

Influence of Narrow Inclined Channels on Fine Particle Separations

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

By

Kelly Joel Walton

B. Eng

September 2011

The University of
Newcastle
Australia

This thesis contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text. I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

I hereby certify that the work embodied in this thesis has been done in collaboration with other researchers I have included as part of the thesis a statement clearly outlining the extent of collaboration, with whom and under what auspices.

I hereby certify that the work embodied in this thesis contains a published paper/s/scholarly work of which I am a joint author. I have included as part of the thesis a written statement, endorsed by my supervisor, attesting to my contribution to the joint publication/s/scholarly work.

.....
Kelly Joel Walton

.....
Kevin P. Galvin

*For
All those who didn't believe*

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor Professor Kevin Galvin for his guidance and support and my co supervisor Dr. James Zhou for his enthusiasm and encouragement throughout the research process.

Many thanks to Dr. Simon Iveson, Dr Siubhan Macpherson and Dr. David Debrincat for their input and advice in the writing process. A special thanks to my family, especially my sister Lydia, for all the help, encouragement, support, patience and assistance in formatting this document.

Financial Support from the following organisations was greatly appreciated:

- The Australian Research Council
- The Australian Coal Association Research Program
- Anglo Coal Australia
- Ludowici Australia

Contents

List of Figures.....	xiii
List of Tables.....	xvii
Abstract.....	xix
Publications.....	xxii
Journal Articles.....	xxii
Conference Papers.....	xxii
Nomenclature.....	xxiv
Chapter 1	1
1.1 Background.....	2
1.2 Objectives.....	9
1.3 Structure.....	10
Chapter 2	11
2.1 Introduction.....	12
2.2. Fluidisation of Particles.....	12
2.3. Fundamentals of Particle Settling	14
2.3.1. Single Particle Settling	14
2.3.2. Multi-Particle Settling.....	22
2.3.3. Hindered Settling.....	24
2.4. Fluidised System Types.....	26
2.4.1. Batch Settling Tests	26
2.4.2. Batch Fluidised Systems	26
2.4.3. Semi-Batch Fluidised Systems.....	27
2.4.4. Continuous Fluidised Systems	28
2.5. Particle Separation	29
2.5.1. Particle Segregation and Dispersion	29
2.5.2 Phase Inversion and other fluidisation phenomenon	31

Chapter 3	33
3.1 Introduction	34
3.2. Fluidised Inclined Channels	34
3.3 Fluid Dynamics	35
3.3.1 Flow Regimes	36
3.3.2. Boundary Layer	37
3.3.3 Velocity Profile of Laminar Channel Flow	37
3.3.5 Entrance Length	40
3.4. Particle Re-suspension	41
3.4.1. Density and Concentration Gradients	42
3.4.2. Particle Properties Causing Lift	43
3.4.4. Calculating Lift	46
3.5. Reflux Classifier	48
3.5.1. Inclined Channels	48
3.5.2. Elutriation Theory	50
3.5.3. Empirical Elutriation Theory	55
3.5.4. Effects of Re-suspension	56
3.5.5. Dense Medium Effects in Continuous Reflux Classifiers	58
 Chapter 4	 60
4.1 Introduction	61
4.2. Background	62
4.3 Theory	63
4.4 Experimental	71
4.4.1 Apparatus Description	71
4.4.2 Procedure	72
4.4.3 Analysis of the Samples	73
4.5. Quantitative Description of Separation Performance	75
4.5.1. Partition Curves	75
4.5.2. Yield-Ash Curves	78
4.6 Results and Discussion	79
4.6.1 Control Feeds	80
4.6.2 Industrial Feeds	92
4.7 Summary	100

Chapter 5	101
5.1 Introduction.....	102
5.2. Background	103
5.3. Theory	103
5.4 Experimental	106
5.4.1 Apparatus Description	106
5.4.2 Procedure	109
5.4.3 Sample Analysis.....	113
5.4.4 Feed Samples.....	114
5.5 Results and Discussion	115
5.5.1 Fine Industrial Feeds.....	116
5.5.2 Coarse Industrial Feeds	121
5.5.3 Solids Processing Rate	126
5.6 Summary	130
 Chapter 6	 132
6.1 Introduction.....	133
6.2. Background	134
6.3 Experimental	136
6.3.1 Practical Considerations.....	136
6.3.2 Apparatus.....	139
6.3.3 Procedure	143
6.4 Results and Discussion	144
6.4.1 The de-sliming vessel.....	145
6.5 Summary	153
Chapter 7	154
7.1 Conclusions.....	155
7.2 Recommendations.....	158
 References	 161

Appendix A 170

Appendix B 176

Appendix C 187

Appendix D 217

Appendix E 226

Appendix F 235

Appendix G 246

Appendix H 325

Appendix I 329

Appendix J 346

Appendix K 356

List of Figures

		Page
Figure 1.1	<i>Schematic representation of a reflux classifier</i>	5
Figure 1.2	<i>Schematics of the three different operational arrangements of the Reflux Classifier used in this study: a) Semi-Batch, b) Continuous and c) Two stage Gravity and De-sliming</i>	7
Figure 2.1	<i>Schematic of a conventional fluidised bed</i>	13
Figure 2.2	<i>Forces acting on a single particle in a fluid for the case of downward particle motion</i>	15
Figure 2.3	<i>The drag coefficient plotted against the terminal particle Reynolds number given by Equation 2.5. (Levenspiel, 1984).</i>	16
Figure 2.4	<i>Comparison of terminal velocity predictions for a particle with a density of 2600 kg/m³ for the relationships of Zigrang & Sylvester (1981) and Haider & Levenspiel (1988) against the mechanistic approach of: Stokes, Intermediate and Newton regime equations.</i>	21
Figure 2.5	<i>Single particle settling (Zimmels, 1983).</i>	23
Figure 2.6	<i>Results of a typical batch fluidised bed system.</i>	27
Figure 2.7	<i>Concentration profile of a binary fluidised bed system operated under batch conditions. The open symbols and closed symbols indicate the low and high density species respectively.</i>	30
Figure 2.8	<i>Phase Inversion phenomena (Moritomi et al. 1982) showing the lower density particles near the base of the vessel at a low fluid velocity, followed by mixing and then full inversion at higher fluid velocity.</i>	32
Figure 3.1	<i>Schematic of the trajectory of a particle in an inclined channel with laminar flow' (Nguyentranlam, 2001).</i>	35
Figure 3.2	<i>Velocity profile of laminar flow in a channel (Perry & Green, 1997).</i>	38
Figure 3.3	<i>Development of a Fluid Velocity Profile in a Channel.</i>	41
Figure 3.4	<i>Flow of a smooth small particle past another smooth larger particle with fluid flow lines depicted.</i>	44
Figure 3.5	<i>Flow of a rough small particle past another rough larger particle.</i>	45
Figure 3.6	<i>Schematic of an inclined settler containing four particle species, with an overflow rate such that only the two slowest-settling species reach the overflow (Davis and Gecol 1996).</i>	49
Figure 3.7	<i>Two dimensional schematic of a Reflux Classifier.</i>	52

Figure 3.8	<i>Critical particle trajectory in inclined channels (Nguyentranlam & Galvin, 2001).</i>	53
Figure 3.9	<i>Experimental results showing an initial decrease then an increase in particle separation size, d_{50}, as the number of channels increase. The symbols represent particles of density 1400kg/m^3 for \circ, 2700kg/m^3 for \blacktriangle and 4820kg/m^3 for \square (Laskovski et al, 2006).</i>	57
Figure 4.1	<i>(a) The parabolic profile inside one of the inclined channels (b) Two different sized particles on the wall of an inclined channels, showing the hydraulic velocity, U', (upwards) and the settling velocity, UT', (downwards) acting on the particles (Galvin et al, 2009).</i>	65
Figure 4.2	<i>Elutriation velocity for a range of ilmenite particle sizes in a 7 mm inclined channel as predicted by Equation 4.4 combined with Equation 2.13. The different particle settling regimes are shown, and also the ratio of particle size to channel width, d/z'.</i>	69
Figure 4.3	<i>A typical partition curve.</i>	76
Figure 4.4	<i>A partition curve with a low-density tail.</i>	77
Figure 4.5	<i>Partition to overflow curves for a number of consecutive increasing flows for the elutriation of beach sand from a 1.77 mm bank of inclined channels (24 channels). Particle size is taken as the geometric mean of the upper and lower sieve size for that interval.</i>	81
Figure 4.6	<i>Semi-batch elutriation velocities for particles of PVC, \triangle, silica sand, \square, fine ilmenite, \circ, and coarse ilmenite, \bigcirc, through a bank of inclined channels (24 channels) with 1.77 mm spacing.</i>	82
Figure 4.7	<i>Elutriation velocities for particles of PVC, \triangle, beach sand, \square, and Ilmenite \circ through a bank of inclined channels (24 channels) with 1.77 mm spacing. The solid symbols represent the separation of combined species while the open symbols are the original single species results. The coloured solid lines are the predictions from the new theory, Equation 4.4, for each particle density and the thick black solid line is the prediction from the Laskovski et al. (2006) correlation, Equation 3.24, for a density of 4600 kg/m^3.</i>	84
Figure 4.8	<i>A comparison of predicted lift results of Galvin and Liu who used the King and Leighton (1995) lift criteria with the experimental data generated in this thesis. The square symbols denote particles of density 1400 kgm^{-3}, the circles denote particles of density 2600 kgm^{-3}, the plus symbols denote particles of density 4300 kgm^{-3} and the cross symbols denote particles of density 4600 kgm^{-3}. The curve representing the densest particles was based on the average density of 4450 kgm^{-3}. (Galvin & Liu, 2011)</i>	88

Figure 4.9	<i>Comparing the elutriation of sand particle using Laskovski et al. (2006) correlation and theory developed in this study (Equation 4.4) for a variety of channel widths.</i>	90
Figure 4.10	<i>Comparisons of the Laskovski et al. (2006) correlation, Galvin & Liu (2011) model and the theory developed in this work (Equation 4.4) with sand elutriation data for 4.1 mm channels.</i>	91
Figure 4.11	<i>A typical coarse feed flow fractionation result compared with float-sink data.</i>	93
Figure 4.12	<i>A typical coarse feed double fractionation result shown with its equivalent flow fractionation and float-sink results.</i>	95
Figure 4.13	<i>Double fractionation semi-batch results of the coarse coal feed for the different channel widths examined</i>	97
Figure 4.14	<i>Double fractionation semi-batch results of the fine coal feed for the different channel widths examined.</i>	98
Figure 4.15	<i>Results from the single flow and double fractionation experiments using finer coal feed and 1.77 mm channel spacing.</i>	99
Figure 5.1	<i>Predicted separation density versus particle size for a superficial channel velocity of 0.06 m/s and width of 4.2 mm for both the newly developed theory and Laskovski's equation. The bolded section of the lines indicates the dominant mechanism by which particles should be elutriated in an experiment.</i>	104
Figure 5.2	<i>An isometric view of the Reflux Classifier used in continuous experiments for coarse particle feeds with dimensions shown in millimetres.</i>	107
Figure 5.3	<i>A schematic of the continuous operation setup.</i>	109
Figure 5.4	<i>(a) Ash versus average particle size results for the feed, product and reject for Coal 2 (flotation feed with a top size of 0.5 mm), processed under baseline conditions of 2 m long, 12 mm wide channels. (b) Ash results for the feed, product and reject for Coal 3 (a different flotation feed also with a top size of 0.5 mm), processed under narrow channel conditions of 1 m long 1.77 mm wide channels. Full details are listed in Appendix F. Dotted lines indicate the particle size below which the ash level in the product starts to rapidly increase.</i>	117
Figure 5.5	<i>A comparison of the density cut-points, D_{50}, versus particle size for the two fine feed experiments.</i>	120
Figure 5.6	<i>Typical - 2.0 mm + 0.25 mm density partition curve results for continuously operated laboratory, pilot and full scale reflux classifiers. The pilot scale vessel had a throughput of 42 t/m²h, where as the full scale had roughly a 15.6 t/m²h throughput and the laboratory scale had approximately an 8 t/m²h throughput. The channel spacing for the pilot scale results was 30 mm, whereas the full scale was 120 mm and</i>	122

	<i>laboratory scale was 5.5 mm. All the partition curves are for coal feed with a nominal size range - 2 mm + 0.25 mm</i>	
Figure 5.7	<i>A comparison between Experiment 5 (12.2 t/(m²h)) fractional ash and Experiment 7 (21.3 t/(m²h)) fractional ash results for the feed, product, and reject for different particle sizes.</i>	127
Figure 5.8	<i>A comparison between Experiment 5 (12.2 t/(m²h)) fractional ash and Experiment 8 (47.3 t/(m²h)) fractional ash results for the feed, product, and reject at different particle size.</i>	128
Figure 5.9	<i>Cumulative yield versus ash results from Experiments 4, 5, 7 and 8 in the - 4.0 mm + 0.075 mm particle size range compared with the washability curve for that feed. Experiments 4, 5, 7 and 8 appear from left to right respectively, data points shown here as crosses.</i>	129
Figure 6.1	<i>Schematic of a 2 stage (Gravity/De-slime) process.</i>	137
Figure 6.2	<i>A schematic of the splitter between the gravity and de-sliming vessels. A photo of this splitter is shown in Figure K.9 in Appendix K.</i>	141
Figure 6.3	<i>The de-sliming vessel size partition curves for the three de-sliming experiments. The cut points were 0.185, 0.089 and 0.047 mm with Eps of 0.107, 0.033 and 0.009 mm for Experiments 1, 2 and 3 respectively.</i>	146

List of Tables

		Page
Table 4.1	<i>The different number of channel spacing used in this study and their respective perpendicular spacings, z'.</i>	71
Table 4.2	<i>Feed particle specifications</i>	72
Table 4.3	<i>Experimental conditions of all the semi-batch experiments.</i>	80
Table 4.4	<i>The key velocity of a number of different densities.</i>	83
Table 4.5	<i>Average sample densities (kg/m^3) of different size fractions from each Flow of experiment using the combined control feed.</i>	87
Table 5.1	<i>Experimental conditions for all the continuous experiments. The “*” indicates that the flow rate is based on the area of the horizontal cross section. Full experimental details are listed in Appendix F.</i>	115
Table 5.2	<i>Average ash contents for the different streams for Experiments 1 and 2.</i>	118
Table 5.3	<i>Summary of D_{50} for different size ranges for laboratory (this work), pilot plant (Galvin et al, 2002) and full scale (Galvin et al, 2005) Reflux Classifier continuous experiments. The channels spacings were 5.5 mm, 30 mm, and 120 mm respectively. The “*” indicate that these densities are for an extended size range of $-1.4 + 0.71$ mm. Further information for Experiments 3 to 6, including the individual size fraction data for particles less than 0.25 mm is given in Appendix F and G.</i>	123
Table 5.4	<i>The separation imprecision, E_{ps}, for the laboratory, pilot and full scale experiments from Table 5.3. The “*” indicate that these E_{ps} are for an extended size range of $-1.4 + 0.71$ mm. Further information for Experiments 3 to 6, including the individual size fraction data of less than 0.25 mm, can be found in Appendix F.</i>	124
Table 6.1	<i>The dimensions of the Reflux Classifiers used in this two stage study.</i>	140
Table 6.2	<i>Measured volumetric rates with mass balanced solid flow rates, pulp densities, average ash content and throughput for all three Gravity / De-slime experiments. The star (*) indicates calculated values. The first number in these boxes is calculated from balancing the gravity vessel's volumetric or solid flow rates, while the second number is the calculation from balancing the de-slime's vessel flows.</i>	145

Table 6.3	<i>Size and ash distribution of the de-slime overflow for Experiments 1, 2 and 3.</i>	147
Table 6.4	<i>Mass balanced size and ash distributions of the two streams leaving the splitter in Experiment 3.</i>	151
Table 6.5	<i>The mass balanced size and ash distributions of the de-sliming vessel for Experiment 3.</i>	152

Abstract

The Reflux Classifier is an industrial technology that separates particles on the basis of size and / or density. It consists of a conventional vertical fluidised bed with a section of parallel inclined channels positioned above. The research described in this thesis is an examination of the effects of using “narrow” inclined channels (with widths as fine as 1.77 mm) on the performance of a Reflux Classifier.

The finest channels studied prior to this work were nominally 7 mm wide. The understanding of particle elutriation from these relatively wide inclined channels was developed by Laskovski *et al.* (2006). They noted that there was an increased preferential re-suspension of low density particles as the channel spacing narrowed. However, this re-suspension phenomenon was not fully investigated, thus, the mechanisms for this re-suspension were not fully understood or accounted for in their generalised correlation.

Experiments were performed in laboratory-scale vessels, with 1 m long channels, inclined at 70° to the horizontal. Channel widths from 18 mm down to 1.77 mm were investigated. Batch experiments were performed using well-defined feeds with particles of a single density (PVC, glass ballotini and ilmenite) and also using an industrial coal sample. It was found that: 1) relatively narrow channels produced a previously unobserved size suppression effect; and 2) the maximum particle size to channel width ratio for optimum performance was determined to be 0.33. A theoretical model, with no adjustable parameters, was developed which successfully predicted and explained the observed results. The main cause of the suppression of size effects is that when laminar

flow occurs in narrow channels, the effective fluid velocity experienced by the particles lying on the channel wall is proportional to their size.

Further experiments were performed in continuous mode with simultaneous feed addition, and underflow and overflow removal. A number of different industrial coal feeds were used. Comparing these results against those from the more traditional wider channelled Reflux Classifiers, it was demonstrated that the size suppression effect observed in batch narrow channel operations also occurred in continuous operations. The new narrow 5.5 mm channel Reflux Classifier was capable of processing an extended size range of - 2.0 mm + 0.25 mm while achieving a separation density of 1560 kg/m³ and E_p of 0.062. Where E_p is a measure of how accurately the separation device performed, with an E_p of “0” being a perfect splitting of a stream over a point and an E_p of “1” showing that there was no preferential segregation in the splitting of the stream. The traditional wide 30 mm or 120 mm channel Reflux Classifier could only achieve for a similar separation density and feed size range of - 2.0 mm + 0.25 mm could only typically produce an E_p of 0.15 (55). While the narrow channels operate best at a capacity of 20 t/(m²h), allowing significant separation down to 0.075 mm, increasing the processing rate of the classifier is possible, though at a diminished capacity. At 30 t/(m²h) the narrow channel Reflux Classifier will competently process particles as fine as 0.125 mm and at throughputs of ~ 40 t/(m²h) the channel Reflux Classifier would only be able to process a feed range of - 2 mm + 0.25 mm which is comparable to the maximum capacity of the more traditional wide channel Reflux Classifier.

A final set of continuous experiments were undertaken to investigate the performance of a two-stage operation in which a narrow 5.5 mm channel gravity Reflux Classifier performed an initial gravity separation and a second wider 12 mm channel Reflux Classifier performed a de-sliming step to remove the high ash content fines. It was concluded for the de-sliming vessel that a separation of less than 0.05 mm with a very low E_p (0.009), accounting for a variance of less than 0.02 mm between 25th and 75th percentiles of the curve, is achievable. It was discovered that: 1) the presence of a dense autogenous bed seems to be detrimental to the operations of the de-sliming vessel; 2) without a bed present the superficial channel velocity is the primary controlling factor in particle elutriation; and 3) the processing area of the de-sliming vessel probably needs to be at least double that of its preceding continuous gravity Reflux Classifier.

Publications

Journal Articles:

- Zhou, J., Walton, K., Laskovski, D., Duncan, P., Galvin K.P. (2006). "Enhanced separation of mineral sand using the Reflux Classifier", Minerals Engineering 19 (15), 1573-1579.
- Galvin, K. P., Walton, K., Zhou, J. (2009). "How to elutriate particles according to their density", Chemical Engineering Science 64, 2003 - 2010.
- Galvin, K. P., Zhou, J., Walton, K. (2010). " Application of closely spaced inclined channels in gravity separation of fine particles", Minerals Engineering 23 (4), 326 - 338.
- Walton, K., Zhou, J., Galvin, K. P. (2010). "Processing of fine particles using closely spaced channels", Advanced Powder Technology 21 (4), 386 - 391.

Conference Papers:

- Macpherson, S., Moghtaderi, B., Walton, K., Galvin, K. P. (2007) "Dry processing using an air-Magnetite dense medium in a Reflux Classifier", 37th Annual Australian Chemical Engineering Conference, CHEMECA 2007, Melbourne, Australia.
- Macpherson, S., Callen, A., Walton, K., Galvin, K. P. (2008), "Dry processing of coal in air-sand Reflux Classifier with vibration", 12th Australian Coal Preparation Society Conference 2008, Sydney, Australia.

- Walton, K., Zhou, J., Galvin, K. P. (2008). "Processing of fine particles using closely spaced inclined channels", 12th Australian Coal Preparation Society Conference 2008, Sydney, Australia.
- Walton, K., Zhou, J., Galvin, K. P. (2008). "Processing of fine particles using closely spaced inclined channels"39th Annual Australian Chemical Engineering Conference, CHEMECA 2009, Perth, Australia
- Galvin, K. P., Walton, K., Zhou, J. (2010). "Gravity separation and classification of fine coal using the hydrodynamics of inclined channels", Thirteenth Australia Coal Preparation Conference, Mackay Convention & exhibition Centre - Mackay.
- Galvin, K. P., Walton, K., Zhou, J. (2010). "Fine gravity separation in the Reflux Classifier, exploiting a high shear rate, laminar flow mechanism", XXV International Mineral Processing Congress, Brisbane, Australia.
- Galvin, K. P., Callen, A., Spear, S., Walton, K., Zhou, J. (2010). "Gravity separation of coal in the Reflux Classifier - new mechanisms for suppressing effects of particle size", XVI International Coal Preparation Congress, Lexington, Kentucky.

Nomenclature

Symbol	Description	Units
B	Depth of channel or vessel	m
C	Constant	$\text{m}^2.\text{s}^{-2}$
C_D	Coefficient of drag	-
C_{DNS}	Non-spherical Coefficient of drag	-
d	Diameter of a particle	m
d_{sph}	Diameter of a spherical particle	m
d^*	Non-spherical diameter	m
D	Dispersion Coefficient	-
D_h	The hydraulic width of channel, pipe or vessel	m
F	Throughput Advantage	-
F_G	Particles gravitational force	m.s^2
F_B	Particles buoyancy force	m.s^2
F_D	Particles drag force	m.s^2
F_f	Frictional force	m.s^2
g	Gravitational force	m.s^2
g_x	Gravitational force in the “x” direction	m.s^2
g_y	Gravitational force in the “y” direction	m.s^2
g_z	Gravitational force in the “z” direction	m.s^2
L	Length of the incline	m
L_f	Lift Force	N
n	Richard and Zaki constant	-

P	Pressure	N.m^{-2}
P_A	Particles acceleration	m.s^2
Re	Fluids Reynolds number	-
Re_p	Particles Reynolds number	-
Re_s	Shear Reynolds number	-
Re_{Sed}	Sedimentary Reynolds number	-
Re_{Sph}	Spherical Particle Reynolds number	-
Re_T	Particles velocity at terminal free settling Reynolds number	-
U_{CP}	Critical particle velocity	m.s^{-1}
U_C	Inclined channel velocity	m.s^{-1}
U_p	Particles velocity	m.s^{-1}
U'_p	Particles velocity in the inclined channel	m.s^{-1}
U_{HS}	Hindered settling particle velocity	m.s^{-1}
U_{seg}	Particle segregation velocity	m.s^{-1}
U_T	Particles velocity at terminal free settling	m.s^{-1}
U'_T	Particles terminal velocity in the inclined channel	m.s^{-1}
U_*	Non-spherical particle velocity	m.s^{-1}
U	Fluid velocity	m.s^{-1}
U'	Average Fluid Velocity	m.s^{-1}
U_I	Interstitial fluid velocity	m.s^{-1}
U_S	Fluid slip velocity	m.s^{-1}
U_x	Fluid velocity in the “x” direction	m.s^{-1}
U_y	Fluid velocity in the “y” direction	m.s^{-1}
U_z	Fluid velocity in the “z” direction	m.s^{-1}

V	Average fluid velocity	m.s^{-1}
x	Distance in the “x” direction	m
y	Distance in the “y” direction	m
z	Distance in the “z” direction	m
z'	Perpendicular distance between inclined channels	m

Greek Letters

Symbol	Description	Units
Δ	Change/difference	-
ϕ	Solids concentration	-
ϕ_{sph}	Sphericity of a particle	-
γ	Fluid shear rate	s^{-1}
η	Segregation Efficiency	-
μ	Viscosity	N.s.m^{-2}
μ_{s}	Suspension viscosity	N.s.m^{-2}
π	Pi	-
ρ_{F}	Fluid density	kg.m^{-3}
ρ_{m}	Fluidised medium density	kg.m^{-3}
ρ_{P}	Particle density	kg.m^{-3}
ρ_{s}	Suspension density	kg.m^{-3}
∂	Partial differential operator	-