Using Machine Learning to Estimate Bubble Size in Turbulent Bubbly Flows
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1. Introduction

The two-fluid model based on Eulerian-Eulerian approach has been widely used for simulating two-phase flows in many industrial applications [1]. However, the two-fluid approach needs accurate modeling for interfacial momentum exchange such as drag, shear-induced lift, and wall-induced lift. In particular, it is important to accurately model the interfacial area (or bubble size) in bubbly pipe flow. Hence, there have been many studies on modeling of bubble size so far. However, the bubble size has not been well estimated because it is closely associated with the complex turbulent flow. Recently, the methods of machine learning are proven to be extensively and successfully used in many areas [2,3], so they could provide us a useful tool in modelling the bubble size in turbulent bubbly flows. Therefore, we aim to investigate the applicability of machine learning for estimating the bubble size in turbulent bubbly flows and evaluate its accuracy.

2. Methods and Results

2.1 Machine learning and training

In the present study, the artificial neural network (ANN) is considered as the method of machine learning. Generally, the ANN is composed of two procedures called training and testing as shown in Fig. 1. In the training procedure, the ANN is trained and optimized by training data composed of input and target output. Then, in the testing procedure, with the ANN built in the training procedure, the fitted output value is determined corresponding to certain input data.

For the training, the target output and input variables should be chosen. In the present study, the Sauter mean diameter is output variable because it is typically used to estimate the bubble size in bubbly flows.

As the training data, the data provided by Hibiki et al. (2001) were used. As the activation function, Hyperbolic tangent function is considered because it is most widely used and known to predict nonlinear problems well. Also, it is used in optimization of connection strength Adam algorithm which is efficient in the cases with more than one hidden layer.

For the training, the data provided by Hibiki et al. (2001) were used. As the training data, the flow condition of \( J_f = 0.986 \text{m/s} \) is considered. Table 1 shows the results of sensitivity study on the number of neurons. In this study, the number of neurons in each hidden layer remains the same. With increasing the number of neurons up to 12, the relative maximum and mean errors decrease. However, with the further increase in the number of neurons, they increase a little. So based on this result, the number of neurons is selected to be 12.

Table 1. Results of sensitivity study on the number of neurons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of neuron</th>
<th>Relative max error (%)</th>
<th>Relative mean error (%)</th>
<th>Correlation coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.9998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0056</td>
<td>0.0017</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
domain is $2800\text{mm}(x) \times 25.4\text{mm}(r)$, and the number of grid points is $1400(x) \times 80(r)$.

Under the assumption of 2D axisymmetric flow, developing flow is simulated. At inlet, the seventh power law (of single-phase turbulent pipe flow) is used for water and air velocity profiles, and the uniform void fraction is adopted. At the outlet, a pressure boundary condition is prescribed.

Fig. 3 shows the distribution of void fraction at a fully-developed location. The data of Hibiki et al. (2001) measured at $x/D=53.5$ and the RANS results with the correlation suggested by Hibiki & Ishii (2002) are included for comparison. For the testing data, the case of $J_g = 0.473 \text{ m/s}$ was chosen among those of $J_f = 0.986 \text{m/s}$. As shown in Fig. 3, the results with the bubble size model based on the present ANN are in good agreement with the experiment of Hibiki et al. (2001), and show better performance than those with the correlation.

3. Conclusions

In this study, we investigated the artificial neural network (ANN) approach to estimate the bubble size in turbulent bubbly flows. For both the training and testing procedures, Hibiki et al. (2001)'s data were considered. Both the training and testing procedures showed that the present ANN model could estimate bubble size quite well in turbulent bubbly flows. In the future, we will consider further training and testing of ANN with more data available in the literature as well as from our own numerical and experimental studies.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This study was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) grant funded by the Korea government (2017M2A8A4018482).

REFERENCES