An experimental study of air–water Taylor flow and mass transfer inside square microchannels
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A B S T R A C T
Flow and mass transfer properties under air–water Taylor flow have been investigated in two square microchannels with hydraulic diameters of 400 and 200 μm. Experimental data on Taylor bubble velocity, pressure drop and liquid side volumetric mass transfer coefficient (kLa) have been presented. It was shown that the measured Taylor bubble velocity in square microchannels could be well interpreted based upon an approximate measurement of the liquid film profile therein. Then, the obtained two-phase frictional pressure drop values in both microchannels were found to be significantly higher than the predictions of the correlation proposed by Kreutzer et al. [2005b. Inertial and interfacial effects on pressure drop of Taylor flow in capillaries. A.I.Ch.E. Journal 51, 2428–2440] when the liquid slug was very short, which can be explained by the inadequacy of their correlation to describe the excess pressure drop caused by the strong inner circulation in such short liquid slugs. An appropriate modification has been made to this correlation in order to improve its applicability in microchannels. Finally, the experimental (kLa) values in the microchannel with hydraulic diameter of 400 μm were found to be in poor agreement with those predicted by the existing correlations proposed for capillaries with diameters of several millimeters. The observed deviation was mainly due to the fact that mass transfer experiments in this microchannel actually corresponded to the case of short film contact time and rather poor mixing between the liquid film and the liquid slug, which was not in accordance with mass transfer assumptions associated with these correlations. A new empirical correlation has been proposed to describe mass transfer data in this microchannel.

© 2009 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction
The improvement of multiphase reactor performance via process intensification has been the focus of considerable researches for many years. The newly emerging gas–liquid microreaction technology presents an attractive alternative and has gained increased interest recently among both academic communities and industrial companies (Chen et al., 2008; Ehrfeld et al., 2000; Hessels et al., 2004, 2005a). This technology features in the use of well-defined microchannel structures with diameters in the order of microns to hundreds of microns to perform a variety of gas–liquid operations. The reduction of channel size to micron scale in such microreactors brings numerous advantages that are hardly achievable in their macroscale counterparts. Remarkably high gas–liquid mass transfer rate can be realized primarily because of large surface to volume ratios inherent in microchannels. A better process safety can also be ensured via the excellent thermal management as well as the effective suppression of the flame propagation in microchannels. Thus it is envisaged that plenty of highly exothermic, fast gas–liquid or gas–liquid–solid catalyzed reactions can benefit substantially from the use of gas–liquid microreactors. The available researches have made it clear that gas–liquid microreactors show great potential in a host of applications including gas absorption (TeGrotenhuis et al., 2000; Yue et al., 2007), direct fluorination (Chambers et al., 2001; de Mas et al., 2003; Jahnisch et al., 2000), liquid phase oxidation (Leclerc et al., 2008), three-phase catalytic hydrogenation (Abdallah et al., 2006; Kobayashi et al., 2004; Losey et al., 2001; Yeong et al., 2003), and direct synthesis of hydrogen peroxide (Inoue et al., 2007; Wang et al., 2007). Among these studies, four main types of gas–liquid microreactors have been reported according to two–phase
contacting principle (Chen et al., 2008; Hessel et al., 2005b), that is, microchannel contactor (or micro bubble column), falling film microreactor, microreactor with phase interface stabilized with physical structures such as meshes and porous plates, and micro packed bed reactor. It seems that microchannel contactor in which gas and liquid flow co-currently inside the same microchannel may be more attractive for future large-scale industrial applications in view of its wide operational range of gas and liquid flow rates, good mass transfer and reaction efficiency under certain gas–liquid two-phase flow patterns, and also relatively easy scale-up process by stacking a multitude of reaction platelets comprising a plurality of microchannels together. The rational design and reliable operation of this type of microreactor require a thorough understanding of fundamental gas–liquid transport process and its interplay with chemical kinetics in microchannels.

Previous studies have indicated that gas–liquid two-phase flow pattern in microchannels mainly includes bubbly, slug, slug–annular, annular, and churn flows, the inner flow details of which are rather different from those observed in large channels (Chung and Kawaji, 2004; Triplet et al., 1999; Yue et al., 2008). This is primarily due to the fact that under most circumstances, surface tension begins to play an important role and laminar flow nature of each phase prevails in microchannels. Among the observed flow patterns, Taylor flow (identified as a sub-regime of slug flow corresponding to the alternative movement of equally long Taylor bubbles and liquid slugs down the channel) is the preferred one for gas–liquid reactions in microchannels, which occurs typically at comparatively low gas flow velocities. In Taylor flow, the liquid slug is separated from each other by the presence of Taylor bubbles and the only means for the communication between two adjacent liquid slugs is through the thin film region between the bubble and the channel wall, thus indicating a significant reduction in axial mixing. For example, recently Trachsel et al. (2005) have measured the residence time distribution (RTD) for single-phase liquid and gas–liquid Taylor flow in microchannel networks by on-site integration of a piezoelectrically activated tracer injection technique. It has been observed that RTD was significantly narrower for Taylor flow case than for laminar flow case at similar conditions. Besides a reduced axial mixing, an improved radial mixing can be also achieved by the recirculation motion inside the liquid slug (Günther et al., 2004; Thulasidas et al., 1997). Moreover, enhanced mass transfer and reaction rates can be offered inside the thin film region (Kreutzer et al., 2001; Vandu et al., 2005). Thus gas–liquid reactions in microchannels will benefit much from the operation under this flow pattern, where the reactions can be further optimized towards conversion and selectivity. From this point of view, Taylor flow has the most priority to be investigated among all possible flow patterns present in microchannels.

Although numerous investigations on transport and reaction properties of Taylor flow in minichannels or capillaries with diameters on the orders of millimeters have been performed during the past several ten years (Angeli and Cavrilli Dis, 2008; Kreutzer et al., 2005a), the relevant studies further down to microchannels (especially with non-circular channel shapes) have not been frequently seen up to now. Thus it is still not clear whether Taylor flow in microchannels presents novel properties when compared to large capillaries. Accordingly, the extrapolation of the available correlations or models proposed for the latter case might be questionable in microchannels, which requires further experimental validation.

In view of the above summary, this paper serves to provide further insights into Taylor flow in square microchannels, where the bubble motion, pressure drop and mass transfer characteristics are mainly concerned. First, experiments on air–water Taylor flow have been performed in two microchannel contactors which consist of Y-shaped square microchannels with hydraulic diameters of 400 and 200 μm, respectively. Taylor bubble velocity, lengths of Taylor bubbles and liquid slugs, two-phase frictional pressure drop data were measured in both microchannels. For the 400 μm hydraulic diameter microchannel, liquid side volumetric mass transfer coefficient was also determined simultaneously under typical operational conditions. Then, based on the obtained data, the applicability of the available correlations from the open literature for describing flow and mass transfer properties of Taylor flow was further examined in the present microchannels. The possible reasons responsible for the observed deviation between the predictions and the experimental results were discussed and some appropriate modifications were also suggested.

2. Experimental apparatus and procedure

2.1. Microchannel contactor specification

The small channel dimension in gas–liquid microreactors usually makes it difficult to perform a direct measurement of fluid pressure or concentration inside the microchannel. Thus in the present work, an indirect measurement approach was used in order to derive pressure drop and mass transfer data in the interested microchannel test section. In detail, two different types of single microchannel contactors have been tested, as described below.

The first type of single microchannel contactor mainly consists of a Y-shaped square microchannel structure (with hydraulic diameter of 400 or 200 μm, respectively) fabricated on the polymethyl methacrylate (PMMA) substrate by using a precision micromilling machine, as schematically illustrated in Fig. 1(a). The microchannel plate was capped with a piece of transparent adhesive and then compressed against another smooth PMMA plate using screw...
fittings through the punched holes on the peripheries of both plates in order to form a closed microchannel section for fluid passage. Gas and liquid are introduced into the contactor through the connectors machined on the backside of the microchannel plate and flow along two respective side microchannels (2.53 cm long) prior to their contact in the main microchannel (4.8 cm long). This type of contactor will be referred to as SMC I hereafter.

The second type of single microchannel contactor (termed as SMC II) was employed for the purpose of measuring equivalent pressure drop or mass transfer contributions in the outlet zone of SMC I, as shown in Fig. 1(b). It adopted the same fabrication and sealing methods as those for SMC I. From Figs. 1(a) and (b), it is seen that the only difference between the two types of contactors lies in the fact that in SMC II two side microchannels are directly fed with the outlet plenum while the other channel dimensions remain identical to SMC I.

2.2. Experimental setup

We first carried out air–water Taylor flow experiments in SMC I with \( d_h = 400 \mu m \) under a variety of gas and liquid flow rates, where mass transfer measurements were also performed simultaneously under most circumstances. Fig. 2 is a schematic of the experimental rig. Air source was provided via the air compressor. After flowing through a filter to remove possible contaminations, the pressure of air was adjusted by a pressure regulating valve. Prescribed flow rate of air was designated by a mass flow controller covering a flow range of 0–10 SCCM (Aalborg, Model GFC 17). Then air stream was directly fed into one side microchannel of the contactor that was placed horizontally and the static pressure in the gas feeding line was measured by a pressure transducer with a range of 0–100 kPa (Kobold, Model SEN-3276 B025). Liquid phase used was deionized water that was stored in a tank. Before each run, nitrogen was employed to strip possible dissolved oxygen out. An electronic metering pump with a range of 0–400 ml/min (Eldex, Model 2HM) was then used to draw certain amount of water from the tank into another side microchannel. This camera has the recording rate up to 250 frames/s at full resolution of 512×480 pixels and up to 1000 frames/s at reduced resolution. The camera was further equipped with a megapixel lens (Pentax C2514-M) as well as a set of extension tubes in order to magnify a section of the microchannel under investigation. The light needed for the illumination of the microchannel was provided by a self-made LED lamp which was placed beneath the microchannel. The recorded large amounts of images were first stored in the PCI board’s memory and were then stored in the hard disk of a computer for later analysis.

To estimate the equivalent pressure drop or mass transfer contribution in the outlet zone of SMC I, experiments were also conducted in the corresponding SMC II under the same volumetric flow rates of gas and liquid as those for SMC I. The other experimental details remained unchanged.

2.3. Image analysis

During experiments with SMC I, Taylor bubble velocity in the middle section of the main microchannel (at a distance of 2.4 cm from the entrance) was first determined from the images captured by the high speed video camera. If the frame speed was set to be sufficiently high (typically 500 frames/s in this study), the same bubble could reside in two successive images. The distance traveled by the bubble during this short period could be measured easily from the variation of the pixel values in the two images. The bubble velocity was then calculated by dividing the distance it traveled by the time interval between the two images. Under each operational condition, a sequence of at least 20 images were analyzed and the resulted bubble velocity data were averaged together to obtain the final value. It was found that the obtained bubble velocity in these images remained nearly constant with the standard deviation lower than 3%.

Lengths of Taylor bubbles and liquid slugs in the middle section of both microchannels were also measured from the corresponding images. A stable bubble or liquid slug length was observed under a fixed operation condition, where the standard deviations in the measured lengths were found to be both lower than 5%.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Taylor bubble velocity

During Taylor flow through microchannels, a thin film region usually presents between the body of Taylor bubble and the channel wall. When both gas and liquid are assumed to be incompressible, Griffith and Wallis (1961) have shown that the mean velocity in
the liquid slug \( U_{\text{slug}} \) can be calculated from the volume continuity equation as

\[
U_{\text{slug}} = \frac{Q_G + Q_L}{A_{\text{mc}}}
\]

(1)

where \( Q_G \) and \( Q_L \) are the volumetric flow rates of gas and liquid and \( A_{\text{mc}} \) the cross-sectional area of the microchannel. Eq. (1) can be further reduced to

\[
U_{\text{slug}} = J_C + J_L
\]

(2)

where \( J_C \) and \( J_L \) refer to the superficial gas and liquid velocities, respectively.

Also, the volume continuity equation will lead to

\[
Q_G + Q_L = U_B A_B + U_{\text{film}} A_{\text{film}}
\]

(3)

Here \( U_B \) and \( U_{\text{film}} \) are the velocities of Taylor bubble and the liquid film, \( A_B \) and \( A_{\text{film}} \) are the cross-sectional areas of Taylor bubble and the liquid film. Then it is obvious that

\[
A_{\text{mc}} = A_B + A_{\text{film}}
\]

(4)

From Eqs. (1)–(4), Taylor bubble velocity can be expressed as

\[
U_B = \frac{U_{\text{slug}} A_{\text{mc}} - U_{\text{film}} A_{\text{film}}}{A_{\text{mc}} - A_{\text{film}}}
\]

(5)

Thus it is clear that Taylor bubble velocity in microchannels depends crucially on the flow condition of the liquid film (i.e., its average velocity and cross-sectional fraction). When the microchannel is placed horizontally, the gravity effect on the flow of the liquid film vanishes. For air–water Taylor flow under this orientation, it is usually reasonable to assume that the liquid film is nearly at rest especially at comparably low capillary numbers \( Ca = \mu U_B / \rho \) (i.e., \( U_{\text{film}} \approx 0 \)), as revealed by the simulation of Kreutzer et al. (2005b). Then, it is obtained from Eq. (5) that

\[
\frac{U_B}{U_{\text{slug}}} = \frac{1}{1 - \frac{A_{\text{film}}}{A_{\text{mc}}}}
\]

(6)

In this study, Taylor bubble velocity in the middle section of two square microchannels with \( d_h = 400 \) and 200 \( \mu m \) was determined from the images captured by the high speed video camera, where the superficial velocities ranged from 0.02–1.2 m/s for the gas and 0.33–1.0 m/s for the liquid in experiments. Fig. 3 depicts the measured \( U_B \) as a function of \( U_{\text{slug}} \) for the two microchannels. Here in order to compensate for the gas compressibility effect, \( U_{\text{slug}} \) was calculated from Eq. (2) in which \( J_C \) was evaluated by using the gas density based on the average pressure between the entrance and outlet of the microchannel (for this system, the amount of gas absorption was insignificant as compared to the gas flow rate so that a constant gas mass flow rate can be assumed throughout the whole microchannel). For other parts in this paper, \( J_C \) was derived in the same way. It can be observed in Fig. 3 that the air bubble in both microchannels moves slightly faster than the liquid slug, which is more significant at relatively high \( U_{\text{slug}} \). From the above simplified analysis, it is concluded that this phenomenon is mainly resulting from the presence of a nearly stagnant film section surrounding the body of the bubble.

To provide a more reliable explanation of Taylor bubble velocity observed in the current microchannels, it is essential to know the cross-sectional fraction occupied by the liquid film, \( A_{\text{film}}/A_{\text{mc}} \), as Eq. (6) suggests. This requires that the thickness distribution of the liquid film surrounding the body of the bubble be well understood. It is noticed from the literature that many experimental and theoretical correlations on liquid film thickness are available for horizontal Taylor flow in circular capillaries and even in microchannels (Aussillous and Quéré, 2000; Bretherton, 1961; Chen, 1986; Fairbrother and Stubb, 1935; Taylor, 1961), whereas only a few relevant studies have been devoted to their square counterparts (Fries et al., 2008; Kolb and Cerro, 1991; Wong et al., 1995a,b). This is primarily due to the fact that the presence of four sharp corners in a square microchannel will have a complicated impact on the bubble shape as well as the liquid film distribution along the channel wall. In detail, the body of Taylor bubble in a circular microchannel can be treated as an ideal axisymmetric cylinder surrounded by the liquid film with even thickness (see Fig. 4(a)). However, for square microchannels as described in this study, the bubble symmetry turns to be firstly dependent on \( Ca \) (Kolb and Cerro, 1991). At low \( Ca \), the bubble is non-axisymmetric (see Fig. 4(b)), which means that the bubble surface is flat near the center of the channel wall and is cylindrical in four corners. In other words, the liquid film is curved in the corner and becomes flat far away from the corner. A transition in bubble symmetry is initiated at higher \( Ca \), where the whole bubble body becomes cylindrical (see Fig. 4(c)). The transitional \( Ca \) was experimentally observed by Kolb and Cerro (1991) to be about 0.1 for upward air–silicone oil flow in a square capillary with \( d_h = 2 \) mm. Later Thulasidas et al. (1995) determined the transitional point with more accuracy, to take place at \( Ca \approx 0.04 \). In both cases, the distribution of the film thickness in square microchannels is uneven around the bubble. That is, the film...
thickness in the diagonal plane \( B-B \), \( \delta_{\text{film}} (B-B) \), is always larger than that in the axial plane \( A-A \), \( \delta_{\text{film}} (A-A) \). Since our experiments were performed under the condition of \( Ca < 0.04 \) (see Fig. 5), it is thought that the liquid film configuration in the investigated microchannels is alike to that shown in Fig. 4(b). This assumption is further corroborated by the experimental data shown in Fig. 5, as can be seen that the obtained \( U_B/U_{\text{slug}} \) is generally less than 1.3. While for the liquid film configuration depicted in Fig. 4(c), the liquid film occupies more than 21.5% of the channel cross-section as the bubble diameter should be less than the channel width or height. Thus in the latter case, the bubble should move at a velocity faster than about 1.3 times \( U_{\text{slug}} \) according to Eq. (6).

For the liquid film configuration in Fig. 4(b), it is easy to show that

\[
A_{\text{film}} = 4\delta_{\text{film}} (A-A) \left( d_h - \delta_{\text{film}} (A-A) \right) + 4\left( 1 - \frac{\pi}{4} \right) \ell^2
\]

(7)

\[
\ell = \frac{d_h}{2} - \frac{W_{\text{film}}}{2} - \delta_{\text{film}} (A-A)
\]

(8)

Note that in the above two equations the value of \( d_h \) is equal to the channel width or height since here a square geometry is dealt with.

Then we can further rewrite Eq. (6) as

\[
\frac{U_B}{U_{\text{slug}}} = \frac{1}{\left( 1 - 2\frac{\delta_{\text{film}} (A-A)}{d_h} \right)^2 - \left( 1 - \frac{\pi}{4} \right) \left( 1 - 2\frac{\delta_{\text{film}} (A-A)}{d_h} \right)^2}
\]

(9)

Thus it is seen that the obtained \( U_B/U_{\text{slug}} \) data should be interpreted based on a reliable estimation of the values of \( \delta_{\text{film}} (A-A) \) and \( W_{\text{film}} \).

With the captured Taylor flow images, we first performed an approximate measurement of \( W_{\text{film}} \) in both microchannels, as illustrated in Fig. 6. By using a shareware software ImageJ (version 1.42a, National Institute of Health, USA), the brightness values of the pixels in the acquired black and white images were analyzed. Since there exists a flat gas–liquid interface near the center of the microchannel cross-section and the interface around the corner is cylindrical, the body of the bubble shown in the captured images turns to be very light in the center region and to be very dark in the corner region. The boundary between the two regions can be approximately identified via a brightness threshold adjustment. As a result, the whole bubble surface in the image was marked as red except the flat region. Then the width of this unmarked region could be determined as \( W_{\text{film}} \) as shown in Fig. 6. Meanwhile, it is also observed from this figure that the liquid film surrounding the bubble in the axial plane is extremely thin and thus \( \delta_{\text{film}} (A-A) \) cannot be measured directly. The existing studies have made it clear that when \( Ca \) is less than 0.04, the film thickness in this plane virtually varies little and a constant value of about 0.02 can be assumed for \( \delta_{\text{film}} (A-A)/d_h \) (Fries et al., 2008; Kolb and Cerro, 1991). Consequently, the same assumption is adopted in our analysis as well. With thus obtained \( W_{\text{film}} \) and \( \delta_{\text{film}} (A-A) \) data, the value of \( U_B/U_{\text{slug}} \) was further estimated according to Eq. (9) and its comparison with our experimental observation is further plotted in Fig. 5. It can be seen that the experimental data in both microchannels agree well with the predictions of Eq. (9). From Fig. 5 it is also observed that the bubble tends to move more quickly than the liquidslug when \( Ca \) is increased. To explain this, the measured \( W_{\text{film}}/d_h \) is plotted as a function of \( Ca \) in Fig. 7. It is clear that the width of the flat film region decreases with increasing \( Ca \), implying the thickening of the liquid film in the diagonal plane. Thus it is suggested that the liquid film will occupy more fraction of the microchannel cross-section at increased \( Ca \), leading to comparatively high value of \( U_B/U_{\text{slug}} \).

### 3.2. Pressure drop characteristics

For engineering calculations, two-phase pressure drop correlations solely based on input parameters are more favorable. Both the homogeneous and separated flow models serve this purpose (Wallis, 1969), where the flow pattern information inside channels is not a necessity. However, it seems unconvincing to apply these models...
directly to Taylor flow in microchannels (Liu et al., 2005; Yue et al., 2008). Actually, Taylor flow is operated under transient conditions due to the discontinuous motion of gas and the alternative expose of the channel wall to the liquid slug and the liquid film. Consequently, this flow pattern can be regarded as neither a homogeneous flow nor a separated flow. This implies that specific details inside Taylor flow should be fully considered in the search of suitable pressure drop correlations.

3.2.1. Pressure drop model

In fact, if we view Taylor flow as a quasi-steady process, two-phase frictional pressure drop in a unit cell (one bubble plus one liquid slug), \( \Delta P_{\text{F,uc}} \), can be decomposed into three components according to the classification shown in Fig. 8 (Dukler and Hubbard, 1975; Garimella et al., 2002; Kreutzer et al., 2005b); (1) frictional loss in the liquid slug, \( \Delta P_{\text{slug,uc}} \); (2) frictional loss in the liquid film, \( \Delta P_{\text{film,uc}} \); and (3) pressure drop over the front and the rear bubble caps, \( \Delta P_{\text{cap,uc}} \). Thus it is obtained that

\[
\Delta P_{\text{F,uc}} = \Delta P_{\text{slug,uc}} + \Delta P_{\text{film,uc}} + \Delta P_{\text{cap,uc}} \quad (10)
\]

Then two-phase frictional pressure drop gradient in Taylor flow can be deduced as

\[
\left( \frac{\Delta P}{\xi} \right)_p = \frac{1}{L_p} \left( \Delta P_{\text{slug,uc}} + \Delta P_{\text{film,uc}} + \Delta P_{\text{cap,uc}} \right) \quad (11)
\]

where \( L_p \) and \( L_s \) are lengths of Taylor bubbles and liquid slugs. It is seen from Eq. (11) that the specific knowledge on each pressure drop component in a unit cell is required for the estimation of pressure drop in Taylor flow. Below is a detailed description based on the available publications.

Under typical operational conditions relevant to Taylor flow in microchannels, both gas and liquid flows are in laminar regime. As conjectured by Taylor (1961) and then experimentally observed by many authors (Cox, 1964; Günther et al., 2004; Thulasidas et al., 1997), the flow in the liquid slug at \( \text{Ca} \) lower than about 0.5 is characterized by recirculation patterns near the bubble caps if viewed from a coordinate system moving with the bubble. But if the liquid slug is not very short, the velocity profile will quickly become fully developed (Thulasidas et al., 1997; van Baten and Krishna, 2004). Then for a first approximation, \( \Delta P_{\text{recirculation,uc}} \) can be assumed as the sum of the extra pressure drop caused by the inner recirculation, \( \Delta P_{\text{recirculation,uc}} \), and the laminar flow pressure drop under fully developed condition in the liquid slug, that is,

\[
\Delta P_{\text{slug,uc}} = \frac{C}{R_e_{\text{slug}}} \left( \frac{L_p U_c^2}{2 d_h} + \Delta P_{\text{recirculation,uc}} \right) \quad (12)
\]

where \( C \) is laminar friction constant and liquid slug Reynolds number \( R_e_{\text{slug}} \) is defined as \( R_e_{\text{slug}} = d_h U_{\text{slug}} \rho_l / \mu_l \).

For horizontal Taylor flow in microchannels, it is usually reasonable to assume that the liquid film is nearly at rest (Kreutzer et al., 2005b). Thus \( \Delta P_{\text{film,uc}} \) is negligible as compared to \( \Delta P_{\text{slug,uc}} \). However, this assumption may be only applicable to situations in which pure liquid is used. When a certain amount of surfactant is involved, Marangoni effect seems to have an important role to play. As an example, the experiments of Fuerstenau et al. (2007) showed that the flow of liquid containing intermediate concentrations of surfactant through four corners of rectangular microchannels was not negligible and therefore the frictional loss in the liquid film region contributed greatly to the total two-phase frictional pressure drop.

The pressure drop over the bubble caps in circular capillaries under the condition of sufficiently small non-zero \( \text{Ca} \) was shown theoretically by Bretherton (1961) to be

\[
\Delta P_{\text{cap}} = 7.16(3\text{Ca})^{2/3} \frac{\sigma}{d_h} \quad (13)
\]

Later Wong et al. (1995b) found that the pressure drop over the bubble caps in square capillaries is about one third that in circular ones of the same \( d_h \). Both works did not consider the inertial effect, which is usually not negligible in practical operations. For example, \( R_e_{\text{slug}} \) in the present study was found to be in the range of 180–830 and 195–405 in two microchannels with \( d_h = 400 \) and 200 \( \mu \text{m} \), respectively. As a result, the influence of inertia on the bubble shape can be easily seen. At higher values of \( R_e_{\text{slug}} \), the bubble front cap becomes more elongated and the rear cap turns to be more flattened. Consequently, an alternative expression to Eq. (13) should be developed in order to account for the significant inertial effect occurred in the real circumstances.

Based on the above description, two-phase frictional pressure drop gradient in Taylor flow through a microchannel can be further written as

\[
\left( \frac{\Delta P}{\xi} \right)_p = \frac{1}{L_p + L_s} \left( \frac{C}{R_e_{\text{slug}}} \left( \frac{L_p U_c^2}{2 d_h} + \Delta P_{\text{recirculation,uc}} \right) + \Delta P_{\text{cap,uc}} \right) \quad (14)
\]

Here the explicit expressions for \( \Delta P_{\text{recirculation,uc}} \) and \( \Delta P_{\text{cap,uc}} \) are still not clear. Recently, Kreutzer et al. (2005b) experimentally investigated pressure drop characteristics of Taylor flow (air–water, air–decane, and air–tetradecane) in a 2.3 mm diameter capillary and conducted CFD simulation to verify their experimental findings. They suggested that the overall contribution of \( \Delta P_{\text{recirculation,uc}} \) and \( \Delta P_{\text{cap,uc}} \) could be estimated from the results of CFD simulation. In detail, a function \( \xi \) was designated to describe their contribution.
and then Eq. (14) is further rearranged to

\[ f_{\text{slug}} = \frac{C}{Re_{\text{slug}} (1 + \zeta)} \]  

(15)

where

\[ \zeta = a \left( \frac{L_S}{d_h} \right)^{-1} \left( \frac{\rho_f \Delta \rho g \sigma}{\mu_f^2} \right)^{1/3} \]  

(16)

and \( f_{\text{slug}} \) is the apparent slug friction factor defined as

\[ f_{\text{slug}} = \frac{\Delta P_f}{\frac{\Delta L}{\mu_f} L_S} \frac{d_h}{L_B + L_S} \]  

(17)

The coefficient \( a \) in Eq. (16) was determined numerically to be 0.07, however, the experimental findings supported a higher value of 0.17. They claimed that this large difference might be caused by Marangoni effect of small amounts of impurities, which was not considered in the simulations, but was likely to be present in the experiments.

In this work, pressure drop data of air–water Taylor flow were collected in two square microchannels with \( d_h = 400 \) and 200 \( \mu \)m. A comparison between the obtained results and the predictions of the Kreutzer correlation (i.e., Eq. (15)) will be performed in the following section, based on which some more light will be shed on pressure drop characteristics of Taylor flow in microchannels.

3.2.2. Experimental verification

In the present experimental setup, two-phase total pressure drop \( \Delta P_f \) in the main microchannel of SMC I was derived indirectly by a comparison with the results from reference experiments with the corresponding SMC II. Further information concerning pressure data reduction method can be found in our previous paper (Yue et al., 2008). Thus it is obtained that

\[ \Delta P_f = P_{\text{in, SMC I}} - P_{\text{in, SMC II}} \]  

(18)

Here \( P_{\text{in, SMC I}} \) and \( P_{\text{in, SMC II}} \) denote the inlet pressures measured in the gas feeding line during experiments with SMCs I and II, respectively.

Then two-phase frictional pressure drop gradient can be derived as

\[ \frac{\Delta P_f}{\Delta L} \frac{d_h}{\mu_f L_S} = \frac{\Delta P_f - \Delta P_A}{\Delta L} \]  

(19)

where \( \Delta P_A \) is two-phase acceleration pressure drop given by

\[ \Delta P_A = C^2 \left( \frac{x^2}{\rho_f u_c^2} + \frac{(1 - x)^2}{(1 - u_c)\rho_c u_c^2} \right) \]  

(20)

The gas hold up data at the microchannel entrance and outlet needed in Eq. (20) were estimated approximately by using the Armand correlation. That is,

\[ \eta_c = 0.833 \beta \]  

(21)

where \( \beta = \frac{j_c}{j_c + j_h} \). This empirical correlation has been shown by many authors to well represent gas hold up data measured during Taylor flow of air–water like fluid pairs in microchannels under relatively wide operational conditions (Serizawa et al., 2002; Warnier et al., 2008; Yue et al., 2008; Zhao and Bi, 2001).

Finally, the product of the apparent slug friction factor and liquid slug Reynolds number, \( (Re)_{\text{slug}} \), can be measured from the experiments as

\[ (Re)_{\text{slug}} = \frac{2 (\frac{\Delta P_f}{\Delta L})}{\mu_f} \frac{d_h^2}{U_{\text{slug}}} L_B + L_S \]  

(22)

Fig. 9 plots the measured \( (Re)_{\text{slug}} \) as a function of \( L_S/d_h \) in two microchannels and its comparison with the prediction of the Kreutzer correlation, Eq. (15). In view of square microchannel cross-section investigated in this study, \( C \) value in Eq. (15) was set as 56.9 (Shah and London, 1978). From Fig. 9 it is first seen that at large values of \( L_S/d_h \), the obtained \( (Re)_{\text{slug}} \) data in both microchannels generally agree well with those predicted by Eq. (15), provided that the numerically derived value of 0.07 is assigned for the coefficient \( a \). Nevertheless, it is also noticed that Eq. (15) with \( a = 0.07 \) significantly underpredicts the experimental \( (Re)_{\text{slug}} \) values when \( L_S/d_h \) is lower than about 1.5. Recall that in the simulation of Kreutzer et al. (2005b), a boundary condition of fully developed laminar flow profile was explicitly imposed on both ends of two half liquid slugs surrounding the same bubble. This condition is usually satisfied so
long as the liquid slug is not very short (Thulasidas et al., 1997; van Baten and Krishna, 2004). For example, Thulasidas et al. (1997) determined velocity distributions in the liquid slug inside capillaries of circular and square cross-section with \(d_h = 2\) mm via particle imaging velocimetry (PIV). Their results revealed that if the liquid slug was longer than 1.5 times the capillary diameter, at a short distance from the bubble caps streamlines were straight, indicating a fully developed laminar flow in the liquid slug. Thus Eq. (15) is thought to be capable of describing pressure drop of Taylor flow containing comparatively long liquid slugs. But it can be seen from Fig. 9 that liquid slug lengths in both microchannels were rather short in the majority of our experiments (normally ranging from 1\(d_h\) to 1.5\(d_h\)). In such short liquid slugs, Thulasidas et al. (1997) have found that streamlines were everywhere curved, indicating that a fully developed laminar flow velocity profile could not be recovered and that the whole liquid slug region was actually dominated by a strong recirculation pattern. Thus it is expected that the simulation of Kreutzer et al. (2005b) tends to underpredict the contribution of the extra pressure drop caused by the inner recirculation, \(\Delta P_{\text{recirculation, uc}}\), to a large extent when the liquid slug is rather short. As a result, it has been observed in the present study that the measured \((Re)_{\text{slug}}\) value is much higher than the prediction of Eq. (15) with \(a = 0.07\) when the liquid slug is shorter than 1.5 times the microchannel hydraulic diameter.

From Fig. 9 it is further observed that if the experimentally derived value of 0.17 in the work of Kreutzer et al. (2005b) is assigned for the coefficient \(a\) in Eq. (15), this equation will yield much higher \((Re)_{\text{slug}}\) values than the measured ones in both microchannels. Kreutzer et al. (2005b) argued that the better fit of Eq. (15) with \(a = 0.17\) to their experimental data was likely because of Marangoni effect present in their experiments. Thus the comparison shown in Fig. 9 suggests that Marangoni effect in our experiments is unimportant, which might be explained based on the following considerations: (i) although water used in this study probably contained traces of impurities, the build-up of a significant concentration gradient of these surface-active contaminants along gas–liquid interface seemed not to occur in view of the fact that the residence time of Taylor bubbles inside the microchannel was rather short (ranging from 21 to 112 ms) (Schulze and Schlünder, 1985; Vasconcelos et al., 2002) and (ii) Marangoni effect is most significant at low \(Ca\) (typically \(< 10^{-3}\)). At large \(Ca\), the bubble velocity becomes so large that Marangoni convection along gas–liquid interface will not cause much alteration of the flow field in Taylor flow (Bretherton, 1961; Ratulowski and Chang, 1990). Since our experiments were mainly carried out at \(Ca\) on the order of \(10^{-2}\) (see Figs. 5(a) and (b)), the influence of Marangoni effect on pressure drop of Taylor flow is expected to be somewhat insignificant here.

To interpret the experimental data in both microchannels more reasonably, an extra item was added to the function \(\xi\) in the Kreutzer correlation in the following way:

\[
\xi = a \left(\frac{L_S}{d_h}\right)^{-1} \left(\frac{\rho L d_h}{\mu^2} \right)^{1/3} + b \left(\frac{L_S}{d_h Re_{\text{slug}}}\right)^m
\]

The second item on the right side of Eq. (23) was designed to reflect the strong influence of inner recirculation in very short liquid slugs that is not revealed in the simulation of Kreutzer et al. (2005b). In view of the dominance of developing flow conditions in such short liquid slugs, it was assumed that the added item might be simply expressed as a power function of \(L_S/d_h Re_{\text{slug}}\), which was analogous to the analysis method previously adopted in the study on the apparent friction factor under hydrodynamically developing flow for non-circular ducts (Muzychka and Yovanovich, 1998; Shah and London, 1978). Then, by a least square regression analysis of the current data, the empirical constants \(b\) and \(m\) associated with this item were obtained and a new expression for \(f_{\text{slug}}\) was found as

\[
f_{\text{slug}} = \frac{56.9}{Re_{\text{slug}}} \left[1 + 0.07 \left(\frac{L_S}{d_h}\right)^{-1} \left(\frac{\rho L d_h}{\mu^2}\right)^{1/3} + 5.5 \times 10^{-5} \left(\frac{L_S}{d_h Re_{\text{slug}}}\right)^{-1.6}\right]
\]

Fig. 10 compares the measured \((Re)_{\text{slug}}\) values with the predictions of this expression, where relatively small standard deviations of 11.1% and 9.4% were achieved for the two microchannels with \(d_h = 400\) and 200 \(\mu\)m, respectively. From Eq. (24), it seems that the inner recirculation is strengthened especially for shorter liquid slugs and higher values of \(Re_{\text{slug}}\). Moreover, it is also shown that the added new item in the bracket, \(5.5 \times 10^{-5}(L_S/d_h Re_{\text{slug}})^{-1.6}\), can be omitted if the liquid slug is not very short. For example, under the condition of \(L_S/d_h = 3\) and \(Re_{\text{slug}} = 200\), this item only takes a value of about 0.05, which is much smaller than the sum of the other items in the bracket. In this case, this equation is essentially the same as Eq. (15) proposed by Kreutzer et al. (2005b). Thus it is believed that Eq. (24) can be used to describe pressure drop data of air–water Taylor flow in square microchannels within a wide range of operational conditions. However, since only experiments of air–water flow are dealt with here, the extrapolation of this equation to other fluid pairs should be taken with caution. In the latter case, pressure drop characteristics of Taylor flow with short liquid slugs still awaits further simulation work as well as experimental validation.

3.3. Mass transfer characteristics

In order to predict the performance of gas–liquid reactions as well as solid catalyzed gas–liquid reactions conducted under Taylor flow in microchannels, it is essential to gain a thorough understanding of mass transfer details inside this flow pattern.

It is noteworthy that considerable attention has been paid to mass transfer studies in Taylor flow through millimeter-sized capillaries during the past years (Bercić and Pintér, 1997; Heiszwolf et al., 2001; Irandoust et al., 1992; Kreutzer et al., 2001; van Baten and Krishna, 2004; Vandu et al., 2005). These studies have made it clear that the overall liquid side volumetric mass transfer coefficient \(k_{La}(the
product of liquid side mass transfer coefficient \( k_l \) and interfacial area \( a_i \) in Taylor flow is highly dependent on the local flow details therein. Among them, a representative experimental work was carried out by Berčič and Pintar (1997) who found that the measured \( k_l a \) during methane–water Taylor flow in circular capillaries of 1.5, 2.5 and 3.1 mm diameters could be estimated by the following empirical correlation:

\[
k_l a = 0.111 \left( \frac{L_B + L_S}{L_B} \right)^{1.19} \text{RCS} \tag{25}
\]

Since it is reasonable to assume that \( (1 - \varepsilon_G) (L_B + L_S) \approx L_S \) if the liquid slug is not very short, Eq. (25) suggests that \( k_l a \) is largely dependent on the liquid slug length rather than that of the bubble. Thus Berčič and Pintar (1997) concluded that the contribution of mass transfer from the bubble caps to the liquid slug was dominant in their experiments. Later van Baten and Krishna (2004) performed a CFD simulation of mass transfer in Taylor flow through circular capillaries of 1.5, 2 and 3 mm diameters, where Taylor bubble was assumed to consist of two hemispherical caps and a cylindrical body. They considered that Eq. (25) might be only capable of predicting \( k_l a \) at long contact times between the liquid film and the bubble since many experimental data of Berčič and Pintar (1997) were obtained with very long bubbles and liquid slugs. For comparatively short film contact times (corresponding to large values of bubble velocity and small unit cell lengths), van Baten and Krishna (2004) found that the obtained \( k_l a \) values could be well represented by their proposed mass transfer model in which separated contributions of mass transfer from the body of the bubble to the surrounding liquid film and mass transfer from the two bubble caps to the liquid slug were both considered. That is,

\[
k_l a = k_{l, \text{film}} a_{\text{film}} + k_{l, \text{cap}} a_{\text{cap}} \tag{26}
\]

where liquid side mass transfer coefficients in the liquid film and the liquid slug, i.e., \( k_{l, \text{film}} \) and \( k_{l, \text{cap}} \), were derived based on the penetration theory (Higbie, 1935) as

\[
k_{l, \text{film}} = 2 \frac{D}{\sqrt{\pi} \alpha_{\text{film}}} \tag{27}
\]

\[
k_{l, \text{cap}} = 2 \sqrt{2} \frac{D U_B}{d_h} \tag{28}
\]

And interfacial areas for the liquid film and two hemispherical caps, i.e., \( a_{\text{film}} \) and \( a_{\text{cap}} \), can be calculated as

\[
a_{\text{film}} = \frac{\pi d_f L_{\text{film}}}{4} \approx \frac{4(L_B - d_h)}{d_h (L_B + L_S)} \tag{29}
\]

\[
a_{\text{cap}} = \frac{\pi d_f^2}{4} \approx \frac{L_B + L_S}{L_B - d_h} \tag{30}
\]

In the above equations, \( L_{\text{film}} \) is the length of the liquid film surrounding the bubble, and \( t_{\text{film}} \) refers to the contact time between the liquid film and the bubble, which can be evaluated from

\[
t_{\text{film}} = \frac{L_{\text{film}}}{U_B} = \frac{L_B - d_h}{U_B} \tag{31}
\]

Then the mass transfer model of van Baten and Krishna (2004) can be further rewritten as

\[
k_l a = 2 \frac{U_B}{\pi} \sqrt{\frac{D U_B}{L_B - d_h}} \left( \frac{4}{L_B - d_h} \right) \left( \frac{L_B + L_S}{d_h (L_B + L_S)} \right) + 2 \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \frac{D U_B}{d_h} \left( \frac{4}{L_B + L_S} \right) \tag{32}
\]

Recently Vandu et al. (2005) have experimentally verified the applicability of Eq. (32) for mass transfer under air–water Taylor flow in 1, 2 and 3 mm diameter capillaries of circular and square cross-sections by further assuming that the major contribution to mass transfer was \( k_{l, \text{film}} a_{\text{film}} \).

In this study, we have performed mass transfer measurements during air–water Taylor flow in SMC I with \( d_h = 400 \mu\text{m} \). For the physical absorption of oxygen from air into water, gas side mass transfer resistance is negligible. Then, by assuming a macroscopic plug flow behavior for the liquid phase, \( k_l a \) in the main microchannel can be expressed as

\[
k_l a = \frac{j_l}{J} \ln \left( \frac{C^* - C_{O_2,0}}{C^* - C_{O_2,1}} \right) \tag{33}
\]

Here, \( C_{O_2,0} \) is the concentration of dissolved oxygen in the water entering the main microchannel of SMC I, which was thought to be the same as that measured in the liquid tank. To derive the concentration of dissolved oxygen in the water leaving the main microchannel, \( C_{O_2,1} \), reference experiments were conducted using SMC II under the same volumetric flow rates of gas and liquid as those for SMC I. Based on the assumptions that hydrodynamic conditions in the outlet zones of both contactors were nearly the same, average liquid side volumetric mass transfer coefficients therein were thought to be equal as well (Yue et al., 2007). Therefore, there should be

\[
\frac{C^* - C_{O_2,1}}{C^* - C_{O_2,2}} = \frac{C^* - C_{O_2,0}}{C^* - C_{O_2,3}} \tag{34}
\]

In this equation, \( C_{O_2,0} \) denotes the concentration of dissolved oxygen in the water entering SMC II while \( C_{O_2,2} \) and \( C_{O_2,3} \) are concentrations of dissolved oxygen measured in the water collected in the phase separator during experiments with SMCs I and II, respectively. From Eqs. (33) and (34), \( k_l a \) in the microchannel can be finally obtained from the experiments as

\[
k_l a = \frac{j_l}{J} \ln \left( \frac{C^* - C_{O_2,3}}{C^* - C_{O_2,0}} \right) \left( \frac{C^* - C_{O_2,2}}{C^* - C_{O_2,0}} \right) \tag{35}
\]

To check whether the above-mentioned two representative mass transfer correlations (i.e., Eqs. (25) and (32)) are further applicable in the current microchannel, the measured \( k_l a \) data are compared to the predictions of these equations in Fig. 11. It should be noted that the gas hold up data in Eq. (25) are given by

\[
\varepsilon_G = \frac{j_c}{U_B} \tag{36}
\]

It is obvious in Fig. 11 that neither of the two equations can give a reasonable description of the present data. Both equations tend to yield higher \( k_l a \) values than the measurements, where more significant deviation was found in the predictions of Eq. (32) proposed by van Baten and Krishna (2004). It is known that both equations were proposed for circular capillaries. Then the direct application of these equations to the present square microchannel will certainly cause some degree of certainty in their predictions due to somewhat large difference of the liquid film profile as well as the shape of the front and rear bubble caps herein from that in circular capillaries (Vandu et al., 2005). But in our opinion, this uncertainty is not the main cause responsible for the deviation observed in Fig. 11. As mentioned before, the two equations were thought to be valid under certain mass transfer circumstances. Eq. (25) might be useful in predicting \( k_l a \) at large film contact times where the transfer of gas into the liquid slug is dominant whereas Eq. (32) is recommended at short film contact times where the transfer of gas into the liquid film and the liquid slug are both important. van Baten and Krishna (2004) suggested \( \varepsilon_0 < 0.1 \) as a criterion for short film contact times,
In this paper, flow and mass transfer issues in air–water Taylor flow through two square microchannels with hydraulic diameters of 400 and 200 μm have been investigated experimentally. The mass transfer process between the liquid film and slug is the complete mixing between the liquid film and the liquid slug. The mass transfer process between the liquid film and slug is the complete mixing between the liquid film and the liquid slug.

The empirical constants c, n and p were determined to be about 2, 0.3, and -0.8, respectively, on the basis of a regression analysis of the experimental data. Finally, we can obtain the following empirical correlation for the estimation of $k_La$ in this microchannel

$$k_La = \frac{2}{d_b} \left( \frac{D_{U_b}}{L_g + L_s} \right)^{0.5} \left( \frac{L_g}{L_g + L_s} \right)^{0.3}$$

where Fourier number $Fo$ is defined as $Fo = \frac{D_{film}/d_{film}^2}{L_{film}}$. In the current mass transfer experiments, a rough estimation revealed that $Fo$ was on the order of 0.01. Therefore, at first sight one may consider that Eq. (32) is more appropriate for describing the current data and the poor predicting performance of Eq. (25) can be easily understood since this equation loses its validity here. However, the even worse predicting performance of Eq. (32) implies that there must be some other factors that may lead to its inapplicability.

In fact, another important assumption for the validity of Eq. (32) is the complete mixing between the liquid film and the liquid slug. In Taylor flow, the liquid film is alternatively exposed to Taylor bubble and the liquid slug. The mass transfer process between the liquid film and the liquid slug (i.e., the transfer of dissolved gas) takes place predominantly by diffusion without the presence of strong convective mixing (Thulasidas et al., 1999). If a complete mixing is achieved between the above two regions, a well-mixed liquid convective mixing (Thulasidas et al., 1999). If a complete mixing is achieved between the above two regions, a well-mixed liquid convective mixing is strongly influenced by the length of the whole unit cell instead of the liquid slug length alone. But it should be pointed out here that length of liquid slugs produced in the current microchannel was strongly influenced by the length of the whole unit cell instead of the liquid slug length alone. But it should be pointed out here that length of liquid slugs produced in the current microchannel was normally very short (e.g., < 3d_b, see also Fig. 9(a)). This implies that the mixing between the liquid film and the liquid slug should be rather incomplete in our experiments. Under this circumstance, the dissolved gas in the liquid film cannot be effectively transferred into the liquid slug, which subsequently leads to a significant decrease in the local absorption rate in the liquid film along the microchannel as compared to the complete mixing case. Thus it has been observed in Fig. 11 that the experimental $k_La$ values are much lower than the model predictions of van Baten and Krishna (2004).

To interpret mass transfer data obtained in the present microchannel with $d_b = 400$ μm, it is assumed that $k_La$ therein can be expressed approximately in the following form:

$$k_La = \frac{c}{d_b} \left( \frac{D_{U_b}}{d_b} \right)^{0.5} \left( \frac{L_g}{d_b} \right)^n \left( \frac{L_g + L_s}{d_b} \right)^p$$

The empirical constants c, n and p were determined to be about 2, 0.3, and -0.8, respectively, on the basis of a regression analysis of the experimental data. Finally, we can obtain the following empirical correlation for the estimation of $k_La$ in this microchannel

$$k_La = \frac{2}{d_b} \left( \frac{D_{U_b}}{L_g + L_s} \right)^{0.5} \left( \frac{L_g}{L_g + L_s} \right)^{0.3}$$

Fig. 12 shows the comparison of the experimental $k_La$ values with those predicted by this correlation. The standard deviation was found to be as low as 10.8%, implying a good fitting performance of this correlation (the ranges of parameters investigated are: 0.4 m/s < $U_b$ < 2 m/s, 1.4 < $L_g/d_b$ < 6.3, 1 < $L_g/d_h$ < 3.2, $d_b$ = 400 μm). It is seen from Eq. (38) that the measured $k_La$ shows great dependence on the bubble velocity and the length of the unit cell. Especially, an increase in $k_La$ is anticipated when the bubble velocity increases or the liquid slug length is reduced, which follows exactly the same trend as that suggested by Eq. (32). Furthermore, Eq. (38) implies that the film contribution to mass transfer is important or at least not negligible in our experiments since the measured $k_La$ is strongly influenced by the length of the whole unit cell instead of the liquid slug length alone. But it should be pointed out here that the current data are still not sufficient. To further elucidate the macroscopic mass transfer results observed in our experiments, the microscopic interplay between the liquid film and slug mass transfer contributions inside each unit cell along the microchannel should be made clear. Therefore, a detailed numerical analysis is currently underway.

### Conclusions

In this paper, flow and mass transfer issues in air–water Taylor flow through two square microchannels with hydraulic diameters of 400 and 200 μm have been investigated experimentally.
Experimental data on Taylor bubble velocity, pressure drop as well as liquid side volumetric mass transfer coefficient have been presented and analyzed. Based on the results of this study, the following conclusions can be drawn:

(1) Taylor bubble in square microchannels was found to move slightly faster than the liquid slug due to the existence of a nearly stagnant film surrounding the bubble body. The experimental bubble velocity results can be well interpreted based upon an approximate measurement of the liquid film profile in microchannels, where it was shown that the velocity ratio between Taylor bubble and the liquid slug further increased with increasing Ca primarily as a result of the thickening of the liquid film in the corner of the microchannel cross-section.

(2) Two-phase frictional pressure drop of Taylor flow through microchannels should be expressed as the sum of the frictional losses in the liquid slug, in the liquid film and pressure drop over the bubble caps. The experimental pressure drop data of air–water Taylor flow in the current two microchannels were found to agree well with those predicted by the correlation of Kreutzer et al. (2005b) only at large liquid slug length. Nevertheless, a significant underestimation in the prediction has been observed when the liquid slug length is short than about 1.5 times hydraulic diameter of the microchannel, which can be explained by the inadequacy of this correlation to describe the excess pressure drop caused by the strong inner circulation in such short liquid slugs. An appropriate modification has been made to this correlation in order to improve its applicability in microchannels.

(3) The available correlations for the estimation of liquid side volumetric mass transfer coefficient in Taylor flow through capillaries proposed by Bercič and Pinter (1997) and van Baten and Krishna (2004) show large deviation from our experimental mass transfer data in the square microchannel with $d_h=400 \mu m$. An accompanying analysis has revealed that due to rather short liquid slugs produced in this microchannel, mass transfer experiments were mainly operated under the condition of short film contact time and rather poor mixing between the liquid film and the liquid slug, which was not in accordance with mass transfer assumptions associated with the above two correlations. A new empirical correlation has therefore been proposed to describe the experimental results with reasonable predicting accuracy.

Notation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$a$</td>
<td>interfacial area, m²/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A$</td>
<td>cross-sectional area, m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>empirical constant in Eq. (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c$</td>
<td>empirical constant in Eq. (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C$</td>
<td>laminar friction constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Ca$</td>
<td>capillary number defined by $(=-\mu U_g/\sigma)$, dimensionless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{O_2}$</td>
<td>molar concentration of $O_2$ in the water, mol/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{O_2,0}$</td>
<td>molar concentration of $O_2$ in the water entering SMC II, mol/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C^*$</td>
<td>physical solubility of $O_2$ in the water, mol/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d_b$</td>
<td>diameter of hemispherical bubble caps, m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d_h$</td>
<td>hydraulic diameter, m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D$</td>
<td>liquid phase diffusivity, m²/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>friction factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_0$</td>
<td>Fourier number defined by $(=-D_{film}/\theta_{film}^2)$, dimensionless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G$</td>
<td>mass flux defined by $(=j_C \rho_C + j_L \rho_L)$, kg/(m²·s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$j$</td>
<td>superficial velocity, m/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_L$</td>
<td>liquid side mass transfer coefficient, m/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{L,a}$</td>
<td>liquid side volumetric mass transfer coefficient, s⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_B$</td>
<td>length of Taylor bubble, m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_{film}$</td>
<td>length of the liquid film, m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_S$</td>
<td>length of the liquid slug, m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta L$</td>
<td>length of the main microchannel, m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m$</td>
<td>empirical constant in Eq. (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>empirical constant in Eq. (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>empirical constant in Eq. (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{in, SMC I}$</td>
<td>inlet pressure in the gas feeding line during experiments with SMC I, Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{in, SMC II}$</td>
<td>inlet pressure in the gas feeding line during experiments with SMC II, Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta P$</td>
<td>pressure drop, Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta P_A$</td>
<td>two-phase acceleration pressure drop, Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta P_F$</td>
<td>two-phase frictional pressure drop, Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta P_T$</td>
<td>two-phase total pressure drop, Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q$</td>
<td>volumetric flow rate, m³/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>circular arc radius of liquid in the diagonal plane, m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_b$</td>
<td>radius of the bubble cylindrical body, m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Re_{slug}$</td>
<td>liquid slug Reynolds number defined by $(=d_hU_{slug}/\mu)$, dimensionless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_{film}$</td>
<td>contact time between the liquid film and Taylor bubble, s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$U$</td>
<td>mean velocity, m/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$W_{film}$</td>
<td>width of the liquid film in the axial plane, m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x$</td>
<td>gas mass fraction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Greek letters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>coefficient in Eq. (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>phase volumetric fraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta_{film}$</td>
<td>thickness of the liquid film surrounding the body of the bubble, m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\epsilon$</td>
<td>hold up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu$</td>
<td>viscosity, Pa·s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\zeta$</td>
<td>extra pressure function defined in Eq. (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>density, kg/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma$</td>
<td>surface tension, N/m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscript</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>microchannel entrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>microchannel outlet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>in the phase separator during experiments with SMC I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>in the phase separator during experiments with SMC II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Taylor bubble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cap</td>
<td>bubble cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>film</td>
<td>liquid film</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>gas phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>liquid phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mc</td>
<td>microchannel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slug</td>
<td>liquid slug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>two-phase mixture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uc</td>
<td>a unit cell of Taylor flow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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