A high-dimensional, stochastic model for twin-screw granulation – part 1: model description

McGuire, Andrew D.; Mosbach, Sebastian; Lee, Kok Foong; Reynolds, Gavin; Kraft, Markus

2018

McGuire, A. D., Mosbach, S., Lee, K. F., Reynolds, G., & Kraft, M. (2018). A high-dimensional, stochastic model for twin-screw granulation - part 1: model description. *Chemical Engineering Science*, 188221-237. doi:10.1016/j.ces.2018.04.076

<https://hdl.handle.net/10356/107589>

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ces.2018.04.076>

© 2018 Elsevier. All rights reserved. This paper was published in *Chemical Engineering Science* and is made available with permission of Elsevier.

Downloaded on 26 Apr 2023 19:45:01 SGT

A high-dimensional, stochastic model for twin-screw granulation

Part 1: Model description

Andrew D. McGuire^a, Sebastian Mosbach^a, Kok Foong Lee^a, Gavin Reynolds^b, Markus Kraft^{a,c,*}

^a*Department of Chemical Engineering and Biotechnology, University of Cambridge, Philippa Fawcett Dr, Cambridge, CB3 0AS, United Kingdom*

^b*Pharmaceutical Technology & Development, AstraZeneca, Charter Way, Macclesfield, SK10 2NA, United Kingdom*

^c*School of Chemical and Biomedical Engineering, Nanyang Technological University, 62 Nanyang Drive, Singapore 637459*

Abstract

In this work we present a novel four-dimensional, stochastic population balance model for twin-screw granulation. The model uses a compartmental framework to reflect changes in mechanistic rates between different screw element geometries. This allows us to capture the evolution of the material along the barrel length. The predictive power of the model is assessed across a range of liquid-solid feed ratios through comparison with experimental particle size distributions. The model results show a qualitative agreement with experimental trends and a number of areas for model improvement are discussed. A sensitivity analysis is carried out to assess the effect of key operating variables and model parameters on the simulated product particle size distribution. The stochastic treatment of the model allows the particle description to be readily extended to track more complex particle properties and their transformations.

Keywords: granulation, twin-screw, stochastic, population balance model

*Corresponding author

Email address: mk306@cam.ac.uk (Markus Kraft)

1. Introduction

Granulation (also known as agglomeration, pelletisation or balling) is a common method of particle manufacture. The formation of granules is a key process in the food industry, in formation of tablets within the pharmaceutical industry and in the production of fertilisers [1]. The granular product will have an optimum size (typically a distribution), porosity, solubility, mechanical strength, shape and flow-ability amongst other properties dictated by the specific application. Granules have several advantages over a simple mixture of the raw ingredients such as better flow-ability; better transport properties (such as limited separation of components and reduced risk of powder explosions); dissolution behaviour and controlled release of Active Pharmaceutical Ingredients (API) [2, 3].

Twin-screw granulation (TSG) is a relatively new method of continuous granule production and is currently subject to a high degree of research as a viable alternative to batch granulation. TSG consists of a barrel with two co-rotating screws into which raw excipient/API are fed in conjunction with a liquid binder as illustrated in Figure 1. In these systems, the screws and barrel wall impart a shear force on the material, forming granules which are then conveyed along the barrel towards the outlet, undergoing a number of transformations such as growth/attrition along the way, depending on the processing conditions.

Figure 1: twin-screw granulator

TSG systems have shown many advantages over traditional batch production methods such as the ability to: produce flow-able granules with high API

content [4]; reduce plant foot print [5]; minimise the use of API/excipient during
25 formulation development and ease the scale-up from development to full
production. [6].

Another advantage of TSG equipment is the variable configuration of the device available to the operator during formulation development. Each screw in the TSG system is composed of numerous screw elements which may be of
30 varying geometry. Different types of element act differently on the particle mass passing through them and thus the screw element configuration may be altered to produce a granular product with different physical properties. The screw speed, liquid feed rate and powder feed formulation may also be varied in this way, resulting in a system with an exceptionally large operating space. The
35 complexity and variability of the TSG system therefore requires a deep understanding of the underlying process in order to predict, and more importantly, control the properties of the resulting granules, in line with the philosophy of Quality by Design [7].

Experimental studies have probed the effects of screw element configuration
40 on the physical properties of the granular product from TSG systems and tried to identify the role of specific types of screw element [8, 9, 10, 11]. Dhenge *et al.* have investigated the effect of powder feed rate [12] and binder viscosity [13] while Li *et al.* [14] and Vanhoorne *et al.* [15] have assessed the impact of the physical properties of the API on the TSG process. Hagrasy *et al.* [16] investi-
45 gated the effect of powder feed formulation and liquid-solid mass feed ratio on product size/porosity distribution and Saleh *et al.* [17] investigated the effect of binder delivery method on the TSG system. Though the number of experimental investigations is extensive, the large operating window of TSG systems often limits the applicability of these results to local regions of the operating space.
50 The comprehensive review of the experimental TSG literature by Seem *et al.* [18] shows a complex interplay between the role of each screw element type, the overall screw configuration, feed formulation and liquid flowrates on the observed experimental trends. This emphasises the need for a particle-scale model of TSG that can accurately predict the physical properties of the bulk granular

55 product. Ultimately, the inversion of such a model could then be carried out and coupled with process control systems to allow specification and control of product specification in TSG systems.

Granular systems are generally modelled using population balance models (PBM) [19, 20, 21, 2, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27]. TSG specific PBMs have been
60 developed, ranging from one [28] to three dimensional particle models [29, 30]. A lumped parameter method is typically used to estimate additional particle properties beyond those explicitly tracked by the model [29]. Flow information and collision data have been incorporated into TSG models through couplings with alternative modelling frameworks such as the discrete element method
65 (DEM) [29] and experimental near-infrared chemical tracing [31, 28]. Many of these TSG PBM studies have shown results in qualitative agreement with the experimental studies; however, quantitative predictions have proven to be much more challenging. One reason for this could be over-simplification of the system within the models. All of the existing TSG PBM models are numerically
70 solved using variations of the sectional method [32]. Such a numerical approach ultimately limits the model dimensionality as high dimensional models become computationally unfeasible, thereby placing a limit on model complexity.

The main objective of this work is to extend the stochastic batch granulation model introduced by Braumann et al. [24] and further developed by
75 Lee et al. [33] to twin-screw granulation. Specifically, this involves the introduction/adaption of existing particle process models to reflect differences in the nature of batch and twin-screw processes (such as nucleation dynamics, continuous inflow/outflow) and rectify identified deficiencies in the existing modelling framework. By stochastically evolving the twin-screw particle ensemble in time,
80 the particle representation may be arbitrarily complex. The additional particle dimensions not afforded to traditional sectional methods can then be integrated in the twin-screw process description.

In the first part of this two-part study we present a four-dimensional stochastic population balance model of a TSG system. In the second part of this study
85 we present and analyse the numerical methods developed to overcome the nu-

merical challenges inherent to stochastic modelling of twin-screw systems and solve the TSG model described in this paper. The model is used to simulate the experiments carried out by Hagrasy et al. [16], specifically those testing the effect of varying liquid-solid ratio (LSR) using a Lactose Impalpable placebo
90 feed formulation.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows: firstly we present an overview of the existing population balance model for high shear granulation developed by Braumann et al. [24] and Lee et al. [33]. A detailed account of the twin-screw model mechanisms is given in Section 2.2. The parameter
95 estimation methodology used to evaluate unknown process rate constants is then briefly discussed, followed by a presentation and discussion of the main results in Section 4. Finally, the main findings and future recommendations for TSG modelling are summarised in Section 5.

2. Methodology

100 2.1. Population balance model

A four-dimensional population balance model is used as the base for the twin-screw granulation model in this study. A general account of the underlying population balance model and the twin-screw specific features are outlined in this section. For a detailed description of the underlying population balance
105 model, the reader is directed to [33, 23].

Building on the work of Lee et al. [33], the granulator is represented by a series of connected, well-mixed compartments filled with particles. In this work we use the type-space $\mathbb{X}$ in which elements $x = (s_o, l_e, l_i, p), x \in \mathbb{X}$ are used to describe each particle. Here: s_o is the original solid volume, l_e is the
110 external liquid volume, l_i is the internal liquid volume and the pore volume as illustrated in Figure 2. Internal liquid only exists within the pore volume and the remaining pore volume is occupied with gas. The same particle vector is capable of representing any of the phases present in a placebo granulation system, namely: primary particles, granules and free liquid droplets.

Figure 2: Particle description.

Using this particle description, the total particle volume is:

$$v(x) = s_o(x) + l_e(x) + p(x) \quad (1)$$

and the particle porosity is defined as:

$$\varepsilon(x) = \frac{p(x)}{v(x)}. \quad (2)$$

115 Particles are assumed to be spherical for the purposes of computing particle surface areas and diameters, however, all non-liquid particles are assumed to have surface asperities with characteristic length scale h_a . These asperities, along with other properties, control the likelihood of successful coalescence between two particles, described further in Section 2.2.

120 2.2. Twin-screw particle processes

The particles ensemble is evolved in time through a mixture of particle jump events and continuous processes as shown in Figure 3. The possible jump events are: nucleation, particle collision (which may or may not lead to rebound, coalescence and particle compaction), particle breakage and particle transport
 125 (between compartments). Liquid penetration (transforming external liquid to internal liquid) is carried out as a continuous particle process. In this work, we make use of the idea of deferred processes as defined by the Linear Process Deferment Algorithm [34]. This algorithm is utilised to defer the applications of linear process operators that are particularly computationally intensive, such
 130 as liquid penetration.

Figure 3: Particle processes permitted in the TSG model.

Since the population balance model is to be solved using the stochastic particle method, it is constructed in weak form. That is to say, each of the terms is integrated against some suitable test function. Let

1. $\lambda(z, t, dx)$ be a concentration measure on $\mathbb{X}$ at time t in compartment z , or more simply, a concentration measure on the interval $x + dx$ in compartment z at time, t .
2. Addition and subtraction on $\mathbb{X}$ correspond to particle coagulation and breakage, respectively.
3. $\varphi(z, x) : \mathbb{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be a suitable test function which is smooth with compact support,
4. $\mathbb{X}_{\text{nuc}} \subset \mathbb{X}$ be the set of all partially formed granular nuclei.
5. $\mathbb{X}_{\text{incept}} \subset \mathbb{X}$ be the set of all possible inception particle forms.

The weak form of the population balance equation (PBE) to be solved is then

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt} \int_{x \in \mathbb{X}} \varphi(z, x) \lambda(z, t, dx) = & \quad (3) \\
& \int_{x \in \mathbb{X}_{\text{incept}}} \varphi(z, x) I_{\text{solid}}(z, t, dx) \\
& + \frac{1}{2} \int_{x, y \in \mathbb{X}} [\varphi(z, x + y) - \varphi(z, x) - \varphi(z, y)] K_{\text{coag}}(z, x, y) \\
& \quad \lambda(z, t, dx) \lambda(z, t, dy) \\
& + \frac{1}{2} \int_{x, y \in \mathbb{X}} [\varphi(z, x) + \varphi(z, x - y) - \varphi(z, x)] F(z, x, dy) \\
& \quad \lambda(z, t, dx) \\
& + \int_{x \in \mathbb{X}} \varphi(z, x) \frac{1}{\tau(z - 1)} \lambda(z - 1, t, dx) \\
& - \int_{x \in \mathbb{X}} \varphi(z, x) \frac{1}{\tau(z)} \lambda(z, t, dx) \\
& + \int_{x \in \mathbb{X}} \varphi(z, x) I_{\text{drop}}(z, t, dx) \\
& + \int_{x \in \mathbb{X}_{\text{nuc}}, y \in \mathbb{X} \setminus \mathbb{X}_{\text{nuc}}} [\varphi(z, T_{\text{nuc}}(x, y)) - \varphi(z, x) - \varphi(z, y)] \\
& \quad K_{\text{nuc}}(z, x, y) \lambda(z, t, dx) \lambda(z, t, dy).
\end{aligned}$$

In this form, each integral on the RHS of Equation (3) represents an aggregate particle processes within the model. The $\varphi(\cdot)$ component of each integrand represents the particle transformation of the associated mechanism. The remainder of the integrand defines the rate at which this event occurs. The first term in Equation (3) represents the inception of solid particle into the system (simulating the inflow of feed powder). The second term in (3) combines the birth and death terms related to coagulation processes. The third term of Equation (3) represents the birth and death terms associated with particle fragmentation. The fourth and fifth terms of Equation (3) capture the inter-compartment particle transport processes. The second last term in Equation (3) represents the inception of liquid droplets into the liquid addition zone of the twin-screw. Fi-

nally, the last term in Equation (3) concerns the growth of nuclei within the
 155 twin-screw device. The physical model and type-space transformations associated with each of these particle processes will be explained, in detail, in the
 remained of this section.

Liquid addition/nucleation

In TSG, primary agglomerates are generally formed by way of immersion nu-
 160 cleation [13, 35, 36] as small primary particles diffuse into large liquid droplets
 that are incident on the surface of the powder bed. This mechanism is relevant
 for TSG, as liquid will typically be added without the use of an atomisation
 nozzle, and primary particles are typically very small (common commercial lac-
 tose excipient blends such GranuLac 200 (Meggler Pharma) have a d50 of around
 165 $30\mu\text{m}$ [37]). It is hypothesised that these liquid-rich primary agglomerates (or
nuclei) are subject to compaction and breakage, particularly in kneading ele-
 ments, as described by the destructive nucleation mechanism of Vonk et al. [38].
 Here we adapt an interpretation of the immersion nucleation mechanism to the
 type-space of the current model.

Liquid addition

The nucleation process begins with the inception of a large droplet. Spherical
 liquid droplets, consisting only of external liquid and with volume v_{drop} and
 diameter d_{drop} , are incepted into the first compartment with the form

$$x_{\text{drop}} = (0, v_{\text{drop}}, 0, 0). \quad (4)$$

Droplets are considered to be mono-disperse and d_{drop} is assumed to be the
 same as the nozzle diameter of the liquid inception port d_{nozzle} . The associated
 rate of this process (which features in PBE (3)) is

$$I_{\text{drop}}(z, t, dx) = \frac{(\text{LSR})\dot{M}_{\text{feed}}}{V_{\text{real}}(z)\rho_l v_{\text{drop}}} \delta_{x_{\text{drop}}}(x) dx. \quad (5)$$

Here $V_{\text{real}}(z)$ is physical volume of the compartment z , $\dot{M}_{\text{feed}}(z)$ is the liquid
 flow-rate delivered to compartment z , LSR is the liquid-solid mass feed ratio,
 v_{drop} is the volume of the droplets being incepted and $\delta_{x_{\text{drop}}}$ is to be interpreted
 as the Dirac delta function, centred on x_{drop} . This results in a total droplet

inception rate of

$$R_{\text{drop}}(z, t) = \begin{cases} \frac{(\text{LSR})\dot{M}_{\text{feed}}}{v_{\text{drop}}\rho_l}, & \text{if } z = 1, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

Nuclei growth

In this work, nuclei growth is defined as the addition of particles to a droplet or semi-formed nuclei (a droplet which has acquired some degree of solid mass). Hence, it is similar to a coagulation event, with the caveat that it involves a droplet/partially formed nucleus and another particle, which is not a droplet or partially formed nucleus. Further to this, immersion nucleation is defined as the process by which a droplet is incepted into the system, undergoes growth and produces a fully formed nucleus. The nuclei growth is described by the following particle size transformation:

$$x_{\text{nuc}}, x_i \mapsto T_{\text{nuc}}(x_{\text{nuc}}, x_i), \quad (7)$$

170 where $x_{\text{nuc}} \in \mathbb{X}_{\text{nuc}}, x_i \in \mathbb{X} \setminus \mathbb{X}_{\text{nuc}}$ ($\mathbb{X}_{\text{nuc}}$ is the set of partially formed nuclei).

The nucleation type-space transformation T_{nuc} is characterised by the individual property transformations:

$$s_o(T_{\text{nuc}}(x_{\text{nuc}}, x_i)) = s_o(x_{\text{nuc}}) + s_o(x_i) \quad (8)$$

$$l_e(T_{\text{nuc}}(x_{\text{nuc}}, x_i)) = l_e(x_{\text{nuc}}) \quad (9)$$

$$- \min([\phi_{\text{max}} - \phi(x_i)]s_o(x_i), l_e(x_{\text{nuc}})),$$

$$l_i(T_{\text{nuc}}(x_{\text{nuc}}, x_i)) = l_i(x_{\text{nuc}}) + l_i(x_i) + l_e(x_i) \quad (10)$$

$$+ \min([\phi_{\text{max}} - \phi(x_i)]s_o(x_i), l_e(x_{\text{nuc}})),$$

$$p(T_{\text{nuc}}(x_{\text{nuc}}, x_i)) = l_i(T_{\text{nuc}}(x_{\text{nuc}}, x_i))/s^*. \quad (11)$$

In the above, $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is to be interpreted as the indicator function on set $\mathcal{A}$, $\phi(x_i)$ is the liquid saturation level of the particle to be added, given as:

$$\phi(x) = \frac{l_i(x) + l_e(x)}{s_o(x)}, \quad (12)$$

and $\phi_{\max}$ is the maximum level of liquid saturation in the nuclei. To quantify this value we follow a similar approach to that taken by Barrasso and Ramachandran [39] to model the size of newly formed nuclei. This approach is consistent with the nucleation mechanism described by Iveson et al. [1], where nuclei are formed by way of droplet penetration into a porous bed. This is captured by the relation:

$$\phi_{\max} = \frac{(1 - \varepsilon_{\text{bed}})s^*}{\varepsilon_{\text{bed}}}, \quad (13)$$

where ε_{bed} is the bed packing fraction and s^* is the maximum internal pore liquid saturation level of the nuclei. The probability that a particle will be selected to form part of a nucleus is assumed to be proportional to the volume of the particle. Additionally, it is postulated that there is a maximum particle size that can be integrated into the nucleus. In this study we set the size limit for integration $v_{\text{nuc}}^{\max} = v_{\text{drop}}$. These model properties can be expressed using a nucleation kernel of the form

$$K_{\text{nuc}}(x_{\text{nuc}}, x_i, z, t) = \begin{cases} k_{\text{nuc}}(z) \min(v(x_{\text{nuc}}), v(x_i)) & \text{if } \min(v(x_{\text{nuc}}), v(x_i)) < v_{\text{drop}}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where k_{nuc} is the nucleation growth rate constant and since, for the conditions we wish to model $v(x_{\text{nuc}}) > v(x_i) \forall i \in \{1, \dots, N(z, t)\}$, this can be simplified to

$$K_{\text{nuc}}(x_{\text{nuc}}, x_i, z, t) = \begin{cases} k_{\text{nuc}}(z)v(x_i) & \text{if } v(x_i) < v_{\text{drop}}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

As noted by Hapgood et al. [40], with α -Lactose formulations and water binders, the droplet penetration time can likely be considered to be negligible. Hence, it is assumed that particle addition to the nuclei is instantaneous (i.e. $k_{\text{nuc}}(z) \rightarrow \infty, \forall z \in \mathbb{L}$). Given this assumption, at the point of droplet inception, nuclei-
175 growth events occur rapidly (and without intermediate events such as breakage etc.) on the same partially formed nuclei particle (initially a droplet) until the product particle $T_{\text{nuc}}(x_{\text{nuc}}, x_i) \notin \mathbb{X}_{\text{nuc}}$. When this condition is met, i.e the initial droplet has become saturated in with solid, the nuclei growth process is

complete. As such, the droplet inception and sequential nuclei-growth process
 180 can be grouped together into a unified immersion nucleation event. Thus per-
 mitting the formation of large, highly porous, liquid rich agglomerates in the
 droplet zone.

Collision/compaction

Model particles may undergo binary collisions according to the transformations

$$\text{Coalescence successful: } (x_i), (x_j) \rightarrow (T_{\text{comp}}(T_{\text{coag}}(x_i, x_j))),$$

$$\text{Coalescence unsuccessful: } (x_i), (x_j) \rightarrow (T_{\text{comp}}(x_i)), (T_{\text{comp}}(x_j)),$$

where T_{comp} and T_{coag} are the compaction and coagulation transforms, respec-
 tively.

The rate of collision between particles x_i and x_j is modelled using the size
 independent collision kernel:

$$K_{\text{col}}(z, x_i, x_j) = n_{\text{screw}} k_{\text{col}}(z), \quad (15)$$

where n_{screw} is the screw speed and k_{col} is the collision rate constant. Each
 particle collision leads to the compaction of the particles involved. This is
 modelled as a porosity reduction described by:

$$\Delta\epsilon(x) = \begin{cases} k_{\text{comp}}(z)[\epsilon(x) - \epsilon_{\min}], & \text{if } \epsilon(x) \geq \epsilon_{\min}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

185 where k_{comp} is the compaction rate constant and $\epsilon_{\min}$ is the minimum porosity
 permitted.

Whether or not a particular collision is successful (resulting in coagulation
 of the parent particles) is governed by the Stokes criterion [41]. This criterion
 states that, given a collision particle pair (x_i, x_j) , coalescence only occurs if

$$\text{St}_v(x_i, x_j) \leq \text{St}_v^*(x_i, x_j), \quad (17)$$

where St_v is the viscous Stokes number and St_v^* is the critical stokes number.

The viscous Stokes number is defined as [41]

$$\text{St}_v(x_i, x_j) = \frac{\tilde{m}(x_i, x_j)U_{\text{col}}}{3\pi\mu\tilde{R}(x_i, x_j)^2}, \quad (18)$$

where $\tilde{m}$ is the mean harmonic mass of the collision pair, U_{col} is the collision velocity, μ is the binder viscosity and $\tilde{R}$ is the harmonic mean radius of the collision pair.

The critical Stokes number is defined as [23]

$$\text{St}_v^*(x_i, x_j) = \left(1 + \frac{1}{e_{\text{coag}}}\right) \ln \left(\frac{\bar{h}_l(x_i, x_j)}{h_a}\right), \quad (19)$$

where e_{coag} is the coefficient of restitution of the granule material, $\bar{h}_l$ is arithmetic average binder thickness of the collision pair and h_a is the height of surface asperities. As in [23], individual particle binder levels h_l are computed as

$$h_l(x) = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt[3]{\frac{6}{\pi}} \left[\sqrt[3]{v(x)} - \sqrt[3]{v(x) - l_e(x)} \right] \quad (20)$$

Given this criterion, the full coagulation kernel K_{coag} , which features the PBE (Equation (3)), can be formulated as

$$K_{\text{coag}}(z, x_i, x_j) = K_{\text{col}}(z, x_i, x_j) \mathbb{1}_{\{x_i, x_j | \text{St}_v(x_i, x_j) \leq \text{St}_v^*(x_i, x_j)\}}(x_i, x_j). \quad (21)$$

Following the approach of Goodson et al. [42], if a coagulation event is successful then a fraction of the external liquid l_e from the particles involved in the collision becomes internal liquid l_i in the newly formed particle. The pore volume of the newly formed particle is further modified for successful collisions. In this way, the coagulation transform is characterised, as in [24, 23], by the following:

$$s_o(T_{\text{coag}}(x_i, x_j)) = s_o(x_i) + s_o(x_j) \quad (22)$$

$$l_e(T_{\text{coag}}(x_i, x_j)) = l_e(x_i) + l_e(x_j) - l_{e \rightarrow i}(x_i, x_j) \quad (23)$$

$$l_i(T_{\text{coag}}(x_i, x_j)) = l_i(x_i) + l_i(x_j) + l_{e \rightarrow i}(x_i, x_j) \quad (24)$$

$$p(T_{\text{coag}}(x_i, x_j)) = \frac{a_{\text{surf}}^+(x_i, x_j)^{\frac{3}{2}}}{6\pi^{1/2}} \quad (25)$$

$$- [s_o(x_i) + s_o(x_j) - l_e(x_i) - l_e(x_j) + l_{e \rightarrow i}(x_i, x_j)]$$

Here, $l_{e \rightarrow i}(x_i, x_j)$ represents the amount of surface liquid that is internalised due to the contact area between the colliding particle pair and $a_{\text{surf}}^+(x_i, x_j)$ is the

surface area of the newly formed aggregate. Both of these terms are described in detail in [23].

Compaction

Several experimental studies [10, 18, 13, 43, 9] have concluded that internal liquid is squeezed to the surface of nuclei/nuclei fragments in areas of high compaction such as kneading blocks. This newly surfaced liquid then permits the layering of dry primary material onto the surface of the compacted particles. To described the movement of liquid during this squeezing process, some of the internal liquid is moved to external liquid. The amount of liquid transferred $l_{i \rightarrow e}$ is hypothesised to be proportional to the relative change in pore volume as described by the following relation:

$$l_{i \rightarrow e} = \Delta p_{\text{comp}} \left(\frac{l_{i,o}}{p_o} \right), \quad (26)$$

where $l_{i,o}$ and p_o are the internal liquid and pore volumes, respectively, prior to compaction and Δp_{comp} is the change in pore volume associated with a compaction event. Consistency between (1), (2) and (26) requires:

$$\Delta p_{\text{comp}} = p_o - \frac{\varepsilon_1(s_o + l_{e,o} + l_{i,o})}{1 - \varepsilon_1 \left(1 - \frac{l_{i,o}}{p_o} \right)}. \quad (27)$$

195 Here, $l_{e,o}$ is the external liquid volume prior to compaction and ε_1 is the post compaction porosity. These relationships define the compaction transform T_{comp} .

Breakage

As in Braumann et al. [23], particles may undergo binary breakage and the daughter distribution is described by a beta distribution. The breakage transform is:

$$T_{\text{break}}(x_i) \rightarrow (x_j), (x_i - x_j), \quad (28)$$

where T_{break} is the breakage operator.

This rate of this process is controlled by fragmentation kernel F of Equation (3), which is formulated as [44]

$$F(z, x, dy) = \mathbb{1}_{\{x, y | m(y) < m(x)\}}(x, y) g_{\text{break}}(z, x) B(x, y) dy, \quad (29)$$

where $g_{\text{break}}(z, x)$ is the breakage frequency function and $B(x, y)$ is the probability measure on the space of fragments y for each parent particle x . In this way, $B(x, y)dy$ is the probability that a fragmentation product from parent particle x exists within the space $[y, y + dy]$.

The choice of breakage frequency function varies significantly across the literature, reflecting the relatively poor understanding of this particle process. Breakage kernels generally take the form of a power law, applied to the particle volume, which may have a fitted [30] or predefined exponent [28] and may also be partially dependent on the particle pore volume [23]. In preliminary model development, various power law kernels were tested and assessed through the PSD evolution of particles along the network. A volume-based kernel with direct proportionality was settled upon, due to its simplicity and the fact that it resulted in sensible PSD evolutions along the network. In the future, more complex breakage kernels could be investigated, with dependencies on particle properties such as the degree of compaction, internal liquid etc. and on screw geometry. Primary particles and particles with volume less than $v_{\text{parent}}^{\min}$ are considered to be unbreakable. The breakage frequency function for particle x is:

$$g_{\text{break}}(z, x) = \begin{cases} k_{\text{att}}(z)n_{\text{screw}}^2(z)v(x), & \text{if } v(x) \geq v_{\text{parent}}^{\min} \text{ and } l_e(x) + l_i(x) + p(x) \neq 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (30)$$

where k_{att} is the attrition rate constant.

As in Braumann et al. [23], the product particles of a breakage event are assumed to have the same composition as the parent particle x . The volume of the fragment particle y is defined using the random variable [23]

$$v_y(z, x, \chi_{\text{frag}}) = v_{\text{frag}}^{\min} + \chi_{\text{frag}} [\nu_{\text{max}}v(x) - v_{\text{frag}}^{\min}], \quad (31)$$

where $v_{\text{frag}}^{\min}$ is the minimum fragment volume that can be produced and ν_{max} defines the maximum fraction of the parent particle which can break off. χ_{frag}

is a random measure on the interval $[0, 1]$ with beta distribution [24]

$$f(\chi_{\text{frag}}) = \frac{1}{\Omega(\alpha_{\text{daughter}}, \beta_{\text{daughter}})} \chi_{\text{frag}}^{\alpha_{\text{daughter}}-1} (1 - \chi_{\text{frag}})^{\beta_{\text{daughter}}-1}, \quad (32)$$

where

$$\Omega(\alpha_{\text{daughter}}, \beta_{\text{daughter}}) = \int_0^1 \chi_{\text{frag}}^{\alpha_{\text{daughter}}-1} (1 - \chi_{\text{frag}})^{\beta_{\text{daughter}}-1} d\chi_{\text{frag}}. \quad (33)$$

This characterises $B(x, y)$.

The total breakage rate R_{break} in compartment z is given by:

$$R_{\text{break}}(z, t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N(z, t)} g_{\text{break}}(z, x_i), \quad (34)$$

205 where $N(z, t)$ is the number of particles in compartment z at time t .

Penetration

As previously mentioned, binder penetration is modelled as a continuous processes within the model. The penetration process is intended to capture the flow of binder from the particle surface to the interior of the particle, driven by capillary forces. As in Braumann et al. [20] this involves the transformation of l_e to l_i at rate r_{pen} , controlled by the rate constant k_{pen} as:

$$r_{\text{pen}}(z, x) = k_{\text{pen}}(z) \mu_{\text{binder}}^{-1/2} l_e(x) (p(x) - l_i(x)), \quad (35)$$

where μ_{binder} is the viscosity of the binder.

Each particle in the ensemble is modified between stochastic jump events according to the following set of ordinary differential equations:

$$\frac{ds_o}{dt} = 0, \quad \frac{dl_e}{dt} = -r_{\text{pen}}, \quad \frac{dl_i}{dt} = r_{\text{pen}}, \quad \frac{dp}{dt} = -r_{\text{pen}}.$$

2.3. Compartmentalisation of the twin-screw

The experimental studies by Hagrasy et al. [16] were used to test the model. This study employed a screw configuration consisting of a conveying section
210 followed by a section of conveying/kneading elements and then an additional conveying section. This is modelled as a series of three well-mixed compartments as illustrated in Figure 4. Compartments $z = 1$ and $z = 3$ are assumed

Figure 4: Compartmental representation of the twin-screw.

to represent pure conveying sections, which are assumed to share the same set of rate constants. Droplet inception/nucleation is only permitted in the first compartment. The central conveying/kneading compartment ($z = 2$) is permitted
 215 to have different collision, breakage and compaction rates, relative to the pure conveying zones. The penetration rate is assumed to be a material constant and thus is the same in each compartment.

It is assumed that transformation of the feed material is limited prior to the
 220 point of liquid injection of the twin-screw system. For this reason the twin-screw system is modelled from the liquid injection point onwards.

In this study, each compartment is assumed to be of equal volume and thus, $V_{\text{real}}(z) = V_{\text{real,T}}/k_{\text{reac}}$ where k_{reac} is the number of compartments in the network and $V_{\text{real,T}}$ is the total volume of the TSG system.

Particle transport

The total rate of particle outflow from compartment $z \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ is given by:

$$R_{\text{outflow}}(z) = \frac{N(z, t)}{\tau(z)}, \quad (36)$$

where $\tau(z)$ is the characteristic residence time of compartment z . The rate of inflow into compartment $z + 1$ from compartment z is then given by:

$$R_{\text{inflow}}(z + 1, t) = \frac{V_{\text{samp}}(z + 1, t)}{V_{\text{samp}}(z, t)} R_{\text{outflow}}(z, t). \quad (37)$$

225 As in the work of Barrasso et al. [30] (which used the same experimental test case as that used in this study) the residence times are assumed to be equal

in all compartments with $\tau = 2.67\text{s}$. In future work this assumption could be relaxed by incorporating information from experimental twin-screw residence time studies [31, 45] and PEPT investigations [36].

Particle Inception/Initialisation

Similar to liquid inception, the rate of inception of primary particles with form:

$$x_{\text{incept}}(d) = \left(\frac{\pi d^3}{6}, 0, 0, 0 \right) \quad (38)$$

into each compartment is given by:

$$I_{\text{solid}}(z, t, dx) = \frac{\dot{M}_{\text{feed}} \mathbb{1}_{\{1\}}(z)}{V_{\text{real}}(z) \bar{m}_{\text{feed}}} q_{0, \mathbb{X}_{\text{incept}}}(x) dx, \quad (39)$$

where $\bar{m}_{\text{feed}}$ is the average arithmetic mass of the feed particles and $q_{0, \mathbb{X}_{\text{incept}}}$ is the distribution of incepted particles on the space $\mathbb{X}_{\text{incept}}$. The primary particle distribution for inception is derived from the volume fraction distribution $q_3(d)$ presented in [16] for the Lactose Impalpable excipient grade. Here, $q_3(d)dd$ is fraction of the total particle volume contained within the size range d to $d+dd$. This is converted into a number distribution $q_0(d)$ for use in the model using the relation [46]:

$$q_0(d) = \frac{q_3(d)d^{-3}}{\int_0^\infty q_3(d)d^{-3}dd}. \quad (40)$$

$q_0(d)$ and $q_{0, \mathbb{X}_{\text{incept}}}(x)$ are related as

$$q_{0, \mathbb{X}_{\text{incept}}}(x_{\text{incept}}(d)) = \frac{x_{\text{incept}}(d)q_0(d)}{\int_{d_{\min}}^{d_{\max}} x_{\text{incept}}(d)q_0(d)dd}, \quad (41)$$

230 where $d_{\max}$ and $d_{\min}$ are the maximum and minimum particle diameters of the inception distribution, respectively.

Each compartment is assumed to be filled with primary particles at $t = 0$. The total rate of particle inception events is

$$R_{\text{incept}}(z) = \begin{cases} \dot{M}_{\text{feed}}/\bar{m}_{\text{feed}}, & \text{if } z = 1, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (42)$$

3. Parameter estimation

The unknown rate constants (seven in total) are estimated using experimental PSDs from Hagrasy et al. [16] at LSR values of 0.15, 0.25 and 0.35 using the simulation parameters given in Table 1. The quality of the model fit against the experimental data is quantitatively measured using a weighted sum-of-squares objective function OF over all N_{exp} experimental conditions and N_{response} model/experimental responses as:

$$OF = \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{exp}}} \sum_{j=1}^{N_{\text{response}}} \left(\frac{y_{j,i}^{\text{model}} - y_{j,i}^{\text{exp}}}{\sigma_j} \right)^2. \quad (43)$$

Here, $y_{i,j}^{\text{model}}$ is the j^{th} model response for the i^{th} LSR value used and $y_{j,i}^{\text{exp}}$ is the associated experimental response. Mass based percentiles diameters d25, d50, d75 and d95 of the granular product are used as the model/experimental responses. These are weighted, respectively, using weighting factors σ of $25\mu\text{m}$, $50\mu\text{m}$, $75\mu\text{m}$ and $95\mu\text{m}$.

The geometry of the objective function is highly complex, containing multiple ridges and local minima. For this reason, we perform a quasi-random search over the parameter space, followed by a (more local) Hooke-Jeeves optimisation [50]. The initial search is carried out by generating a quasi-random sequence of rate constant vectors known as Sobol sequences [51]. Sobol sequences are used in order to spread the model evaluation points more evenly across the parameter space. The Hooke-Jeeves algorithm is selected for the local optimisation since it is a ‘derivative-free’ optimisation technique. This characteristic is highly desirable in the context of this paper, since derivative approximation by finite differences is problematic with models whose response is subject to stochastic noise. Five Hooke-Jeeves optimisations are carried out, starting from each of the five best Sobol points (i.e. those with the lowest OF value).

Preliminary parameter estimation showed that very similar product PSDs could be obtained for very different sets of rates constants. For example, using the same wide search space for the breakage rate constant k_{att} in both the pure conveying and partial kneading section may result in a situation in which

Table 1: Summary of simulation parameters.

Parameter	Type	Value	Unit
d_{nozzle}	Operating parameter [16]	2×10^{-3}	m
$\dot{M}_{\text{feed}}$	Operating parameter [16]	4.0	kg hr ⁻¹
n_{screw}	Operating parameter [16]	6.67	rev s ⁻¹
$V_{\text{real,T}}$	Equipment geometry [47]	4.05×10^{-5}	m ³
e_{coag}	Material property (estimated)	0.2	-
ρ_l	Material property [48]	998	kg m ⁻³
ρ_s	Material property [49]	1545	kg m ⁻³
μ_{binder}	Material property [48]	10^{-3}	Pa s
d_{max}	Model parameter [16]	3.31×10^{-6}	m
d_{min}	Model parameter [16]	8.26×10^{-4}	m
h_a	Model parameter (estimated)	5×10^{-6}	m
k_{reac}	Model parameter (estimated)	3	-
s^*	Model parameter (estimated)	0.5	-
U_{col}	Model parameter (estimated)	0.3	m s ⁻¹
$v_{\text{frag}}^{\text{min}}$	Model parameter (estimated)	8.18×10^{-12}	m ³
$v_{\text{parent}}^{\text{min}}$	Model parameter (estimated)	1.80×10^{-11}	m ³
$v_{\text{nuc}}^{\text{max}}$	Model parameter (estimated)	v_{drop}	m ³
α_{daughter}	Model parameter (estimated)	5.0	-
β_{daughter}	Model parameter (estimated)	2.0	-
ε_{bed}	Model parameter (estimated)	0.32	-
ε_{min}	Model parameter (estimated)	0.5	-
ν_{max}	Model parameter (estimated)	0.5	-
τ	Model parameter [30]	2.76	s

most of the breakage occurred in the conveying sections and very little in the
255 partial kneading section and vice-versa, both giving relatively similar product
PSDs. Since only the final PSD is used in the fitting process (mid-barrel ex-
perimental PSD data was not available), unphysical PSD evolutions along the
network are not penalised by the objective function. Hence, such PSD evolu-
tions must be eliminated through careful selection of the search space for each
260 rate constant, reflecting what is know from experimental investigation. As pre-
viously discussed, the body of experimental TSG literature would suggest that
the breakage and compaction rates in the kneading element and significantly
higher than those present in pure conveying sections (though conveying section
are known to break large agglomerates using a cutting action [8]). Thus, the pa-
265 rameter limits for k_{comp} and k_{att} in the central, partial kneading compartment
($z = 2$) are chosen such that they are higher than those of the pure convey-
ing compartments ($z = 1, 3$). To assess the predictive power of the model, the
optimised rate constants are then used to model two additional experimental
cases with intermediate LSR values of 0.2 and 0.3 and the model parameters in
Table 1.

Table 2: Rate constant bounds used in the parameter estimation process.

Compartment							
index z	1,3			2			1-3
Parameter	k_{col}	k_{att}	k_{comp}	k_{col}	k_{att}	k_{comp}	k_{pen}
Unit	m^3	m^{-3}s	-	m^3	m^{-3}s	-	$\text{kg}^{\frac{1}{2}}\text{m}^{-\frac{7}{2}}\text{s}^{-\frac{3}{2}}$
Lower bound	10^{-12}	1.68×10^4	0.01	10^{-12}	1.68×10^6	0.6	10
Upper bound	10^{-9}	1.68×10^7	0.6	10^{-9}	1.68×10^{10}	1.0	10^6
Scaling	Log	Log	Linear	Log	Log	Linear	Log

270

The parameter estimation steps are carried out using the Model Development
Suite (MoDS) [52]. MoDS is an advanced software package capable of analysing
‘black-box’ models.

4. Results and discussion

275 In this section we present the simulation results using the optimised rate
constants derived from parameter estimation. In Section 4.1 we analyse the
model results in the context of the experimental data at LSR values used in
the fitting and at a number of intermediate LSR values. This is followed by
an analysis of the model PSD evolution along the length of the screw barrel in
280 Section 4.2.

The product ensembles are sieved using a sieve set starting from $32\mu\text{m}$ to
 $8064\mu\text{m}$ using a $\sqrt{2}$ geometric progression. Sieve mass fractions are plotted
against the mid-point of the corresponding sieve intervals. Statistical errors
estimations for these parameters are reported as 90% confidence intervals.

285 4.1. The effect of liquid flowrate on particle size distribution

A comparison between the model and experimental product PSD is pre-
sented in Figure 5. There is an obvious trend in the results where by the
intensity of the primary particle mode is reduced with increasing LSR, leading
to a reduction in the fines and a larger mean granule size, as observed in TSG
290 experiments [53, 35, 18]. The main disparities occur at higher LSR values where
the largest particles size classes produced in the experiment are not captured
by the model. The model PSD is bimodal in all cases, consisting of a primary
particle mode and an additional mode composed of nuclei fragments which have
gone through breakage, coagulation and compaction processes. Such bimodality
295 is generally a feature of TSG product PSD. Hagrasy et al. [16] hypothesised that
the inherently bimodal nature of the twin-screw device was a result of the liquid
addition method, resulting in a non-uniform liquid distribution, in agreement
with the results of [17]. In contrast, Vercruysse et al. [9] concluded that the
biomodality was not primarily induced by insufficient mixing of the powder and
300 liquid phases, and was instead a result of the granulation mechanism inherent
to TSG. This was supported by the experiments carried out by Fonteyne et al.
[54] and Vercruysse et al. [55]. El Hagrasy and Litster [10] also observed that

the liquid distribution becomes more uniform with the addition of more kneading blocks. The experimental PSD for low to moderate LSR in Figure 5 may well be evolved from a more pronounced bimodal distribution, with a degree of overlap between the modes. Such a distribution would be subjected to reduction in intensity along the barrel length. The current model appears to fail in capturing some of the more subtle processes that lead to the mitigation of this bimodality, even in the presence of relative few kneading elements.

There is a clear over-prediction of fines by the model at high LSR values (Figure 5(c) and 5(e)). This may indicate the need for a layering mechanism in the model. This would allow primary particles to become attached to the surface of larger, surface wet agglomerates as a rapid continuous process or additional particle jump process. This would ultimately lead to the separate treatment of the rates/particle transforms associated with agglomerate-primary and agglomerate-agglomerate collisions. Such layering mechanisms have been implemented in the context of a sectional TSG model by Barrasso and Ramachandran [39] and a stochastic model for a high-shear batch mixer by Oullion et al. [56]. The failure to produce the pronounced peak at $4000\mu\text{m}$ in the case where $\text{LSR}=0.3$ may also indicate that a less aggressive/more versatile breakage kernel (possibly with a variable volume exponent) may be required in the future. This peak may also correspond to particles which have become strengthened through compaction in the kneading elements. Again, such structural changes may need to be introduced into the breakage functional to capture the resistance of such particles to further breakage.

Moving to the lower LSR operating range, the disparity between model and experiment in the lowest sieve classes (Figures 5(a) and 5(d)) indicates that, in the real system, large primary particles and/or agglomerates may undergo attrition along the barrel length, therefore acting as a source of ‘fines’. Another possible explanation for this discrepancy is that preferential incorporation of larger primary particles in the nucleation mechanism of the model is more pronounced than it is in the real system. Dhenge et al. [13] showed that the material in the barrel became less cohesive with decreasing LSR, resulting in a material

that was less resistant to flow and subject to shorter residence times (though
 335 this was only tested to LSR values as low as 0.25). This reduction in residence
 time indicates a lower degree of barrel filling at lower LSR values and may, as
 suggested by Thompson and Sun [57], result in the material not being pro-
 tected from the high shear zone at the barrel wall, causing subsequent attrition
 of largest primary particles in the low LSR regime. Since the breakage of dry
 340 primary particles is distinct from the breakage of wet agglomerates, (which may
 be able to deform and elongate) it is likely that distinct breakage models are
 required to accurately capture the breakage process for each phase.

Across the complete LSR operating range, the discrepancies between the
 model and experimental PSD in Figure 5 may have been affected, to some
 345 degree, by the varying aspect ratio of particles produced experimentally. It is
 known that the aspect ratio of particles generally decreases with increasing LSR
 producing more rounded particles [53, 13, 58], however, as demonstrated by Ha-
 grasy et al. [16], this breaks down at very high LSR. At this high LSR operating
 range, long extrudate like particle are produced as the mixture becomes more
 350 of a paste, making the geometrical variations particularly hard to capture from
 a modelling perspective. Ultimately, the presence of particles with high aspect
 ratios may skew the sieve analysis, depending on the particle orientation. It
 will also affect the nature of subsequent particle breakage and growth. In the
 current model, particles are considered to be spherical. More complex particle
 355 descriptions with element-specific shape transformations may need to be taken
 into account in future modelling works. Due to the highly extensible nature of
 stochastic models, it is possible to track such additional features without signif-
 icantly affecting the computational cost of the solution process. Nevertheless,
 work would be required to elucidate the effects of each type of element and how
 360 these effects depend on the properties of the particles involved.

Another potential source of error in the model is the assumption of equal
 residence times across all compartments. As TSG Positron Emission Particle
 Tracking (PEPT) studies have shown [59, 36], the material fill ratio before/in
 the kneading block is generally greater than that in the final conveying zone.

365 This would extend the residence time of the kneading block and thereby reduce
the time spent by particles in conveying sections. The fill level is known to
play an important role in determining the shape and size of the particles since
this determines the degree of compaction [58] and, again, may also protect
particles from contacting the high shear boundary between the wall and the
370 screw, thereby mitigating breakage [57]. This variation in mass distribution
could be incorporated into the model by way of a flow model (such as that done
for hot melt extrusion by Eitzlmayr et al. [60]) or, alternatively, by coupling the
population balance to simulations using the Discrete Element Method (DEM),
though such DEM couplings come at a high computational cost.

375 4.2. Evolution of the particle size distribution along the barrel

In this section the evolution of the model PSD is assessed along the length
of the network (or equivalently, the length of the barrel) for an operating LSR
of 0.25. Figure 6 shows the PSD in each compartment along the network and
Table 3 details the optimised rate constants for each compartment.

380 We see that the dominant mechanism in the first compartment ($z = 1$)
is nucleation, which causes a pronounced peak in the PSD around $2500\mu\text{m}$.
As a result of the bounds used for parameter estimation, in Table 3 we see
that conveying-only compartments ($z = 1, 3$) are subject to a lower degree of
breakage (k_{att}) relative to the compartment containing the kneading elements
385 ($z = 2$). The reduced breakage rate allowed the oversized nucleates to co-exist
with the remaining primary powder in a highly bimodal distribution, alluding
to the inherent bimodality-by-liquid-inception suggested by Hagrasy et al. [16]
and observed by [17]. The position of the nuclei peak relative to the droplet
size of $2000\mu\text{m}$ indicates that nuclei have been subjected to a moderate degree
390 of compaction in the first compartment following their formation.

Moving from $z = 1$ to $z = 2$ in Figure 6, we see that a high degree of
compaction and breakage has broken down the large nuclei into smaller, more
dense fractions, consistent with the findings of Djuric and Kleinebudde [61]. We
also note that the penetration rate constant has reached its lower bound and this

395 [process has effectively turned of. This is likely a reflection of the competition
between the compaction and penetration processes in. These processes compete
to move liquid to and from the surface of the particles, respectively. Thus the
amount of surface liquid available during coagulation events is not sensitive to
the absolute the value of k_{comp} and k_{pen} but rather their relative magnitudes.
400 This coupling is undesired and is areas in which the model could be improved
upon in the future. The squeezing effects of the compaction processes are further
evident from the average particle composition statistics (Figure 7), in which a
slight reduction in internal liquid (and resulting increase in external liquid)
is evident in the transition between $z = 1$ and $z = 2$. This replicates the
405 squeezing process within kneading blocks observed in numerous experimental
studies [10, 18, 13, 43, 9].

It is also noted that breakage is the dominant process in the second com-
partment (kneading zone) and that the coagulation rate constant has reached
it's lower bound, indicating very limited coagulation within this compartment.
410 It is likely that similar ratios of k_{att} to k_{col} could feasibly generate similar size
distributions within $z = 2$ due to the competing nature of the coagulation and
breakage processes.

As the particles transition from the kneading zone to the final conveying
zone, we observe a degree of coalescence between primary particles and com-
415 pacted/surface wet agglomerates. At this stage the combination of moderate
breakage and low compaction rate allows particles to grow whilst increasing in
porosity (the reader is reminded that successful coalescence events result in an
increase in particle pore volume in the model). This is in line with the produc-
tion of large friable agglomerates from conveying only section observed in TSG
420 and twin-screw extrusion systems [61].

4.3. Model sensitivity

In this section the sensitivity of the resulting model to four main input pa-
rameters, namely the droplet diameter d_{drop} , collision rate constant k_{col} , particle
collision velocity U_{col} and surface asperities height h_{a} are investigated.

Table 3: Optimised rate constants.

Compartment	1,3			2			1-3
index z							
Parameter	k_{col}	k_{att}	k_{comp}	k_{col}	k_{att}	k_{comp}	k_{pen}
Unit	m^3	m^{-3}s	-	m^3	m^{-3}s	-	$\text{kg}^{\frac{1}{2}}\text{m}^{-\frac{7}{2}}\text{s}^{-\frac{3}{2}}$
Value	1.21×10^{-10}	9.42×10^6	0.395	9.99×10^{-13}	1.09×10^9	0.954	10.0

4.3.1. Droplet diameter

From the results in Section 4.1, Figure 5, it is noted that the agglomerate mode of the simulated PSD response did not, as in the case of the experiments, shift to right with increasing LSR. The shift in the experimental response could be indicative of the the re-wetting of agglomerates in the liquid zone when the liquid flowrate is significantly high. To attempt to capture this feature within the model, an effective droplet size is determined from each experimental response (for each LSR). The effective droplet size is indirectly estimated from the approximated centre of the agglomerate mode in each experimental response. Let x_{agg} be an estimate of the representative particle that takes position at the centre of the agglomerate mode in experimental PSD response. Let the diameter and volume of this particle be denoted d_{agg} and v_{agg} , respectively. Suppose that x_{agg} has an internal liquid volume equal to that of an effective droplet and a solid-to-liquid volume ratio equal to that of a newly formed nuclei. Furthermore, to account for the effects of compaction of nuclei along the length of the barrel, let x_{agg} have a pore volume given by αv_{drop} , where v_{drop} is the droplet volume/particle internal liquid volume and α is some constant that may dependent on the LSR. We then have

$$x_{\text{agg}} = (v_{\text{drop}}\phi_{\text{max}}^{-1}, 0, v_{\text{drop}}, \alpha v_{\text{drop}}). \quad (44)$$

From the particle volume definition in Equation (1), it follows from (46) that

$$v_{\text{agg}} = v_{\text{drop}}(\phi_{\text{max}}^{-1} + \alpha v_{\text{drop}}), \quad (45)$$

Converting volumes into diameters in Equation (47) and re-arranging for the droplet diameter d_{drop} , we arrive at an expression for the effective droplet size with the form:

$$d_{\text{drop}} = \frac{d_{\text{agg}}}{\sqrt[3]{\phi_{\text{max}}^{-1} + \alpha}}. \quad (46)$$

To quantify α , we use the granule porosity measurements for particles in the size fraction 1.0-1.4mm, presented for each LSR in Hagrasy et al. [16]. Hagrasy et al. [16] reported the granule porosity as

$$\varepsilon_{\text{granules}} = 1 - \frac{\rho_{\text{env}}}{\rho_{\text{true}}}, \quad (47)$$

where ρ_{env} is the envelope density, measured using a GeoPyc (Micrometrics, Norcross, GA) device which subjects the wet particles to a compaction cycle. ρ_{true} is termed the ‘true’ density of the material and is measured using helium pycnometry on the pre-desiccated product granules.

Combining Equations (46),(49) and the definitions of ρ_{env} and ρ_{true} , it can be shown that (see Appendix A for the full derivation):

$$\alpha \approx \frac{\phi_{\text{max}}^{-1} + \frac{\rho_l}{\rho_s}}{1 - \varepsilon_{\text{granules}}} - \frac{1}{\phi_{\text{max}}}. \quad (48)$$

Of course the above treatment neglects the effects of breakage on this mode along the barrel length, nevertheless, it will suffice to generate sensible droplet diameters with which to test the sensitivity of the model response. Using (45) to generate effective droplet diameters, simulations were carried out for LSR values 0.15, 0.2, 0.25, 0.3 and 0.35. All simulations were carried out using the optimised rate constants presented in Table 3. The resulting simulation responses are presented in Figure 8 in conjunction with the simulation responses for the default droplet diameter of 2mm (used in the fitting procedure). From the results, it is observed that the change in droplet diameter has caused moderate changes to the shape of the primary particle mode, though these changes are generally within the confidence bands of the respective responses. In terms of the agglomerate mode, moderate changes intensity of the peak are observed for very low and very high LSR values, however, the position of this mode has only

shifted to the left by a relatively small degree. No significant shift in the position of the product agglomerate mode is observed for LSRs above 0.15. However,
445 it must be noted that the difference between the effective droplet diameter and the default of 2mm is much larger for the lowest LSR than the others in the test set. The insensitivity of the model to the droplet diameter is most likely explained by a combination of the breakage and compaction dynamics. It was previously observed from the PSD evolution in Figure 6 that there is
450 a significant shift in the agglomerate mode along the compartmental network of the simulation. The final position of the agglomerate mode is therefore a balance between the compaction, breakage and coagulation processes. Since the rate constants associated with these process do not differ between the new simulations and the reference simulation presented in Figure 8, the effect of
455 altering the droplet size on resulting PSD is minimal.

4.3.2. Collision rate

In light of the under-prediction of fines consumption in the fitted experimental responses of Figure 5, particularly at high LSR, it is worth exploring the effect of increasing the collision rate constants k_{col} on the simulation response.
460 It is expected that increased collision rates should promote increase the coagulation rate between the agglomerate and fines modes, provided there is sufficient surface liquid available to facilitate the formation of liquid bridges between the colliding species. A number of simulations were carried out in which the set of fitted collision rate constants (see Table 3) was increased (scaled by the same
465 factor in each compartment). The maximum collision rate tested for $z = 1, 3$ was $6.05 \times 10^{-10} \text{m}^3$, which lies close to the upper bound used in the parameter optimisation procedure. For all other rate parameters, the values in Table 3 were employed in conjunction with the LSR-dependent effective droplet sizes given in Figure 8. The resulting simulation responses are compared in Figure 9.
470 As expected, in all cases, increasing in the collision rate constants has promoted the consumption of fines and increased the intensity of the agglomerate mode. Though the resulting model fits with the experimental data have improved for

high LSR values (0.3, 0.35), this has come at the expense of a reduced quality of fit at low LSRs. The level of fines consumption at LSRs in the range
475 0.15-0.25 is much greater than that observed experimentally. Though an overall poor fit quality is expected for the simulations with modified coagulation rates (since the other rate constants have not been re-estimated), the results nevertheless indicate that competition of processes that controls the level of surface liquid, namely compaction (currently driven by collision processes) and liquid
480 penetration, may need to be re-visited in future modelling efforts.

4.4. Stokes criterion parameters

A number of simulations were performed to analyse the effect of changing the two estimated coalescence-specific parameters within the Stokes criterion of the collision mechanism on the product PSD. These were the height of surface
485 asperities h_a and the particle collision velocity U_{col} . The results are shown in Figure 10. It is noted that there is very little sensitivity towards U_{col} at high and low LSR and h_a at high LSR. However, we do observe a reduction in the consumption of fines at very high h_a and low LSR (Figure 10(c)). These results indicate that most of the simulated collisions involving at least one aggregate
490 particle have resulted in coagulation. Note that fine-fine collisions, by way of the Stokes criterion, cannot result in coalescence, due to the absence of surface liquid. This result is most likely due to the high amount of external liquid present on the simulation particles, as observed in the particle compositions in Figure 7. The main difference in the simulated LSRs can therefore be attributed
495 to an increased number of nuclei created with increasing LSR, since the various rate constants are the same for each LSR simulated. This result indicates that future model efforts should focus on the refinement of the mechanism which control the availability of external liquid, such that the external liquid level is kept sufficiently low through the competition of these mechanisms.

Figure 5: Simulation PSDs compared with the experimental results of Hagrasy et al. [16]. LSR values which were used in the fitting of the rate constants are presented in (a)-(c) and ‘blind tested’ intermediate LSR values in (d) and (e).

Figure 6: Spatial PSD evolution for simulation with LSR=0.25.

Figure 7: Number averaged particle composition along the length of the compartment network with with an operating LSR=0.25.

(a) LSR=0.15

(b) LSR=0.2

(c) LSR=0.25

(d) LSR=0.3

(e) LSR=0.35

Figure 8: Simulation PSDs compared with experimental results of Hagrasy et al. [16] using the default droplet size of 2mm (blue trace) and hypothesised effective droplet size for each LSR (grey trace). All simulations were carried out with the calibrated rate constants in Table 3.

(a) LSR=0.15, $d_{\text{drop}}=1.090\text{mm}$

(b) LSR=0.2, $d_{\text{drop}}=1.605\text{mm}$

(c) LSR=0.25, $d_{\text{drop}}=1.662\text{mm}$

(d) LSR=0.3, $d_{\text{drop}}=2.026\text{mm}$

(e) LSR=0.35, $d_{\text{drop}}=2.031\text{mm}$

Figure 9: Simulation PSDs compared with the experimental results of Hagrasy et al. [16] for varying collision rate constants sets $[k_{\text{col}}(1), k_{\text{col}}(2), k_{\text{col}}(3)]$. Each simulation uses the effective droplet sizes for each LSR, shown in the sub-captions. Here, k_{col}^f represents the set of fitted collision rate constants presented in Table 3. Where collision rates have been scaled, the fitted value of k_{col} in Table 3 has been scaled by the same factor in all compartments.

(a) LSR=0.15, U_{col}

(b) LSR=0.35, U_{col}

(c) LSR=0.15, h_a

(d) LSR=0.35, h_a

Figure 10: Simulated product PSD for high and low liquid flow levels using various values of the key estimated parameters within the Stokes criterion. These are the particle collision velocity U_{col} (a) - (b) and height of surface asperities h_a (c) - (d). All simulations were performed using the fitted rate constants in Table 3 and the effective droplet sizes given in Figure 8.

500 5. Conclusions and future recommendations

In this paper we have presented a high dimensional model for TSG which includes particles coagulation, compaction, breakage, penetration and nucleation. The model performed reasonably well against experiment at low LSR values but showed an over-prediction of fines at higher LSR values, resulting in a consistently bimodal PSD. It was demonstrated that changes in droplet size (within the range tested) did not appreciably alter the PSD of the simulated granular product for low to medium LSR. The effective droplet sizes estimated for high LSR values were too similar to the default value to draw any conclusions here. No shift in the central position of the product PSD could be observed for the range of droplet diameters/LSR combinations tested with $LSR > 0.15$. This indicates that, when operating in the immersion nucleation regime with a fixed minimum particle porosity and rate constant set, the mean agglomerate size predicted by the model is generally constant at low to medium LSR. It was also shown that a significant increase in the coagulation rate constant was capable of shifting the simulated product PSD from a bi-modal state towards a more mono-modal state, for all LSR tested. Investigation of the sensitivity of the model to the particle collision velocity and the estimated asperities height indicated that the model produced higher surface liquid levels than expected, leading to a likely over-estimation of the collision success rate.

520 Based on the results of this study a number of recommendations for model improvements and future analysis can be made. Firstly, the introduction of a layering mechanism may mitigate the over-prediction of fines by the current model. This may also better reflect the difference between collision events involving a mixture of primary particles and agglomerates and those between agglomerates alone. Consideration of variable particle aspect ratios may be required to reflect the experimentally observed particle elongation. This is important both in the sieving process and in determining the likelihood of particle breakage/the resulting daughter distribution. It is also suggested that the population balance be coupled to a method for prediction of the mass distribution

530 along the barrel from which compaction rates and residence times may be esti-
 mated. Finally, in order for optimised rates to be ‘re-used’ across varying screw
 configurations the fitting methodology itself must be improved upon. In the
 future more advanced parameter optimisation could be carried out by fitting
 each compartmental PSD of the model against the experimental PSD at each
 535 associated barrel position, as carried out experimentally by Kumar et al. [58].
 However, non-destructive extraction of a representative sample mid-barrel can
 be challenging. Alternatively, the model could be optimised against a large
 number of experiments with varying screw configuration (such as that carried
 out by Vercruysse et al. [9]), in order to isolate the individual contributions of
 540 each group of elements. Another option is to perform optimisation of element
 specific rate constants based on experimental studies such as that by Sayin et al.
 [11]. Here the role of each element types is assessed by only supplying liquid
 at the very end of the barrel, such that only a short section of the twin-screw
 is active and the compounded effects of different elements in sequence are miti-
 545 gated. However, it is likely that the role of specific screw elements is inherently
 coupled to the complete screw configuration and other processing conditions. It
 is more likely that a combination of these approaches will be required to build
 and refine future TSG models, gather element specific rate constants and move
 towards a truly modular TSG modelling framework.

550 Nevertheless, the stochastic method employed in the solution of this model,
 unlike traditional sectional methods, allows the dimensionality of the particle
 description to be readily extended to include many of the features that have been
 described above. These additional properties may then be incorporated into
 the particle transformations associated with TSG mechanisms. This makes this
 555 work an important step towards a quantitative prediction tool for formulation
 development with TSG systems.

In the second part of this study we present and analyse the properties of
 the numerical methodology employed to overcome the numerical challenges pre-
 sented by twin-screw systems and solve the model presented in this paper.

560 **Acknowledgements**

The authors would like to thank AstraZeneca for funding this work. This work was partially funded by EPSRC Grant 1486478 and the National Research Foundation (NRF), Prime Minister's Office, Singapore under its Campus for Research Excellence and Technological Enterprise (CREATE) programme.

Nomenclature**Roman symbols**

B	breakage fragment distribution	-
d	particle diameter	m
$d_{\max}$	maximum primary particle diameter	m
$d_{\min}$	minimum primary particle diameter	m
F	breakage kernel	s^{-1}
g_{break}	breakage frequency	s^{-1}
h_l	thickness of external binder layer	m
h_a	height of surface asperities	m
I_{drop}	droplet inception rate	$s^{-1}m^{-3}$
I_{solid}	solid inception rate	$s^{-1}m^{-3}$
k_{att}	breakage rate constant	$s\,m^{-3}$
k_{col}	collision rate constant	m^3
k_{comp}	compaction rate constant	-
k_{nuc}	nucleation rate constant	s^{-1}
k_{pen}	penetration rate constant	$kg^{1/2}m^{-7/2}s^{-3/2}$
k_{reac}	number of compartments	-
K_{coag}	coagulation kernel	m^3s^{-1}
K_{col}	size independent collision kernel	m^3s^{-1}
K_{nuc}	nucleation kernel	m^3s^{-1}
l_e	external liquid volume	m^3
l_i	internal liquid volume	m^3
$l_{i \rightarrow e}$	volume of liquid transferred to exterior during compaction	m^3
LSR	operating liquid solid mass flowrate ratio	-
$\tilde{m}$	harmonic mean particle mass	kg
$\bar{m}_{\text{feed}}$	number average feed particle mass	kg

$\dot{M}_{\text{feed}}$	solid mass flowrate	kg s^{-1}
n_{screw}	screw speed	rev s^{-1}
N	number of particles	-
N_{exp}	number of experimental conditions	-
N_{response}	number of simulation/experimental responses	-
OF	fitting objective function	-
p	pore volume	m^3
Δp_{comp}	compaction pore reduction	m^3
q_0	primary particle number distribution	m^{-1}
$q_0, \mathbb{X}_{\text{incept}}$	primary particle number distribution on $\mathbb{X}_{\text{incept}}$	-
q_3	primary particle volume distribution	m^{-1}
r_{pen}	particle penetration rate	$\text{m}^3 \text{s}^{-1}$
$\tilde{R}$	harmonic mean particle radius	m
R_{incept}	primary particle inception rate	s^{-1}
R_{droplet}	droplet inception rate	s^{-1}
R_{inflow}	particle inflow rate	s^{-1}
R_{nuc}	nucleation rate	s^{-1}
R_{outflow}	particle outflow rate	s^{-1}
s_o	original solid volume	m^3
s^*	pore saturation limit	-
t	time	s
T_{break}	breakage operator	-
T_{coag}	coagulation transform	-
T_{comp}	compaction transform	-
T_{nuc}	nucleation growth transform	-
U_{col}	particle collision velocity	m s^{-1}
v	particle volume	m^3

$v_{\text{nuc}}^{\text{max}}$	maximum particle volume permitted to join nucleus	m^3
$v_{\text{parent}}^{\text{min}}$	minimum volume for breakage	m^3
v_{drop}	droplet volume	m^3
V_{real}	compartment volume	m^3
$V_{\text{real,T}}$	total volume of all compartments	m^3
V_{samp}	compartment sample volume	m^3
$\dot{V}_l$	binder flowrate	m^3s^{-1}
x	particle vector	m^3
x_{drop}	droplet particle vector	m^3
x_{nuc}	nuclei particle vector	m^3
y_{exp}	experimental fitting response	m
y_{sim}	simulation fitting response	m
z	compartment index	-
Greek symbols		
α	effective droplet diameter parameter	-
α_{daughter}	breakage distribution parameter	-
β_{daughter}	breakage distribution parameter	-
ε	particle porosity	-
ε_{bed}	particle bed packing fraction	-
$\varepsilon_{\text{granule}}$	Haggras agglomerate porosity definition	-
ε_{min}	minimum particle porosity	-
μ_{binder}	binder viscosity	Pa s
λ	concentration measure	m^{-3}
ν	breakage product parameter	-
ρ_{env}	envelope density	kg m^{-3}
ρ_l	binder density	kg m^{-3}
ρ_s	solid density	kg m^{-3}

ρ_{true}	true density	kg m^{-3}
ϕ	liquid saturation	-
ϕ_{max}	maximum liquid saturation	-
σ	fitting response scaling factor	m
τ	compartment residence time	s
ϕ	test function	-
χ_{frag}	breakage parameter	-

570 Appendix A. Derivation of effective droplet diameter parameter α

Since the envelope density ρ_{env} is measured by the displacement of free flowing solid by the undried agglomerates, then if it is assumed that these particles have composition equal to that of x_{agg} in (46) it follows that

$$\rho_{\text{env}} \approx \frac{m_s + m_l}{v_s + v_p}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where m_s and m_l are the solid mass and total liquid mass in x_{agg} , respectively. Similarly, v_s and v_p are the solid volume and total pore volume in x_{agg} , respectively.

Since the true density ρ_{true} is measured using helium pycnometry on the desiccated agglomerates, it can be approximated as

$$\rho_{\text{true}} \approx \rho_s. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Given that the density of the solid component is ρ_s and that of the liquid component ρ_l , we have

$$m_l = \rho_l v_l, \quad m_s = \rho_s v_s. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Furthermore, given the definition of x_{agg} in (46), we may also write

$$v_p = \alpha v_l, \quad v_s = v_l \phi_{\text{max}}^{-1}, \quad m_s = \rho_s v_l \phi_{\text{max}}^{-1}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Substitution of (A.3),(A.4) into (A.1) yields

$$\rho_{\text{env}} \approx \frac{\phi_{\text{max}}^{-1} + \frac{\rho_l}{\rho_s}}{\phi_{\text{max}}^{-1} + \alpha}. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Substitution of (A.5) into the porosity definition $\varepsilon_{\text{granules}} = 1 - \rho_{\text{env}}/\rho_{\text{true}}$ used by Hagrasy et al. [16] and re-arranging for α yields

$$\alpha \approx \frac{\phi_{\text{max}}^{-1} + \frac{\rho_l}{\rho_s}}{1 - \varepsilon_{\text{granules}}} - \frac{1}{\phi_{\text{max}}}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

References

1. Iveson SM, Litster JD, Hapgood K, Ennis BJ. Nucleation, growth and breakage phenomena in agitated wet granulation processes: a review. Powder Technology 2001;117(1-2):3 – 39. doi:10.1016/S0032-5910(01)00313-8.
2. Braumann A, Kraft M. Incorporating experimental uncertainties into multivariate granulation modelling. Chemical Engineering Science 2010;65(3):1088 –100. doi:10.1016/j.ces.2009.09.063.
3. Tu WD, Ingram A, Seville J. Regime map development for continuous twin screw granulation. Chemical Engineering Science 2013;87:315 –26. doi:10.1016/j.ces.2012.08.015.
4. Shah U. Use of a modified twin-screw extruder to develop a high-strength tablet dosage form. Pharmaceutical technology 2005;29(6):52–66.
5. Cartwright JJ, Robertson J, D’Haene D, Burke MD, Hennenkamp JR. Twin screw wet granulation: Loss in weight feeding of a poorly flowing active pharmaceutical ingredient. Powder Technology 2013;238:116 –21. doi:10.1016/j.powtec.2012.04.034.
6. Vercruysse J, Peeters E, Fonteyne M, Cappuyns P, Delaet U, Assche IV, Beer TD, Remon J, Vervaet C. Use of a continuous twin screw granulation and drying system during formulation development and process optimization. European Journal of Pharmaceutics and Biopharmaceutics 2015;89:239 –47. doi:10.1016/j.ejpb.2014.12.017.

7. Ge W, Han Y, Wang J, Wang L, Liu X, Zhou J, Li J, Freeman T, Birkmire A, Armstrong B. A QbD approach to continuous tablet manufacture. Procedia Engineering 2015;102:443 –9. doi:10.1016/j.proeng.2015.01.185.
8. Lute SV, Dhenge RM, Hounslow MJ, Salman AD. Twin screw granulation: Understanding the mechanism of granule formation along the barrel length. Chemical Engineering Research and Design 2016;110:43 – 53. doi:10.1016/j.cherd.2016.03.008.
9. Vercruysse J, Burggraef A, Fonteyne M, Cappuyens P, Delaet U, Assche IV, Beer TD, Remon J, Vervaet C. Impact of screw configuration on the particle size distribution of granules produced by twin screw granulation. International Journal of Pharmaceutics 2015;479(1):171 –80. doi:10.1016/j.ijpharm.2014.12.071.
10. El Hagrasy AS, Litster JD. Granulation rate processes in the kneading elements of a twin screw granulator. AIChE Journal 2013;59(11):4100–15. doi:10.1002/aic.14180.
11. Sayin R, Hagrasy AE, Litster J. Distributive mixing elements: Towards improved granule attributes from a twin screw granulation process. Chemical Engineering Science 2015;125:165 –75. doi:10.1016/j.ces.2014.06.040.
12. Dhenge RM, Cartwright JJ, Doughty DG, Hounslow MJ, Salman AD. Twin screw wet granulation: Effect of powder feed rate. Advanced Powder Technology 2011;22(2):162 –6. doi:10.1016/j.apt.2010.09.004.
13. Dhenge RM, Cartwright JJ, Hounslow MJ, Salman AD. Twin screw wet granulation: Effects of properties of granulation liquid. Powder Technology 2012;229:126 –36. doi:10.1016/j.powtec.2012.06.019.

14. Li H, Thompson M, O'Donnell K. Examining drug hydrophobic-
625 ity in continuous wet granulation within a twin screw extruder.
International Journal of Pharmaceutics 2015;496(1):3 – 11. doi:10.1016/
j.ijpharm.2015.07.070.
15. Vanhoorne V, Bekaert B, Peeters E, Beer TD, Remon JP, Vervaet C.
Improved tableability after a polymorphic transition of delta-mannitol
630 during twin screw granulation. International Journal of Pharmaceutics
2016;506(1-2):13 – 24. doi:10.1016/j.ijpharm.2016.04.025.
16. Hagrasy AE, Hennenkamp J, Burke M, Cartwright J, Litster J. Twin screw
wet granulation: Influence of formulation parameters on granule properties
and growth behavior. Powder Technology 2013;238:108 –15. doi:10.1016/
635 j.powtec.2012.04.035.
17. Saleh MF, Dhenge RM, Cartwright JJ, Hounslow MJ,
Salman AD. Twin screw wet granulation: Binder delivery.
International Journal of Pharmaceutics 2015;487(1-2):124 –34.
doi:10.1016/j.ijpharm.2015.04.017.
- 640 18. Seem TC, Rowson NA, Ingram A, Huang Z, Yu S, de Matas M, Gab-
bott I, Reynolds GK. Twin screw granulation - a literature review.
Powder Technology 2015;276:89 – 102. doi:10.1016/j.powtec.2015.01.
075.
19. Ramkrishna D. Population Balances: Theory and Applications to Partic-
645 ulate Systems in Engineering. Elsevier Science; 2000.
20. Braumann A, Man PLW, Kraft M. Statistical approximation
of the inverse problem in multivariate population balance model-
ing. Journal of Industrial and Engineering Chemistry 2010;49(1):428–38.
doi:10.1021/ie901230u.
- 650 21. Braumann A, Kraft M, Mort PR. Parameter estimation in a multidi-

- mensional granulation model. Powder Technology 2010;197(3):196 – 210. doi:10.1016/j.powtec.2009.09.014.
22. Braumann A, Man PLW, Kraft M. The inverse problem in granulation modeling-two different statistical approaches. AIChE Journal 2011;57(11):3105–21. doi:10.1002/aic.12526.
23. Braumann A, Kraft M, Wagner W. Numerical study of a stochastic particle algorithm solving a multidimensional population balance model for high shear granulation. Journal of Computational Physics 2010;229(20):7672 – 91. doi:10.1016/j.jcp.2010.06.021.
24. Braumann A, Goodson MJ, Kraft M, Mort PR. Modelling and validation of granulation with heterogeneous binder dispersion and chemical reaction. Chemical Engineering Science 2007;62(17):4717 –28. doi:10.1016/j.ces.2007.05.028.
25. Kastner CA, Brownbridge GP, Mosbach S, Kraft M. Impact of powder characteristics on a particle granulation model. Chemical Engineering Science 2013;97:282 –95. doi:10.1016/j.ces.2013.04.032.
26. Barrasso D, Tamrakar A, Ramachandran R. Model order reduction of a multi-scale PBM-DEM description of a wet granulation process via ANN. Procedia Engineering 2015;102(Supplement C):1295 –304. doi:doi.org/10.1016/j.proeng.2015.01.260.
27. Chaudhury A, Armenante ME, Ramachandran R. Compartment based population balance modeling of a high shear wet granulation process using data analytics. Chemical Engineering Research and Design 2015;95:211 – 28. doi:10.1016/j.cherd.2014.10.024.
28. Kumar A, Vercruysse J, Mortier ST, Vervaet C, Remon JP, Gernaey KV, Beer TD, Nopens I. Model-based analysis of a twin-screw wet granulation system for continuous solid dosage manufactur-

- ing. Computers & Chemical Engineering 2016;89:62 – 70. doi:10.1016/j.compchemeng.2016.03.007.
- 680
29. Barrasso D, Eppinger T, Pereira FE, Aglave R, Debus K, Bermingham SK, Ramachandran R. A multi-scale, mechanistic model of a wet granulation process using a novel bi-directional PBM-DEM coupling algorithm. Chemical Engineering Science 2015;123:500 –13. doi:10.1016/j.ces.2014.11.011.
- 685
30. Barrasso D, Hagrasy AE, Litster JD, Ramachandran R. Multi-dimensional population balance model development and validation for a twin screw granulation process. Powder Technology 2015;270, Part B:612 –21. doi:10.1016/j.powtec.2014.06.035.
- 690
31. Kumar A, Vercruysse J, Toivainen M, Panouillot PE, Juuti M, Vanhoorne V, Vervaet C, Remon JP, Gernaey KV, Beer TD, Nopens I. Mixing and transport during pharmaceutical twin-screw wet granulation: Experimental analysis via chemical imaging. European Journal of Pharmaceutics and Biopharmaceutics 2014;87(2):279 –89. doi:10.1016/j.ejpb.2014.04.004.
- 695
32. Hounslow MJ, Ryall RL, Marshall VR. A discretized population balance for nucleation, growth, and aggregation. AIChE Journal 1988;34(11):1821–32. doi:10.1002/aic.690341108.
- 700
33. Lee KF, Mosbach S, Kraft M, Wagner W. A multi-compartment population balance model for high shear granulation. Computers & Chemical Engineering 2015;75:1 – 13. doi:10.1016/j.compchemeng.2015.01.009.
- 705
34. Patterson RIA, Singh J, Balthasar M, Kraft M, Norris J. The linear process deferment algorithm: A new technique for solving population balance equations. SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing 2006;28(1):303–20.

35. Dhenge RM, Cartwright JJ, Hounslow MJ, Salman AD. Twin screw granulation: Steps in granule growth. International Journal of Pharmaceutics 2012;438(1-2):20 – 32.
36. Seem TC, Rowson NA, Gabbott I, de Matas M, Reynolds GK, Ingram A. Asymmetric distribution in twin screw granulation. European Journal of Pharmaceutics and Biopharmaceutics 2016;106:50 – 8. doi:10.1016/j.ejpb.2016.01.013.
37. Meggle excipients and technology. <https://www.meggle-pharma.com/en/productConfigurator.html>; 2018. Accessed: 2018-01-30.
38. Vonk P, Guillaume C, Ramaker J, Vromans H, Kossen N. Growth mechanisms of high-shear pelletisation. International Journal of Pharmaceutics 1997;157(1):93 – 102. doi:10.1016/S0378-5173(97)00232-9.
39. Barrasso D, Ramachandran R. Qualitative assessment of a multi-scale, compartmental PBM-DEM model of a continuous twin-screw wet granulation process. Journal of Pharmaceutical Innovation 2016;11(3):231–49. doi:10.1007/s12247-015-9240-7.
40. Hapgood KP, Litster JD, Smith R. Nucleation regime map for liquid bound granules. AIChE Journal 2003;49(2):350–61.
41. Ennis BJ, Tardos G, Pfeffer R. A special volume devoted to the second symposium on advances in particulate technology a microlevel-based characterization of granulation phenomena. Powder Technology 1991;65(1):257 –72. doi:10.1016/0032-5910(91)80189-P.
42. Goodson M, Kraft M, Forrest S, Bridgwater J. A multi-dimensional population balance model for agglomeration. In: PARTEC 2004:International Congress for Particle Technology. 2004:.
43. Vercruysse J, Díaz DC, Peeters E, Fonteyne M, Delaet U, Assche IV, Beer TD, Remon J, Vervaet C. Continuous twin screw granulation: Influence of process variables on granule and tablet quality.

- European Journal of Pharmaceutics and Biopharmaceutics 2012;82(1):205
 735 –11. doi:10.1016/j.ejpb.2012.05.010.
44. Lee KF, Patterson RIA, Wagner W, Kraft M. Stochastic weighted particle
 methods for population balance equations with coagulation, fragmentation
 and spatial inhomogeneity. Journal of Computational Physics 2015;303:1
 – 18. doi:10.1016/j.jcp.2015.09.031.
- 740 45. Kumar A, Vercruysse J, Vanhoorne V, Toiviainen M, Panouillot PE, Juuti
 M, Vervaet C, Remon JP, Gernaey KV, Beer TD, Nopens I. Concep-
 tual framework for model-based analysis of residence time distribution
 in twin-screw granulation. European Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences
 2015;71:25 – 34.
- 745 46. Allen T. Particle size measurement. Springer; 2013.
47. Sayin R. Mechanistic studies of twin screw granulation. PhD dissertation;
 Purdue University; 2016.
48. Hodgman CD. Handbook of chemistry and physics.; vol. 71. LWW; 1951.
49. Zadow JG. Lactose: Properties and uses. Journal of Dairy Science
 1984;67(11):2654–79. doi:10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(84)81625-2.
 750
50. Hooke R, Jeeves TA. “Direct search” solution of numerical and statistical
 problems. Journal of the ACM 1961;8(2):212–29. doi:10.1145/321062.
 321069.
51. Bratley P, Fox BL. Algorithm 659: Implementing Sobol’s quasiran-
 755 dom sequence generator. ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software
 1988;14(1):88–100. doi:10.1145/42288.214372.
52. MoDS . (Model Development Suite). Cambridge, United Kingdom: CMCL
 Innovations; 2015. <https://cmclinnovations.com/products/mods/>.

53. Dhenge RM, Fyles RS, Cartwright JJ, Doughty DG, Hounslow MJ,
760 Salman AD. Twin screw wet granulation: Granule properties.
Chemical Engineering Journal 2010;164(2-3):322 –9.
54. Fonteyne M, Fussell AL, Vercruysse J, Vervaet C, Remon JP, Strachan
C, Rades T, Beer TD. Distribution of binder in granules produced by
means of twin screw granulation. International Journal of Pharmaceutics
765 2014;462(1):8 – 10. doi:10.1016/j.ijpharm.2013.12.008.
55. Vercruysse J, Toiviainen M, Fonteyne M, Helkimo N, Ketolainen J, Juuti
M, Delaet U, Assche IV, Remon JP, Vervaet C, Beer TD. Visualiza-
tion and understanding of the granulation liquid mixing and distribution
during continuous twin screw granulation using NIR chemical imaging.
770 European Journal of Pharmaceutics and Biopharmaceutics 2014;86(3):383
–92. doi:10.1016/j.ejpb.2013.10.012.
56. Oullion M, Reynolds G, Hounslow M. Simulating the early stage of
high-shear granulation using a two-dimensional Monte-Carlo approach.
Chemical Engineering Science 2009;64(4):673 –85. doi:10.1016/j.ces.
775 2008.08.014.
57. Thompson M, Sun J. Wet granulation in a twin-screw extruder: Implica-
tions of screw design. Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences 2010;99(4):2090–
103.
58. Kumar A, Vercruysse J, Bellandi G, Gernaey KV, Vervaet C,
780 Remon JP, Beer TD, Nopens I. Experimental investigation
of granule size and shape dynamics in twin-screw granulation.
International Journal of Pharmaceutics 2014;475(1-2):485 –95. doi:10.
1016/j.ijpharm.2014.09.020.
59. Lee KT, Ingram A, Rowson NA. Twin screw wet granula-
785 tion: The study of a continuous twin screw granulator us-
ing positron emission particle tracking (PEPT) technique.

European Journal of Pharmaceutics and Biopharmaceutics 2012;81(3):666
–73. doi:10.1016/j.ejpb.2012.04.011.

790 60. Eitzlmayr A, Koscher G, Reynolds G, Huang Z, Booth J, Shering P,
Khinast J. Mechanistic modeling of modular co-rotating twin-screw ex-
truders. International Journal of Pharmaceutics 2014;474(1-2):157 –76.
doi:10.1016/j.ijpharm.2014.08.005.

61. Djuric D, Kleinebudde P. Impact of screw elements on continuous gran-
ulation with a twin-screw extruder. Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences
795 2008;97(11):4934–42. doi:10.1002/jps.21339.