

On the estimation of specific interfacial areas in self-aerated flows

M. Kramer¹

¹Senior Lecturer, UNSW Canberra, School of Engineering and Technology (SET), Canberra, ACT 2610, Australia, ORCID 0000-0001-5673-2751, Email: m.kramer@unsw.edu.au

ABSTRACT

This work provides a short clarification on the definition of specific interfacial areas in self-aerated flows, thereby distinguishing between the specific interfacial area related to the volume of an air-water mixture, and the specific interfacial area related to the water volume. This distinction is important when it comes to solving the air-water mass transfer equation, as there has been some misconception on the past. It is hoped that this contribution will help to clarify on these basic fundamentals, which is anticipated to be important for the future development and application of advanced air-water mass transfer models to self-aerated flows.

1 INTRODUCTION

In high Froude-number self-aerated flows, such as flows down smooth chutes or stepped cascades, the gas-liquid interfacial area is of key interest, as the mass transfer between air and water is directly proportional to this area. In the mass transfer equation, the interfacial area typically appears in form of a specific interfacial area, which represents an interfacial area per unit volume. In this work, some considerations on the definition and estimation of specific interfacial areas in self-aerated flows are presented. These considerations are deemed very relevant to several previous works, where aeration efficiencies were estimated through a combination of the mass transfer equation with phase-detection intrusive measurements.

In these previous works, the specific interfacial area was defined as the interfacial area per unit volume of air and water (Toombes and Chanson 2000; Toombes 2002; Toombes and Chanson

2005; Bung 2009; Felder and Chanson 2015; Wuthrich and Chanson 2015; Bung and Valero 2018; Severi 2018; Nina et al. 2022; Niu et al. 2024; KC et al. 2025), and was computed on the basis of phase-detection probe measurements as follows (Cartellier and Achard 1991; Chanson 2002)

$$a_m = \frac{4F}{V}, \quad (1)$$

where a_m (1/m) is the specific interfacial area per unit volume of air and water, F (1/s) is the bubble count rate, V (m/s) is the time-averaged interfacial velocity, and the index m stands for mixture.

However, in the mass transfer equation, the interfacial area must be related to the volume of water (Wilhelms and Gulliver 1993; Cussler 2009), and as such, the correct equation for the specific interfacial area reads

$$a_w = \frac{4F}{V(1-C)}, \quad (2)$$

where a_w is the specific interfacial area per unit volume of water (1/m), C is the time-averaged volumetric air concentration (-), and the index w stands for water.

The reasoning as to why the interfacial area must be related to the volume of water, as well as a derivation of a_w , is given in the next section, while the re-analysis of a literature data set shows that aeration efficiencies, estimated using a_m instead of a_w , may be subject to significant errors.

2 METHODS - DERIVATION OF SPECIFIC INTERFACIAL AREA

Here, some considerations on mass transfer are presented, followed by a derivation of the expression for the interfacial area per unit volume of water. First, we are interested in the transfer of mass from an air-water interface into a well-mixed solution. The amount of transferred mass per interfacial area can be written in familiar form (Cussler 2009)

$$N = K_L (c_{\text{sat}} - c_{\text{gas}}), \quad (3)$$

where N (kg/(m² s)) is the mass flux through the interface, K_L is the mass transfer coefficient (m/s),

c_{gas} is the dissolved gas concentration in the bulk solution (kg/m^3), and c_{sat} is the equilibrium gas concentration at the interface (kg/m^3). Next, we write the rate mass transfer between the interface and the water phase as follows

$$\underbrace{\frac{d(c_{\text{gas}} \mathcal{V}_w)}{dt}}_{\text{Accumulation of mass in water phase (kg/s)}} = NA = \underbrace{K_L A (c_{\text{sat}} - c_{\text{gas}})}_{\text{Rate of mass transfer across interface (kg/s)}}, \quad (4)$$

where \mathcal{V}_w is the water volume (m^3), and A (m^2) is the interfacial area. We recognise that the water volume does not change over time, and as such, Eq. (4) is divided by \mathcal{V}_w to yield

$$\frac{dc_{\text{gas}}}{dt} = K_L \frac{A}{\mathcal{V}_w} (c_{\text{sat}} - c_{\text{gas}}) = K_L a_w (c_{\text{sat}} - c_{\text{gas}}), \quad (5)$$

where the specific interfacial area $a_w = A/\mathcal{V}_w$ ($1/\text{m}$) is defined as the interfacial area per unit of water volume. Using $ds = Vdt$, the following formulation is obtained

$$\frac{dc_{\text{gas}}}{ds} = \frac{K_L a_w}{V} (c_{\text{sat}} - c_{\text{gas}}), \quad (6)$$

where s is the distance along a streamline. Equation (6) can be integrated to calculate the aeration efficiency of a hydraulic structure, given that K_L , V , and a_w are known at each location (Toombes 2002).

Considering a bubbly flow with n uniform-sized bubbles, each bubble having a surface area $A_b = \pi D_b^2$ (m^2) and a volume $\mathcal{V}_b = \frac{\pi D_b^3}{6}$ (m^3), with D_b being the uniform bubble diameter (m), the specific interfacial area a_w in Eqns. (5), (6) can be written as

$$a_w = \frac{A}{\mathcal{V}_w} = \frac{n A_b}{\mathcal{V}_w}. \quad (7)$$

Next, we define the time-averaged volumetric air concentration C (-), which can be understood as the volume of air bubbles per unit volume of air-water mixture, obtained during a measurement

with a time scale significantly larger than the time scale of turbulent processes

$$C = \frac{\mathcal{V}_a}{\mathcal{V}_m} = \frac{\mathcal{V}_a}{\mathcal{V}_w + \mathcal{V}_a}, \quad (8)$$

where \mathcal{V}_m is the mixture volume (m^3), and \mathcal{V}_a is the volume of air (m^3), i.e., $\mathcal{V}_a = n \mathcal{V}_b$. Solving Eq. (8) for \mathcal{V}_w and substitution into Eq. (7) yields

$$a_w = \frac{n A_b}{\mathcal{V}_w} = \frac{C n A_b}{\mathcal{V}_a (1 - C)} = \frac{6 C n \pi D_b^2}{n \pi D_b^3 (1 - C)} = \frac{6 C}{D_b (1 - C)}. \quad (9)$$

When deploying a phase detection intrusive probe, bubbles are not necessarily pierced at their centreline, and a chord length is measured instead of a bubble diameter. The mean air chord length L_{ch} (m) can be expressed as (Toombes 2002)

$$L_{\text{ch}} = \frac{C V}{F}, \quad (10)$$

where V is the time-averaged interfacial velocity (m/s), and F is the bubble count rate (1/s). It is known that the bubble diameter is typically larger than the chord length, and a theoretical value of 1.5 has been reported for the ratio of bubble diameter to chord length, i.e., $D_b/L_{\text{ch}} = 1.5$ (Liu and Bankoff 1993; Rüdüsüli et al. 2012). Inserting this condition into Eq. (10) gives

$$D_b = \frac{1.5 C V}{F}. \quad (11)$$

In a last step, Eq. (9) is combined with Eq. (11), leading to the following expression for the specific interfacial area per unit volume of water

$$a_w = \frac{6 C}{D_b (1 - C)} = \frac{4 F}{V (1 - C)}. \quad (12)$$

It is noted that several assumptions were made in the derivation of Eq. (12), including (i) uniform bubble size distribution, (ii) spherical bubble shape, and (iii) ratio bubble diameter to chord length

$D_b/L_{ch} = 1.5$. Note that Eq. (1) can be derived in a similar fashion, by defining $a_m = A/\mathcal{V}_m = (n A_b)/\mathcal{V}_m$.

Returning to Eq. (12), it is emphasized that this expression presents a rough approximation of the specific interfacial area, which is assumed to hold for bubbly flows with $C < 0.3$. In order to account for more complex bubble shapes, we define a shape factor $\beta = (A_b L_{ch})/\mathcal{V}_b$, leading to the following expression for a_w

$$a_w = \beta \frac{F}{V(1-C)}. \quad (13)$$

Equation (13) is in accordance with Toombes (2002), who stated that “*the specific interface area is simply proportional to the number of air-water interfaces per unit length of air-water mixture*”. An evaluation of the shape factor for spherical bubbles yields $\beta = 4$, demonstrating that Eq. (13) can be reconciled with Eq. (12). For simplicity, and in the absence of other evidence, a value of $\beta = 4$ can be used across the air-water flow column, while it is acknowledged that the definition of a_w may not hold for the wavy free-surface layer, i.e., the Turbulent Wavy Layer (TWL), where bubbles and waves are superposed (Kramer and Valero 2023; Kramer 2024).

3 RESULTS - APPLICATION TO STEPPED SPILLWAY FLOW

To show the differences between Eq. (1) and Eq. (12), previously recorded transition flow data from Kramer and Chanson (2018) were re-analysed, comprising a bed-normal profile of air-water flow properties, measured at step edge 8; the specific flow rate was $q = 0.067 \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$ and the chute angle was $\theta = 45^\circ$. For more information about the experimental setup and flow measurement instrumentation, the reader is referred to Kramer and Chanson (2018). Figure 1 shows the results of this re-analysis, including a typical S-shaped air concentration profile (Fig. 1a), as well as profiles of the specific interfacial areas (Fig. 1b). Note that the vertical axes were normalised with $y_{90} = y(C = 0.9)$. Considering the data presented in Fig. 1b, it becomes clear that there are large differences in the computation of a . For the recorded profiles, the depth-averaged specific interfacial area, defined as

$$\langle a \rangle = \frac{1}{y_{90}} \int_{y=0}^{y_{90}} a \, dy, \quad (14)$$

yielded values of $\langle a_m \rangle = 158.2 \text{ m}^{-1}$ and $\langle a_w \rangle = 693.2 \text{ m}^{-1}$, respectively. This finding implies that aeration efficiencies, estimated using a_m instead of a_w , may carry some significant error.




Fig. 1. Air-water flow properties of flows down a stepped spillway; measurements taken at step edge 8 for $q = 0.067 \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$; re-analysis of data from Kramer and Chanson (2018): (a) Air concentration distribution; (b) Specific interfacial areas a_m [Eq. (1)] and a_w [Eq. (12)]

4 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this work, a novel formulation for the estimation of specific interfacial areas in self-aerated flows is derived, which relates the interfacial area to the volume of water, on the basis of phase-detection intrusive measurements. The underlying assumptions and limitations of this new formulation are discussed, followed by the introduction of a shape factor, which allows application beyond spherical particle shapes. It is acknowledged that this shape factor requires some future experimental or numerical exploration. Further, the presented approach may not hold for the wavy free-surface layer of a high-Froude number flow, and a differentiation between entrapped and entrained air is required, along with the conceptualisations of Bung and Valero (2018) and Niu et al. (2024).

In relation to air-water mass transfer calculations in self-aerated flows, it is stressed that previous researchers have used an incorrect definition of the specific interfacial area in their computations

(Toombes and Chanson 2000; Toombes 2002; Toombes and Chanson 2005; Bung 2009; Felder and Chanson 2015; Wuthrich and Chanson 2015; Bung and Valero 2018; Severi 2018; Nina et al. 2022; Niu et al. 2024; KC et al. 2025), and it was shown that this could have led to significant errors. While the presented formulation corrects for this shortcoming, there are a few other limitations worthwhile mentioning.




Fig. 2. Snapshots of air water flows down a stepped spillway, demonstrating the air entrainment process as well as the cavity recirculation vortex; images were recorded at the University of Queensland (UQ) with a Phantom v2011 camera for a specific discharge $q = 0.110 \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$, where the focus was set on step edges 3 to 5; note that the images are rotated by $\theta = 45^\circ$, for presentation purposes, and that the pseudo-bottom is represented by the black dashed lines; phase-detection probe measurements are typically performed above the step edges, indicated by the vertical lines

- First, it is emphasized that stream aeration coefficients K_L are fundamentally controlled by turbulence, involving the two scalings $K_L \sim \text{shear velocity}$ and $K_L \sim (\text{turbulence dissipation rate})^{1/4}$ (Wang et al. 2021). In this context, an empirical equation from Kawase and Moo-Young (1992) is still frequently used by the air-water flow community, which predicts K_L independent of bubble size and flow conditions. This has been recognised by Demars and Manson (2013), who commented that the model of Kawase and Moo-Young (1992) is “likely

to apply only at cascades and hydraulic structures”, which seems rather paradox. In short, there is strong evidence suggesting that the mass transfer coefficient K_L depends on flow turbulence, and subsequently on the bubble size, which needs to be accounted for.

- Second, the mass transfer equation has also been applied to characterize the aeration efficiency of flows down stepped spillways. It is stressed that phase-detection intrusive measurements are typically performed above the step edges, indicated by the vertical lines in Fig. 2, and therefore, the adopted modelling approach does not account for gas transfer occurring within the step cavities, below the pseudo-bottom (Fig. 2). As the residence time of air bubbles trapped inside a cavity vortex may exceed the residence time of air bubbles travelling above the pseudo-bottom by one or two orders of magnitude, the air-water mass transfer within the step cavities may not be negligible.

To summarize, the state-of-the-art approach for estimating aeration efficiencies in flows across hydraulic structures using intrusive phase-detection measurements has some limitations, which have been discussed in detail herein. The newly introduced formulation for the specific interfacial area per unit volume of water provides a key element for a physically based description of gas transfer processes in self-aerated flows, while other limitations are still to be addressed. Altogether, it is hoped that this short contribution provides valuable insights for the future development of advanced air-water mass transfer models for self-aerated flows.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author thanks the School of Civil Engineering (The University of Queensland) for providing full-access to the AEB Hydraulics Laboratory. The exchanges and discussions with Daniel Bung, Brian Crookston, John Gulliver, and Hubert Chanson are acknowledged.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

No data, models, or code were generated or used during the study.

NOTATION

A	Interfacial area (m^2)
A_b	Air bubble surface area (m^2)
a_m	Specific interfacial area per unit volume of air-water mixture ($1/\text{m}$)
a_w	Specific interfacial area per unit water volume ($1/\text{m}$)
$\langle a \rangle$	Depth-averaged interfacial area ($1/\text{m}$)
C	Time-averaged volumetric air concentration (-)
c_{sat}	Equilibrium gas concentration (kg/m^3)
c_{gas}	Dissolved gas concentration in bulk solution (kg/m^3)
D_b	Air bubble diameter (m)
F	Bubble count rate ($1/\text{s}$)
K_L	Mass transfer coefficient (m/s)
L_{ch}	Air chord length (m)
N	Mass flux through interface ($\text{kg}/(\text{m}^2 \text{ s})$)
n	Number of air bubbles (-)
q	Specific water discharge (m^2/s)
s	Distance (m)
t	Time (s)
V	Time-averaged interfacial velocity (m/s)
\mathcal{V}_b	Air bubble volume (m^3)
\mathcal{V}_a	Volume of air (m^3)
\mathcal{V}_m	Volume of air-water mixture (m^3)
\mathcal{V}_w	Volume of water (m^3)
y	Direction normal to pseudo-bottom (m)
y_{90}	Mixture flow depth where $C = 0.9$ (m)
β	Shape factor (-)
θ	Chute angle ($^\circ$)

REFERENCES

- Bung, D. (2009). “Zur selbstbeluefteten Gerinnestromung auf Kaskaden mit gemaessigter Neigung.” Ph.D. thesis, Bergische Universitaet Wuppertal, Wuppertal, Wuppertal, Germany.
- Bung, D. and Valero, D. (2018). “Re-Aeration on Stepped Spillways with Special Consideration of Entrained and Entrapped Air.” *Geosciences*, 8(9), 333.
- Cartellier, A. and Achard, J. (1991). “Local phase detection probes in fluid/fluid two-phase flows.” *Review of Scientific Instruments*, 62(2), 279–303.
- Chanson, H. (2002). “Air-water flow measurements with intrusive, phase-detection probes: can we improve their interpretation?.” *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering*, 128(3), 252–255.
- Cussler, E. L. (2009). *Diffusion - mass transfer in fluid systems*. Cambridge University Press.
- Demars, B. O. and Manson, J. R. (2013). “Temperature dependence of stream aeration coefficients and the effect of water turbulence: a critical review.” *Water Research*, 47(1), 1–15.
- Felder, S. and Chanson, H. (2015). “Aeration and air–water mass transfer on stepped chutes with embankment dam slopes.” *Environmental Fluid Mechanics*, 15(4), 695–710.
- Kawase, Y. and Moo-Young, M. (1992). “Correlations for liquid-phase mass transfer coefficients in bubble column reactors with newtonian and non-newtonian fluids.” *The Canadian Journal of Chemical Engineering*, 70, 48–54.
- KC, M. R., Crookston, B., Flake, K., and Felder, S. (2025). “Enhancing flow aeration on an embankment sloped stepped spillway using a labyrinth weir.” *Journal of Hydraulic Research*, 63(1), 32–47.
- Kramer, M. (2024). “Turbulent free-surface in self-aerated flows: Superposition of entrapped and entrained air.” *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 980 (A25).
- Kramer, M. and Chanson, H. (2018). “Transition flow regime on stepped spillways: air–water flow characteristics and step-cavity fluctuations.” *Environmental Fluid Mechanics*, 18, 947–965.
- Kramer, M. and Valero, D. (2023). “Linking turbulent waves and bubble diffusion in self-aerated open-channel flows: Two-state air concentration.” *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 966 (A37).
- Liu, T. and Bankoff, S. (1993). “Structure of air-water bubbly flow in a vertical pipe. void fraction,

- bubble velocity and bubble size distribution.” *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer*, 36(4), 1061–1072.
- Nina, Y. A., Shi, R., Wüthrich, D., and Chanson, H. (2022). “Aeration performances and air-water mass transfer on steep stepped weirs with horizontal and inclined steps.” *Journal of Hydrodynamics*, 34(5), 904–916.
- Niu, Z., Zhao, W., Luo, Y., Prata, A., and Wang, H. (2024). “Hydrodynamics matters: Unravelling the gas transfer law for the energy dissipation process in a high-energy stream.” *ESS Open Archive*, preprint.
- Rüdisüli, M., Schildhauer, T. J., Biollaz, S. M., and van Ommen, J. R. (2012). “Monte carlo simulation of the bubble size distribution in a fluidized bed with intrusive probes.” *International Journal of Multiphase Flow*, 44, 1–14.
- Severi, A. (2018). “Aeration performance and flow resistance in high-velocity flows over moderately sloped spillways with micro-rough bed.” Ph.D. thesis, The University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia.
- Toombes, L. (2002). “Experimental study of air-water flow properties on low-gradient stepped cascades.” Ph.D. thesis, The University of Queensland, St Lucia, Brisbane.
- Toombes, L. and Chanson, H. (2000). “Air-water flow and gas transfer at aeration cascades: A comparative study of smooth and stepped chutes.” *In International Workshop on Hydraulics of Stepped Spillways (IAHR)*, Minor, H.-E., Hager, W.H., Eds.; A.A. Balkema: Zurich, Switzerland, 2000; pp. S77–S84.
- Toombes, L. and Chanson, H. (2005). “Air-water mass transfer on a stepped waterway.” *Journal of Environmental Engineering*, 131(10), 1377–1386.
- Wang, J., Bombardelli, F. A., and Dong, X. (2021). “Physically based scaling models to predict gas transfer velocity in streams and rivers.” *Water Resources Research*, 57(3), e2020WR028757 e2020WR028757 2020WR028757.
- Wilhelms, S. C. and Gulliver, J. S. (1993). “Reaeration at low-head hydraulic structures.” *Report no.*, U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Washington, DC.

Wuthrich, D. and Chanson, H. (2015). “Aeration performances of a gabion stepped weir with and without capping.” *Environmental Fluid Mechanics*, 15(4), 711–730.