Argon Injection Optimization in Continuous Slab Casting

Tiebiao Shi and Brian G. Thomas

Department of Mechanical Engineering University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

March 25, 2001

Objectives

- Develop multiphase computational model to simulate the 3-D flow pattern of molten steel in the continuous casting mold with argon gas injection.
- Compare and evaluate differences between steel caster and scale water models.
- Estimate flow pattern (single roll, double roll, etc.) obtained in steel caster as a function of gas injection rate, steel throughput, mold width, and argon bubble size etc.
- Recommend practices related to argon gas injection optimization to improve steel product quality, especially as related to flow pattern.

Bubble Size Investigation



Double-needle experiment schematic

Bubble Size Investigation





Bubble size in the water model Case A (55ipm + 13 SLPM/ 11% hot gas)



Bubble size in the water model Case B (35ipm + 6.3 SLPM/ 8.5% hot gas)

Bubble Size Investigation



	Normal Conditions	Enlarged Slide Gate
Mold Width W (mm) x Thickness H (mm)	730 x 80	730 x 80
Mold Height (mm)	950	950
Nozzle Submergence Depth	80	80
(top surface to top of port)		
Nozzle Inner Diameter (mm)	31	31
Nozzle Port Width (mm) x Height (mm)	31 x 31	31 x 31
Jet Angle	30° down	30° down
Inlet Jet Spread Angle	0°	0°
Water Flow Rate Q _w (<i>SLPM</i>)	58.59 (15.5 GPM)	76.06 (20.1 GPM)
Equivalent Steel Casting Speed (ipm)	54.03	70.14
$V_c = rac{Q_w}{0.4 imes W imes 0.4 imes H imes \sqrt{0.4}}$		
Gas Flow Rate (SLPM, hot volume)	7.43 (15.8 SCFH)	7.43 (15.8 SCFH)
Gas Volume Fraction (%)	11.3	8.9
Inlet Velocity, $V_x(m/s)$	0.571	0.724
Inlet Velocity, $V_z(m/s)$	0.330	0.418
Inlet Turbulent Kinetic Energy, $K_0(m^2/s^2)$	0.044	0.044
Inlet Turbulence Dissipation Rate, $\varepsilon_0(m^2/s^3)$	0.999	0.999
Water Density (kg/m^3)	1000	1000
Water Viscosity (m^2/s)	1×10 ⁻³	1×10 ⁻³
Gas Density (kg/m^3)	1.20	1.20
Gas Viscosity (m^2/s)	1.7×10^{-5}	1.7×10 ⁻⁵
Average Bubble Diameter (mm)	2.590	2.590
Volume Fraction of 0.5 mm Bubble (%)	1.07	1.07
Volume Fraction of 1.5 mm Bubble (%)	4.53	4.53
Volume Fraction of 2.5 mm Bubble (%)	31.15	31.15
Volume Fraction of 3.5 mm Bubble (%)	55.83	55.83
Volume Fraction of 4.5 mm Bubble (%)	7.42	7.42
Breakup Coefficient	0.5	0.5
Coalescence Coefficient	0	0

Parameters for water model for Case A (55 ipm+11% hot gas)

	Normal Conditions	Enlarged Slide Gate
Mold Width W (mm) x Thickness H (mm)	730 x 80	730 x 80
Mold Height (mm)	950	950
Nozzle Submergence Depth	80	80
Nozzle Inner Diameter (mm)	31	31
Nozzle Port Width (mm) x Height (mm)	31 x 31	31 x 31
Water Flow Rate (SLPM)	37.80 (10.0 GPM)	43.64 (11.54 GPM)
Equivalent Steel Casting Speed (ipm)	34.86	40.24
$V_c = \frac{Q_w}{0.4 \times W \times 0.4 \times H \times \sqrt{0.4}}$		
Gas Flow Rate (SLPM, hot volume)	3.71 (7.9 SCFH)	3.71 (7.9 SCFH)
Gas Volume Fraction (%)	8.9	7.8
Inlet Velocity, $V_x(m/s)$	0.358	0.410
Inlet Velocity, $V_z(m/s)$	0.207	0.237
Inlet Turbulent Kinetic Energy (m^2/s^2)	0.044	0.044
Inlet Turbulence Dissipation Rate (m^2/s^3)	0.999	0.999
Water Density (kg/m^3)	1000	1000
Water Viscosity (m^2/s)	1×10 ⁻³	1×10 ⁻³
Gas Density (kg/m^3)	1.20	1.20
Gas Viscosity (m^2/s)	1.7×10 ⁻⁵	1.7×10 ⁻⁵
Jet Angle	30° down	30° down
Inlet Jet Spread Angle	0°	0°
Average Bubble Diameter (mm)	2.43	2.43
Volume Fraction of 0.5 mm Bubble (%)	4.43	4.43
Volume Fraction of 1.5 mm Bubble (%)	4.90	4.90
Volume Fraction of 2.5 mm Bubble (%)	10.34	10.34
Volume Fraction of 3.5 mm Bubble (%)	8.73	8.73
Volume Fraction of 4.5 mm Bubble (%)	11.60	11.60
Volume Fraction of 5.5 mm Bubble (%)	12.71	12.71
Volume Fraction of 6.5 mm Bubble (%)	0	0
Volume Fraction of 7.5 mm Bubble (%)	0	0
Volume Fraction of 8.5 mm Bubble (%)	0	0
Volume Fraction of 9.5 mm Bubble (%)	21.83	21.83
Volume Fraction of 10.5 mm Bubble (%)	25.46	25.46
Breakup Coefficient	0.1	0.1
Coalescence Coefficient	0	0

Parameter for water model for Case B (35 ipm+8.5% hot gas)



Flow Picture of Water Model

Simulation Result

PIV Mesurements

Comparison of Velocity at centerplane between PIV measurements, simulation and eyeview (55 ipm+13SLPM/11% hot gas)



Flow Picture of Water Model (55ipm +11% gas)



Liquid Velocity Vectors of Modeling (55ipm+11%gas)

Comparison of simulation and eyeviews while adjusting liquid level with 15% increase in flow rate Case A (55 ipm + 13 SLPM/11% hot gas)



Flow Picture of Water Model

Simulation Result

PIV Mesurements

Comparison of velocity at centerplane between PIV measurements, simulation and eyeview (35 ipm+6.5SLPM/8.5% hot gas)



Flow Picture of Water Model (35ipm +8.5% gas)

0.4 m/s



Liquid Velocity Vectors of Modeling (35ipm+8.5%gas)

Comparison of simulation and eyeviews while adjusting liquid level with 15% increase in flow rate Case B (35 ipm + 6.3 SLPM/8.5% hot gas)

	Case A	Case B (6.3SLPM
	(13 SLPM, 55 ipm)	/13SLPM, 35 ipm)
Mold Width	1854 mm	
Mold Thickness	228 mm	
Nozzle Submergence Depth	165 mm	
(top surface to top of port)		
Nozzle Bore Inner Diameter	78 mm	
Nozzle Port Height	78 mm	
Nozzle Port Width	78 <i>mm</i>	
Vertical Velocity in Nozzle	2.05 m/s	1.31 m/s
Nominal Vertical Angle of Port Edges	15° down	
Inlet Jet Spread Angle	0°	
Casting Speed, V _c	23.2 mm/s	14.8 mm/s
Liquid Steel Density, ρ_1	7020 kg/m^3	
Gas Density, ρ_{gas}	$0.27 \ kg/m^3$	
Steel Laminar (Molecular) Viscosity, μ_o	0.00560 kg/m s	
Gas Vescosity, μ_{gas}	7.42E-5	
Surface Tension Coeff. (Steel-Argon)	1.192 <i>N/m</i>	
Inlet steel flow rate	$0.584 \ m^3/min$	$0.376 \ m^3/min$
Throughput (ton/min)	4.10	2.64
Inlet Gas Flow Rate	13 SLPM	6.3 <i>SLPM</i> /13 <i>SLPM</i>
Inlet Gas Volume Fraction, f_{gas}	11%	8.5%
Average Gas Bubble Diameter, D_o	2.59 mm	2.43 mm
Gravitational Acceleration, g	9.8 m/s^2	

Parameters in the real caster modeling

*Blank in second column is the same as the first column.



Liquid velocity in the nozzle (Case A)



Liquid velocity in the nozzle (Case B)



Steel flow pattern calculated using CFX with distributed bubble size (2.59mm mean)



Steel flow pattern calculated using CFX with distributed bubble size(2.43 mm mean)



Steel Flow pattern calculated using CFX with distributed bubble size(2.43 mm mean)





Steel flow pattern calculated using CFX with distributed bobble size(2.59 mm mean)



Conditions: 73" slab, 35ipm, 6.3 SLPM, 8.5% Gas (hot))

Steel flow pattern calculated using CFX with distributed bobble size(2.43 mm mean)



Steel flow pattern calculated using CFX with distributed bobble size(2.43 mm mean)

1m/s

Flow Pattern Identification

(Water Model, Modified from M. Assar, P. Dauby and G. Lawson)



Flow Pattern Identification

(Real Caster)



Flow Pattern Identification (Real Caster)



Recommendations

- Do not inject argon into the lowest pressure locations in the nozzle. These low pressure regions will attract large gas flow rates locally, leading to large gas pockets and potential flow instabilities.
- Ramp the casting speed back up slowly after a ladle change to minimize unstable transient flow.
- Change submergence gradually and try to arrange for the deeper submergence depths to occur the wider slabs and shallower for narrow slabs.

Recommendations

- Optimal argon injection depends on width, casting speed, and submergence depth. Vary argon injection rate with throughput, width, and submergence depth.
- Keep argon injection *below* the levels recommended for stable double roll flow.
- When casting speed drops severely, cut argon to zero or minimal flow rate. Argon should be needed to prevent nozzle clogging due to air aspiration in these conditions; very little gas is needed to maintain a constant gas percentage; and bubble size might grow severely.

Further Work

- Further study is recommended using the mathematical models to quantify the conditions which lead to defects and then to fully quantify the flow patterns which lead to safe conditions through subsequent parametric studies.
- Further study is also needed of gas flow through the refractory relative to pressure drops in the nozzle in order to understand how the gas exits into the nozzle.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank:

- National Science Foundation.
- Continuous Casting Consortium (CCC) at UIUC.
- National Center for Supercomputing Applications (NCSA) at the UIUC.
- AEA technology for use of the CFX 4.2 program
- LTV Steel, especially Pierre Dauby and Mohammad Assar, for use of the water model and PIV system and access to PIV and MFC measurements.