution of secondary droplets by Yarin and Weiss (1995). The contribution of fine secondary droplets generated by the splashing to the neighboring panels has been neglected.

2.2.4. Droplet drying

A relatively simple drying model was used in this work, in which the drying rate $mdrying$ (in kg · m$^{-2}$ · s$^{-1}$) of the first drying period was applied to evaluate the total drying time. The drying rate during the first period is dependent only on the conditions of drying in the Wurster tube, formed as

$$mdrying = \beta \rho_d \left( Y_{sat} - Y \right),$$

in which $Y_{sat}$ is the adiabatic saturation moisture content of the gas, and $Y$ is the moisture content of the bulk gas. Given that, at any time, the amount of evaporated water should be equal to the amount of sprayed water, $Y$ can be calculated by

$$Y = Y_{inlet} + \frac{M_l}{M_{l, dry}},$$

in which $Y_{inlet}$ is the moisture content at the inlet, $M_l$ is the mass flow rate of the spray liquid, and $M_{l, dry}$ is the mass flow rate of the dry fluidization gas. As for a spherical particle, the gas side mass transfer coefficient $\beta$ can be calculated by the correlation (Gnielinski, 2010):

$$\beta = \frac{Sh \cdot \delta}{d_d},$$

$$Sh = 2 + \sqrt{Sh_1^2 + Sh_2^2},$$

$$Sh_1 = 0.664Re_d^{1/3}Sc^{1/3},$$

$$Sh_2 = \frac{0.037Re_d^{0.85}Sc}{1 + 2.443Re_d^{0.85}Sc^{1.3} - 1}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (12)

Sherwood number $Sh$ represents the ratio of convective mass transfer to the rate of diffusive mass transport and $\delta$ is the binary diffusion coefficient of water in air. $Sc = \mu_f / (\rho_f \delta)$ denotes the Schmidt number, and the Reynolds number of the droplet is given by

$$Re_d = \frac{\epsilon f |u - v_i| d_d}{\mu_f}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (13)

The magnitude of relative velocity between the gas and the particle that received the droplet $|u - v_i|$ and the volume fraction of gas $\epsilon f$ obtained from the CFD-DEM simulation was used to calculate $Re_d$.

Then, the drying time $\Delta t_{drying}$ can be calculated using the drying rate $mdrying$ and the liquid mass of a single deposited droplet $M_{drop,i}$ to

$$\Delta t_{drying} = \frac{M_{drop,i}}{mdrying \cdot m_{drying}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (14)

where $A_{drop} = \pi d_d^2 \text{contact} / (2 + 2 \cos \theta)$ is the surface area of the deposited droplet in contact with the gas (Meric and Erbil, 1998). The drying of the liquid droplet was assumed to start after its deposition on the particle at the instant $t_{deposition}$. The following criterion determined if a droplet on the deposition panel had been dried:

$$t_m \geq t_{deposition} + \Delta t_{drying}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (15)

If the Monte Carlo simulation time $t_m$ was larger than the sum of the deposition time and the drying time of the droplet, the deposition panel was considered dry. In the current model, a droplet can only be deposited on dry or empty panels. Empty panels are either initial or fully), which is affected by the droplet size, the impact energy of a single droplet and the wetting condition of the surface (Yarin, 2005; Josserand and Thoroddsen, 2016). Therefore, the splashing of droplets was regarded as a source of non-uniformity of porosity in the coating layer. In this work, only half of the droplet was assumed to deposit on the considered position, according to the measurement of the number and size distribution of secondary droplets by Yarin and Weiss (1995). The contribution of fine secondary droplets generated by the splashing to the neighboring panels has been neglected.

2.2.5. Intra-particle coating properties update

According to the method used by Rieck et al. (2016), the layer thickness of the $i^{th}$ individual panel on the $j^{th}$ particle $h_{layer,ij}$ can be evaluated from the volume of the complete coating layer $V_{layer,ij}$ assuming every droplet to possess the same solid mass $M_{drop, i,j}$. Hence,

$$V_{layer,ij} = \frac{M_{drop, i,j}}{1 - \epsilon_{layer, ij}} \cdot N_{dep, ij},$$  \hspace{1cm} (16)

$$h_{layer,ij} = \left( \frac{d_{core}^2}{8} + \frac{3}{4} \frac{V_{layer,ij}}{\pi} \right)^{1/3} - \frac{d_{core}}{2},$$  \hspace{1cm} (17)
Table 2
Monte Carlo simulation parameters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>Monte Carlo</th>
<th>Experiment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Configuration</td>
<td>Wurster bed</td>
<td>Top-spray bed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particle material</td>
<td>MCC</td>
<td>NaB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coating material</td>
<td>NaB</td>
<td>NaB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial bed mass [kg]</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial particle diameter dp₀ [mm]</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial particle density [kg/m³]</td>
<td>1420</td>
<td>1040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of particles [–]</td>
<td>50000</td>
<td>125000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid density of coating material ρc [kg/m³]</td>
<td>1440</td>
<td>1440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow rate of solution Ṁc [kg/h]</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Droplet diameter dₜ [µm]</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscosity of droplet μ [Pa·s]</td>
<td>4.18 × 10⁻³</td>
<td>4.18 × 10⁻³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface tension of droplet γ [N/m]</td>
<td>6.98 × 10⁻²</td>
<td>6.98 × 10⁻²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density of droplet ρₜ [kg/m³]</td>
<td>1125</td>
<td>1125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact angle θ [°]</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid mass fraction of solution [%]</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porosity of the coating layer [%]</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inlet temperature of gas [°C]</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inlet moisture content of gas Yᵣ [%]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow rate of gas Ṁg [kg/h]</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

where dₛᵥₑ is the diameter of the core particle. In the current work, the porosity of layer εₛᵥₑ is for normal deposition was a constant model parameter according to the X-ray micro-computed tomography experiments (εₛᵥₑ = 0.3, Table 2, Sondej et al. (2015)). Splashing is not considered to affect layer thickness; instead, layer porosity increases compared with normal droplet deposition. Keeping the factor Mₛᵥₑₛᵥₑ(1 − εₛᵥₑ) constant for both, normal and splashing deposition results in a higher porosity of εₛᵥₑ = 0.65 for splashing deposition. Moreover, the average layer thickness (intra-particle) and the diameter of each particle can be written as:

\[
h_m = \frac{1}{N_{sᵥₑ}} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{N_{sᵥₑ}} h_{sᵥₑ,j} \right),
\]

(18)

\[
ds_j = d_{sᵥₑ} + 2h_m.
\]

(19)

The diameter of each particle was given back to the DEM solver. The mean layer thickness in the particle population (inter-particle) was calculated by

\[
h = \frac{1}{N_p} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{N_p} h_m \right).
\]

(20)

To evaluate the coating coverage of each particle, the number of initial deposition panels Nₛᵥₑ and the number of deposition panels that have received droplets (dry or wet) Nₛᵥₑₛᵥₑ were counted. Then, the following equation was used to calculate the coating coverage of each particle Ψₗ in each time step:

\[
Ψₗ = \frac{Nₛᵥₑₛᵥₑ}{Nₛᵥₑ}.
\]

(21)

If the coating coverage of the particle reaches 100%, a full closed coating layer has formed around the particle. The average inter-particle coating coverage is

\[
Ψₗ = \frac{1}{N_p} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{N_p} Ψₗ \right).
\]

(22)

2.3. Simulation setup

2.3.1. CFD-DEM

In this work, the geometry of the Wurster coater was built according to the positron emission particle tracking (PEPT) measurements of Li et al. (2015a); and the operation condition was set according to the run number 16 in their measurements. The total batch mass of 1.75 mm microcrystalline cellulose (MCC) particles is 200 g (about 50000 particles). The diameter and length of the concentric cylindrical Wurster tube are 50 mm and 150 mm, respectively. There is a 15 mm partition gap between tube bottom and the distributor plate. A circular symmetric spray zone with inflection boundaries (Börner et al., 2014) was predefined in the CFD-DEM simulation, in which the maximum penetration starting from the nozzle tip is 75 mm and the spray angle is about 52.5° (as shown in Fig. 1). The volumes of the spray zone and the Wurster tube are 0.19 × 10⁻³ and 1.18 × 10⁻³ m³, respectively. In total, 81600 hexahedral grids were built using the orthogonal grid method. The details about bed dimensions, structured grids, boundary conditions and mesh independence can be found in our previous published work (Jiang et al., 2018a).

Detailed material properties of MCC particles related to the HSD, the rolling and the capillary force models are given in Table 1. The coefficient of restitution ε was directly measured by the free fall test using a vibratory feeder and a high-speed imaging system as presented in Jiang et al. (2019). Youngs modulus E and the friction coefficient μt were taken from Li et al. (2015b). The Poisson ratio σ was measured by Roberts et al. (1994). Similar to the method of Goniva et al. (2012), the rolling coefficient kr in the directional constant rolling friction model was calibrated based on the static angle of repose of MCC particles.

Time step should be smaller than some critical value to conform with physical laws and guarantee stability in DEM and CFD solvers. The CFD time step was set to 5 × 10⁻⁵ s, which ensured that the maximum Courant number was less than 0.5 (for stability). The collision time τₑ can be estimated based on HSD contact theory (Antypov and Elliott, 2011):

\[
τₑ = 2.21 \left( \frac{ρ_p}{E₉₃} \right)^{2/5} \frac{d_p}{Y_{sₑ} τ_{cₚₙₚ}}.
\]

(23)

Assuming a maximum collision velocity Vₛₚₚ max of 1.5 m/s in the whole bed (Jiang et al., 2017), the estimated collision time τₑ for two 1.75 mm particles is approximate 2.6 × 10⁻⁵ s. Hence, the DEM time step was set as 10⁻⁶ s, less than τₑ/20 of particles, to ensure the accuracy of HSD contact model. The coupling interval between the DEM and CFD solvers tₛ was set to 50 times the DEM time step, i.e. 50 μs.

CFD-DEM simulations of two cases were performed using four-way coupling by the code OpenFOAM and LIGGGHTS (Goniva et al., 2012). The first case without capillary forces between particles can be directly compared to the PEPT measurement at dry condition by Li et al. (2015a). The second case with capillary forces was designed to investigate the influence of wetting and agglomeration in the Wurster tube on the residence time distribution. The liquid bridges were assumed to be formed by sodium benzoate (NaB) solution with a mass fraction of approximately 30%. The surface tension of the liquid γ was measured by the pendant drop method (Table 1). As measured by Zhu et al. (2013), the motion of particles in spouted beds was significantly influenced by the effects of cohesion as z₀ exceeded 10⁻³. Therefore, the parameter z₀ was set as 0.1% in order to investigate the effects of cohesion on particle circulation. In other words, the parameter z₀ was purposely enlarged, compared with the value of 6 × 10⁻⁶ calculated by the volume of a single droplet used in the Monte Carlo (Table 2).

2.3.2. Monte-Carlo

A relatively large tₛ = 0.005 s, about 1/200 of the mean residence time in the tube and 1/30 of the mean residence time in the spray zone, was used to avoid excessively high computational
cost because of too frequent communication between CFD-DEM code and Monte Carlo method.

Sondej et al. (2015, 2016) measured both the intra-particle and inter-particle distributions of coating layer thickness in a top-spray fluidized bed. In their experiment series A, the diameter of the core particles was 1.8 mm which is similar to the value of 1.75 mm used in the current simulations. In order to compare with their experiment, the mass flow rate of spray solution particles was 1.8 mm which is similar to the value of 1.75 mm used in the fluidized bed. In their experiment series A, the diameter of the core particles in different beds, which leads to similar values of the mean layer thickness and mean coating mass per particle. Although the coating performances of the top-spray fluidized bed and the Wurster fluidized bed are not exactly the same, the comparison of intra-particle layer thickness distribution is still meaningful when the mean coating mass received by individual particles is the same. The coating material is sodium benzoate, which has an antibacterial effect and is used as a preservative in the food industry. The mass fraction of sodium benzoate solution is about 30%. The viscosity of the solution was measured by a Hpler viscometer; and the density of the liquid was measured by a density meter (DMA 58, Anton Paar). Other properties associated with the spray droplets and gas flow were set same as in the corresponding experiment series A (Sondej et al., 2016). Detailed parameters of the Monte Carlo model and the experiment are listed in Table 2.

2.4. Recurrence of particle circulation

In this work, the CFD-DEM takes about 5 h to simulate 1 s real time (with 8 CPUs), while the Monte Carlo only needs about 0.05 h. If the simulation had to be performed, for example, 1 h to predict a real coating process, it would take more than 750 days, which is not acceptable.

In the CFD-DEM-Monte Carlo model, the coating of particles is largely determined by the cycle time distribution and residence time distribution in the spray zone obtained from the CFD-DEM, with the details of droplets deposition, drying and solidifying being modeled by the Monte Carlo. It was found that the distributions of cycle time and residence times are almost constant after 60 s. As listed in Table 3, the deviations of mean cycle time, mean ideal cycle time, mean residence times in the tube and the spray zone, as well as the corresponding coefficients of variation are very small between 60 s and 180 s. Based on the circulation characteristics of particles, it is thus reasonable to use the database of particle dynamics obtained from a relative short duration to reconstruct the recurring motion of particles in a long-term period. In this work, a simple approach was used to recur the particle circulation motion, as follows:

First, the database of 50000 individual particles was generated using the full CFD-DEM-Monte Carlo simulation data in the duration of 180 s, including particle positions, particle velocities, relative velocities between particles and the fluid phase, particle diameter, and the indicator of cycle time. Based on the trajectory of each individual particle, the indicator function was defined to indicate the occurrence of event A, that the particle entered into the spray zone through the partition gap at instant t, expressed as

\[ I_{Ac}(t) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } t \in A_c, \\ 0, & \text{if } t \notin A_c. \end{cases} \]  

In other words, the instant t corresponds to the start point of a new cycle as \( I_{Ac}(t) = 1 \).

Second, for each individual particle, the particle dynamics after the last instant t satisfying \( I_{Ac}(t) = 1 \) in the full simulation can be recurred by repeatedly extrapolating the particle dynamics in the range of \([t_{ij}, t_{ij+1}]\) from the database. The instant \( t_{ij} \) was a randomly selected instant that corresponds to \( I_{Ac}(t_{ij}) = 1 \); and \( t_{ij+1} \) was the next instant that made the indicator function equal to unity. As listed in Table 3, the relative deviations of mean cycle time, mean ideal cycle time, mean residence times in the tube and the spray zone as well as the corresponding coefficients of variation are all almost negligible (less than 1%) between the full simulation results of 180 s and recurring results of 1 h by this method.

It is emphasized that this simple approach to recur the particle circulation only reproduces the circulating motion. However, if the database obtained from the full simulations is large enough, this simple method is statistically reliable and can well predict the distributions of cycle time and residence times in the Wurster fluidized bed with negligible computation cost compared with the CFD-DEM. Therefore, the CFD-DEM simulation was terminated after 180 s in this work; subsequently, the particle dynamics required in the Monte-Carlo model were extrapolated from the database. The total computational times of CFD-DEM and Monte Carlo to model one-hour coating process were about 900 h and 180 h, respectively. Additional 20 h were used to repeatedly

\[
\begin{align*}
l_{ij} & = \sum_{j=1}^{N_{ij}} t_{ij}/N_i, \\
l_{ij} & = \sum_{j=1}^{N_{ij}} t_{ij}/N_j, \\
l_{ij} & = \sum_{j=1}^{N_{ij}} t_{ij}/N_j, \\
R_0 & = \sum_{j=1}^{N_{ij}} t_{ij}/N_j, \\
C_v & = \text{coefficient of variation.}
\end{align*}
\]
extrapolate the particle dynamics. It should be noted that the influence of increasing particle diameter \( d_p \), on the particle dynamics cannot be captured in this way. However, this influence is very limited for particles with very thin coating layers considered in this work.

3. Results and discussion

The results obtained from the coupled CFD-DEM-Monte Carlo method will be presented in form of the residence and cycle time distributions, and the intra-particle and inter-particle coating properties. Residence and cycle time distributions are compared with PEPT measurement data (Li et al., 2015a); and the intra-particle coating layer thickness distribution is compared with experimental data gained by X-ray micro-computed tomography (\( \mu \)-CT) (Sondej et al., 2015; Sondej et al., 2016).

3.1. Residence and cycle time distributions

The particle oriented features of the CFD-DEM simulation environment were advantageous to investigate the circulation of particles in the Wurster fluidized bed. As depicted in Fig. 1, the chamber of the Wurster fluidized bed is divided into: (1) spray zone, (2) Wurster tube (without overlap with the spray zone), (3) fountain zone (only a part of the fountain zone is depicted for better visualization), (4) down bed, and (5) horizontal zone. In each ideal cycle, particles move upward from the tube from the spray zone, lose momentum in the fountain zone, fall down into the external annulus, are transported in the horizontal zone in plug flow manner, and re-enter the spray zone through the partition gap at the bottom of the internal annulus. Particles can recirculate within the Wurster tube without passing the partition gap, including the motion from zone 2 to zone 1 and from zone 3 to zone 2. The recirculation influences the distributions of cycle time and residence time in the spray zone and Wurster tube. In this work, the ideal cycle and nonideal cycle were distinguished by the determination of the appearance of recirculation based on particle trajectories (Jiang et al., 2018a). The cycle time of particles related to the number of passes through the spray zone and the residence time in the spray zone related to the amount of the obtained coating material per cycle are two significant parameters for the uniformity of the coating process.

Simulation results associated with distributions at different processing times are summarized in Table 3. Data for 10 s, 60 s and 180 s come from the full simulations, and data for 1 h was evaluated based on the recurrence of particle circulation, as discussed in Section 2.4. Comparing the data of 180 s and 1 h for dry condition without capillary forces in the DEM shows that the recurrence method well reconstructs the long-term circulation of particles in terms of mean values of cycle time \( t_c \), ideal cycle time \( t_{ic} \), residence time in the spray zone \( t_{rs} \) and residence time in the Wurster tube \( t_r \) as well as the corresponding coefficients of variation. However, if the database is not big enough for the recurrence process (for instance after only 10 s), large deviations will be introduced into the recurring data and final coating properties. To apply the recurrence method for the Wurster fluidized bed, the full CFD-DEM simulation must be performed at least until stabilization of the mean cycle time of particles has been achieved.

Comparing the data of simulation for dry condition with the PEPT measurement (Li et al., 2015a), the mean of ideal cycle time obtained from the simulation is found to be slightly higher; inversely, the mean of total cycle time is under-predicted, which is due largely to a high fraction of ideal cycles in the simulation. In the simulation, most of the non-ideal cycles were caused by intensive interactions with the Wurster tube wall and other particles. Further discussion on the possible reasons would require more information about particle–particle and particle–wall interactions from the PEPT measurements. Moreover, the distributions of total cycle time and ideal cycle time were found to be fairly broad for the PEPT measurement, the spreads predicted by the simulation being somewhat smaller. These observations are similar to those made on simulations for binary particle mixtures (Jiang et al., 2018a). The mean residence times in the Wurster tube were found to be in good agreement with experimental data. The mean residence time in the spray zone is 0.158 s (about 1/6 \( t_{c,1} \)) based on the geometry of the predefined spray zone. Note that only a single tracer particle was used in PEPT measurement. According to the concept of ergodicity, the distribution of circulations was evaluated by the motion of this tracer particle in a long tracking period of about 1 h.

Additionally, the influence of capillary forces in the Wurster tube on the circulation motion was investigated by the cohesion DEM model. Fig. 5 shows snapshots of particle motion for conditions with and without capillary force. The global circulation of particles with capillary forces (\( \alpha_l = 0.1\% \)) is very similar to that at dry condition; however, the particles tend to be agglomerated by the liquid bridges as the inter-particle distances are shorter than the rupture distance. Because no drying and solidification of liquid bridges were considered in CFD-DEM simulations, the agglomerates formed by liquid bridges were not stable, and could break up as the relative distances between particles in the agglomerates varied due to collisions with the tube wall or other particles (or agglomerates). Comparing the simulation results of the two cases in Table 3, the capillary force decreases the mean ideal cycle time.
as well as the mean residence times in the Wurster tube and in the spray zone. Since agglomeration of particles increased the local solid volume fractions $\epsilon_s$ in Eq. (A.7), momentum exchange between particles and the gas in these regions and the mean velocities in vertical direction in the Wurster tube were increased. Nevertheless, the capillary force decreases the fraction of ideal cycles $R_c$ due to more complex interactions between temporary agglomerates and the tube wall. As a consequence of this decrease, the capillary force further scatters the distributions of total cycle time, and residence times in the Wurster tube and the spray zone. This effect is more obvious in the Wurster tube. It is therefore important to provide enough drying capacity of the fluidization gas, so that particles are dry before re-entering the spray zone. The influence of the capillary force is expected to be more pronounced in coating of fine particles, and is subject of further investigations.

### 3.2. Morphology of coating layer

#### 3.2.1. Coating properties of a sample particle

Fig. 6 illustrates the coating properties of a random sample particle predicted by the simulation without capillary forces. The intra-particle coating coverage is an important property for functional coatings especially in pharmaceutical film coating applications. The variations of coating coverage from 20 s to 100 s are shown in Fig. 6a). Droplets on the deposition panels can be dried (gray color) or wet (blue color) depending on Eq. (15). The coating coverage $\Psi$ increases from 9.24% to 33.51% in a duration of 80 s, which is affected by both the cycle time and residence time of this particle in the spray zone.

At process times of 500 s, 1500 s and 3000 s, the coating layer thickness and the splashing positions along a great-circle of the spherical particle.

**Fig. 6.** Coating quality of single sample particle: a) coating coverage (2D front elevation), b) coating layer thicknesses and splashing positions along a great-circle of the spherical particle.
spherical particle are depicted in Fig. 6b). The layer thickness on each panel on the single particle was calculated by Eq. (17). The information on layer thickness of each panel can be further used to evaluate the uniformity of coating by, for instance, the mean layer thickness \( h_{n,j} \) (Eq. (18)), the standard deviation, the coefficient of variation and the arithmetic average roughness.

In the current Monte-Carlo model, the porosity of splashing panels was assumed to increase, due to lower volume of received droplet, changes in droplet shapes, as well as droplet drying and solidification during the impact. The splashing panel is drawn with a relatively light color, which implies a relatively high porosity. For an individual splashing position, the orthodromic distance to its nearest neighboring splashing position on the same layer was defined as \( L_{\text{min}} \), which can be further normalized by the particle radius \( r_p \). For the sample particle at 3000 s, the mean and the coefficient of variation of \( L_{\text{min}}/r_p \) are 0.224 and 45.2% in the 3D space, respectively. In addition, the size of individual high porosity regions \( S_p \) was defined by the number of connected splashing positions. If several splashing positions with the same radial distance belonged to the same Voronoi star, these positions were considered as a connected high porosity region at this radial distance. The Voronoi star was assembled by the centroid (the center of star) and corresponding natural neighboring points (endpoints of the extremities of the star) in the Voronoi diagram (Jiang et al., 2017), as shown in Fig. 4. If several high porosity regions at different radial distances were overlapping, these high porosity regions were merged. For the sample particle at 3000 s, the mean and the coefficient of variation of \( S_p \) are 1.21 and 42.8% in the 3D space, respectively. Usually, the risk to form cracks and large pores in the coating layer increases with decreasing \( L_{\text{min}} \) and increasing \( S_p \).

At 500 s, all deposition panels along the chosen great-circle have been coated. However, this does not imply complete coating in all great-circles. Actually, the time to accomplish the 100% coating coverage \( t_{\text{cover, 100}} \) for this sample particle is about 880 s.

### 3.2.2. Layer thickness

Fig. 7 shows intra-particle cumulative distributions of coating layer thickness. The individual panels correspond to 0.1, 0.5, and 0.9 of the property value in the population. Besides the plotted distributions, the mean values and coefficients of variation of intra-particle and inter-particle coating properties are listed in Table 4 to further characterize the distributions.

It can be seen that the predicted results of MC-50 for both conditions are close to the measurement data. The distance between the curves of MC-10 and MC-90 for the condition with capillary forces is much larger than that for simulation without capillary forces, corresponding to a wider distribution of residence time in the spray zone with comparable mean value (Table 3). Compared with the Monte Carlo modeling of Rieck et al. (2016) (Exp. 3), the deviations of mean layer thickness between different single particles are much larger, as a result of the non-uniformity of residence times and cycle time predicted by the CFD-DEM. However, the coefficients of variation of all single particles for both conditions are very close, since the probability for each panel to receive droplets was similar and only affected by the number \( N_{\text{dep}} \) in the Monte-Carlo model. If layer thickness of the particle is 30 \( \mu \)m, then there will be about 6.9% increase in \( N_{\text{dep}} \) due to growth of a 1.75 mm core particle.

In addition to the intra-particle scale, the distribution of mean layer thickness per single particle in the population (inter-particle) can also be extracted from the simulations (Table 4). It is interesting to observe that the coefficient of layer thickness variation in the particle population is much smaller than the values for the single particles (Table 4). The predicted value of 7.7% is comparable to the value of 5.1% for the particle population in the experimental data for top-spray coating of Sondej et al. (2015). Information about the RTDs in the coupled CFD-DEM-Monte Carlo approach can better represent the situation in experimental equipment under different operation conditions than the spatially concentrated, single compartment Monte Carlo approach by Rieck et al. (2016).

### 3.2.3. Coefficient of variation of coating layer thickness

When the same amount of material is deposited on each particle for each pass through the spray zone, the coefficient of variation of the inter-particle coating mass distribution is given by (Cheng and Turton, 2000)

\[
C_{v,\text{inter}} = C_v(t_c) \left( \frac{t_c}{t_{\text{coat}}} \right)^{0.25} \tag{25}
\]

in which \( C_v(t_c) \) is the coefficient of variation of cycle time (Table 3), \( t_c \) is the mean cycle time and \( t_{\text{coat}} \) is the total coating time. The coefficient of variation of the intra-particle layer thickness is proportional to the number of coating passes raised to the \(-1/2\) power (Freireich and Wassgren, 2010). When every deposition panel has
an equal opportunity of being coated and only one deposition panel can receive the droplet in each Monte Carlo time step, Eq. 28 in Freireich and Wassgren (2010) can be rewritten as

$$C_{v,\text{intra}} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N_{\text{drop}}} \left[N_{\text{dep}} + (N_{\text{drop}} - 1)\right] - 1}, \quad (26)$$

where $N_{\text{drop}}$ is the number of droplets deposited on the certain particle.

According to simulation data, the coefficients of variation of intra-particle and inter-particle layer thickness distribution can be directly calculated based on Eq. (17) and Eq. (18), respectively. Fig. 8 depicts the coefficients of variation from the simulation without capillary forces and from analytic models as functions of coating time. It can be seen that the coefficients of variation of intra-particle coating layer thickness predicted by the simulation (MC-10, MC-50 and MC-90) almost coincide with that of the analytic model after about 1500 s. In the simulation, the amount of material that is deposited on each particle in each pass is affected by the volume swept by the moving particle and residence time in the spray zone. As a result, the inter-particle coefficient of the coating mass distribution predicted by the simulation is larger than that of the analytic model. The inter-particle coefficient of the coating mass distribution predicted by the simulation is very similar to that of the coating layer thickness. However, the difference between the two curves gradually becomes distinct, since the distribution of $N_{\text{dep}}$ spreads with increasing coating time. Generally, the trend is that the coefficient of variation quickly decreases in the initial stage and then it gradually asymptotes to zero as time increases. The reduction of the value of the coefficient of variation on the inter-particle scale is faster than that on the intra-particle scale.

### 3.2.4. Coating coverage and uniformity

Fig. 9 shows the changes of mean coating coverage $\Psi_m$ of all individual particles with coating time. It takes more than 1600 s to achieve a completely closed coating layer on every individual particle in both simulation cases. The rate of increase of coating coverage incrementally decreases as the coating time increases. The mean coating coverage of the simulation without capillary forces is slightly larger than that of the simulation with capillary forces.
forces, which can be traced back to the influence of the capillary force on the RTDs in the Wurster coater. Fig. 10 shows the density distributions of coating coverage \( W \) obtained from the simulation without capillary forces for different processing times. The coating coverage can be seen to experience a highly peaked distribution at 50 s, flat distributions at 100 s and 200 s, and a highly skewed distribution towards 100% at 500 s. Note that 100% is the maximum value that can be achieved according to Eq. (21). The shape of the distribution of coating coverage was mainly affected by the RTDs in the bed. It is found that the distributions of coating coverage closely follow the Weibull distribution

\[
f_w(x) = \begin{cases} 
k_1 \left( \frac{x}{k_2} \right)^{k_1-1} e^{-\left( \frac{x}{k_2} \right)^{k_1}}, & x \geq 0, \\ 0, & x < 0. \end{cases}
\]

The shape parameter \( k_1 \) and scale parameter \( k_2 \) are used to fit the simulation data given in Fig. 10. Furthermore, information about the time to achieve 100% coverage is also listed in Table 4. The difference of \( t_{\text{cover},100} \) at 90% of the cumulative distribution with and without capillary force is longer than 6 min, due to the wider RTDs predicted by the simulation with capillary forces.

Fig. 11 shows the cumulative distributions of \( L_{\min}/P \) and \( S_p \) for the particle population. When capillary force is taken into account in the DEM, the spreads of distributions of \( L_{\min}/P \) and \( S_p \) slightly increase due to the effect on RTDs. According to the related data listed in Table 4, the coefficients of variation are again much smaller than the values obtained for the single particles.

\[
k_1 = 2.74; k_2 = 0.193
\]

\[
k_1 = 3.08; k_2 = 0.349
\]

\[
k_1 = 4.02; k_2 = 0.58
\]

\[
k_1 = 8.93; k_2 = 0.909
\]
On the intra-particle scale, the layer thickness distributions were in accordance with available data on particles from coating experiments that had been characterized by X-ray micro-computed tomography (μ-CT); the change of coefficient of variation with time was close to the analytic model. The value of the coefficient of variation of layer thickness over the particle population is much smaller than the values of individual particles. The capillary force scattered the layer thickness distributions due to its influence on RTDs. The density distributions of coating coverage at different times well followed Weibull distributions. The required \( t_{\text{cover,100}} \) to achieve a completely closed coating layer on every individual particle was much longer for the simulation with capillary force. With the postulate that splashing of droplets characterized by the dimensionless number \( K_d = \text{We}^{1/2} \text{Re}^{1.4} \) could produce high porosity on deposition panels, the model can predict the uniformity of porosity in the coating layer in terms of distributions of the minimum orthogonal distance \( L_{\text{min}} \) and the size of individual high porosity regions \( S_p \). The simulation with capillary forces predicted slightly higher non-uniformity of high porosity regions for the particle population. In summary, it is important to reduce the negative effects of capillary forces on the coating process by providing enough drying capacity of the fluidization gas and by accurate control of the size distribution of spray droplets.

Further experimental research will be conducted using X-ray micro-computed tomography to access the porosity distribution of single particle coating layers.
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### Appendix A. CFD-DEM formulations

** Governing equations for particle phase**

The motion of an individual particle \( i \) with mass \( m_i \) and moment of inertia \( I_i \) is calculated in a Lagrangian frame by Newton’s laws of motion:

\[
\frac{d\mathbf{r}_i}{dt} = \mathbf{f}_{\text{gr},i} + \sum_{j=1,j\neq i}^{N_p} \left( f_{\text{cij}} + f_{\text{ij}} \right) + \sum_{k=1}^{N_2} f_{\text{capillary,ik}} + m_i \mathbf{g}. \tag{A.1}
\]

\[
\frac{d\omega_i}{dt} = \sum_{j=1,j\neq i}^{N_p} \left( \mathbf{T}_{ij} + \mathbf{T}_{ji} \right); \tag{A.2}
\]

\( \mathbf{v}_{cij} \) and \( \omega_i \) are, respectively, the transitional and angular velocities of the individual particle \( i \). \( N_p \) is the number of particles in interaction with particle \( i \), and \( N_2 \) is the number of liquid bridges associated with the particle \( i \). The quantity \( f_{\text{gr},i} \) is the particle–fluid interaction force on the particle scale; \( f_{\text{cij}} \) and \( f_{\text{ij}} \) are the particle–particle interaction forces in the normal and tangential directions; \( f_{\text{capillary,ik}} \) is the capillary force between particles induced by the liquid bridge; and \( m_i \mathbf{g} \) is the gravitational force. The torque acting on particle \( i \) by the particle \( j \) includes two components: \( \mathbf{T}_{ij} \) generated by the tangential force \( f_{\text{tij}} \) and \( \mathbf{T}_{ji} \) generated by the rolling
friction. The particle–fluid interaction force \( \mathbf{f}_{gfj} \) mainly includes the drag force \( \mathbf{f}_{di} \), pressure gradient force \( \mathbf{f}_{vp} \), viscous force \( \mathbf{f}_{\tau} \), due to fluid shear stress tensor and some other non-dominant forces \( \mathbf{f}' \) (such as virtual mass force, Magnus force and Basset force, Crowe et al. (2011)), expressed as

\[
\mathbf{f}_{gfj} = \mathbf{f}_{di} + \mathbf{f}_{vp} + \mathbf{f}_{\tau} + \mathbf{f}',
\]

in which \( \mathbf{f}_{vp} = -\mathbf{p}_v \nabla \mathbf{p} \) and \( \mathbf{f}_{\tau} = \mathbf{p}_v \nabla \cdot \mathbf{\tau} \). The drag force \( \mathbf{f}_{di} \) was calculated according to Beetstra et al. (2007a,b). The non-dominant forces \( \mathbf{f}' \) were not considered in this work.

**Governing equations for fluid phase**

Based on the local averaged Navier–Stokes equations, mass and momentum conservation for fluid phase are given as (Zhou et al., 2010)

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\epsilon \rho_f \mathbf{u}) + \nabla \cdot (\epsilon \rho_f \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}) = 0,
\]

(A.4)

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\epsilon \rho_f \mathbf{u}) + \nabla \cdot (\epsilon \rho_f \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}) = -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{\tau} + \mathbf{f}_{gfj} + \epsilon \rho_f \mathbf{g},
\]

(A.5)

where \( \epsilon \) is the volume fraction of fluid, \( \rho_f \) is the density of fluid, \( \mathbf{u} \) is the velocity of fluid, respectively. The volumetric particle–fluid interaction force \( \mathbf{F}_{gf} \) is calculated by summation of all individual forces and divided by the volume of the CFD cell,

\[
\mathbf{F}_{gfj} = \frac{1}{N_p} \sum_{i=1}^{N_p} (\mathbf{f}_{di} + \mathbf{f}')
\]

(A.6)

where \( N_p \) is the number of particles in the CFD cell. Note that the pressure gradient force \( -\epsilon \nabla \mathbf{p} \) and the viscous force \( \epsilon \nabla \cdot \mathbf{\tau} \) on particles have been separated from \( \mathbf{F}_{gfj} \) in Eq. (A.5).

**Beetstra drag model**

In the CFD-DEM coupling, the drag force \( \mathbf{f}_{di} \) due to the fluid–solid friction at the surface of particles is calculated by the momentum exchange coefficient \( \beta_{gf} \), expressed as

\[
\mathbf{f}_{di} = \epsilon v \beta_{gf} (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}).
\]

(A.7)

Simulations by the fully resolved lattice Boltzmann method (LBM) have been considered as a promising tool to derive drag models, in which the inter-phase interaction is not modeled via empirical assumptions but follows from boundary conditions at the surface of the particles. Based on extensive LBM simulations, Beetstra et al. (2007a,b) proposed a drag model for mono-disperse systems in a wide range of solid volume fractions \( \epsilon \in [0.1, 0.6] \) and particle Reynolds numbers \( Re_p \) in [20, 1000] in the form of

\[
F(\epsilon, Re_p) = \frac{10\epsilon}{\epsilon f} + \epsilon f (1 + 1.5\epsilon^{0.5})
\]

\[
+ \frac{0.4133}{24\epsilon f} \left[ \epsilon f^{-1} + \frac{3\epsilon f}{\epsilon f} + 8.4Re_p^{-0.343} \right]
\]

\[
+ 1 + 10^{0.25\epsilon} \cdot Re_p^{1+0.4/\epsilon} \right].
\]

(A.8)

The relationship between normalized drag force \( F(\epsilon, Re_p) \) and momentum exchange coefficient \( \beta_{gf} \) can be written as

\[
\beta_{gf} = \frac{18\mu_p \epsilon f}{d_p^2} F(\epsilon, Re_p).
\]

(A.9)

It is important to note that the drag force acting on the solid phase might be reduced due to the decrease of inter-phase surface for relatively large agglomerate (Wang et al. 2011). Normally, the drag force can be scaled by a constant factor or a dynamic factor related to the structure of the agglomerate and the number of primary particles in the agglomerate (Liu et al. 2016). In current work, the scaling of drag force was not attempted in consideration of the relatively small size and instability of the agglomerates induced by the liquid bridge.

**Hertzian spring-dashpot (HSD) contact model**

Two spherical particles are in mechanical contact if \( |R_i + R_j - | \mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j || > 0 \), i.e. the sum of particle radii exceeds the distance between the two centers of particles. The overlap \( \epsilon_q \) can be expressed as

\[
\epsilon_q = \max \{ 0, |R_i + R_j - | \mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j || \}.
\]

(A.10)

The normal and tangential components of contact force can be written as

\[
\mathbf{f}_{cij}^n = \mathbf{f}_{cij}^n \cdot \mathbf{n}', \mathbf{f}_{cij}^t = \mathbf{f}_{cij}^t \cdot \mathbf{n}';
\]

(A.11)

where \( \mathbf{n}' \) and \( \mathbf{n} \) are unit vectors. The normal force \( \mathbf{f}_{cij}^n \) changes the translational motion of particles and the tangential force \( \mathbf{f}_{cij}^t \) changes the rotational motion of particles. Both components of the contact force are related to the relative position of particle \( \mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j \) and the relative velocity of particles \( \mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{v}_j + (R_i \mathbf{w}_i - \mathbf{n}') + (R_j \mathbf{w}_j - \mathbf{n}') \).

In the Hertzian spring-dashpot model, stiffness coefficient (or elastic coefficient) \( k \) and the damping coefficient (or dissipative coefficient) \( \eta \) are used to model the conservative force \( \mathbf{f}_{es} \) and the dissipative force \( \mathbf{f}_{ed} \) depending on the overlap and relative velocity, respectively. The equations used in HSD model to calculate \( \mathbf{f}_{cij}^n \) and \( \mathbf{f}_{cij}^t \) are summarized in Table A.1. The expressions for equivalent properties, including Young’s modulus \( E_{eq} \), shear modulus \( G_{eq} \), radius \( R_{eq} \) and mass \( m_{eq} \) can be found in the literature, for example in Jiang et al. (2018a,b). Parameters required for the simulations are the coefficient of restitution \( e \), the friction coefficient \( \mu_f \), Young’s modulus \( E \) and the Poisson ratio \( \sigma \).

**Rolling model**

The slight non-sphericity of the particles can be modelled by a rolling model that introduces an additional torque even when the relative tangential velocity at the contact point is zero. According to the work of Ai et al. (2011), the rolling friction torque \( \mathbf{T}_{fij} \) can be modelled by

\[
\mathbf{T}_{fij} = -k_f e_q \frac{\omega_{tij}^2}{\omega_{tij}} - R_{eq},
\]

(A.19)

in which \( k_f \) is a model parameter; and the relative angular velocity \( \omega_{tij} \) is defined as

\[
\omega_{tij} = \frac{R_i \omega_i + R_j \omega_j}{R_i + R_j}.
\]

(A.20)

**Table A.1**

Summary of equations used in the HSD contact model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \mathbf{f}_{cij}^n )</td>
<td>Normal contact force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \mathbf{f}_{cij}^t )</td>
<td>Tangential contact force (Coulomb frictional limit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_f = \frac{E_{eq}}{2R_{eq}} )</td>
<td>Damping ratio ( \psi_q(e) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \eta_f = \sqrt{E_{eq} / \mu_f R_{eq}} )</td>
<td>Damping ratio ( \psi_q(e) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \psi_q(e) = \begin{cases} \sqrt{E_{eq} / \mu_f R_{eq}} &amp; e &gt; 0 \ \sqrt{E_{eq} / \mu_f R_{eq}} &amp; e = 0 \end{cases} )</td>
<td>Damping ratio ( \psi_q(e) )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cohesion model
The static capillary force $f_{\text{capillary}}$ associated with the liquid bridge, can be considered as the sum of two components: 1) the surface tension acting on the three-phase contact line, and 2) the pressure difference $\Delta p$ across the gas–liquid interface. Limited to the spherical shape of particles, the equation for calculating the capillary force $f_{\text{capillary}}$ associated with a liquid bridge between two particles was obtained by fitting a set of discrete solutions of the Laplace equation (Soulié et al., 2006), expressed as:

$$ f_{\text{capillary}} = \pi \gamma R_i R_j \left[ C + \exp \left( A \frac{d_{\text{inter}}}{\max(R_i, R_j)} + B \right) \right], $$

(A.21)

where $d_{\text{inter}}$ is the inter-particle distance, and $\gamma$ is the surface tension. The coefficients $A, B$ and $C$ can be expressed as functions of the volume of liquid $V_l$ associated with the liquid bridge, the contact angle $\theta$ (in unit of radian) and the radius of larger particle $R_{\text{max}} = \max(R_i, R_j)$:

$$ A = -1.1 \frac{\gamma^{0.53}}{R_{\text{max}}}, $$

(A.22)

$$ B = -0.148 \ln \left( \frac{V_l}{V_{\text{max}}} \right) - 0.96 \theta^2 - 0.0882 \ln \left( \frac{V_l}{V_{\text{max}}} \right) + 0.48, $$

(A.23)

$$ C = 0.0018 \ln \left( \frac{V_l}{V_{\text{max}}} \right) + 0.078. $$

(A.24)

It is assumed that the volume of all liquid bridges is equal and constant during the simulation (no drying effect). The rupture distance of liquid bridge can be calculated by (Lian et al., 1993)

$$ D_i = (1 + 0.5 \theta) \frac{V_l}{R_i^3}. $$

(A.25)
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