Direct effect of solvent viscosity on the physical mass transfer for wavy film flow in a packed column
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ABSTRACT

The interphase mass transfer plays a critical role in determining the height of packed column used in absorption process. In a recent experiments2, the direct impact of viscosity ($\mu_L$) on the physical mass transfer coefficient ($k_L$) was observed to be higher in a packed column as compared to the wetted wall column. We offer a plausible mechanism involving the wavy film and eddy enhanced mass transfer in a packed column to explain underlying physics via analytical and numerical studies. The analytically derived mass transfer coefficient matches well with experimental observation in a packed column. The countercurrent flow simulations in a packed column with both uniform and wavy films also confirm this behavior. The predicted $k_L$ shows steep variation with $\mu_L$ for a wavy film than a uniform film, further confirms the proposed theory. A similar relation ($k_L \sim \mu_L^{-0.38}$) for a wavy film is also observed in theoretical, experimental and numerical studies.
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1. Introduction

Solvent absorption by countercurrent flow in a packed column is a promising technology for mitigating carbon dioxide (CO$_2$) emissions from power plants 3-5. The structured packings provides a large surface area for mass transfer while minimizing pressure drop across the column as compared to random packings 6. Before deploying this technology to industry, its performance and scalability needs to be investigated 7. Accordingly, hydraulic characteristics and mass transfer between flue gas and liquid

a) Electronic mail: zhijie.xu@pnnl.gov
solvent phases in the packing system need to be better understood for optimal packing design. It is a challenging problem because of the large number of factors that influence the hydrodynamics and mass transfer behavior, such as solvent properties, surface characteristics, packing design, and liquid loading. In this view, understanding the local hydrodynamics and mass transfer behavior is important as it reflects the liquid flow pattern within the column that significantly influences the overall mass transfer rate between phases. In this regard, a number of experimental and numerical studies were conducted to understand the flow hydrodynamics in the packed column. Most of the numerical studies were focused on the multiphase flow simulations using volume of fluid methods that investigates the liquid film thickness and interfacial areas. Further, the interphase mass transfer is a key factor that governs the overall height of the packed column in absorption process.

A number of experimental and theoretical studies have been conducted to explain the mechanism for mass transfer in structured packings. Various theories, including two-film theory, penetration theory, surface renewal theory, and boundary layer theory, are applied to explain the mass transfer in a packed column. Most of the models for physical mass transfer are based on two-film theory, which only considers the molecular diffusion that form each side of the gas-liquid interface. On the other hand, Higbie’s penetration theory considers the residence time of a fluid element at the gas-liquid interface. It suggests an elementary idea to account for turbulence in mass transfer phenomena. Subsequently, correlation for the mass transfer coefficient is derived in terms of various dimensionless numbers, such as Reynolds, Schmidt, Froude, or Galileo numbers. Previously, the wetted wall column (WWC) concept was adopted to predict mass transfer based on the assumption of well-defined geometry and precise surface area in the structured packings. However, recent investigations have shown complex flow behavior inside the packed column along with the presence of different flow morphologies. As a result, the mass transfer prediction significantly deviates from the WWC. The mass transfer between phases is dictated by many factors. Surface tension was proposed to have negligible effect on mass transfer in the turbulent wavy film flow. On the other hand, viscosity is one of the critical factors affecting the interphase mass transfer.
transfer in absorption phenomenon. A large value of solvent viscosity can lead to a significant reduction in the mass transfer coefficient. High solvent viscosity can lead to slow diffusion of gas through the gas-liquid interface (indirect effect) and modify the local hydrodynamics by generating a more stabilized liquid film on the packing surface (direct effect). As a result, mass transfer between phases can be significantly reduced.

The effect of viscosity on the mass transfer coefficient has been investigated in detail over the last few decades. Rochelle and his coworkers \(^2, 11, 24-26\) have performed extensive experimental studies examining the performance evaluation of structure/random packings. The effects of various factors impacting the mass transfer area \(^11, 25, 26\) and mass transfer coefficients between phases \(^2, 24\) also have been systematically investigated. Song et al. \(^2, 24\) have experimentally investigated the physical mass transfer for various packings (Structured, Random and Hybrid) utilized in carbon capture process. The effect of viscosity on the overall mass transfer coefficient has been explained in two parts: 1) direct contribution due to hydrodynamics and 2) indirect impact that accounts for solvent diffusivity. An experimental campaign designed to study these factors could be expensive and time consuming. Conversely, computational fluid dynamic (CFD) simulations may be leveraged in the design process to achieve economic and efficient solutions while providing important insights into the physics. Notably, CFD does not replace the need for measurements, but it may significantly reduce the amount of experimentation requirement and complement it. In addition, CFD steadily has been gaining acceptance for studying the flow characteristics in structured packings over time \(^27-31\).

Haroun et al. \(^32, 33\) and Marschall et al. \(^34\) have developed the single fluid formulation for mass transfer between two phases. It is capable of simulating species transfer across interfaces having arbitrary morphology using interface capturing methods, such as the Volume of Fluid (VOF) method. Both approaches utilized Henry’s law with a constant coefficient for thermodynamic equilibrium of chemical species to capture the jump of the species concentration across the interface. This approach also is employed \(^35-38\) for various chemical processes involving mass transfer phenomenon. Nieves-Remacha et
al. \textsuperscript{36} use this approach to simulate the hydrodynamics and mass transfer phenomenon in advanced-flow reactor technology, an alternative to scale up continuous flow chemistries from micron to millimeter scales. Hu et al. \textsuperscript{39} have conducted a VOF simulation similar to the method suggested by Haroun et al. \textsuperscript{33} for mass transfer in a falling wavy film. They characterize the CO\textsubscript{2} absorption mass transfer in vorticity in the vicinity of the interface and the local CO\textsubscript{2} concentration. In the same context, Singh et al. \textsuperscript{8, 40} have conducted VOF simulations for film and rivulet flow over an inclined plate for the shape gas-liquid interface and flow morphology. Extensive multiphase flow simulations also have been conducted that account for the factors affecting rivulet shape and stability. Note that the shape of the interface significantly affects the mass transfer across it. Sebastia-Saez et al. \textsuperscript{41} have investigated physical mass transfer in a countercurrent flow over an inclined plate. Mass transfer due to physical absorption shows non-monotonic variation with increased liquid load. The maximum value of mass transfer is observed at the fully wetted film. Recently, Wang et al. \textsuperscript{37, 38} have applied a similar approach for physical and reactive mass transfer for CO\textsubscript{2} capture in a WWC, where they show the advantage of CFD modeling over the standard two-film theory. In addition, CFD modeling can account for the local flow hydrodynamics, such as wavy interface, and variation in film thickness in CO\textsubscript{2} capture. Haroun et al. \textsuperscript{33} shows that mass transfer between phases strongly depends on the packing design. A sheet of triangular channel shows higher mass transfer than a flat surface. However, their problem setup was limited to concurrent gas-liquid flow.

In a recent experimental study by Song et al. \textsuperscript{2}, the direct effect of viscosity on the mass transfer coefficient is shown to be significantly higher than the corresponding one for a WWC. The mass transfer coefficient for a WWC was derived by Pigford \textsuperscript{42} and can be expressed as:

\begin{equation}
    k_L = 1.15 \cdot u_L^{0.333} \cdot \nu_L^{-1/6} \cdot g^{1/6} \cdot a^{1/3} \cdot \left( \frac{L^{1/2}}{a^{1/3}} \right) \cdot D_L^{1/2},
\end{equation}

where $u_L$ is solvent velocity at the inlet, $\nu_L$ is the kinematic viscosity, $g$ is the gravitational acceleration, $D_L$ is the diffusivity of the transport species in the solvent phase, $a$ is the solvent inlet size,
and \( L \) is the WWC height. This above analytical expression (1) was derived via solving the hydrodynamic equations for laminar film falling over a vertical plate coupled with mass transfer in accordance with the penetration theory \(^{42, 43}\). On the other hand, a similar correlation was derived from extensive experimental outcome for the packed columns \(^2\):

\[
k_L = 0.12 \cdot u_L^{0.565} \cdot \nu_L^{-2/5} \cdot g^{1/6} \cdot a_p^{-0.065} \cdot D_L^{1/2},
\]

where \( a_p \) is specific area of the packings presented as \( m^2/m^3 \). Equation (2) clearly shows a higher impact of solvent viscosity on the mass transfer coefficient for a packed column with an exponent of \(-2/5\) as compared to \(-1/6\) for the WWC (Eq. (1)). In addition, a larger dependence of mass transfer on the solvent velocity \( (u_L) \) also can be identified for the packed column with an exponent of 0.565 compared to 0.33 in Eq. (1). Of note, the flow in a packed column is more complicated compared to WWC because of various factors, including the intermittent nature of the liquid distributor, surface characteristics of the packing material, and turbulent nature of flows due to design and arrangement of packing units. As a result, flow in the packed column significantly deviates from a well-controlled laminar flow present in the WWC. Subsequently, it may contribute to the enhanced dependency of mass transfer on the viscosity \(^2\).

However, unlike analytical expression for WWC (Eq.(1)) that is corroborated by a rigorous and quantitative theory, the exact mechanism is not fully understood for the packed column, and associated quantitative analysis is still lacking. In this context, an extensive theoretical study with numerical simulations will provide significant insights and quantitative explanations of the physics behind the correlation in Eq. (2), as well as additional insights into the design optimization of a packed column.

In this paper, an analytical derivation for the dependence of mass transfer on viscosity is presented in Section 2. Section 3 briefly describes the formulation for VOF simulations followed by a description of the multiphase flow simulation setup and meshing of computational domain. The simulation results and comparison for the mass transfer coefficient are presented in Section 4 followed by a conclusion.
2. Mathematical Formulation of the Physical Mass Transfer

We consider a wavy film with rolling waves falling over a vertical flat plate due to gravity with the physical mass transfer of gas species across the gas-liquid interface. Figure 1 shows the schematic of the problem, where rolling waves can be characterized by an amplitude \( A \), wavelength \( \lambda \), and wave speed \( \omega_w \).

As a result, the thickness profile \( \delta(x, t) \) of the wavy film varies vertically in the falling direction. The \( x \)-axis is directed downward in the streamwise direction (see Figure 1), and the \( y \)-axis is perpendicular to the plate. The governing (continuity and momentum conservation) equations dictating the falling film are given as:

\[
\frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} = 0, \quad (3)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + v \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} = -\frac{1}{\rho_L} \frac{\partial P}{\partial x} + \frac{\mu_L}{\rho_L} \left( \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial y^2} \right) + g, \quad (4)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial v}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} + v \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} = -\frac{1}{\rho_L} \frac{\partial P}{\partial y} + \frac{\mu_L}{\rho_L} \left( \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial y^2} \right), \quad (5)
\]

where \( u \) and \( v \) are the vertical and horizontal components of the velocity, \( \rho_L \) is the liquid density, \( \mu_L \) is the dynamic viscosity, \( g \) is the gravity, and \( P \) is the pressure. A parabolic velocity profile in the streamwise direction for \( u \) may be established across the film, which is based on the exact solution of a steady and fully developed laminar film flow:

\[
u(x, y) = \frac{3}{2} \frac{q}{w} \left( \frac{2y}{\delta^2(x)} - \frac{y^2}{\delta^3(x)} \right). \quad (6)
\]

Here, \( w \) is the width of film along the direction perpendicular to the x-y plane, and \( q \) is the flow rate,

\[
q = w \int_0^{\delta(x)} u(x, y) dy = w \cdot u_{av}(x) \delta(x), \quad (7)
\]

where \( u_{av}(x) \) is the average vertical velocity at a location \( x \). Using Eq. (6), the gradient of vertical velocity \( u \) in the \( x \) direction can be related to the local film thickness \( \delta(x) \),
\[
\frac{\partial u}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial u}{\partial \delta} \frac{\partial \delta}{\partial x} = -\frac{3}{2} \frac{q}{w} \frac{y}{\delta} (4\delta - 3y) \frac{\partial \delta}{\partial x}.
\] (8)

The gradient of lateral velocity \( v \) along the \( y \) direction at the interface can be computed using the continuity equation (3)

\[
\frac{\partial v}{\partial y} \bigg|_{y=\delta(x)} = -\frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \bigg|_{y=\delta(x)} = \frac{3}{2} \frac{q}{w} \frac{1}{\delta_0} \frac{\partial \delta}{\partial x},
\] (9)

where \( \delta_0 \) is the average film thickness that can be written as

\[
\delta_0 = \left( \frac{3\mu_L^2 \text{ Re}}{\rho_L^2 \rho g} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}}
\] (10)

according to the Nusselt theory. Here, \( \text{ Re } \) is the film Reynolds number defined as,

\[
\text{ Re } = \frac{\rho_L q}{\mu_L w} = \frac{q}{u_L w} = \frac{u_L a}{v_L w},
\] (11)

where \( a \) is the size of the solvent inlet, \( u_L \) is the solvent velocity at inlet, and \( v_L \) is the kinematic viscosity of the solvent. For a turbulent wavy film flow, transport near a gas-liquid interface is governed by eddies whose length and velocity scales are characterized by bulk turbulence. According to the mixing length model for eddy diffusion, the eddy diffusivity stemming from the local turbulent flow in the direction normal to the vertical plate can be written as:

\[
D_{Le} = C_1 \left( \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} \right)_{y=\delta(x)} \left( \Delta y \right)^2.
\] (12)

Here, \( C_1 \) is a proportional constant, \( \Delta y \) is the penetration depth of gas species into the solvent during a single wave period \( T = \frac{\lambda}{u_w} \) (shown in Figure 1). The penetration depth \( \Delta y \) depends on the wave frequency \( f \) and can be related to the diffusivity of that species in liquid phase \( D_L \) and the frequency \( f \) of rolling waves,

\[
\Delta y = \sqrt{\frac{D_L}{f}} = \sqrt{D_L \frac{\lambda}{u_w}}.
\] (13)
Substitution of Eqs. (9) and (13) into Eq. (12) leads to the expression for eddy diffusivity $D_{Le}$:

$$D_{Le} = \left[0.72C_f \frac{\partial \delta}{\partial x} f \left( \frac{\rho_L g^2}{\mu_L} \right)^{1/3} \Re^{1/3} \right] L_e.$$  \hspace{1cm} (14)

To determine $D_{Le}$, the thickness gradient $\frac{\partial \delta}{\partial x}$ and the wave frequency $f$ need to be modeled explicitly. We assume that an arbitrary fluid element at the gas-liquid interface follows a random walk motion along the $y$ direction (shown in Figure 1) due to the momentum transfer. The velocity of that fluid element over a single period $T$ of the rolling wave can be written as:

$$V_y = \sqrt{V_L \frac{u_w}{\lambda}} = \sqrt{V_L f},$$  \hspace{1cm} (15)

where, again, $V_L$ is the kinematic viscosity; $\lambda$ is the wavelength; $u_w$ is the wave speed; and $f = \frac{u_w}{\lambda}$ is the wave frequency. Concurrently, the same fluid element also will experience downward motion along the $x$ direction because of the gravity and vertical velocity gained during the same period $T$ can be written as:

$$V_x = g \frac{\lambda}{u_w} = \frac{g}{f}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (16)

The gradient of film thickness along the $x$ direction ($\frac{\partial \delta}{\partial x}$) can be approximated using the wave amplitude $A$ and wavelength $\lambda$ as:

$$\frac{\partial \delta}{\partial x} \approx \frac{2A}{\lambda}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (17)

$A$ and $\lambda$ can be related to the distance that the fluid element travels in vertical and lateral directions in a single rolling wave period $T$. These two quantities should be proportional to the speed in both directions and can be written as:

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial \delta}{\partial x} \approx \frac{A}{\lambda} = C_2 \frac{V_y}{V_x}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (18)
where $C_2$ is a dimensionless constant on the order of unity. To verify this relation, we use the results obtained from the nonlinear solution of the wavy film falling over a vertical plate by Shkadov \(^1\). The various optimum parameters of the wave regime, such as wavelength, wave propagation speed, and frequency, can be computed as a function of the Reynolds and Kapitza numbers ($Ka$), where $Ka$ incorporates the effect of surface tension:

$$Ka = \frac{\sigma}{\rho_L} \left( \frac{\rho_L^4}{g \mu_L^4} \right)^{1/3} = \frac{\sigma}{\rho_L} \left( \frac{1}{g \nu_L^4} \right)^{1/3},$$

(19)

where $\sigma$ is the surface tension. In Figure 2, we plot the variation of the computed value of $A/\lambda$ with $V_y/V_x$ at three given Reynolds numbers with the Kapitza number varying between 400 and 4000. It can be observed that the variation of $A/\lambda$ with $V_y/V_x$ remains unchanged for all Reynolds and Kapitza numbers studied. Furthermore, it clearly shows the linear scaling relation as $A/\lambda = C_2 V_y/V_x$ with $C_2 = 0.67$. The numerical solutions \(^1\) are in good agreement with our projection (Eq. (18)) and confirm that the ratio between wave amplitude and wavelength is proportional to the ratio of two velocity components gained during a single wave period $T$.

Next, the ratio $A/\lambda$ can be plotted as a function of Reynolds and Kapitza numbers using the same solution methods \(^1\),

$$\frac{A}{\lambda} = C_3 Ka^{-n} Re^m.$$  

(20)

Here, $C_3$ is another dimensionless constant. In Figure 3(a), we present the variation of $A/\lambda$ with Reynolds number $Re$. As expected, $A/\lambda$ increases with an increased value of $Re$. Conversely, $A/\lambda$ decreases with an increased value of $Ka$, which is shown in Figure 3(b) for two different Reynolds numbers. Physically, it can be understood by the fact that the increased value of the Kapitza number leads to a reduction in film thickness and an increase in wavelength. Subsequently, fluctuations in film thickness also decrease, causing a lower value of $A/\lambda$. Both observations also are confirmed in the numerical simulations and will be explained in a later section (Figures 6 and 7). Accordingly, $A/\lambda$ decreases with the increased value
of $Ka$. In addition, $A / \lambda$ shows nonlinear variation with $Re$ and $Ka$. To find the scaling relation for the variation of $A / \lambda$ with $Re$ and $Ka$, nonlinear regression is conducted, and a scaling relation $A / \lambda = C_3 \text{Re}^{0.78} Ka^{-0.47}$ is observed (shown in Figure 4) with $C_3 \approx 1/60$, with $m \approx 3/4$ and $n \approx 3/7$.

Finally, we can write these relations together as:

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial \delta}{\partial x} \approx \frac{A}{\lambda} = C_2 \frac{V_y}{V_x} = C_2 \sqrt{\frac{V_L}{g}} f^{1/2} = C_3 Ka^{-n} \text{Re}^m.$$  \hspace{1cm} (21)

Substituting Eq. (21) into Eq. (14), the final expression for the eddy diffusivity for wavy film flow with rolling waves can be presented as:

$$D_{le} = 1.44 \left[ C_1 \cdot C_2 \left( \frac{V_y}{V_x} \right)^{1/3} \text{Re}^{1/3} \right] D_L$$

$$= 1.44C_1 C_2^{2/3} C_3^{1/3} \text{Re}^{(m+1)/3} Ka^{-n/3} D_L$$

$$= C \text{Re}^{(m+1)/3} Ka^{-n/3} D_L$$ \hspace{1cm} (22)

Here, $C = 1.44C_1 C_2^{2/3} C_3^{1/3}$ is another empirical constant that aggregates three constants together. To derive the expression for effect of viscosity on the mass transfer coefficient in a wavy film flow with rolling waves, the molecular diffusivity $D_L$ in the analytical expression for WWC (Eq. (1)) can be replaced by the eddy diffusivity $D_{le}$. The difference in mass transfer between wavy film and uniform film flow primarily is assumed to be primarily due to the difference in diffusivity. It generates the following expression:

$$k_{le} = 1.15u_L^{1/3} \left( \frac{\rho_L}{\mu_L} \right)^{1/6} g^{1/6} \left( \frac{a_L^{1/3}}{L^{1/2}} \right) D_{le}^{1/2}$$

$$= 1.15u_L^{1/3} \left( \frac{1}{v_L} \right)^{1/6} g^{1/6} \left( \frac{a_L^{1/3}}{L^{1/2}} \right) C^{1/2} \left( \frac{u_L a}{v_L} \right)^{(m+1)/6} \left( \frac{\sigma}{\rho_L} \left( \frac{1}{v_L^4 g} \right)^{1/3} \right) D_L^{1/2}$$

$$= 1.15 C^{1/6} u_L^{(3+m)/6} g^{(3-n)/18} \left( \frac{a_L^{(3+m)/6}}{L^{1/2}} \right) \left( \frac{\sigma}{\rho_L} \right)^{-n/6} v_L^{-6+3m-4n/18} D_L^{1/2}$$ \hspace{1cm} (23)
The original expression for WWC (Eq. (1)) can be fully recovered by substituting the value of the constant $C=1$, exponents $m = -1$, and $n = 0$ in Eq. (23). However, in the case of a packed column, these values can differ because of the turbulent wavy nature of flow. From the solutions of wavy film flow with rolling waves, we find the exact values of exponents as $m \approx 3/4$ and $n \approx 3/7$ that can be estimated from the scaling relations (Eq. (20)), shown in Figure 4.

Substituting the value of exponents of $m$ and $n$ into Eq. (22), the eddy diffusivity can be related to the Reynolds number (Re) and Kapitza number (Ka)

$$D_L = C \text{Re}^{7/12} \text{Ka}^{-1/7} D_L,$$  \hspace{1cm} (24)

and the corresponding mass transfer coefficient ($k_{le}$) can be expressed as:

$$k_{le} = 1.15 C^{1/8} u_L^{5/8} g^{4/21} \left( \frac{a}{L} \right)^{1/7} \left( \frac{\sigma}{\rho} \right)^{-1/14} \nu_L^{-6/168} D_L^{1/2}$$

$$= 1.15 C^{1/8} u_L^{0.625} g^{0.19} \left( \frac{a}{L^{0.5}} \right)^{0.07} \nu_L^{-0.36} D_L^{1/2}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (25)

The preceding expression for effective mass transfer coefficient is based on the coupling of hydrodynamic equations and eddy diffusion. It can be quantitatively compared to the correlation derived from extensive experiments for a packed column (Eq. (2), repeated here for convenience),

$$k_{e} = 0.12 u_L^{0.65} g^{0.17} \nu_p^{-0.4} D_L^{0.5}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (26)

It is clear that the mass transfer coefficient for wavy film has significantly higher dependence on both the solvent flow rate and viscosity compared to the uniform film flow in a WWC (Eq. (1)). This dependence matches well with the correlation (Eq. (26)) developed from an experimental investigation for a packed column. The expression presented in Eq. (25) confirms the functional form of the correlation derived from the experimental observations (Eq. (26)) with a slight difference in the exponent values. The proposed mechanism, i.e., enhanced diffusivity due to wavy film flow in a packed column, reasonably captures the deviation of physical mass transfer from the WWC. Furthermore, the present expression for the mass transfer coefficient explores additional contributions from interfacial surface tension. Note that
this term is missing in the experimentally derived correlation (Eq. (26)), which highlights the impact of surface tension on the hydrodynamics, thereby influencing the mass transfer phenomena. While it may be minor for an aqueous amine-based solvent, it can be more significant for a solvent with a higher value of interfacial surface tension.

Moreover, the mass transfer coefficient can be normalized by \( D_L / (v_L^2 / g)^{1/3} \), where the term \( (v_L^2 / g)^{1/3} \) is the viscous length scale. A similar method also has been applied earlier by Yih \(^{46}\). The normalized mass transfer coefficient \( (k_{Le}^*) \) depends on several dimensionless numbers:

\[
k_{Le}^* = \frac{k_{Le}}{D_L} \left( \frac{v_L^2}{g} \right)^{1/3} = 1.15 C^{1/2} \cdot \text{Re}^{(3+m)/6} \cdot \text{Sc}^{1/2} \cdot \text{Ka}^{-n/6} \cdot \text{Ga}^{-1/6}.
\]  

(27)

Here, \( \text{Sc} = v_L / D_L \) is the Schmidt number, and \( \text{Ga} = gL^2 / v_L^2 \) is the Galileo number. In the case of a WWC, the normalized mass transfer coefficient can be obtained by substituting the value as \( C = 1, m = -1, \) and \( n = 0 \) in Eq. (27):

\[
k_{Le}^* \text{WWC} = 1.15 \cdot \text{Re}^{1/3} \cdot \text{Sc}^{1/2} \cdot \text{Ga}^{-1/6}.
\]  

(28)

Therefore, enhancement in the mass transfer for a wavy film can be expressed as:

\[
E = \frac{k_{Le}}{k_{Le}^* \text{WWC}} = C^{1/2} \cdot \text{Re}^{(1+m)/6} \cdot \text{Ka}^{-n/6}.
\]  

(29)

A greater enhancement in the mass transfer can be expected for a large Reynolds number and small Kapitza number because \( m > 0 \) and \( n > 0 \) for a wavy film flow with rolling waves.

3. Numerical Modeling

3.1 Mathematical formulation and numerical Scheme

Multiphase flow simulations for mass transfer of a WWC and zigzag column (ZZC) are performed using the VOF method \(^{48}\) to verify the analytical derivation of the physical mass transfer in the previous section. Physical mass transfer across the interface is modeled by a gas dissolution model based on the Rayleigh–Plesset equation available in Star-CCM\(^*\). This method is fully explained in the Star-CCM\(^*\) User Guide \(^{49}\) with only a brief outline provided here. The governing equations for flow are as follows:
\[ \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0, \quad (30) \]

\[ \frac{\partial (\rho \mathbf{u})}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}) = -\nabla p + \mu \nabla \cdot \left( \nabla \mathbf{u} + \left( \nabla \mathbf{u} \right)^T \right) + \rho \mathbf{g} + \mathbf{F}, \quad (31) \]

where \( p \) is pressure and \( g \) is the gravitational acceleration. The surface tension force, \( \mathbf{F} \), which produces a jump in the normal across the interface, is expressed as a singular body force. The terms \( \rho \) and \( \mu \) are the phase average density and viscosity, respectively. The surface tension force (\( \mathbf{F} \)) appears at the gas-liquid interface and is implemented through the continuous surface force (CSF) model:

\[ \mathbf{F} = \sigma \frac{\rho \kappa \nabla \alpha}{\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( \rho_s + \rho_l \right)}, \quad (32) \]

where \( \sigma \) is the interfacial tension, \( \kappa \) is the local curvature of the interface, \( \alpha \) is the volume fraction of the liquid phase, and \( \nabla \alpha \) can be related to the normal vector that is perpendicular to the interface. The curvature \( \kappa \) is computed by the divergence of the unit normal \( \hat{n} = \nabla \alpha / \| \nabla \alpha \| \) at the interface,

\[ \kappa = \nabla \cdot \hat{n} \quad (33) \]

The interface between the phases is captured by solving an additional transport equation (34), where the value of \( \alpha \) is between 0 to 1,

\[ \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial t} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \alpha = 0. \quad (34) \]

Equation (34) is solved only for the liquid phase, and the volume fraction of the other phase is computed as \((1-\alpha)\).

The transient flow simulations are conducted using the implicit scheme in a commercial CFD code Star-CCM+49. In the implicit scheme, specified number time step involves multiple inner iterations to converge the solution. The integration scheme marches inner iterations using pseudo-time steps according to specified value of the Courant number (CO) for stable and converged simulations. The segregated solver was used that solves each of the momentum equations in turn, one for each dimension. The coupling between the momentum and continuity equations is achieved with a predictor-corrector
approach based on the Rhie and Chow interpolation scheme in conjunction with SIMPLE (Semi-Implicit Method for Pressure-Linked Equations) algorithm \(^5\) for pressure-velocity coupling. The second-order upwind scheme is used in the spatial discretization of all equations. An implicit solution scheme is used in conjunction with an algebraic multigrid method (AMG) for accelerating convergence of the solver.

### 3.2 Problem setup and grid independency test

We have investigated the influence of solvent viscosity on the mass transfer for both wavy film and uniform film flows in a WWC and a ZZC. The wavy film having rolling waves is introduced via harmonically excited periodic actuations at the solvent inlet. The geometry of WWC is considered from our previous studies \(^3\), \(^7\). The ZZC is selected for its two-dimensional (2D) representation of structured packed columns. A similar approach also has been considered earlier for 2D representation of the structured packed column for investigating the hydrodynamics of countercurrent flow \(^2\), \(^3\). Figure 5 depicts the schematic of the WWC and ZZC column designs and their dimensions. Both columns are placed vertically and gravity acts in a downward direction. Dimension (height and width) of the WWC and ZZC geometries are kept the same to compare the mass transfer coefficient for both cases. The inlet and outlet of the gas and liquid phases have 1 mm widths. This inlet and outlet size is selected based on a previous WWC study \(^3\).

The computational flow domain is developed and meshed in StarCCM\(^+\). To accurately and efficiently capture the physical mass transfer phenomenon between phases, the domain is discretized using very fine mesh. The mesh density proximate to the left wall where liquid falls appears finer than in the adjacent region for the surrounding gas. A more refined mesh also is required in the inflexion region near the zigzag channel apex to capture the flow behavior (see the exploded view of dark region of the mesh domain in Figure 5(c)). A resolution sensitivity study was also conducted to determine a reasonable mesh while maintaining grid independent predictions. Only the grid across the width of the inlet and left wall was varied, as opposed to the whole domain, as mass transfer phenomenon occurs proximate to the left wall of the flow domain where the inlet was located. The value of physical mass transfer coefficient was evaluated for the case \(\mu_L = 1 \text{ cP}, \quad D_L = 1.3 \times 10^{-9} \text{ m}^2/\text{s}, \quad u_L = 0.17 \text{ m/s} \quad \text{and} \quad u_G = \)
0.049 m/s at different grid resolutions. The grid resolution is varied from 30 grid points (GP) across the width of the inlet region to 80 GP. The value of the physical mass transfer coefficient does not substantially change with resolutions greater than 60 GP (see Table 1). For numerical simulation of diffusive mass transfer, grid size near the interfacial region needs to be lower than the mass diffusion length scale ($\sqrt{4D_t L}$). The exposure time ($t$) was calculated from the interfacial velocity (maximum velocity) and height of the column. The grid size near the film region corresponds to 60GP was 16 $\mu$m which is lower than the minimum diffusion length scale (27 $\mu$m). Therefore, the grid size was assumed to be sufficient for the flow simulation. Because of very small grid size, flow simulations require a tiny time step ($\Delta t \sim 10^{-6} - 10^{-5}$ sec) to satisfy the Courant–Friedrichs–Lewy (CFL) condition for stability with a Courant number = 0.50. As a result, flow simulations become quite expensive computationally.

**Table 1: Variation of the Physical mass transfer coefficient ($k_L$) with grid resolutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grid points at inlet width</th>
<th>$k_L$ (m/s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.225E-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>8.403E-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.842E-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.776E-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>4.982E-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.388E-05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Countercurrent flow simulations have been conducted for the multicomponent gas (air and nitrous oxide, N$_2$O) and amine-based solvents ($\rho_L = 1058 \text{ kg/m}^3$) as working fluids. The solvent viscosity is varied over a wide range ($\mu_L \sim 1 - 10 \text{ cP}$) to investigate its direct impact on the mass transfer between two phases. The gas phase has a density of ($\rho_g$) $1 \text{ kg/m}^3$ and viscosity ($\mu_g$) of 0.015 cP. The diffusivities of N$_2$O in the air and solvent are specified as $D_G = 1.67 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$ and $D_L = 1.3 \times 10^{-9} \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$, respectively. The solvent enters the domain at the top (1) and exits the bottom (3) because of gravity. Both uniform (0.17 m/s) and oscillating velocity profiles [0.17(1 +
0.05\sin(2\pi ft) \text{ m/sec} \) and \( f = 60 \text{ Hz} \) are prescribed at the solvent inlet to introduce the flat film flow and wavy film flow, respectively. On the other hand, uniform gas inlet velocity (0.049 m/s) with N₂O concentration of 13.31 \text{ mol/m}^3 is specified at the bottom (see gas inlet (4) in Figure 5 (a and b). The outlet of both phases is specified as a pressure outlet with zero gauge pressure. The remaining boundaries, including zigzag sheet, are defined as a no-slip wall with a static contact angle (γ) of 40°. The benchmark results correspond to fixed liquid flow rates. In that case, a flow rate of \( u_L = 0.17 \text{ m/s} \) and \( u_G = 0.049 \text{ m/s} \) ensure a stable film flow with a smooth interface for a flat surface. The simulation cases are summarized in Table 2.

**Table 2: Details of the cases in flow simulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solvent Viscosity (cP)</th>
<th>Wetted wall column (WWC)</th>
<th>Zigzag column (ZZC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flat film flow with uniform flow rate</td>
<td>Wavy film flow with oscillating flow rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ~ 10</td>
<td>UWWC</td>
<td>OWWC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Results and Discussion**

Analytical and numerical studies have been conducted for the mass transfer via physical absorption in a countercurrent gas-liquid flow. To explain its impact on the mass transfer coefficient, the flow simulations have been conducted for a range of solvent viscosity (1–10 cP) for uniform and harmonically excited oscillating periodic inlet flow. In the simulations, we only consider the direct effect of solvent viscosity that affects the hydrodynamics. The indirect impact of viscosity on the mass transfer coefficient via viscosity-dependent diffusivity is not included, which involves the relations between diffusivity and viscosity of the solvents. The simulated results are presented in terms of dimensionless numbers: Reynolds, Kapitza, Schmidt, and Galileo numbers. These numbers already are defined in the previous section.
4.1 Comparison with experiment for hydrodynamics of wavy film flow

The present study involves a complex problem of the physical mass transfer via absorption in wavy film flow in a packed column. Accordingly, preliminary simulations were conducted for validation against experimental studies for wavy film flow\textsuperscript{19,52} and physical mass transfer in wetted wall column\textsuperscript{38}. The CFD simulations are first compared with those from experiment and DNS studies by Denner et al\textsuperscript{19} to validate the flow prediction for studying wavy film falling over inclined plate. The same method has already been quantitatively validated for studying film flown down an inclined flat plate in our previous studies\textsuperscript{8}. Specifically, simulations results for wetted area and film thickness were compared against experiment measurements of Hoffmann et al\textsuperscript{53} and predictions from Nusselt theory\textsuperscript{45}, respectively\textsuperscript{8}. Subsequently validation for wavy film flow, the experimental work by Denner et al\textsuperscript{19} for wavy film over a inclined plate was chosen. Similar to the numerical studies by Denner et al\textsuperscript{19}, 2-D flow simulations were conducted in a domain having dimension of $400 \times 15 \text{mm}^2$ and $20^\circ$ inclination angle to the horizontal (see Figure 6(a)). A harmonically excited periodically varying flow rate (frequency $f = 7 \text{ Hz}$ and amplitude $A=10\%$ from the mean) is specified at the inlet of the flow domain. Top and outlet of the flow domain was specified as pressure outlet boundary with zero gauge pressure. The bottom, i.e. plate was specified as no slip wall with $10^\circ$ contact angle. A semi-parabolic velocity profile (35) is specified in the film regime at the inlet whereas remaining portions of inlet was specified as zero velocity.

$$u = \frac{3y}{2h_N} \left(2 - \frac{y}{h_N}\right) \left(1 + A \sin(2\pi ft)\right) u_N \quad \text{for } 0 \leq y \leq h_N$$

$$h_N < y \leq H$$

Here, $h_N$ and $u_N$ are the film thickness and film velocity computed from Nusselt theory\textsuperscript{45} for uniform film flow as

$$h_N = \left(\frac{3\nu^2 \text{Re}}{g \sin \beta}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \quad \text{and} \quad u_N = \frac{g \sin \beta h_N^2}{3\nu}$$

The air was chosen as gas phase having density of $1.205 \text{ kg/m}^3$ and viscosity of $1.82 \times 10^{-5} \text{ Pa.s}$. Aqueous glycerol solutions at three concentrations (A: 45\% by weight, B: 65\% by weight and C: 45\% by weight...
weight) were used in the experiments. The physical properties and liquid flow rates are shown in the Table 3. Consistent with experiments, film velocity and film thickness and wave speed were measured at the 256 mm downstream from the inlet of flow domain.

**Table 3: Input parameters and physical properties of the aqueous glycerol solution used in the simulation for wavy film flow over an inclined plate.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>$\rho$ ($Kg/m^3$)</th>
<th>$\mu$ (mPas)</th>
<th>$\sigma$ (mN/m)</th>
<th>Ka</th>
<th>Re</th>
<th>$h_N$ (m)</th>
<th>$u_N$ (m/s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.00261</td>
<td>0.1231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>1169</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.00118</td>
<td>0.0997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>1169</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>0.00166</td>
<td>0.1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>0.00072</td>
<td>0.0997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>0.00110</td>
<td>0.2359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>0.00125</td>
<td>0.3013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>0.00132</td>
<td>0.3369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CFD-predicted shape of the wave ($f=0.50$) was then qualitatively compared with that of the experiment. As shown in Figures 6 (b-d), the normalized maximum film thickness ($h_{max}/h_N$), normalized minimum film thickness ($h_{min}/h_N$) and normalized wave speed ($c/u_N$) computed from the CFD reasonably matches with the experimental and DNS studies by Denner et al. The maximum and minimum film thickness matches excellently with the experiments and DNS studies at low Re value ($\leq 20$). A similar trend for the valuation of these quantiles with Re was observed at all Re and Ka values in CFD, experimental and DNS studies.

Figure 7 compares the CFD predicted normalized velocity ($u/u_N$) inside the film with corresponding ones from experimental and DNS studies by Denner et al at three locations of the rolling wave for two cases namely B1 and C4. The locations: tail (L1), crest (L2) and front (L3) of the rolling wave are presented in the top of Figure 7. The predicted velocity profiles matches well with the experimental and DNS studies by Denner et al. In particular, the predicted velocity profile excellently matches with DNS for all cases. A slightly discrepancy in the velocity profile is observed at higher
Reynolds number (=77). As shown by Charogiannis et al\textsuperscript{54}, flow field inside the film strongly depends on the local wave shape that quickly vary in space at higher Re value. Subsequently, a small difference in the measuring location can results in a noticeable change in the velocity profile. Subsequently, a small discrepancy in the velocity profile can be seen at Re=77. Overall, present CFD prediction matches well for film height, wave speed and velocity profile in the liquid film with experiments and DNS studies.

4.2 Comparison with experiment for physical mass transfer in wetted wall column

After successful validation of the CFD prediction for wavy film flow, CFD simulations were further validated for physical mass transfer phenomenon. In our previous study of physical mass transfer in the wetted wall column \textsuperscript{38, 55}, VOF prediction for physical mass transfer coefficient were found to compare well with the experimental results. To ensure reliability of the present simulation, the predicted results are quality and quantitatively compared with those obtained from experiments. Wang et al \textsuperscript{38, 55} conducted experiments to transport of N\textsubscript{2}O into MEA solvents on a WWC to generate data for WWC validation. Measurements were performed using a custom-built WWC apparatus consisting of a stainless-steel tube contained within a cylinder. Gas enters the column through three 1/8-inch tubes spaced evenly around the annulus’ perimeter. The gas flows upward, contacting a liquid film falling down the outside of the tube, then exits through a ¼-inch tube at the top. Gases are delivered to the column from cylinders via mass flow controllers (MFC). The shift in concentration while the gas is routed through the column then is used to deduce the rate at which the gas is being absorbed by the column. Gas composition of the stream exiting the WWC was analyzed using a quadrupole mass spectrometer sampling at atmospheric pressure. The mass spectrometer provides an analysis of gas composition at four-second intervals. Because CO\textsubscript{2} and N\textsubscript{2}O both have an atomic mass of 44, N\textsubscript{2}O is analyzed on the mass spectrometer at mass 30, corresponding to a nitric oxide (NO) splitting peak.

Based on the experimental studies, countercurrent flow simulations were conducted with same parameters in wetted wall column. The input controlled parameters and corresponding value of the experimentally measured physical mass transfer coefficient are presented in the Table 4. As shown in the
Table 4, the physical mass transfer coefficient was evaluated for a wide range of gas and liquid loads, CO₂ loadings and MEA mass fractions in the aqueous solvents. The flow simulations were conducted for a sufficiently long time as to achieve pseudo-steady state for wetted area of the plate and solvent mass flow at the exit. The physical mass transfer coefficient was calculated when flow simulation achieved pseudo-steady state and further compared with corresponding value from the experiment. Figure 8 shows the comparison between the CFD predicted values of physical mass transfer coefficient with corresponding experimental values. The data points scatters around the dashed line. Note that the slope of the dashed line is one correspond to the perfect matching. The difference between the CFD predicted results and experimental results are within 20%. Overall, the CFD results for physical mass transfer coefficient reasonably matches with experiments.

Table 4: Input parameters and experimental value of the Physical mass transfer coefficient for absorption of N₂O in MEA in wetted wall column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Temperature</th>
<th>MEA Fraction</th>
<th>CO₂ Loading</th>
<th>Flow Rate</th>
<th>N₂O Conc.</th>
<th>Henry’s Constant</th>
<th>Diffusivity (×E-09)</th>
<th>k_L (×E-05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>0.4267</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>0.4410</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.4665</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td>0.5367</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>0.3550</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>0.3424</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.4817</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.4127</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.3648</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>0.4355</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.4134</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>0.3767</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After successful validation of CFD prediction for hydrodynamics of wavy film flow over an inclined plate and physical mass transfer in wetted wall column, flow simulation were further conducted to investigate the impact of the viscosity on physical mass transfer.

4.3 **Film thickness**

The film thickness is a critical factor that impacts the overall efficiency of the column by wet pressure drop across the column. A thin film facilitates the mass transfer between the gas and liquid phases. In addition, it also dedicates the heat transfer between the solvents and wall. In this context, computation of the film thickness is performed first. The effect of viscosity on the film thickness is presented in terms of Kapitza number, a dimensionless number that depends only on the solvent properties. Figure 9(a) shows the variation of film thickness with viscosity for a uniform film flow in WWC and ZZC (UWWC and UZZC). As expected, film thickness increases with increased viscosity for both cases. The predicted value of the film thickness \( \delta \) matches well with the corresponding value computed from the Nusselt theory \(^{45}\). A slightly discrepancy in the value of film thickness is observed at low viscosity \( \mu \leq 2 \text{cP} \). This may be due to the triangular shape of the channel that causes little instability in the film flow. The film velocity accelerates at the tip and retards in the trough region to satisfy flow continuity. However, the magnitude of the discrepancy in the film thickness is considered to be negligible. At higher viscosity, both show almost same \( \delta \) value. Note that the damping of turbulent eddies within the liquid film near both the liquid and solid surface is governed mainly by viscosity \(^{46}\). Subsequently, smooth and uniform film appears in both cases (UWWC and UZZC).

Next, the film thickness is normalized by the viscous length scale as \( \delta^* = \delta/(\nu L^2/g)^{1/3} \). Figure 9(b) shows the variation of \( \delta^* \) with Kapitza number for a UWWC. Kapitza number (Ka) is a representation of the ratio of the surface tension force to inertia force. The major advantage of the Kapitza number is that it depends only the physical properties, therefore, it has fixed value for a given solvent properties. The Kapitza number was used for explaining the film thickness and mass transfer for a falling film down an inclined plate. The normalized film thickness increases with an increased Kapitza number. However,
absolute value of the film thickness varies the other way, i.e decreases with increased value of Kapitza number. Note that a higher value of Kapitza number corresponds to a lower value of solvent viscosity. It also shows a scaling relation \( \delta^* \sim K a^{3/4} \). Earlier, Singh et al. \(^8\) presented similar scaling for film falling over an inclined plate. Film thickness also has been reported to increase with solvent viscosity \(^8,56\), which is consistent with the Nusselt theory \(^45\). As mentioned earlier, film stability is governed by the competing effects between various forces acting on it. At high viscosity, enhanced viscous forces act against gravity and make the film more stable \(^27\). As a result, film thickness increases.

As already mentioned, flow simulations have been conducted for the oscillating inlet. Because of the oscillating inlet velocity, a wavy film appears. Wang et al. \(^38\) observe that wavelength (\( \lambda \)) of the wavy film decreases with increased frequency (\( f \)) for OWWCs. The pronounced impact of the frequency is visible at \( f = 60 \) Hz. Accordingly, \( f = 60 \) Hz is chosen in the flow simulations for all viscosities. The wavelengths of the wavy film are computed and compared for both WWCs and ZZCs. The computed value of the wavelength also can be normalized as \( \lambda^* = \lambda/(v_f^2/g)^{1/3} \). Figure 10 shows the variation \( \lambda^* \) with \( K a \). As expected, the normalized wavelength increases with the increased value of Kapitza number for both cases. Note that the lower value of Kapitza number corresponds to higher viscosity. As noted, viscosity stabilizes the film and acts as damping factors for wave. Furthermore, the normalized wavelength \( \lambda^* \) value is almost the same for both case, except slight discrepancy is observed at a higher value of Kapitza number.

### 4.4 Mass transfer coefficient

In this section, we consider the mass transfer from gas to liquid phase due to physical absorption. The 2D simulation using the VOF method of co-current gas-liquid flow in the structure packed column is conducted to compute the interfacial mass transfer \(^35\). The mass transfer is not directly affected by the recirculation in the liquid side under corrugation cavities. Indeed, the chemical species only penetrate in a very thin concentration layer. Thus, the transfer process is controlled by the diffusion/advection at the film interface.
The methodology for computing the mass transfer coefficient is the same as in Wang et al. and is only briefly presented here. The mass transfer coefficient \( k_L \) for physical transport via absorption is calculated using standard formula

\[
k_L = \frac{j}{\Delta \rho},
\]

(37)

where \( J \) is the mass transfer flux (mol/m\(^2\)-s) at the gas-liquid interface and \( \Delta \rho \) is the driving force computed as:

\[
\Delta \rho = \frac{P_{N_2O,in} - P_{N_2O,out}}{\ln\left(\frac{P_{N_2O,in}}{P_{N_2O,out}}\right)}.
\]

(38)

Applying the ideal gas law, \( \Delta \rho \) can be written in terms of the concentration of the N\(_2\)O at the gas inlet and outlet:

\[
\Delta \rho = \frac{(C_{N_2O,in} - C_{N_2O,out})RT}{\ln\left(C_{N_2O,in} / C_{N_2O,out}\right)},
\]

(39)

where \( R \) is the ideal gas constant (J/K·mol) and \( T \) is the temperature in the unit of K. To compare the numerically computed value of the mass transfer coefficient with an analytically calculated one, the unit of the mass transfer is converted to m/s.

Figure 11 shows the variation of the mass transfer coefficients with viscosity for uniform inlet velocity (UWWC and UZZC) of \( u_L = 0.17 \) m/s. The UZZC shows higher mass transfer coefficient (especially at small viscosity) when compared to the WWC. This effect is due to the packing geometry and can be explained by the flow field in the packed column in Figure 12. Note that hydrodynamics plays a critical role in the mass transfer. In Figure 12(a), the recirculation zone is seen in the gas side for the UZZC. The recirculation zone enhances the convection. On the other hand, recirculation is absent in case of wetted wall column (see Figure 12(b)). The stream line is parallel to the gas liquid interface. Note that the hydrodynamics significantly impact the mass transfer phenomenon. Previous studies by Haroun et al. also uncovered a similar observation. The mass transfer is found to be higher for a triangular channel as compared to a corresponding one for flat liquid film.
Further, effects of the gas flow rate \((u_G)\) on the physical mass transfer coefficient were extensively investigated. Flow simulations were conducted for three solvent viscosities (1cP, 5cP and 10cP) at \(u_L = 0.17 \text{ m/s} \), \(D_L = 1.3 \times 10^{-9} \text{ m}^2/\text{s}\) and different gas velocities. The range of the gas flow rate was considered according to the controlled design condition. Figure 13 shows the variation of physical mass transfer coefficient with gas velocity for three values of solvent viscosity. As expected, the value of physical mass transfer coefficient decreases with increased value of solvent viscosity at all gas flow rates. On the other hand, the physical mass transfer coefficient slightly increases and then achieves nearly constant values with increased gas velocity. Overall, gas velocity has marginal impact on the mass transfer coefficients. A similar observation was drawn by Aroonwilas et al.\(^{57, 58}\) and Tan et al.\(^{59}\). They also observed insignificant effect of gas flow rate on the overall mass transfer coefficient using aqueous 2-amino-2-methyl-1-propanol (AMP) solvent. The mass transfer phenomenon is controlled by the liquid phase resistance; subsequently diffusion of solvent molecules in the liquid phase was restricted. As a result, amount of CO\(_2\) absorbed by solvent remains nearly constant regardless the change in gas flow rates.

Figure 14 shows the variation of \(k_L\) with solvent viscosity for both uniform and wavy film flows in WWC and ZZC. As expected, the mass transfer coefficient decreases with increased solvent viscosity in all four cases. Here, wavy film flow shows steep variation with viscosity for both ZZC and WWC. The difference between \(k_L\) for wavy and uniform film is observed to be higher (35% at \(\mu = 1 \text{ cP}\)) at lower viscosity. At higher viscosity, the difference in \(k_L\) values becomes small (nearly same at \(\mu = 10 \text{ cP}\)). Increased value of solvent viscosity damps the initial actuation in wavy film flow in the flow field. On the other hand, interfacial surface tension and gravitational forces dominate the viscous force at small viscosity. As a result, eddies at the interface occurs and promotes the mass transfer, in addition to higher interfacial area. Effect of the wavy film is found to be more pronounced in WWC than in ZZC. In the ZZC, the maximum difference of \(k_L\) between wavy and uniform film was found to be around 20%. In the
ZZC, acceleration of the solvent near the crest and subsequent retardation proximate to trough can mitigates the inlet flow actuation.

In Figure 15(a), we compare the variation of the mass transfer coefficient with viscosity for expression (25) and numerically compute one at a fixed solvent and gas flow rate and wide range of viscosity ($\mu \sim 1 - 10 \text{ cP}$), where $C = 0.115$ corresponds to wetted wall column. The value of $C$ might be different for the structured packed column where flow is generally considered to be more chaotic. Both plots match reasonably well, except the analytically derived expression shows slightly steep variation, i.e., higher exponent value (-0.36). In addition, the scaling for $k_L$ with solvent viscosity shows a scaling relation $k_L \sim \nu_L^{-0.34}$ for wavy film in the OWWC (see Figure 15(b)). This is nearly the same as the exponent value -0.36 in Eq. (25), as well as the experimental observation (-0.4 in Eq. (26)) by Song et al. 2, 24.

5. Conclusion

Post combustion carbon capture via solvent absorption in a packed column is a promising technology for mitigation of the greenhouse gas emissions. Absorption is carried out through countercurrent gas-liquid flow in a packed column. The mass transfer between the gas and liquid phases plays a critical role in determining the column height. Recent experiments have found the direct impact of viscosity on mass transfer is larger for a packed column ($k_L \sim \mu^{-0.40}$) compared to WWC ($k_L \sim \mu^{-0.17}$). In principle, this direct influence of viscosity on the mass transfer coefficient may be due to the liquid turbulence enhanced mass transfer in a packed column. In this context, detailed analytical studies and numerical simulations have been conducted to explain the underlying physics behind such discrepancy.

Wavy film flow is proposed as a plausible mechanism responsible for the discrepancy and expressions for eddy-enhanced diffusivity, and the mass transfer coefficient for wavy film falling over a flat plate is derived based on the hydrodynamic and mass transfer equations. It demonstrates a higher dependence of mass transfer on viscosity and solvent flow rate in accordance to the experiment. In addition, to investigate the direct impact of viscosity on the mass transfer coefficient, multiphase flow
Simulations have been conducted for WWCs and ZZCs. ZZC was chosen for its 2D representation of a structured packed column. CFD prediction for the hydrodynamics of wavy film flow matches well with corresponding experiments and DNS studies by Denner et al\textsuperscript{19}. Further, predicted physical mass transfer was found to compare well with previous experimental studies for wetted wall column by Wang et al\textsuperscript{18}. The predicted value of average film thickness ($\delta_{av}$) matches well with Nusselt theory. The value of $\delta_{av}$ increases with increased value of solvent viscosity. For a periodic wavy film, the normalized wavelength increases with increased Kapitza number i.e. decreased viscosity. The WWC and ZZC show almost identical wavelength values, except at low viscosity where the WWC showed a slightly higher value. Notably, the mass transfer coefficient for a wavy film shows larger dependence on the viscosity compared to a flat uniform film, which is true for both WWC and ZZC. This dependence from simulations ($k_L \sim \nu_L^{-m}$), $m = 0.35$ reasonably agrees with that found in both analytical ($m = 0.36$) and experimental ($m = 0.40$) studies.
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Figure 1: Schematic description of a wavy film falling over a vertical plate, where $u$ and $v$ are vertical and horizontal velocity, respectively. The falling film with an average thickness $\delta_0$ can be described by a rolling wave with an amplitude $A$, a wavelength $\lambda$, and a wave speed $u_w$. 
Figure 2: Variation of normalized wave amplitude ($A/\lambda$) with ratio of wave velocity components ($V_y/V_x$) at different Reynolds numbers. It shows the linear scaling ($A/\lambda \sim V_y/V_x$) and independent of Reynolds number.
**Figure 3:** (a) Variation of the normalized wave amplitude ($A/\lambda$) with Reynolds number at $Ka=2850$. (b) Variation of ($A/\lambda$) with $Ka$ at two Reynolds numbers shows that normalized amplitude decreases with increased Kapitza number.
Figure 4: Variation of normalized wave amplitude with Reynolds and Kapitza numbers shows the scaling $A/\lambda \sim Re^{0.78}K^{-0.47}$. The exponents of the fitting for Re and Ka reasonably match the previous studies by Shkadov.¹
Figure 5: Schematic of flow domain showing the inlet and outlet positions for both phases: (a) wetted wall column and (b) zigzag column as 2D representative of structured packings. The inlet and outlet of both phases have 1 mm width. (c) The dark region at the left in the exploded view of the discretized domain shows very fine mesh to capture the mass transfer phenomenon.
Figure 6: (a) Schematic of the computational flow domain used for validation shows the direction of rolling waves on an inclined flat plat. The flow dolman has dimension of L×H and 20° inclination angle. Comparison of the present predicted (CFD) normalized (b) maximum film thickness, $h_{\text{max}}/h_N$, (c) minimum film thickness, $h_{\text{min}}/h_N$, (d) wave speed, $c/u_N$, with corresponding ones for experiments (Exp) and DNS simulation by Denner at al\textsuperscript{18} at $f=7$ Hz and different Re values.
Figure 7: Comparison of the CFD predicted velocity profile with corresponding ones from Experiments and DNS by Denner at al\textsuperscript{18} at three locations (a) tail, L1 (b) crest, L2 and (c) front, L3 of the rolling wave for two cases, A1 and C4. The vertical position is normalized by local firm thickness (h(x)). The velocity is normalized by the Nusselt flat film velocity (u_n). The position of tail, crest and front are shown at the top.
Figure 8: Comparison of the CFD predicted physical mass transfer coefficient with corresponding experimental value at different cases presented in the Table 3.
Figure 9: (a) Plot shows variation of the film thickness ($\delta$) with solvent viscosity ($\mu_L$) for the wetted wall column. Predicted value of the film thickness matches well with Nusselt theory [34]. (b) Variation of the normalized film thickness with Kapitza number. Inset of the Figure (b) shows the scaling relation of $\delta^* \sim Ka^{1/4}$. 
Figure 10: Plot shows variation of the normalized wavelength ($\lambda^*$) of a periodic wavy film with Kapitza number (Ka) for WWC and ZZC. Inset shows the wavy film (red color) and method to compute wavelength.
Figure 11: Variation of the mass transfer coefficient ($k_L$) with solvent viscosity ($\mu_L$) wetted wall column and zigzag column in the case of a smooth and uniform film. The unit of the
Figure 12: (a) Exploded view in the triangular channel shows velocity streamline and concentration distribution in the flow domain. It also illustrates the recirculation zones on the gas side due to triangular geometry. (b) Velocity streamline and concentration distribution in wetted wall column does not shows the flow recirculation zone and streamline are parallel to the wall.
Figure 13: Effect of the gas flow rates on the physical mass transfer coefficient for uniform film flow in zigzag column at three values of solvent’s viscosity. The physical mass transfer coefficient initially increases marginally and then becomes independent of gas flow rate.
Figure 14: Variation of the mass transfer coefficient \((k_L)\) with solvent viscosity \((\mu_L)\) for smooth and wavy film flow in: (a) wetted wall column and (b) zigzag column. Prefix U: Uniform and O: Oscillatory Inlet.
Figure 15: (a) Comparison of the variation of the mass transfer coefficient with solvent viscosity for analytically derived expression (Equation 25) and CFD simulations for OWWC. Both reasonably show the same trend of the variation of mass transfer coefficient with viscosity. (b) Variation of the mass transfer coefficient ($k_L$) with solvent viscosity ($v_L$) shows a scaling $k_L \sim v_L^{-0.34}$ for OWWC.