



UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI SALERNO

Department of Industrial Engineering
Master's Degree in Chemical Engineering

CFD-PBE MODELING OF NANOPARTICLE FORMATION IN A COAXIAL JET MIXER

Thesis in
**Modellistica Matematica e Controllo
per l'Industria di Processo**

Supervisors:

Prof. Ing. Diego Caccavo

Prof. Ing. Gaetano Lamberti

Candidate:

Francesca Landi

Student Number: 0622201928

Academic Year 2024/2025

Alla mia famiglia

This text was printed in-house, in Times New Roman.

The scheduled date for the thesis discussion is 20/11/2025
Fisciano, 07/11/2025

Table of contents

Table of contents	I
Table of figures	IV
Table of tables.....	VII
Abstract	VIII
Sommario	IX
Introduction	1
1.1 Nanotechnology _____	2
1.1.1 Nanoparticles classification	2
1.1.2 Liposomes	4
1.2 Nanoprecipitation _____	5
1.2.1 Batch nanoprecipitation	5
1.2.2 Microfluidic and simil-microfluidic nanoprecipitation	6
1.2.3 Flash nanoprecipitation	8
1.3 Turbulent mixing _____	12
1.3.1 Overview of turbulence	13
1.3.2 Turbulence time scales	13
1.3.3 Macro, meso and micromixing	15
1.4 State of the art _____	16
1.5 Aims _____	17
Materials and methods	18
2.1 Materials _____	19
2.1.1 Soybean lecithin	19
2.1.2 Solvents	19
2.2 Equipment _____	19

Table of contents	Pag. II
2.2.1 Coaxial jet mixer	19
2.2.2 Analytical instruments	20
2.3 Methods	20
2.3.1 Phospholipids extraction and quantification	20
2.3.2 Determination of PC density	22
2.3.3 Determination of PC solubility in ethanol/water mixtures	22
2.3.4 Liposome production and injection length analysis	23
2.3.5 Liposome characterization	24
Modeling.....	27
3.1 General model structure	28
3.1.1 Geometry and mesh	28
3.1.2 Mixture properties	30
3.1.3 Model implementation	31
3.2 Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) and ethanol-water mixing	32
3.2.1 Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) model	33
3.2.2 Ethanol-water mixing	37
3.2.3 Boundary conditions	38
3.2.4 Model implementation	39
3.3 Phosphatidylcholine mass transport and Population Balance Equations (PBEs) modeling	41
3.3.1 PC interphase mass transport	41
3.3.2 Population Balance Equations (PBEs) model	42
3.3.3 Boundary conditions	45
3.3.4 Model implementation	46
Results and discussion.....	55
4.1 Experimental results	56
4.1.1 Phospholipids quantification	56
4.1.2 Determination of PC density	56
4.1.3 Determination of PC solubility in ethanol/water mixtures	57
4.1.4 Liposome characterization	59
4.2 Modeling results	62
4.2.1 CFD and ethanol-water mixing	62
4.2.2 Phosphatidylcholine mass transport and PBEs modeling	68
4.2.3 Effect of hydrodynamic conditions	77

Conclusions	84
References	87

Table of figures

Figure 1 Nanoparticles classification based on their composition [4]	3
Figure 2 Liposome structure [5]	4
Figure 3 Liposome classification according to size and lamellarity	5
Figure 4 Schematic of batch nanoprecipitation (BNP) [7].....	6
Figure 5 Representative schematics for microfluidic mixing geometries [10]	7
Figure 6 Schematic of the simil-microfluidic apparatus [12]	8
Figure 7 Representative schematics of impinging jet mixers geometries. Showing top view and side view of the two-channel confined impinging jet (CIJ) (left) and top view of the multi-inlet vortex mixer (MIVM) (right) [10].....	9
Figure 8 Representative schematics of coaxial turbulent jet mixer geometry. Inset illustrates the mixing zone and concentration gradient that forms during turbulent mixing and dissipation of the centerline jet, leading to nanomaterial self-assembly [10]	10
Figure 9 Turbulent mixing stages [21].....	15
Figure 10 Structure of soybean phosphatidylcholine[27]	19
Figure 11 Coaxial turbulent jet mixer apparatus (left) and close-up of the injection zone (right)	20
Figure 12 HPLC chromatogram of the phosphatidylcholine (PC) standard showing its three characteristic peaks at retention times of 9.608, 10.388, and 11.824 min.....	21
Figure 13 PC calibration curve	22
Figure 14 Injection zone during liposome production	24
Figure 15 Autocorrelation fitting performed using the NNLS algorithm ($\alpha = 0.05$)	25
Figure 16 Effect of the Tikhonov regularization factor (α) on the particle size distributions (PSDs) reconstructed through the NNLS algorithm, compared with the experimental DLS distribution (grey line)	26
Figure 17 Axisymmetric computational domain of the coaxial turbulent jet mixer: full geometry (top) and detailed view of the injection zone (bottom)	28
Figure 18 Triangular mesh of the computational domain showing local refinement near walls	29
Figure 19 Fitted viscosity of the ethanol-water mixture at 25°C as a function of ethanol mass fraction....	30
Figure 20 Definition of materials (left) and mixture template (right) in ANSYS Fluent.....	31

Figure 21 Computational domain and boundary configuration of the coaxial turbulent jet mixer. Blue boundaries represent the inlets, red indicates the outlet, grey corresponds to the solid walls, and yellow denotes the axis of symmetry.....	39
Figure 22 (a) solver settings; (b) activated physical models in ANSYS Fluent: RSM turbulence formulation and species transport enabled.....	40
Figure 23 RSM configuration: linear pressure–strain formulation with enhanced wall treatment	40
Figure 24 Species transport model configuration and mixture selection	41
Figure 25 Multiphase model setup in Fluent	46
Figure 26 Phase definitions in Fluent	46
Figure 27 Phase interaction panel in Fluent.....	47
Figure 28 Population Balance Model setup in Fluent.....	47
Figure 29 Appearance of phospholipid suspensions in ethanol/water mixtures before (x.1) and after (x.2) tangential flow filtration (TFF): (a.1-a.2) 10% EtOH; (b.1-b.2) 30% EtOH; (c.1-c.2) 40% EtOH; (d.1-d.2) 50% EtOH; (e.1-e.2) 60% EtOH; (f.1-f.2) 75% EtOH. No permeate was collected for the 20% EtOH sample, as the phospholipid phase was completely retained by the membrane.	57
Figure 30 Solubility of the phospholipid extract as a function of the ethanol mass fraction	58
Figure 31 Evolution of the DLS peak diameter as a function of the collection tube length	60
Figure 32 PSD obtained in the stabilized region ($z > 2.5$ cm) from NNLS reconstruction of DLS data	61
Figure 33 Comparison of axial velocity profiles predicted by the standard $k-\epsilon$ model using (a) Standard Wall Functions and (b) Enhanced Wall Treatment (EWT).....	63
Figure 34 Comparison of axial velocity profiles predicted by the standard $k-\omega$ model with (a) and without (b) the Low Reynolds correction	64
Figure 35 Comparison of axial velocity profiles predicted by the SST $k-\omega$ model with (a) and without (b) the Low Reynolds correction	65
Figure 36 Comparison of axial velocity profiles predicted by the Reynolds Stress Model (RSM) using (a) Standard Wall Functions and (b) Enhanced Wall Treatment (EWT).....	66
Figure 37 Contours of velocity magnitude predicted with the Reynolds Stress Model (RSM) combined with the Enhanced Wall Treatment (EWT): overall view (top) and close-up of the mixing zone (bottom)	67
Figure 38 Contours of ethanol mass fraction predicted with the RSM + EWT model: overall view (top) and close-up of the mixing zone (bottom)	68
Figure 39 Comparison between experimental and simulated intensity-weighted particle size distributions	70
Figure 40 Contour of the supersaturation field ($S > 1$) predicted by the CFD-PBE model	70
Figure 41 Contour of phosphatidylcholine mass fraction	71
Figure 42 Contour plot of nucleation rate [$\text{m}^{-3} \text{s}^{-1}$]	71
Figure 43 Contour plot of growth rate [$\text{m}^3 \text{s}^{-1}$].....	72
Figure 44 Spatial distributions of the particle volume fraction (α_i) for bins 24 to 9, predicted by the CFD-PBE model. Each subfigure (a-p) corresponds to a particle size bin identified by its mean diameter, as reported in the labels.....	73
Figure 45 Number-based particle size distributions at different axial positions	74

Figure 46 Spatial distribution of the large-eddy time scale (top) and micromixing time scale (bottom) within the supersaturated region of the coaxial jet mixer	75
Figure 47 Spatial distribution of the characteristic time scales of nucleation (top) and growth (bottom) within the supersaturated region of the coaxial jet mixer	76
Figure 48 Spatial distribution of the local Damköhler number within the supersaturated region of the coaxial jet mixer	77
Figure 49 Spatial distributions of supersaturation (S) predicted by the CFD-PBE model for different flow rate combinations: (a) 36/360 (reference case), (b) 36/180, (c) 18/360, (d) 60/600, (e) 18/600, and (f) 60/180 mL/min (inner/outer)	79
Figure 50 Number-based particle size distributions predicted by the model for different flow conditions, evaluated at the axial position where S drops below unity	80
Figure 51 Correlation between d_{76} and τ_{res} obtained from model predictions.....	81
Figure 52 Comparison between the characteristic liposome diameters predicted by the CFD-PBE model and the experimental MIPS values obtained from the Box-Behnken DoE.....	82

Table of tables

Table 1 Box-Behnken experimental matrix showing the combinations of process parameters and the corresponding liposome characteristics (mean \pm standard deviation) [18]	12
Table 2 Details of ethanol-water-PC prepared solutions	23
Table 3 Dilution factors for HPLC analysis.....	23
Table 4 Experimental configurations used for liposome production at different outlet tubing lengths	24
Table 5 Main geometric dimensions of the computational domain	29
Table 6 Empirical constants used in the standard k- ϵ turbulence model	34
Table 7 Empirical constants for the standard k- ω model.....	35
Table 8 Boundary conditions for the CFD and ethanol-water mixing simulation	39
Table 9 Boundary conditions for the CFD-PBE simulation	45
Table 10 Results of pycnometric measurement and calculation of PC density	56
Table 11 Final kinetic parameters adopted for the CFD-PBE model.....	69
Table 12 Residence time within the supersaturated region for each flow condition.....	79
Table 13 Comparison between the injected phosphatidylcholine (PC) mass flow rate and the total particle mass flow rate predicted by the CFD-PBE model for each flow condition	82

Abstract

Nanoparticles play a crucial role in drug delivery, sensing, and advanced materials, yet their performance depends on precise control of size and polydispersity during synthesis. Among bottom-up routes, nanoprecipitation offers simplicity and versatility, but batch processes suffer from poor mixing, while microfluidic systems trade control for scalability. Flash nanoprecipitation (FNP) in Coaxial Jet Mixers (CJMs) bridges this gap, providing millisecond mixing under continuous operation and tunable flow ratios, conditions transferable to large-scale manufacturing if described predictively. This thesis develops an experimentally grounded CFD-PBE framework for liposome formation by FNP, implemented in ANSYS Fluent. Hydrodynamics are modeled via RANS (RSM with Enhanced Wall Treatment) using composition-dependent mixture properties, while a discrete population balance (25 bins) captures nucleation and growth of liposomes driven by supersaturation derived from measured solubility data. The model reproduces key features of self-assembly: supersaturation and particle formation localize within the first 2-3 cm downstream of the injection point, where nucleation and growth dominate. Time-scale analysis indicates mixing-controlled formation ($Da > 1$), with nucleation slower than growth and large-eddy turnover governing homogenization. Model predictions qualitatively align with experimental observations, capturing the overall dependence of liposome size on flow conditions. The framework provides a mechanistic basis for predictive design and can be extended with micromixing-aware closures, secondary mechanisms (e.g., coalescence), and scale-resolving CFD (e.g., LES) to enhance reliability across operating conditions.

Conclusions

In this chapter, the conclusions of the thesis work will be discussed, along with potential future developments.

This thesis developed and assessed a mechanistic CFD-PBE framework to describe liposome formation in a coaxial turbulent jet mixer. The modeling strategy was built in layers: hydrodynamics and ethanol-water mixing; introduction of phosphatidylcholine (PC) as precipitating solute; and fully coupled discrete PBEs for nucleation and growth. A comparative analysis of turbulence closures and near-wall options led to the selection of the Reynolds Stress Model (RSM) with Enhanced Wall Treatment (EWT) as the most reliable combination to capture anisotropy and near-wall shear in the jet shear layer, which then served as the backbone for all CFD-PBE simulations.

On the experimental side, three datasets underpinned model construction and validation. First, lipid extract quantification and compositional HPLC analysis confirmed PC as the representative species. Second, the PC density was estimated pycnometrically and used within the mixture property framework. Third, the PC solubility in ethanol/water exhibited a re-entrant trend with a pronounced maximum near $\omega_{\text{etoh}} \approx 0.6$ and was implemented as a piecewise correlation for the saturation function used by the CFD-PBE model. These data anchored the thermodynamic driving force for precipitation directly to experiment.

The calibrated model reproduces the main features of precipitation-driven self-assembly within the mixer. Supersaturation and the associated nucleation-growth activity are confined to the first few centimeters downstream of the needle; below $S = 1$, kinetics cease and particle properties stabilize. The model parameters were adjusted based on the experimental data to reproduce the observed stabilization of liposome size after approximately 2.5 cm, yielding a supersaturation decay ($S \approx 1$ at ~ 2.8 cm) consistent with the DLS measurements. Therefore, the simulated profiles reflect the experimentally observed axial extent of the active formation zone, where particle growth effectively freezes out.

Population-balance diagnostics clarify the respective roles of nucleation and growth. Nucleation is localized in the smallest class (bin 24), after which growth transports dispersed volume toward larger classes; the highest particle volume fractions reside in intermediate bins (≈ 19 -15, corresponding to 31.7-80 nm) where growth slows and accumulation occurs, while the contribution of the largest bins is negligible. These features provide a mechanistic basis to interpret the measured and simulated PSDs under the reference operation.

The time-scale analysis identifies the controlling steps. Within the supersaturated region, the large-eddy turnover time is about an order of magnitude higher than the micromixing time, demonstrating that bulk turbulent turnover limits homogenization under the investigated conditions. Kinetically, nucleation is much slower than growth, making nucleation the intrinsic kinetic bottleneck. A local Damköhler number computed from the limiting kinetic time (nucleation) and the limiting turbulent time (large-eddy) indicates predominantly mixing-controlled conditions ($Da > 1$) over most of the active zone, particularly downstream as turbulence decays.

Across operating conditions, variations in hydrodynamics modulate both the residence time within the supersaturated region and the final liposome size. Longer residence times favor a more extended growth period and thus larger diameters, whereas shorter contact times lead to earlier freeze-out and smaller particles. The overall trends confirm that

nucleation remains the rate-limiting step, while growth rapidly equilibrates once supersaturation begins to decay, establishing a direct link between mixing dynamics, residence time, and the stabilized particle size.

Model-to-experiment comparison against a DoE dataset shows that the framework captures the overall dependence of liposome size on flow conditions with a slight overestimation; the two highest-inner-flow cases deviate more markedly, plausibly due to pump-limited uncertainties and/or modeling simplifications (steady, axisymmetric flow; no explicit micromixing; no secondary particle processes).

The results indicate clear directions for advancement. Future work should focus on improving both the predictive reliability of the CFD-PBE framework and its ability to reproduce experimental trends more quantitatively. On the turbulence side, incorporating a micromixing model (e.g., IEM) consistently coupled to the discrete PBE would allow the model to track scalar variance at the Kolmogorov/Batchelor scales, precisely where nucleation is triggered. From the kinetic standpoint, refining the nucleation and growth parameters and extending the model to account for limited aggregation or coalescence phenomena, could help capture the experimental PSDs more faithfully. On the CFD side, exploring 3D or scale-resolving simulations (e.g., DES or LES localized in the near-jet region) for selected conditions would enhance the description of unsteady mixing and shear-layer intermittency, which strongly affect local supersaturation fields. Finally, at the experimental level, expanding the database of validation points by varying flow-rate ratios, total flow rate and PC feed concentration, would provide a broader basis for calibration and uncertainty quantification, thereby consolidating the model's generality and predictive robustness.

In summary, this thesis delivers a coherent CFD-PBE description of liposome formation in a coaxial turbulent jet mixer, identifies nucleation and large-eddy turnover as the rate-limiting phenomena, and shows that, under the tested conditions, liposome size is governed primarily by mixing-controlled supersaturation relaxation within the first ~2–3 cm downstream of injection. The framework provides a credible starting point for micromixing-aware, fully predictive simulations to guide design and scale-up of continuous nanoparticle manufacturing in coaxial jet platforms.

References

1. Nasrollahzadeh, M., et al., *An introduction to nanotechnology*, in *Interface science and technology*. 2019, Elsevier. p. 1-27.
2. Altammar, K.A., *A review on nanoparticles: characteristics, synthesis, applications, and challenges*. *Frontiers in microbiology*, 2023. **14**: p. 1155622.
3. Joudeh, N. and D. Linke, *Nanoparticle classification, physicochemical properties, characterization, and applications: a comprehensive review for biologists*. *Journal of nanobiotechnology*, 2022. **20**(1): p. 262.
4. Milesi, P., et al., *Nanoparticles and Glycosaminoglycans: Progress and Applications for Cancer Therapy*. *Proteoglycan Research*, 2025. **3**(1): p. e70024.
5. Choo, W. and H.L. Tey, *Skin Lightening Efficacy of Tranexamic Acid in Topical Delivery Systems*. *Clinical and Experimental Dermatology and Therapies*, 2024. **9**.
6. van Swaay, D. and A. DeMello, *Microfluidic methods for forming liposomes*. *Lab on a Chip*, 2013. **13**(5): p. 752-767.
7. Kuddushi, M., et al., *Recent advances in nanoprecipitation: from mechanistic insights to applications in nanomaterial synthesis*. *Soft Matter*, 2025. **21**(15): p. 2759-2781.
8. Zielińska, A., et al., *Polymeric nanoparticles: production, characterization, toxicology and ecotoxicology*. *Molecules*, 2020. **25**(16): p. 3731.
9. Kozalak, G., et al., *Optimization of PLGA Nanoparticle Formulation via Microfluidic and Batch Nanoprecipitation Techniques*. *Micromachines*, 2025. **16**(9): p. 972.
10. Streck, S., et al., *Comparison of bulk and microfluidics methods for the formulation of poly-lactic-co-glycolic acid (PLGA) nanoparticles modified with cell-penetrating peptides of different architectures*. *International journal of pharmaceutics: X*, 2019. **1**: p. 100030.
11. VandenBerg, M.A., et al., *Learning from the future: towards continuous manufacturing of nanomaterials*. *AAPS Open*, 2025. **11**(1): p. 7.
12. Zaibudeen, A., *Recent Advances in Different Nanoprecipitation Methods for Efficient Drug Loading and Controlled Release*. *Journal of Nanotechnology and Nanomaterials*, 2025. **6**(1): p. 12-25.
13. Bochicchio, S., et al., *Advances in nanoliposomes production for ferrous sulfate delivery*. *Pharmaceutics*, 2020. **12**(5): p. 445.
14. Chan, H.-K. and P.C.L. Kwok, *Production methods for nanodrug particles using the bottom-up approach*. *Advanced drug delivery reviews*, 2011. **63**(6): p. 406-416.

15. Saad, W.S. and R.K. Prud'homme, *Principles of nanoparticle formation by flash nanoprecipitation*. Nano Today, 2016. **11**(2): p. 212-227.
16. Lim, J.-M., et al., *Ultra-high throughput synthesis of nanoparticles with homogeneous size distribution using a coaxial turbulent jet mixer*. ACS nano, 2014. **8**(6): p. 6056-6065.
17. Caccavo, D., G. Lamberti, and A.A. Barba, *Coaxial Injection Mixer for the Continuous Production of Nanoparticles*. Chemical Engineering Transactions, 2023. **100**: p. 301-306.
18. De Caro, C., *Characterization of a coaxial injection mixer for continuous production of nanoparticles*, in *Department of Industrial Engineering*. 2023, University of Salerno. p. 93.
19. Caccavo, D., et al., *Optimization of Nanoliposomes Production using a Coaxial Jet Mixer: a Response Surface Modeling Approach*. Chemical Engineering Transactions, 2025. **118**: p. 295-300.
20. Bałdyga, J. and J.R. Bourne, *Turbulent mixing and chemical reactions*. 1999: John Wiley & Sons.
21. Wilcox, D.C., *Turbulence modeling for CFD*. Vol. 2. 1998: DCW industries La Canada, CA.
22. Johnson, B.K. and R.K. Prud'homme, *Chemical processing and micromixing in confined impinging jets*. AIChE Journal, 2003. **49**(9): p. 2264-2282.
23. Paul, E.L., V.A. Atiemo-Obeng, and S.M. Kresta, *Handbook of industrial mixing*. 2004: Wiley Online Library.
24. Shin, S., et al., *Mechanistic Modeling of Lipid Nanoparticle (LNP) Precipitation via Population Balance Equations (PBEs)*. arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.10533, 2025.
25. Cupolo, A., *Curcumin nanoprecipitation in coaxial jet mixer: experiments and modeling*, in *Department of Industrial Engineering*. 2023, University of Salerno.
26. Du, Y., et al., *Disulfide phosphatidylcholines: alternative phospholipids for the preparation of functional liposomes*. Chemical Communications, 2019. **55**(58): p. 8434-8437.
27. Scholfield, C., *Composition of soybean lecithin*. Journal of the American Oil Chemists' Society, 1981. **58**(10): p. 889-892.
28. de Sousa, R.S., et al., *Effects of α -eleostearic acid on asolectin liposomes dynamics: Relevance to its antioxidant activity*. Bioorganic Chemistry, 2013. **51**: p. 8-15.
29. Iannone, M., et al., *A low-cost push-pull syringe pump for continuous flow applications*. HardwareX, 2022. **11**: p. e00295.
30. Jangle, R., et al., *Selective HPLC method development for soy phosphatidylcholine fatty acids and its mass spectrometry*. Indian journal of pharmaceutical sciences, 2013. **75**(3): p. 339.
31. Bird, R.B., W.E. Stewart, and E.N. Lightfoot, *Transport Phenomena*. 2nd Edition ed. 2002, New York: John Wiley & Sons.
32. Menter, F.R., *Two-equation eddy-viscosity turbulence models for engineering applications*. AIAA journal, 1994. **32**(8): p. 1598-1605.
33. Ramkrishna, D., *Population balances: Theory and applications to particulate systems in engineering*. 2000: Elsevier.

34. Zhigaltsev, I.V., et al., *Bottom-up design and synthesis of limit size lipid nanoparticle systems with aqueous and triglyceride cores using millisecond microfluidic mixing*. *Langmuir*, 2012. **28**(7): p. 3633-3640.
35. Hounslow, M., R. Ryall, and V. Marshall, *A discretized population balance for nucleation, growth, and aggregation*. *AIChE journal*, 1988. **34**(11): p. 1821-1832.
36. Lister, J., D. Smit, and M. Hounslow, *Adjustable discretized population balance for growth and aggregation*. *AIChE Journal*, 1995. **41**(3): p. 591-603.
37. Shiea, M., et al., *CFD-PBE modelling of continuous Ni-Mn-Co hydroxide co-precipitation for Li-ion batteries*. *Chemical Engineering Research and Design*, 2022. **177**: p. 461-472.
38. Patra, M., et al., *Under the influence of alcohol: the effect of ethanol and methanol on lipid bilayers*. *Biophysical journal*, 2006. **90**(4): p. 1121-1135.
39. Burni, F.A., et al., *Complexity in a Simple Self-Assembling System: Lecithin-Water-Ethanol Mixtures Exhibit a Re-Entrant Phase Transition and a Vesicle-Micelle Transition (VMT) on Heating*. *Langmuir*, 2024. **40**(34): p. 17941-17950.

