

**PERFORMANCE OF COCOA HUSK MUCILAGE
AS A DRAG REDUCTION AGENT IN PIPES**

HAMAD KHUDHAIR MOHAMMED

Faculty of Chemical and Natural Resources Engineering
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA PAHANG

PERFORMANCE OF COCOA HUSK MUCILAGE
AS A DRAG REDUCTION AGENT IN PIPES

HAMAD KHUDHAIR MOHAMMED

Thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the award of the degree of
Master of Chemical Engineering

Faculty of Chemical and Natural Resources Engineering
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA PAHANG

June 2011

**UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA PAHANG
CENTER FOR GRADUATE STUDIES**

We certify that the thesis is entitled “Performance of cocoa husk mucilage as a drag reduction agent in pipes” written by Hamad Khudhair Mohammed. We have examined the final copy of this thesis and that in our opinion; it is fully adequate in terms of scope and quality for the awarding the degree of Masters of Chemical Engineering. We herewith recommend that it be accepted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Masters of Chemical Engineering.

PROF. IR. DR. MOHD SOBRI TAKRIFF
Faculty of Engineering and Built Environment
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia

Signature

ASSOC. PROF. ZULKAFLI HASSAN
Faculty of Chemical & Natural Resources Engineering
Universiti Malaysia Pahang

Signature

SUPERVISOR'S DECLARATION

I hereby declare that I have checked this thesis and in my opinion this thesis is satisfactory in terms of scope and quality for the award of the degree of Master of Chemical Engineering.

Signature :

Name of Supervisor: DR. HAYDER A. ABDUL BARI

Position: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Date: June 2011

STUDENT'S DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the work in this thesis is my own except for quotations and summaries which have been duly acknowledged. The thesis has not been accepted for any degree and is not concurrently submitted for award of other degree.

Signature :

Name: HAMAD KHUDHAIR MOHAMMED

ID Number: MKC09002

Date: June 2011

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of a large, stylized loop followed by a horizontal line with a small flourish at the end.

To all the hearts that pray for me, and to all whom supported me.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my great thank and appreciation to my supervisor Associate Prof. Dr. Hayder A. Abdulbari, for his continuous support, patience, motivation, enthusiasm and knowledge. I appreciate all his contributions of time, ideas and funding to complete my studies.

Besides my supervisor, I would like to thank Dr. Saba Ghani for her encouragement and insightful comments. I would also like to thank Emma Suali and Safa'a Mohammed Rasheed for their useful advice and information. Special thank to Dr. James N. BeMiller from Purdue University, for sending me the helpful information for my work. My great appreciation to Mrs. Rachel for reading and makes the corrections.

To the staff of the Malaysian Cocoa Board, thank you for assisting me in getting and in the preparation of cocoa samples needed for this research.

Special thanks to the Faculty of Chemical Engineering and Natural Resources and Universiti Malaysia Pahang for the support and facilities provided.

Fellow compatriots who are very concerned and provide the necessary cooperation and support to make this person feel very lucky and do not feel isolated here. You made me feel I am in my country and among my family.

To all my friends in the hostel and lab, for the support and give me a suitable environment to study, and for the nice and useful moments.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my family for supporting me spiritually throughout my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
SUPERVISOR’S DECLARATION	ii
STUDENT’S DECLARATION	iii
DEDICATION	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	V
ABSTRACT	Vi
ABSTRAK	Vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	Viii
LIST OF TABLES	xi
LIST OF FIGURES	xii
LIST OF SYMBOLS	xv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xviii
LIST OF APPENDICES	xx
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Problem Statement	2
1.3 Objectives of Research	3
1.4 Scopes of Research	4
1.5 Thesis Layout	4
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1 Introduction	6
2.2 Energy Losses in Piping Systems	6
2.3 Drag Reduction	12
2.4 Drag Reduction Agent	13
2.4.1 Polymers	13
2.4.2 Surfactants	23
2.4.3 Suspended fiber	29
2.5 Drag Reduction Mechanism	33

CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1	Introduction	38
3.2	Materials and Apparatus	38
3.2.1	Cocoa husk	38
3.2.2	Ethanol	40
3.2.3	Acetone	41
3.2.4	Calcium chloride	41
3.2.5	Anti oxidant	42
3.2.6	Autoclave	42
3.3	Preparation of the Mucilage	43
3.3.1	The physical treatment	43
3.3.2	The extraction	44
3.4	Mucilage Tests	46
3.5	Experimental Rig Description	46
3.6	Experimental Calculations	53
3.6.1	Velocity and Reynolds number calculations	53
3.6.2	Percentage drag reduction calculations	53
3.6.3	Percentage flow increase calculations	54

CHAPTER 4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1	Chemical Tests of the Mucilage	55
4.2	Circulation System Verification	56
4.3	Effect of process variables	58
4.3.1	Effect of Fluid velocity	58
4.3.2	Effect of Mucilage Concentration on Drag Reduction	62
4.3.3	Effect of pipe diameter on drag reduction	65
4.3.4	Effect of length on drag reduction	70
4.4	Numerical Model (Correlation)	75

CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1	DRA Performance	80
5.2	Recommendations	81
	REFERENCES	82
	APPENDICES	90

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.	Title	Page
3.1	Specification of ethanol	40
3.2	Specification of acetone	41
3.3	Specification of calcium chloride	41
3.4	Specification of anti oxide triton®	42
3.5	Specification of 500 E autoclave	42
3.6	Symbol description of the schematic diagram	48
4.1	Results of the chemical tests for the mucilage	56
4.2	Maximum % DR for each experimental set	62
4.3	Correlation parameter for selected samples of the experimental data	76

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure No.	Title	Page
2.1	(a) Laminar flow shear stress caused by random motion of molecules. (b) Turbulent flow as a result of random three dimensional eddies	8
2.2	Random Velocity Fluctuation at a point in turbulent flow	9
2.3	Schematic view of cis and trans forms of hydrocarbon chains	26
3.1	Mature cocoa pod	39
3.2	Cocoa pod husk after removing the seeds	40
3.3	Autoclave 500 E in biotechnical laboratory in UMP	43
3.4	Cocoa pod husk after been cut to small cubic pieces	44
3.5	Preliminary extraction of mucilage	45
3.6	Cocoa husk mucilage	45
3.7	The schematic diagram of the pipes flow system	48
3.8	A schematic of the test section	49
3.9	Drag reduction experimental rig in the common lab (UMP)	49
3.10	A portable mini sonic P flow meter	51
3.11	A 0.25 bar Baumer differential pressure gauge	52
3.12	A 0.16 bar Baumer differential pressure gauge	52
4.1	The friction factor versus Re of water for L/D equal to 26.24	57
4.2	The friction factor versus Re of water for L/D equal to 39	57
4.3	The friction factor versus Re of water for L/D equal to 59	58
4.4	The drag reduction of mucilage along 0.0127 m diameter at 0.5 m pipe length using different mucilage additions	59
4.5	The drag reduction of mucilage along 0.0254 m diameter at 0.5 m pipe length using different mucilage additions	60
4.6	The drag reduction of mucilage along 0.0381 m diameter at 0.5 m length using different mucilage additions	61
4.7	The drag reduction versus mucilage concentration in 0.0127 m diameter at 0.5 m length.	63
4.8	The drag reduction versus mucilage concentration in 0.0254 m diameter at 2.0 m length.	64
4.9	The drag reduction versus mucilage concentration in 0.0381 m diameter at 2.0 m length	65
4.10	Re versus DR for 100 ppm additive at 0.5 m length.	68
4.11	Re versus DR for 300 ppm additive at 0.5 m length.	68
4.12	Re versus DR for 300 ppm additive at 1.0 m length.	69
4.13	Re versus DR for 300 ppm additive at 1.5 m length	69
4.14	Re versus DR for 300 ppm additive at 2.0 m length	70
4.15	Drag reduction versus test section length for 5.0 m ³ /hr at 0.0254 m ID. Pipe	72
4.16	Drag reduction versus test section length for 5.5 m ³ /hr at 0.0254 m ID	72
4.17	Drag reduction versus test section length for 6.0 m ³ /hr at 0.0254 m ID	73

4.18	Drag reduction versus test section length for 6.5 m ³ /hr at 0.0254 m ID	73
4.19	Drag reduction versus test section length for 1 m ³ /hr at 0.0127 m ID	74
4.20	Drag reduction versus test section length for 1.5 m ³ /hr at 0.0127 m ID	74
4.21	Predicted versus observed values for the 100 ppm solution flowing through 0.0127 m I.D. pipe and 1.0 m testing section length	76
4.22	Predicted versus observed values for the 100 ppm solution flowing through 0.0254 m I.D. pipe and 0.5 m testing section length	77
4.23	Predicted versus observed values for the 100 ppm solution flowing through 0.0254 m I.D. pipe and 1.5 m testing section length	77
4.24	Predicted versus observed values for the 100 ppm solution flowing through 0.0381 m I.D. pipe and 0.5 m testing section length	78
4.25	Predicted versus observed values for the 200 ppm solution flowing through 0.0254 m I.D. pipe and 1.5 m testing section length	78
4.26	Predicted versus observed values for the 300 ppm solution flowing through 0.0127 m I.D. pipe and 2.0 m testing section length	79

LIST OF SYMBOLS

C	Concentration
% FI	Percentage flow increase
ΔP	Pressure drop
D	Diameter
D1	Main tank drain
D2	Collecting tank drain
<i>F</i>	Fanning friction factor
F1	Ultrasonic flow meter
<i>F_p</i>	Friction factor of the drag reduced flow
<i>F_s</i>	Friction factor of the tap water
KKM 22	Cocoa clone.
Le	Length required for a fully developed velocity profile
L _p	Length of the pipe
P1	Section pipe one
P2	Section pipe two
P3	Section pipe three
P4	Pressure gauge
p1	Main pipe
p2	Bypass pipe
p3	0.0127 m pipe
p4	0.0254 m pipe
p5	0.0381 m pipe

p_6	Circulation pipe
ppm	Part per million
PU1	Main pump
PU2	Recirculation pump
Q	Mass flow rate
Q	Volumetric flow Rate
R	Pipe radius
R	Radius at measuring position
Re	Reynolds number
Sc	Schmidt number
St	Stanton number
T1	Main tank
T2	Collecting tank
t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4, t_5	Testing point
U	Streamwise velocity fluctuation
U	Velocity
U_{av}	Mean fluid velocity
U_m	Bulk mean velocity
V	Wall-normal velocity fluctuation
ν	Kinematics viscosity
v1	Pump valve
v2	Bypass valve
v3, v4, v5	Pipe valve
v6	Circulation valve

Wt	Weight
Θ	Temperature fluctuation
M	Dynamic viscosity
P	Density
Tw	Wall shear stress

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AM	Acrylamide
AMPDAPS	3-((2-acrylamido-2-methylpropyl)dimethylammonio)- 1-Propanesulfonat
AMPTAC	2-acrylamido-2-methylpropyl)trimethylammoniumchloride
CMC	Critical micellization concentration
CMT	Critical Micellization temperature
CWM	Coal water mixture
DNS	Direct numerical simulation
DR	Drag reduction
DRA	Drag reduction agent
DRPs	Drag reduction polymers
LDA	Laser Doppler anemometry
LDV	Laser-Doppler-velocimetry
LEBU	Large eddy breakup
LIE	Laser induced fluorescence
LMM	Like mucilage molecules
MOL	Main oil line
NaAMPS	Sodium 2-acrylamido-2-methylpropanesulfonate
ODEAO	Oleyldihydroxyethylamineoxide
PAAM	Polyacrylamide
PEO	Polyethylene oxide
PIB	Polyisobutylene
PIV	Particle image velocimetry
PNVF	Poly(N-vinylformamide)

PVAC	Polyvinylacetate
SIS	Shear induced structure
TME	Trimethyloethane
TTAA	tris (2-hydroxyethyl) tallowalkyl ammonium acetate
TTAB	n- e-tradecyltrimethylammoniumbromide

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix	Title	Page
A1	Pressure drop data for 0.0127 m diameter	90
A2	Pressure drop data for 0.0254 m diameter	91
A3	Pressure drop data for 0.0381 m diameter	92
B1	Pressure drop records for 0.0127m diameter, 0.5 m	93
B2	Pressure drop records for 0.0127m diameter, 1.0 m	94
B3	Pressure drop records for 0.0127m diameter, 1.5 m	95
B4	Pressure drop records for 0.0127m diameter, 2.0 m	96
B5	Pressure drop records for 0.0254m diameter, 0.5 m	97
B6	Pressure drop records for 0.0254m diameter, 1.0m	98
B7	Pressure drop records for 0.0254m diameter, 1.5 m	99
B8	Pressure drop records for 0.0254m diameter, 2.0 m	100
B9	Pressure drop records for 0.0381m diameter, 0.5 m	101
B10	Pressure drop records for 0.0381m diameter, 1.0 m	102
B11	Pressure drop records for 0.0381m diameter, 1.5 m	103
B12	Pressure drop records for 0.0381m diameter, 2.0 m	104
C1	Drag reduction for 0.0127 m diameter, 0.5 m length	105
C2	Drag reduction for 0.0127 m diameter, 1.0 m length	106
C3	Drag reduction for 0.0127 m diameter, 1.5 m length	107
C4	Drag reduction for 0.0127 m diameter, 2.0 m length	108
C5	Drag reduction for 0.0254m diameter, 0.5 m length	109
C6	Drag reduction for 0.0254m diameter, 1.0m length	110
C7	Drag reduction for 0.0254m diameter, 1.5 m length	111

C8	Drag reduction for 0.0254m diameter, 2.0 m length	112
C9	Drag reduction for 0.0381m diameter, 0.5 m length	113
C10	Drag reduction for 0.0381m diameter, 1.0 m length	114
C11	Drag reduction for 0.0381m diameter, 1.5 m length	115
C12	Drag reduction for 0.0381m diameter, 2.0 m length	116
D1	Re versus DR for 100 ppm additive at 0.5m length	117
D2	Re versus DR for 200 ppm additive at 0.5 m length	118
D3	Re versus DR for 300 ppm additive at 0.5m length	119
D4	Re versus DR for 100 ppm additive at 1.0 m length	120
D5	Re versus DR for 200 ppm additive at 1.0 m length	121
D6	Re versus DR for 300 ppm additive at 1.0 m length	122
D7	Re versus DR for 100 ppm additive at 1.5m length	123
D8	Re versus DR for 200 ppm additive at 1.5m length	124
D9	Re versus DR for 300 ppm additive at 1.5m length	125
D10	Re versus DR for 100 ppm additive at 2.0 m length	126
D11	Re versus DR for 200 ppm additive at 2.0 m length	127
D12	Re versus DR for 300 ppm additive at 2.0 m length	128
E1	Drag reduction versus test section length for 0.5 m ³ /hr at 0.0127 m ID	129
E2	Drag reduction versus test section length for 1.0 m ³ /hr at 0.0127 m ID	130
E3	Drag reduction versus test section length for 1.5 m ³ /hr at 0.0127 m ID	131
E4	Drag reduction versus test section length for 2.0 m ³ /hr at 0.0127 m ID	132
E5	Drag reduction versus test section length for 4.5 m ³ /hr at 0.0254 m ID	133

E6	Drag reduction versus test section length for 5.0 m ³ /hr at 0.0254 m ID	134
E7	Drag reduction versus test section length for 5.5 m ³ /hr at 0.0254 m ID	135
E8	Drag reduction versus test section length for 6.0 m ³ /hr at 0.0254 m ID	136
E9	Drag reduction versus test section length for 6.5 m ³ /hr at 0.0254 m ID	137
E10	Drag reduction versus test section length for 7.0 m ³ /hr at 0.0254 m ID	138
E11	Drag reduction versus test section length for 4.0 m ³ /hr at 0.0381 m ID	139
E12	Drag reduction versus test section length for 5.0 m ³ /hr at 0.0381 m ID	140
E13	Drag reduction versus test section length for 6.0 m ³ /hr at 0.0381 m ID	141
E14	Drag reduction versus test section length for 7.0 m ³ /hr at 0.0381 m ID	142
E15	Drag reduction versus test section length for 8.0 m ³ /hr at 0.0381 m ID	143
F1	Back view of experimental rig	144
F2	Isometric view of experimental rig	145
G	List of publications	146

PERFORMANCE OF COCOA HUSK MUCILAGE
AS A DRAG REDUCTION AGENT IN PIPES

HAMAD KHUDHAIR MOHAMMED

Thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the award of the degree of
Master of Chemical Engineering

Faculty of Chemical and Natural Resources Engineering
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA PAHANG

June 2011

ABSTRACT

Energy loss during transport of fluids in an industry is one of the problems to be resolved. This research worked on the possibility of using cocoa husk mucilage as a drag reducing agent to replace synthetic polymers used by the industry today. A closed loop liquid circulation system was used to carry out the experimental work. The major variables investigated in the present work to study the effectiveness of the new drag reducer are pipe size (0.0127 m, 0.0254 m, 0.0381 m), liquid flow rate (0.5-8 m³/hr), additives concentration (100 ppm, 200 ppm and 300 ppm) and testing section length (0.5 m, 1 m, 1.5 m and 2.0 m). The extraction of the mucilage achieved by mixing 75 % ethanol and 25 % acetone for one hour and further extracted by autoclave for half an hour at 150 °c and 0.25 Mpa. Generally, the drag reduction effectiveness of the cocoa husk mucilage was proven in the present work, with a maximum percentage drag reduction value of 54.55% for the solution flowing in 0.0254 m I.D. pipe and at testing section length of 0.5 m, concentration 300 ppm and at 4 m³/hr flow rate. The cocoa bean husk mucilage concentration and the solution flow rate, showed a great effect on profile of drag reduction in the pipe. As concentration of cocoa bean husk mucilage increases, drag reduction increases in all conditions of experimental research. Besides, drag reduction is also increased by increasing flow rate until a maximum drag reduction is reached where degradation happens. The effect of pipe diameter on the percentage of drag reduction was not completely stable, generally, the 0.0254 m I.D. pipe showed the best and the most stable performance of the new mucilage as drag reducing agent. Increasing the testing section length led to the reduction in the cocoa husk mucilage effectiveness as a drag reducer due to continues effect of shear force on the mucilage molecules with length. A numerical empirical expression was developed depending on the experimental data. The numerical model major equation was $f = a (Re)^b$. Several solutions and models were introduced for each case of drag reduction in the present work depending on the experimental system investigated. As a conclusion; a new environmental friendly drag reducing agent is successfully introduced and its effectiveness in improving the flow was proven experimentally.

ABSTRAK

Kehilangan tenaga semasa pengangkutan bendalir dalam industri yang merupakan salah satu masalah yang perlu diselesaikan. Penggunaan lendiran sekam koko sebagai ejen mengurangkan geseran bagi menggantikan bahan polimer sintetik yang digunakan oleh industri hari ini. Pembinaan sistem perpaipan tertutup disediakan khas bagi menguji keberkesanan bahan tambah yang baru dari segi kadar pengurangan geseran. Parameter utama yang dikaji di dalam penyelidikan ini adalah, keberkesanan bahan tambah, saiz paip (0.0127 m, 0.0254 m, 0.0381 m), kadar aliran bendalir (0.5-8 m³/hr), kepekatan bahan tambah (100 ppm, 200 ppm dan 300 ppm) dan juga panjang paip yang diuji (0.5 m, 1.0 m, 1.5 m, dan 2.0 m). Ekstrak bendalir (bahan tambah) diperoleh dengan mencampurkan 75% ethanol dan 25% aseton untuk sejam, dan diteruskan dengan pengekstrakan menggunakan “autoclave” selama setengah jam pada suhu 150°C dan 0.25 Mpa. Keberkesanan pengurangan geseran setelah menggunakan lendiran kulit koko telah berjaya dibuktikan di dalam kajian ini, dengan rekod pengurangan geseran tertinggi pada bendalir yang mengalir dalam paip 0.0254 m iaitu 54.55% pada ukuran panjang 0.5 m, kepekatan lendir 300 ppm dan kelajuan aliran pada 4 m³/hr. Kepekatan lendiran kulit koko dan juga kelajuan aliran bendalir menunjukkan kesan terbesar kepada gambaran kejadian pengurangan geseran di dalam paip. Apabila kepekatan meningkat, pengurangan geseran pada semua keadaan di dalam aspek kajian turut meningkat. Malahan, pengurangan geseran turut direkod berlaku dengan peningkatan kelajuan aliran sehingga paras maksimum pengurangan geseran iaitu dengan berlakunya penguraian lendiran. Kesan diameter paip kepada peratusan pengurangan geseran tidak begitu stabil. Umumnya direkodkan diameter 0.0254 m I.D mempunyai bacaan yang paling stabil dan menunjukkan prestasi yang terbaik. Apabila jarak ujikaji ditingkatkan akan menyebabkan pengurangan dalam prestasi lendiran kulit koko sebagai pelincir kerana kesan daya ricih terhadap molekul bendalir dengan panjang paip. Persamaan utama secara model numerikal dijana bagi menunjukkan kaitan antara parameter iaitu $f = a (Re)^b$. Beberapa penyelesaian dan model turut diperkenalkan dalam setiap ujikaji pengurangan geseran ini. Kesimpulannya, satu pelincir mesra alam dengan jayanya diperkenalkan dan dibuktikan ia dapat meningkatkan prestasi secara eksperimen.

REFERENCES

- Al-Sarkhi, Abdelsalam. 2010. Drag reduction with polymers in gas-liquid/liquid-liquid flows in pipes: A literature review. *Journal of natural gas science and engineering*. 2 (2010) 41-48
- Aguilar, G., K. Gasljevic and E. F. Matthys. 1998. On the relationship between heat transfer and drag reduction for polymer and surfactant solutions." HTD (*Am. Soc. Mech. Eng.*) 361-1(Proceedings of the ASME Heat Transfer Division--1998, Vol. 1): 139-146.
- Bello, J.B., Müller, A.J. and Shez, A.E. 1996. Effect of intermolecular cross links on drag reduction by polymer solutions. *Polymer Bulletin*. 36:111 - 118.
- Benzi, R. 2010. A short sureview on drag reduction by polymers in wall bounded turbulence. *Physica D*. 239 (2010) 1338-1345
- Bewersdorff, H. W, Gyr, A., Hoyer, K., Tsinober, A. 1993. An investigation of possible mechanisms of heterogeneous drag reduction in pipe and channel flows, *Rheol Acta*. 32:140-149.
- Bewersdorff, H. W. 1990. Drag reduction in surfactant solutions. *Structure of turbulence and drag reduction*. Springer-Verlag: 293.
- Bewersdorff, H. W. 1990. Drag reduction in surfactant solutions. *Structure of micelles Surfactant science series*. R. Zana and W. Kaler Eric. 140: 473-492.
- Bewersdorff H.W., Ohlendorf, D. 1988. The behavior of drag-reducing cationic surfactant solutions. *Colloid Polym Sci*. 266 : 941 – 953.
- Bewersdorff, H. W. Frings, B. Lindner, P. and Oberthfir, R. C. 1986. The conformation of drag reducing micelles from small-angle-neutron-scattering experiments. *Rheol Acta*. 25 : 642 - 646.
- Bewersdorff, H. W., Gyr, A., Hoyer, K. and Tsinober, A. 1993. An investigation of possible mechanisms of heterogeneous drag reduction in pipe and channel flows. *Rheol. Acta*. 32(2): 140-149.
- Boffetta, G., Celani, A. and Mazzino, A. 2005. Drag reduction in the turbulent Kolmogorov flow. *Physical Review E* 71, 036307 (2005).
- Broniarz, P. L., Rozanski, J., and Rozanska, S. 2007. Drag reduction effect in pipe systems and liquid falling film flow. *Rev. Chem. Eng.* 23(3-4): 149-245.
- Chekalova, L. A., Grigor'ev, V. Yu. and Denisov, É. P. 2002. The Friction Drag of a Turbulent Flow Reduced on the Surface with a Molecular Film of Foleox Polymer. *Technical Physics Letters*. 28(5): 399–400.

- Choi, J. H., Jhon, M.S. 1996. Polymer Induced turbulent drag reduction. *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* 35 (9): 2993-2998.
- Coleman, P. B., Ottenbreit, B. T. and Polimeni, P. I. 1987 Effects of a Drag-Reducing Polyelectrolyte of Microscopic Linear Dimension (Separan AP-273) on Rat hemodynamics. *American Heart Association Circ. Res.* 61: 787-796.
- Darby, R. 2001. *Chemical Engineering Fluid Mechanics*. 2nd Edition. Marcel Dekker Inc.
- Daas, M. A. 2001. *Modeling the effects of oil viscosity and pipe inclination on flow characteristics and drag reduction in slug flow*. Phd thesis. Ohio University.
- de Gennes, P. G. 1990. *Introduction to Polymer Dynamics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Dodge, D. W. & Metzner, A. B. 1959. Turbulent Flow of Non-Newtonian Systems. *AICHE Journal*. 5: 189-204
- Dschagarowa, E., and Bochossian, T. 1978. Drag reduction in polymer mixtures. *Rheol. Acta*. 17: 426-432.
- Dschagarowa, E., Mennig, G., 1977. Influence of molecular weight and molecular conformation of polymers on turbulent drag reduction. *Rheol, Acta*. 16: 309-316.
- Dubief, Y., Terrapon, V. E., White, C. M., Shaqfeh, E. S.G. Moin, P., Lele, S. K. 2005. New Answers on the Interaction between Polymers and Vortices in Turbulent Flows, *Springer Flow, Turbulence and Combustion*. 74: 311–329.
- Fisher, D. H. and Rodriguez, F. 1971. Degradation of drag-reducing polymers. *Journal of Applied Polymer Sci.* 15: 2975.
- Gasljevic, K. 1995. An experimental investigation of drag reduction by surfactant solutions and of its implementation in hydronic systems (turbulent flow, heat transfer). PhD Dissertation. University of California, Santa Barbara.
- Gyr, A. 1976. Burst Cycle and Drag Reduction. *Journal of Applied Mathematics and Physics (ZAMP)*. 27.
- Gyr, A., Buhler, J. 2010. Secondary flows in turbulent surfactant solutions at maximum drag reduction. *Journal of Non-Newtonian Fluid Mechanics*. 165 (2010): 672-675
- Hellsten, M. 2001. Drag reducing surfactants. *Journal of Surfactants and Detergents*. Vol. 5, No 1: 65-70.

- Hershey, H. C. 1965. *Drag Reduction in Newtonian Polymer Solutions*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Missouri-Rolla.
- Hershey, H. C. and Zakin, J. L. 1967. The existence of two types of drag reduction in pipe flow of dilute polymer solutions. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Fundamentals*. 6(3): 381-387.
- Holland, F. A. and Bragg, R., 1995. *Fluid flow for chemical engineers*. UK: Edward Arnold.
- Hou, Y., Somandepalli, V. S. R. and Mungal, M. G., 2006. A Technique to Determine Total Shear Stress and Polymer Stress Profiles in Drag Reduced Boundary Layer Flows,” *Experiments in Fluids*. 40: 589-600.
- Hoyt, J. W. 1986. Drag reduction. *In Encyclopedia of polymer science and engineering*. New York, John Wiley and Sons. 5: 129-151.
- Hu , Y. and Matthys, E. F. 1996. The effects of salts on the rheological characteristics of a drag-reducing cationic surfactant solution with shear-induced micellar structures. *Rheol Acta*. 35:470-480.
- Interthal, W., Wilski, H., 1985. Drag reduction experiments with very large pipes. *Colloid & Polym. Sci*. 263: 217-229.
- Joseph, D.D., 1990. Fluid Dynamics of Viscoelastic Liquids, *Applied mathematical sciences, Vol. 84, Springer Verlag, New York Inc*.
- Jovanovic, J., Frohanapfel, B., Pashtropanska, M. and Durst, F. 2005. The effect of polymers on the dynamics of turbulence in a drag reduced flow. *Thermal Science*. 9(1): 13-41.
- Kanda, K. and Yang, M. 2006. Drag Reduction Effect of BSA Monodispersed Solution in micro tube Flow. *JSME Journal*, 49(4): 1190-1196.
- Kreith, F., et. al. 1999. “*Fluid Mechanics, Mechanical Engineering Handbook*” Ed. Frank Kreith. Boca Raton: CRC Press LLC.
- Kim , K. and Sirviente, A. I. 2007. Wall versus Centerline Polymer Injection in Turbulent Channel Flows. *Flow Turbulence Combust*. 78: 69–89.
- Kim, N. J., Kim, S., Lim, S. H., Chen, K., and Chun, W., 2009. Measurement of drag reduction in polymer added turbulent flow. *International Communication in Heat and Mass Transfer* 36 (2009): 1014-1019
- Kim, S. C. and Kim, C. B. 1991. A Drag reduction in CWM transportation with polymer additives. *Journal of Mechanical Science and Technology*. 5(1): 53-58.

- Krause, E. 2005. *Fluid Mechanics with Problems and Solutions, and an Aerodynamic Laboratory*. New York: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Krope, A., and Lipus, L. C. 2010. Drag reducing surfactants for district heating. *Elsevier. Applied Thermal Engineering*. 30 (2010): 833-838
- Landahl, M. T. 1973. Drag reduction by polymer addition. *Dep. Aeronaut. Astronaut. Massachusetts Inst. Technol., Cambridge, MA, USA*.
- Liaw, G. C. 1969. Effect of polymer structure on drag reduction in nonpolar solvents. *PhD Dissertation, University of Missouri- Rolla*.
- Little, R. C., Patterson, R. L. and ling, R. Y. 1976. Characterization of the drag reducing properties of poly(ethylene oxide) and poly(acrylamide) solutions in external flows. *Journal of Chemical and Engineering Data*. 21(3): 281-283.
- Little, R., Smidt, S., Huang, P., Romans, J., Dedrick, J. and Matuszko, J. S. 1991. Improved drag reduction by control of polymer particle size. *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* 30: 403-407.
- Lodes, A., and Macho, V. 1989. The influence of polyvinylacetate additive in water on turbulent velocity field and drag reduction. *Experiments in Fluids*. 7: 383-387.
- Luetgen, C.O., Lindsay, J.D. and Stratton, R.A. 1991. Turbulent dispersion in pulp flow: Preliminary results and implications for the mechanisms of fiber- turbulence interactions. *Technical Paper. IPST Georgia: IPST Technical Paper Series No.408*.
- Manfield, P. D., Lawrence, C. J. and Hewitt, G. F. 1999. Drag reduction with additives in multiphase flow: A literature survey. *Multiphase Science and Technology* 11(3): 197-221.
- Marhefka, J. N., Marascalco, P. J., Chapman, T. M., Russell, A. J. and Kameneva, M. V. 2006. Poly (N-vinylformamide) A drag reducing polymer for biomedical applications. *Biomacromolecules*. 7: 1597-1603.
- Metzner, A. B., Reed, J. C. 1955. Flow of non Newtonian fluids – correlation of the laminar, transition, and turbulent - flow regions. *Aiche Journal*. 1: 434-440.
- Mumick, P. S., Welch, P. M., Salazar, L. C. and McCormick, C. L. 1994. Water soluble copolymers: 56. structure and solvation effects of polyampholytes in drag reduction. *Macromolecules*. 27: 323-331.
- Myska, J. and Stern, P. 1998. Significance of shear induced structure in surfactants for drag reduction. *Colloid Polym Sci*. 276: 816-823.
- Myska, J. and Zakin, J. L. 1997. Difference in the flow behaviors of polymeric and cationic surfactant drag reducing additives. *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* 36: 5483-5487.

- Nakamura, H. and Igarashi, T. 2007. Reduction in drag and fluctuating forces for circular cylinder by attaching cylindrical rings. *Journal of fluid science and technology*. 2(1): 12-22.
- Nowak, M. 2003. Time-dependent drag reduction and ageing in aqueous solutions of a cationic surfactant. *Experiments in Fluids*. 34: 397–402.
- Peet, Y., Sagaut, P., and Charron, Y. 2007. Towards large eddy simulation of turbulent drag reduction using sinusoidal riblets. *WSEAS paper*. 565-355, *5th IASME/WSEAS International Conference on Fluid Mechanics and Aerodynamics*, Athens, Greece
- Pollert, J., Komrzy, P., Vozenilek, A. and Zakin, J. L. 1993. Influence of pipe diameter and temperature on efficiency of drag reducing surfactants. *Proc. Fluid Mechanics and Hydrodynamical Aspects of Biosphere, Castle Liblice, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic*. pp 61-67.
- Pollert, J., Zakin, J.L., Myska, J., and Kratochvil, R. 1994. Use of friction reduction additives in district heating system field test at Kladno-Kroehlavý, Czech Republic. *In: Proc. Intern. District Heating and Cooling Assoc., Seattle, WA*. 141-156.
- Povkh, I. L., Serdyuk, A. I., Naumov, A. V. and Kovalenko, N. P. 1981. *Drag reduction by cation surfactants: the relation to physicochemical and micellar characteristics*. Plenum Publishing Corporation.
- Prieve, D. C. 2000. *A course in fluid mechanics with vector field theory*. Department of Chemical Engineering, Carnegie Mellon University. An electronic version of this book in PDF format was made available to students of 06-703, Department of Chemical Engineering, 2000.
- Ptasinski, P.K., Nieuwstadt, F.T.M., Van Den Brule, B.H.A.A. and Hulsen, M.A. 2001. Experiments in turbulent pipe flow with polymer additives at maximum drag reduction. *Flow, Turbulence and Combustion*. 66: 159–182.
- Qi, Y. and Zakin, J. L. 2002. Chemical and rheological characterization of drag reducing cationic surfactant systems. *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* 41:6326-6336.
- Ridzwan, B. H., Fadzli, M. K, Rozali, M. B. O., Daniel, T. F. C, Ibrahim, B.M., and Faridnordin, B. I., 1993. Evaluation of cocoa-pod husks on performance of rabbits. *Animal feed Science and Technology*. 40 (1993): 267-272
- Saadeh , M. and Strehlow, A. 1993. The influence of the injection system on drag reduction. *Rheol Acta*. 32: 398-404.
- Sabadini, E, and Alkschbirs, M. I. 2002. Drag reduction in polymer solutions based on splash visualization, *Experiments in Fluids* 33: 242–248

- Savins, J. G. 1961. *J. Inst. Petrol.* 47: 329.
- Savins, J. G. 1964. Drag reduction characteristics of solutions of macromolecules in turbulent pipe flow. *Soc. Petr. Eng. J.* 4: 203.
- Savins, J. G. 1967. A stress controlled drag reduction phenomenon. *Rheol. Acta.* 6: 323-330.
- Sedahmed, G. H., Abd El Nabey, B. A. Abdel-Khalik, A. 1978. Effect of drag-reducing additives on the rate of mass transfer in diffusion-controlled electrochemical processes. *Journal of Applied Electrochemistry.* 8: 473-478.
- Sedahmed, G. H. Asfour, H. M. Nassar, M. M. and Fadali, O. A. 1982. Effect of drag-reducing additives on the rate of mass transfer in a parallel-plate electrochemical flow reactor. *Journal of Applied Electrochemistry.* 12: 7-11.
- Serife, Z. 2005. Experimental Investigation of Drag Reduction Effects of Polymer Additive on Turbulent Pipe Flow. MSc. Thesis. Middle East Technical University.
- Shanliang, Z., Jianzhong, L. and Weifeng, Z. 2007. Numerical Research on the Fiber Suspensions in a Turbulent T-shaped Branching Channel Flow. *Chin. J. Chem. Eng.* 15 (1): 30-38.
- Sharifi, F., Azaiez, J. 2005. Vortex dynamics of fiber-laden free shear flows. *Journal of Non-Newtonian Fluid Mechanics.* 127: 73-87.
- Shatat, M. M. E., Yanase, S., Takami, T., and Hyakutake, T., 2009. Drag reduction effects of micro – bubbles in straight and helical pipes. *Journal of fluid science and technology.* 4 (1): 156 – 167.
- Simakov, N. N. 2004. Crisis of hydrodynamic drag of drops in the two - phase turbulent flow of a spray produced by a mechanical nozzle at transition reynolds numbers. *Technical Physics.* 49(2): 188–193.
- Simpson, B. K., Oldham, J. H., Martin, A. M., 1985. Extraction of potash from cocoa pod husks. *Agricultural Wastes.* 13: 69-73.
- Smith, R.E. and Tiederman, W.G. 1991. The mechanism of polymer thread drag reduction. *Rheol Acta.* 30: 103-113.
- Sommer, S.T. and Petrie, H. L. 1992. Diffusion of slot injected drag-reducing polymer solution in a LEBU modified turbulent boundary layer. *Experiments in Fluids.* 12: 181-188.
- Steinberg, Victor. 2009. Elastic stresses in random flow of a dilute polymer solution and the turbulent drag reduction problem. *Elsevier. C.R. Physique* 10: 728-739.

- Stem, R., Myska, J., Lu, B., Smith, B.C., Chou, L.C., and Zakin, J.L. 1994. Relationship of flow birefringence and normal stresses of cationic surfactant systems to their turbulent friction reduction characteristics. *In: Proc. 4th European Rheology Conf., Seville* (1994): 605-608.
- Subramanya, K., 1998, Pipeline transportation technology: An overview. *Current science, volume 75 Number 8*.
- Suzuki, H., Itotagawa, T., Indartono, Y. S., Usui, H. and Wada, N. 2006. Rheological characteristics of trimethylolethane hydrate slurry treated with drag-reducing surfactants. *Rheol Acta*. 46: 287–295.
- Suzuki, H., Wada, N., Komoda, Y., Usui, H., and Ujiie, S. 2009. Drag reduction characteristics of trimethylolethane hydrate slurries treated with surfactants. *Elsevier. International Journal Of Refrigeration* 32: 931-937.
- Tesauro, C., Boersma, B. J., Hulsen, M. A., Ptasincki, P. K., and Nieuwstadt, F. T. M. 2007. Events of High Polymer Activity in Drag Reducing Flows. *Flow Turbulence Combust.* 79: 123–132.
- Toonder, J. M. J. D., Hulen, M. A., Kuiken, G. D. C. And Nieuwstadt F. T. M. 1997. Drag reduction by polymer additives in a turbulent pipe flow: numerical and laboratory experiments. *J. Fluid Mech.* vol. 337, pp. 193 and 226.
- Toonder, J. M. J. D., Nieuwstadt, F. T. M, and Kuiken, G.D.C. 1995. The Role of elongational viscosity in the mechanism of drag reduction by polymer additives. *Kluwer Academic Publishers, Applied Scientific Research* 54: 95-123.
- Toms, B.A. 1989. Some observations of the flow of linear polymer solutions through straight tubes at large Reynolds numbers. *In Proceedings of the 1st International Congress on Rheology*. North Holland, Amsterdam: 135–141.
- Usui, H. Itoh, T., and Saeki, T. 1998. On pipe diameter effects in surfactant drag-reducing pipe flows. *Rheol Acta*. 37: 122–128.
- Vancko, R. M., 1997. Effect of drag reducing agent on pressure drop and flow regime transitions in multiphase horizontal low pressure pipelines. Master thesis, Ohio University.
- White, C. M., Somandepalli, V.S.R., and Mungal, M.G. 2004. The turbulence structure of drag reduced boundary layer flow. *Experiments in Fluids*. 36: 62–69.
- Wu Ge, 2008. Studies on the nanostructure rheology and drag reduction characteristics of drag reduction cationic surfactant solutions. PhD thesis. Ohio State University.

- Xueming, S., and Jianzhong, L. 2002. Experimental research on drag reduction by polymer additives. *Canadian Journal of Chemical Engineering*. Volume 80, Issue 2, pages 293–298, April 2002.
- Yang, K. S., Choi, H. J., Kim, C. B., Kim, I. S. and Jhon, M. S. 1994. Characterization of turbulent drag reduction in rotating disk system. *Korean J. of Chem. Eng.* 11(1): 8-13.
- Zakin, J. L., Zhang, Y., Ge, W. 2007. Drag reduction by surfactant giant micelles in *Giant Micelles: Experimental and Theoretical Aspects and Applications*, Surfactant Science Series, 140, Eds: Zana, R. and Kaler, E., Taylor and Francis, New York. 473- 492.
- Zhang, Y. 2005. Correlations among surfactant drag reduction, additive chemical structures, rheological properties and microstructures in water and water/co-solvent systems. Ph. D. Dissertation, Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.
- Zhu, L., Peskin, C. S. 2007. Drag of a flexible fiber in a 2D moving viscous fluid. *Computers & Fluids*. 36: 398 - 406.