

Granular Activated Carbon Sound Absorption Calculation with Measured Particle Parameters

Huawei Yang^{1,2}, Tongyang Shi¹





¹ Institute of Acoustics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, No. 21 North 4th Ring Road, Haidian District, 100190 Beijing, People's Republic of China

²University of Chinese Academy of Sciences



Table of Contens

01. Introduction

03. Simulation Result

02. Modeling Method

04. Conclusion



PART 01 Introduction

Hierarchical Porous Particles

- Typical Hierarchical Porous Particle
- Activated Carbon

Zeolite





Macro-pore: r > 50nm



Micro-pore: r < 2nm

Meso-pore: 2nm < r < 50nm

Silica Gel





• Adsorption effect decreases the modulus of air, then slow down the speed of sound



Sound Absorption Comparison



• Same thickness AC shows better sound absorption compared with fibrous material







$\eta \nabla^2 \mathbf{u} - \nabla p = j \omega \rho_0 \mathbf{u}$ conservation of momentum $\kappa \nabla^2 \tau + j\omega p = j\omega \rho_0 C_p \tau$ conservation of energy $pP_0^{-1} = \tau \tau_0^{-1} + \rho \rho_0^{-1}$ state equation $\frac{j\omega p^{(0)}}{E(\omega, \mathrm{Kn}, k_a, k_d)} = \nabla_x \cdot \frac{\mathbf{k}(\omega, \mathrm{Kn})}{\eta} \nabla_x p^{(0)}$ $j\omega(\rho + \rho_a) + \rho_0 \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0$ conservation of mass $\mathbf{u} = -c_{v}l_{mean}(\mathbf{t}_{1} \cdot (\nabla \mathbf{u}) \cdot \mathbf{n})\mathbf{t}_{1} \text{ on } \Gamma_{s}$ Slip boundary condition $\tau = 2c_t \gamma(\gamma + 1)^{-1} \operatorname{Pr}^{-1} l_{\text{mean}} (\nabla \tau \cdot \mathbf{n}) \operatorname{on} \Gamma_s$ temperature jump boundary condition $\rho_a = k_a k_d \rho_N \omega_a^{-1} (j\omega + \omega_a)^{-1} p$ Langmuir model

Rigid Granular Activated Carbon Model

Model Input Parameters



| ϕ_p | Inter-particle porosity | Part of the parameters are from inverse fitting 1.Can we get those parameter directly? | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| <i>r</i> _p [mm] | Particle radius | | |
| ϕ_m | Meso-pore porosity | | |
| <i>r_m</i> [µm] | Meso-pore radius | | |
| ϕ_n | Micro-pore porosity | | |
| <i>r_n</i> [nm] | Micro-pore radius | 2.Design the particle for better acoustics performance | |
| $b \times 10^{6} [1/Pa]$ | Langmuir constant | | |



PART 02 Material Parameter Measurement

Pore Size Analyzer





Pore Volume Comparison



| | | PC-K14E | PC-K15E | PC-K20E |
|----------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| | Particle Size [µm] | [300,600] | [300,600] | [300,600] |
| [cm^3/g] | 0,5 | ■ PC-K14E ■ 0,8895 0,827 0,71 | PC-K15E PCK20I 4 0,73 | E 35 0,588 0,341 |
| | U | Micro-pore | | Meso-pore |





Micro-pore

Meso-pore

Langmuir Constant





Instrument measures Langmuir Constant at 77K Measure isothermal adsorption curve at 20C and 0C



| Δ <i>H</i> [KJ/mol] | b0[1/Pa] | b[1/Pa] |
|---------------------|----------|---------|
| -15.52 | 3.4e-06 | 1.9e-06 |



PART 03 Acoustics Measurement

E-1050 Measurement



Measurement Set-up



Introduce Adsorption Effect Into Meso-Scale





Introduce Adsorption Effect Into Meso-Scale





Introduce Adsorption Effect Into Meso-Scale



17





PART 04 Conclusion

Conclusion



A 2DFD model was built to simulate the performance of absorbers consisting of membrane and porous granules:

- The comparison between the 2DFD simulation and 1D analytical model prediction shows that it 1. is necessary to consider the modal response in the radial direction when separation between membrane and granules is small
- The simulation shows potential advantages of bringing the granules close to the membrane, 2. where the interaction of the membrane nearfield and the granule stack may be exploited to increase energy dissipation and to reduce reflection
- The simulation of the absorber with a perforated membrane shows more dramatic improvement 3. at low frequencies when GAC is added to the absorber

In the future, it is of interest to experimentally validate the predictions of the 2DFD model, and find theoretical explanation of the difference with the 1D model prediction, especially when the air gap is narrow 19

Thanks for your attention!