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Abstract

Collision-exchange process is a common physical process where system members interact with each other to exchange materials and these individual interactions cumulatively drive a macroscopic system evolution in time. In this paper, a compartment-based stochastic model is formulated to study the collision-exchange process between members in a system. The discrete Markov analysis on the stochastic model presents the analytical results that show the independence of the system equilibrium on its initial distribution, and the derived differential equations reveal the deterministic time evolution of material amount on system members. As a specific example of a physical system that can be described via this model, a seed coating process is presented where the inter-particle coating variability is expressed by the stochastic model parameters. The promising agreement between simulation predictions and experimental results demonstrates the feasibility of stochastic modelling on the collision-exchange process and facilitates further model identification and applications to industrial processes.
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1 Introduction

Collision-exchange process is a common physical process that arises in many systems where system members interact to engender material transfers or information exchange over the population. The nature of collision-exchange process in thermodynamic systems can be reflected by the energy exchange process between neighbouring particles, leading to a thermal conduction throughout the model grid [1]. In epidemiology, the interaction behaviour is mathematically formulated to study the spread of infections and diseases that may lead to an outbreak as a result of individual contacts [2, 3]. In chemical reaction-diffusion systems with low molecule concentration, molecules are formulated to react when they come across and consequently lead to population changes in reactants and products [4, 5]. In particle coating processes, coating liquid is transferred between particles as a consequence of particle contacts [6].

To understand the evolution of such systems and to obtain a quantitative distribution of exchanged material, it is essential to simulate the collision-exchange process assuming proper operation conditions and interaction mechanism. For chemical reaction-diffusion systems [4, 5] with very small elements (i.e. molecules) or pandemic models [3, 7] with large elements (i.e. humans), stochastic modelling has been widely employed to investigate the time-dependent system evolution dynamically driven by successive member interactions. Conversely, discrete element method (DEM) is commonly used to simulate the collision-exchange behaviour of system members, especially for granular particle systems [8–10]. For such systems with elements of intermediate size, very
few studies have investigated the system state and its evolution using stochastic modelling approach. The most challenging part in DEM simulations of these systems is to adequately trace each independent particle and change its system state within each numerical time interval, which is computationally demanding, especially for systems with large population size. Besides, particle collisions in DEM simulations usually involve the analysis of elastic [11] and inelastic [12] collisions, to increase the simulation precision by sacrificing computational efficiency. Consequently, DEM simulations require sufficiently long time to complete and produce results, which is not conducive to further model identification and system optimisation. Due to these limitations, DEM is not usually adopted as an approach for process optimisation unless advanced computing resources, such as large computer clusters and powerful graphical processing units, are available. Compared to the DEM, a stochastic modelling approach is more flexible and simulation time-saving. It assumes complex particle behaviour as random behaviour, regardless of elastic or inelastic collision, by applying a lower number of parameters and resultant low computational intensity, giving much convenience to quantitatively characterise simulation outcomes.

In this paper, a stochastic modelling approach by formulating a compartment-based stochastic model is applied to investigate a system with collision-exchange processes with the goal to characterise the state evolution by material distribution. The model is mainly concerned with the exchange behaviour between system members. Material distribution is used as a specific application of the model. To simulate the model, Gillespie’s stochastic simulation algorithm (SSA) [4] is used to numerically compute the state change of the system. An illustrative example related to a seed coating process is given to present the feasibility of the model in practical use.

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, a 3D stochastic model is formulated with essential assumptions to implement the collision-exchange processes. In this section, we will discuss the properties of the stochastic model and give a deterministic approximation of the system evolution. In Section 3, stochastic simulations are presented based on an industrial example of seed coating process, with comparisons of simulations and experiments. Conclusions are presented in Section 4.

## 2 Methodology

Stochastic models built for molecular and epidemiological systems describe the system process in terms of model equations considering the nature of system uncertainty. Unlike DEM simulations giving the same output from unchanged operating conditions, stochastic modelling is inherently random. Repeating a simulation with the same conditions allows to explore the variability of the prediction. From these different simulation realisations, an ensemble of model outputs including uncertainty provides the statistic information missing from deterministic models.

### 2.1 Stochastic modelling on neighbouring collision-exchange process

A compartment-based model is formulated to represent collisions between neighbouring particles as illustrated by Figure 1. A 3D spatial domain is divided into compartments with one particle in each compartment. The numbers of compartments in \(x\), \(y\) and \(z\) dimensions are \(K_x\), \(K_y\) and \(K_z\), respectively. It is postulated that every cubic compartment contains a single spheric particle of the same size in diameter and is confined within this subvolume. We assume that each particle tends to stay in its own compartment and the neighbours behave as barriers to prevent the particle to travel into another compartment, that is to say, the order of particles remains unchanged in the model. To illustrate the collision-exchange process between particles from two neighbouring compartments, the compartments and the inside particles are denoted by the following index set

\[
I_{all} = \{(i,j,k) \mid i,j,k \in \mathbb{Z}, 1 \leq i \leq K_x, 1 \leq j \leq K_y, 1 \leq k \leq K_z\}
\]

The confined particles are assumed to collide with their neighbours in only non-diagonal directions. We define the following set of collision directions by which one particle may contact one of its non-diagonal neighbours

\[
E = \{(-1,0,0), (1,0,0), (0,-1,0), (0,1,0), (0,0,-1), (0,0,1)\}
\]

The non-diagonal neighbours of the particle in the \((i,j,k)\)-th compartment are defined by the following set
where $\mathbf{e}$ represents the direction of one of the neighbouring particles.

$$N_{i,j,k} = \{(i, j, k) + \mathbf{e} | (i, j, k) + \mathbf{e} \in I_{\text{all}}, \mathbf{e} \in E\} \quad (3)$$

**Particle contact frequency**

A collision is required for an extensive physical property to be transferred between particles. A specific example is the exchange of mass. Let $c_f$ (s$^{-1}$) denote the contact frequency to characterise the total number of particle contacts per second in the system. It is reasonable to assume that $c_f$ stays constant by neglecting potential slight fluctuation when the system achieves dynamic equilibrium. In this model we do not consider the contact frequency of a single particle because particles at different positions can have different contact frequencies. Tracking every particle individually would increase computational expense in simulations.

**Material transfer mechanism**

Focusing on the specific example of material transfer, upon each collision involving two particles, see Figure 2, it is considered that one particle would both give and receive material from the other particle, forming an exchange event. Let $m_{i,j,k}(t)$ and $m_{(i,j,k)+\mathbf{e}}(t)$ denote respectively the material amount on the $(i,j,k)$-th particle and one of its neighbour $(i,j,k)+\mathbf{e}$ at time $t$. For the $(i,j,k)$-th particle colliding with the neighbour $(i,j,k)+\mathbf{e}$, we define the following expression to represent the material amount change involving two particles in the exchange event at time $t$,

$$m_{i,j,k}(t + \Delta t) - m_{i,j,k}(t) = -m_{i,j,k}(t)K_{A} + m_{(i,j,k)+\mathbf{e}}(t)K_{P} \quad (4)$$

where $K_{A}$ represents the material amount fraction transferred from the particle $(i,j,k)$ to its selected neighbour $(i,j,k)+\mathbf{e}$ and $K_{P}$ from the selected neighbour to the particle. $\Delta t$ represents the numerical computational time interval which will be discussed later. In this model, we assume that the material transferred is determined only by the material amount on the involved particles and the transfer coefficients. To simplify the model, we consider a process for which $K_{A}$ and $K_{P}$ can be considered as constant (no strong variation of physical properties during the process). The exchange process (4) is a stochastic process for the $(i,j,k)$-th particle as its neighbour selected from the set $N_{i,j,k}$ is completely random. Later we will show how we can implement a stochastic simulation algorithm based on this exchange mechanism.

**Computational time interval**

After introducing the material transfer mechanism above, the numerical time step, denoted as $\Delta t$, needs to be discussed. The value of $\Delta t$ applied in the simulation is dependent on two critical factors of the system: collision frequency $c_f$ and particle population $K$. One needs to consider the following constraints when selecting of an appropriate value of $\Delta t$. 

---

Figure 1: (a) Discretisation of a 3D spatial domain $L_x \times L_y \times L_z$ by cubic compartments of the same edge length $h$. The domain with the number of compartments in each dimension $K_x = K_y = K_z = 8$ is shown on the figure; (b) Single particle is confined in each cubic compartment where the particle has limited space to move. 

---

### Equations

1. $N_{i,j,k} = \{(i, j, k) + \mathbf{e} | (i, j, k) + \mathbf{e} \in I_{\text{all}}, \mathbf{e} \in E\} \quad (3)$
2. $m_{i,j,k}(t + \Delta t) - m_{i,j,k}(t) = -m_{i,j,k}(t)K_{A} + m_{(i,j,k)+\mathbf{e}}(t)K_{P} \quad (4)$

---

### Notes

- $\Delta t$ represents the numerical computational time interval.
- $K_{A}$ and $K_{P}$ are material transfer coefficients.
- Collision frequency $c_f$ is constant.
- Particle population $K$ affects the material transfer.

---

**Further Reading**

- [Dissertation Title](http://example.com/dissertation)
- [Journal Article](http://example.com/article)
- [Conference Paper](http://example.com/paper)
Figure 2: Illustration of a two-particle collision involving particle \((i,j,k)\) and its neighbour \((i,j,k) + e\).

- \(\Delta t\) is required not to be larger than \(K/2c_f\). Once \(c_f \Delta t > K/2\), the simulation goes to failure as there would be not enough particles left to be neighbours.

- \(\Delta t\) should not be too small. When \(c_f \Delta t < 1\), the simulation would risk “nothing happens” for a lot of the time, which makes the simulation progress extremely slowly.

- \(c_f \Delta t\) should not be close to \(K/2\) as it “forces” \(c_f \Delta t\) selected particles to collide at the same time (every particle is independent in the system).

With these considerations, it is actually required a trade-off between acceptable simulation time and forcing as less particles to collide at the same time as possible. To apply decent and reliable value of \(\Delta t\), in this paper, we use a value selection criterion for \(\Delta t\) that \(1 \leq c_f \Delta t < K/10\) where the randomly selected \(c_f \Delta t\) particles and \(c_f \Delta t\) corresponding neighbours per iteration account for only a small part of all particles in the system, ensuring the simulations can be completed with reasonable computational time and high reliability.

**Collision propensity**

During a small time interval, the particles need to “choose” with which neighbour they would collide and therefore exchange. This decision is related to the external forces, like gravitational force and centrifugal force applied on the particles. In this stochastic model, instead of determining collision directions based on Newtonian models (like in DEM simulations), we introduce the concept of “collision propensity” to characterise the probabilities that the particles would contact their neighbour in a specific direction. Let \(P_{e_{i,j,k}}\) denote the collision propensity for the \((i,j,k)\)-th particle in the direction \(e\). Evidently, we have

\[
\sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} P_{e_{i,j,k}} = 1 \quad (5)
\]

**Stochastic simulation algorithm**

Prompted with considerations above, the stochastic simulation algorithm of the particle collision-exchange process is implemented as follows:

1. Initialise the model with the following model parameters \(\theta = [K_A, K_P, c_f]^T\) and simulation settings \(P_{e_{i,j,k}}, \Delta t, T_{total}\) and \(t_{sampling}\);
2. Record the system status every \(t_{sampling}\) seconds;
3. Randomly select \(c_f \Delta t\) particles from the model;
4. Randomly select \(c_f \Delta t\) neighbours for the selected particles;
5. Calculate the material change amount on all selected particles and their involved neighbours;
6. Update the material of the corresponding particles based on Equation (4) to reflect particle exchange processes; set \(t \leftarrow t + \Delta t\);
7. Go to step 2 if \(t < T_{total}\).

**2.1 Stochastic model property**

**a. Property of the stochastic process**

In this section, we investigate the discrete stochastic process associated with the collision-exchange system via a hidden stochastic Markov chain [13]. A Markov chain analysis produces insight on the fundamental properties of the system without running complex simulations. In fact, it elucidates how simulations are expected to behave offering a test for their validity.

Let us label the particles in the model from 1 to \(N\), the system state at time \(t\) with respect to the material amount on all particles are denoted by

\[
s(t)^T = (s_1^{(t)}, \ldots, s_l^{(t)}, \ldots, s_N^{(t)}) \quad 1 \leq l \leq N \quad (6)
\]

where \(s_l^{(t)}\) represents the material amount on the particle labelled by \(l\) at time \(t\). The system state at time \(t\) can be obtained by updating the system state computed at time \(t - \Delta t\) and Equation (4) is rewritten in matrix form.

\[
s(t)^T = s(t - \Delta t)^T P_t \quad (7)
\]

where \(P_t \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}\) is the transition matrix at time \(t\), describing the change of the system state of all particles in the model from \(t - \Delta t\) to \(t\). As the exchange process is stochastic, the transition matrix applied to every update is not constant but dependent on the randomly selected collision particle pairs. The stochastic transition matrix is formally written as follows,

\[
P_t = I_N - \sum_{l_A, l_P} (e_{l_A}K_A - e_{l_P}K_P) (e_{l_A} - e_{l_P})^T \quad (8)
\]
where \( I_N \) is the identity matrix. Indices \( l_A \) and \( l_P \) represent the label of all selected particles and corresponding neighbours at time \( t \), respectively. \( \mathbf{e}_{l_A} \) (resp. \( \mathbf{e}_{l_P} \)) denotes the column vector where all entries are 0 except in position \( l_A \) (resp. \( l_P \)) where the entry is 1. The system state discrete evolution can be expressed by the following form from its initial state,

\[
s(t)^T = s(0)^T \mathbf{H}^{(t,0)}
\]

where \( \mathbf{H}^{(t,0)} = \mathbf{P}_{1\Delta t} \mathbf{P}_{2\Delta t} \cdots \mathbf{P}_{n\Delta t} \mathbf{P}_t \) (the right product of a sequence of stochastic matrices) is the so-called non-homogenous stochastic Markov chain [14].

The properties of stochastic Markov chain have been extensively studied [15–18]. It is easy to observe that the transition matrix \( \mathbf{P}_t \) is a row-stochastic matrix in which each row sum is equal to 1. When a stochastic Markov chain formed of such matrices is long enough, (i) its ergodic property [15] shows that the long-term system state will be independent of its initial state and (ii) its result is almost identical to the average of the ensemble of simulations. According to Tahbaz-Salehi and Jadbabaie [16], the stochastic chain \( \mathbf{H}^{(t,0)} \) can always lead to convergence when \( t \) is large enough because all of the particles are connected in the exchange network with no isolated component, showing

\[
\mathbf{H}^{(t,0)} = \mathbf{1d}(t)^T \quad (10)
\]

where \( \mathbf{1} \) is an \( N \)-by-1 column vector where all entries are 1 and \( \mathbf{d}(t)^T \) is the distribution vector at time \( t \) that describes the asymptotic system state after long-run process. To characterise the system state, the variance of material distribution is defined as

\[
\sigma(t)^2 = \frac{1}{N} \| s(t) - m_{\text{avr}} \mathbf{1} \|^2 \quad (11)
\]

where \( m_{\text{avr}} \) is the average material amount and \( \| \cdot \| \) is the euclidean norm of vector. Combining Equations (9) to (11), we have the following expression for the coefficient of variation of material distribution in the stochastic model,

\[
\text{CoV}(t) = \left( \| \mathbf{d} \|^2 N - 1 \right)^{0.5} \quad (12)
\]

It is observed that once the particle population is given, \( \text{CoV}(t) \) is only dependent on the distribution vector \( \mathbf{d} \). For a Markov chain that has constant stochastic matrix at each step, the system would eventually achieve an equilibrium with deterministic convergence and constant distribution vector [19]. In our collision-exchange system, however, the stochastic matrix \( \mathbf{P}_t \) at each iteration is stochastic, which results in a random convergence and an uncertain distribution vector [20, 21] that are significantly dependent on the sequence of stochastic matrices. According to Tahbaz-Salehi and Jadbabaie [18], the asymptotic state that the system will approach is a distribution with non-zero variance. The mean of variance at steady state is determined by

\[
K \vec{\mathbf{e}}(\mathbf{I}_N) = \mathbb{E}(\| \mathbf{d} \|^2) \vec{\mathbf{e}} \mathbf{(1}_{N \times N}) \quad (13)
\]

where \( K = \lim_{t \to \infty} [\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{P}_k \otimes \mathbf{P}_k)]^t \) (14) \( \otimes \) denotes the Kronecker product, \( \vec{\mathbf{e}}(\cdot) \) is the vectorisation by stacking columns of a matrix into a single column vector.

Let us give illustrative examples of the results computed using Markov chain analysis (Equations (11) and (12)) and obtained from stochastic simulations (using simulation algorithm in Section 2.1), to present the impact of the conditions and parameters on the model outputs. Table 1 shows the comparisons of analytical expected values and simulation averages of material distribution with different model conditions and parameters. From the table, the stochastic simulation outputs completely agree with the Markov analysis results. The discrepancies between \( \mathbb{E}(\sigma) \) and \( \sigma \) (as well between \( \mathbb{E}(\text{CoV}) \) and \( \text{CoV} \)) in all examples are acceptable as the fluctuation of numerical simulation realisation is inevitable due to the model stochasticity. In Table 1, it is observed from models No.1 to 4 that the expected \( \sigma \) and \( \text{CoV} \) of material distribution weakly depend on the particle population for the same transfer coefficients \( K_A = 0.72 \) and \( K_P = 0.26 \). The slight change of expected \( \sigma \) (or expected \( \text{CoV} \)) is caused by the increasing number of particles in the system because the same transfer coefficients would make the coating material distributed more raggedly in a system with larger particle population. This result agrees with what has been presented in Huang et al. [22].

Models No.4 to 6 are constructed with the same particle population \( K = 60 \) but different dimensionality, i.e. 1D, 2D and 3D, respectively. The results show that once transfer coefficients and number of particles are fixed in the model, the system always tends to the same asymptotic state as described by the analytic solution, no matter what dimensionality the model applies. This implies that when the process time is large enough the material distribution at steady state is theoretically not related to the system geometry. From an industrial point of view, using vessels with different geometries would yield similar results of material distribution for the same amount of material and the same number of particles.
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In models No.6 to 11, the results are compared using

the same population dimension for the different values of

the transfer coefficients given by Table 1. It is observed

that σ and CoV of material distribution are significantly

influenced by the difference between $K_A$ and $K_P$. For

smaller differences, σ and CoV decrease, indicating that

the material is distributed more evenly in the system. In

model No.12, the model condition is set as $K_A = K_P$.

In the result, $σ = CoV = 0$ implies that the system

achieves a state where all particles have identical amount

of coating material. With the condition of $K_A = K_P$, the

transition matrix $P_t$ is known as a doubly-stochastic matrix

where both row sum and column sum are equal to 1. The

stochastic Markov chain $H^{(t,0)}$ will consequently always

lead to a distribution vector in which all entries are identical

[15, 16].

Analytically computing the expected value of $||d||^2$

allows to see the average material distribution behaviour at

steady state instead of repeating simulation multiple times

with the same input variables. However, the computational

burden on a system with a large particle population will

be terribly high as the size of stochastic matrix $P_t$ will

be squared after Kronecker multiplication and $vec(·)$ also

yields vectors of dreadful size. This problem can be solved

by using a regression fitting method with respect to $N$ and

$||d||^2$.

b. Deterministic model approximation

In Section 2.1.1 a, we have discussed the long-term

system state and the distribution of coating materials in

the particle collision-exchange model. In this section,

we study the deterministic evolution of system state.

The system is simulated by using the SSA illustrated in

Section 2.1. Re-running a stochastic simulation with the

same input condition would almost surely not reproduce

the realisation due to model stochasticity. Even though

stochastic simulations present the system uncertainty,

one still expects to see the average emergent dynamic

behaviour of the system.

Any particle $(i, j, k)$ in the system will randomly

experience one of the following three situations in a

simulation time step.

(1) Particle $(i, j, k)$ involved in an exchange event

associated with the transfer coefficient $K_A$. In

this situation, the particle state $m_{i,j,k}^{(1)}(t + \Delta t)$ is

determined by Equation (4). The probability of

occurrence of situation (1) is defined as

$$P^{(1)} = N^{-1} P_{i,j,k} e \Delta t$$ \hspace{1cm} (15)

(2) Particle $(i, j, k)$ involved in an exchange event

associated with the transfer coefficient $K_P$. In this

situation, the particle state is written as

$$m_{i,j,k}^{(2)}(t+\Delta t) = m_{i,j,k}(t)(1-K_P)+m_{i,j,k}+\epsilon(t)K_A$$ \hspace{1cm} (16)

The probability of occurrence of situation (2) is

defined as

$$P^{(2)} = N^{-1} P_{(i,j,k)} e \Delta t$$ \hspace{1cm} (17)

(3) Particle $(i, j, k)$ not involved in any exchange event

during $\Delta t$. In this situation, the particle state will keep

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Population dimensions $(K_x, K_y, K_z)$</th>
<th>Transfer coefficient $(particle)$ $K_A$</th>
<th>Transfer coefficient $(neighbour)$ $K_P$</th>
<th>Expected value $E(\sigma)$</th>
<th>Expected value $E(CoV)$</th>
<th>Numerical simulation average $\sigma$</th>
<th>Numerical simulation average $CoV$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(30,1,1)</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>35.71</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>34.44</td>
<td>0.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(40,1,1)</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>35.94</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td>34.13</td>
<td>0.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(50,1,1)</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>36.08</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>33.57</td>
<td>0.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(60,1,1)</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>36.17</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td>32.73</td>
<td>0.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(12,5,1)</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>36.17</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td>34.23</td>
<td>0.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(5,4,3)</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>36.17</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td>33.85</td>
<td>0.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(5,4,3)</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>74.13</td>
<td>1.483</td>
<td>66.87</td>
<td>1.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(5,4,3)</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>18.72</td>
<td>0.374</td>
<td>16.99</td>
<td>0.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>(5,4,3)</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>18.09</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>16.58</td>
<td>0.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(5,4,3)</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>0.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>(5,4,3)</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>(5,4,3)</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3: (a) Comparison between stochastic realisation and deterministic evolution of material amount on particles and (b) material amount distribution in the stochastic model at $t = 50$ s for $K_x = K_y = K_z = 10$, $N = 1000$, $m_{\text{avr}} = 10$, $K_A = 0.5$, $K_P = 0.45$, $c_f = 8000 \text{s}^{-1}$, $\Delta t = 0.01$ s, $P_{i,j,k} = 1/6$. Initially only the particles on the top two layers have identical amount of material. The solid lines represent the stochastic realisations of the particles and the dashed lines represent the deterministic evolution of the corresponding particles with the same colour.

unchanged so we have

$$m_{i,j,k}^{(3)}(t + \Delta t) = m_{i,j,k}(t)$$

(18)

The probability of occurrence of situation (3) is defined as

$$P^{(3)} = 1 - P^{(1)} - P^{(2)}$$

(19)

By using addition and multiplication laws of probability theory, we derive the stochastic mean of the state of particle $(i,j,k)$ at time $t + \Delta t$:

$$m_{i,j,k}(t + \Delta t) = P^{(1)}m_{i,j,k}^{(1)}(t + \Delta t)$$

$$+ P^{(2)}m_{i,j,k}^{(2)}(t + \Delta t)$$

$$+ P^{(3)}m_{i,j,k}^{(3)}(t + \Delta t)$$

(20)

The collision propensities $P_{i,j,k}^e$ are crucial to determine how Equation (20) can be further simplified and solved. For systems with homogeneous isotropic turbulence, it is plausible to assume that a particle has the same possibility to collide with one of its neighbours, that is to say, the particle collision is non-diagonally isotropic that all $P_{i,j,k}^e$ are identical, Equation (20) can be simplified into the following form:

$$\frac{dm_{i,j,k}}{dt} =$$

$$\left( \sum_{(i,j,k)+e \in I_{\text{all}}} m_{(i,j,k)+e} - R m_{i,j,k} \right) \left( K_A + K_P \right) \frac{c_f}{N} P_{i,j,k}^e$$

(21)

where $R$ is the number of valid non-diagonal neighbours with respect to the $(i,j,k)$-th particle, depending on the particle position.

Equation (21) is expected to describe the deterministic time evolution of the material amount on the $(i,j,k)$-th particle. Figure 3 compares the stochastic simulation realisation by using the SSA and deterministic system evolution by using Equation (21), with model inputs and initial condition listed in the caption.

Figure 3(a) gives an example of the good agreement between stochastic realisation (solid lines) and corresponding deterministic evolution (dashed lines) with respect to the material amount over individual particles. For clarity, we plotted the time evolution of three particles at different positions in the system. The material is transferred between particles and gradually spread throughout the entire system. The dashed lines converge at around 40 seconds, indicating that the system is approaching the steady state. Afterwards it is observed
Table 2: Summary of modelling approaches characterising the system evolution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stochastic process</th>
<th>Deterministic mean field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions</td>
<td>• Unchanged order of members</td>
<td>• All assumptions in Stochastic process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Binary collisions in non-diagonal directions only</td>
<td>• Identical collision propensity (non-diagonally isotropic process)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Linear liquid transfer mechanism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Constant model parameters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No material quantity loss after a collision with model boundary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>• Expected uncertainty of material distribution</td>
<td>• Expected material quantity on individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Revealing the relationship between parameters and uncertainty on material</td>
<td>• Allowing deterministic sensitivity analysis and experimental design with explicit model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>distribution</td>
<td>expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Suitable for identifying material distribution uncertainty in specific systems</td>
<td>• Suitable for approximately identifying transient behaviour of system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with small population size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitation</td>
<td>• High computational burden for large population size</td>
<td>• Material distribution not investigated at steady state</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

from the solid lines that the individual particle material amount no longer dramatically varies but fluctuates around the average value $m_{avf}$. The deterministic approximation represents the mean field of the particle states, summarised based on all potentials at the same time. This mean field approximation allows an explicit model expression to be used for further studies, which would save computational time in performing sensitivity analysis and designing experiments.

However, the deterministic mean field evolution is limited because it cannot predict any coefficient of variation or material distribution at steady state which can instead be obtained from stochastic simulations such as the one shown in Figure 3(b) obtained at $t = 50s$ in stochastic simulation. This limitation may be relaxed in the future by adding noise terms derived from the system uncertainty to the deterministic expression, forming stochastic differential equations.

Table 2 summarises the modelling approaches characterising the system evolution discussed in Section 2.1.1. In order to investigate the potential of the collision-exchange stochastic model, in Section 3, we will present an illustrative example of seed coating process to discuss how we can fit the collision-exchange stochastic model to understand the seed coating process.

### 3 Model application

In this section, a simple collision-based real system is studied applying the 3D compartment model in order to investigate feasibility, potential and possible issues. The physical process selected as a test case is seed coating.

#### 3.1 Seed coating process

In agrochemical industry, seed coating is a vital unit operation where raw seeds are coated by some chemical agent that reinforces seed growth performance and protects seeds from being damaged and contaminated by ambient surroundings. This process is affected by several factors such as seed shape, surface texture, property of chemical agent and coating vessel configuration. The seeds are mixed with a coating agent in a batch coater whose geometry is shown as in Figure 4. More details on coater geometry, coating variability, and relevant studies have been summarised [23].

The operating conditions of the seed coating process involve...
consist of seed loading mass, coating formulation loading mass, average seed size, average seed mass, post-mixing time and spray droplet size. Average seed size refers to the average diameter of the seeds to be coated. For seeds of irregular shape, the geometric mean diameter would be considered. Post-mixing time represents the mixing time applied after the coating agent is completely added to the system.

3.2 Seed coating experiment

In the experiment, the coating amount on seed surface is measured and compared to the stochastic simulation results. Figure 5 presents the flowchart of experiment design, stochastic simulations and seed coating distribution measurement and estimation.

The operating conditions of experiments are obtained based on Response Surface Methodology (RSM) in Design of Experiments (DoE) [24], generating seven experiments with experimental settings of different coating agent amounts and post-mixing times. The input variables of stochastic simulations are determined as follows,

- Particle population, $N$: determined by the seed loading mass and the average seed mass in the system. One kilogram of corns is applied in each run which approximates more than 3000 number of seeds.
- Population dimensions, $(K_x, K_y, K_z)$: determined by the seed coater geometry, the average seed size and the pattern of seed bed, see Figure 6. In the coater, when the rotator is on, the seeds fed into the coating chamber tend to stay away from the centre of the floor and gather at the wall due to the effects of strong centrifugal force and inevitable gravitational force. When the moving seed bed becomes stable, the bed forms a hollow cylinder with very limited number of seeds escaping from the bulk.
- Average amount of material, $m_{avr}$: assigned based on the average estimated coating amount $m^*_{avr}$ to be mentioned later;
- Initial distribution: the stochastic Markov analysis in Section 2.1.1 suggests that all particles (seeds) can be assumed to initially have identical amount of material, i.e. $m^*_{avr}$, when one focuses only on final distribution. However, if one wants to investigate the dynamic behaviour of the system, the initial distribution should be consistent with realistic situations.

Image analysis is applied to obtain the coating area to measure the coating distribution at steady state. The coated seeds are captured by camera and then the images are analysed to give the data that describes the coating coverage on seed surface. As seen from Figure 5, the analysed image shows three distinct colours, which represent the different degrees of adsorption of coating agent. The red region represents the area is fully coated. The cyan region represents the area is partially coated. And the yellow region represents no coating observed in the area. Assuming a uniform coating thickness in every region allows to convert the coating area distribution into estimating coating mass distribution by introducing

Figure 5: Flowchart for seed coating distribution measurement and estimation by using image analysis and nominal thickness parameters $t_p^*, t_F^*$. 
and the fully coated regions, respectively. The coating realisations and experimental results. This is because CoV impact on the value of m distribution pattern. Additionally, realisations and experimental results but not change their locations (mean value) of distribution curves of stochastic n where P∗(resp. n) corresponds to the number of pixels F∗linearly and therefore m∗ would not affect the comparison between simulation t∗P and t∗F would not affect the comparison between simulation realisations and experimental results. This is because t∗P and t∗F affect m∗ linearly and therefore m∗avr. That is to say, using different values of t∗P and t∗F would only alter the locations (mean value) of distribution curves of stochastic realisations and experimental results but not change their distribution pattern. Additionally, m∗avr would have no impact on the value of CoVmaterial due to Equation (12). In what follows, the experimental results would be compared to the stochastic simulations with t∗P = 0.5 and t∗F = 1.

\[ m^* = t^*_P n_P + t^*_F n_F \]  

(22)

where nP (resp. nF) corresponds to the number of pixels in the partially (resp. fully) coated region of projected area.

It is worth noting that using different values of \( t^*_P \) and \( t^*_F \) would not affect the comparison between simulation realisations and experimental results. This is because \( t^*_P \) and \( t^*_F \) affect \( m^* \) linearly and therefore \( m^*_\text{avr} \). That is to say, using different values of \( t^*_P \) and \( t^*_F \) would only alter the locations (mean value) of distribution curves of stochastic realisations and experimental results but not change their distribution pattern. Additionally, \( m^*_\text{avr} \) would have no impact on the value of \( \text{CoV}_{\text{material}} \) due to Equation (12). In what follows, the experimental results would be compared to the stochastic simulations with \( t^*_P = 0.5 \) and \( t^*_F = 1 \).

### 3.3 Model verification

In this section, we identify the impact of different experiment operating conditions by taking proper values of \( K_A \) and \( K_P \) in stochastic simulations which give similar coating material distributions.

Table 3 on the left shows the seed coating experimental results with different amount of coating agent fed and post-mixing time applied and on the right presents the simulation outputs based on the stochastic collision-exchange model. For each experiment, three sample sets of the coated seeds are measured to show the standard deviation and coefficient of variation. In Table 3, the values of transfer coefficients were estimated to ensure we could obtain simulated material distributions that would agree with experiments in terms of mean, variance and distribution pattern.

Figures 7(a) to 7(g) illustrate the comparisons between experimental results and stochastic simulation realisations with respect to the estimated coating mass distribution, which shows how this model is capable of reproducing observed experimental results, with the appropriate coefficients selected. Figure 7(h) illustrates the comparison between coating mass distributions of different amounts of coating agent. Figure 7(i) illustrates the comparison between coating mass distributions of different post-mixing times. Experiments No.2 to 5 give the bell-shaped distributions which can be reproduced by the simulations with model parameters \( K_A = 0.50 \) (\( K_A = 0.495 \) in experiment No.4) and \( K_P = 0.42 \) (\( K_P = 0.41 \) in experiment No.2). Experiment No.1 gives the exponential-like distribution which can be reproduced by the simulation with \( K_A = 0.60 \) and \( K_P = 0.20 \).

The observed coating mass distribution in the experiments is anticipated to be described by the model parameters \( K_A \) and \( K_P \). From Figure 7(h), in experiments No.2 to 5, the higher amount of coating agent was fed into the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Coating agent fed</th>
<th>Post-mixing time</th>
<th>Sample stddev</th>
<th>Sample CoV</th>
<th>Average coating mass</th>
<th>Expected stddev</th>
<th>Expected CoV</th>
<th>Transfer coefficient coefficient</th>
<th>Transfer coefficient coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(549.8, 477.3, 513.0)</td>
<td>(0.609, 0.582, 0.632)</td>
<td>845.3</td>
<td>528.4</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>(460.4, 514.6, 450.4)</td>
<td>(0.134, 0.150, 0.130)</td>
<td>3443.0</td>
<td>438.1</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(473.2, 476.7, 426.2)</td>
<td>(0.114, 0.116, 0.102)</td>
<td>4144.6</td>
<td>467.9</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>24.30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>(454.0, 470.6, 479.5)</td>
<td>(0.106, 0.110, 0.112)</td>
<td>4277.6</td>
<td>452.8</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30.45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(450.1, 469.9, 473.1)</td>
<td>(0.107, 0.111, 0.113)</td>
<td>4206.4</td>
<td>474.9</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>(451.1, 487.9, 516.6)</td>
<td>(0.129, 0.141, 0.145)</td>
<td>3510.8</td>
<td>496.2</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(435.8, 534.5, 480.9)</td>
<td>(0.127, 0.155, 0.137)</td>
<td>3467.7</td>
<td>440.3</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6: Sketch of the seed bed forming a hollow cylinder during coating process.

Table 3: Seed coating experimental results and corresponding stochastic simulation realisations for \( t^*_P = 0.5 \) and \( t^*_F = 1 \).
Figure 7: (a) to (g) Comparisons between seed coating experimental results and simulation outputs for experiments No.1 to 7. Model conditions: $(K_x, K_y, K_z) = (60, 10, 5)$, i.e. $N = 3000$, $c_f = 9000s^{-1}$, $dt = 0.01s$, $P_{e,j,k} = 1/6$, $t_F^* = 0.5$ and $t_F^* = 1$; (i) Comparison between coating mass distributions of different amounts of coating agent; (h) Comparison between coating mass distributions of different post-mixing times.

In Figure 7(i), the results of experiments No.2, 6 and 7 are presented as distributions with different colours. Experiments No.2, 6 and 7 applied the same amount of coating agent but different post-mixing times. Experiments No.2, 6 and 7 are designed to verify the steady state that the seed coating system can achieve after a certain period of time. As seen from the figure, as well as the values of $K_A$ and $K_P$, there is no big variation among the samples, indicating that the seed coating distribution does not significantly evolve with time any longer after post-mixing time larger than 20 seconds. The actual post-mixing time threshold, i.e. the minimum post-mixing time required for system to reach steady state, can be even smaller and its effect will be analysed more in details in the future.

Experiments No.3, 4 and 5 applied very different amount of coating agent but it is observed that these three experiments present very similar coating result in terms of the distribution pattern and the average coating mass $m_{AVG}$. This phenomenon can be explained by two aspects. (1) After discharging the coated seeds, the residual coating system so that the liquid was easily transferred between the seeds, leading to a better coating distribution, described by two close values of $K_A$ and $K_P$. In experiment No.1, using coating agent of 2.8 g leads to a poor liquid transfer between the seeds as inadequate coating liquid on seed surface makes it hard for other seeds to capture coating from it, which is reflected by the large difference between $K_A$ and $K_P$. Estimating the model parameters $K_A$ and $K_P$ with experiment operating conditions can characterise the coating behaviour in the experiment. $K_A$ and $K_P$ can be influenced by several factors in the coating system, including seed surface texture, coating liquid density and coating liquid viscosity. Investigating $K_A$ and $K_P$ by varying these properties allows to understand their impacts on the coating result.

In Figure 7(i), the results of experiments No.2, 6 and 7 are presented as distributions with different colours. Experiments No.2, 6 and 7 applied the same amount of coating agent but different post-mixing times. Experiments No.2, 6 and 7 are designed to verify the steady state that the seed coating system can achieve after a certain period of time. As seen from the figure, as well as the values of $K_A$ and $K_P$, there is no big variation among the samples, indicating that the seed coating distribution does not significantly evolve with time any longer after post-mixing time larger than 20 seconds. The actual post-mixing time threshold, i.e. the minimum post-mixing time required for system to reach steady state, can be even smaller and its effect will be analysed more in details in the future.

Experiments No.3, 4 and 5 applied very different amount of coating agent but it is observed that these three experiments present very similar coating result in terms of the distribution pattern and the average coating mass $m_{AVG}$. This phenomenon can be explained by two aspects. (1) After discharging the coated seeds, the residual coating
agent left in the coater in experiment No.5 was much more than that observed in experiment No.1. This indicates that there exists a maximum capability for seeds to keep coating adsorbed on surface as it would be increasingly hard for seed surface to receive excessive coating agent when the surface has been gradually occupied. As more coating agent fed into the system, the final coating distribution would approach asymptotically to an upper limit. The maximum capability of holding coating liquid for seeds will be inserted in the model in a future version to present stochastic simulation outputs with higher precision. (2) Introducing nominal thickness parameters $t^*_P$ and $t^*_P$ artificially is equivalent to assuming that the real coating thickness is uniform in fully coated region and this approximation may ignore the existence of the potential multilayer coating on seed surface, leading to an artificial upper bound of $m^*_{av}$ which might be lower than the real maximum capability. High-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) will be applied in the future to precisely measure the coating amount on seed surface.

The promising agreement on the coating material distribution between experimental results and stochastic simulation outputs shows how this modelling approach is applicable and the flexibility of the proposed modelling approach. It is worth noting that the presented $K_A$-$K_P$ pairs in the results are not the only choice to give similar distributions. In this work, the value of $K_A$ is chosen to be around 0.5 which is convenient for us to compare the influence of $K_A$-$K_P$ differences on the results. According to Equation (21), $K_A$ and $K_P$ influence the system dynamics in the coating process. Taking samples at different time points would facilitate estimating the actual values of $K_A$ and $K_P$. Rigorous parameter estimation requires strategies for uncertain sampling in experiments and optimisation with uncertainty in stochastic models, and it will be the subject of a separate work.

4 Conclusion

A compartment stochastic model is developed in this paper, aiming to simulate the particle collision-exchange system. The implemented SSA allows to compute the state evolution in the collision-exchange system with less computational intensity.

The discrete Markov process associated with the stochastic model is studied. The analytical results present the average long-term state in the collision-exchange system that is independent of model population, model dimensionality and model initial condition. The deterministic mean field analysis presents the average evolution with respect to the material amount on each single particle, computed based on all potential states of a particle at the same time.

The application of the model to the investigation of mass distribution in the seed coating process is promising because the coating system can be identified and described by the accessible model parameters. This work also shows that this model can support identification of basic physics of the collision-exchange process in the system.

Future work will aim to develop the model considering dynamics, particle motion and simulation efficiency, and to attempt global sensitivity analysis and parameter estimation for the stochastic model. The former will enable the model to predict the collision-exchange system evolution with high accuracy, while the latter aims to identify the impact of uncertainty on model outputs and understand the model-based design of experiment for stochastic models.
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Nomenclature

Alphabetical letters

- $c_f$: Contact frequency (s$^{-1}$)
- $E$: Exchange direction set
- $\mathbb{E}(\cdot)$: Analytical average or Expected value
- $I_{all}$: Compartment index set
- $K$: Total number of elements
- $K_x$: Number of compartments in x direction
- $K_y$: Number of compartments in y direction
- $K_z$: Number of compartments in z direction
- $K_A$: Transfer coefficient for reference particle
- $K_P$: Transfer coefficient for neighbour particle
- $m_{av}$: Average material quantity over particles
- $m_{i,j,k}(t)$: Material quantity on the $(i,j,k)$-th particle at time $t$
- $m^*$: Estimated coating mass on seed surface
- $m^*_{av}$: Estimated average of coating mass over particles
- $N$: Number of particles
- $N_{i,j,k}$: Set of neighbours for the $(i,j,k)$-th particle
- $n_F$: Number of pixels in fully coated region
- $n_P$: Number of pixels in partially coated region
- $P^e_{i,j,k}$: Collision propensity for the $(i,j,k)$-th particle
$R$  Number of valid non-diagonal neighbours
$t_f^*$  Nominal thickness parameter for fully coated region
$t_p^*$  Nominal thickness parameter for partially coated region
$T_{total}$  Total simulation time $(s)$

Vectors and Matrices [dimension]

$d(t)$  Distribution vector at time $t$ $[N]$  
$e$  Exchange direction $[3]$  
$e_{iA}$  Column vector  
$e_{iP}$  Column vector  
$H^{(t,0)}$  Stochastic Markov chain from 0 to $t$ $[N \times N]$  
$M_0$  Initial material distribution $[N]$  
$P_t$  Stochastic transition matrix at time $t$ $[N \times N]$  
$s(t)$  System state at time $t$ $[N]$  

Greek letters

$\Delta t$  Numerical computational time interval  
$\sigma(t)$  Standard deviation of material distribution at time $t$  
$\bar{\sigma}$  Numerical average of $\sigma$  
$\sigma^*$  Coating mass standard deviation of sample seeds

Acronyms

CoV  Coefficient of variation  
DEM  Discrete element method  
DoE  Design of experiments  
RSM  Response surface methodology  
SSA  Stochastic simulation algorithm  
TTEP  Travelling traders’ exchange process
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